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ABSTRACT

This thesis demonstrates how new theories concerning language and cognition can be applied to our understanding of specific languages, and to the task of translation.

Section one documents the theory of scenarios, how people store, categorize, and access information in the brain, and demonstrates how these mental scenarios are reflected in the grammar and lexicon of texts. It shows how scenarios shared by speaker and audience allow effective communication without enormous verbal detail, and explains how miscommunication occurs, especially across cultural and linguistic divides.

Section two applies scenario theory to the Greek New Testament, demonstrating how specific grammatical forms, such as Participles and the Article, are linked to scenarios. This affects discourse analysis and exegesis, by giving textual evidence that certain scenarios are open, and thus certain information is implicit and intended to be communicated. Scenario theory is also applied to lexical choice, providing a theoretical framework for determining the topic of a passage, and clarifying exegetical decisions.

Section three applies scenario theory to texts in the Parkari language of Pakistan. This not only helps in textual analysis, explaining the choice and significance of certain grammatical forms, but also demonstrates that although Parkari, like New Testament Greek and English, uses different grammatical forms depending on whether a scenario is currently open or not, the specific forms used differ between languages.

Section four shows how the mismatch of mental scenarios, between original speakers of New Testament Greek and modern Parkaris, highlights potential problem areas in translation. It also suggests possible solutions to such problems, by using scenario theory not only to determine the author's intended meaning, but also to provide strategies for communicating that same meaning in translation, specifically addressing the issue of what information is implicit in the source text, and when and how to make it explicit in translation.
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INTRODUCTION

Motivation for research

The motivation for this research is practical as well as theoretical. As members of SIL International, my wife and I have worked with the Parkari people in a language development, literacy and Bible translation programme, under the auspices of the Language Project of the Church of Pakistan. Whilst translating the New Testament into the Parkari language, it was often necessary for the translation team to change wording, or to make implicit information explicit in order to convey accurately to the intended audience the message preserved for us in the Greek texts.

At a Translation Consultant Workshop in Summer 1993, Kathleen Callow described a theory of cognition, being developed by both linguists and cognitive psychologists, that explains how people store information in the brain by linking it into experientially related networks, known as scenarios, which are used to structure people’s world-view and communication. It was then that I realized the significance of scenario theory in giving a solid theoretical grounding for certain translation principles which have long been accepted in practice as necessary for meaningful and accurate cross-cultural communication. I hope this thesis will help to weld the insights of linguistic theorists and cognitive psychologists more tightly to the principles and practice of biblical exegesis and translation.

Translation problems requiring a theory

In translating scripture certain problems arise which do not seem to be related to an individual issue of exegesis or lexical mismatch, but seem to be symptomatic of a deeper underlying issue, the way communication works. It is these problems which modern linguistic theory has begun to address.

Sometimes the words of the original text do not seem to say everything they mean, e.g. Acts 12:19 “Herod ... having examined the guards ordered that they be led away.” The RSV, like many other versions, translates: “Herod ... examined the sentries and ordered that they should be put to death.” But on what theoretical basis does a translator add this “new” concept of execution into the text?

Sometimes the words of the original text do not seem to fit the situation at all, e.g. Matthew 19:12 “there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs on account of the kingdom of heaven.” The New Living Translation says: “and some choose not to marry for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven.” What theory justifies changing the text from “becoming a eunuch” to “choosing not to marry”? What does the word “eunuch” mean?

Sometimes characters are introduced as though we already know who they are, when we do not, e.g. Luke 5:14, Jesus having healed a leper says “Go and show yourself to
the priest...” What priest? There is no priest in the immediately preceding text. How do we know which priest is being referred to? And if we knew, on what theoretical basis should we clarify that in a translation?

Sometimes the facts are clear in the text, but the rationale is not clear. We cannot read between the lines, e.g. in Mark 5:33, about the woman who had an “issue of blood”, we read: “then the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what had happened to her, came and fell before him and told him the whole truth.” Why was she afraid? What was the “whole truth”? Something is obviously going on here, but we are not told what it is. And if we do know what it is, on what theoretical basis should we add it to the text when we translate?

Sometimes we are given clues to understand why characters act the way they do, but we do not spot them. Instead, we infer our own reasons, from our own viewpoint, e.g. in Luke 10:25-37, the parable of the good Samaritan, why did the priest and the Levite pass by on the other side? Most English readers conclude they were uncaring people, who did not love their neighbour, unlike the Samaritan, who cared. But the text does not say! Is it important to know why characters act as they do? What clues are in the text? If we know why they acted in this way, should we “add” it to the text in a translation? Is there an applicable theory?

I believe that the theory of scenarios gives a theoretical basis for understanding and resolving all these problems.

Outline of thesis

The first section of this thesis discusses scenario theory, and investigates the nature of scenarios and their significance for understanding discourse. Chapter one surveys the development of scenario theory. Chapter two describes the structure and content of scenarios. Chapter three relates scenarios to the classification of information status, arguing for a connection between scenarios and Hearer-old information, and shows how scenarios are significant in affecting grammatical and lexical choice and guiding readers in their understanding of text. Chapter four shows how scenarios provide structure and cohesion at discourse level and assist comprehension and memory.

The second section of this thesis concerns New Testament Greek, and investigates how the author’s scenarios can be deduced by analysing grammatical and lexical patterns in the original texts. Chapter five investigates the relationship between scenarios and Greek Verb Phrases and tests the hypothesis that Participles are used for Hearer-old information. Chapter six investigates the relationship between scenarios and Greek Noun Phrases and tests the hypothesis that Hearer-new items are always anarthrous, and the Greek article marks Hearer-old information, with anarthrous exceptions indicating salience. Chapter seven identifies various other grammatical forms which refer to Hearer-old information. Chapter eight explores the link between scenarios and lexical cohesion.
Chapter nine shows how scenario theory can be used in discourse analysis of the New Testament.

The third section of this thesis concerns the Parkari language, and investigates how Parkari scenarios are reflected in the grammar and lexicon of Parkari texts. The chapters directly correspond to those in the Greek section. Chapter ten investigates the relationship between scenarios and Parkari Verb Phrases and tests the hypothesis that Nonfinal verb forms are used for Hearer-old information. Chapter eleven investigates the relationship between scenarios and Parkari Noun Phrases and tests the hypothesis that salient Hearer-new items are always identified by a specific salience marker along with the noun, whereas nouns without that salience marker refer to Hearer-old items or non-salient Hearer-new items. Chapter twelve identifies various other grammatical forms which refer to Hearer-old information. Chapter thirteen explores the link between scenarios and lexical cohesion. Chapter fourteen shows how scenario theory can be used in discourse analysis of Parkari texts.

The final section of this thesis concerns translation, and shows how scenario theory can be used both to identify causes of miscommunication in translation and to provide possible solutions. Chapter fifteen investigates the mismatch between scenarios in New Testament Greek and modern Parkari, and gives examples of how this results in miscommunication. Chapter sixteen uses scenario theory to provide a theoretical basis for certain translation principles which can be used to counteract scenario mismatch, and gives examples of the use of these principles in the Parkari translation of the New Testament.

Conventions used for terminology, transcriptions and glosses

To distinguish technical terminology from ordinary uses of the same terms, this thesis uses various conventions. Inverted commas are used for the four semantic classes "event", "thing", attribute" and "relation". Initial capitalization is used for specific grammatical and linguistic terms (e.g. Present Indicative, Prenuclear Aorist Participle, Hearer-old, Perfective and Imperfective Aspect, Event and Process). Full capitalization is used for certain semantic categories such as information status (e.g. NEW, GIVEN), discourse levels (e.g. PARAGRAPH, EPISODE) and interclausal relationships (e.g. MEANS, RESULT).

This thesis uses texts and examples from both New Testament Greek and Parkari. Where only the broad sense is required, I quote in English rather than the original language. The Parkari translation is always my own, the Greek translation is my own unless acknowledged. Where the focus is on a given lexical item, I quote the original language together with an English gloss for the benefit of those unfamiliar with the source language. Where the grammatical form of the original text is in focus, I give the original text, a word level gloss and a translation, each on separate lines.
For Greek, the word level gloss uses hyphens between multiple words which translate a single Greek word (e.g. he-cut), and uses () to gloss ἴε and ἴεν which have no obvious equivalent. In order to clearly indicate the Greek verbal form, Aorist participles are glossed "having-verbed" and Present Participles are glossed "verbing", which does not match the original Aspectual distinction of Perfective and Imperfective, but reflects their most common pragmatic meaning. The gloss translates case by the pragmatic meaning in context rather than reflecting the form of the Greek and omits case where it obscures the phrase or clause structure in English.

Parkari texts and examples are given in the International Phonetic Alphabet, IPA, rather than in the Parkari orthography, which uses a modification of the Arabic-based Sindhi script. Hyphens are used to divide Parkari words into morphemes, and the word level gloss also uses hyphens between the glosses of each morpheme. Where two English words gloss a single Parkari morpheme they are joined by a full stop, e.g. "just.as". The glosses use -P for suffixes marking Person, and -G for suffixes marking Gender, enabling the reader to identify verb forms without focussing on distinctions which are not relevant to this thesis. The Parkari texts referred to, together with a list of grammatical morphemes including -P and -G suffixes, are given in full with glosses and translations in Appendix O.
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Chapter 1
SCENARIO THEORY
AN OVERVIEW

This chapter provides a brief overview of the development of the theory of scenarios, which are mental networks of information, formed by categorizing our experiences into related concepts, and used for understanding the world and communicating with others. In this chapter I also list and compare various terms used to describe scenarios, and suggest how scenario theory is relevant for exegesis and translation.

The development of scenario theory

Scenario theory is being developed and applied in a wide range of disciplines. Linguists, artificial intelligence researchers, educationalists, and cognitive psychologists have made observations which have contributed towards the theory of scenarios, and to the potential of this theory in helping us understand the nature of learning, communicating, and understanding. I list some important theorists, in broad chronological order, noting their key points and how these relate to translation.

Bartlett

Bartlett, a social psychologist conducting experiments on memory, was apparently the first to describe scenarios, using the term “schema”. In his book Remembering (1932) he argued from experimental evidence, testing English speakers’ recall of a North American Indian story, that memory is a “construction” rather than a “copy” of the information presented, and that our our previous knowledge stored as large chunks of organized information in the brain, affects, and indeed may distort, what we remember.

Although his experimental procedures can be faulted, his basic findings have been confirmed by further research (Eysenck, 1993:88-89). The way scenario mismatch distorts the understanding and recall of a text is of great significance for Bible translation.

Rumelhart

Rumelhart, a cognitive psychologist developing the theory of cognition and comprehension, proposed a more developed concept of the scenario, which he terms “schema” (1975, 1980 et al.). Information is organized in the brain in schemas. Each
schema consists of a number of nodes, each of which corresponds to a conceptual category. Within each schema the nodes are interlinked, being related to each other in a variety of ways. Each schema is also interlinked with other schemas, and these are also inter-related in a variety of ways. This means that words do not relate to dictionary-type entries in the brain, but to much more complex interlinked schemas.

Rumelhart sees these schemas as not simply a means of storing facts, but together constituting the individual’s view of the world, enabling the individual to meaningfully interpret events, objects and situations (1980).

Since the interlinking of nodes and schemas is conceptually based, according to our individual experiences of the world, people of different languages and cultures have different interlinking conceptual networks. Consequently translators must know what conceptual links are implicit between items in the original text, and make them explicit if necessary.

Minsky

Minsky, calling scenarios “frames”, defines them as mental structures representing stereotyped situations, by which we understand new situations, and which we constantly update in the light of experience (1975). Stereotypical elements function as “defaults” within these frames unless contradicted.

Since understanding and interpretation is based on comparison between the “remembered framework” and the actual situation, it is vital in communication that the audience access the appropriate “frame”. However, as we shall see below, experience, and thus “remembered frameworks” are affected by culture. So translations, which normally involve transfer of meaning not just across language but also across culture, will be interpreted in the light of different frames from those of the original author and audience. This means that a translation must do more than duplicate words, it must duplicate the situational frames those words originally referred to.

Minsky acknowledges that people’s mental frames can be modified in the light of new experience. This means that translated scriptures can modify people’s scenarios, e.g. connecting God with love and forgiveness.

Fillmore

Fillmore, a linguist, had already recognized how event words presuppose the existence of wider frames. Verbs have a frame which includes certain participant roles, and this affects both grammar and semantics. The grammatical marking of participants (e.g. case, prepositions, word order) identifies the participants’ underlying semantic role. Each language has its own rules as to which role slots must be made explicit in the grammar. So the “case frame” for any given lexical item contains both semantic roles (“deep structure”) and grammatical markers (“surface structure”). Fillmore explains (1968:31-32):
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the deep structure of (the propositional component of) every simple sentence is an array consisting of a
V [Verb] plus a number of NP's [Noun Phrases] holding special labeled relations (cases) to the sentence.
These relations, which are provided for categorially, include such concepts as Agentive, Instrumental,
Objective, Factivive, Locative, Benefactive...
A surface case system may be related to the set of underlying cases in a variety of ways.
Fillmore's "case frame" was similar to the core participant roles of an "event" scenario,
but without any encyclopaedic information, such as who would prototypically fill these roles.

Later Fillmore showed how words relate not to simple dictionary definitions in the
brain, but to complex scenarios based on cultural norms and expectations (1982a). He
gives the example of "bachelor", which does not simply mean "unmarried man" but
presupposes a society with specific expectations that males of a certain age should marry.
Consequently it is odd to call the Pope a bachelor. Though we cannot say the Pope is NOT
a bachelor, we can say he is not a prototypical bachelor, since a bachelor prototypically has
the option of marriage available, but the Pope does not.

Fillmore's concept of case frames has been applied to New Testament Greek by
Danove (1993) in his analysis of the choice between genitive and accusative cases with the
verb ἀκούω "hear", and in arguing for the reading in 1 John 2:20 as πάντες (masculine
plural nominative) since the case frame for ἴδια "know" need not grammaticalize the
contents of the complement slot where it is recoverable from the immediate context.
Danove also uses case frames (1993b) in the analysis of the discourse structure of Mark's Gospel,
showing how the roles of participants help identify pericopes, and how the explicit
surface representation of optional elements of the case frame, such as "gladly" in "hear
gladly" is used to set up specific linguistic frames thematic to the book.

As regards translation, Fillmore, by identifying that scenarios are culture-specific,
and that the grammatical markers of the case-frame are language specific, gives a
theoretical basis for understanding common translation problems of lexical and
grammatical mismatch. Case frame mismatch, including the mismatch of which
participants must be grammatically marked, can result in instances where what is implicit
in the source language must grammatically be made explicit in the target language. In such
instances exegetical decisions must be made based on context rather than the text itself.
For example, in languages which must grammatically show the agent, all source language
passive constructions must be given explicit agents (e.g. God, people, or someone specific)
depending on the wider context. Part of this context is, of course, the case frame (i.e. core
participants of the event scenario) of the source language

Schank and Abelson

Schank, working in artificial intelligence, and Abelson, a social psychologist, in
their book Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding (1977) develop scenario theory by
using the computer as a metaphor for expressing and evaluating a possible model of
cognition. They see their work as relevant to artificial intelligence, psychology and linguistics and argue that what works on a computer is probably close to the way the mind works (1977:175-6):

we have presented the theories outlined in this book as theories of human natural language processing. One possible test of the adequacies of those theories is their viability as the basis of computer programs... if understanding programs can be written we have a viable theory... the fact that a theory works for the basis of a computer program means that it effectively characterizes the process that it is modelling.

They stress that understanding any section of text depends on identifying a scenario into which the elements of that text fit. Thus comprehension depends on previous experience, which allows accurate communication without making everything explicit. They argue that memory is organized on the basis of experience, putting similar experiences into the one grouping. They emphasize the need to correctly understand the intention of characters in order to predict their likely actions, and so follow the plot of a narrative.

Since explicit language in a text is like shorthand referring to pre-existing scripts in the audience’s mind, in translation, if the target audience has no such script, the “shorthand” will need to be made “longhand”, i.e. implicit facts and relationships must be made explicit. They note that intention is often implicit, since it is part of known scripts. Therefore, in translation, the purpose of certain actions may need to be made explicit if it is not clear from the target language scripts.

Schank (1981) also proposes that memory is arranged hierarchically in Memory Organization Packets (MOPs) with higher levels being generalized scenarios and lower levels storing specific details of particular events. This low-level memory is normally only short term, being absorbed in generalized form into the higher level scenarios. Only if an event is peculiar or untypical are the details retained in low-level memory. This accounts for both “semantic” memory with generalized information stored in high-level structures, i.e. scenarios, and “episodic” memory with significant details of events stored in low-level memory.

Sanford and Garrod

Sanford and Garrod, as discourse analysts, demonstrate conclusively the essential role of scenarios in correctly understanding a text (1981:5):

the message conveyed goes far beyond the individual sentences which make up a text...
(1) Jill came bouncing down the stairs.
(1') Harry rushed off to get the doctor.
Most readers would interpret this in terms of Jill falling on the stairs injuring herself, and as a result of this Harry calling a doctor. Notice how different the interpretation is when (1) is followed by a slightly different sentence.
(1) Jill came bouncing down the stairs.
(1") Harry rushed over to kiss her.
What this suggests is that far from being tied to the literal content of the component sentences, the message in a text is dependent on the reader bringing in additional knowledge in an attempt to come up with a coherent interpretation of the passage as a whole.
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This “additional knowledge” used to interpret the text is stored in scenarios. The relevant scenario is called from long-term memory by a particular linguistic input. Each scenario consists of a framework with labelled “slots” for different elements which are expected to occur. When reading or listening to a message, once we recognize which scenario is being referred to by the writer or speaker, the framework of that scenario provides us with the background information necessary for correctly interpreting the message (Sanford and Garrod, 1981:115):

- we use a linguistic input to call up representations of situations or events from long-term memory as soon as we have enough information to do so. In other words a scenario is invoked. Implicit background information would be incorporated within the structure of the initial scenario as part of its definition, while new information from the text would be used to fill partially defined slots available in the skeleton structure, or to otherwise modify it.

- They note that mental scenarios are used for making all types of inferences: lexical inferences (e.g. for solving problems of lexical ambiguity or nominal reference), inferences of space and time, extrapolative inferences (such as Jill hurting herself in the first example above), and evaluative inferences (about the significance of a given statement).

- They also stress the contractual nature of communication (1981:8):
  - The basis on which discourse is produced is essentially contractual. A writer wishes to convey an idea to his readers. In essence, this means that he must establish in the mind of his reader a situational model which is the same (or closely similar to) the one in his own mind. He can then refer to this model as his discourse unfolds and be reasonably certain that what he says will be intelligible.

- Their work is important for translation, because they show not only that texts are understood by the reader’s interlinking the text with existing mental scenarios, but also that the writer has the responsibility to make the appropriate scenario clear to the reader. The implicit/explicit issue then, concerns not simply translation, but communication. Translators, as communicators to a new target audience, must re-evaluate the level of implicit information in accordance with their new audience’s mental scenarios, so that essential links missing in the hearers’ scenarios are supplied explicitly in the text.

Sperber and Wilson

Sperber and Wilson, the proponents of Relevance Theory, in their book *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (1986) emphasize that successful communication is not achieved through language alone, but by the combination of language and a “mutual cognitive environment”, in the light of which that language is structured by the speaker, and understood and interpreted by the hearer. Sperber and Wilson state (1986:39):

\[(40)\] A cognitive environment of an individual is a set of facts that are manifest to him. To be manifest, then, is to be perceptible or inferable. An individual’s total cognitive environment is the set of all the facts that he can perceive or infer: all the facts that are manifest to him. An individual’s total cognitive environment is a function of his physical environment and his cognitive abilities. It consists of not only all the facts that he is aware of, but also all the facts that he is capable of becoming aware of, in his physical environment. The individual’s actual awareness of facts, i.e. the knowledge that he has acquired, of course contributes to his ability to become aware of further facts. Memorized information is a component of cognitive abilities.

- Although they speak of “cognitive environment”, which also includes the real life situation at the time of communication, the “memorized information”, which makes up the
bulk of an individual’s “cognitive environment” and which facilitates perception and inference, is of course the organized body of information categorized and stored in the individual’s mental scenarios.

For Sperber and Wilson, the communicator’s role is to express the message in the most “relevant” way, in the light of assumptions about the audience’s cognitive environment. This includes communicating in the most efficient way, omitting what can be easily inferred, but making explicit anything whose omission would make the text harder to process.

If translation is to be “relevant” it must communicate in this same manner, saying neither too much nor too little to efficiently communicate the author’s intended message. Thus in translation, the decision whether to make part of the message explicit should not be decided simply by what was explicit in the source language text, but rather be based on whether the target audience, in the light of their pre-existing mental scenarios, will understand the original message easily and accurately.

**Howard**

Howard (1987) writes as an educationalist to help teachers develop in pupils the concepts they need for comprehension. Howard’s summaries give an excellent overview of the structure and role of scenarios.

Howard, using the term “schema” for scenario, emphasizes that one’s mental scenarios are based on one’s experience, and are used in categorization and making inferences (1987:31):

A schema can be defined as an organized body of knowledge, a mental structure that represents some part of some stimulus domain (Rumelhart and Ortony 1977; Rumelhart 1980). Like a concept, a schema is a representation abstracted from experience, which is used to understand the world and deal with it. It consists of a set of expectations about how part of the world is organized; these expectations are applied to categorize various stimuli.

He stresses that in education it is vital to teach new information by systematically connecting it to what is already known, i.e. to relate new concepts to the scenarios they belong in. This is a conscious attempt to facilitate what cognitive theorists posit happens naturally over time through multiple experiences.

Translators, like teachers, must ensure that they accurately communicate a new concept, by enabling their audience to identify the scenario the new concept belongs in, and also how that concept relates to other elements of the same scenario.

**Wierzbicka**

Anna Wierzbicka, a semanticist, in her books *The Semantics of Grammar* (1988) and *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition* (1992), argues forcibly that there are indeed some universal concepts, but vocabulary tends to refer to *culturally* relevant clusters of concepts (i.e. scenarios). Thus the lexicon of a given language reflects the culture of the people who
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speak it. Although the real world may be common to people, nevertheless it is people themselves who classify whatever exists in the real world, and different peoples classify the world differently. She also emphasizes the meaning of words in relation to real life human experiences, rather than the Saussurean idea of contrastive definitions.

Wierzbicka also gives an enormous amount of detail in her dictionary entries, reflecting the encyclopaedic nature of scenarios. This is totally in contrast to a Saussurean approach which would give the minimum amount of information necessary to distinguish one word from another.

As regards translation, her work reinforces the need for the translator to be aware of the full range of semantic associations of words in both source and target language, and not to assume that any word in one language means exactly the same as a word in another language.

Lakoff

Lakoff, a linguist, also reacted against the Saussurean “objectivist” view of language, characterizing it as the “CONDUIT theory” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:231):

When it really counts, meaning is almost never communicated according to the CONDUIT metaphor, that is where one person transmits a fixed, clear proposition to another by means of expressions in a common language, where both parties have all the relevant common knowledge, assumptions, values etc. When the chips are down, meaning is negotiated...

He stresses that the speaker must communicate in the light of what he assumes to be the knowledge, assumptions, and values of the audience (i.e. their mental scenarios). The speaker’s role is to present his message in such a way that the audience understands it accurately. Meaning is “negotiated” in as much as the speaker tries to guess what the audience will understand, and the audience draws their own conclusion as to the meaning (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:179):

We understand a statement as true in a given situation when our understanding of the statement fits our understanding of the situation closely enough for our purposes.

Lakoff also reacted against the “objectivist” view of categories, where groups are defined by sharing a common property. He argues that categorization can be related to “holistically structured activities” i.e. categories that are related experientially (1987:21):

A modifier like cricket in cricket bat, cricket ball, cricket umpire, and so on does not pick out any common property or similarity shared by bats, balls, and umpires. It refers to the structured activity as a whole. And the nouns that cricket can modify form a category, but not a category based on shared properties... Cognitive psychologists have recently begun to study categories based on such holistically structured activities... Such categories, among their other properties, do not show family resemblances among their members.

Lakoff’s main thesis in his book *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things* is that “we organize our knowledge by means of structures called Idealized Cognitive Models, or ICMs, and that category structures and prototype effects are by-products of that organization” (1987:68). In other words our experience is understood and organized according to our own culturally-specific idealized model of reality, not reality itself. Lakoff’s definitions of ICMs provide a detailed account of scenario structure.
Lakoff explicitly traces his ideas to four sources within cognitive linguistics (1987:68): Fillmore’s frame semantics (Fillmore, 1982b), which he compares to schema theory (Rumelhart, 1975), scripts (Schank and Abelson, 1977) and frames with defaults (Minsky, 1975), Lakoff and Johnson’s theory of metaphor and metonymy (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), Langacker’s cognitive grammar (Langacker, 1986) and Fauconnier’s theory of mental spaces (Fauconnier, 1985). Since Langacker and Fauconnier’s work is largely outside the scope of this thesis, and Lakoff incorporates their specific observations concerning image-schematic structure (Langacker, 1986:38-40) and metonymy (Fauconnier, 1985:3-34), they are not included in this overview.

Lakoff defines these Idealized Cognitive Models as follows (1987:68):
- propositional structure, as in Fillmore’s frames
- image-schematic structure, as in Langacker’s cognitive grammar
- metaphoric mappings, as described by Lakoff and Johnson
- metonymic mappings, as described by Lakoff and Johnson

Lakoff argues that certain basic concepts are associated metaphorically with our bodily experiences as human beings, and these Idealized Cognitive Models, or metaphorical ways of categorizing our human experience, affect the structuring of our mental structures and our language. These different types of ICMs affect the way scenarios are structured and interlinked.

Translation may seem impossible, given Lakoff’s stress on the experiential and holistic nature of mental categorization. However his definition of “true” as what “fits our understanding of the situation closely enough for our purposes” allows for translation between languages as a possibility. Translation, then, is not transferring identical thoughts, but enabling the new audience to fit what the original author said into their own conceptual viewpoint well enough to achieve the author’s purpose.

Summary of the development of scenario theory

Although in 1932 the psychologist Bartlett recognized that memory was a construction based on input rather than a copy of the input, and documented how cultural differences between writer and audience skewed recall, these ideas were left undeveloped. Much later, in 1968, the linguist Fillmore proposed the concept of “case frames” for verbs, where the participants had both conceptualized semantic roles, and grammatical surface marking. However, the real expansion of research into the theory of scenarios has taken place from the mid 1970s onwards, and has involved a fusing of these separate disciplines of psychology and linguistics, together with new input from computer science particularly in the field of artificial intelligence. Currently, not only is the theory being developed and refined, but being applied to other disciplines, for example by Howard to education (1987), by Danove to exegesis and textual criticism (1993, 1993b), and in this thesis to discourse analysis and translation.
Terminology

As shown above, the theory of scenarios has been developed in a variety of disciplines, and different theorists use different terminology for scenarios, even when referring to essentially the same concepts. The concept of scenarios relates closely to what are called frames (Minsky, 1975; Fillmore, 1982b), schemata or schemas (Rumelhart and Ortony, 1977), scripts (Schank and Abelson, 1977; Riesbeck and Schank, 1978), Idealized Cognitive Models (Lakoff, 1987), and relational frameworks (Callow, 1998).

I compare and contrast the use of terminology below.

Scenario

This thesis uses the term “scenario”, as do Sanford and Garrod (1981), to refer to the cognitive structures in our minds, which we form by categorizing our experiences, and we use to organize information and to retrieve information from memory.

Schema

Schema is the term for scenario used by both Bartlett and Rumelhart. Mandler (1984) lists scenes, scripts and stories as types of schemata, to which Howard (1987) adds persons and actions.

Scenes and persons are sub-types of “thing” scenarios. Actions are “event” scenarios. Scripts are complex “event” scenarios which contain prototypically co-occurring sequences of events.

The story schema is a prototypical framework for a narrative story, and is an abstraction or generalization of a macro-script, i.e. a series of prototypically co-occurring “event” scenarios. These include participants, purpose, events to achieve that purpose, and problems which interrupt the successful completion of the script thus initiating sub-scripts.

Frame, Relational Framework, and Case Frame

Frame is Minsky’s term for scenario. Callow (1998) use the term “relational framework”. Both terms tend to focus on “event” scenarios.

Fillmore’s term “case frame” refers only to the core relationships of an “event” scenario, i.e. the event and its prototypical participants related semantically (“deep structure”), together with the ways those relationships are represented in surface structure. Fillmore’s case frames, at the level of “deep structure”, are posited as language universal. As such they exclude the culture-specific elements of the scenario, such as what type of person prototypically fills what case slot, where, when, why such activity takes place etc.
Script

Script is the term used by Schank and Abelson for a complex type of “event” scenario which includes a prototypical sequence of events. This thesis also uses the terms “script” and “script-type scenario” for this sub-type.

Idealized Cognitive Model

Lakoff uses the term “Idealized Cognitive Models” (ICMs). These ICMs describe the way that scenarios are structured and interlinked.

Lakoff lists five kinds of ICM: image-schematic, propositional, metaphoric; metonymic, and symbolic. The “propositional idealized cognitive model” describes the basic structures of typical “event” and “thing” scenarios. The other ICMs are used in structuring the overall structure of scenarios.

Chart of terminology

Underline = term used for scenario, and author
Normal = term used for scenario subtype, or link, and author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Author/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>scenario frame</td>
<td>Minsky 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“event” case frame (relational framework)</td>
<td>Fillmore 82 (Callow 98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>script</td>
<td>Schank &amp; Abelson 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joined scripts</td>
<td>Rumelhart 77 (Mandler 84 (Howard 87))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>script (action)</td>
<td>Sanford &amp; Garrod 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scenario (propositional ICM) a) proposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“thing” scene (person)</td>
<td>Lakoff 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“attribute”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“relation” / relational link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing-event-attribute link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-whole link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generic-specific link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prototypical core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphorical link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metonymic link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scenario structure (nodes, links, hierarchy etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language to concept link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) feature bundle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) taxonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) radial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor ICM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metonymic ICM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>image-schematic ICM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbolic ICM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Relevance of scenario theory to exegesis and translation

The above writers give overwhelming evidence that communication relies on the communicator and audience having similar mental scenarios. These shared scenarios are the "given" in communication, on the basis of which the communicator chooses how explicit or implicit to be, so that the audience is able to accurately guess the fuller picture of what the communicator is trying to say, by "filling in" what is left unsaid from their existing knowledge stored in their mental scenarios.

However these scenarios are not universally the same, but are culture and language specific. So to understand any text, we must not rely on our own mental scenarios, but identify the mental scenarios in the mind of the original author. Thus knowledge of New Testament Greek scenarios is vital for exegesis of the New Testament texts. Similarly, to translate, we must also know the mental scenarios of the new target audience, since our message must be framed in such a way that they can accurately fill in what the author intended as implicit information, rather than make incorrect assumptions on the basis of their own cultural presuppositions.

But how can we possibly know what other people's scenarios are? Fortunately, there are lexical and grammatical clues. Because concepts are grouped mentally in scenarios, the grouping of vocabulary in a text indicates which concepts were grouped in the writer's mind. Also, as Schank and Abelson point out with respect to scripts, the presence of scenarios may be linked to certain grammatical markers such as the definite article (1977:41):

Scripts allow for new references to objects within them just as if these objects had been previously mentioned; objects within a script may take "the" without explicit introduction because the script itself has already implicitly introduced them.

Since New Testament Greek survives only in texts, without the original writers and audiences being available to explain the content of their mental scenarios, analysis of scenarios in the source text must be based on a correlation between grammar and lexis on the one hand, and probable conceptual associations on the other hand. Where scenarios relate to physical aspects of our existence, such as our bodies, or our mortality, we are on fairly sure ground that certain items are conceptually linked by all humans everywhere. For example, Acts 9:40: δεξιος δε τα γονατα "having-placed () the knees". Here "the knees" refers to the knees of the person performing this action, i.e. Peter. This suggests that the Greek article marks a noun as being part of another scenario already open in the text. Similarly, Acts 9:37: ἐγένετο ... ἀναιματίσαςαυν αυτήν ἀποθάνετιν "it-happened ... having-become-ill her to-die". Here "becoming ill" refers to an event which commonly precedes dying. This suggests that the Greek Aorist Participle before the main verb marks an event which is part of the expected script of the main verb.
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Where grammatical structures correlate with lexical items in relation to such “universal” scenarios, they suggest a hypothesis which can be used to investigate other possible scenarios in the source text. It will be shown in this thesis that where grammatical structures indicate the presence of scenarios, the existence of these scenarios can often be readily confirmed by Biblical or extrabiblical texts, or by archaeological and historical evidence. For example, Acts 14:13b: ἐνὶ ὅθεν τὴν Ἀγιάσματι “to the gates”. The article shows that “the gates” belong in an open scenario, here the scenario of the city (14:13a). This suggests it was quite normal for such a city to have a surrounding wall, and hence gates, which history confirms. Similarly, Acts 9:40: ἔθαμβεν ἐκ τῶν γόνατος προσηκόατο “having-placed () the knees he-prayed”. Here the Greek Aorist Participle before the main verb marks “kneeling” as an event which belongs in the script of the main verb “praying”. This is confirmed by Acts 7:60, and 20:36, the only other occurrences of ἔθαμβεν in Acts.

It is this link between scenarios and both lexicon and grammar which I will investigate in New Testament Greek and in Parkari, to discover what explicit markings there may be in a given text to indicate the presence and nature of open scenarios. Once we can identify source language scenarios we can determine on the basis of this what information is implicit, i.e. not written in the text but expected to be inferred by the readers from their own mental scenarios. By comparing the scenarios of the original author and the current target audience, we can determine what of this implicit information is lacking in the scenarios of the target audience, and must therefore be made explicit in translation, in order to communicate the original message fully and accurately.

Chapter summary

Scenarios are networks of information stored in the brain. We form scenarios by categorizing our experiences and organizing them into related concepts. Scenarios are experientially based, so may differ from culture to culture. We use scenarios to interpret new experiences and to understand and structure communication. Scenarios are highly structured, and the information contained in specific “slots” is used as a “default” in comprehension and communication.

Despite variations in terminology, there is clear cross-discipline consensus about the existence and nature of scenarios.

Accurate communication depends on shared scenarios. Since scenarios affect not only mental conceptualization, but also the grammar and lexicon used in communication, scenarios influence the structure of discourse. This means that the original scenarios can be identified from the grammar and lexicon of the source text, and must be used in exegesis to discover any implied information. Where scenarios differ between source and target languages, implied information may need to be made explicit in translation to enable the new audience to access the original concepts.
Chapter 2
THE STRUCTURE OF SCENARIOS

Since scenarios are clusters of information, which have significance for both exegesis and translation, it is important to understand how they are structured. This chapter investigates the structure of scenarios in detail. I summarize Lakoff’s principles for structuring scenarios, and combine data from various sources to propose typical contents of scenarios for different semantic categories. I also document how, given this structure, the title of a scenario can be used to refer to the whole scenario, and I give examples from New Testament Greek to show how scenario structure links vocabulary as well as concepts.

Scenarios are organized chunks of information

Scenarios can be envisaged as groups of linked information stored in chunks in the brain. The chunking of information into “units” plays an essential part in cognition, memory, communication and comprehension (van Dijk, 1977:159):

[A frame i.e. scenario] denotes a conceptual structure in semantic memory and represents a part of our knowledge of the world. In this respect a frame is an ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLE, relating a number of concepts which by CONVENTION and EXPERIENCE somehow form a ‘unit’ which may be actualized in various cognitive tasks, such as language production and comprehension, perception, action, and problem solving.

The principles by which scenarios are structured

Lakoff details the principles underlying scenario structure, calling them Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs). He lists five basic types (1987:284):
(a) image-schematic; (b) propositional; (c) metaphoric; (d) metonymic; (e) symbolic

I will list and comment on Lakoff’s observations.

(a) image-schematic ICMs

Lakoff, commenting on Johnson (1987), states that our concepts and conceptual structures are based on our bodily experiences (1987:271):

One of Mark Johnson’s basic insights is that experience is structured in a significant way prior to, and independent of, any concepts ... [Johnson] makes an overwhelming case for the embodiment of certain kinesthetic image schemas. Take, for example, a container schema - a schema consisting of a boundary distinguishing an interior from an exterior. The CONTAINER schema defines the most basic distinction between IN and OUT. We understand our own bodies as containers - perhaps the most basic things we do are ingest and excrete, take air into our lungs and breathe it out. But our understanding of our own bodies as containers seems small compared with all the daily experiences we understand in CONTAINER terms ...
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Lakoff lists several types of image-schematic ICMs, each based on our bodily experience, together with their structural elements (1987:272-275):

The CONTAINER schema
Bodily experience: We experience our bodies as containers and as things in containers (e.g. rooms)
Structural elements: INTERIOR, BOUNDARY, EXTERIOR

The PART-WHOLE schema
Bodily experience: We experience our bodies as WHOLEs with PARTs in a set relationship
Structural elements: WHOLE, PARTS, CONFIGURATION

The LINK schema
Bodily experience: We are first linked to mother by the umbilical cord, as children we hold on to parents and things.
Structural elements: Two entities, A and B, and LINK

The CENTER-PERIPHERY schema
Bodily experience: We experience our bodies as having centers (the trunk and internal organs) and peripheries (fingers, toes, hair)
Structural elements: ENTITY, CENTER, PERIPHERY

The SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema
Bodily experience: Going somewhere
Structural elements: SOURCE, DESTINATION, PATH, DIRECTION

Also UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, LINEAR ORDER schemas etc.

I accept Lakoff’s Spatialization of Form hypothesis, that our mental conceptual structures are based on our physical experiences. As Lakoff argues, these image-schematic ICMs are essential for structuring scenarios (1987:283):

- Categories (in general) are understood in terms of CONTAINER schemas.
- Hierarchical structure is understood in terms of PART-WHOLE schemas and UP-DOWN schemas.
- Relational structure is understood in terms of LINK schemas.
- Radial structure in categories is understood in terms of CENTER-PERIPHERY schemas.
- Foreground-background structure is understood in terms of FRONT-BACK schemas.
- Linear quantity scales are understood in terms of UP-DOWN schemas and LINEAR ORDER schemas.

By linking mental structuring to man’s physical body, Lakoff’s theory provides a basis for believing that all humans use the same structures in conceptualizing. In other words, although the contents of individual scenarios are language and culture specific, the structural patterns of scenarios and the way they are linked is universal.

(b) propositional ICMs

Lakoff cites five common types (1987:284):
(a) the proposition; (b) the scenario (sometimes called a “script”); (c) the feature bundle; (d) the taxonomy; (e) the radial category.

Lakoff defines subsection (a) the proposition as follows (1987:285):
A simple proposition consists of an ontology of elements (the “arguments”) and a basic predicate that holds of those arguments ... In addition, certain semantic relations may hold among the arguments: there may be an agent, a patient, an experiencer, an instrument, a location, etc. Semantic relations are represented structurally by link schema, and the kinds of schemas are represented by assignments of links to categories of relations (e.g., the agent category).

Lakoff’s proposition schema underlies the structure of an “event” scenario.
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Lakoff defines subsection (b) the **scenario or script** as follows (1987:285-6):
A scenario consists fundamentally of the following ontology: an initial state; a sequence of events, and a final state. In other words, the scenario is structured by a SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema in the time domain, where
- the initial state = the source
- the final state = the destination
- the events = locations in the path
and the path stretches through time. The scenario is a WHOLE and each of these elements is a PART.

Lakoff also states (1987:286):
The scenario ontology also consists typically of people, things, properties, relations and propositions. In addition there are typically relations of certain kinds holding among the elements of the ontology: causal relations, identity relations, etc. These are represented structurally by link schemas, each of which is characterized as to the kind of relation it represents. Scenarios also have a purpose structure, which specifies the purposes of people in the scenario.

This ICM provides the structure of the script-type scenario, as a series of “event” scenarios, including not only participants, but also causal and purpose relations.

Lakoff defines subsection (c) the **feature bundle** as follows (1987: 286):
A feature bundle is a collection of properties ... Structurally, the bundle is characterized by a CONTAINER schema, where the properties are inside the container. Classical categories can be represented by feature bundles.

The feature bundle structure is typical of “thing” scenarios. It refers to the patterning where a group of different features (such as attributes, part-whole relationships, associated events) are strongly linked together. This linking could be classical, defined by necessary and sufficient features as in a scientific “expert” definition, or it could be experiential, and fuzzy, formed by natural experiences.

Lakoff defines subsection (d) the **taxonomy** as follows (1987: 287):
The elements in the ontology of the taxonomic model are all categories. Each category is represented structurally by a CONTAINER schema. The hierarchy is represented structurally by PART-WHOLE and UP-DOWN schemas. Each higher-order category is a whole, with the immediately lower categories being its parts.

This kind of propositional ICM models a way in which scenarios can be linked, i.e. specific-generic and part-whole links of this thesis.

Taxonomy does not presume “scientific” definitions such as “a fruit is a fleshy part of a plant containing seeds” by which tomatoes are fruits. In everyday life, most British people categorize tomatoes with vegetables because they generally share the same attributes, function the same way, and are connected with the same activities and locations, e.g. eaten in sandwiches, kept in the fridge. These experiential categories have “fuzzy boundaries” as Lakoff explains (1987:287-8):
In classical categories, the boundary is sharp and does not have any internal structure. But in graded categories, the boundary is fuzzy; it is given a “width,” defined by a linear scale of values between 0 and 1, with 1 at the interior and 0 at the exterior. Elements are not merely in the interior or exterior, but may be located in the fuzzy boundary area, at some point along the scale between 0 and 1. That point defines the degree of membership of the given element.
In categories with fuzzy boundaries one can qualify membership, e.g. “A chaise-longue is like a cross between a chair and a sofa.”
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Lakoff defines subsection (e) the radial category as follows (1987: 287):
Like other categories, a radial category is represented structurally as a container, and its subcategories are containers inside it. What distinguishes it is that it is structured by the CENTRE-PERIPHERY schema. One subcategory is the center; the other subcategories are linked to the center by various types of links. Noncentral categories may be “subcenters,” that is, they may have further center-periphery structures imposed on them.

This radial category shows that some categories or concepts are not simple but are like wheels with one complex hub and numerous spokes attached. Lakoff gives “mother” as an example of a radial category, stating (1987:91):
The central case, where all the models converge, includes a mother who is and has always been a female, and who gave birth to the child, supplied her half of the child’s genes, nurtured the child, is married to the father, is one generation older than the child, and is the child’s legal guardian.

He then lists stepmother, adoptive mother, surrogate mother, etc. and says: “These subcategories of mother are all understood as deviations from the central case.” The central case has a feature bundle connected to it, but each other case is linked to only part of that feature bundle.

Lakoff’s ICMs are not so much types of scenario as ways of structuring information within scenarios. For example “cat” is the title of a scenario, which links to propositions (e.g. “Cats purr”), to scripts (e.g. “When you stroke cats, they purr”), to attributes (e.g. “furry”), to feature bundles (e.g. all the attributes which together make cats “feline”, including body shape, whiskers, tail, face shape, grace of movement), and to categories and hierarchies (e.g. “Tigers and leopards are types of cat”, “Cats are animals”).

(c) metaphoric ICMs

Lakoff defines the mental processes involved in the use of metaphorical language (1987:288):
A metaphoric mapping involves a source domain and a target domain. The source domain is assumed to be structured by a propositional or image-schematic model. The mapping is typically partial; it maps the structure of the ICM in the source domain onto a corresponding structure in the target domain. As we mentioned above, the source and target domains are represented structurally by CONTAINER schemas, and the mapping is represented by a SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema.

This metaphorical ICM allows scenarios in one domain to be linked to scenarios in another domain. This mapping is typically partial, so not every element of the one scenario corresponds metaphorically to an element in the other scenario. Also mapping is done at the level of a structure not an individual isolated concept, so metaphors usually occur in groups (see Lakoff and Johnson, 1980).

Metaphorical linking between scenarios allows for a whole series of related metaphorical expressions, and for the natural expansion of known metaphors. A biblical example is the metaphorical link between the shepherd and spiritual leader scenarios. Since each of these scenarios is linked to events and other participants, many metaphors operate along the same link, e.g. sheep/flock means people/disciples, feed/pasture means care for/teach. These standard metaphors can also be expanded by the linked scenarios to
include: fold means fellowship/community of believers, thieves/robbers means false teachers, wolves means people who harm the believers, etc.

\[(d)\] metonymic ICMs

Lakoff defines metonymic ICMs as follows (1987:288):
A metonymic mapping occurs within a single conceptual domain which is structured by an ICM. Given two elements, A and B, in the ICM, A may "stands-for" B. The "stands-for" relation is represented structurally by a SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema.

Lakoff points out that metonyms, like metaphors, are usually not isolated phenomena, but group according to a generic organizational principle. For example (1987:511):
THE THING PERCEIVED STANDS FOR THE PERCEPT
Among the percepts are sounds, smells, pains, etc., while the things perceived are entities that give rise to the percepts like alarm clocks, chemical factories, injured knees, etc. This metonymy shows up in the synonymy of sentences like
- There goes the beep.
- There goes the alarm clock.

Similarly, Matthew 13:16 “Blessed are your eyes because they see, and your ears because they hear” contains the metonymic ICM: “THE ORGAN OF PERCEPTION STANDS FOR THE PERCEIVER IN RELATION TO THAT ACT OF PERCEPTION.” “Organs of perception” includes eyes, ears, noses, etc., and “acts of perception” includes events such as see, hear, smell. This metonymy shows up in the synonymy of sentences like:
Blessed are you because you see.
Blessed are your eyes because they see.

\[(e)\] symbolic ICMs

Lakoff defines symbolic ICMs as follows (1987:289):
Purely conceptual ICMs can be characterized independently of the words and morphemes of particular languages. When linguistic elements are associated with conceptual elements in ICMs, the result is what we shall call a symbolic ICM.

So symbolic ICMs relate lexical items, grammatical categories, and grammatical constructions to concepts, semantic categories, and propositions. In this way scenarios structure not only our mental processes, but also the language by which we express ourselves.

Lakoff further states (1987:289):
As Fillmore has established in his papers on frame semantics (Fillmore 1975, 1976, 1978, 1982a, 1982b, and 1985) the meanings of lexical items - words and morphemes - are characterized in terms of cognitive models. The meaning of each lexical item is represented as an element in an ICM. The ICM as a whole is taken as the background against which the word is defined.

So a concept gets its meaning by its relationship to a scenario, and words are associated with concepts by means of symbolic ICMs. Thus a lexical item in a given language, by association with one element of a scenario, is connected to the whole network of structural links within that scenario, and to links between that scenario and other scenarios. In this way the scenario is “the background against which that word is defined.”

Grammatical categories are also structured by ICMs (Lakoff, 1987:289-90):
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The traditional definition of the grammatical category noun as the name of a person, place, or thing is not that far off. The best examples of nouns are words for basic-level physical objects. Noun is a radial category. Its central subcategory consists of names for physical entities - people, places, things. Those are the prototypical nouns. There are of course noncentral nouns: abstract nouns (like strength), and strange nouns that occur only in idioms (like umbrage in take umbrage at). Verb is also a radial category with basic-level physical actions as central members (e.g. run, hit, give, etc.). Thus, although grammatical categories as a whole cannot be given strict classical definitions in semantic terms, their central subcategories can be defined in just that way. The remaining members of each grammatical category can then be motivated by their relationships to the central members.

This explains why grammatical categories frequently match semantic categories (i.e. nouns for “things,” verbs for “events,” adjectives and adverbs for “attributes,” and prepositions and conjunctions for “relations”), and yet there is skewing both within a given language, and between languages.

This fact is extremely significant for translation. Since translation is about communicating meaning (semantically based) then the mismatch of semantic categories and grammatical categories, both within languages and between languages, will mean that the grammatical category will sometimes need to be changed. In some cases the source language will be skewed in a way that is unnatural for the target language, e.g. the use of an abstract noun μέτανοια ("repentance") in New Testament Greek for an “event” concept such as “repent”. In other cases the target language will be skewed in a way that is different from the source language, e.g. the use of an abstract noun “beginning” in the Parkari language for an “event” concept “begin”. To communicate clearly and naturally, a translation needs to observe the language-specific relationship between grammar and semantics in the target language, rather than try to preserve the specific grammatical form of the source text.

Syntactic structure is also characterized in terms of ICMs (Lakoff, 1987:290):
- Hierarchical syntactic structure (i.e. constituent structure) is characterized by PART-WHOLE schemas;
  The mother node is the whole and the daughters are the parts.
- Head-and-modifier structures are characterized by CENTER-PERIPHERY schemas.
- Grammatical relations and co-reference relations are represented structurally by LINK schemas.
- Syntactic “distance” is characterized by LINEAR SCALE schemas.
- Syntactic categories, like other categories, are characterized by CONTAINER schemas.

The general principle of a relationship between grammatical constructions and ICMs is significant for the topic of this thesis. The fact that “Grammatical relations and co-reference relations are represented structurally by LINK schemas” is vital for explaining how the relationships within and between scenarios are mirrored by certain grammatical constructions in Greek and Parkari, specifically a correlation between certain constructions and whether the scenarios they relate to are open or closed.

The Central ICM: An Experiential Gestalt

Lakoff makes a further point about ICMs which is significant for this thesis (1987:490-1):

It is one of the principal findings of prototype theory that certain clusters of conditions are more basic to human experience than other clusters and also more basic than individual conditions in the cluster.
Lakoff and Johnson (1980) refer to such a cluster as an experiential gestalt. Such a gestalt is often representable by an ICM. It should be borne in mind that in such cases the entire ICM is understood as being psychologically simpler than its parts - hence the term gestalt.

Lakoff’s example of an experiential gestalt is the ICM for “pointing out” which consists of some 20 interrelated elements (1987:490-1). Although all humans (we presume) point things out, the contents of this ICM are culture specific, e.g. Westerners tend to point with the index finger of their right hand, but in Parkari culture you point by raising your chin in the relevant direction.

Lakoff’s key point is that gestalts are experiential, and although human experiences are very similar when they relate to the physical nature of our bodies and environment, our experiences may differ greatly when they relate to our specific environment and culture. So as we look at the typical contents of scenarios, let us not forget that scenarios are language and culture specific, and what in one language and culture is a gestalt may not even exist in another culture as a gestalt at all, since it may have no experiential significance.

The content of scenarios

Scenarios contain all the information related to a given concept. Sperber and Wilson list three types of information - logical, encyclopaedic and lexical - which are linked to any given concept and stored in the brain at a “conceptual address” (1986:86):

The information that may be stored in memory at a certain conceptual address falls into three distinct types: logical, encyclopaedic and lexical. The logical entry for a concept consists of a set of deductive rules which apply to logical forms of which that concept is a constituent. The encyclopaedic entry contains information about the extension and/or denotation of the concept: that is about the objects, events and/or properties which instantiate it. The lexical entry contains information about the natural-language counterpart of the concept or phrase of natural language which expresses it. On this approach a conceptual address is thus a point of access to the logical, encyclopaedic and linguistic information which may be needed in the processing of logical forms containing this address.

The lexical entry includes what I refer to as the “title” of a scenario, i.e. the word or phrase in a given language related to the concept in focus. According to Sperber and Wilson it also contains “information about its syntactic category membership and co-occurrence possibilities, phonological structure and so on” (1986:90).

The encyclopaedic entry forms the main bulk of the scenario’s contents, as Sperber and Wilson note (1986:87):

... various models have been proposed to describe what we are calling encyclopaedic entries. These models are intended to answer questions about the structure of the entries, the relations between the various kinds of assumption contained in them, and the relations among the entries themselves. Many of the models that have been proposed incorporate such notions as schema, frame, prototype or script.

The logical entry I do not regard as a separate category per se, but rather as part of the encyclopaedic entry, consisting not of “real” logical connections, but rather a cataloguing of experiences which are perceived as related. For example, “If I break a mirror then I will have seven years bad luck” would be in the same “logical” form as “If I walk off a cliff, then I will fall.”
Sperber and Wilson regard the logical entry as essential for deducing implicatures, by being linked to a “deductive device” (1986:94-5):

The device we envisage is an automaton with a memory and the ability to read, write and erase logical forms, compare their formal properties, store them in memory, and access the deductive rules contained in the logical entries for concepts. Deductions proceed as follows. A set of assumptions which will constitute the axioms, or initial theses, of the deduction are placed in the memory of the device. It reads each of these assumptions, accesses the logical entries of each of its constituent concepts, applies any rule whose structural description is satisfied by that assumption, and writes the resulting assumption down in its memory as a derived thesis. Where a rule provides descriptions of two input assumptions, the device checks to see whether it has in memory an appropriate pair of assumptions; if so, it writes the output assumption down in its memory as a derived thesis. The process applies to all initial and derived theses until no further deductions are possible.

I propose that these theses, which Sperber and Wilson see as logically formulated by the deductive device, are in fact formulated as a consequence of real life (first or second hand) experience, and are not necessarily logical, but simply perceived personally as such (perhaps under the influence of cultural norms). So at the time of making implicatures, the brain is not normally formulating logical theses, or even accessing pre-formulated logical theses, but rather accessing existing theses which consist of concepts already linked in mental scenarios by our structuring of previous experience.

How then is our experience structured? A newborn baby instinctively cries when hungry. Normally his mother with then come and put him to the breast. His innate suckling reflex means he will suck at the nipple and normally he will get milk. The child’s crying and suckling are instinctive, but through repeated experiences he learns a connection between his crying and his mother’s arrival, between his sucking and his getting milk, between his drinking milk and his feeling comfortable. These mental connections are the beginning of the experiential links which form complex scenarios in the mind. The closer these events cluster together in time, the more they will seem to be connected as cause and effect. The more frequently they co-occur, the more prototypical the relationship between them will become.

This same chain of cause and effect, learned as a baby, enables adults to make sense of a mother saying “The baby’s crying. Heat up some milk, will you?”. The hearer does not connect these two sentences by a series of logical deductions or inferences, such as “The baby’s crying, therefore it is probably hungry. If it is hungry, it needs feeding. Milk is an appropriate food for a baby. The baby’s mother is not breastfeeding, otherwise she would give the child breastmilk. The baby must therefore be given bottled milk. The milk is kept in the fridge and will be cold. Cold milk is not good for a baby. The milk should therefore be heated.” Rather, the two sentences fit experientially into a single scenario, where the heating of milk for a baby’s bottle is a prototypical occurrence in the context of a baby crying.
Scenario contents for things, events, attributes and relations

One way of classifying concepts is by their conceptual nature. In this fourfold classification, every concept is either a “thing”, an “event”, an “attribute”, or a “relation”.

In this section, the contents of a scenario refers to the organized array of interlinked slots, labelled according to conceptual roles and relationships, which would prototypically occur in the scenario of a particular type of concept. The individual items which fill those slots, however, are language and culture specific. The scenario contents listed below are mainly extrapolations from Wierzbicka and Beekman, with some elements from Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Wierzbicka (1988), contributing to theoretical linguistics, catalogues the kind of semantic information which is in real life connected with a given word. Beekman (1966), as a practical aid to language learning, lists questions for investigating the meaning of a concept. His methodology enables a foreigner to build a second language scenario system, as opposed to simply learning second language vocabulary in isolation.

"Thing" scenario:

A scenario for a “thing” would typically include:

TITLE: the “thing”
GENERIC CATEGORY
PART-WHOLE RELATIONS
LOCATION
ORIGIN
SIZE
APPEARANCE
BEHAVIOUR if animate
RELATION TO PEOPLE if animate
PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT (e.g. how used)

One subtype of “thing” scenario is a “scene” scenario, focusing on prototypical spatial orientation between “things”. Howard (1987:45) quotes Mandler (1984):

Scene schemata pertain to the arrangement of objects in space. They encapsulate our knowledge that objects should be arranged in certain ways. Examples are the face and body schemata ... We expect their parts to be in certain places. We expect parts of the landscape schemata, such as rivers, mountains, lakes and the sky to be arranged in a certain way.

Another subtype of “thing” scenario is a “person” scenario, which includes social stereotypes and is used as a basis for predicting likely action (Howard, 1987:47):

We use schemata to understand and predict the behaviour of others (Anderson, 1980; Hastie, 1981). Probably we all develop a general person schema, which includes slots for motivations, interests, personality traits, etc. ... There are also many more specific person schemas ... The third type is for various social, ethnic and occupational groups. There might be a schema for librarians and one for bricklayers. The features of the librarian schema might be: female, quiet, orderly, etc.; those for the bricklayer might include features such as male, strong, a beer drinker, etc.

"Event" scenario:

A scenario for an “event” would typically include:

TITLE: the “event”
PARTICIPANTS:
agent (typically grammatical subject)
goal (typically grammatical direct object)
benefactive (typically grammatical indirect object)
instrument
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GENERIC CATEGORY:
CIRCUMSTANCES: (adjuncts or circumstantial complements)
  (including: means, manner, occasion: related to attributes such as temporal, spatial, intensity,
  appraisive or evaluative, manner)
PART-WHOLE RELATIONS:
PARTS: discrete elements of the "event"
STAGES: (arranged in linear time order)
  Precondition
  Beginning
  Middle
  End
  Final state
CAUSATION:
  Beginning and middle enable end
  Middle and end cause final state
PURPOSE:
  Goal: final state
  (include: purpose, motive, intention, reason, occasion, grounds, cause or condition)
  Plan: meet precondition, perform beginning and middle

The participants in an event scenario are labelled in terms of their semantic role, not the way they are grammaticalized. Although semantic roles are intended to be language independent, Palmer (1994:5) points out that "they cannot be defined in any precise way" and "there is, in principle, no limit to the number of possible roles". This is because the semantic roles are conceptual categorizations of the multiplicity of real life relationships between participants in events. Palmer also argues that semantic roles are "often partly based on the grammatical distinctions noted in languages" and thus not "truly notional". However, according to scenario theory grammatical distinctions reflect notional and conceptual distinctions, and since real life relationships are not discrete and clear cut, semantic roles similarly have "fuzzy borders" and are, as with all scenario contents, based on a culturally conditioned categorization of experiences.

Different theorists not only identify different numbers of semantic roles, but also use different terminology, e.g. Fillmore (1971:376), Andrews (1985:69-71), Radford (1988:373), Halliday (1994:109, 144). This thesis uses the terms Agent, Goal, Instrument, Experiencer and Benefactive to refer to the core semantic roles listed below. The terminology used by others is shown for comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic role</th>
<th>Prototypically</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Experiencer</th>
<th>Benefactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>animate doer</td>
<td>She sang.</td>
<td>affected by doer</td>
<td>He was hanged.</td>
<td>used by doer</td>
<td>affected, no doer</td>
<td>benefits from event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore (1971)</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Experiencer</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford (1988)</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Theme (Patient)</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Experiencer</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliday (1994)</td>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Sense</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prototypical sequences of "event" scenarios are linked together as scripts. Story schemata are generalized macro-scripts, which include such slots as setting, main characters, and episodes. Howard elaborates (1987:48):

One hypothesized schema was proposed by Mandler (1984). It has slots that relate to each other in certain ways. First of all there is a setting, which may introduce the time and place and the main
character/s. Secondly, the story has one or more distinct episodes, each of which has a beginning, a development, and an ending. Each episode is usually organized around a goal. The hero has an aim which he tries to achieve, and the ending describes his success or failure.

The story schema provides a generic framework on which people hang the specific events of a given story. This hypothesis is supported by experimental evidence (Howard, 1987:49):

Thorndyke and Yekovich (1980) summarize some lines of evidence. Firstly people tend to recall only part of a given story, but it is the same part. Secondly, people tend to reconstruct very poorly written stories, distort them to bring them into line with their schema. Thus people who read a scrambled story tend to recall it in a form that fits the schema. Thirdly, the more explicit the temporal, causal and intentional relations between events in the story, the more comprehensible people find it.

The story schema usually includes all types of scenario, and is operative at the highest level. As Howard points out (1987:50), other types of text have their own schemas and their own structures, which affect the interpretation of texts, since they form the basis of the expected contents and their order within the text.

"Attribute" scenario:

A scenario for an "attribute" would typically consist of multiple links to "things" and "events" where the attribute is prototypically significant, and to other attributes which share components of meaning, are on the same scale (including homonyms and antonyms), or prototypically co-occur.

"Relation" scenario:

A "relation" concept is not so much the core of a scenario, but refers rather to the type of link between "things", "events" or "attributes". As such "relations" may be encoded linguistically not only by lexical items (such as prepositions), but also by grammatical marking (such as case, person, tense, aspect, voice) and by syntactical marking (such as word order).

See also:

Appendix A The content of scenarios for different types of concept
Appendix B Greek "relation" words and other relationship markers

Links between items in scenarios and between scenarios

Representations of scenarios usually involve concepts being conceived of as nodes, and relationships being conceived of as labelled links, such as "is a" (linking specific "thing" to generic "thing"), "has a" (linking whole "thing" to part "thing"), "is" (linking "thing" to "attribute"), and "can" (linking "thing" to "event"). Likewise, whole scenarios can be linked to other scenarios, by such links as cause and effect, or literal-metaphorical.

If nodes represent concepts for "things", "events" and "attributes", and links represent "relations", then many relational links can be formed "implicitly". For example,
all concepts which link to the same node by a specific-generic link are implicitly linked to one another by a specific-specific link. Similarly, all concepts which link to the same node by a part-whole link are implicitly linked to one another by a part-part link. The general principle is that all concepts which link to the same node by the same type of link are implicitly linked to one another by a similarity link.

One argument for postulating links between concepts and between scenarios is that storage space in the brain can be minimized, since information can be stored at the highest node to which it applies, and be accessible to all levels below that node. For example, "breathes oxygen" can be attached to the node "animate" rather than being a separate entry at the node for every single animate being. The corollary of this is that retrieval time is greater, since it involves searching for information at higher levels. This postulation has been confirmed as a general principle by experimental results involving reaction times (Collins and Quillian, 1969).

Assuming, then, that there are indeed mental links between concepts, I postulate the following types of links based on the contents of the different types of scenario proposed above, giving examples of related grammar or vocabulary, and with explanations in brackets:

**Relational links between items in "thing" scenarios**

- linking “thing” to “thing”
  - specific-generic link: e.g. “of” “sort of” “kind of”
  - specific-specific link: e.g. “both are kinds of”
  - similarity link: e.g. “like” “similar”
  - part-whole link: e.g. “part of”
  - part-part link: e.g. “together with”
  - locative link: e.g. “in” “on” “under” etc.
  - origin link: e.g. “from”
  - reciprocity link: (links “thing” to “thing” via participant links) e.g. “buyer” links to “seller”

- linking “thing” to “attribute”
  - attribute link: e.g. “fire” links to “hot”

- linking “thing” to “event”
  - participant-event links:
    - agent link: e.g. subject, English preverbal position (cf. Greek nominative case)
    - goal link: e.g. direct object, English postverbal position (cf. Greek accusative case)
    - benefactive link: e.g. “to” or “for” (cf. Greek dative case)
    - instrument link: e.g. “with” (cf. Greek dative case, ἐν)

**Relational links between items in "event" scenarios**

- linking “event” to “event”
  - reciprocity link: (links “event” to “event” via the participant links) e.g. “buy” links to “sell”
  - specific-generic link: e.g. “of” “sort of” “kind of”
  - specific-specific link: e.g. “both are kinds of”
  - similarity link: e.g. “like” “similar”
  - means link: e.g. “by” “through”
  - occasion link: (event 1 is the occasion for event 2)
  - part-whole link: (event 1 is a part of event 2)
  - part-part link: (events 1 and 2 are parts of event 3) e.g. “aim” links to “load” as parts of “shoot”
sequence link  e.g. "first" "next" "finally" (events 1 and 2 are sequential) e.g. "load" "aim"
stage link  e.g. "first" "next" "finally" (part-part link plus sequence link) e.g. "load" "aim"
next-stage link  e.g. "next" (part-part link plus adjoining in sequence link)
causal link  e.g. "because" (special kind of sequence link, tagged for cause)
purpose link  e.g. "in order to" "so that" (special kind of sequence link, tagged for purpose)

linking "event" to "thing"
event-participant links:
agent link  e.g. subject, English preverbal position (cf. Greek nominative case)
goal link  e.g. direct object, English postverbal position (cf. Greek accusative case)
benefactive link  e.g. "to" or "for" (cf. Greek dative case)
instrument link  e.g. "with" (cf. Greek dative case, ἐν)
locative link  e.g. "at" "beside"
temporal link  e.g. "at" "in"

linking "event" to "attribute"
attribute links  e.g. "burn" links to "brightly"

Relational links between items in "attribute" scenarios
linking "attribute" to "attribute"
gradation link  e.g. "cold" "cool" "lukewarm" "warm" "hot"
contradictory link  e.g. "big" "small"

Relational links between items in "relation" scenarios
linking "relation" to "relation"
contradictory link  e.g. "up" "down"

The co-occurrence link
The co-occurrence link typically occurs between "things", but also may occur between "events", "attributes", and "relations". It links items that prototypically co-occur without there being a specific semantic relationship between them.

The metaphorical link
The metaphorical link typically links complete scenarios, including both the core and its prototypical links, and thus includes all the things, events, attributes and relations contained therein. It is the basis for similes, metaphors and idioms.

The metonymic link
The metonymic link can apply to all types of scenario, thing, event, attribute and relation, whenever part of the scenario stands for the whole.

The synonymy link
The synonymy link also applies to all types of scenario, thing, event, attribute and relation. It occurs where more than one word can be applied to the same concept.

See also:
Appendix C  English and Greek examples of relational links
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Proposed nature of information storage and linking

This thesis proposes that scenarios are mental structures involving multiple nodes and complex interlinking, where links can be strong or weak (prototypicality), formed and modified by experience (cultural and experiential), and hierarchically arranged (specific-generic and part-whole links).


By applying a special electrical prober to the surface of the brain, Dr. Penfield was actually able to make a patient emotionally re-experience a situation or event he or she had long forgotten. Each patient, Dr. Penfield wrote in his report on the experiments, ‘does not just remember exact photographic or phonographic reproductions of past scenes and events ... he feels again the emotions which the situation actually produced in him ... what [he] saw and heard and felt and understood.’

This neurological experiment into the processes of memory shows that not only are sights and sounds stored in the brain, but also feelings and understandings. Moreover they are stored in, or linked to, the same place in the brain, since they can be accessed by stimulation of a particular physical part of the brain.

Schank and Abelson argue that we categorize experiences into some sort of stereotypes in memory (1977:17):

The form of memory organization upon which our arguments are based is the notion of episodic memory. An episodic view of memory claims that memory is organized around personal experiences or episodes, rather than around abstract semantic categories. If memory is organized around personal experiences then one of the principle components of memory must be a procedure for recognizing repeated or similar sequences. When a standard repeated sequence is recognized it is helpful in ‘filling in the blanks’ in understanding. Furthermore much of the language generation of people can be explained in this stereotyped way.

They believe that memory is primarily organized along a time line (1977:19):

The overall organization of memory is a sequence of episodes organized roughly along the time line of one’s life.

However they also argue that information is also structured by connecting patterns of similar events (1977:227):

To summarize; the pattern of learning would seem to be that first, definitions of objects are learned as episodes. Then scripts are learned to connect events. Finally, scripts are organized by goal structures that are used to make sense of the need for them.

This implies, firstly, that the content of any given scenario is immense, and secondly, that the physical nature of storing the information in a scenario as a chunk must be primarily by linking information, rather than by copying the same information numerous times and storing it in many different places. Consequently, when the content of any scenario is updated by adding new information, then that new information is readily available in other scenarios which include that item, via existing links between the scenarios.

Similarly, this implies that a scenario may be updated without adding new information, but by simply adding new linkages. Since both scenarios and their links are formed experientially, when a person experiences something (whether personally or by hearing or reading) then they attempt to equate it with an existing scenario. If there is no
such scenario already stored in the brain, then they create a new scenario, and link it to existing scenarios in whatever ways are applicable. Likewise, when a person first experiences concepts as linked, then they link the relevant scenarios in the brain. If there is already a linkage, then they strengthen that linkage.

Experimental evidence using a PET (positron emission tomography) scan shows that repeated linking results in more efficient processing. Richard Haier of the Brain Imaging Center, University of California, argues that mental efficiency in performing tasks is achieved by “neural pruning”, which appears to be the establishment of meaningful linkages between neurons in the brain (Begley, 1992:47):

At birth a baby’s brain is a rat’s nest of jumbled neurons. It uses up more and more glucose until the child is about five, when the brain is roughly twice as active as an adult’s. Then glucose use and the number of circuits plummet until the early teens.

This is called neural pruning, and Haier speculates it’s the key to neural efficiency. More intelligent people become like that by more pruning, which leaves remaining circuits much more efficient.

These theories raise the question of brain capacity. How can all this information not only be stored in the brain, but organized in chunks, and cross-referenced in such a way that the same information can be accessed in a vast range of different ways, some semantic, some lexical, some phonetic? Begley remarks that the human brain is admirably designed for such a complex task (1992:44):

With 100 billion cells or neurons, each sprouting about 1,000 sylph-like fingers to reach out and touch another, “the brain is the last and grandest biological frontier”, says geneticist James Watson, co-discoverer of the double helix in DNA. In a new book, Discovering the Brain, Watson calls this organ “the most complex thing we have yet discovered in our universe”.

Regarding specific-generic hierarchy, Howard quotes experimental evidence suggesting that information is stored at the highest relevant level of the hierarchy (1987:79):

It should take longer to verify questions that require traversing several links. Verifying ‘A robin is a bird’ or ‘A bird has feathers’ should be a quick process, because only one link needs to be traversed. But, to verify ‘A robin is an animal’ or ‘A canary has skin’ should take longer, because more than one link must be traversed. Collins and Quillian [1969] tested this hypothesis in a reaction time study with people and it was indeed verified. The more links traversed, the longer the sentence took to confirm.

However, this experimental evidence can be interpreted in other ways, as Howard, referring to Conrad (1972), points out (1987:79):

the experiment that found an effect of the number of links traversed on reaction time taken to verify the statements was criticized for confounding link number with associative frequency. When associative strength differences are eliminated, the link number effect vanishes.

“Associative frequency” means that concepts which are associated experientially are linked in the brain, and the more frequent the experiential co-occurrence, the stronger the mental link.

Thus, the level where information is stored may not be the highest level possible, indeed information may not even be stored at only one level. Rather, information may be stored, or most “strongly” stored, at the level where it is most commonly encountered and therefore most useful. Howard points out (1987:80):
the assumption of complete cognitive economy was questioned. While a computer with limited storage space might need such a feature, people do not need complete economy. We often need to store information at particular levels of abstraction to make speedy decisions ... It is likely then that we store features where they are convenient or used often (Lachman and Lachman, 1979). Further, Rosch (1978) argues that such property values are often stored at the basic-level rather than at more abstract ones. Sanford and Garrod, on the basis of controlled experiments recording the time taken to verify certain propositions, come to the same conclusion (1981:25): The picture which emerges, therefore, is one in which properties are stored directly at a node referring to the object (or some general set of that object) if the object and those properties are often encountered together, but in which novel combinations can only be verified by inference.

Although models of mental systems generally use nodes and links to diagram the system, linguistic theorists usually make no specific claims as to how information is physically stored and retrieved, but merely state that models based on scenario structures illustrate diagrammatically aspects of memory and language which can be experimentally proven. Howard states (1987:79): it should be noted that the networks [of scenario structures diagrammed] are just representations of semantic memory parts. It cannot be said that there are actually neural systems that correspond to nodes and pointers.

However Professor Gerald Edelman, Director of the Neurosciences Institute, California, and Nobel Prize winner for Medicine and Physiology in 1972, explicitly links co-occurring cognition in real life experience to the building of neural networks. On “Melvyn Bragg-In Our Time” (Radio 4, 29/6/2000) he summarized it thus: “Neurons that fire together, wire together.”

**Scenario titles are linked to the whole scenario**

The title of a scenario is linked to the whole scenario. Consequently, a scenario title can be used as a shorthand way to refer to all the items within that scenario.

An example of the relationship between the title of a scenario and its discrete elements comes from van Dijk (1977:151):

[32] A man in a fast car stopped before the bank. He quickly got out and ran into the bank. He drew a pistol and shouted to the cashier to hand him the money in her desk... The hold-up did not last longer than three minutes.

The definite article in the last sentence can only be explained if we assume that the previous passage contains an argument or predicate which is co-referential with respect to the same event as the word *hold-up.*

Here a selection of the key stages of the hold-up scenario are referred to anaphorically by the scenario title.

It is these scenario titles which we remember when we hear a story, rather than every single specific detail, and the title acts as a reminder for the whole event (Schank and Abelson, 1977:167):

For the purposes of what is remembered, we are claiming the following: The macro-events are remembered primarily; the micro-events are remembered (after enough time) equally poorly whether they were inferred and filled into the causal chain, or explicitly stated. This is because when an event is
script-based, the actual event can be forgotten. What needs to be remembered is a pointer to the script that defined that event. This pointer is the macro-event itself.

As Schank and Abelson point out, the title is often the main event of a script, e.g. “playing golf” is the title of a scenario whose script includes going to the golf course, carrying balls and clubs, etc. but playing golf is also the main event within that scenario. In contrast, sometimes the title refers to the sum of the script events not to any individual most important event within it, e.g. for British people “make tea” opens a scenario including boiling water, putting tea leaves in a teapot, adding water, leaving it to brew etc. but no one event can be singled out as “making tea.”

For “thing” words, the scenario title will be the name of the object, and likewise for “attribute” words the scenario title will be the name of that attribute. The title of a “thing” scenario may also refer not simply to the “thing” itself but also to the event or script of events associated with it, as noted by Schank and Abelson (1977:47):

12 John took a bus to New York.
    In New York he went to a museum.
    Then he took a train home.

In this example the names of scripts are mentioned and it is presumed that each script proceeded normally... Here we have the three explicitly stated scripts, BUS, MUSEUM-GOING, and TRAIN. Schank and Abelson call such a scenario title a “script name” and use the sign $ to mark it. This allows a distinction between BUS as the title of a “thing” scenario (including size, shape, purpose, number of wheels etc.), and $BUS as the title of a script-type scenario (including wait at bus stop, get on, buy ticket, sit down etc.).

Whether a word refers to a single concept or to the scenario related to that concept depends on the function of that word in the discourse. A single concept within one scenario, may also be the title of its own scenario. Howard, referring to Markman (1983), comments (1987:33):

Schemata are often organized into partonomies, each schema being part of one and itself composed of schemata... Consider the human body schema. It consists of such parts as face, arms, legs, and trunk. Each can be considered a schema, as described before with face. These each bear a part-whole relation to a more inclusive schema. They are part of it, just as a given tree is part of a forest.

Thus “face” can refer both to a single concept in the “human body” scenario, and to the whole “face” scenario of which it is a title, including all its discrete elements such as nose, eyes, ears, etc.

Scenarios link vocabulary as well as concepts

Since concepts are linked within scenarios, vocabulary referring to those concepts is also linked. The relationship between lexicon and scenarios is addressed by van Dijk (1977:160):

For a linguist it might be tempting to ask how such frames differ from the conceptual knowledge of a lexicon of the language, a question which for the psychologist is less relevant since there seems no cognitive/behavioural difference between knowledge of the language and knowledge of the world. It
might be proposed, though, that the top-level, essential information of frames, is the conceptual information associated with the lexically expressed concepts of a language.

Howard defines the relationship between words and concepts as follows (1987:17): Words are labels for concepts and a word’s meaning is the attached concept. Thus a word is distinct from a concept.

Types of lexical links within scenarios

Scenario structure produces these common types of lexical link, shown here with New Testament Greek examples:

**Same set links, i.e. specific-specific links**

The specific-generic link in scenario structure, by connecting hyponyms (e.g. roses and daffodils) to a single superordinate node (e.g. flower), automatically produces co-hyponyms which belong to the same set. These are at the same level of hierarchy, of the same grammatical class, and in the same generic class. Thus same set links are formed automatically between items which have specific-generic links to the same node, e.g.

Luke 6:13-14:

co-hyponyms: Σίμων Simon
Σωδόρεας Andrew

These both link to the same generic node:

superordinate: ἀπόστολος apostle

**Generic-specific links**

Generic-specific links in the scenario create hierarchical lexical links, e.g.

Luke 6:13-15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic:</th>
<th>person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific type of “person”:</td>
<td>μαθητής disciple (6:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific type of “disciple”:</td>
<td>ἀπόστολος apostle (6:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific type of “apostle”:</td>
<td>Ἀπόστολος James (6:14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific type of “James”:</td>
<td>Ἰάκωβος Ἄλφαλων James (son) of Alphaeus (6:15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All words in generic-specific relation belong to the same lexical class.

Lexical items related by generic-specific links are often used in reiteration to achieve co-reference. Kinds of reiteration include: repetition, synonym, superordinate, and general word (Baker, 1992:203), acronyms and naming (Jordan, 1992:188). For example, reiteration of “apostles” (Luke 6:13):

repetition: ἀπόστολος apostle (9:10)
synonym: οἱ δώδεκα the twelve (8:1) same scenario, different lexical item
superordinate: μαθητής disciple (6:13) superordinate
general word: πτωχός poor (6:20) attribute
proper name: Σίμων Simon (6:14) hyponym

**Part-whole links**

Part-whole semantic links within one scenario produce lexically linked vocabulary of the same lexical class, e.g.
Whole Parts

Thing: δέντρον tree ῥίζα root, καρπός fruit (Luke 3:9)
Event: ἀποτίμων touch ἐκτείνων stretch (hand) (Luke 5:13)
Attribute: χριστιανός kind εὐπλαγγχυνος tender hearted, χαριζόμενος forgiving (Eph. 4:32)

participant-event links

Vocabulary for participants and events belong in the same scenario, and produce lexical collocations, e.g. Luke 11:13:

event: δίδωμι give
agent: πατὴρ Father (God)
goal/patient: έπι τούτου Holy Spirit
benefactive: οἱ αἰτοῦντες people asking

location-event links

Vocabulary for certain locations links with the events that occur there, producing lexical collocations, e.g. Luke 4:16:

location: συναγωγή synagogue
event: διαγινώσκω read
agent: Ἰησοῦς Jesus (4:14)
goal/patient: βιβλίον scroll (scripture)
benefactive: πᾶνς everyone (4:20)

conjoined scenario links

Vocabulary may belong in the same scenario, even where that vocabulary does not belong to the same domain. For example, for first-century Palestinian Jews, leper, clean, far off, touch, priest, laws of Moses belong to one scenario “leprosy.” This is because leprosy is part of a script-type scenario which reads something like:

Cause: leprosy
Effect: ritual impurity, untouchability
Cure: divine intervention
Verification: examination by priest in Jerusalem
Result: make offering to God

Thus, all the vocabulary of Luke 5:12-14 can be linked to this one leprosy scenario, even though most of it is directly linked to ritual impurity not to disease.

metaphorical links

The metaphorical link of scenario structure explains lexical links between metaphorical and non-metaphorical language. Metaphorical links are often different from culture to culture. For example, the Urdu word for owl (ul:u) is used as an insult meaning “stupid person”. In English, owl can be linked either with stupidity or with wisdom (e.g. The Wordsworth Concise English Dictionary definition of owl includes “a dullard”, whereas The Concise Oxford Dictionary’s definition includes “a person compared to an owl, esp. in looking solemn or wise”). However, in first-century Greek culture the owl was only seen as wise. So calling Billy Bunter “a fat owl”, if translated literally into New
Testament Greek, would have probably been understood metaphorically, but
misunderstood as meaning wise.

Similarly, in line with Old Testament usage, sheep is linked in New Testament
Greek with religious follower, and shepherd with religious leader and protector, as in John
21:15, where Jesus says to Peter “Feed my lambs.” In cultures where sheep and shepherd
are not used metaphorically in a religious context, and where most people keep sheep for
milk, this would be understood literally.

Other collocational links

The above list of links which connect vocabulary within scenarios is representative
not exhaustive. All vocabulary which refers to linked concepts within the same scenario,
whatever the type of semantic link, is lexically linked. As such it will collocate naturally in
text, since episodes or stretches of text usually have a single scenario as their backdrop.

The complexity of scenario structure is inevitable since scenarios are constructed
mental representations of reality. Hence the lexical networks organised by scenario
structure are also extremely complex and research into this area is ongoing, as noted by

Longacre (1983:174) has at least forty-eight different classes listed in his scheme of case frames for
verbs. Semantic inventories in Grimes (1986) are especially relevant to referential classes and an
interlocking network of lexical systems. The lexical decomposition of Dowty (1979), also adopted by
Foley and Van Valin (1984), would be another fruitful entry to the understanding of this very intricate
area of study.

See also:
Appendix D  Greek evidence that words are linked by scenarios

Scenarios, lexical fields, and sense relations

Scenario theory explains a broader set of lexical relationships than other theories,
including those relationships as a part of scenario structure.

Lexical fields

Some early lexicologists, such as Trier (1934), looked at “semantic fields”
paradigmatically in terms of interrelated but contrastive words (Lyons, 1977:252):

Trier looks upon the vocabulary of a language as an integrated system of lexemes interrelated in sense.
The system is in constant flux ... Any broadening in the sense of one lexeme involves a corresponding
narrowing in the sense of one or more of its neighbours.

This vocabulary would typically be linked in scenarios by specific-generic or part-whole-
links to the same superordinate node.

Others, such as Porzig (1950:68), viewed “semantic fields” syntagmatically,
focussing on the “essential meaning relationship” between certain pairs of words, as
quoted by Lyons (1977:261):
What does one bite with? With the teeth, of course. What does one lick with? With the tongue, obviously. What is it that barks? A dog. What does one fell? Trees. What is it that is blond? Human hair. The fact that is here illustrated by means of a few examples is so banal that we are inclined to overlook it and above all to underestimate its importance.

This vocabulary would be linked in scenarios by participant-event links, although scenarios would include prototypical participants as well as “essential” ones.

Lyons incorporates both ideas (1977:268):
Lexemes and other units that are semantically related, whether paradigmatically or syntagmatically, within a given language-system can be said to belong to, or be members of, the same (semantic) field; and a field whose members are lexemes is a lexical field. A lexical field is therefore a paradigmatically and syntagmatically structured subset of the vocabulary.

This definition of lexical field still only includes vocabulary from a limited part of the semantic range of a scenario. It lacks vocabulary for elements such as prototypical locations, time sequence, intention, and cause-effect relationships which are included in script-type scenarios.

Scenarios and sense relations

Similarly the various types of semantic relationship between words, known as sense relations (Lyons, 1977:270-335), are included within the structure of scenarios, being defined as links.

Opposition and contrast, known commonly as antonymy, is based on “dichotomy” (Lyons, 1977:271):
... dictionaries will classify as antonyms pairs of lexemes which, as we shall see, are related in a variety of ways (‘high’; ‘low’, ‘buy’; ‘sell’, ‘male’; ‘female’, ‘arrive’; ‘depart’, ‘left’; ‘right’, ‘front’; ‘back’ etc.). What all these examples have in common, it should be noticed, is their dependence upon dichotomization ... binary opposition is one of the most important principles governing the structure of languages; and the most evident manifestation of this principle, as far as the vocabulary is concerned, is antonymy.

Since dichotomy causes divergence, antonyms play a major role within scenarios, predicting different results, belonging in different stages, or even relating to different sub-scenarios. For example, the high/low dichotomy (contradiction link) may well affect the outcome of a participant’s action, e.g. a person may die falling from a high place, but not from a low place. “Arriving” would be at the beginning of a “visit” scenario, “departing” would be at the end. “Buy” and “sell” belong to the same event scenario, with the same participants, but lexicalize the viewpoint of a different participant with different agendas, sellers being typically professionals, whereas buyers are typically ordinary people with specific needs. Whether a participant is “male” or “female” (different attribute links, and part-whole links, but same specific-generic link to human) may well affect expectations of their actions, e.g. if someone attacks, a stereotypical male would fight back, and a stereotypical woman would scream or run.

Hyponomy is marked by the specific-generic link. Note that co-hyponyms have the same specific-generic links, but different metaphorical links. For example, in the sentence “I saw some ... at the farm” cows, pigs, or animals could fill the same slot. But usually in metaphors, neither different hyponyms, nor superordinates, can fill the same slot, e.g. “She
is so spiteful, she is an absolute cow”, “She is so greedy, she is an absolute pig”, and “She is so vicious, she is an absolute animal”.

Part-whole relations reflect the part-whole link between scenarios. Lyons (1977:312-313) notes that the principles involved in making cut-off points in part-whole chaining are unclear. He gives examples such as “the handle of the door”, “the door of the house”, but not “the handle of the house”, contrasted with “the cuff of the sleeve”, “the sleeve of the jacket”, and “the cuff of the jacket”. In terms of scenario structure, “handle” has a part-whole link to the “door” scenario, but only links to the “house” scenario via the node of “door”, whereas “cuff” is linked directly by a part-whole link to both the “sleeve” and “jacket” scenarios. These links are formed by experiencing the entities as related.

Scenarios also include the information identified by componential analysis, which defines the sense of words by the combination of one or more “sense-components”, e.g. “man” combines the sense-components “male” “adult” and “human”. In this example, scenario structure would encode the data by a combination of generic-specific and attribute links. Componential analysis fails to account for certain aspects of language use, e.g. in English “X is now a woman” does not imply “X is no longer a girl” (Lyons, 1997:334). Scenario theory, however, allows for “components of meaning” as prototypical rather than necessarily making a discrete cut-off point between lexical items.

Chapter summary

Scenarios are structured by concepts which are themselves metaphorical, based on bodily experience, such as “container” and “link”. Scenarios store information in chunks, have metonymic and hierarchical networks, link related concepts, have prototypical categories with fuzzy boundaries, and encode directionality of space, time, and intention. Concepts within scenarios are also linked to lexicon and grammar. Scenarios for different types of semantic class are structured differently, but all involve linking concepts according to experiential frequency and relevance. Scenario theory is supported by psychological and neurological research.

Scenario structure means that the “title” of a scenario, i.e. the lexical item connected to a given concept, can be used to refer to the whole cluster of semantically interrelated concepts which are linked to that conceptual node.

Since the lexicon of a given language is linked to concepts which are themselves interlinked with other concepts in scenarios, scenarios link lexical items as well as concepts.
Chapter 3
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SCENARIOS

Since scenarios are complex mental structures storing information and vocabulary in interlinked networks, it is important to understand their significance in communication. This chapter explores how scenarios affect both the surface structure of language and how it is comprehended. I link scenario theory to the categorization of information status, noting that information status has been shown to correlate with English grammatical structure. I show how scenarios determine the contextual meaning of lexical items, and how scenarios affect comprehension by setting up patterns of expectation and by allowing the retrieval of implied information. Finally I show the different ways scenarios are opened by a speaker or writer and how they can be identified by the audience using lexical and grammatical clues.

Scenarios affect information status and reference

Information status concerns whether information is "new", "old" or "given". Much research (mostly in English) shows that the semantic status of information affects the grammatical structures used to refer to such information, e.g. Schiffrin (1994:317-9), van Dijk (1977:159), Baker (1992:148), and Brown and Yule (1983:185-6).

I argue that information status is best understood in terms of scenario theory, and that the link between scenarios and patterns of reference is cognitively based, and so will be reflected in the grammatical patterns of all languages.

Information status

Brown and Yule propose an "information status taxonomy" (1983:184):

1. NEW ENTITIES
   a. brand new
   b. unused
2. INFERRABLE ENTITIES
3. EVOKED ENTITIES
   a. situational
   b. textual - current
   c. textual - displaced

They define these categories as follows (1983:181-2):

1. NEW
   1. a. Brand new entities are assumed by the speaker not to be in any way known to the hearer (e.g. "a man I know").
   1. b. Unused entities are assumed by the speaker to be known to the hearer, in his background knowledge, but not in his consciousness at the time of utterance (e.g. "your father" (as in 'I saw your father yesterday'), "Chomsky").
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“Unused” also includes items with only one real-world referent, e.g. “the sun”, and items restricted to a single referent by the time and location of the communication, e.g. “the Prime Minister”. These may be regarded as belonging in the always open “whole world” scenario.

2. INFERRABLE
2. Inferrable entities are assumed by the speaker to be inferred by the hearer from a discourse entity which has already been introduced (e.g. “the driver”, when a car has already been mentioned. This is inferrable as long as you have the background knowledge that “cars have drivers”).

This includes the scenario-based entities which Sanford and Garrod (1981:114) classify as “given” (e.g. a courtroom scenario includes the presence of “lawyer” as “given”).

3. EVOKED
3. a. Situationally evoked entities are salient in the discourse context (e.g. ‘I’ and ‘you’).

Situationally evoked entities are assumed by the speaker to be sensorily perceived (seen, heard, felt, etc.) by the hearer at the time the discourse is framed, e.g. The smell is terrible! I wish someone would stop that noise. Pass the pencil.

3. b and c Textually evoked entities are entities which have already been introduced into the discourse
3. b. Current textually evoked entities are those which were introduced immediately before the current new entity was introduced (e.g. He, after the introduction of a man).
3. c. Displaced textually evoked entities are those which were not introduced immediately before the current new entity was introduced, but prior to that (e.g. the triangle, after the introduction of a triangle, followed by the introduction of a circle).

Brown and Yule’s individual categories are well supported by other theorists, e.g. Prince charts the three entity types Brand-new, Unused, and Evoked in terms of the categories Hearer-old/Hearer-new and Discourse-old/Discourse-new (1992:309):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearer-new</th>
<th>Discourse-new</th>
<th>Discourse-old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearer-old</td>
<td>Brand-new</td>
<td>Unused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[not applicable]</td>
<td>Evoked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He also comments on inferrables, pointing out their dependence on both Discourse-old triggers and Hearer-old knowledge (Prince, 1992:309).

Chafe also distinguishes evoked entities, calling them “given” and defining them as “that knowledge which the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance” (1976:30). “Given” entities must be currently salient “in the forefront of the mind” and “spotlighted in the hearer’s attention” (1970: 211). Chafe includes not only textually evoked categories (1992:270), but also situationally evoked (1976:31-2):

The fact that the speaker and addressee themselves are regularly treated as given (and pronominalized as I and you respectively) stems from the same consideration. The speaker is conscious of the addressee, and the addressee is conscious of the speaker.

Similarly Halliday says “given” information is that treated by the speaker as “recoverable either anaphorically or situationally” (1967: 211).
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Scenarios and information status

I directly link the categories of Brown and Yule’s information status taxonomy to whether scenarios are currently open or not, as shown in the chart below.

The first line of comment refers to the entity using Prince’s terms Hearer-old / Hearer-new (referring to what the speaker expects the hearer to know or not know), and Discourse-old / Discourse-new (referring to what has already been mentioned in the preceding stretch of discourse) (Prince, 1992:302-3).

The second line refers to the entities’ role or function as related to scenarios.

1. NEW ENTITIES
   a. brand new
      Discourse-new, Hearer-new
      Open specific new scenarios
   b. unused
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in the “whole world” scenario

2. INFERRABLE ENTITIES
   Discourse-new, Hearer-old
   Refer to new entities from an open co-text scenario

3. EVOKEED ENTITIES
   a. situational
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in the open “here and now” scenario
   b. textual - current
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to the last opened scenario
   c. textual - displaced
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to a previously opened scenario

Information status categories cannot be distinguished simply in terms of Discourse-old/Discourse-new and Hearer-old/Hearer-new, since three categories (1b, 2 and 3a) are Discourse-new and Hearer-old, and two categories (3b and 3c) are Discourse-old and Hearer-old. However, they can be clearly distinguished in relationship to scenarios.

Moreover, only one category is both Discourse-new and Hearer-new, the category 1a “brand new” which opens a brand new scenario. This suggests the category 1b “unused” may be misclassified as NEW since it has the same Discourse-new and Hearer-old status as the INFERRABLE category.

Revised Information Status Taxonomy

There are theoretical reasons for revising Brown and Yule’s Information Status Taxonomy. Only “brand new” entities are Hearer-new, and open new scenarios. This suggests a distinctive information status. All other entities, without exception, are Hearer-old, i.e. already stored in memory. This provides a cognitive rationale for a basic Hearer-new / Hearer-old division. The categories which Brown and Yule call “evoked” are more
normally termed “given”, e.g. Halliday (1967: 211), and Chafe (1976:30). The term “evoked” is also open to misunderstanding, since “inferrable” entities might be regarded as “evoked” by the context.

Accordingly I suggest the following revision:

NEW = Hearer-new
1. NEW ENTITIES
   a. brand new
      Discourse-new, Hearer-new
      Open specific new scenarios

KNOWN = Hearer-old but not previously in focus. Long term memory
2. KNOWN ENTITIES
   a. unused
      (Brown and Yule’s 1.b New entities - unused)
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in “whole world” scenario
   b. inferrable
      (Brown and Yule’s 2 Inferrable Entities)
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities from an open co-text scenario

GIVEN = Hearer-old and already in focus.
3. GIVEN ENTITIES (Brown and Yule’s 3 Evoked Entities)
   Current perceptual experience
   a. situational
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in open “here and now” scenario
   Short term memory (with reference to long term memory)
   b. textual - current
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to the last opened scenario
   c. textual - displaced
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to a previously opened scenario

In brief:
1. NEW ENTITIES (Hearer-new)
   Discourse-new, Hearer-new
   Open specific new scenarios

2. KNOWN ENTITIES (Hearer-old but not previously in focus)
   a. unused
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in “whole world” scenario
   b. inferrable
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities from an open co-text scenario

3. GIVEN ENTITIES (Hearer-old and already in focus)
   a. situational
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in open “here and now” scenario
   b. textual - current
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to the last opened scenario
   c. textual - displaced
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to a previously opened scenario
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The terms used above avoid the ambiguity of New/Old terminology. Chafe states (1976:30):

The terminology has been and continues to be misleading to linguists and psychologists who use it. Calling something ‘old information’ suggests it is ‘what the listener is expected to know already.’

Chafe’s comment suggests “old information” is most naturally understood as Hearer-old. Some linguists contrast New with Given, where New means not in the listener’s focal consciousness, i.e. Focus-new, e.g. Chafe (1992:270) and Halliday, 1967:204, 211). Accordingly, this thesis distinguishes between Discourse-old and Hearer-old, and uses the terms NEW, KNOWN and GIVEN as defined in my revised taxonomy. This thesis uses the term “in focus” or “focal” in Chafe’s sense of being in “focal consciousness” (1992:270), i.e. currently salient “in the forefront of the mind” and “spotlighted in the hearer’s attention” (1970: 211).

This thesis uses the revised taxonomy above which links information status directly to scenarios. NEW entities require the hearer to create new scenarios. KNOWN entities refer to Discourse-new items which belong in the always-open “whole world” scenario (KNOWN unused) or in scenarios already open in the co-text (KNOWN inferrable). GIVEN entities refer to open scenarios which are already focal, whether Discourse-old (GIVEN textual-current, and GIVEN textual-displaced), or Discourse-new (GIVEN situational).

Scenarios, information status and reference

The relationship between information status and patterns of reference in English supports this revised scenario-based taxonomy as a genuine cognitive reality affecting both thought and language.

The Hearer-new / Hearer-old division suggested above is mirrored by the grammatical distribution of Indefinite Article for Hearer-new versus Definite Article for Hearer-old (e.g. Schiffrin, 1994:317-9). The use of the definite article for KNOWN inferrable entities is explicitly linked to scenario theory by van Dijk (1977:159).

The Hearer-new / Hearer-old division is also grammatically marked for “events”, independent main verbs for Hearer-new, noun phrases and subordinate clauses for Hearer-old (Baker, 1992:148).

The “given” category and subcategories are supported by the use of pronouns for GIVEN situational, and GIVEN textual-current, but not other categories (Brown and Yule, 1983:185-6). The “given” distinction is also supported by phonological evidence (Brown and Yule, 1983:185-6), NEW and KNOWN inferrable information being pronounced with intonational peak, GIVEN information without intonational peak. (Intonational peak might function to alert the hearer of the need for extra mental processing, i.e. opening a new
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scenario or accessing Discourse-new information from an open one, as opposed to simply re-accessing an already focal entity.)

In sections 2 and 3 of this thesis, I will show that New Testament Greek and modern Parkari also use specific grammatical marking to distinguish Hearer-new entities from Hearer-old entities, whether Discourse-new or Discourse-old. This not only supports the theory that referential choice has a genuine cognitive basis, but also enables the exegete to identify open scenarios by the use of Hearer-old forms for Discourse-new entities.

See also:
Appendix E  Greek examples of scenarios, information status and reference.

Scenarios determine the focal components of meaning

Scenarios determine the sense of a word

Scenarios, by linking concepts tagged to vocabulary, create lexical networks which determine the sense of a word in a given context (Baker, 1992:206):

Lexical networks do not only provide cohesion, they also determine collectively the sense in which each individual item is used in a given context. As Hoey (1991:8) points out, 'the text provides the context for the creation and interpretation of lexical relations, just as the lexical relations help create the texture of the text'.

At the most basic level, the participant structure of an “event” scenario can determine the sense of the verb, e.g.

1. walk out = exit on foot
   participants: agent
   location “of” e.g. He is walking out of the house.

2. walk out = go on a date, court
   participants: agent companion (of opposite sex) “with” e.g. He is walking out with Jane.

3. walk out = abandon
   participants: agent affectee (wife, family etc.) “on” e.g. He is walking out on his wife.

The sense of “He’s just walking out” is primarily determined by the explicit or implicit presence of other participants. In the context of location, e.g. a phone call “Is John there?”, it would refer to exiting on foot. In the context of a relationship, e.g. “Is John engaged?”, it would refer to courting. In the context of a marriage, e.g. “Is John going for marriage counselling?”, it would refer to his abandoning his wife.
Interlocking scenarios determine which elements of meaning are focal

A word accesses a whole scenario. Since scenarios contain huge amounts of information, effective communication depends on highlighting certain elements of that scenario and ignoring others. The interlocking of scenarios is the factor which determines which components of a word or scenario are in focus. Take “millet” below (Callow and Callow, 1996; quoting a review of *The Barefoot Revolution*, WORLD, May 1988:91):

1 THE BAREFOOT REVOLUTION
2 In Bolivia, 43 per cent of under-fives suffer serious malnutrition;
3 in parts of Brazil only half the children survive to the end of their first year at school;
4 in some areas of Nigeria, land under millet has fallen by 30-40 per cent in the last ten years
5 (the population has risen by 25 per cent);
6 in Cameroon ... And so the numbers pile up.
7 Over one-third of humanity has insufficient resources, is underfed, badly cared for and without education.

Using the concept of lexical networks, i.e. interlocking scenarios, we see that the “staple foods” scenario has been opened in line 2 by “malnutrition”, and instantiated again in line 3 by “survive”. This is reinforced in line 7 by “underfed”. The word “millet” links to “staple foods” via a specific-generic link. Thus the component of millet which is focal in line 4 is its value as a staple food, rather than its colour, smell, size or any other one of the numerous details stored in its scenario.

Conversely, if there seems to be a lack of “lexical networks”, a seemingly random jumble of vocabulary, then we cannot determine what aspect of meaning is focal. This is frequently due to a linking of scenarios which the writer assumed, but which we the audience do not share, e.g. Luke 5:12-14 where “illness” vocabulary is “randomly” collocated with “cleansing” and “religious” vocabulary. Here the meaning of καθαρίσω “cleanse, purify” must be determined as “make ritually pure” as part of the “ritual impurity” scenario, which is itself opened implicitly by the “leprosy” scenario, through a causal link “leprosy causes ritual impurity”.

Interlocking of literal and metaphorical scenarios

A “seemingly random jumble of vocabulary” may be particularly apparent when metaphorical and non-metaphorical scenarios overlap. For example, Proverbs 5:15-18, in a chapter warning against seductive women (NIV):

Drink water from your own cistern,
running water from your own well.
Should your springs overflow in the streets,
your streams of water in the public squares?
Let them be yours alone,
ever to be shared with strangers.
May your fountain be blessed,
and may you rejoice in the wife of your youth.

For most English readers there is no lexical coherence between wife and water, cistern, springs, stream, and fountain. Drinking water as a euphemism for sexual relations is not in normal English usage. This “randomness” of vocabulary is a sign that there is a
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“missing link”, here a metaphorical link between the “cistern” scenario and the “wife” scenario, so that “drink from your own cistern” means “make love to your own wife”.

Accordingly, the New Living Translation makes this metaphorical link explicit (here bolded):

Drink water from your own well
- share your love only with your wife.
Why spill the water of your springs in public,
having sex with just anyone?
You should reserve it for yourselves.
Don’t share it with strangers.
Let your wife be a fountain of blessing for you.
Rejoice in the wife of your youth.

Scenarios determine expectations

Scenarios and expectation

Once we recognize a scenario, we have expectations as to its contents. Although scenarios do not contain totally fixed elements, they do contain prototypical conceptual categories or “slots” (e.g. agent, location), together with the memory of specific elements which have filled them in the past, and this provides parameters for a limited range of expectations. As van Dijk states (1977:160):

Due to their general conceptual nature, frames may have VARIABLE INSTANTIATIONS, which allows the application or use of frames in concrete cognitive contexts; there are many ways to ‘execute’ the action of going to and eating in a restaurant, but they will all belong to, or be subsumed by, the same RESTAURANT-frame.

Scenarios enable us to memorize whole sequences in “shorthand” (Schank and Abelson, 1977:19):

rather than list the details of what happened in a restaurant for each visit to a restaurant, memory simply lists a pointer (link) to what we call the restaurant script and stores the items in that particular episode that were significantly different from the standard script as the only items specifically in the description of that episode.

Similarly scenarios enable us to evaluate whether new information in a text fits the expected pattern or not (Schank and Abelson, 1977:45):

In a text new information is interpreted in terms of its place in one of the paths within the script.

Schank and Abelson (1977:61-66) identify three types of script: situational scripts (e.g. restaurant, bus), personal scripts (e.g. flatterer, jealous spouse), and instrumental scripts (e.g. lighting a cigarette, frying an egg). These all set up expectations as to what is likely to happen.

Situational scripts set up broad parameters of expectation.

Recognizing a personal script enables the understander to “expect certain interferences during the progress of the situational script” (1977:64). Personal scripts, like Lakoff’s social stereotypes (1990:85-86), help the audience predict and evaluate the actions of a participant, e.g. in the New Testament the personal script for Pharisee includes
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scrupulous attention to the minutiae of religious observance (e.g. Luke 6:1-2, 6-7, 11:37-42). Such personal scripts can be used in parables to set up patterns of expected behaviour, e.g. the Pharisee in Luke 18:10-12. Similarly, “a saintly rabbi” occurs as the main character in a modern joke about overscrupulous observance of dietary laws (Blue, 1986:83).

Instrumental scripts, though highly predictable, are still culture-specific, e.g. frying an egg, in Parkari culture, includes the stage of mixing together the yoke and the white. Similarly, there are culture-specific restraints on which stages can be left implicit, without suggesting the script did not occur prototypically. For example, in Mark 4:8 Greek mentions three stages of crop growth, “It came up, grew and produced a crop”, whereas Parkari must make explicit the stage of the ears of grain developing.

Whenever script-type scenarios are opened, whether by the participants, location, or event, there is a strong expectation for the script to proceed according to the norm. Schank and Abelson call this “instantiating” the script (1977:48):

the rules for dealing with instantiated scripts are directly related to how many steps are left out. Essentially, instantiated scripts are those that make explicit one or more specific steps in the script itself. It is then our job to fill in the surrounding steps that ought to be inferred and treat them as if they were said.

Luke 4:16-21 is a classic example of a script being instantiated, thus implying that all the steps of the script took place. Every element of the “scripture reading” scenario is explicit except the actual reading. “Reading” is implicit, i.e. not stated but intended to be understood.

Compare Luke 7:11-15, the widow’s son at Nain, where a dead person, a healer, a command, and a physical response are intended to instantiate the “healing” scenario and imply that he came to life. But the text says “The dead man sat up and began to talk”. In cultures with a strong belief in ghosts and evil spirits, this may be seen as decidedly spooky! The translation may need to be explicit: “The dead man came back to life, sat up and began to talk”.

Similarly, where events do not proceed according to the expected script, there is a strong contraexpectation involved, e.g. in Luke 4:27, there are the sick (“lepers”), the healer (“Elisha”), and the opportunity (“in Israel”) “yet not one of them was cleansed - only Naaman the Syrian.” This contraexpectation, set up by the failure of the healing script to follow its expected course, is marked explicitly in the Greek by καὶ οὐδεὶς ... εἶ μὴ “and nobody ... except”.

Script-type scenarios, goals, and the purposive chain

As Schank and Abelson argue (1977), by bundling together specific script-type scenarios and making generalizations from them, we can form plans in order to achieve
goals. Beekman notes that to understand the meaning of an event word one must also understand the “purpose, motive, intention, reason, occasion, grounds, cause or condition” motivating that event (NOT 29:2). Similarly, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:167) list the purpose, including both the goal and the plan for achieving it, as an essential part of the scenario of an event word.

In my analysis also, event scenarios contain purpose links to goals, i.e. intended results, and causal links to both intended and unintended results. Thus causal links show both success and failure in achieving goals. Due to these links, the kind of implicature which Callow and Callow call the purposive chain can be explained by the same process as other aspects of text comprehension, that the hearer “runs ahead” of the text “reading” it in advance from the existing scripts in their mental scenarios.

Callow and Callow say of the purposive chain (1992:9):

Human beings communicate in order to:
(i) exchange knowledge about the world around them;
(ii) relate mutually with their fellows, especially by sharing emotions, attitudes, and evaluations;
(iii) bring about changes in the course of events.

We are calling these three imports the informative, the expressive, and the conative respectively... We are calling this informative-expressive-conative progression the purposive chain. Once more a cognitive reality lies behind the technical term: there is an inherent directionality in human thinking. Our thought-processes are not static, but in constant directional flow. We constantly assume purposiveness, and our minds very readily move forward from one purpose to the next.

The purposive chain means we can state a fact, intending to communicate an intention (Callow and Callow, 1992:9):
... the familiar utterance Dinner’s ready! is not purely informative; the speaker really means come and eat! The hearer is intended to move on from the given information to the required action. If any family member treats the utterance as purely informative, and responds with Thank you for telling me, then the utterance has failed of its purpose, and the speaker may well be annoyed: information exchange is inappropriate while the dinner is cooling on the table.

This type of implicature, though quite complex if seen as a deductive process, is straightforward from a cognitive linguistics viewpoint. The fact of dinner being ready is a necessary precondition to eating, and is in the eating scenario. Telling people that dinner is ready is part of the (home-location) “making dinner” scenario, as a stage in the script leading up to the purpose, i.e. “eating dinner”. The intermediary stage, omitted in the text “Dinner’s ready!” but present in the scenario script, is coming to the table. Callow and Callow say we take the relevant meaning which is furthest along the purposive chain, informative-expressive-conative. Thus relevant conative meaning takes precedence over expressive meaning, and relevant expressive meaning takes precedence over purely informative meaning. Sperber and Wilson (1986) say we first look for “relevance”. However, such relevance must be understood in terms of following the purposive chain within the open scenario.

Deviations from scripts and subscripts

Schank and Abelson also show how a script may include deviations from the norm (1977:55):
Every act in the restaurant (or any other) script is potentially subject to obstacles and errors, each of which suggests its own appropriate prescriptions or loops. A few of these will occur with sufficient frequency that a person repeatedly exposed to the script situation will learn them along with the script.

They also point out that the occurrence of a new script may signal either an interruption in the previous script, thus preventing the rest of the previous script happening at that point, or may signal the opening of a subsequent script, thus implying that the rest of the previous script occurred as expected. For example (1977: 60-61):

27 Yesterday John was in New York.
He went to a restaurant.
He ate a large lobster.
Then he bought a watch.

... In the example ... ('Then he bought a watch') we have something that can normally be handled by a script, but that takes place in watch stores and not restaurants. We have to assume that the restaurant script has ended and infer 'He left the restaurant'. This would cause all the normal MAINCONs [Main Constituents] of the restaurant script to be inferred. The watch-buying event thus serves double-duty; it activates a new script at the same time it terminates an instantaous one. We call this a 'script-ending script.'

Of course it is conceivable that one could buy a watch in a restaurant. Because of this possibility, we keep the requests active from the original script. Thus if we next encounter 'Then he paid the check', if we have marked our previous inference with a lack of certainty, we can undo what we have inferred and place the 'watch' event inside the restaurant script as a Distraction.

Recognizing whether a new script is an interruption (Schank and Abelson’s “Distraction”) or a “script-ending script” is obviously significant for exegesis, and for translation. In translation, if the target audience’s scripts do not match the source language scripts, they cannot accurately evaluate whether the script is completed or interrupted, and this would need to be made explicit, e.g. “Whilst in the restaurant” or “After leaving the restaurant”.

For example, Luke 9:18 reads:

And it-happened in the to-be him praying in private where-with him the disciples and he-asked them saying, Whom me say the crowds to-be? Grammatically, the events “the disciples were with him” and “he asked them” are presented as “within” the event of “him praying privately” (ἐν plus Present Infinitive with Present Participle, both Imperfective Aspect). This suggests “praying” here refers not to a single event scenario “pray”, but to a script-type scenario of “prayer” involving multiple times of praying, and “asking questions” is an interruption not a “script-ending script”.

NIV translates “Once when Jesus was praying in private and his disciples were with him, he asked them...” The English verb form “was praying” suggests a single event with “ask” as an interruption, i.e. Jesus interrupted his prayer. Yet the co-text gives no indication that Jesus resumed praying, suggesting “ask” might be a script-ending script, i.e. Jesus first finished his prayer. The translation is unclear.

The Berkeley Version translates “When in his season of private prayer the disciples joined Him, He asked them...” Here, “season of private prayer” clarifies that “pray” is the title of a complex script-type scenario, in which “ask” can function as an interruption to
the main “pray” script, without meaning either “He interrupted his individual prayer to ask” (semantically unlikely in the original context) or “He finished praying and then asked” (grammatically impossible in the original Greek).

Greek often uses specific devices, as in the “Jairus’s daughter” incident, to explicitly mark the difference between interruptions (e.g. “in” plus Present Infinitive in Luke 8:42b, and “behold” in Matthew 9:20), and script-ending scripts (e.g. Aorist Participles in Luke 8:51 and Matthew 9:23).

Thus the translator must analyse whether a new scenario is an interruption within the open scenario, or signals the prototypical closure of one scenario and the opening of a new one. Then the translator must ensure that the translation does not miscue the reader as to which scenarios are open by ambiguous or contradictory signals.

**Violating expectations**

If our scenario-based expectations are violated, we are surprised. If they are violated in ways which we believe too ridiculous to make any sense, we interpret this as humour. Howard comments (1987:34):

> Much humour is based on violating schemata. The epitome of this practice is the material from the Monty Python troupe. They often take some existing schema and then violate it severely by filling in one or two slots with very unusual stimuli.

Howard cites the Monty Python sketch teaching self-defence against attackers wielding items of fruit. The interpretation of violated expectations as humour was noted by Bergson (1911:69) and linked to scenarios by Goffman (1975:38-39).

As translators we must be very aware of the seemingly “unguided”, ridiculous and pointless things that biblical characters do (as viewed from the standpoint of other cultures, whose scenarios do not match theirs). They lie down to eat (Matthew 9:10), they deliberately tear their clothes (Matthew 26:65), they smash jars instead of taking the lid off (Mark 14:3), they make music at funerals (Matthew 9:23), they even kill “holy” cows at feasts (Luke 15:23). If we do not wish our translations to be Pythonesque, we will need to make explicit the reason for such actions, and/or make it explicit that for those people, in that era, these action were normal. The source culture may still seem weird, but at least the characters themselves are seen to be acting normally not eccentricly within their own culture.

We must also beware of assuming that people can automatically evaluate what is normal. For example, Borges (1966) presented an imaginary classification system (Howard, 1987:13):

(a) those that belong to the emperor, (b) embalmed ones, (c) those that are trained, (d) suckling pigs, (e) mermaids, (f) fabulous ones, (g) stray dogs, (h) those that are included in this classification, (i) those that tremble as if they were mad, (j) innumerable ones, (k) those drawn with a very fine camel’s hair brush, (l) others, (m) those that have just broken a flower vase, (n) those that resemble flies at a distance.

Lakoff referring to this passage says (1987:92):

Borges of course deals with the fantastic. These not only are not natural human categories - they could not be natural human categories. But part of what makes this passage art, rather than mere fantasy, is
that it comes close to the impression a Western reader gets when reading descriptions of non-western languages and cultures.

Lakoff then lists the classifiers for noun classes in Dyirbal, an aboriginal language of Australia, as recorded by Dixon (1982):

I. Bayi: men, kangaroos, possums, bats, most snakes, most fishes, some birds, most insects, the moon, storms, rainbows, boomerangs, some spears, etc.
II. Balan: women, bandicoots, dogs, platypus, echidna, some snakes, some fishes, most birds, fireflies, scorpions, crickets, the hairy mary grub, anything connected with fire or water, sun and stars, shields, some spears, some trees, etc.
III. Balam: all edible fruit and the plants that bear them, tubers, ferns, honey, cigarettes, wine, cake
IV. Bala: parts of the body, meat, bees, wind, yamsticks, some spears, most trees, grass, mud, stones, noises, and language, etc.

My point is that both classifications appear incongruous, yet Dyirbal groupings are not arbitrary, but are grouped logically according to both physical and mythical relationships (for details see Lakoff, 1987:92-103). What is logical and expected in one person’s world-view, may be totally unexpected in another’s.

Translators must be aware that the difference in world-view and scenario contents between source and target languages skews patterns of expectation and prevents accurate understanding of a text.

**Scenarios are the basis for implicature**

Since scenarios contain semantically linked information, the explicit mention of only certain items from the scenario enables the hearer to fill in missing implicit information and make the text coherent.

This thesis uses a narrow definition of “implicit” to include information not in the text but necessary for correctly understanding the author’s intended meaning. This excludes mere “background information”, as van Dijk states (1977:112):

> The set of conceptual and factual implications of each sentence of a discourse may be very large and, from a cognitive point of view, most of these implications are irrelevant for the comprehension of the discourse.

**Scenarios and implicature**

Communication is rarely totally explicit (Schank and Abelson, 1977:22):

People, in speaking and writing, consistently leave out information that they feel can easily be inferred by the listener or reader. They try to be concise and therein begins the root of the problem.

Implicit information may be referential, identifying exactly what a particular item refers to. It may be relational, indicating the semantic relationship between parts of the discourse. It may be one or more implicit propositions which must be understood in order to follow a chain of logic, cause and effect, or intentionality. Or indeed it may be emotive, indicating the attitude of the speaker or characters to some thing or event.
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Understanding natural language requires having the relevant scenario already stored in memory with all parts of the proposition explicit, and then correctly identifying that scenario, thus adding previous knowledge to the explicit information in the text (Schank, 1975; Schank and Abelson, 1977:11-12).

Where scenarios are shared between author and reader, the reader is able to correctly interpret implicit events and semantic relationships. For example (Baker, 1992:222):

I went to the cinema. The beer was good.
... anyone who hears or reads it will reach the following interpretation: the speaker says that s/he went to the cinema, that s/he drank beer at the cinema, and that the beer in question was good. Note that we naturally provide the necessary links to render the discourse coherent.

Applying Grice's maxim "be relevant" (Grice, 1975) often gives a clue to identifying an implicature, as shown below (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:34):

(32) Peter: Do you want some coffee?
Mary: Coffee would keep me awake.
Suppose that Peter is aware of (33). Then from the assumption explicitly expressed by Mary’s answer, together with assumption (33), he could infer conclusion (34):

(33) Mary does not want to stay awake.
(34) Mary does not want any coffee.

But identifying this implicature depends not just on knowledge and relevance, but also on identifying an appropriate semantic slot to link them. Here, the knowledge is identified as grounds for the relevant implicit conclusion (Coffee would keep her awake. She does not want to stay awake. Therefore she does not want coffee).

This inference does not require the hearer to consciously use ordered principles of formal logic. Links between cause and effect, grounds and conclusion, together with prototypical slot-fillers, are already stored in our Western “coffee” scenario. We already know that coffee keeps you awake, so you do not drink coffee late if you want to sleep.

We understand most implicatures, not by conscious reasoning, but by assuming that existing links in our mental scenarios apply in this situation (Schank and Abelson, 1977:67-68):

Understanding then, is a process by which people match what they see and hear to pre-stored groupings of actions that they have already experienced. New information is understood in terms of old information ... we view human understanding as heavily script-based. A human understander comes equipped with thousands of scripts. He uses these scripts almost without thinking.

However, our inferential abilities are affected by culture and language (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:38):

People speak different languages, they have mastered different concepts; as a result, they can construct different representations and make different inferences.

In cross-cultural communication, facts or relationships essential for understanding are often left implicit in the source language, but the implicatures cannot be correctly inferred as the relevant information is not part of the target language scenario, e.g.

Abdul: Do you want some water?
Tariq: Why do you ask? I have just eaten lentils.

The hearer cannot infer whether Tariq wants water or not, without knowledge from Tariq’s culturally-based scenario “Lentils make you thirsty.”
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Similarly, Luke 23:6: "Pilate asked if the man was a Galilean. When he learned that Jesus was under Herod's jurisdiction ..." The reader cannot infer that Jesus was indeed Galilean, and Galilee was under Herod's jurisdiction, without scenario-based knowledge. A translation may need to be explicit, e.g. in Parkari "When he learned that Jesus is of Galilee, and is of the jurisdiction of the ruler Herod..."

**Implicatures - plausible not logical**

Many scholars agree that the recovery of implicatures is not conscious application of logical deduction. Sperber and Wilson summarize (1986:69):

> The recovery of implicatures, for example, is a paradigm case of non-demonstrative inference, and it is becoming commonplace of the pragmatic literature that deduction plays little if any role in the process. Leech (1983:30-1) claims that the process by which implicatures are recovered 'is not a formalised deductive logic, but an informal rational problem-solving strategy', and that 'all implicatures are probabilistic'. Levinson (1983:115-16) suggests that in certain respects implicatures 'appear to be quite unlike logical inferences, and cannot be directly modelled in terms of some semantic relation like entailment'. Bach and Harnish (1979:92-3) argue that the form of inference by which implicatures are recovered 'is not deductive but what may be called an inference to a plausible explanation'.

Inference being based on probabilities, and plausible explanations, is consistent with the theory that we interpret explicit information in the context of appropriate scenarios which contain prototypical elements and relationships. As Brown and Yule state (1983:33):

> It may be the case that we are capable of drawing a specific conclusion ... from specific premises ... via deductive inference, but we are rarely asked to do so in the everyday discourse we encounter. ... We are more likely to operate with a rather loose form of inferencing.

So Sperber and Wilson's idea of a "logical entry" (1986:86), which I reject as part of scenario content, is redundant even here, since the "encyclopaedic" entry already handles inference. Schank and Abelson state (1977:3):

> Procedures for applying past knowledge to new experience often seem to require common sense and practical rules of thumb, in addition to, or instead of, formal analysis (Abelson, 1975)

I argue that these "common sense" procedures and "practical rules of thumb" are based on the semantically related information stored in our mental scenarios. Scenario theory also explains how false "logical relationships", such as superstitions, are stored mentally, and expressed grammatically in a logical form, e.g. "If a black cat crosses your path, then you will have bad luck."

**Scenarios and semantic relationships between clauses**

The scenario a reader chooses to account for explicit data in a text also determines which semantic relationship the reader assumes to exist between the explicit events in a text.

Semantic relationships between clauses, sentences and larger text units, are often left implicit (Meyer, 1992:81):

> Even in well-written text, the underlying structure may be implicitly rather than explicitly signalled. In these cases, it is necessary for the text analyst to make inferences about the organization in the text.
Readers and hearers make inferences about implicit semantic relations in the text according to their own preconceptions of likely semantic relations, as perceived through the grid of their mental scenarios, which embody their lifetime's experience (Pike, 1992:229):

the relation that exists between the features of each tagmeme [unit of meaning] and between tagmemes are not always overt, but are deduced by decoders relative to their real world knowledge and interests.

Rumelhart (1976) states “The process of understanding a passage consists in finding a schema which will account for it” (quoted in Schank and Abelson, 1977:10).

For example, :
1 Young Michael suffered terrible pain in his leg.
2 His father burned him on the ankle with a lighted rag.
3 He's fine now.

As Westerners, we probably choose a child abuse scenario to account for these data:
1 Young Michael suffered terrible pain in his leg.
2 BECAUSE his father burned him on the ankle with a lighted rag.
3 HOWEVER, he's fine now.

A Parkari would choose a traditional medicine scenario, and interpret the text as follows:
1 Young Michael suffered terrible pain in his leg.
2 THEREFORE his father burned him on the ankle with a lighted rag.
3 AS A RESULT, he's fine now.

To translate this text from one cultural milieu to the other, one must analyse the semantic relationship between clauses by comparing the text with scenarios in the source culture, and then lexicalize those semantic relationships to ensure correct understanding by members of the target culture.

Even an explicit conjunction often marks multiple semantic relationships, e.g. van Dijk (1977:58):

Typical in this respect is the conjunctive connective and e.g. in the following examples:
[18] John smoked a cigar and Peter smoked a pipe.
[19] John went to the library and checked his references.
[20] Please go to the store and buy me some beer.
[21] John smoked a cigar and Mary left the room.
[22] I took a sleeping pill and fell asleep.
[23] Give me some more time, and I'll show you how it can be done.
[24] Laugh and the world laughs with you, love and you love alone (Thurber).

Intuitively, the uses of and in these sentences may be paraphrased by e.g.: (and) at the same time [18], (and) there [19, 20], (and) therefore [21], (and) then or (and) so [22], if... then [23,24]. Apparently, therefore, and may be used to express not only a conjunction but also conditionals, causals, temporal and local connectives.

What van Dijk calls “intuitively” is in fact achieved by matching explicit events in the text with the framework of likely events, as stored in mental scenarios.

Scenarios and the causal chain

Many scenarios include scripts containing a “causal chain” where one event causes another event or results in a new situation being established.
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Such scenarios are used to interpret cause and effect relationships. For example (Schank and Abelson, 1977:23):
2 John came over yesterday. When Mary saw John she almost died laughing. Boy, was he mad.
... the third sentence is implicitly the result of the second part of the second sentence.

Events may even be omitted (1977:23):
3 John cried because Mary said she loved Bill.
Sentence (3) is a meaningful, well constructed English sentence. Yet, it is literally quite silly. Certainly John didn’t cry because of the event of Mary speaking. What ‘speaking’ does is cause ‘thinking’, which can cause ‘sadness’ which can be a reason for ‘crying’.

Schank and Abelson argue a general principle that speakers can omit certain stages, and audiences infer these missing stages by searching for specific items which correspond to generic rules of Causal Syntax (CS), defined as follows (1977:25-6):
CS1 Actions can result in state changes.
CS2 States can enable actions.
CS3 States can disable actions.
CS4 States (or acts) can initiate mental states.
CS5 Mental states can be reasons for actions.

Such examples, which are theoretically complex, do not normally cause comprehension problems; we simply consult our mental scenarios and assume a plausible chain of causality.

What we judge as plausible depends heavily on our assessment of the participants involved (Schank and Abelson, 1977:33):
Concepts of causal propensity come from whatever knowledge is available about the attitudes and capabilities of actors, and this knowledge can be manipulated by shadings in the verbal descriptions of actors.

For example, in Luke 7:5b we read concerning a centurion:
τὴν συναγωγὴν ἀυτὸς ἐκκόσμησεν ἡμᾶς.
the synagogue he built for us.

To the original target audience, whose “centurion” scenario included his status and relative wealth, it was obvious that a centurion would not put the stones into position himself. They would automatically infer the missing link in the causal chain, that “He has built the synagogue for us” means “He has paid money for materials and workers. Those workers have built our synagogue from those materials.” For those whose “centurion” scenario lacked such information, this inference would be less apparent.

Greek and English use the same verb for both building and causing to build. Other languages, such as Parkari, mark a causal chain grammatically using a causative form of the verb, so the translator must identify implicit causal chains before attempting to translate. Again, understanding, and hence translation, relies on using scenarios to disambiguate the form of the original text and reveal the causal chain in its entirety.

Scenarios and stereotypes

Certain scenarios contain stereotypes, and this explains the implicit communication of value judgments. Lakoff gives “mother” as an example (1987:80):
The category working mother is defined in contrast to the stereotypical housewife-mother. The housewife-mother stereotype arises from a stereotypical view of nurturance, which is associated with the
nurture model. According to the stereotypical view, mothers who do not stay at home all day with their children cannot properly nurture them.

Lakoff emphasizes that social stereotypes are culturally determined, and can be challenged and altered (1987:85):

social stereotypes can be used to stand for a category as a whole. Social stereotypes are usually conscious and are often the subject of public discussion. They are subject to change over time, and they may become public issues. Since they define cultural expectations they are used in reasoning and especially in what is called "jumping to conclusions." However they are usually recognized as not being accurate, and their use in reasoning may be overtly challenged.

Since social stereotypes "define social expectations" and "their use in reasoning may be overtly challenged," it is not surprising that John the Baptist and Jesus frequently do just this. John challenges people's stereotypes of Jews as automatically saved (e.g. Matthew 3:9), and Jesus challenges stereotypes of tax collectors and prostitutes as permanently excluded from God's kingdom (e.g. Matthew 21:31), and stereotypes of Samaritans as beyond the pale (e.g. Luke 10:33).

Similarly, when Jesus chose characters for his parables, he capitalized on the value judgements implicit in social stereotypes. For example:

- The stereotypical Pharisee is strictly religious, and self satisfied, e.g. Matthew 5:20 "unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees ..." 23:23 "you give a tenth of your spices - mint dill and cummin."
  12:2 the Pharisees criticize the disciples plucking com for working on the Sabbath.

- The stereotypical tax-collector is irreligious, corrupt, and avaricious, e.g. Matthew 9:10 "tax-collectors and sinners", Luke 3:12-13 "tax collectors ... Don't collect any more than you are required to"

Luke tells us that Jesus's parable in Luke 18:9-14 was addressed "To some who were confident of their own righteousness and looked down on everybody else", so Jesus chooses appropriate stereotypical characters to explore this theme. The Pharisee follows his stereotype perfectly, but the tax-collector's stereotype is challenged. Yes, he is a sinner, on that all agree, but he seeks God's mercy, and contrary to all stereotypical expectation, it is he who goes home "justified".

The cultural value judgments which are being challenged, and the flow of expectation and contraexpectation in the development of a discourse, are implicatures derived from stereotypical scenarios. As Schank and Abelson state (1977:174):

you can attribute specific motivations to certain stereotyped characters in a story, sight unseen, unless specific information overrides the stereotype.

Scenarios can be opened by their title or their contents

Scenarios can be opened in two basic ways, either from the top down, or bottom up (Howard, 1987:30). The top-down method uses the "title" of a scenario, the bottom-up method uses one or more of the individual elements from within the scenario, which enables the target audience to correctly identify the scenario in question.
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Opening scenarios by their title

Since scenarios have a title, that word or phrase opens the whole scenario. For example, συναγωγή “synagogue” is the title of a scenario whose contents can be identified from lexical collocations with “synagogue”. In Matthew, where “synagogue” occurs, three passages refer to διδάσκω “teach” (4:23, 9:35, 13:54), two to μαστιγώ “scourge” (10:17, 23:34), and others refer to Pharisees who proudly give ἐλεμονή “alms” (6:2), προσεύχομαι “pray” (6:5), and love the πρωτοκαθεδρία “place of honour” (23:6). The mere mention of synagogue, then, opens up a scenario which includes participants: e.g. teacher (such as Jesus), Pharisees, and others being taught; and events: e.g. teaching, punishing, almsgiving, praying, and seeking status.

So in Matthew 12:9, when Jesus is in the synagogue, it is expected from the contents of the synagogue scenario that the Pharisees should also be there, and should ask Jesus, a religious teacher, a religious question. This explains why, in 12:14, despite Pharisees being Discourse-new participants in that pericope, “the Pharisees” takes the article (marking Hearer-old information) and means “the Pharisees who were in the synagogue”, and “went out” means “went out of the synagogue”, even though the text had not stated explicitly where the Pharisees were.

Opening scenarios by metonymy

Scenario structure means that any single highly prototypical element within a scenario can be used to open the whole scenario. Lakoff gives an example of metonymy dependent on a locative link (1987:77):

English has a general principle by which a place may stand for an institution located at that place:
- The White house isn’t saying anything.

A parallel example occurs in Acts 17:19 ἐπὶ τῶν Αρεόπογον πάγον ἤγαγον “they took him to the Areopagus.” Young, in his concordance (1879:48), comments under Areopagus “This institution ...”, and Arndt and Gingrich (1979) remark that Areopagus should “be understood here less as a place ... than as the council”. Hence NIV translates this as “the Council of Philosophers”, making explicit the contextually focal element of the Areopagus scenario.

Lakoff also refers to data collected and analysed by Rhodes (1977) where one stage of an “event” scenario stands for the whole (1987:78):
... he asked speakers of Ojibwa who had come to a party how they got there. He got answers like the following (translated into English):
- I started to come.
- I stepped into a canoe.
- I got into a car.
... in Ojibwa it is conventional to use the embarkation point of an ICM of this sort [script] to evoke the whole ICM.

A parallel example occurs in Acts 12:19:

"Herod ... having examined the guards ordered that they be led away."
The RSV translates: “Herod ... ordered that they should be put to death.” In scenario theory terms, “leading out”, as the initial stage of the “execution” scenario, opens that scenario, which includes “put to death” as the next event.

The specific links which can be used by metonymy to evoke the whole scenario are culture and language specific, e.g. English, unlike Ojibwa above, can only use embarkation to stand for the whole journey when no further effort is involved (Lakoff, 1987:79):
- I hopped on a bus.
- I just stuck out my thumb.

**Opening scenarios by a “header”**

Schank and Abelson (1977:49-50) describe four types of “header” which are used to open script-type scenarios, and which also indicate the likelihood of the whole script being fulfilled. I summarize and add Greek examples.

**Precondition Header:** e.g. “hunger” is a Precondition Header for the restaurant script “because it is the goal condition for the MAINCON [Main Constituent] (INGEST food), which is normally assumed to be true when the script is instantiated.”

Compare Matthew 25:35-36 where there is a series of precondition headers opening scripts, starting with the word ἐπετέλεσα. “I hungered” opening the “eat” scenario (headers underlined, scenario title bolded):

epetelēsa γὰρ καὶ ἔθικατε μοι φαγεῖν, ἐθύμησα καὶ ἐποτίσατε με,
I-hungered for and you-gave to-me to-eat, I-thirsted and you-caused-to-drink me

ἔψιν ἤμως καὶ συμπήγαγατέ με, γυμνὸς καὶ περιβδλετέ με,
stranger I-was and you-received-as-guest me, naked and you-clothed me

ἡθύμησα καὶ ἔπεωκελασθή με, ἐν φυλακῇ ἤμως καὶ ἐζητῆτε πρός με.
I-sickened and you-looked-after me, in prison I-was and you-came to me

The Instrumental Header mainly occurs where two scripts are linked in an instrumental relationship. Schank and Abelson (1977:49-50) give this example: “in ‘John took the subway to the restaurant’, both the subway and restaurant contexts would be predicted, since subsequent inputs about either make perfectly good sense.”

Compare Acts 3:1, where Peter and John are going into the Temple, but the subsequent input (healing a lame man, Acts 3:2-8a) takes place within the instrumental scenario “going into”, and only in Acts 3:8 do they finally enter:

Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Ιωάννης δωλέαυσιν εἰς τὸ λεπόν ... Peter () and John were-going-up into the temple...

The Greek imperfect tense indicates that the action is viewed as Imperfective Aspect (Porter, 1993) and thus may be interrupted. Here it provides a Setting for the miracle.

Contrast Matthew 21:12, where the subsequent input is about the resulting scenario, here the temple. Note the verb of entering is Aorist (Perfective Aspect) (Porter, 1993):

Καὶ ἔστωλεν Τησοῦς εἰς τὸ λεπόν
And entered Jesus into the temple
καὶ ἔβαλεν τάντας τοὺς πωλοῦσας καὶ ἐγοραζότας ἐν τῷ λεπό
and he-threw-out all the sellers and buyers in the temple
The **Locale Header** is the most strongly predictive. It relates time-place to scripts, e.g. time “on December 25th”, place “the soccer field” or “the Museum of Modern Art.”

An example of the Locale Header is Luke 4:16 where the words 

“sabbaths” and “synagogue” together open the “service” scenario, thus

indicating what it was Jesus stood to read, the scriptures:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{Kal elqif}X\text{Gev} \\
&\text{kcxtci t}6 \\
&\text{elw}06s* \text{aimo} \\
&\text{tt}) \text{fpepq} \\
&\text{to w} \\
&\text{aaSSdTatv}
\end{align*}\]

and he-entered according-to the custom to-him on the day of-the sabbaths 

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{els} \text{t}h\text{a} \text{synagogov} \text{h} \\
&\text{kai anestth d}v\text{agnovai}
\end{align*}\]

into the synagogue, and he-stood to-read.

Schank and Abelson note that where different scripts intersect, either script may follow, e.g. a delivery man going to a restaurant might be followed by the delivery man script with restaurant as a place he delivers to, or the restaurant script with him as a customer.

Compare John 4:6-7 where the “drink” scenario is opened by “headers”

(precondition “being wearied”, locale “the well”) plus other elements such as time 

“midday” (the hottest time), goal “water”, agent “woman”, and the event “draw water”.

These set up a strong expectation that “drink” will occur:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{d o} \text{w} \text{v} \text{I} \text{n} \text{os} \text{ov} \text{kekopiakos e} \text{t}h\text{e} \text{d}e\text{i} \text{aporia} \text{es} \\
&\text{The therefore Jesus being-wearied from the journey} \\
&\text{ekatheteo o} \text{th}wos \text{etl t}h\text{e} \text{piy}h. \\
&\text{sat thus at the well ...} \\
&\text{O} \text{r}a \text{h} \text{e} \text{w} \text{os} \text{ekta}. \\
&\text{'Erxetai gynai e} \text{t}h\text{e} \text{Sigma} \text{r} \text{e} \text{le} \text{s} \text{anai} \text{h} \text{g} \text{a} \text{w} \text{oro}. \\
&\text{Comes woman from the Samaria to-draw water.} \\
&\text{legei autth o} \text{I} \text{n} \text{os} \text{ov}, \text{D} \text{os} \text{m} \text{o} \text{a} \text{pe} \text{nu}. \\
&\text{Says to-her the Jesus, Give to-me to-drink}
\end{align*}\]

However, the first-century Palestinian scenarios for Jew and Samaritan, man and woman, include strong cultural contraexpectations such as Jews should not drink from Samaritan vessels (John 4:9), and lone men should not speak to lone women (John 4:27).

Scenario theory shows Jesus’s dilemma, whether to satisfy his needs or conform to cultural norms. We do not even know whether Jesus got his drink, but he did break cultural norms to meet the woman’s needs.

Where the target language and culture do not share focal script details with the source language and culture, a literal translation may open the scenario but will not access its focal elements. The translator will then need to make such details explicit.

The **Internal Conceptualization Header** refers to any conceptualization or role from a script. In combination these open scenarios, as described next.

**Opening scenarios by a combination of items**

A scenario is often opened by making explicit several prototypical elements within it. For example, “Sitting in the balmy warmth of a summer afternoon, listening to the soft thwack of willow on leather” opens up the “cricket” scenario for an English person, though probably not for an American.
Likewise in Matthew 3:4 the detailed description of John the Baptist’s clothing is intended to open the “prophet” scenario, possibly even the “Elijah” scenario. Compare “John’s clothes were made of camel’s hair and he had a leather belt round his waist” with 2 Kings 1:8 “He was a man with a garment of hair and with a leather belt round his waist.” The king said, “It is Elijah the Tishbite.” Note the NIV translation of Zechariah 13:4 “On that day every prophet will be ashamed of his prophetic vision. He will not put on a prophet’s garment of hair in order to deceive”, where “prophet’s” is implicit in Hebrew.

Similarly, in Acts 9:36-41, Dorcas’s coming alive is not stated explicitly, but in verse 40b two verbs which belong in the result category of the “come alive again” scenario, are used together to open that scenario: ἡ δὲ ἀνέφη τούς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἑδόσα τὸν Πέτρον ἀνεκάθαρσεν. She opened the eyes of her, and having-seen the Peter sat-up.

In cultures where these explicit elements do not open the correct scenario, the scenario title may need to be made explicit, e.g. Acts 9:40b “She came back to life, opened her eyes, and seeing Peter she sat up.”

**Identifying scenarios**

It is crucial that scenarios are correctly identified by the audience so they can correctly understand a text and remember it (Howard, 1987:39):

To understand something is to select a schema that provides a plausible account of it, and thus allows us to assimilate it to something we know (Anderson, 1977; Rumelhart, 1980 and 1984).

Translators must not only identify the source text scenarios for accurate exegesis, but also produce a translation which enables the target audience to identify the appropriate scenarios.

What ways do we have then to correctly identify scenarios?

**Identifying scenarios from the grammar**

We have seen that scenarios determine information status and so affect grammatical patterns of reference (Schank and Abelson, 1977:41):

Scripts allow for new references to objects within them just as if these objects had been previously mentioned; objects within a script may take ‘the’ without explicit introduction because the script itself has already implicitly introduced them.

Thus the use of Hearer-old grammatical markers for Discourse-new elements is a signal that a scenario is open. The element so marked must belong to a scenario which has been explicitly mentioned in the text, is situationally focal, or is a unique element of the “whole world” scenario, which is regarded as always open (e.g. the sun). The specific Hearer-old markers in Greek include participles and the article, as will be argued in section 2 of this thesis.
Identifying scenarios from the lexicon

Lexical items are used to open scenarios. Consequently, we can identify a scenario from the explicit use of its "title", so long as that "title" opens the same conceptual framework in our mind as the author intended. For example, in Matthew 4:2 we recognize the "fast" scenario from the participle "having fasted". For a Muslim, however, the "fast" scenario has very different prototypical contents, including abstaining from both food and drink, during daylight only, for the month of Ramadan.

Similarly, we can identify a scenario from a combination of explicit lexical items belonging to that scenario. However, if the contents of our own scenario do not match the contents of the source text's scenario, we may identify a scenario that the original author did not intend, or fail to identify any relevant scenario. For example, in Luke 8:5-8 we are expected to identify the "wheat" scenario from "sower" "sow" "seed" "soil" "fruit" and "hundredfold". Different cultural groups might identify different crops.

Identifying scenarios using analogy and local interpretation

Brown and Yule (1983:59) identify two key "principles of interpretation available for the hearer which enable him to determine ... a relevant and reasonable interpretation of an expression ... on a particular occasion of utterance", the principles of analogy and of local interpretation.

The principle of analogy (Brown and Yule, 1983:65):

is one of the fundamental heuristics which hearers and analysts adopt in determining interpretations in context. They assume that everything will be as it was before unless they are given specific notice that some aspect has changed. Dahl (1976:46) formulates a principle for speakers: 'Indicate only things which have changed and omit those which are as they were before.' To repeat what is known to be shared knowledge, 'things as they were before', flouts Grice's maxim of quantity.

In terms of scenario theory, the principle of analogy means the audience should assume that the currently open scenario remains open and its prototypical contents remain valid, unless told otherwise. This principle parallels Grice's maxims of quantity, "Make your contribution as informative as required" and "Do not make your contribution more informative than required" (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:33-4). In terms of scenario theory, these maxims predict that a certain amount of explicit information is necessary to open a new scenario, but once a scenario is opened, prototypical information within that scenario can be assumed and need not be made explicit.

The principle of local interpretation (Brown and Yule, 1983:59):

instructs the hearer not to construct a context any larger than he needs to arrive at an interpretation. Thus if he hears someone say 'Shut the door' he will look towards the nearest door available for being shut.

This principle, rephrased in terms of scenario theory, states that explicit things and events should be presumed to belong to currently open scenarios, unless otherwise stated. The context in which to identify a referent, then, is the prototypical contents of the currently open scenario (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:137-138):
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The organization of the individual’s encyclopaedic memory, and the mental activity in which he is engaged, limit the class of potential contexts from which an actual context can be chosen at any given time.

Hearer-old grammar, combined with the principle of local interpretation, signals that the item in question should first be sought in a currently open scenario, whether textual or situational (Lyons, 1977:181):

In many cases the use of a common noun preceded by the definite article will suffice without further description, even though the referent has not been previously mentioned, because the speaker can fairly assume, in the given situation or universe of discourse, that the hearer will know which of the potential referents satisfying the description he is referring to. For example, if I say to my wife or children, The cat has not been in all day, in a context in which there has been no previous mention of cat, I can be sure that the reference will be successful.

The Greek article, which I regard as a Hearer-old marker, signals that the referent belongs to a currently open scenario, e.g. Acts 7:60a:

\[ \text{Having-placed \( \delta \)} \text{the knees he-shouted in-voice loud} \]

Here “the knees” refers to the knees of the person in the currently open scenario, the agent of the verbs, i.e. Stephen.

The identity of the speaker often determines which referent is most “local”, as Lyons points out (1977:181):

If an Englishman uses referentially the expression ‘the queen’ and an American the expression ‘the president’, in a context in which no queen or president has already been referred to, they will normally expect to be understood as referring to the queen of England and to the president of the United States respectively.

Similarly, the use of θεός “the god” by Jewish (and also gentile Christian) writers means Yahweh, the true God, e.g. John 1:1

\[ \text{καὶ \( \delta \)} \text{λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν \( \thetaεόν \)} \]

and the word was with the god

However, the co-text or situational context can change the referent of θεός from Yahweh to a pagan deity, e.g.

Acts 7:43a

\[ \text{καὶ ἄνελβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολὼχ} \]

and you-took-up the tent of-the Moloch

\[ \text{καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ \( \thetaεοῦ \)} [\text{you}] \text{ Phiβόν,} \]

and the star of-the god [of-you] Rephan

Identifying scenarios using relevance

According to Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986), the dictum “be relevant” explains why the audience will search for implied information in order to make sense of the text itself. Audiences expect the text not only to mean something, but to mean something relevant to the context.

Relevance Theory also makes explicit the role of shared extra-textual information, the “mutual cognitive environment” of speaker and audience, for correctly understanding communication. I argue that scenarios are the storehouse of such extra-textual information,
and enable the audience to identify relevant implicatures by simply “reading” them from the prototypical contents in the open scenario, even though they are not in the text.

However, the search for relevance also guides the audience in determining which scenario is open. Items are assumed to belong in the same scenario where possible, since their collocation is thus more relevant. For example, “She bought a set of knives and a set of forks” could refer to throwing knives and garden forks, but unless there is some special context their collocation is more relevant if both are cutlery. Similarly, new scenarios that link to currently open scenarios are more relevant than unconnected scenarios. For example, “The detective had no leads” could refer to dog’s leads, or electrical leads, but investigative leads are more relevant as they are prototypically linked to the detective scenario.

Chapter summary

Scenario theory provides a cognitive framework for understanding categories of information status. Grammatical patterns of reference in English, such as the use of indefinite and definite articles and pronouns, reflect cognitive distinctions between Hearer-new and Hearer-old information, and between items which are currently in mental focus and those which are not.

Scenarios enable an audience to determine the contextual sense of a word by identifying the conceptual areas where the scenario of that word interlocks with other scenarios in the text. Encyclopaedic scenario contents enable an audience to predict the likely actions of characters and the likely sequence and result of events. Similarly the prototypical elements and interrelationships stored in scenarios allow the audience to correctly understand implicatures.

Scenarios can be opened top-down, by the explicit use of the scenario’s title, or bottom-up by the collocation of prototypical elements from a single scenario. Scenarios can be identified by the audience using both lexical and grammatical clues, whilst observing the principles of analogy, local interpretation and relevance.
Chapter 4
SCENARIOS AND DISCOURSE

Since scenarios not only affect the writer's choice of grammar and the audience's interpretation of vocabulary, but also provide the information base for the audience to predict likely events and fill in implicatures, it is crucial to look at their role in discourse. In this chapter I consider the role of scenarios in dividing text into discourse units and I make the hypothesis that New Testament Greek uses a combination of main verbs and participles to show such chunking, demonstrating this within a single pericope. I also show, using New Testament Greek examples, how scenarios are the basis for both lexical cohesion and semantic coherence in discourse, and review the theory and research which suggests how scenarios guide an audience in predicting, comprehending and remembering discourse.

Scenarios break discourse into chunks

Because scenarios are information chunks, whole clusters of information can be communicated simply by referring to the scenario. The opened scenario guides the audience's expectations, and enables them to correctly infer implicatures. Scenarios also provide the cognitive basis by which the audience divides a discourse into chunks, since a scenario not only communicates clusters of related information, but also integrates clusters of related information into a single conceptual unit.

Chunking information and text processing

Scenarios, by clustering information in chunks, make the processing of texts simpler. Scenarios enable the hearer to correctly identify elements of the text and to cluster them appropriately, either linking them within an open scenario, or opening a new scenario where they belong. In this way, scenarios enable the audience to analyse the discourse into distinct conceptual units.

Once the hearer has chunked the text into scenarios, he does not need to store in memory the masses of minor details which are specific to particular scenarios, but can simply store the scenario "titles", and these will enable him to recall the scenarios and retrieve the scenario contents, as and when required. So a scenario, regardless of its internal complexity, is not only a unit in memory, but can also function as a unit in
discourse structure and memory recall. Schank and Abelson, in the context of making theoretical representations of stories, make this same point (1977:151):

it is clear that we do not want to represent every event in a script explicitly every time the story invokes it. The level of detail would be overwhelming. Furthermore, psychologically such a representation would seem to indicate that people always actually think of all the detail in the particular script they are using. This seems quite wrong.

Similarly Pike, terming scenarios “vectors”, notes they fill a single slot in the macro-structure of a text (1992:232):

The macro structure of the referential hierarchy is made up of vectors ... Vectors of more than one event are sequences of happenings which are more closely related to each other than they are to events in other vectors and fill a single higher-level slot role.

For example, Mark 1:4 states that “John came baptizing in the desert region.” Only in verse 5 does he mention “in the Jordan river”, and only in verse 10 “coming up out of the water”. Yet every instance of baptism involved going into the river, being baptized, and coming out of the river. The word βαπτίζω “baptize, wash”, when people are the goal of the event, is the title of a scenario which includes these details, but can function in discourse as a single information chunk.

Role of Greek participles and main verbs in chunking text

Since scenarios affect information status and consequently grammatical forms, the grammar of a text often gives clear indications as to which information should be clustered within a single scenario. This works alongside lexical clues, enabling the audience to correctly assign concepts into distinct scenario chunks.

I posit that Greek uses a main verb to mark the core event in a scenario, and uses participles, or verbs in subordinate clauses, to refer to other events which are conceptually part of the main verb’s scenario. Thus the cluster of main verb plus related participles represents one mental scenario, and fills one memory slot in the macro structure of the text.

For example, Mark 1:31 (chunked according to main verbs, bolded, participles underlined):

kal τρομελλων ἰησοῦν αὐτὴν κατατίθαι τῆς χειρός
And having-come-towards he-raised her having-seized the hand

kal διάθηκεν αὐτήν ὀ πυρέτος, and it-left her the fever,

kal διηκόμει αὐτῶν. and she-served them.

Note that the first line has two event ideas in participial form, which both belong to the “raise” scenario, “come” being a preceding stage, and “seize” being the means used to “raise”. Thus this story segment, although it has five verbal forms, has only three information “chunks”: Jesus raised her, the fever left her, she served them.

Similarly, in Acts 9:36-41, chunking and numbering the text according to main verbs clearly identifies scenario units (main verbs bolded, subordinate clauses indented,
Participles underlined). The section headings are from a "story grammar" analysis by Callow and Callow (1996):

**SETTING**

1. In Joppa (̣̣) certain was female-disciple by-name Tabitha, which being-interpreted is-called Dorcas

2. She was full of works good and almsgiving, which she was doing

**PROBLEM**

3. It-happened (̣̣) in the days those having-sickened she to die

**HOLDING INCIDENT (would be PARTIAL RESOLUTION in normal storyline)**

4. having-washed (̣̣) they placed [her] in upper-room

**PARTIAL RESOLUTION (1)**

5. Near (̣̣) being Lydda to the Joppa, the disciples having heard that Peter is in it, sent two men towards him requesting Do not hesitate to come to us

**PARTIAL RESOLUTION (2)**

6. having-risen (̣̣) Peter went with them whom having arrived they led up into the upper-room

**PARTIAL RESOLUTION (3) (a)**

7. and showing under-garments and over-garments which she was making with them being the Dorcas

**PARTIAL RESOLUTION (3) (b)**

8. having-given (̣̣) to her hand he raised her, having-called (̣̣) the saints and the widows he presented her living.

**RESOLUTION: PART (i)**

9. Tabitha, rise/be raised

**RESOLUTION: PART (ii) (a)**

10. She (̣̣) opened the eyes of her

**RESOLUTION: PART (ii) (b)**

11. and having seen the Peter sat up.

12. having-given (̣̣) to her hand he raised her,

13. having-called (̣̣) the saints and the widows he presented her living.
In section 3, εγένετο “it happened” acts as a dummy main verb, the semantic main verb being the infinitive διποθανεῖν “die.”

It should be noted that there is generally one main verb (i.e. excluding subordinate clauses) per structural section. Exceptions are in the setting, and in the resolution, both part (i) and part (ii), each of which contains two main verbs.

The setting, then, contains two chunks: line 1 identifying the new participant, line 2 giving information about her character.

Resolution part (i) (lines 10 and 11) also contains two chunks. It has two main verbs, conjoined by καὶ “and”, both with the same subject. This co-occurrence marking (occurring only here and in lines 8 and 9) shows that the two verbs “open” (eyes) and “sit up” both belong in the same scenario. Here Luke opens the “come alive again” scenario by stating two of the elements within it. They both belong in the “result” section of that scenario, thus implying that the cause “coming alive again” has taken place.

Schank and Abelson (1977:47) argue that if only the title of a script is used, the script is presumed to be a “fleeting script” and understood and remembered as a single chunk which occurs according to the expected pattern in the script. If however a script is referred to not only by a header but by some other element from the same script, then the script is “non-fleeting” and details from the script are accessed. Here the “instantiation” of the “coming alive again” scenario, by both “open” (eyes) and “sit up”, marks it out formally as a “non-fleeting script” whose details are to be remembered.

Resolution part (ii) (lines 12 and 13) also contains two chunks, each marked by the developmental particle δε (Levinsohn, 1992:32-40). This Callow and Callow divide into two subsections, noting that, in line with Longacre’s observations (1996:36), line 13 would be the climax of this story, since:

In Longacre’s theory of narrative analysis, the ‘peak’ or ‘climax’ of the narrative is characteristically indicated by the presence ‘on stage’ of all or most of the participants in the story. At this point, Peter, Dorcas, the saints and the widows are all referred to...

Further evidence in support of the accuracy of this “chunking” is that the developmental particle δε normally occurs here with each “main verb plus participles” chunk. Exceptions occur where the main verb is not developmental to the plot (i.e. the holding incident, line 7), and where two main verbs belong in the same section (i.e. the setting, lines 1 and 2, where the second line, the character of Dorcas, is linked to the first by an anaphoric pronoun; the partial resolution (3), lines 8 and 9, where parts (a) and (b) are joined by καὶ “and”; and the resolution part (i) where lines 10 and 11 are conjoined by καὶ “and”). Thus the holding incident is the only section in the Callows’ analysis which does not have δε in second position, which supports this hypothesis for chunking.

Note that the developmental particle δε marks out the “main verb plus participles” chunk (or “main verb and main verb” chunk) as developmental, i.e. it operates at “chunk”
level in the hierarchy, not “event” level, marking out whole scenario blocks as developmental. For example in section 6:

6. 

\[\text{δευτέρας δὲ Πέτρος συνήχον ἀυτὸς.}\]

having-risen () Peter went-with them

\[\text{ὅπως παρέβεβλευεσσάς ἀυτῆς τοῦ ἐν πατρί.}\]

whom having-arrived they-led-up into the upper-room

it is not Peter’s rising which is marked by δὲ as developmental, but the whole script-type scenario of Peter “rising, accompanying them, and being led into the upper-room.” This whole scenario, as indicated by the main verb, can be given the title “accompany”. I posit then that all of section 6 can be stored in the brain as the chunk “Peter accompanied them”, and only this need be remembered as the “prompt” for successful recovery of the story from memory.

The “chunks” of text marked by non-subordinated main verbs, i.e. the distinct scenarios which form the story framework, and which the hearers need to consciously remember, are as follows (with main verb in bold as the scenario title, followed by all the verbal forms listed in that scenario):

1. was disciple - was a disciple, whose name being translated is called ...
2. was good - was full of good works and almsgiving, which she did
3. died - sickened, died
4. placed body - washed body, placed in upper room
5. sent for Peter - towns were near, heard Peter is near, sent requesting he come quick
6. Peter went along - Peter got up, went along, arrived, they led him up
7. widows stood beside - stood, weeping and showing clothes which Dorcas had made when she was with them
8. Peter prayed - ejected, knelt, prayed
9. and said - turned, said “rise”
10. she opened eyes
11. and sat up - saw Peter, sat up
12. he raised her - gave her his hand, raised her
13. presented her - called people, presented her alive

A caveat to this process, which does not affect the chunking per se, but rather the way the hearer “titles” the chunks, is that when a chunk consists of a verb of speech (or thought etc.) followed by what is spoken, the title of the chunk is the sum of these two, i.e. not just “X said” but “X said Y”. Within the speech itself, the same kind of grammatical analysis can be used to chunk the content of the speech and find the scenarios. In line 9 above the best summary is clearly:

9. and said rise - turned, said “rise”

Using this grammatical approach to “chunking” the text, we can see that not only is the story line presented in its briefest form by the sequence of main verbs, but also the strings of verbs which are grammatically related to each main verb can be seen to be semantically related also. This tends to support the analysis that independent main verbs are used in Greek narrative to chunk the text into scenarios, or semantic clusters, which
form the building blocks of the story. In contrast, events which are grammatically encoded in subordinate clauses or as Participles, are part of the same scenario as the main verb.

This does not mean that non-main-verb events are inherently less important than main verb events, but rather that, once you have heard the whole story, you need only to recall the flow of main verbs, and the rest of the events can be assigned their place in the story automatically, since they belongs in the “normal place” of the relevant scenarios.

Thus the Greek grammatical structure of main clause and subordinated clauses reflects the semantic structure of the discourse in terms of nuclear concepts and related or “satellite” concepts. In Mann and Thompson’s words, “Nuclearity in text structure is a plausible communicative basis for the grammar of hypotactic clause combining” (1987:35). This concept of nuclearity explains why the main verbs, referring to the nuclei of scenarios, constitute the main storyline in narrative. As Mann and Thompson predict (underlining theirs), “If units that only function as satellites and never as nuclei are deleted, we should still have a coherent text with a message resembling that of the original; it should be something like a synopsis of the original text. If, however, we delete all units that function as nuclei anywhere in the text, the result should be incoherent and the central message difficult or impossible to understand” (1987:32).

Discourse structure, however, is not only based on nucleus-satellite relationships between units, but on hierarchical relationships. The number of levels in the hierarchy is theoretically limitless, since any text parts which are related functionally constitute one level of the hierarchical structure (Mann and Thompson, 1987:2, 25). Practically, however, it is useful to limit the number of levels when describing texts generically, rather than describing a specific text, whilst recognizing that there may be several levels of structural relationship within a single broad hierarchical level.

This thesis recognizes the following hierarchical levels of discourse as useful in discussing New Testament texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms used here</th>
<th>Equivalent terms</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>Discourse (includes oral texts)</td>
<td>Matthew’s Gospel, Paul’s letter to Philemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME UNIT</td>
<td>Pericope cluster with same theme</td>
<td>Matthew 1:1-25 (Jesus’s birth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPISODE</td>
<td>Pericope</td>
<td>Matthew 1:1-17, 1:18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAGRAPH</td>
<td>Pericope</td>
<td>Matthew 1:1-6a, 1:6b-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCE</td>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Matthew 1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUSE</td>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Matthew 1:21a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These discourse levels, apart from EPISODE and THEME UNIT, are defined functionally by Reed (1997:46):

- **WORD** = sound + sense
- **PHRASE** = sound + sense + attribution
- **(CLAUSE)** = sound + sense + attribution + transitivity [+relation]
- **SENTENCE** = sound + sense + attribution + transitivity
- **(PARAGRAPH)** = sound + sense + attribution + transitivity + social task [+relation]
- **DISCOURSE** = sound + sense + attribution + transitivity + social task
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An EPISODE is made up of PARAGRAPHS and is potentially a TEXT in its own right, but it also functions to fulfil a specific social task in the context of the whole book or letter. Translations of the Bible which use section headings typically divide the text at the level of EPISODE. Similarly, a THEME UNIT is made up of distinct EPISODES which are grouped together, in the context of the whole book or letter, because of a common theme or "topic", defined by Callow as "conceptual material which is of central importance throughout a unit - what a unitary stretch of text is primarily about" (1998:218).

Using this terminology, Acts 9:36-41 above, the story of Tabitha, is an EPISODE within the TEXT of Acts 1:1-28:31. The elements of "story grammar" such as Setting, Problem, Holding incident, Resolution, each constitute a PARAGRAPH, which is made up of one or more SENTENCES (e.g. the Setting is made up of two sentences, the Problem of one). Acts 9:32-11:18 could be understood as a THEME UNIT about Peter’s ministry. Since scenarios are also structured hierarchically, they relate to all levels of this structure, e.g. the “sitting up” scenario relates to the SENTENCE (unit 11 above), the “prayer” scenario relates to the PARAGRAPHS (units 8 and 9 above), the “healing” scenario relates to the EPISODE, the “Peter” scenario relates to the THEME UNIT, and the “apostles” scenario relates to the whole TEXT.

Scenarios provide cohesion and coherence in discourse

Scenarios and lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion “refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text” (Baker, 1992:203). Lexical cohesion relies on the fact that vocabulary is tagged to concepts which are already stored in prototypical relationships within a scenario. Baker gives two categories of lexical cohesion, reiteration and collocation (1992:203). These have distinct discourse functions.

Reiteration

The primary use of reiteration in discourse is to keep track of participants over an extended span of discourse, thus providing “basic continuity”. Jordan lists various reiteration devices (1992:188):

- Basic continuity involves the use of repetition (full and partial), substitution, clausal ellipsis (deletion), acronyms, synonyms, naming and generic nouns.

For example, Mark 5:1-20:

- first mention: ἀνθρώπος ἐν πνεύματι ἄκαθόρτῳ “person in unclean spirit” 5:2
- full repetition
- partial repetition: τοῦ ἀνθρώπου “the person” 5:8
- pronoun: αὐτῶν “him” 5:3
- null pronoun: 5:5, 5:6, 5:7 etc.
Another reiteration device in the New Testament is the use of titles, e.g. Matthew 9:27-31:

- **first mention:** τῷ Ἰησοῦ “Jesus” 9:27
- **full repetition:** δ’ Ἰησοῦς “Jesus” 9:28
- **partial repetition:** -
- **pronoun:** αὐτῷ “him” 9:28
- **null pronoun:** 9:29
- **synonym:** -
- **superordinate:** κύριε “sir” 9:28 (possibly a title “Lord”)
- **general word:** κύριος Δαυίδ “Son of David” 9:27
- **name:** τῷ Ἰησοῦ “Jesus” 9:27
- **title:**

Although many reiteration devices are grammatical, e.g. use of pronoun (and null pronoun), superordinates and titles are only understood as co-referential if the relationship is already part of the hearer’s scenario.

For example, the superordinate “bread” in John 6:31:

οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς ἔστιν γεγραμμένον.

The fathers of us the manna ate in the wilderness, as it is written,

"Ἀρτον ἐκ τοῦ ὄφρανοι ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.

Bread from the heaven he gave to them to eat.

Here co-referentiality depends on a specific-generic link between “manna” and “bread” in the source culture scenario. In English, “bread” is not a natural superordinate, since manna was uncooked. The Greek term, being also a generic term for food, provided better lexical cohesion throughout this discourse section, John 6:25-59.

Similarly, in Matthew 27:11-18, the same character is referred to by his title ὁ ἡγεμὼν “the governor” (verses 11 and 15), and by his name ὁ Πιλᾶτος “Pilate” (verses 13 and 17). This caused no problem for the original target audience, since Pilate was linked with governor in their existing mental scenario. In the Parkari translation, however, title and name are explicitly linked in verse 13, “Then the ruler Pilate said”. Without such explicit linking, the target audience, who are not familiar with the name Pilate and who he was, would understand Pilate and the governor to be two different individuals. Note that there is no ambiguity at sentence level, only at higher discourse levels.

Compare Matthew 17:12b, where “Son of Man” refers to Jesus (Matthew 16:21 shows this is not intentionally obscure), and John 18:13-24, where “the high priest” is used both of Caiaphas (18:13, 24) and also (apparently) of Annas (18:15, 19, 22). The latter requires complex exegetical decisions, and both require careful translation to achieve appropriate co-reference.

**Collocation**

Collocation “covers any instance which involves a pair of lexical items that are associated with each other in the language in some way” (Baker, 1992:203). Collocation
also depends on the word-concept link within scenarios. The major discourse function of collocation is to provide lexical cohesion within paragraphs and episodes, thus helping the audience understand paragraph and episode boundaries by changes in collocational sets.

Jordan regards lexical continuity as one of three essential strands in text analysis (1992:173):

“There is] the need for a system of analysis which goes beyond just the relations between clauses. Lexical continuity and problem-solution aspects are also ... essential parts of the system, and this analysis seeks to show the inter-dependence of these three methods in a full analysis of connections within the text.

For example, in Luke 5:12-14, the source culture “leprosy” scenario provided lexical continuity and problem-solution continuity, due to a causal link between leprosy and ritual impurity. The string of lexical items - leprosy, cleanse, touched, be cleansed, leprosy, priest, cleansing, Moses - marked this as a distinct episode or pericope.

However, where source and target culture scenarios do not match, collocations are not apparent, and lexical cohesion is lost. The average English audience expects a leper to ask for healing, and to go to a doctor. Moreover, since no ritual-impurity scenario is opened, “touched” is not perceived as contraexpectation. Again semantic relationships within and between sentences are clear. What is unclear is the logic of the discourse.

Lexical cohesion is also promoted by “associated nominals”, i.e. KNOWN inerrable referents, which are marked by the definite article in English (Jordan, 1992:189):

The key to understanding many of the lexical connections in the ZPG letter [letter on Zero Population Growth being analysed] lies in recognizing nominal groups which are “associated” in some way with one or more of the topics. These were named “associated nominals” ... [e.g.] once a particular book has been established as a topic in a text, it is quite reasonable to write “The author is unknown.”

Similarly, Greek uses the article with KNOWN inerrable referents, e.g.

Matthew 4:18, 20,
They-were-for fishermen ...
οἱ δὲ εὐθείως ἀδένυς τὰ δίκτυα ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.
They () straightway having-left the fishing-nets followed him.
The use of the article with τὰ δίκτυα “the fishing-nets” marks them as Hearer-old, indicating that these Discourse-new items are linked to an open Discourse-old scenario, here “fishermen”. This clarifies the meaning of “the nets” as “their nets”, and shows verse 20 is part of the same episode as verse 18.

Scenarios and discourse disambiguation

Scenarios can be opened by co-text, or real life context. This causes potential ambiguity in identifying scenarios, and thus in disambiguating a text, e.g.

Matthew 16:6
Ὅρατε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τὸς ζυμὸς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.
Look-out and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

As presented by the Gospel writer, Jesus expects the preceding “co-text” to provide the scenario, i.e. his calling the Pharisees and Sadducees wicked (16:4). But the disciples take
their current real life context as the scenario, i.e. forgetting bread (16:5). Both scenarios are potentially open to Jesus’s disciples, and both are explicit in the co-text for the Gospel readers.

When the disciples understand “leaven” as part of the “bread” scenario (16:7), Jesus first shows the “bread” scenario is not focal (verses 8-10), then states categorically that “bread” is the wrong scenario (verse 11): “How is it you don’t understand that I was not talking to you about bread? But be on your guard against the yeast of the Pharisees and Sadducees.”

Simply by dismissing “bread” as the appropriate scenario, Jesus enables the disciples to find the correct scenario for interpreting “leaven” (16:12): “Then they understood that he was not telling them to guard against the yeast used in bread, but against the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.”

Scenario theory explains why “leaven” is ambiguous, and how the “leaven” scenario is thematic to the whole section 16:5-12, through its part-whole link with “bread” and its metaphorical link with “evil”.

Scenario theory also suggests a re-evaluation of Matthew’s intended section boundary. Since the “evil” scenario Jesus intended was opened in 16:4, TEV’s and NIV’s section 16:5-12 should not be separated from 16:1-4. Both belong in a single section “The wickedness of the Pharisees and Sadducees”.

**Scenarios, metaphorical language and discourse**

Scenario theory provides a cognitive framework for understanding the nature of idioms, where a fixed collocation of lexical items is linked by a metaphorical link to a single concept. Chafe comments (1992:276):

... several content words often combine to form a single lexicalized unit, and thus to express a single idea ... The clearest cases are idioms, where the meaning of the lexicalized sequence is unpredictable from the meanings of the individual words. An example ... is blow the whistle.

Chafe used the cloze test (a comprehension test requiring the reader to supply single words that have been omitted) to prove that collocations within idioms are predictable (1992:276), and Baker confirms that collocational patterns indicate that a phrase is used idiomatically (1992:67):

Idiomatic and fixed expressions ... enter into collocational sets which are different from those of their individual words. Take, for instance, the idiom to have cold feet. Cold as a separate item may collocate with words like weather, winter, feel, or country. Feet on its own will perhaps collocate with socks, chilblain, smelly, etc. However, having cold feet, in its idiomatic use has nothing necessarily to do with winter, feet or chilblains and will therefore generally be used with a different set of collocates.

In other words, idioms belong to different scenarios from their individual lexical items, e.g.

2 Corinthians 6:11:

Τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἐνέφεξεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, Κορινθιαί. The mouth of-us has-opened towards you, Corinthians, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλατυνθεί. the heart of-us is-widened.
"Mouth" and "heart" belong in the "body" scenario, and "open" and "widen" are both physical acts. However lexical collocations in the co-text concern attitudes and emotions ("I speak to you as my children", 6:13). Thus these two clauses are idioms, and should be translated as such, e.g. TEV "We have spoken frankly to you; we have opened our hearts wide."

Thus collocations within a higher level discourse unit, often paragraph, determine the open scenario in which idioms belong. Any idiomatic language used in a translation must also collocate naturally with the open scenarios at discourse level.

This same criterion is valid for identifying metaphorical uses of language, where two scenarios, each quite distinct at the literal level, are joined by a metaphorical link.

For example, the Bible has two separate literal scenarios of religious leadership and shepherds. The one includes "rabbia, disciple, teach, obey", the other "shepherd, sheep, pasture, follow". Yet in many instances (Matthew 26:31, John 10:1-16, 21:15-17 etc.) vocabulary from the shepherd scenario (bold) occurs in contexts of religious leadership (underlined), e.g.

Matthew 26:31

Then says to-them [the disciples] the Jesus [religious teacher]

All you will-be-caused-to-sin through me in the night this,

This collocation of vocabulary from different literal scenarios indicates a metaphorical link between scenarios.

Lakoff and Johnson demonstrate that metaphorical links operate at scenario level, e.g. "the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR" underlies many metaphors (1980:105):

What may at first appear to be random, isolated metaphorical expressions - for example, cover those points, buttress your argument, get to the core, dig deeper, attack a position, and shoot down - turn out not to be random at all. Rather they are part of whole metaphorical systems that together serve the complex purpose of characterizing the concept of an argument in all of its aspects, as we conceive them.

Such scenario-level metaphorical links often provide lexical cohesion at higher discourse levels. For example, in John’s preaching, Matthew 3, the metaphorical link between “people” and “trees” runs throughout paragraph 3:7-10 , and the metaphorical link between “people” and “wheat” runs throughout paragraph 3:11-12.

Since metaphorical links are culture and language specific, translating metaphors literally may both miscarry and destroy lexical cohesion in discourse.

**Scenarios and semantic coherence within discourse**

Whereas lexical cohesion "refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text" (Baker, 1992:203), semantic coherence refers to the
"underlying functional or logical connectedness" of a text (Crystal, 1995:449). Scenarios not only produce lexical cohesion between items which belong in the same scenario, but also provide the framework for semantic coherence, through the prototypical semantic links already stored within scenarios, such as generic-specific and cause and effect. In discourse, such semantic links may be lexically and grammatically explicit, or may be implicit, recoverable only from the appropriate scenario.

Meyer (1992:84-5) describes five “top-level structures to organize discourse”, summarized below:

- **Description**, e.g. newspaper article describing who, where, when and how.
- **Causation**, e.g. directions, explanations
- **Response**: Problem/solution, e.g. scientific articles
- **Comparison**, e.g. political speeches
- **Collection**, including **Sequence**, e.g. recipe procedures, history of Civil War battles, growth from birth to 12

Certain lexical items function as “Signals that Cue Readers to these Structures” (1992:84), e.g.

**Description** is signalled by:
- for example, which was one, this particular, for instance, specifically, such as, attributes of, that is, namely, properties of, characteristics are, qualities are, marks of, in describing

**Causation** by:
- as a result, because, since, for the purpose of, caused, led to, consequence, thus, in order to, that is why, if/then, the reason, so, in explanation, therefore.

Winter (1992:140) also notes that semantic relations in discourse are not only marked by subordinators (e.g. when, before, even though), and conjunctions (e.g. at first, now), but also by specific nouns such as (1992:150):

- achievement, addition, affirmation, antonymy, basis, cause, comparison, concession, contradiction, correction, denial, difference, distinction, error, exception, explanation, fact, feature, form, general, grounds, hypothesis, instance, justification, kind, manner, match, means, object, opposite, particulars, point, reason, reality, repetition, requirement, resemblance, result, reversal, sameness, similarity, specification, statement, synonymy, truth, uniqueness, way etc.

Such nouns in Greek include certain metaphors, such as “wages” and “fruit” as markers of “cause and result” relationships, e.g.

**Romans 6:23**

τὰ γάρ ὀφέλη ἡς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος

The for wages of the sin death.

i.e. Sin causes death. Death is the result of sin.

**Galatians 5:22**

Ὁ δὲ καρματός τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἀρετὴ ἐλπὶ ...

The () fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace ...

i.e. The Spirit causes love, joy, peace... Love, joy, peace are the results of the Spirit.

See also Ephesians 5:9, Philippians 1:11, James 3:18. Similarly, many of Jesus’s parables use trees or seed for people, and “fruit” for resulting actions. Such vocabulary is not only referential, but also signals the discourse function of that particular clause, sentence or paragraph.
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The cultural basis of scenarios and semantic coherence

What makes a text coherent and comprehensible is our ability to interpret it as normal in the light of a particular scenario or frame, as van Dijk point out (1977:99):

An important COGNITIVE condition of semantic coherence is the ASSUMED NORMALITY of the worlds involved. ... The set of propositions characterizing our conventional knowledge of some more or less autonomous situation (activity, course of events, state) is called a FRAME.

Even the purely physical nature of the world which individuals have experienced varies. In England, sunshine is seen as positive and rain as negative. For Parkaris, living in arid desert areas, the reverse is true. Scenarios also differ due to cultural differences. Shared scenarios provide semantic coherence in discourse, whereas scenario differences destroy it.

For example:

"She had been covered with a paste of flour and oil. Now she was clothed all in red. Her face was hidden behind her headdress, and a triangular headdress had been fixed around her forehead. Today she would walk four times around the fire."

Despite simple vocabulary and grammar, this probably seems disjointed. Who is she? Why is her face hidden? Why will she walk around a fire? Compare:

"Her hair and her make-up were perfect. She put on her long white dress and her veil. The one and only time she would wear them. She glanced at the single ring on her left hand. Today there would be two!"

This text is clearly about a bride on her wedding day, as shown by the wedding dress, the engagement ring and the wedding ring. Yet neither wedding nor bride is explicit.

The first text is also about a bride, a Parkari bride. The lexicon of each text clearly opens the "wedding" scenario, for its appropriate cultural audience. The "wedding" scenario not only identifies "she" as a bride, but determines the specific stage reached in the wedding script, i.e. the preparation of the bride. This also provides semantic coherence with the next section of discourse, which will refer to the next script stage, the wedding itself, or to some interruption (or Distraction) in that script.

Thus semantic coherence in discourse depends not only on lexically marked semantic relations, or even on the co-occurrence of lexical items per se, but on cultural and experiential linking of things and events in one's mental scenarios. It is the ability to correctly identify the author's intended scenario which produces semantic coherence and makes comprehension possible.

Scenarios help comprehension and memory

We cannot follow or easily remember what we do not understand. And our understanding comes not by decoding unambiguous words and grammar, but rather by fitting explicit linguistic information into a conceptual pattern already established in memory (Schank and Abelson, 1977:67):

The actions of others make sense only insofar as they are part of a stored pattern of actions that have been previously experienced. Deviations from the standard pattern are handled with some difficulty.
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So when communicator and audience share mental scenarios, communication can be maximally effective, since the communicator can decide both what he says and what he leaves implicit in accordance with this “mutual cognitive environment”. Howard, similarly states the significance of scenarios for comprehension. Summarizing Skemp (1979), he notes that “Material that cannot be readily assimilated will be poorly understood and poorly retained”, and thus concludes (1987:176):

The most general point to keep in mind is to relate information taught to students’ existing schemata, or to teach them schemata that they can use to assimilate new material.

Scenarios provide a structure for storylines

When speaker and audience share the same cultural scenarios, the communication situation is ideal. Because scenarios contain prototypical characters (social stereotypes), and prototypical scripts of what will happen, the story can be easily processed and remembered - it is a prototype with twists. The chains of cause and effect, of intention and action, are clear, even when they are not explicitly stated, because they are part of the common stock of cultural assumptions about the way the world works, embedded in the mental scenarios of both speaker and audience.

Howard lists five types of scenario, “scenes, events, actions, persons and stories” (1987:30), all of which, as we have seen above, are culturally-based, and so their contents will vary from language to language. It can be readily seen that these types of scenario form the background of any narrative, and guide the expectations of how a narrative will develop and be resolved.

Moreover, storylines themselves follow prototypical patterns (Bruner, 1986:16):

Narrative deals with the vicissitudes of human intentions. And since there are myriad intentions and endless ways for them to run into trouble - or so it would seem - there should be endless kinds of stories. But, surprisingly, this seems not to be the case. One view has it that lifelike narratives start with a canonical or “legitimate” steady state, which is breached, resulting in a crisis, which is terminated by a redress, with recurrence of the cycle as an open possibility.

This implies that narrator and audience typically share common concepts concerning what is normal and expected (i.e. the canonical or “legitimate” steady state), what is unexpected (i.e. what breaches the norm), what is significant (i.e. what constitutes a crisis, or signifies an intention), and what is the relationship between situations, actions, and motives (in order to appreciate the intentions of participants and cause and effect relationships between events within the narrative). Such information, however, is not universal, but is part of each individual’s culturally conditioned scenario bank.

If a storyline appears totally unprototypical, it is categorized as a bad story, unrealistic, far-fetched, stupid, and arbitrary, e.g. “A frog met a witch. They went to the moon, and got eaten by an angel.” Moreover, it is hard to comprehend (since the purpose of actions is not clear), and hard to remember (since the story cannot be grouped with similar, already memorized and organized experiences). This so-called story violates the
basic principles we expect of behaviour, i.e. that it has motive, and conforms to the physical constraints of the natural world. As Goffman states (1975:23):

> The assumption is ... that although natural events occur without intelligent intervention, intelligent doings cannot be accomplished without entrance into the natural order. Thus any segment of a socially guided doing can be partly analyzed within a natural schema.

A good story takes place against the background of a prototypical script, but adds detail and unexpectedness. The scenario provides as it were a row of pegs to hang the story on. Thus the new can be interpreted against the background of the old. This enables the audience to cope with the information flow at a manageable rate, since much of it is predictable. It alerts the audience to important facts, since they are in contraexpectation to the pre-recorded script in the scenario which is being played back, as it were, fractionally ahead of the unfolding story. It enables the audience to supply implicit events, and implicit reasons, intentions etc. by interpreting the explicit information in the text through the cultural grid of shared mental scenarios.

Because a story includes many sets of familiar scripts, every detail need not be held in memory but the story line can be remembered as a series of familiar “chunks” (the scenario-based scripts) with a few key variations.

**Scenarios cue characters' intentions and expected action**

Storylines especially focus on the characters’ intentions and their actions to achieve their goals. Goffman, a social psychologist, acknowledges the role of “social frameworks” or scenarios in evaluating intentions and actions (1975:21-22):

> Social frameworks ... provide background understanding for events that incorporate the will, aim, and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency, the chief one being the human being ... motive and intent are involved, and their imputation helps select which of the various social frameworks of understanding is to be applied.

Correctly identifying appropriate scenarios for each character helps the audience determine their intentions, understand the motivation behind their actions, and predict what is likely to happen in a discourse, e.g. Acts 12:19 “Herod, having sought him [Peter] and not having found [him], having interrogated the guards ordered [them] to be led away.” Knowing Herod is a callous ruler, and Peter an escaped prisoner, helps identify Herod’s likely actions, and hence his purpose in having the guards “led away” viz. for execution.

Unless we understand characters’ motivations using appropriate scenarios, the discourse seems arbitrary, so is hard to comprehend and recall.

Although I focus here on the expected actions of narrative characters, the same principle applies to other genres. For example, the Galatians' assessment of Paul’s character would affect their assessment of his intentions, and on the basis of their expectations, they would interpret “O foolish Galatians” (Galatians 3:1) as expressing either disdain or concern.
Scenarios contain social stereotypes and cue contraexpectation

We have already seen that scenarios of classes of people frequently contain social stereotypes. When such people are characters in a narrative, there is the expectation that they will behave according to their stereotypical character. Lakoff says that “social stereotypes are commonly used to characterize cultural expectations” (1987:85). But, because this is only a “stereotype” the character is free to conform or not conform to the stereotype. Acceptance of the stereotype is expected, and deviance from the stereotype is the basis of contraexpectation.

The use of explicit contraexpectation markers (such as “but” in English) is a signal that stereotypical expectations are being broken, e.g. in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector, Luke 18:14:

\[\text{κατέβη ὁ ὅτες δεδικασθέντος εἷς τὸν ἀκον αὕτος παρὰ ἐκείνου.}\]

went-away this[one] being-made-right to the house of-him rather-than that[one].

Here παρα is a contraexpectation marking, stressing “the tax-collector was justified, rather than the Pharisee, whom you would have expected”.

Stereotypical expectations are particularly important in parables. For example, in the Good Samaritan, Luke 10:25-37, the Priest and Levite’s motive for avoiding the half-dead victim is to avoid possible ritual pollution (Caird, 1963:148-149; Karris, 1994 in loc).

Note the parable’s characters are social stereotypes:

Priest: the kind of Jew most concerned with ritual purity,
not allowed to touch a corpse except of a close relative (Leviticus 21:1-3).

Levite: the kind of Jew next most concerned with ritual purity,
impure for a week if he touches a corpse (Numbers 19:11).

Half-dead man: potentially the most ritually impure Jew, a corpse.

Samaritan: one of the most ritually impure ethnic groups.

Although some major commentaries do not even mention this theme of ritual impurity (e.g. Geldenhuys, 1977), the ritual purity exegesis is confirmed by its direct relevance to all the parable’s characters. Moreover, ritual purity was of immense cultural significance for first-century Palestinian Jews, as amply demonstrated by the New Testament texts themselves, thus providing the social context in which this parable should be understood (Neyrey, 1991:274-289, specifically 287).

Understanding this motive is vital for understanding the original thrust of the parable, and its link not simply with the question “Who is my neighbour?” (i.e. fellow Jew, or ritually impure Gentiles too?), but also with the command “Love your neighbour as yourself”. The command to love overrides the ritual purity laws.

As Schank and Abelson say (1977:154):

If a reader doesn’t know or can’t figure out why a character is doing what he is doing, he will have a hard time understanding what he is reading.
Scenarios affect both predictability and perception

Scenarios affect perception. People often perceive what corresponds to their mental model, i.e. their existing scenarios, rather than reality itself. Bruner cites a card recognition experiment, where perception was “regularized” to fit expectation (1986:47):

The displays consisted of both normal playing cards, and ones in which colour and suit were reversed - a red six of clubs, for example. The reversed cards as one would expect, took much longer to recognize. But more interestingly, our subjects went to extraordinary length to “regularize” the reversed cards to make them conform to their canonical pattern. I recall one reporting that red six of clubs was indeed a six of clubs, but that the illumination inside the tachistoscope was rather pinkish! In fact, what human perceivers do is to take whatever scraps they can extract from the stimulus input, and if these conform to expectancy, to read the rest from the model in their head.

A personal experience of this tendency to “regularize” input, occurred in testing the Parkari translation of the Golden Rule: “Do unto others as you would have them do to you” (Luke 6:31). The translation team read this saying of Jesus to ordinary Parkaris, then asked them how, according to Jesus’s teaching, they should treat someone who mistreated them. They invariably replied “Mistreat them back.” Although the text said “Do unto others as you would have them do to you”, the hearers’ pre-existing mental scenarios had the strong expectation of “Do unto others as they do to you.” What was actually heard was “corrected” to fit in with what was expected to be heard. As Bruner says (1986:47):

perception is to some unspecifiable degree an instrument of the world as we have structured it by our expectancies. Moreover, it is characteristic of complex perceptual processes that they tend where possible to assimilate whatever is seen and heard to what is expected.

Thus, Luke 6:31 begins in Parkari: “My meaning is this, do not treat people badly as they treat you badly,” explicitly denying the audience’s expectation, before introducing the Golden Rule.

It is vital, then, that translations clearly establish appropriate scenarios to avoid initial misperceptions, since once misunderstanding has occurred, it is hard to alter it.

Experiments by Bruner and Potter (1964) confirm this (Howard, 1987:39):

Subjects were shown slides of some object that was greatly out of focus. The slides were slowly focused, and at various points each subject had to guess what object was depicted. Those who had to guess, still inaccurately identified the object long after subjects who began with clearer slides had got it right. Evidently, they had, at the early stage, become committed to one schema and were loath to give it up.

Scenarios guide expectation and flag the unexpected as significant

We have seen above that scenarios, by providing prototypical patterns, participants, events and relationships, enable the audience not only to interpret what is explicit in a text and fill in what is implicit, but also to recognize what in the text is expected, and what is contrary to expectation.

The pattern of expectation and contraexpectation crucially affects our ability to follow a discourse successfully. Our very neurological system is made to be extraordinarily responsive to contraexpectation, i.e. surprise. Bruner states (1986:46):

Our central nervous system seems to have evolved in a way that specializes our senses to deal differently with expected and with unexpected versions of the world. Unexpected versions (unexpected in the sense that such versions violate the neural “models of the world” stored in the brain) most often alert the cerebral cortex through discharge of impulses in the so-called ascending reticular system, a tangled skein
of fibers that runs in parallel with orderly sensory nerves, both working their way upstream to the upper brain.

This presupposes that we as it were "look ahead" in the scenarios stored in our brains before we actually perceive new information through our senses, otherwise contraexpectation could not occur. Bruner describes the process as follows (1986:46):

Better to say that the nervous system stores models of the world that, so to speak, spin a little faster than the world goes. If what impinges on us conforms to expectancy, to the predicted state of the model, we may let our attention flag a little, look elsewhere, even go to sleep. Let input violate expectancy, and the system is put on alert. Any input, then must be conceived of as made up not only of environmentally produced stimulation but also of accompanying markings of its conformity with or discrepancy from what the nervous system is expecting.

What we perceive, then, is always compared with what is expected, i.e. what is already stored in our mental scenarios, and the mind marks conformity and discrepancy between the new (current input) and the old (existing scenarios). This is enormously significant when it comes to our ability to process information. The more predictable the information, the quicker we can process it. Too much unpredictable information means we lose the thread. Unexpected information must be consciously remembered.

**Scenarios determine relevance and guide memory**

Scenarios also determine what information we assess as significant, and what as insignificant and not worth remembering. Howard cites experimental evidence showing that we choose which facts to remember (and which to forget, or not actively remember), depending on its relevance within the scenario we have in mind (1987:37):

Schemata filter out data. We can only absorb a limited amount of information and need some way to extract what is most important for our purposes. Piaget and Inhelder (1956) demonstrated this effect of a schema. Students read a single passage describing a house from either the perspective of a burglar, or of a housebuyer. The perspective taken affected what was recalled from the passage, evidently because it directed attention to different data. A burglar is likely to notice such things as the number of locks there are ... A buyer may be more concerned with the number of rooms ...

The scenario selected by the audience or reader affects not only which facts they remember, but also what interpretation they put on those facts, which may even skew the facts remembered. Howard gives evidence of this (1987:44):

Schemata affect recall of meaningful material in two major ways (Rumelhart, 1980). Firstly a schema can affect the form of what we acquire. We tend to remember our instantiated schema of some event rather than the event itself. We take in data relevant to our schema, recall that data and forget the extraneous matter. Secondly schemata are used to reconstruct the original interpretation of an event from fragments in memory. Carmichael et al. (1932) showed subjects a variety of figures. One, for example, was a pair of circles connected with a line. One group was told that it was a pair of eyeglasses and another that it was a dumb-bell. Later they drew the figures from memory. Those given the eyeglass label tended to draw eyeglasses and those given the dumb-bell label drew dumb-bells.

Again, the importance of this fact for translation is that the correct (i.e. author's intended) scenario must be clear early in the episode, and if necessary made explicit, otherwise the explicit information will be sifted and evaluated according to the wrong scenario. This will mean that the audience misinterpret what is significant and what insignificant.
Chapter 4 - Scenarios and Discourse

Scenarios facilitate memory by providing expectations

There is a limit to the amount of unexpected information we can actually process at any one time (Bruner, 1986:46-7):

Thresholds, the amount of time and input necessary for seeing or recognizing an object or event, are closely governed by expectancy. The more expected an event, the more easily it is seen or heard. There is a limit on the amount the system can take in - its channel capacity, said to be 7 ± 2 slots, the Magic Number. You can get a lot of expected information into seven slots, but much less unexpected information. The more unexpected the information, the more processing space it takes up.

The significance of this to discourse is immense. If a discourse contains material which is unexpected, i.e. different to our own culturally determined mental scenarios, that material will take longer to process. If there are too many such elements, i.e. if the informational load exceeds 7 ± 2 distinct elements at any one time, then we get information overload, causing inability to follow the text.

When the audience shares the mental scenarios of the speaker, then the speaker’s information can be communicated in chunks, i.e. a whole scenario, including preconditions, stages, purpose, participants etc., can be communicated as one unit. Similarly, the following events, if they are in line with the chain of expectation that scenario has established, take very little processing effort. Even if they are not in line with expectations, they are frequently not random, but a specific instance within a pattern of possible deviations (e.g. Luke 8:43, “she had spent all she had on doctors, but no one had been able to cure her”).

Random details are harder to remember than details which can be understood in term of existing scenarios, as experiments confirm (Howard, 1987:45):

Having well-developed schemata for a domain allows one to take in and recall much more information. A good example is chess. ... De Groot (1965) showed novices and experts various chess positions for a few seconds and asked them to reproduce each position from memory, experts were better at recalling them, usually making few errors. Then random piece placements were tried - positions that would never occur in a real game and that the experts’ schemata would be of no use in recalling. The expert/novice difference disappeared.

Take a literal translation of scripture. If the current audience does not share the mental scenarios of the original author and audience, they lack the relevant framework on which to peg the text. Literal translations, by leaving implicit what the source text left implicit, omit information which was available from the source scenario and which is necessary for understanding the following events. This means that a chain of expectation is not established, so keeping track of what occurs takes huge processing effort. Nothing is in line with expectations, so appears random. Information overload, caused by too many unpredictable items at once (7 ± 2), may lead to lack of comprehension.

So, in translation, when the audience does not share the mental scenarios of the original author, specific elements of the scenario, including preconditions, stages, purpose, participants etc., may need to be communicated explicitly. Although this naturally increases the number of discrete elements to process, it has the benefit of slowing down the information rate, since each new element requires time to say (or read), allowing time to process. Moreover, by explicitly linking elements they can be remembered as single
chunks. Such clearly identified scenarios give high predictability, allowing efficient processing and better memorization.

Chapter summary

Scenarios, as cognitive units in memory, also function as semantic units allowing the audience to divide a discourse into scenario chunks, thus facilitating comprehension, memory storage and recall. Since scenarios affect both grammar and lexicon, these semantic chunks are marked by lexical and grammatical patterning, such as the cluster of a main verb and participles in New Testament Greek belonging together in a single scenario.

Scenarios provide the cognitive framework for tracking participants, identifying lexical cohesion, disambiguating reference, and interpreting idioms and metaphors. Scenarios also enable the audience to perceive semantic coherence in the text, even when semantic relations are not explicitly marked, by assuming the prototypical relationships from the relevant scenario. Consequently, scenario mismatch between author and audience reduces the semantic coherence of a discourse.

Scenarios also act as a backdrop to a text, providing information as to what is expected in the development of the discourse. Predictability means the audience does not have to forge new connections between events in the story as it develops, but simply has to hang this information as expected onto the prelabelled pegs of the scenario, occasionally noting an item which is unexpected. Since the story unfolds in the light of expected norms, it is easy to spot unexpected and thus significant events, and to memorize the story in scenario chunks, also related prototypically, plus significant deviations. Translations need to cue scenarios effectively in order to give the new target audience the same ability to process and memorize events as the original audience had.
Since scenarios affect both the structure of a discourse and the way an audience understands it, it is essential for exegesis to discover the grammatical clues which indicate that certain elements are related together in a single scenario. In this chapter I test the hypothesis that New Testament Greek uses certain grammatical forms, such as Participles and the article, to mark Hearer-old information, which is either Discourse-old, or Discourse-new and part of an open scenario. Specifically I give evidence for the hypothesis that Greek main verbs encode Discourse-new events, whereas Participles encode either Discourse-old events, or Discourse-new events which belong as Hearer-old items in the scenario of the main verb.

**Evidence for scenarios in New Testament Greek**

With a living language, scenarios can be investigated using Mother Tongue speakers (Howard, 1987:17):

- Concept structure and concept learning can be studied by various methods, ranging from intuitions about language, to various experimental procedures.

However, neither speaker intuition nor experiment can be used to discover the scenarios underlying biblical texts. Nevertheless all is not lost (Porter, 1989:8):

- Although within an epigraphic language the corpus is limited, the use of the concepts of system and network bind evaluation to actual instances in opposition to other possible selections within the language, primarily in terms of the language itself before formulation of translational equivalents.

I hope to show that the New Testament texts themselves can be used to reveal scenario structures, since not only lexical collocations but the choice of grammatical forms is directly related to open scenarios.

I make the hypothesis that Greek uses the same grammatical marking for Discourse-old information and for Discourse-new information which is contained in an open (or about to be opened) scenario. Both these types of information are Hearer-old, i.e. stored in the hearer’s mind as part of a scenario. In particular I make the hypothesis that the use of Aorist Participles for verbs, and the article with nouns can only be explained satisfactorily by scenario theory, and is a clear indication of when a given scenario is open. I present evidence for this below.
Terminology and glosses

Greek verb stems mark Aspect (McKay, 1974; Porter, 1989; Fanning, 1990). This thesis uses Porter’s terms Perfective Aspect, Imperfective Aspect, and Stative Aspect to refer to the Aspects per se, and Event, Process, and State to refer to the different conceptualizations involved in Greek Aspectual choice, i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Stem:</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspect:</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization:</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditionally Greek was analysed as having three Tenses, Past, Present, and Future. Some modern scholars dispute Tense as a category altogether (e.g. Porter, 1989). This thesis recognizes two Greek tenses, Past and Future, marked morphologically (i.e. Past by the prefix ἐ- with Aorist, Imperfect and Pluperfect indicatives, and Future by the infix -σ- with Future indicatives). Present and Perfect indicatives are unmarked for tense, and Participles, except the rare Future Participle, are marked only for Aspect.

Whilst accepting an Aspectual analysis of Participles (as in Porter, 1989), this thesis glosses Greek Aorist Participles as “having-verbed” and Present Participles as “verbing”. This reflects their most common pragmatic meaning, and enables the reader to easily tell the form of the Greek.

This thesis specifies the term “marked” either as morphologically marked where the marked form necessarily includes a specific semantic meaning, or statistically marked where the rarer form implies extra pragmatic meaning.

Discourse-new and Discourse-old events

Greek indicative, imperative, subjunctive and optative verb forms all take a suffix marking person and number. Such verb forms with person suffixes are called “main verbs” in this thesis. In contrast, Greek Participles are morphologically distinctive, since they do not mark person.

My preliminary hypothesis is that main verbs are used to mark Discourse-new events, whereas Participles are used to refer back to Discourse-old events.

Discourse-new events are encoded by main verbs

A discourse naturally contains much new information (else it would not be worth telling). The normal way to mark such “event” information as Discourse-new is to use a main verb.
In narrative, Aorist indicatives (past tense, Perfective Aspect) typically present the
Discourse-new events which form the backbone of the narrative (Porter (1989:106):
When the chronological thread or background events of an account are selected for simple narration, the
Greek speaker readily uses the aspect most compatible with this conception: perfective. The perfective
aspect is used to characterize the process in its entirety and as a whole, with no specific reference to its
internal consistency and with no regard for its internal movement ... Thus in sections of the Gospels, and
other Greek narrative literature, the basis of the narrative is carried by a string of Aorist verbs ...

Contrastingly, non-indicative verb forms and Imperfect indicatives are regularly used for
the setting, or to present subordinate verbal concepts. For example, Acts 2:1-4 (Aorist
indicatives bold, other verbal forms underlined, subordinate clauses indented):

**SETTING**

Kal ἐν τῷ σμαίληπνοδαθεὶς τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς
And in the being-completed the day of-the Pentecost

ἡγαν τάντες ὁμοι ἐτέ τῷ αὐτῷ.
they were all together in the same-place.

**DEVELOPMENT**

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἅγιος ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τῆς ἁγίας
And occurred suddenly from the heaven sound

ὅπερ ἐφευρέσθησεν πνεῦμα βαλαζ
as of-rushing wind violent

καὶ ἐπήρωσεν ἡγαν τοῦ ὄλου
and filled whole the house

οἵ ἤγαν καθίσατον
of-which[where] they were sitting,

καὶ διέσχατον αὐτῶν διαμείκτες γλώσσαι ὧν ἔχει τυχεῖν
and were-seen by-them being-distributed tongues as fire

καὶ ἐκάθισεν λέγει ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτῶν,
and sat on one each of-them,

καὶ ἐλάφησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου
and they were filled all with spirit holy

καὶ ἤρεκαν λαλῶν ἐκεῖνος γλώσσαις
and began to speak in other tongues

καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδον ἀποδόθηγες αὐτῶς.
as the spirit was giving to speak out to them.

Note that in the verb phrase ἤρεκαν λαλῶν "began to speak" the main
conceptual idea is speaking, and "began" functions as a kind of aspeuctual modifier. I posit
that the "précis" form of this passage would have "speak" as the core element, and "begin"
as peripheral.

Every main verb in Acts 2:1-4 is conjoined by καὶ "and", which suggests that the
author is presenting these as events belonging to a single script-type scenario. Why then
does he not use the pattern of several Aorist Participles with one main verb to chunk
events into a single scenario? The events occurring here are surprising new events, not the
same old predictable events that regularly co-occur in some well-known scenario. I
propose that the author, by using main verbs conjoined with "and", is signalling that every
one of these items needs to be committed to long-term memory to create a new script-type
scenario "the coming of the Holy Spirit".

The whole issue of parataxis (conjoining clauses) versus hypotaxis (subordinating
clauses) is complex. Whereas classical Greek favours hypotaxis with more subordinated
verbs than main verbs, post-classical non-literary Greek favours parataxis (Turner,
1963:50-51). The New Testament texts are generally closer to the latter, no doubt
influenced by their target audience. Certainly parataxis, as in Acts 2:1-4 above, was common in koine Greek. As Turner states “the papyri provide ample evidence that popular speech favours parataxis” (1963:334). As regards the evangelists Turner says “Mark studiously avoids subordinate clauses, in the way of vernacular Greek” (1976:19), “There is no doubt about Luke’s paratactic style, although it is much modified in Acts, especially in the We sections” (1976:50), and “Biblical Greek will often disguise the parataxis by making one of the verbs a participle, e.g. answering said, but John prefers the coordination (answered and said)” (1976:71). Only Matthew is seen as possibly less extreme in this regard (1976:34).

Data from GRAMCORD shows remarkable consistency throughout the New Testament in the percentage of participles used, with only John showing markedly low use and Acts markedly high use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All verb forms</td>
<td>28114</td>
<td>4001</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>4449</td>
<td>3609</td>
<td>3952</td>
<td>7901</td>
<td>1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td>6658</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles/verbs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This might suggest that John is highly paratactic and Acts highly hypotactic. However, GRAMCORD searches for evidence of paratactic co-ordination show Mark and especially Revelation as highly paratactic, each showing a high use of καλ, a low use of δε, and a high percentage of καλ followed immediately by an Indicative verb. In contrast, the Epistles show low parataxis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καλ</td>
<td>28114</td>
<td>4001</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>4449</td>
<td>3609</td>
<td>3952</td>
<td>7901</td>
<td>1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλ/verbs</td>
<td>9161</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>2257</td>
<td>1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δε/verbs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data suggest that the choice of hypotaxis or parataxis is affected by both the genre (e.g. Epistles and Revelation) and by the author’s style (e.g. Mark). However, each author has the choice of using main verbs (with asyndeton, δε, or καλ), subordinate clauses, or participles, and by this choice the author shows which events he is clustering together. Whereas “the grammar of hypotactic clause combining” makes explicit the “nuclearity in text structure” (Mann and Thompson, 1987:35), paratactic clause combining with καλ reflects the clustering of concepts without assigning to them any relative status of nuclear or satellite.
Discourse-old events are encoded by Participles

In contrast, Discourse-old events are regularly encoded in the Aorist Participle form. Such Aorist Participles are anaphoric, referring back to events already presented as a main verb (relevant main verbs are bold, anaphoric Aorist Participles underlined), e.g.

**with repetition of the lexical item**

**Matt. 20:10, 11**

καὶ ἔλαβον τῷ δούλῳ διηνάριον καὶ αὐτοῖς λαβόντες δὲ ...  
And took the each denarius also themselves. Having-taken () ...

**Mark 6:14, 16**

Καὶ ἠκούσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης ...  
And heard the king Herod ...

**Acts 6:14, 16**

καὶ ἠκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ...  
having-heard () the Herod ...

Compare Luke 8:24 (διήγερσαν ... διεγραφέον), Acts 4:21, 23 (ἀπέλυσαν ... Ἀπολύσετες), Acts 5:26, 27 (ἤγεν ... Ἁγαγώντες)

**with same lexical root but variation of word class**

**Acts 16:23b-24**

ἐβαλον εἰς φυλαχὴν παραγγελλόντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακα, ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖν αὐτοὺς.  
they-threw into jail having-commanded to-the jailer safely to-keep them.

διὶ παραγγέλλον ταυτῷ λαβών ἐβαλεν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἑωράτην φυλαχὴν...  
Who charge such having-taken threw them into the inner jail...

Note that the initial reference to commanding is also in an Aorist Participle, which, I argue later in this chapter, marks it as a prototypical element of the main verb “throw into jail”.

**with lexical variation**

**Luke 9:30-31**

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἱ τίνες ἦσαν Μωσῆς καὶ Ἰλίας,  
And behold men two were-talking-with him, who were Moses and Elijah,

οἱ ἀπελύσαντες ὑπὸ δόθη ἑλέγον τὴν ἐξοδον αὐτοῦ...  
who having-been-seen[appeared] in glory were-talking-about the departure of-him...

**Acts 13:2-4**

εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἄγγελῳ,  
said the spirit the holy,

'Αφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν Βαρνάβαν καὶ Ἁγαθάν εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτοὺς...  
Separate then for me the Barnabas and Saul for the work [for]which I-have-called them τότε ... ἀπέλυσαν.  
then ... they-dismissed.

Ἀπολύτων αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγγιος πνεύματος κατίθλου ...  
They () therefore having-been-sent by the holy spirit went-off

Compare Matthew 26:7, 12 (κατεχόμεν ... βαλοῦσα) where the Aorist participle refers to information which was not Discourse-old, but old in terms of the real-life context, i.e. they had just seen it happen.

**with logical corollary**

a) Where an action is referred back to from the point of view of a different participant, e.g.

**Matt. 14:15**

ἀπέλυσεν τοὺς δύο ἱδροὺς, ἵνα ἀπελύσης  
send-away the crowds, so-that having-gone

**Mark 1:43, 45**

ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν ... δὲ ἐξέβαλον ...  
throw-out him ... He () having-gone-out ...
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b) Where something which occurs is assumed to be perceived by those present, e.g.

Matthew 2:9, 10
καὶ Ὅδε ὁ ἀστήρ ... παρεπηγμένοις ... ἔδωκατε 8ε ὑμῖν ἀστέρα ...  
and behold the star ... went before them ... Having-seen the star ...

Matthew 2:8-9
καὶ πέμψας αὐτοῖς ἔλεγε Βεθλεέμ ἔπευ, Πορεύθητε ἔξετάσατε ...  
And having sent them to Bethlehem he said, Having-gone ask ...

οὐ δὲ ἀκούσατε τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπορεύθησαν ...  
They having heard the king went ...

Compare Matthew 4:25-5:1 (ἐλογίσθην ... 'Ἰδων), Luke 2:46, 48 (ἐφορον ... ἔδωκατε), Acts 5:19-21 (ἔπευ ... ἀκούσατες)

Note that the most common example of a logical corollary being regarded as Discourse-old is the use of the Aorist Participle "having-heard", agreeing with the addressee, after direct speech. O'Donnell (1997, Appendix) shows that out of 430 occurrences of the verb ἀκούω in the New Testament, 92 are in Aorist Participle form. Of these I calculate that 85 occur in the nominative, 10 being part of a noun phrase, 2 occurring after the main verb, and 73 occurring before the main verb. Of these 73 pre-verbal Aorist Participles, I calculate that 48 (66%) occur after an explicit or implicit speech act in the co-text, and mark a change to a different subject from the speaker.


In contrast the Aorist Participle of "hear" occurs in the genitive only 3 times (John 1:40, Acts 4:4, and Heb. 2:3), always as part of a noun phrase, i.e. it never occurs in a Genitive Absolute. This is easily explained by a combination of grammar, semantics, lexis and human behaviour. The Aorist Participle nominative is used to refer to one of a list of events belonging to a single script, where the same participant does a series of related acts. In contrast the Genitive Absolute is used to refer to an action of one participant, at the time of which or in the light of which a new participant acts. Since humans often act in reaction to what they hear, but rarely in reaction to what someone else has heard, the semantics of the lexical item "hear" make it likely to occur first in a series of sequential and related actions, such as constitute a script in scenario theory. As such it will normally be grammaticalized by an Aorist Participle nominative.

c) Where an action suggested, commanded or begun is assumed to be completed or successful

As stated above, scripts are assumed to develop normally, unless the text states the contrary. Thus, it is assumed that what is begun will be completed, and that commands will be obeyed. So what the text says has merely been begun or commanded can be referred to when completed as Discourse-old. Note that the back-reference may or may not use the same lexical item, e.g.
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Action suggested:
Matt. 14:22, 23
εὖς ὁ ἄρποντα τοὺς δῆλους, καὶ ἀρπούσας τοὺς δῆλους
until which he-should-dismiss the crowds. And having-dismissed the crowds.
Matt. 20:8, 9
λέγει ὁ κύριος... Κάλεσαν τοὺς ἑργάτας... καὶ ἔδοξατε...
says the master... Call the labourers... And having-come...

Action begun:
Mark 6:7a, 12
καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἀργατο αὐτὸς ἀποστέλλειν 800 800...
And he-calls the twelve and began them to-send two two...
Καὶ ἔδοξωντες ἐκήρυξαν ἐνα μετανοίαν.
And having-gone-away they-announced in-order-that they-should-repent

Action successful:
Luke 23:6b-7a
εἶπα τοῖς εἰς ἀνδρίμως Γαλιλαίος ἔστιν,
he-questioned if the person Galilean is,
καὶ ἔδοξωντες ὃ ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἧμων ἄρτον.
And having-discovered that from the authority of-Herod he-is

Action commanded:
Mark 6:27
ὁ βασιλεὺς σπειρούμενος ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀπελθὼν...
the king executioner ordered to bring the head of-him. And having-gone...
Mark 6:38
ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ἐράθητε ἔθετε.
He () says to-them, How-many loaves have-you? Go see!
καὶ γνώστες λέγουσιν...
And having-known[ascertained] they-say...

Compare John 9:11b (εἶπέν μοι... "Ἰσαγε... καὶ νυσή... ἀπελθὼν... καὶ νυσάμενος..."), Acts
16:22b-23 (ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίζειν... ἐπιθέμενε... πληγάς...)
Note that with all the examples of logical corollary above, the verbal ideas expressed in the Aorist Participles are totally predictable from the preceding main verbs. Naturally, it is possible that things begun are never completed, things commanded are not done, and things said are not heard, but prototypically when one happens the other follows, and scenario theory states that what is prototypical is assumed to be true, unless stated otherwise.

Participles are used for all Hearer-old events

As shown above, main verbs are used to introduce Discourse-new events, and Participles are used anaphorically to refer back to Discourse-old events. This might suggest a major grammatical and conceptual division in Greek between Discourse-old and Discourse-new. However, Participles are frequently used to refer to Discourse-new events which belong to Hearer-old information categories, i.e. of the information status KNOWN (see Chapter 3 “Revised Information Status Taxonomy”):
KNOWN unused - prototypical event in the "whole world" scenario, e.g. Time passes:

Matt. 14:15
δύσης εἰς γενόμενον
evening () having-occurred
Acts 7:30
Καὶ προσφέροντες ἑτῶν τεσσεράκοντα
And having-been-completed years forty

KNOWN inferrable - prototypical event in open co-text scenario

Mark 14:45
καὶ ἔλθον εὐθὺς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει... And having-come immediately having-come-near to-him he-says...
Coming and drawing close are prototypical prerequisites in the script for speaking to someone.

Luke 2:16
καὶ ἤλθαν σπεύδοντες
And they-came having-hastened
Hastening is the manner of coming.

Acts 15:8
καὶ ὁ καρδιαγγέλτης θεοῦ ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς
And the heart-knowing God bore-witness to-them
δοκεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγνω καθὼς καὶ ἥμισυ
having-given the spirit the holy as also to-us
Giving the Holy Spirit is the means of God’s testifying to his acceptance of the Gentiles

This grammatical patterning suggests a parallel conceptual patterning, which can only be explained by scenario theory. Discourse-new events from open scenarios are treated grammatically the same way as Discourse-old events, since the speaker/writer believes they are already known to the audience, that is Hearer-old.

I therefore make the hypothesis that the major grammatical and conceptual division in Greek is not between Discourse-old and Discourse-new, but between Hearer-old and Hearer-new. Consequently, when Participles are used for Discourse-new events, they mark grammatically that these events are prototypical Hearer-old elements of an open scenario, i.e. the scenario of the main verb.

**Defining a Participial Clause**

It is commonly accepted that Participles in Greek may fill noun, adjective, or verb slots.

Following the article, the Participle may function like a noun, identifying the referent. This Noun Phrase may refer either to a Hearer-old generic class (as title of a generic scenario), or to a specific Hearer-old entity (from an open scenario), e.g.

generic class:

Luke 6:49
ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας
The () having-heard and not having-done
NIV “The one who hears my words and does not put them into practice”

specific entity:

Mark 5:14
καὶ οἱ ἁπακούντες αὐτῶς ἐξῆγον
And the grazing them fled.
NIV “Those tending the pigs ran off”
Following a noun, the Participle may function like an adjective, describing that noun. This functions like a descriptive relative clause in English, e.g.

Luke 6:49
διοικός ἐστιν διαθήματι αἰκίας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρίς θεμελίου
like is to-man having-built house on the earth without foundation
NIV “is like a man who built...”

The Participle may also function like a verb, describing what the subject does, e.g.

Luke 6:48
πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης
flood () having-happened
NIV “When the flood came”

Luke 7:14
καὶ προσελθὼν ἦκατο τῆς σοροῦ
and having-approached he-touched the bier
NIV “Then he went up and touched the coffin”

Such Participles which function as verbs, i.e. predicate information about a participant’s actions, constitute the Verb Phrase within a Participial Clause.

What is the meaning of Participial Clauses?

It is generally acknowledged that Participial clauses can be related to their main verb in a bewildering variety of semantic relationships. Burton, under the cover term “Adverbial Participle”, states (1898, 1987:169):

The Adverbial Participle logically modifies some other verb of the sentence in which it stands, being equivalent to an adverbial phrase or clause denoting time, condition, concession, cause, purpose, means, manner, or attendant circumstance.

The various uses of the Participle, including adjectival and substantival uses as well as verbal and adverbial uses, have been well documented (e.g. Porter, 1989:365-388 and 1994:181-93). These uses, as listed and labelled by Greek grammarians, can be charted thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJECTIVAL/ATTRIBUTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATTRIBUTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Headterm</td>
<td>ADVERBIAL/CIRCUMSTANTIAL</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADVERBIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERBIAL</td>
<td>TEMPORAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDITION</td>
<td>TEMPORAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDITION</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>Concessive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Purpose/Final/Desultive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Instrumental (Means)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Instrumental (Manner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding</td>
<td>Commanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLEMENTARY</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These uses can be further broken down into specific categories as follows:

- ADJECTIVAL/ATTRIBUTIVE:
  - Modifier
  - as Headterm
  - ADVERBIAL/CIRCUMSTANTIAL:
    - TEMPORAL
    - CONDITION
- Time
- Condition
- Concession
- Cause
- Purpose/Final/Desultive
- Means
- Instrumental (Means)
- Manner
- Instrumental (Manner)
- Commanding
- Commanding
- Supplementary/Complementary
- PREDICATIVE
- Genitive Absolute
- Independent
- Commanding
- Idiomatic
- Cognate with verb
- SUPPLEMENTARY
In the light of the many uses of Participles, it is generally acknowledged that Participial Clauses do not of themselves signify specific semantic relationships (Levinsohn, 1992:179):

Greek grammarians point out that, when a circumstantial participial clause is employed, no specific semantic relationship to the nuclear clause is specified.

Consequently, the semantic relationship between a Participle and main verb depends not on grammar or syntax but on pragmatics, as Porter states (1989:381):

pragmatically a range of relations, such as causal, concessive, conditional, commanding etc., may be possible

The appropriate pragmatic interpretation of a Participle must be inferred from the "context", e.g. Funk (1973:669):

The circumstantial participle as the equivalent of an adverbial clause may be taken (i.e. inferred from the context) to denote time, cause, means, manner; purpose, condition, concession, or attendant circumstances.

So the single grammatical form of Participle can be used to express pragmatically a variety of semantic relationships. What, then, is the essential semantic meaning of the Participle? And what "context" can we use to infer the author's intended pragmatic meaning? Scenario structure, I believe, provides the answer.

**Participial Clauses belong in the scenario of the main verb**

I made the hypothesis in Chapter 4 that, in Greek, a cluster of Participles and main verb belong in a single scenario chunk, whose "title" is the main verb. A Greek author uses a main verb to indicate that this event is the title or main event of the scenario, and uses a Participle to indicate that this event is part of the same scenario as the main verb.

Porter stresses that the Participle must have a single semantic meaning which applies in all of its uses (1989:374):

A distinction must be made between the Participle as grammaticalizing an essential semantic feature and its pragmatic usage. The participle is always a Participle by form, with its concomitant semantic meaning.

According to Porter, the essential semantic meaning of a Participle in the Adverbial or Circumstantial construction is as modifier of a headterm in the Noun Phrase (1989:368):

the Participle always appears to be a modifier of a stated or implied (if even within the monolectic verb) head.

The term "modifier" seems to imply that the Participle, by grammatically agreeing with a head, is semantically a part of the Noun Phrase. However, I argue that a Participle which is neither substantival nor adjectival is part of the Verb Phrase; it does not describe the head of the Noun Phrase, but by grammatical agreement in number, case and gender, it marks the head of the Noun Phrase as grammatical subject of the Participle's event, i.e. the semantic agent if the Participle is Active, and the semantic goal if the Participle is Passive. This is true of both Genitive and Nominative Participles.

In Nominative Participial Clauses, the Participle agrees in gender, number and case with the head of a Noun Phrase which is also the grammatical subject of the main verb. The Nominative case indicates that the subject of both Participle and main verb are the
same, and I argue that the Participial form indicates that this event is Hearer-old and belongs as a prototypical element in the scenario of the main verb. In Genitive Participial Clauses, so-called Genitive Absolutes, the Participle agrees with the head of a Noun Phrase which is different from the subject of the main verb. Although the Genitive case indicates that this event has a different subject from that of the main verb, I argue that the Participal form still indicates that this event belongs in the main verb’s scenario and has a prototypical relationship with the main verb.

I make the hypothesis, therefore, that the semantic meaning of a Participle is “a Hearer-old event, belonging in the scenario of the head of its Phrase, and related to that head in a prototypical way.” In Participial Clauses which are Adverbial rather than Adjectival, the Participle belongs in a Verb Phrase, and the prototypical relationship of the Participle is with the main verb in the sentence, which is the “title” of a complex event scenario and the head or nucleus, as it were, of the whole complex of Verb Phrases within that sentence. Consequently, the “context” for inferring the pragmatic relationship between a Participle and a main verb is the scenario of that main verb. The pragmatic relationship intended is the prototypical relationship between those events within the scenario.

Evidence that Greek Participial Clauses belong in the main verb’s scenario

I suggest that there is strong evidence to support this hypothesis that the clusters of Participles and main verbs in Greek represent single scenarios or semantic chunks. This evidence is summarized below.

Semantic evidence is that the string of main verbs summarizes the story line, individual clusters of Participles and main verb seem to refer to culturally related concepts, and chunking the text into units of main verb with Participles produces results corresponding to analysis by other methods of discourse analysis.

Grammatically, the high frequency of conjunctions at the beginning of each Participle and main verb cluster, together with the low frequency and restricted choice of conjunctions within the cluster, suggests that the scenarios are the building blocks of stories between which relationships may be overtly marked, but within which marking is largely unnecessary. Similarly, certain semantic elements, such as grammatical subject, tense and mood, conjunctions and negation, may operate at the level of the scenario, and have as their scope the whole cluster of Participles and main verb, even though they are explicit only once.

All this supports my theory that the use of participles in Greek for Discourse-old and Discourse-new information, and with a wide range of different pragmatic meanings, can only be satisfactorily explained in terms of scenario theory and the clear marking of Hearer-old information in Greek grammar.
See also:
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Exceptions that prove the rule: conjoined main verbs in a single scenario

I have argued that the cluster of Participles and main verb formally marks that the events all belong in a single scenario, the title of which is the main verb. I have argued that if only the main verbs, i.e. the titles of the scenarios, are remembered, then the plot of the story is given in outline, and the other details, represented in the text as Participles, can be remembered passively, by fitting them into the slots already existing within the scenarios.

In other words, regardless of genre, information presented in Participles is marked “prototypical in the scenario”, and information presented in main verbs is marked “REMEMBER THIS”. In narrative, this accounts for the common pattern of “Aorist Participle, Aorist Participle, Aorist Indicative”, which indicates a sequence of “Event, Event, PAST-EVENT” and functions to chunk together prototypical elements which belong in the script of the main verb’s scenario.

However script-type events from a single scenario are sometimes encoded as a series of conjoined main verbs. In narrative, such verbs are typically Aorist, but may be Present in form. These forms, being statistically unusual, are thus “marked” and indicate extra semantic information. I argue that these forms are used to “highlight” the scenario in which they belong, i.e. give it extra significance or prominence at discourse level.

For example, in Mark 5:33 three conjoined Aorist Indicatives (“came”, “fell before” and “said”) are used to highlight the discourse significance of the single scenario “telling the whole truth”, i.e. that she was ritually-polluted and had polluted many of the crowd and Jesus in seeking healing. Similarly, in Mark 15:46 three conjoined Aorist Indicatives (“wrapped”, “placed” and “rolled forward”) are used to highlight the discourse significance of the single scenario “burying Jesus”.

Present Indicatives in past time narrative, being rarer than Aorist Indicatives and thus statistically “marked”, indicate an even greater degree of highlighting. Not only do they highlight the discourse significance of the scenario in which they belong, but they also highlight the discourse significance of the whole episode. For example, as noted by Black (1999), twelve of the thirteen “Historic Presents” in Matthew occur in only four highly significant episodes: Jesus’s baptism (3.13, 15), temptation (4.5, 8 [two occurrences], 11), transfiguration (17.1 [two occurrences], and prayer in Gethsemane (26.36, 40 [two occurrences], 45). This hypothesis that the function of “Historic Presents” is “highlighting”, i.e. marking discourse prominence, is also supported by other evidence. “Historic Presents” occur in the “backbone” of narrative but not in explanations (e.g. John 12: 4 and 6, John 13:10 and 11), they introduce significant sayings (e.g. “Follow me!” Matthew 8:22, 9:9, Mark 2:14, John 1:43, 21:19, 21:22), they occur with restricted lexical
items especially verbs of speech (Johnson, 1984:iii), and they show patterns of collocation with anarthrous nouns which mark "salience" (see Chapter 6) (e.g. John 1:43-48).

In summary then, in narrative we have three major ways to refer to what is in real life a series of stages from a script-type scenario (main verbs capitalized):

Normal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical form:</th>
<th>Aorist Participle, Aorist Indicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic meaning:</td>
<td>Event, PAST-EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic function:</td>
<td>panning past the first event to the main event Indicates that the audience need memorise only the main verb's event since the participial events are prototypical in the script of that scenario.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marked as important:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical form:</th>
<th>Aorist Indicative and Aorist Indicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic meaning:</td>
<td>PAST-EVENT and PAST-EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic function:</td>
<td>focussing separately on each event Indicates that the audience should memorise each main verb's event although the events are prototypical in the script of the last verb, thus highlighting this unit at episode level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marked as very important:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical form:</th>
<th>Present Indicative and Present Indicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic meaning:</td>
<td>PROCESS and PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic function:</td>
<td>focussing on each event, as if in slow motion Indicates that the audience should carefully note each main verb's event although the events are prototypical in the script of the last verb, thus highlighting this complete episode at the level of the whole text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also:
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### Grammatical and syntactic parameters of Participial Clauses

Participial clauses can be divided up in several ways. Taking grammar and syntax as a basis, I propose there are at least three parameters to consider:

a) Position relative to the main verb: Prenuclear or Postnuclear

The terminology Prenuclear and Postnuclear, referring to Participles occurring before and after the main verb respectively, reflects the hypothesis that the main verb encodes the "title" or nuclear element of a scenario.

b) Verb form: Aorist or Present

Only Aorist and Present Participles are analysed here since they are much more numerous than Perfect and Future Participles, especially in the Nominative case (data from ACCORDANCE):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole NT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td>6658</td>
<td>3687 = 55%</td>
<td>2285 = 34%</td>
<td>673 = 10%</td>
<td>13 = &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>4616</td>
<td>2370 = 51%</td>
<td>1895 = 41%</td>
<td>342 = 7%</td>
<td>9 = &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Case: Nominative or Genitive

Only Nominative and Genitive cases are discussed here, because it is the Nominative and Genitive Participles which typically encode an event related to the scenario of the main verb, rather than having an adjectival function within a Noun Phrase. Nominative and Genitive Participles together account for the great majority of occurrences (data from ACCORDANCE):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole NT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td>6658</td>
<td>4616 = 69%</td>
<td>741 = 11%</td>
<td>354 = 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From these three parameters, eight possibilities occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position relative to the main verb</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prenuclear Aorist Participle</td>
<td>Prenuclear Aorist Participle Genitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenuclear Present Participle</td>
<td>Prenuclear Present Participle Genitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postnuclear Aorist Participle</td>
<td>Postnuclear Aorist Participle Genitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postnuclear Present Participle</td>
<td>Postnuclear Present Participle Genitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ordering of these eight possibilities above is not significant. I argue that each parameter has its own effect on the semantics of the Participial Clause, and hence its pragmatics, i.e. the relationship of the written form to the real-life event it is referring to, and the way the author chooses to present that relationship. This being the case, there is no best order for examining these eight forms, since they can only be diagrammed satisfactorily in a three-dimensional grid with the parameters interlinked.

I have already given evidence that using a Participle to encode a Discourse-new event marks that event as Hearer-old, i.e. part of an open scenario. On the basis of this connection between Participle and scenario, I make the general hypothesis that the form and function of Participles is integrally related to the scenario structure of the main verb.

I will briefly look at the parameters above and make hypotheses about how they relate to scenario structure. I will then give examples of the different types of Participial Clause as evidence for these hypotheses.

a) Position relative to the main verb: Prenuclear or Postnuclear

Some Greek grammarians, in discussing Participles with respect to tense and aspect, make no comment on their position relative to the main verb, e.g. Moule (1953:99): broadly speaking, following the 'linear' - 'punctiliar' terms already adopted Present Participle represents 'linear' action and the Aorist represents 'punctiliar'. But the time of these actions will be determined by the main verb.

Several authors, however, distinguish prenuclear from postnuclear Participles, but there is little agreement as to the significance of this choice.

Porter suggests that the position of the Aorist Participle is frequently related to its temporal reference (1989:381):

when the Participle is placed before the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be depicted as antecedent, and when the Participle is placed after the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be seen as concurrent or subsequent.

Porter points out, however, that this is merely a tendency, resulting from the aspectual nature of Participles, and quotes Blass/Debrunner, section 339 (1989:381):

Participles originally had no temporal function, but denoted only the Aktionsart [i.e. real life nature of the event]; their temporal relation to the finite verb was derived from the context. Since, however, a participle expressing the notion of completion often preceded the finite verb ... so that the sequence was: the completion of the action denoted by the participle, then the action of the finite verb, the idea of relative past time became associated to a certain degree with the aorist participle ...

Healey and Healey (including "when" clauses in their data) analyse the distinction in terms of both temporal and logical relations (1990:224):

(1) Those clauses expressing temporal relations and those expressing most logical relations occurred before the main clauses in 652/757 (86 percent) of instances.
(2) Those clauses expressing elaboration relations and those expressing two logical relations (result-means and reason-result) occurred following their main clause in 55/70 (79 percent) instances.
According to Levinsohn, the issue is one of importance. Prenuclear Participles are of "secondary importance" in relationship to the main verb (1992:179):

According to Greenlee (1963:66-67) and Healey and Healey (1990:247), a circumstantial participial clause that precedes the verb typically describes an event different from and of secondary importance with respect to the information conveyed by the nuclear clause. I therefore consider that prenuclear participial clauses which refer to an event distinct from that of the nuclear clause are so encoded to indicate, not a specific semantic relationship, but rather that the information concerned is of secondary importance, with reference to the nuclear event.

Levinsohn adds the rider (1992:179 note):

This claim excludes prenuclear participial clauses that refer to the same event as that of the nuclear clause, e.g. ἀποκαθήσεις ... ἐπεν "answering said".

In contrast, Levinsohn says that Postnuclear Participles (1992:179):

may be concerned with some aspect of the nuclear event or else describe "a circumstance as merely accompanying the leading verb" (Greenlee, 1986:57).

Levinsohn summarizes (1992:179):

whereas prenuclear participial clauses usually present information of secondary importance, the information presented in a postnuclear participial clause is downgraded in importance only if it describes a different action from that of the nuclear clause.

By discovering which verbs frequently occur as nominative Participles, both Aorist and Present, in Prenuclear and Postnuclear position, one can note statistical patterns and select examples which are representative of significant groupings, and thus make reasonable hypotheses. Using GRAMCORD searches of the whole New Testament corpus provides numerical data and some objectivity. However, such searches are limited by the search string and may include false "hits" which meet the criteria but are not in fact examples of the category being searched for. To reduce the number of false hits, I have limited the searches below to Participles within 4 words of an indicative main verb within the same clause (as analysed by GRAMCORD).

Searching for Prenuclear Aorist Participles, then analyzing which verbs frequently occur, shows that of 994 occurrences found several verbs occur more than ten times (1% of total), and most of these verbs cluster into a few specific semantic domains, as follows: GRAMCORD search string:

[VERB aorist participle nominative] <FOLLOWED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]

[VERB aorist participle nominative] (994 total words)
Number of different forms = 266:

Perception =112
ἀκούω to hear, to heed, to obey = 56
ἐπιθεw to see = 56
ἐπιθέω to find = 12

Orientation = 32
ἀναστήσω to raise up, set up, resist, restore, arise = 22
καθίζω to sit, set, place = 10

Movement = 159
ἀπερχόμαι to go away, depart = 16
ἀφίημι to leave = 13
ἐταρχομαί to enter = 17
ἐξερχόμαι to come out, go out = 30
ἐρχόμαι to come, go = 40
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πορεύομαι to go = 10
προσέρχομαι to come to = 33

Speech = 109
ἀποκρίνομαι to answer, reply = 91
eἶπον to say = 18

Control = 50
λαμβάνω to take, receive, choose = 36
προσκαλέω to summon = 14

Miscellaneous = 16
γίνομαι to become, be, be born, be created = 16

Thus typical examples of Prenuclear Aorist Participles include:
Matt. 8:10
ἀκούσας ἔδειξεν ὕπον ἔπευ... Having-heard () the Jesus he-became-amazed and said ...
Matt. 2:11
καὶ ὁ Πάπας ἔδειξεν τῷ παιδίῳ... And having-come to the house they-saw the child ...
Matt. 3:15
ἀποκλείοντες ἔδειξεν ἔπευ... Having-responded () the Jesus said ...
Matt. 13:31
ὅτι λαμβάνειν ἐνθροεΐν ἔπευ... which [seed] having-taken person sowed ...
In these examples the Prenuclear Aorist Participle refers to an event which precedes the main verb, either temporally, or logically, or both.

In contrast, the search for Postnuclear Aorist Participles shows only 190 occurrences (compared to 994 Prenuclear Aorist Participles), of which only one verb εἶπον “say” occurs more than ten times. Verbs occurring 3 times or more are listed and analyzed below:

GRAMCORD search string:
[VERB aorist participle nominative] <PRECEDED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]
[VERB aorist participle nominative] (190 total words)
Number of different forms = 112:

Perception = 15
ἀκούω to hear, to heed, to obey = 7
eἶδον to see = 8

Orientation = 3
dιετραβώ to raise up, set up, resist, restore, arise = 3

Movement = 13
ἀπέρχομαι to go away, depart = 3
eἰσέρχομαι to enter = 3
eἴρχομαι to come, go = 7 (mostly false hits after καὶ)

Speech = 15
eἶπον to say = 15

Control = 19
λαμβάνω to take, receive, choose = 5
παραγγέλλω to command = 4
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παραδίδωμι to deliver, deliver over = 3
πέμπω to send = 3
ποιεῖω to do, make = 4

Miscellaneous = 13
βαπτίζω to baptize, wash, dip = 3
gίνομαι to become, be, be born, be created = 7 (mostly false hits, substantives)
δίδωμι to give = 3

7 of the occurrences of εἶπον found are not Postnuclear Aorist Participles but substantive or adjectival, e.g.
Matt. 27:9
tότε ἐπηράθη τὸ ἰησοῦν
Then was-fulfilled the having-been-said

Thus typical Postnuclear Aorist Participles include:
Luke 1:12
καλ ἐπάρθη Ζαχαρίας ἸΣών καὶ φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν.
And became-frightened Zachariah having-seen and fear fell upon him.
Luke 22:8
καὶ ἐπέστειλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην ἑλπίν· πορευθέντες ἐτοιμάσατε...
And he-sent Peter and John having-said: Having-gone make-ready...
Phil. 2:7
ἀλλὰ ἐκαυτόν ἐκένωτεν μορφήν δοῦλον λαβὼν
But himself he-emptied form of-slave having-taken

In neither of these examples does the Participle seem to relate to the main verb in a primarily temporal way. “Having seen” refers to the reason for being afraid, “having said” refers to the commands which are inextricably related to the act of sending, and “having taken” seems to refer to the manner in which Jesus emptied himself.

Charting Prenuclear Present Participles shows only 486 occurrences (compared to 994 Prenuclear Aorist Participles) of which several verbs occur more than ten times. Verbs occurring 5 times (1% of total) or more are listed and analyzed below:
GRAMCORD search string:
[VERB present participle nominative] <FOLLOWED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]
[VERB present participle nominative] (486 total words)
Number of different forms = 213:

Perception = 21
ἀκούω to hear, to heed, to obey = 11
βλέπω to see = 10

Orientation = 5
καθίσμαι to sit = 5

Movement = 11
ἔρχομαι to come, go = 11

Speech = 37
λαλῶ to speak = 5
λέγω to say, speak, tell = 32 (mostly false hits)

Control = 19
λαμβάνω to take, receive, choose = 7
ποιεῖω to do, make = 12
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Exist = 42
   εἶμι to be, exist = 26
   ζῶ to live = 7
   ὑπάρχω to be, exist, possess = 9

Miscellaneous = 26
   δραπάω to love = 6
   ἔχω to have = 15
   ζητέω to seek, inquire = 5

23 of the occurrences of λέγω are false hits where the Participle is followed by δὲ plus quoted speech, e.g.
Matt. 10:7
κηρύσσετε λέγοντες δὲ ἤγγικεν
announce saying that is-drawn-near

Thus typical Prenuclear Present Participles include:
Matt. 13:13
βλέποντες οὖν βλέπουσιν καὶ διδάσκοντες οὐκ ἀκούσαν ὁδὲ συνέλομεν,
seeing not they-see and hearing not they-hear nor understand
John 4:9
τὸς οὖν 'Ιουδαίος ὡς παρ' ἐμοῦ πεῖν ἀπείθης
How you Jew being from me to-drink ask

In both these examples the Participles refer to an event which is in process at the time of the main verb, i.e. simultaneous or overlapping in time.

Charting Postnuclear Present Participles shows 720 occurrences (compared to only 486 Prenuclear Present Participles) of which several verbs occur more than ten times, especially those in the semantic domain of speech. Verbs occurring 7 times (1% of total) or more are listed and analyzed below:

GRAMCORD search string:
[VERB present participle nominative] <PRECEDED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]

[VERB present participle nominative] (720 total words)
Number of different forms = 255:

Perception = 7
   ἀκοῦω to hear, to heed, to obey = 7

Movement = 8
   ἔρχομαι to come, go = 8

Speech = 272
   διδάσκω to teach = 17
   λαλέω to speak = 12
   λέγω to say, speak, tell = 228
   μαρτυρέω to bear testimony = 8
   προσεύχομαι to pray = 7

Control = 24
   ἔχω to have = 24

Exist = 13
   εἶμι to be, exist = 13

Miscellaneous = 20
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228 of the 720 hits (32%) are from λέγω alone, and 272 (38%) are verbs of speech.

Thus typical Postnuclear Present Participles include:

Matt. 5:2
εἰπών αὐτοῖς λέγων ... he-taught them saying ...

Matt. 8:25
ἡγείραν αὐτῶν λέγοντες: κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλῆμέθα. They-roused him saying: Lord, save, we-perish.

In the first example the Participle λέγον, together with the following speech, specifies the exact contents of the generic main verb “teach”. In the second example the Participle introduces a speech which gives the explanation for the action of the main verb. In both cases the relationship seems to be primarily a logical one, clarifying a generic speech verb or the purpose of an action by introducing direct speech.

In the light of the above data, given that scenarios contain a network of concepts all linked to the scenario’s nuclear concept (i.e. “title”), and given that Greek Participles are marked for Aspect, I make the following hypotheses:

Prenuclear Participles are used to mark a temporal relationship with the main verb, whereas Postnuclear Participles are used to mark a non-temporal semantic relationship. The nature of the non-temporal semantic relationships is determined by the prototypical relationship in the main verb’s scenario between the two events referred to.

A Prenuclear Aorist Participle refers to a preceding item from the script of the main verb, i.e. it marks time sequence, showing that the participial event occurred previous in time relative to the main verb. (This does not mean that no other relationship is implicit, e.g. “When he heard about it, he was furious” implies a causal relationship, but it is the temporal relationship that is grammaticalized). Using the Participle marks this verbal idea as part of the main verb’s scenario. Since the Participle is Aorist, the event is conceptualized simply as an Event (Perfective Aspect). Prenuclear word order follows what is probably a universal linguistic phenomenon in narrative, that events are normally recounted in the same sequential order as they occurred in real life. So an Aorist Participle followed by an Aorist or Future main verb can be conceptualized as Event EVENT.

This definition uses the terms “time sequence” and “previous in time”. However, even in the seemingly objective categories of Tense and Time (as opposed to the subjective “speaker’s conceptualization” of Aspect) the categorization of reality into time divisions of Past, Present and Future is still a conceptualization, and depends to some extent on the speaker’s choice, no doubt modified by linguo-cultural conventions. For example, Comrie says of the present tense (1985:37):
it is relatively rare for a situation to coincide exactly with the present moment, i.e. to occupy, literally or in terms of our conception of the situation, a single point in time which is exactly commensurate with the present moment. [italics mine]

Thus, there seem to be certain uses of the Prenuclear Aorist Participle which encode not so much real-time sequence, but conceptualized time sequence, e.g.
Matthew 5:2 ἀνοιξας τῷ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν having opened his mouth taught.
Matthew 3:15 ἀποκρίθη δὲ ἔλεγεν having replied said.

A Prenuclear Present Participle denotes an event occurring at the same time as the main verb. Use of the Participle shows that the event is part of the main verb’s scenario. The Present Participle conceptualizes the event as a Process, being Imperfective aspect. The combination of Participle and Imperfective aspect (an event viewed from within) conceptualizes the event as part of the main verb’s scenario, with the main verb’s event related “within” the Present Participle’s event. If the main verb is also a Process (Imperfective Aspect), then the events are typically contemporaneous (Process PROCESS). If the main verb is Event (Perfective Aspect), then the main verb’s event occurs whilst the Participle’s event is in process (Process EVENT).

Postnuclear Participles denote a non-temporal semantic relationship, e.g. means, manner, restatement, reason, cause, and, I believe, also a compound relationship “purpose and result” or “successful purpose.” It should be noted that purposes and results are often the same, and in a scenario all the concepts in a purpose slot would also be in a result slot. However the result slot will also contain other concepts, i.e. the undesired results of an action. Note that a purpose clause does not say whether that purpose was achieved, and a result clause does not say whether that result was the desired one. (This semantic link between purpose and result explains why ἵνα, which in Classical Greek only marks purpose, is occasionally used in New Testament Greek to mark result (Wallace, 1996:473, Porter, 1994:235-6), e.g. John 9:2, Romans 11:11.)

Postnuclear position is a natural position syntactically for such non-temporally related events to be placed. For example, subordinate clauses of purpose (with infinitive, εἰς “to” plus noun or infinitive, ἵνα “in order that”), result (with ὅτε “so that as a result”), and reason or explanation (with γὰρ “for”) regularly occur after the main verb of the independent clause. Consequently, Postnuclear Present and Aorist Participles may both be used for REASON clauses and for PURPOSE AND RESULT clauses. Postnuclear Aorist Participles, conceptualizing Event (Perfective Aspect), are also typically used for MEANS clauses. Contrastively Postnuclear Present Participles, conceptualizing Process (Imperfective Aspect), are typically used for MANNER clauses.

In summary, I make the hypothesis that in Participial Clauses:
Prenuclear = marks temporal relationship to main verb
Postnuclear = marks non-temporal relationship to main verb
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See also:
Appendix H Examples of Prenuclear Aorist Participles in discourse

2) Verb form: Aorist or Present.

Traditionally the difference between Aorist and Present Participles was seen as temporal. Porter (1989:365-388) argues strongly and convincingly against a temporal meaning, and in favour of Aorist being Perfective Aspect and Present being Imperfective Aspect. It is clear that Aorist and Present stems do not of themselves mark tense, otherwise, for example, an Aorist Imperative would have to command a past action. It should be noted, however, that Aorist and Present Participles often refer to actions which are conceptualized as occurring, respectively, before or concurrent with the main verb. Whatever the semantics behind the choice of Aorist or Present Participles, we need to know the range of real-time relationships they can refer to, not least because we cannot understand the text until we can visualize a real-life situation it refers to. Also, since many languages do grammaticalize tense and may or may not grammaticalize aspect, we cannot translate until we have made a decision about the real-life event the Greek verbal form refers to. The Aspect of the Participle provides a clue, but the scenario it belongs in provides the framework for reaching conclusions.

Since scenarios may contain a script which lists conceptually related sequences of events, I make the hypothesis that Prenuclear Aorist Participles, being Perfective Aspect, refer to events in a script, which are conceptualized as beginning (and frequently ending) before the beginning of the main verb. In contrast, Prenuclear Present Participles, being Imperfective Aspect, refer to events conceptualized as occurring at the same time as the main verb, e.g.

Matthew 8:7
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ἔγνω ἔλθὼν θεραπεύω αὐτόν.
and he-says to-him I having-come will-heal him

Luke 15:25
καὶ ὃς ἔρχομενος ἔγνωσεν τῇ οἰκίᾳ
and when coming he-drew-near to-the house

Here the Prenuclear Aorist Participle ἔλθὼν refers to an event “coming” which occurred previous to the main verb “healing”, whereas the Present Participle ἔρχομενος refers to an event “coming” which was concurrent with the main verb of “drawing near”.

This distinction applies equally to Genitive Absolutes, e.g.

Matthew 26:6-7
Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν οἴκῳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ γυνή
The () Jesus having-occurred in Bethany in house of-Simon the leper, approached him woman

Mark 14:3
Καὶ ὃς ἐρχόμενος ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ ... ἀνέβη γυνή
And being him in Bethany in the house of-Simon the leper ... came woman

Here the Prenuclear Aorist Participle γενομένου refers to an event “arriving” (cf. Acts 21:17, Mark 1:4) which occurred before the woman’s arrival whereas the Present
Participle ὑπὸς refers to an event "being" which was concurrent with the woman's arrival. Similarly:

Acts 28:9

τούτου δὲ ἡγομένου
This () having-occurred
This must mean "After this had happened" not "while this was happening" since in the previous verse Paul has healed the governor's father, and in this verse people start bringing their own sick for healing. Up till 28:8 nobody on Cyprus has any idea that Paul can heal.

Mark 14:43

Καὶ εἶδος ἕτερον ἀναλύοντος
And immediately yet him speaking
This must mean "while he was still speaking" not "when he had still spoken" since ἕτερον seems to be used only with an action still in process.

In the Gospels, by my count, ἕτερον occurs 13 times in a Genitive Absolute construction, 8 times are with λαλῶ (Matthew 12:46, 17:5, 26:47, Mark 5:35, 14:43, Luke 8:49, 22:47, 22:60), 5 times with other verbs (Luke 9:42, 14:32, 15:20, 24:41, John 20:1). In each occurrence the verb form is Present, i.e. there is 100% co-occurrence of Present stem with ἕτερον in Genitive Absolutes. Similarly, there are 10 occurrences of λαλῶ as a Genitive Absolute Present, all are Prenuclear, and all but 2 (Matthew 9:18, John 8:30) also have ἕτερον, i.e. there is 80% co-occurrence of ἕτερον with λαλῶ in a Present Genitive Absolute. This tends to confirm that Prenuclear Present Participles (Process, Imperfective Aspect) naturally refer to events which are still in process when the main verb takes place, thus indicating concurrent time.

In the whole New Testament, of 63 occurrences of ἕτερον, 23 occur with Participles, of which 22 are Present. There are 17 Prenuclear Genitive Absolutes, all Present (as above, plus Luke 9:42, 14:32, 15:20, 24:41, John 20:1, Acts 10:44, Rom. 5:6, 5:8, Heb. 9:8), 3 Postnuclear Present Participles Nominative (Matt. 27:63, Luke 24:6, 24:44), and 3 Prenuclear Participles Nominative, 2 Present (Acts 9:1, 2Th. 2:5), and 1 Aorist (Acts 18:18), where ἕτερον is part of the noun phrase "having remained many more days". The co-occurrence of this adverb with Imperfective Aspect is natural, but also strongly suggests the pragmatic meaning of Prenuclear Present Participles as concurrent time with the main verb.

Another example with Aorist and Present Participles contrasted is Acts 27:30-31:

τῶν δὲ ναυτῶν Λιττορίων φυγεῖν εἰς τοῦ πλοίου
The () sailors seeking to-flee from the ship
καὶ λαλάσαντες τὴν σκάφην ἐξ τῆς ἀλασάναν
and having-lowered the rowing-boat into the sea
προσαφέος ὡς ἐκ πρώτης ἀγκύρας μελέτων ἐκθεινεῖν,
in-pretence as-if from the-prow anchors intending to-cast-out
ἔστεν ὁ Παῦλος...
said the Paul...

It is clear that the sailors' intention to flee was still in process when Paul spoke, whereas the lowering of the rowing boat had already taken place, so the soldiers instead of stopping it being lowered, cut it loose (verse 32).
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So, whereas the immutable semantic meaning of the Participle is Aspect related, with Prenuclear Participles the choice of Aspect regularly corresponds to relative time, giving a pragmatic meaning which is time related.

Porter agrees (1989:381) that “when the [Aorist] Participle is placed before the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be depicted as antecedent”, but argues strongly against temporal reference being the main pragmatic contrast between Prenuclear Aorist and Present Participles. He cites Luke 2:42-43 as evidence (1992:184) since the text has both a Present Participle (here bold), and an Aorist Participle (underlined) which, in Porter’s view, are both referring to the same time:

Luke 2:42-43
καὶ οὗτος ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, And when he became of years twelve,
ἀναβαλόμενοι αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἐορτῆς
going up them according to the custom of the feast
καὶ τελεσαρτόν τὸς ἱμέρας;
and having completed the days,
ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτοὺς
in the to return them
ὑπέμεινεν ἤτοι δὲ πᾶς ἔν Ἰερουσαλήμ
remained Jesus the boy in Jerusalem.

However, in the light of scenario theory, there is no problem with interpreting the Participles in this text as having temporal reference. As we have seen above, scenarios have titles which refer not just to the single event lexically encoded but to the whole cluster of associated events. The lexical item “going up” seems to be almost a technical term, the title of the scenario for making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. For example, in Acts 18:22 Jerusalem is not even mentioned, and in Acts 21:12 it is clear that the fear is not of Paul’s actual going up to Jerusalem, but what might happen after he arrives there:

Acts 18:22
καὶ κατέλθαν εἰς Καισαρείαν,
And having gone down to Caesarea,
ἀναβαλόμενοι εἰς Ἐκκλησίαν,
having gone up and having greeted the church
κατέβας εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν,
he went down to Antioch.

Acts 21:12
καὶ οἱ ἐκκλησιαῖοι ταῦτα, παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἑτούμοι
When we heard these things, besought we and also the people there,
τῷ μὴ ἀναβαλεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.
of the not to go up him to Jerusalem.

As a scenario title then, “going up” can quite normally refer to the whole cluster of events associated with a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, including the time there. Thus I suggest that Luke 2:42-43 can mean: “When Jesus was twelve, whilst he and his parents were on pilgrimage to Jerusalem as was the custom for the Passover Festival, after they had completed their time there, when they set off back home, the lad Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem.” The choice of Aorist and Present makes perfect sense. When Jesus stayed behind, it was during the time they were on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, after they had completed the customary days of the feast.
Even though Porter says (1989:370) regarding Luke 2:42-43 “traditional temporal determinations on the basis of tense form make nonsense of the passage” his own explanation seems fully compatible with a temporal analysis, “The difference is that the Present is used of the entire trip as one in progress, while the Aorist is used as a transition to summarize the event as complete.” My only disagreement is that whereas “going up” refers to “the entire trip as one in progress” the “event that is complete” is specifically “the days” set for celebration in Jerusalem, the central part of the “going up” scenario, excluding the “going up” itself, and the “returning”.

I am NOT arguing that the fundamental meaning of these Participles is time related, but that in this context, the choice of aspect, Event (Perfective) or Process (Imperfective), matches the real-life distinction of previous time and current time, and pragmatically it is the real-life temporal distinction which is marked by the choice of Aspect. I posit that the reason the Greek author chose to conceptualize “going up” as a Process (Imperfective) was that it was a current event and so “felt like a process”, and the reason he chose to conceptualize “completing the days” as an Event (Perfective) is because it was an event which had already been completed and so “felt like a straightforward undifferentiated Event”. In other words I believe that the real-life situation envisaged, and the possible contrasts of temporal relationships within it, are factors which influence the author’s choice of Aspect.

In summary, I make the hypothesis that in Participial Clauses:

Prenuclear = marks temporal relationship to main verb
Prenuclear Aorist Participle = Perfective Aspect
= event begun previous to main verb
Prenuclear Present Participle = Imperfective Aspect
= event concurrent with main verb

Postnuclear = marks non-temporal relationship to main verb
Postnuclear Aorist Participle = Perfective Aspect
= event related non-temporally to main verb
e.g. means, reason, concurrent event, purpose+result,
If purpose+result the result occurs at the time of the main verb
Postnuclear Present Participle = Imperfective Aspect
= event related non-temporally to main verb
e.g. manner, reason, specific, purpose+result,
If purpose+result the result begins at the time of the main verb and continues
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e) Case: Nominative or Genitive

Participial clauses in the Genitive case are traditionally known as Genitive Absolutes. Out of 6258 participles in the New Testament (O’Donnell, 1997:13) 268 are in Genitive Absolute constructions (Argyle, 1957/8). Thus they make up less than 5% of participial usage (4.28%). According to Argyle (ibid.) 192 occurrences are in narrative sections of the Gospels and Acts, 32 in “discourse” sections of the same books, and 44 in the Epistles. He comments “the genitive absolute is more suited to the Greek of narrative or rhetoric than to the Greek of real letters. There is a notable contrast in the rhetorical Greek of Hebrews, which contains more than half as many instances as all the Pauline Epistles put together” (13 as against 21).

A distinction has long been made between Participial Phrases in the Nominative and Genitive cases. Whereas the subject of a Nominative Participial Phrase is normally the same as that of the main verb, the Genitive Absolute is grammatically independent of the main verb, e.g. Burton (1987:174):

THE GENITIVE ABSOLUTE. An Adverbial Participle may stand in agreement with a noun or pronoun in the genitive without grammatical dependence upon any other part of the sentence, the two constituting a genitive absolute phrase and expressing any of the adverbial relations enumerated in 435-449. [viz. Time, Condition, Concession, Cause, Purpose, Means, Manner, Attendant Circumstance.]

Traditionally, it has been regarded that the subject of the Genitive Absolute ought not to be coreferential to a participant in the rest of the sentence, e.g. Burton (1987:175):

The noun or pronoun of the Genitive absolute phrase regularly refers to a person or thing not otherwise mentioned in the sentence.

Burton notes exceptions (ibid.):

Occasionally, however, this principle is violated, and the genitive phrase may even refer to the subject of the sentence. This irregularity is somewhat more frequent in the New Testament than in classical Greek.

Similarly, Porter (1989:370):

On the basis of there being significant instances in earlier Greek where the subject is in some form repeated in the main clause, a significant difference in use of the Genitive absolute from earlier to Hellenistic Greek cannot be posited.

Indeed, it is quite common in the New Testament for the logical subject of a Genitive Absolute to be a non-subject participant in the rest of the sentence, e.g.

Luke 3:15-16
...kal διαλογιζομένων πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρδιασιν αὐτῶν περί τοῦ Ιωάννου ...
and debating all in the hearts of them concerning the John

Luke 3:21-22:
kαὶ Ἰησοῦς ἐπήρθε καὶ προσευχήθη ...
and Jesus having-been-baptized and praying ...

tοδε δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς ἐδείκνυ ὡς περιστεράν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν,
to-descent the spirit the holy in-bodily form as dove on him

Healey and Healey (1990:184-187) consider four possible rules concerning the subject of “Genitive Absolutes”:
The subject of a circumstantial participial clause is genitive when
Rule A: it ‘refers to a person or thing not otherwise mentioned in the sentence’ (Burton, 1973:175...)
Rule B: ‘its referent does not appear in the main clause’ (Funk, 1973:674)
Rule C: it ‘does not denote the same person or thing as the subject or object of the sentence [i.e. main clause]’ (Nunn, 1930:77)
Rule D: it ‘refers to some other person or thing than the subject of the principal sentence [i.e. clause]’ (Vine, 1947:182)
By testing these rules using New Testament data and noting the number of exceptions to each rule, they show that rule D best explains the data, thus providing good evidence that “Genitive Absolutes” are a switch-reference device:

- Rule A: 130/313 exceptions (35%)
- Rule B: 92/313 exceptions (29%)
- Rule C: 36/313 exceptions (12%)
- Rule D: 4/313 exceptions (1%)

The function of the “Genitive Absolute” in classical Greek as switch-reference is recognized by Givón (1983b: 70-71) as noted by Healey and Healey (1990:187 note).

Levinsohn comments on how the Genitive Absolute switch-reference system is used in discourse (1992:178):

A construction that indicates switch reference provides a natural way of introducing to an existing scene participants who perform key actions, change the direction of the story, etc. This is because, when the GA has the same subject as the previous clause, the scene is set for a different participant to be the subject of the nuclear clause. The employment of the GA with the same subject as the previous clause this gives natural prominence to the event described in the following nuclear clause.

Levinsohn gives an example of how a GA is used immediately before the introduction of new participants:

Acts 4:1

Speaking (they to the people)

Here the pronoun “they” refers back to Peter and John (Acts 3:11, 12), whereas the subjects of the main verb are all new characters coming onto the scene. This use of Genitive Absolutes as a switch-reference system, marking the setting for some other action, may be what Porter means when he talks of “transition” (1989:370):

As in extra-biblical Greek, the Genitive absolute is often used transitionally, as well as in the midst of narrative: Acts 1:8 ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ σαρκὶ τοῦ άγίου άγίου τῆς ἁγίασμος (when the Holy Spirit comes upon you); Acts 4:37 ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτῷ ἄγιον ἀγαθόν (a field belonged to him).

Levinsohn not only accepts that NPCs (Nominative Participial Clauses) are distinguished from GAs (Genitives Absolutes) on the basis of switch-reference, but also argues that apparent exceptions can be explained in terms of semantic roles (Levinsohn, 1992:178):

Healey and Healey (1990:187) found that the subject of the GA typically “is not identical with the subject of the leading verb” ... Out of the 313 New Testament occurrences of the GA that they identified, only three or four did not strictly obey this rule. Even the apparent exceptions show changes consistent with the behaviour of switch-reference markers in other languages.

Thus, in Acts 21:34b, although the surface subject of the GA and the nuclear clause is the same, the role of the subject changes from patient to agent ...

Conversely, NPCs almost always have the same subject as their nuclear clause, as in Acts 5:17. Apparent exceptions typically involve the same underlying subject.

This means that Nominative Participles, whose agent is the same as the agent of the main verb, typically encode foreground or main line events in a discourse. In contrast, Genitive Participles, whose agent is different from the agent of the main verb, typically encode background or off-line events. The term “foreground” here refers to the “actual
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story line” or “skeletal structure of the discourse”, whereas “background” refers to “supportive material which does not itself relate the main events” (Hopper, 1979:213).

The use of Genitive Participles for backgrounded events, which are not part of the main story line of the discourse, explains why they are relatively rare, accounting for only 11% of Participles compared to 69% for Nominatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Participle</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>3687</td>
<td>2370 = 64%</td>
<td>464 = 13%</td>
<td>601 = 16%</td>
<td>255 = 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>1895 = 83%</td>
<td>215 = 9%</td>
<td>123 = 5%</td>
<td>52 = 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>342 = 51%</td>
<td>61 = 9%</td>
<td>222 = 33%</td>
<td>47 = 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9 = 69%</td>
<td>1 = 8%</td>
<td>3 = 23%</td>
<td>0 = 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participles</td>
<td>6658</td>
<td>4616 = 69%</td>
<td>741 = 11%</td>
<td>949 = 14%</td>
<td>354 = 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also:

Appendix I Further evidence for Genitive Absolutes as switch-reference markers

Charting Prenuclear Aorist Participles Genitive using GRAMCORD shows that of the 59 occurrences found only two verbs occur three or more times, in the following semantic domains:

GRAMCORD search string:

[VERB aorist participle genitive] <FOLLOWED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]

[VERB aorist participle genitive] (59 total words)

Number of different forms = 33:

Happening = 22
- γίνομαι to become, be, be born, be created = 22

Movement = 3
- εξερχόμαι to come out, go out = 3

Almost all occurrences of γίνομαι are with time words such as evening, morning, day, hour. A few are with abstract nouns, e.g. Acts 15:7 “discussion”, 21:40 “silence”.

Thus typical examples of Prenuclear Aorist Participles Genitive include:

Matt. 8:16 'Οφίλος δὲ γενομένης προσήλυγαν...
Evening () having-arrived they-brought...

Matt. 27:1 Προφητας δὲ γενομένης συμβολαν ελαβον...
Morning () having-arrived decision they-took...

Luke 11:14 ἔγενετο δὲ τοις αμαλακοις εξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός καὶ ἑθαλάσσας ὁ δόχλος...
It-happened () the demon having-come-out spoke the dumb[man] and became-amazed the crowds.

These refer to events that occurred before the action of the main verb, and provide a temporal setting.

Charting Prenuclear Present Participles Genitive shows that of the 87 occurrences found several verbs occur three or more times, mainly clustering in the semantic domains of speech and existence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Participle</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>3687</td>
<td>2370 = 64%</td>
<td>464 = 13%</td>
<td>601 = 16%</td>
<td>255 = 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>1895 = 83%</td>
<td>215 = 9%</td>
<td>123 = 5%</td>
<td>52 = 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>342 = 51%</td>
<td>61 = 9%</td>
<td>222 = 33%</td>
<td>47 = 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9 = 69%</td>
<td>1 = 8%</td>
<td>3 = 23%</td>
<td>0 = 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participles</td>
<td>6658</td>
<td>4616 = 69%</td>
<td>741 = 11%</td>
<td>949 = 14%</td>
<td>354 = 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GRAMCORD search string:
[VERB present participle genitive] <FOLLOWED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]

[VERB present participle genitive] (87 total words)
Number of different forms = 58:

Speech = 12
λαλέω to speak = 8
λέγω to say, speak, tell = 4

Control = 4
ἐχω to have = 4

Exist = 10
ἐμί to be, exist = 6
ὑπάρχω to be, exist, possess = 4

Thus typical examples of Prenuclear Present Participles Genitive include:
Mark 5:35
"Ετι αὐτὸν λαλοῦσιν ἔρχονται ...
Yet him speaking they-come ...

Luke 7:42
μὴ ἔχοντων αὐτῶν ἀποδόντας ἀμφότεροις ἔχαρισατο.
not having them to-repay to-both he-canceled-debt.

John 21:11b
καὶ τοσοῦτοις δόντων οὰκ ἔσχιζο γὰ τὸ δίκτυον.
And so-many being not was-torn the net.

These refer to situations in existence at the time of the main verb.

Charting Postnuclear Aorist Participles Genitive shows only 18 occurrences, of
which only one verb occurs more than once:
GRAMCORD search string:
[VERB aorist participle genitive] <PRECEDED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]

[VERB aorist participle genitive] (18 total words)
Number of different forms =16:

πέμπω to send = 3

Several of these occurrences, including those with πέμπω, are substantival, e.g.
John 6:39
τὸῦτο δὲ ἦστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμπαντος με ...
This () is the will of-the [one]having-sent me ...

The few examples of Postnuclear Aorist Participles Genitive include:
Matt. 26:59b-60
ἐζήτουν ψευδωμαρτύρων ... καὶ οὓς ἔδυναν πολλῶν προσελθούσων ψευδωμαρτύρων.
they-were-seeking false-witness ... and not they-found many having-approached false-witnesses.

Acts 1:8
ἀλλὰ ἄμφοθεθ δύναμιν ἐπέλθοντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ἦμᾶς ...
But you-will-receive power having-come-upon the holy spirit upon you ...

These seem to describe precise events which are logically related to the main event, and
create a situation after which, or at which time, the main verb occurs.
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Charting Postnuclear Present Participles Genitive in the New Testament using GRAMCORD shows 64 occurrences, of which several verbs occur more than three times, but apart from elmi all are false hits:

GRAMCORD search string:
[VERB present participle genitive] <PRECEDED BY> <WITHIN 4 Words> [VERB indicative]

[VERB present participle genitive] (64 total words)
Number of different forms = 32:

Orientation = 4
daKeimai to sit at table, recline at table = 4 (all false hits)

Existence = 12
elmi to be, exist = 5
ζω to live = 6 (all false hits)

Speech = 14
λαλω to speak = 7
λεγω to say, speak, tell = 7 (all false hits)

Miscellaneous = 7
μελω to be about to; to linger = 4
ασθενω to be weak = 3 (all false hits)

Most of these false hits are substantival or adjectival, including 3/4 with daKeimai (the fourth Matt. 9:10 is also a false hit), and all examples with ζω, λαλω, λεγω, μελω, and ασθενω, e.g.
Matt. 22:10b
καλ ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος daKeimaiνων.
And was filled the wedding with-reclining[guests].
Mark 12:27
οὐκ ἔστω θεὸς νεκρῶν ἄλλα ζωτικῶν.
Not is God of-dead[people] but of-living[people]
Acts 2:11b
ἀκούομεν λαλοῦμεν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ.
we-hear speaking them in-the our languages the mighty[acts] of-the God.

Thus typical examples of Postnuclear Present Participles Genitive are with elmi:
John 5:13b
ὁ γὰρ ἤνωσεν ἐξενευμεν δρακον δρτος ἐν τῷ τόπῳ.
The for Jesus slipped-away crowd being in the place
Rom. 5:13b
ἡμαρτὰ δὲ ὅτι ἔλλεγεν τοῖς δρτοῖς νόμου,
Sin () not is-reckoned not being law.

These seem to describe ongoing situations logically related to the main verb and during which the main verb occurs.

In the light of these data, given that Genitive Absolutes mark switch-reference, and given that the grammatical main verb of the sentence refers to the scenario “title”, i.e. the nuclear concept of the scenario to which both Nominative Participles and Genitive Absolute constructions are prototypically related, I make the following hypotheses:

The difference between Nominative Participial Clauses and Genitive Absolutes as regards switch-reference affects the pragmatic range of semantic relationships between this
clause and the main verb. This fundamental difference is due to Nominative Participial Clauses having the same subject as the main verb, and therefore belonging to a script sequence, whereas Genitive Absolutes have a different subject and refer to events not controlled by the main verb’s subject.

Genitive Absolutes do not refer to events in a sequence of stages from the script of the main verb, since they have a different agent from that of the main verb. They may be unrelated to the main verb’s scenario at all (i.e. purely temporal and incidental), or may fit into the main verb’s scenario as a prototypical temporal setting, precondition, or attendant circumstance.

Prenuclear Genitive Absolutes are used as a temporal or perceptual setting for the following main verb. This often implies a causal relationship, in as much as the passing of time and the actions of other people affect the perceptual environment and actions of the different agent of the main verb. Sometimes the event in a Prenuclear Genitive Absolute is a precondition for the following scenario to unfold.

Postnuclear Genitive Absolutes are used for attendant circumstances to the preceding main verb, which do not function simply as a setting for the actions of the different agent of the main verb, but are logically related to the main event and describe a restricted situation or condition within which the main event takes place.

Summary of Participial Clauses and Parameters:
Semantically, Participles in Participial Clauses refer to events which belong in the same scenario as the main verb.

Pragmatically, they signify whatever semantic relationship is prototypical between the Participle’s event and the main verb’s event.

The three sets of parameters affecting Participial Clauses are listed below with their semantic meaning (=) and their pragmatic use (>):

a) position relative to the main verb:

Prenuclear = temporal relationship to the main verb
> used for temporal sequencing and settings
Postnuclear = non-temporal relationship to main verb
> used for non-temporal relationships, and circumstances

b) verb form:
Aorist = Perfective Aspect, Event
Prenuclear = Perfective + temporal
> used for preceding Event
Postnuclear = Perfective + non-temporal
> used for various semantic relationships
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Present = Imperfective Aspect, Process
Prenuclear = Imperfective + temporal
> used for concurrent Process
Postnuclear = Imperfective + non-temporal
> used for various semantic relationships

c) case:

Nominative Participial Clause
= same subject as main verb
> used for foreground or main story line events,
  i.e. main narrative development, main points

Genitive Absolute
= different subject from main verb
> used for background or off-line events,
  i.e. situations and actions of other characters

Semantic meaning of syntactic and grammatical elements:
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb
Prenuclear = temporal relationship to the main verb
Postnuclear = non-temporal relationship to main verb
Aorist = Perfective Aspect, Event
Present = Imperfective Aspect, Process
Nominative = same subject as subject of the main verb
Genitive = different subject from subject of the main verb

Types of Participial Clause with examples

The eight types of Participial Clauses listed below are distinguished formally in terms of position (Prenuclear or Postnuclear), verbal form (Aorist or Present) and case (Nominative or Genitive). Each type is given a semantic definition with a summary chart of its form, meaning and use, followed by any discussion of theoretical issues and then examples.

The pragmatic meaning of a Participle is derived from its prototypical semantic relationship within the main verb’s scenario. The pragmatic uses given below are examples of common uses, not exhaustive lists. (Main verbs are bolded, and relevant Participles underlined.)
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1) Prenuclear Aorist Participle Nominative
= preceding EVENT with same subject as main verb

*Grammatical and syntactic form:*
Subject 1 Aorist Participle Nominative ... Subject 1 Nuclear Verb

*Semantic meaning:*
Prenuclear = temporal relationship to the main verb
Aorist = Perfective Aspect, Event
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb
Nominative = same subject as subject of the main verb
Prenuclear Aorist Participle Nominative = preceding Event with same subject as main verb, in the main verb’s scenario

*Pragmatic use:*
> preceding time setting
   (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)
> preceding event, implicit reason
   (usually Participle is verb of perception)
> previous event in sequential stages of a script

Prenuclear Aorist Participles refer to events which are stages of the script in the scenario of the main verb. As such they are main events on the storyline of a narrative, preceding the event of the main verb. However, they need not be remembered separately by the hearer, since they can be retrieved from filling in the pre-existing slots in the scenario of the main verb.

Levinsohn is perhaps reacting to the retrievability of such prototypical script events when he says that prenuclear participial clauses are of “secondary importance” (1992:183):

> When a circumstantial participial clause precedes a nuclear clause, the information it conveys is of secondary importance with respect to that conveyed in the nuclear clause. No specific semantic relationship with the nuclear clause is indicated; rather, it is deduced from the context.

However, Healey and Healey confirm that events in participial clauses can be main line events (1990:225):

> From the way grammarians talk it is easy to get the impression that main finite clauses express events that are on the spine (i.e. they are on the main event line in narrative or on the main theme line) and that all the various kinds of subordinate clauses express background (i.e. events that are off the main event line or theme line). But this is far from the case. In fact, in this study more than half (457/827 or 55 percent) of the subordinate clauses turned out to be expressing events on the spine.

As regards the temporal reference of Prenuclear Aorist Participles, Porter, whilst arguing that their semantic meaning is simply Perfective Aspect, agrees that pragmatically they tend to refer to time antecedent to the main verb (1989:381):

> the syntactical pattern [of Participle and main verb] appears to be used to make relative statements about when the process is seen to have occurred (This recognizes the artificiality of imposing temporal criteria upon Participle usage, since pragmatically a range of relations, such as causal, concessive, conditional, commanding etc., may be possible). Thus when the Participle is placed before the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be depicted as antecedent.

This is in line with two general tendencies observed by Healey and Healey (1990:217):

> If an instance [of a participial or “when” clause] is early in the sentence in narrative, it has a 412/507 (81 percent) likelihood of being temporal in meaning.

and (1990:215):

> Where a temporal relationship is involved, an aorist (or punctiliar) aspect on the dependent verb usually indicates that the relationship between the dependent clause and its associated main clause is chronological sequence.
The frequent correlation between real time sequence and linear narration was also noted by the ancient Greeks (Reed, 1997:117, n. 185) (bolding mine):

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Comp. 5) sets out to demonstrate the 'natural' word order of Greek:...

things prior in time before subsequent temporal things ... He abandons this theory after discovering exceptions to the rules ... His remarks on word order, then, would suggest that there were patterns of natural arrangement but that he himself could not theoretically explain all of the reasons underlying marked patterns.

My hypothesis is that Prenuclear Aorist Participles grammaticalize events in the same linear order as the real-time events they refer to. It seems to be a language universal that narratives are normally retold in the same order as the events actually occurred (although languages also have devices for "flashbacks"). Thus it is psychologically and linguistically plausible that the "real-life order" pattern, observable in narrative as strings of finite verbs, is also being followed when there are strings of Aorist Participles preceding a main verb.

Perfective Aspect verb strings in narrative naturally have the implicature of sequential time, as explained by Comrie (1985:28):

Since a perfective verb form, by definition, encodes an event globally, it is representable as a point on the time line. Although it is possible for a number of events to occur absolutely simultaneously, it is relatively unlikely for such a coincidence to occur, therefore the more natural interpretation is that the events did not occur simultaneously. If the events did not occur simultaneously, then the most orderly presentation, i.e. the one adhering to Grice's maxim of manner ('be orderly'), is for the chronological order of events to be reflected directly in the order of presentation ... It is thus the interaction of the meaning of perfective aspect, the context, and conversational principles that gives rise, in neutral contexts, to the interpretation of sequentiality for a succession of perfective verbs. Sequentiality (and more generally, time reference) is thus not part of the meaning of the perfective.

It should be noted that a prenuclear Aorist Participle and main verb are never linked by conjunctions. The relationship between the events is not expressed in the surface structure by explicit conjunctions marking temporal relationships, since these relationships are already Hearer-old, stored as part of the speaker's and hearer's scenario for this type of event. The semantic relationship encoded is simply that of sequential events within the same script. The order of sequence is marked syntactically by word order, and the relationship to the main verb is marked grammatically, by Participle form agreeing with the subject of the main verb in number, gender and case. The fact that the event is to be conceptualized as an undifferentiated whole, rather than as a process, is indicated by Aorist form, marking Event Aspect (Perfective).

> preceding time setting (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)

Matt. 20:10, 11
kal ἔλαβον τὸν αὐτὸν διηράσαν καὶ ἀνέκτησεν. ἔγυρνον καὶ ἀνέκτησεν τὸν οἰκοδομότου ...
And took [the] each denarius and they. Having-taken () they-were-grumbling against the householder NIV “But each one of them also received a denarius. When they received it, they began to grumble.” The second occurrence of receiving is Discourse-old. It thus provides a time setting for its main verb, grumbling.

> preceding event, implicit reason (usually Participle is verb of perception)

Mark 6:29
kal ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
And having-heard the disciples of-him
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they came and took the body of him and placed it in tomb.
NIV “On hearing of this, John’s disciples came and took his body and laid it in a tomb.”
It is clear that their hearing provides both a time setting and a motivation for their actions.

> preceding event in sequential stages of a script
Matthew 22:25
καὶ ὁ πρῶτος νήματα ἐτελεύτησεν...
And the first having-married died...
NIV “The first one married and died”

2) Prenuclear Aorist Participle Genitive
= preceding EVENT with different subject to main verb

Grammatical and syntactic form:
Subject 1 Aorist Participle Genitive ... Subject 2 Nuclear Verb

Semantic meaning:
Prenuclear = temporal relationship to the main verb
Aorist = Perfective Aspect, Event
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb
Genitive = different subject from subject of the main verb
Prenuclear Aorist Participle Genitive
= preceding Event with different subject to main verb, in the main verb’s scenario

Pragmatic use:
> preceding time setting
(where event is Discourse-old or predictable, frequently related to day, night, time passing)
> preceding event, implicit reason
(usually implying 2’s perception of 1’s action)
> preceding event, precondition to sequential stages of a script

Semantically, a prenuclear Genitive Absolute in the Aorist form marks an Event (Perfective Aspect), occurring before the main verb’s event (syntactic order following real-time order), with the subject being different from the subject of the main verb (Genitive construction, as opposed to Nominative). It must also be Hearer-old information (Participle as opposed to main verb) and thus be Discourse-old (part of an open scenario), real-world predictable (such as passing of time), or part of the about-to-be-opened scenario of the main verb. Also it must be significant or relevant to the action of the main verb, in accordance with relevance theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986), and Grice’s maxims “be relevant” “be brief” (Grice, 1975).

In real life, anything relevant that someone else does before a different subject does something, is likely to be either a time setting for the following action (when?), or a reason for the following action (why?). Hence Prenuclear Genitive Absolutes in the Aorist often provide information which is the time setting or reason for the following action.

> preceding time setting (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)
Matt. 18:23b-24
δὲς ἠθέτησεν συμφάλον λόγον μετὰ τῶν δοῦλων αὐτοῦ.
who wished to-take reckoning with the slaves of-him
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δραμένον δὲ αὐτῷ συνάρευν προσπέραξεν αὐτῷ εἷς ὁφειλέτης μυρίων ταλάντων.

having-begun () he to-take, was-brought-forward to-him one debtor of-ten-thousand talents

NIV “As he began the settlement”

I would translate “When he had started taking the reckoning...” since the Greek, by using Aorist, marks Perfective rather than Imperfective Aspect. He began to take accounts before this debtor was brought. His beginning to take accounts is predictable as he wanted to do this (Matt. 18:23)

> preceding event, implicit reason

(usually implying subject 2’s perception of subject 1’s action)

Acts 20:3b

γενομένης ἐπιβολής αὐτῷ ἕως τῶν Ἰουδαίων μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἷς τὴν Συρίαν,

having-occurred plot to-him by the Jews intending to-sail to the Syria,

εὑρέθη γὰρ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν ἐπὶ Μακεδονίας.

he-became of-intention of-the to-return through Macedonia.

NIV “Because the Jews made a plot... he decided...”

Although what is marked semantically and explicitly is that the plot occurred before the decision, it is clear that pragmatically the plot was the REASON for the decision. This is because the concepts plot and change of decision belong in the same scenario in that one prototypical relationship.

> preceding event, precondition to sequential stages of a script

Mark 16:1

Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα...

And having-passed the sabbath ... they-bought spices

NIV “When the Sabbath day was over ... bought spices...”

It is especially clear here that the Aorist means the Sabbath is not passing but has passed, since Jews would not have worked on the Sabbath. The passing of the Sabbath is a precondition to working.

3) Prenuclear Present Participle Nominative

= concurrent PROCESS with same subject as main verb

Grammatical and syntactic form:
Subject 1 Present Participle Nominative ... Subject 1 Nuclear Verb

Semantic meaning:

Prenuclear = temporal relationship to the main verb
Present = Imperfective Aspect, Process
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb
Nominative = same subject as subject of the main verb
Prenuclear Present Participle Nominative
= concurrent Process with same subject as main verb, in main verb’s scenario

Pragmatic use:

> concurrent time setting
(where event is Discourse-old or predictable)

> concurrent time setting, implicit reason
(usually Participle is verb of perception)

> concurrent situation, implicit reason
(usually Participle is verb of being)

> concurrent event in non-sequential scenario

> concurrent time setting  (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)

Mark 6:2b

ἠρέατο διδάσκειν εν τῇ συναγωγῇ, καὶ πολλοὶ ἄκοιντες ἔξεπλησσοντο...

he-began to-teach in the synagogue, and many hearing were-being-astonished ...

NIV “… and many who heard him were amazed”
Perhaps “… and many people, as they heard him speak, were becoming astonished ...”
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Here the verb “began” and the Imperfective Aspect of both Present Participle and Imperfect Indicative suggest a progressive sense for the Participle and distributive and iterative Aktionsart for the Imperfect Indicative, with many different individuals each becoming astonished, one after the other, as they were listening. There is also the implication that what they heard is the reason for their astonishment.

> concurrent time setting, implicit reason (usually Participle is verb of perception)

Acts 5:5  
δικαιῶν δὲ ὁ ἀνανιάς τοὺς λόγους τούτους πεσὼν ἐξέφυγεν  
hearing (§) the Ananias the words these having-fallen he-died.  
NIV “When Ananias heard this ...” , TEV “As soon as Ananias heard this...”  
Since the Present Participle indicates PROCESS, this might be translated “as he heard these words, he fell down and died”, not “when he had heard these words ...”.

> concurrent situation, implicit reason (usually Participle is verb of being)

Matthew 1:19  
Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ ἄνευ αὐτῆς, δίκαιος ὁ καὶ μήθεικαὶ αὐτήν δεινοματίσαι.  
Joseph (§) the husband of-her, righteous being and not wishing her to-disgrace ἐπευληθή λάθρα ἄπολασαι αὐτήν.  
decided secretly to-divorce her.  
NIV “Because Joseph her husband was a righteous man ...”  
Such participles are typically Hearer-old or Discourse-old. Joseph being righteous may have been common knowledge among Christians, and is implied by God’s choice of him as husband of the Christ’s mother 1:16.

> concurrent event in non-sequential scenario

Luke 11:45  
Ἄριστος Καί ταῦτα λέγων καὶ ἠμᾶς ὑδροϊς.  
Teacher, these[things] saying also us you-insult.  
NIV “Teacher, when you say these things, you insult us also”  
The Prenuclear Present Participle refers to the same event as the main verb, but from another angle. Here “saying” is the implicit MEANS of insulting.

4) Prenuclear Present Participle Genitive

= concurrent PROCESS with different subject to main verb

Grammatical and syntactic form:
Subject 1 Present Participle Genitive ... Subject 2 Nuclear Verb  
Semantic meaning:
Prenuclear = temporal relationship to the main verb  
Present = Imperfective Aspect, Process  
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb  
Genitive = different subject from subject of the main verb  
Prenuclear Present Participle Genitive = concurrent Process with different subject to main verb, in main verb’s scenario

Pragmatic use:
> concurrent time setting  
(where event is Discourse-old or predictable, frequently related to day, night, time passing)  
> concurrent event, implicit reason  
(usually implying 2’s perception of 1’s action)  
> concurrent event, precondition to sequential stages of a script

Present Participles denote a Process (Imperfective Aspect). In Prenuclear Genitive Absolutes the Present Participle represents a Process begun before the commencement of the main verb and continuing up to, and possibly beyond, the action of the main verb. In
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such instances Imperfective Aspect is used since the event was in process and incomplete when the main verb occurred. There is a subject switch between the GA and the main verb.

> concurrent time setting (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)

Luke 19:11

'Ακουόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα προσθήκες εἶπεν παραβολήν...
Hearing () them these[things] having-added he-said parable...

NIV "While they were listening to this, he went on to tell them a parable..."

Here the Genitive Absolute shows concurrent time setting. This interpretation is supported by the statement that Jesus “having-added said”, i.e. continued to speak (cf. ν9-10).

> concurrent event, implicit reason

(usually implying subject 2’s perception of subject 1’s action)

Matt. 18:25

μὴ ἐξορτοῦ τὸν αὐτόν ἀποδοῦναί ἐκείνους αὐτόν ὁ κύριος προσήκει...
not having () he to-pay-back ordered him the master to-be-sold ...

NIV “Since he was not able to pay ...”

His situation is predictable as his debt was so large (Matt. 18:24).

> concurrent event, precondition to sequential stages of a script

Acts 27:21-22

Πολλὴς τε ἀϋπότις ἰμαρκούσες τότε σταθεὶς ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἶπεν ...
Much and lack-of-appetite being then having-stood the Paul in the middle of-them said ...

παρακαλῶ τίμιος εἰθημεῖν
I-beseech you to-be-of-good-cheer

NIV “After the men had gone a long time without food, Paul stood up among them and said ... I urge you to keep up your courage.”

The men’s despondency is the precondition for Paul making a speech of encouragement.

5) Postnuclear Aorist Participle Nominative

= EVENT with same subject as main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

Grammatical and syntactic form:
Subject 1 Nuclear Verb ... Subject 1 Aorist Participle Nominative

Semantic meaning:
Postnuclear = non-temporal relationship to main verb
Aorist = Perfective Aspect, Event
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb
Nomative = same subject as subject of the main verb
Postnuclear Aorist Participle Nominative = Event with same subject as main verb related non-temporally to main verb

Pragmatic use:
NOT sequential relationship
> MANNER
> MEANS
> PURPOSE AND RESULT, but not random subsequent event
(The result occurs at the completion of the main verb.)
> REASON, especially with verbs of perception
> CONCESSIVE, i.e. REASON plus contraexpectation
> CONDITION, i.e. REASON without factuality
> CONCOMITANT ACT, i.e. related Event (Perfective Aspect)
> CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE, i.e. subject is goal or patient
> RESTATEMENT
> RESTRICTIVE SETTING, locational, temporal, or circumstantial
> AMPLIFICATION / SPECIFIC
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Postnuclear Aorist Participles are less common than prenuclear, and the change in lexical order seems to indicate a change in the temporal relationship between the Participle and the main verb. Thus Porter, analysing data from a GRAMCORD study by Taylor (1984) of the Aorist Participle in Paul, states (1989:383-4):

of approximately 120 Aorist Participles found in relation to a main verb, approximately 78 precede and 42 follow the main verb, with those preceding showing a definite tendency toward antecedent action and those following showing a definite tendency toward coincidental action.

Porter further states that postnuclear Aorist Participles may refer to action occurring after the main verb (1989:381):

the syntactical pattern [of Participle and main verb] appears to be used to make relative statements about when the process is seen to have occurred ... This when the Participle is placed before the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be depicted as antecedent, and when the Participle is placed after the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be seen as concurrent or subsequent.

In other words, Porter argues, the grammatical and syntactic pattern of Aorist Participle followed by main verb seems to parallel the real-life order of sequential events, but when the Aorist Participle is placed after the main verb, then the time sequence is disrupted. I agree with this but go further.

Whereas the Prenuclear Aorist Participle refers to a preceding event from the list of stages in the script of the main verb, the Postnuclear Aorist Participle does not. This distinction between Prenuclear and Postnuclear Aorist Participles is not a temporal distinction, between preceding and concurrent or subsequent. Rather it is a distinction between temporal and non-temporal. The possible non-temporal relationships marked by a Postnuclear Aorist Participle are those which may be found in the non-temporal relationships part of the scenario of the main verb, such as MEANS, PURPOSE AND RESULT, REASON, and perhaps any type of CONCOMITANT ACT. These relationships are not grammaticalized separately in the text, since the particular concepts and related lexical items are already linked in the main verb scenario in specific prototypical relationships.

Although the relationship of Postnuclear Aorist Participles to the main verb is non-temporal, this does not mean that there is no temporal relationship between them, but rather that the author has chosen to mark a non-temporal relationship (by postposing the Participle). Indeed, the temporal relationship between a Postnuclear Aorist Participle and its main verb is often implied by the non-temporal relationship which is marked, e.g. REASON frequently implies a preceding event, MANNER frequently implies a concurrent event, and PURPOSE+RESULT implies a subsequent event.

The examples below support the following hypotheses:

a) The grammatical choice of Participle indicates that the verbal concept belongs to the same scenario as the main verb.
b) The grammatical choice of Aorist Participle indicates that the verbal concept is conceived of as a single undifferentiated Event (Perfective Aspect).

c) The syntactic choice of Postnuclear Aorist Participle indicates that the verbal concept is conceived of as an event in a non-temporal relationship with the main verb.

d) The pragmatic relationship between Postnuclear Aorist Participle and main verb is determined by the prototypical relationship of these particular verbs within the main verb’s scenario, i.e. it does not depend on the co-text or the specific context or the spoken or written text itself, but rather on the typical relationship between these events in the speaker’s and audience’s scenario. The lexical items, by referring to concepts already stored together in a single scenario, convey to the hearer not only the concepts themselves, but also the semantic relationship between them, by accessing the prototypical semantic relationship from the pre-existing mental scenario in speaker’s and hearer’s minds.

In Greek, non-temporal subordinate clauses typically occur after the main clause. This means that the postnuclear position is a natural place to find an event which relates to the main verb by a non-temporal semantic relationship, e.g.

**REASON**

Acts 4:3

\[ \text{they-put un guard till the next-day, it-was for evening already.} \]

Acts 5:38

\[ \text{leave them, because if be from people the intention this or the work this, it-will-fail.} \]

**PURPOSE**

Matthew 26:2

\[ \text{will-be-handed-over for the to-be-crucified.} \]

Mark 4:3

\[ \text{ Went-out the sower to-sow.} \]

Acts 8:19

\[ \text{ Give to-me-also the authority this} \]

\[ \text{so-that to-whom soever I-place hands may-receive spirit holy} \]

**RESULT**

Acts 14:1

\[ \text{It happened () to-speak thus} \]

\[ \text{as-a-result to-believe of-Jews and also of-Greeks much crowd.} \]

According to my thesis, the list of different semantic relationships above does not delimit what the Postnuclear Aorist Participle may mean, rather it shows the wide range of meanings which can be established within the New Testament text corpus. The meaning, I argue, is always “an event within the scenario of the main verb related to that verb by a non-temporal relationship.” What that non-temporal relationship is in any given text is the
prototypical semantic relationship between the two verbal concepts in the scenario of the original author and audience.

In many cases, we share the original author and audience’s scenarios, so it is “obvious” to us what the relationship between the verbal concepts is. However, even when we know intuitively what the relationship is from our experiential knowledge of the world, we may be unable to define it clearly in terms of any one specific semantic relationship since there may be multiple and complex relationships between events. Indeed ANY real-life experiential relationship which prototypically occurs between two events may be encoded by a Participle, yet the exact nature of that relationship is NOT encoded grammatically, and only the temporal/non-temporal distinction is marked syntactically by word order.

> **MANNER**
Matthew 20:8b

| ἀνέδωκεν αὐτῶς τὸν μισθὸν ἀρχάνως ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχάριτων οὕς τῶν πρώτων. |
|—|—|
| pay to-them the wage having-begun from the last[ones] to the first[ones]. |

(Compare John 8:9 and LXX Gen. 44:12)

> **MEANS**
James 2:21

| Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴр ἡμῶν οὐκ ἦν ἐξ ἔργων ἐκκαθάρθη |
|—|—|
| Abraham the father of-us not from works was-justified |

| ἄρενεγκας Τσαῦ τῶν ἕλληνων αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσαυτήριον; |
|—|—|
| having-offered Isaac the son of-him on the altar |

> **PURPOSE AND RESULT**
(Adjunctive result is conceptualized as a single one-off event)
Acts 25:13b

| Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Βερνίκη κατάρτισαν εἰς Κασάρειαν ἀποστάσιμον τοῦ Φήστου. |
|—|—|
| Agrippa the king and Bernice went-down to Caesarea having-greeted the Festus. |

NIV “King Agrippa and Bernice arrived at Caesarea to pay their respects to Festus.”

English cannot mark both purpose and result in a single grammatical form. Here the NIV marks purpose.

> **REASON, especially with verbs of perception**
Col. 1:3, 4

| Εὐχαριστοῦμεν ... ἀκούοντες τὴν πίστιν ήμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ... |
|—|—|
| We-give-thanks ... having-heard the faith of-you in Christ Jesus... |

NIV “We always thank God ... because we have heard of your faith ...”

> **CONCESSIVE, i.e. REASON plus contraexpectation**
Hebrews 12:17

| μετανοεῖς γὰρ τῶν οἷς ἔδειν καὶ περιμένας ἕκαστης αὐτῆς. |
|—|—|
| of-repentance for place not he-found although with tears having-sought it (blessing or repentance) |

NIV “He could bring about no change of mind, though he sought the blessing with tears.”

> **CONDITION, i.e. REASON or MEANS without factuality**
3 John 6

| οἷς καλὰς ποιήσεις προτέρους αἴλους τοῦ θεοῦ |
|—|—|
| whom well you-will-do having-sent-on worthyly of-the god |

NIV “You will do well to send them on their way in a manner worthy of God”
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i.e. “You will do well IF you send them ...” This is related to the MEANS statement “You did well in sending them ...”

> **CONCOMITANT ACT, i.e. related Event, not concurrent**

*Galatians 2:1*

διήλθη εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ μετὰ Βαρνάβα συνεπορευόμενον καὶ Τίτον.

I-went-up to Jerusalem with Barnabas having-taken-along also Titus.

I analyse the Aorist Participle here as conceptualizing the initial act of taking Titus along, which naturally resulted in his accompanying them throughout the trip.

> **CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE, i.e. subject is not agent but experiencer**

*Mark 12:21*

καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ... ἀπέθανεν μὴ καταλαμμένοι σπέρμα.

And the second ... died not having-left seed

i.e. “died childless” (cf. Luke 20:29 ἀπέθανεν ἀτεκνός “died childless”)

> **RESTATEMENT**

*Acts 27:33b*

δούλοι διατέλεσαν μηδὲν προσελθομένοι.

foodless you-continued nothing having-taken.

NIV “have gone without food - you haven’t eaten anything”

> **RESTRICTIVE SETTING, locational, temporal, or circumstantial**

*John 4:54*

Τῷ ὁδὸν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἔζησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

This () again second sign did the Jesus having-come from the Judea into the Galilee.

NIV “This was the second miraculous sign that Jesus performed, having come from Judea to Galilee.”

> **AMPLIFICATION / SPECIFIC**

*Matthew 27:4*

Τῇ ἤμερᾳ τοῦ παραδοσοῦ αἷμα ἁδύνατον.

I-sinned having-betrayed blood innocent.

6) **Postnuclear Aorist Participle Genitive**

= EVENT with different subject from main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

**Grammatical and syntactic form:**

Subject 1 Nuclear Verb ... Subject 2 Aorist Participle Genitive

**Semantic meaning:**

Postnuclear = non-temporal relationship to main verb

Aorist = Perfective Aspect, Event

Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb

Genitive = different Subject from Subject of the main verb

Postnuclear Aorist Participle Genitive = Event with different subject from main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

**Pragmatic use:**

> MEANS

> REASON

> CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE, i.e. related circumstance

NOT preceding action giving time-setting for main verb

> RESTRICTIVE SETTING
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Prenuclear Genitive Absolutes are used when the events are predictable from the preceding context, and form the temporal setting for, and sometimes implicit reason for, the nuclear verb. Such Genitive Absolutes may have no special relationship with the main verb’s scenario other than giving explicit details for its temporal slot, i.e. when it occurred.

In contrast, Postnuclear Genitive Absolutes are used when the events are a prototypical part of the main verb’s scenario, irrespective of whether they were predictable from the preceding text or not.

> MEANS
Matt. 26:60 (MEANS plus contraexpectation)
καὶ οὖν εὗρον πολλὰν προσπέλασμαν ψευδομαρτύρων.
and not they-found many having-come-forward false-witneses
NIV "But they did not find any, though many false witnesses came forward"
The CONCESSIVE sense is a result of contraexpectation in the normal MEANS relationship of finding false “evidence” by using false witnesses.

> REASON
...σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν γῆν ... τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκαλύτερος.
... darkness occurred on whole the land ... the sun having-failed
NIV “darkness came over the whole land ... for the sun stopped shining.”

> CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE, i.e. related circumstance
1 Peter 3:22
ος ἐκεῖνος ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ προεπεθείς εἰς οὐρανὸν
Who is at right [of-the] of-god having-gone into heaven
ἐποτάγησαν αὐτῷ ἀγγέλου καὶ ἑξουσίων καὶ δυνάμεων.
having-submitted to-him angels and authorities and powers
NIV “with angels, authorities and powers in submission to him.”
I analyse the first Aorist Participle προεπεθέεις as MEANS.

> RESTRICTIVE SETTING
John 6:23
ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου δην έφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.
near the place where they-ate the bread having-thanked the lord.
NIV “near the place where the people had eaten the bread after the Lord had given thanks”
This setting is “restricted” to refer to a specific occasion, because there is an underlying MEANS relationship between the Lord blessing the bread and people eating it.

7) Postnuclear Present Participle Nominative
= PROCESS with same subject as main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

Grammatical and syntactic form:
Subject 1 Nuclear Verb ... Subject 1 Present Participle Nominative

Semantic meaning:
Postnuclear = non-temporal relationship to the main verb
Present = Imperfective Aspect, Process
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb
Nominative = same subject as subject of the main verb
Postnuclear Present Participle Nominative
= Process with same subject as the main verb, related non-temporally to the main verb
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Pragmatic use:

- MANNER
- MEANS
- PURPOSE
- PURPOSE AND RESULT, the result begins at the time of the main verb and continues
- REASON
- CONCESSIVE
- AMPLIFICATION / SPECIFIC
- CONCOMITANT ACT, simultaneous and related
- RESTRICTIVE SETTING, locational, temporal, or circumstantial

Postnuclear Present Participles are especially common with the verb λέγω “say”.

According to statistics by O’Donnell (1997:13) the Present Participle occurs 3437 times in the New Testament out of a total 6258 Participles, and 27585 verbal forms, i.e. 55% of Participles are Present. From these averages, O’Donnell calculates the degree to which individual lexical items differ from the norm, taking a z-score of 3 or more (positive or negative as significant (1997:15). With the verb λέγω “say”, there are 451 occurrences of the Present Participle compared to an expected 283, giving a z-score of 14.89 for statistical significance (Meaning in Numbers, 1997:20, Appendix). In other words, this is VERY significant. Examples with λέγω will be given in several categories.

- MANNER
  Matthew 9:27
  ήκολούθησαν [αὐτῷ] δύο τυφλοὶ καὶ λέγοντες καὶ λέγοντες ...
  Followed [him] two blindmen shouting and saying ...

- MEANS
  Acts 27:38
  ἐκούφιζον τὸ πλοῖον ἔκβαλλομενοι τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.
  they-were-lightening the ship throwing out the wheat into the sea.
  NIV “they lightened the ship by throwing the grain into the sea.”

- PURPOSE
  Luke 2:45
  καὶ μὴ ἐλάβοντες ἑνεκτρέφαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀνατιθημένος αὐτὸν,
  and not having-found they-retumed to Jerusalem seeking him.
  NIV “When they did not find him, they went back to Jerusalem to look for him.”

- PURPOSE AND RESULT, the result begins at the time of the main verb and continues
  Matthew 19:3
  And approached him Pharisees testing him and saying
  The next verse 19:4 begins ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ἔπειν “He () having-responded said” which not only proves that these words were actually said (i.e. the RESULT is included), but uses the ὁ δὲ formula, i.e. articular pronoun and developmental particle marking “tight-knit” conversation (Levinsohn, 1992:127).

- REASON
  Acts 9:7
  οἱ δὲ διότι τοῦ καυχοῦντος αὐτῶν εἰσῆλθεν ἐν ἐκείνῳ,
  the () men the travelling-with him stood speechless
  ἐκούφισαν μὲν τῆς φωνῆς μηδὲν δὲ θεωροῦσαν, hearing () the sound/voice nobody () seeing.
  NIV “The men travelling with Saul stood there speechless; they heard the sound but did not see anyone.”
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They were speechless BECAUSE they could hear the sound but could see nobody.

> CONCESSIVE
Acts 9:7
οὐ δὲ ἔδειξεν οἱ συνοδεοῦτες αὐτῷ ἐλευθεροῦν ἐνεοῖ, the () men the travelling-with him stood speechless ἀκοῦσαν μὲν τὸς φωνὴς μηδέν δὲ θεωροῦσαν . hearing () the sound/voice nobody () seeing.
NIV "... they heard the sound, but did not see anyone."
Note the CONCESSIVE relationship is between Postnuclear Participles within a REASON clause. The men were speechless BECAUSE, ALTHOUGH they heard the sound, YET they saw nobody.

> AMPLIFICATION / SPECIFIC
Matthew 21:1-2
τότε Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς Μηχαν αὐτοῖς ... then Jesus sent two disciples saying to them...
NIV “Jesus sent two disciples saying to them...”

> CONCOMITANT ACT, simultaneous and related
Mark 15:36b
ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν Μηχαν. "Αφετε ἐδώμεν εἰ ἐρχεται Ἠλίας καθελεν αὐτῶν. he-gave-to-drink him saying, Leave, let-us-seen if comes Elijah to-take-down him.
NIV “and offered it to Jesus to drink. “Now leave him alone. Let’s see if Elijah comes to take him down,” he said.”

> RESTRICTIVE SETTING, locational, temporal, or circumstantial
John 3:4b
Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γερον ὅπως. How can person to-be-born old being?
NIV “How can a man be born when he is old?”

8) Postnuclear Present Participle Genitive
= PROCESS with different subject from main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

Grammatical and syntactic form:
Subject 1 Nuclear Verb ... Subject 2 Present Participle Genitive

Semantic meaning:
Postnuclear = non-temporal relationship to the main verb
Present = Imperfective Aspect, Process
Participle = in the same scenario as the main verb
Genitive = different subject from subject of the main verb
Postnuclear Present Participle Genitive = Process with different subject from main verb related non-temporally to the main verb

Pragmatic use:
> CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE, simultaneous and related
(NOT simultaneous circumstance simply as a time-setting)

> CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE, simultaneous and related
Acts 27:2b
ἄνθρωπον δυναστεὶς σὺν ἡμῖν Ἀριστάρχου Μακεδόνος Θεσσαλονίκεως. we set-sail being with us Aristarchus Macedonian of-Thessalonica.
NIV “we put out to sea. Aristarchus, a Macedonian from Thessalonica, was with us.”
Chapter summary

Scenarios affect Greek Grammar, so can be discovered by grammatical analysis of the text. In the Verb Phrase, the choice between main verb and Participle is related to scenario theory.

Main verbs mark Discourse-new events, whereas Participles mark Hearer-old events. Where Participles refer to Discourse-new events, those events belong to the scenario of the main verb, and have a prototypical relationship with the main verb, which is the nuclear element of the complex event scenario.

The semantic meaning of Participles is defined by word order (Prenuclear marking temporal relationship to the main verb, and Postnuclear marking non-temporal), by verb form (Aorist marking Perfective Aspect, and Present marking Imperfective Aspect), and by case (Nominative marking that the subject is the same as the main verb, Genitive marking that the subject is different).

These parameters limit the possible pragmatic meanings of different types of Participles, but the specific pragmatic meaning is determined by the prototypical relationship between the event encoded by the Participle and the event encoded by the main verb within the main verb’s event scenario. New Testament examples provide support for these hypotheses.
Chapter 6
GREEK NOUN PHRASES
AND SCENARIOS

Since scenarios affect the grammatical form of the Greek Verb Phrase, I investigate in this chapter whether scenarios also affect the grammatical form of the Greek Noun Phrase. I test two hypotheses, that use of the article with a noun marks that the referent is Hearer-old (i.e. Discourse-old, or Discourse-new and part of an open scenario), and that lack of the article with a noun which refers to a Hearer-old entity marks that entity as salient (i.e. having some special significance in the discourse, potentially at any level). I also give examples of grammatical patterns used in the Noun Phrase for all information status categories.

The meaning of the article in Greek

Greek nouns, including proper nouns and abstract nouns, may occur both with the article (arthrous or articular) and without (anarthrous). Various attempts have been made to describe the use of the Greek article, e.g. Carson’s chart (1984:83):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use 1</th>
<th>Use 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) definite</td>
<td>(c) generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarthrous</td>
<td>(b) indefinite i.e. qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carson however comments:
the articular usage under use 1 has certain conceptual affinities with the anarthrous usage under use 2;
and the anarthrous usage under use 1 has certain conceptual affinities with the articular usage under use 2.

Porter, accepting Carson’s analysis, demonstrates various usages (and non-usages) of the article (1994:103-114). Porter notes that, despite problems in analysis, nouns with the article are morphologically “marked” and fundamentally anaphoric (1989:101):

Use of the article in Greek is not an easy issue to resolve, especially in relation to anaphora, but the best concise description seems to be Carson’s (Fallacies, 83, cf. 82-84...). The articular is the marked form in Greek on the basis of its additional morphological element and its anaphoric use in definite statements (Acts 10:4), as well as generic statements (Luke 10:7), where reference appears to be made to a known state of affairs. (It has long been recognized that the article is related to the demonstrative morphologically; see Robertson, 755; cf. Lyons, Semantics, 652-54).

Use of the article for both anaphoric reference and generic reference, as well as its historical link to the demonstrative, fits my analysis in terms of scenario theory. I make the hypothesis that the article always refers back, either to a Hearer-old scenario (generic), or to a specific Hearer-old item within a Hearer-old scenario. This would result in the following scenario-based analysis of Carson’s chart:
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Use 1
Articular (a) definite specific Hearer-old item from open scenario 

Use 2
Anarthrous (b) indefinite i.e. qualitative non-specific Hearer-old item from open or closed scenario 

c) generic specific Hearer-old scenario referred to by title, singular or plural (including singular abstract nouns) 

(d) non-generic (individual) specific Hearer-new item from open or closed scenario 

However, neither Carson’s definition, nor the scenario-based restatement of it above, addresses the problem that an indisputably definite referent, i.e. a specific Hearer-old item, frequently occurs anarthrously (e.g. Jesus, in Matthew 1:1, 16). 

The traditional definition of the article in Greek is that it marks “known, particular” (Blass, Debrunner and Funk, 1961, sec. 252). The most obvious understanding of “known particular” would be Discourse-old, and indeed I will show that the article is used regularly to mark Discourse-old items. 

However, there are two major problems associated with this traditional definition: 
1) The definition “known particular” is not clear. 

The meaning of the article needs to be defined precisely, and in terms of modern linguistic categories of information status, such as Discourse-new/old, Hearer-new/old, given, inferrable etc. I suggest that if the article refers not only to Discourse-old information, but also to Discourse-new inferences, then it relates directly to scenario theory. The article’s link with scenarios has indeed been noted but not developed by Levinsohn (1992:97) (bolding mine): 

(The definite article may be used also to refer to particular referents that are associated by a “script” with a known entity. For example, once reference has been made to a father, an arthrous reference to his child is acceptable, even if previously unmentioned.) 

2) The definition “known particular” does not fit the facts. 

As Levinsohn notes (1992:97) (bolding mine): 

Throughout the New Testament, nouns whose referents are “known, particular” ... are at times preceded by the definite article (i.e. “arthrous”) and at times appear without it (i.e. they are “anarthrous”) 

So, either the concept “known particular” must be defined in linguistic terms and the exceptions explained systematically, or a totally new definition must be found. Levinsohn has attempted to explain anarthrous nouns with “known particular” referents in terms of “salience” and “topic” (ibid.): 

Typically those of the latter type [anarthrous] are salient or highlighted. 

And again (ibid.) (bolding mine): 

Frequently, the propositional topic is information that the author considers to be “known” to the reader and the subject is most frequently the topic. The observed tendency for the subject to be arthrous in Greek naturally follows. 

In the light of the observations above, I make the following hypotheses concerning use of the Greek article:
The use of the article in Greek can be defined in terms of two categories: information status and salience.

The basic use of the article in Greek is not to mark that an item is Discourse-old, but to mark that it is Hearer-old, in short-term or long-term memory. Naturally, whatever is Discourse-old will also be Hearer-old, but Hearer-old also includes the categories KNOWN unused, KNOWN inferrable and GIVEN situational.

All nouns without the article are “salient” either because they are Hearer-new, or because the author chooses to mark Hearer-old items as salient. “Salient” means having some special significance in the discourse, potentially at any level, e.g. marking clause level focus, marking theme at clause level or higher levels of discourse, or highlighting interpersonal relations, etc.

**Discourse-new and Discourse-old referents**

Greek regularly contrasts Discourse-new and Discourse-old information.

**Discourse-new nouns typically have no article**

Nouns for major participants, whether human, animate or inanimate, are typically introduced without the article. Typically they are also Hearer-new, i.e. the audience does not know, or know of, the individual participant being introduced, e.g. (relevant nouns bolded)

**human**

Matt 21:33b *Ανδρῶν ος ἠκολούθησεν Ἰάκωβ ... Man was householder who ...

Mark 5:25 καὶ γυνὴ οὗτη ἐν ῥίσει αὐτῶν διδάκτη ἑτη ... And woman being in flow of-blood twelve years ...

cf. Acts 1:23, 4:36

**inanimate**

Acts 2:2a καὶ ἐγένετο δέφοι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θύεις ὀμπέρ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαῖς And occurred suddenly from the heaven sound as of-rushing wind violent

Acts 2:3a καὶ ὠφθήσαντο αὐτῶς διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὅσει πυρὸς And were-seen by-them being-distributed tongues as of-fire

Nouns for major participants, especially in Luke and Acts, are introduced with τις “a certain” (singular, specific member of a category) or τινὲς “certain/some” (plural, specific members of a category or group), e.g.

Matthew 28:11 καὶ τινὲς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἀπό τοῦ δέχοντον πρὸς αὐτὸν ... And certain of-the Pharisees from the crowd said to him ...
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Mark 14:51
Καὶ νεανίσκος τῆς συνηκολοῦσε αὐτῷ...  
And youth certain was-following him...

Ἐγένετο... λεπτὰς Ζαχαρίας...  
Occurred... priest certain by-name Zechariah...

Acts 3:2 (major character in Acts 3:1-4:22 episode), cf. 5:1
καὶ τῆς ἀνήρ... κοίλας... καὶ τοῦ ὑπάρχου ἐβαστάζετο  
And certain man lame from womb of-mother of-him being was-being carried

Sometimes τινὲς "certain/some" occurs without a head noun but with the group

the referents belong to made explicit, e.g.

Acts 6:9 (major characters in Acts 6:9-7:60 episode)
ἀνέστησαν δὲ τινὲς τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Ἀβεβέρεων...  
Arose () certain of the[ones] from the synagogue the being-called of-Freemen

disputing-with the Stephen

Acts 12:1 (includes Peter, major character in Acts 12:1-19 episode)
Καὶ ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν καλρόν  
At that () the time

laid Herod the king the hands to mistreat certain of the[ones] from the church.

Nouns for major participants (human or supernatural) whose presence is surprising
are introduced with "behold", e.g.

καὶ ὡς ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν παρευμένου αὐτοῦ,  
And as gazing they-were to the heaven going him,

καὶ οἷος ἄνδρας δόο παρεισήκολαν αὐτὸς ἐν ἐσθήσει λευκάς...  
and behold men two-stood-by them in garments white...

(surprising because on a desert/deserted road)
καὶ οἷος ἄνδρα Ἅθηση... ἤν τε ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθίσμασ...  
And behold man Ethiopian... was both returning and sitting...

Acts 10:30b (supernatural)
ἡμεν τὴν ἑνήδαν προσευχόμενον εν τῷ οἴκῳ μου,  
I-was the ninth-[hour] praying in the house of-me,

καὶ οἷος ἄνδρα ἐστίν εἰμπληθός μου ἐν ἐσθίω χαμπρα  
and behold man stood before me in clothing bright

Note that supernatural beings may only be present in the narrative for a short time, but their intervention is always very significant, hence they are regarded as major participants.

Similarly, the voice of God may be introduced in this way, e.g.:

Matthew 3:17 (cf. Matthew 17:5, Mark 1:11 anarthrous noun alone)
καὶ οἷος φωνή ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα,  
and behold voice from the heavens saying,

Anarthrous nouns may be used for first introductions (Discourse-new) even when the referent is Hearer-old. This marks that the participant so introduced is salient, which is typical of major characters, e.g.

Matthew 17:3 (supernatural)
καὶ οἷος ἄνθρωπος ἔστιν καὶ Πάθους καὶ Χώρας συλλαβώτες μετ’ αὐτοῦ.  
And behold were-seen by-them Moses and Elijah discussing with him.
**Discourse-old nouns typically are marked with the article**

In contrast nouns which are Discourse-old are normally arthrous, i.e. take the article. Naturally all Discourse-old items are (by now) Hearer-old. This category seems to be what was primarily meant by the traditional definition (Levinsohn, 1992:97):

> It is generally agreed that one reason for using the definite article is when the referent of the noun to which it is attributive is “known particular”.

Examples here have the first mention in bold, anaphoric reference underlined, e.g.

*with repetition of the same noun*

Luke 9:30, 32

καλ ἰδοὺ 

_in upper-room... into the upper-room_

Acts 12:7-10

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος ... ὁ ἄγγελος ... ὁ ἄγγελος

And behold angel ... the angel ... the angel

Acts 13:6b, 8

εἶρον ἄνδρα πυλή μάγον ... Ἐλίμας ὁ μάγος ...

they-found man certain sorcerer ... Elymas the sorcerer...

*Compare:*

Acts 9:37b, 39b

ἐν ὑπερώφα ... ἔς τῷ ὑπερώφῳ

in upper-room... into the upper-room

*with coreferential noun*

Luke 6:6b, 8b (generic specific)

καὶ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἑκεί ... And was person there ...

Luke 7:19, 20 (specific generic)

καὶ προσκαλεσάμενοι διὸ τινὸς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶ ... And having-called two certain of-the disciples of-him...

Luke 8:27, 29 (specific generic)

ἄνηρ τις ... ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωποῦ. man certain ... from the person.

Luke 8:29b (specific generic)

ἄλοσειν καὶ νέβαις ... τὰ δεσμῖν with-chains and with-fetters ... the bonds ...

Luke 8:27b, 29 (synonyms)

ὑπηρτησαν ἄνηρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔχων δαιμόνια ...

met man certain from the town having demons...

he-commanded for the spirit the unclean to-come-out from the person.

Acts 14:8a, 13a (name, class)

Καὶ τὸς ἄνηρ ἄνθρωπος ἐν Ἀδριατί τοῦ πολιοὶ ἐκάθεν ... And certain man poweress in Lystra in-the-feet sat ...
with variation of word class

Mark 1:30, 31

The (other-in-law) of Simon was lying aside fevering...

and it left her the fever, and she served them.

Mark 7:32, 35b

And they bring to him dumb and poor-speaking...

and was loosed the bond of the tongue of him.

Discourse-old entities may be referred to by pronouns or zero anaphora

It is of course extremely common in the Greek of the New Testament for anaphoric reference to a known particular entity to use a pronoun, relative pronoun or zero anaphora. Zero anaphora is typically used for already focal subjects (also marked in the verb suffixes), whereas the pronoun may be used for already focal participants in any semantic role, such as agent, goal, instrument, benefactive, experiencer, etc. This is the normal pattern when the entity concerned is in explicit focus, i.e. already mentioned and part of the current scenario, e.g.

(all references to the “man” are bolded, asterisk = zero anaphora)

Acts 14:8-10

Kal * tis * d' is * απαθητος * εν * λυστης * τοις * ποιν * εκαθητο...

This shows that * zero anaphora is used in narrative for items of the information status 3b GIVEN textual - current (Chapter 3, part 1) which are Discourse-old (and by definition Hearer-old) and refer again to the last opened scenario.

I have also used * to mark the (intended) agent of an Imperative, although Imperatives normally would not have an explicit subject anyway. This is partly for consistency in showing that the agent is the same as in other places where there is no pronoun. It also emphasizes a general principle, which otherwise might go unnoticed, that the agent of a command in narrative is always Discourse-old and currently focal. As far as the narrative is concerned, the agent of the imperative is the person addressed by the speaker, and so has the information status of 3b GIVEN textual-current (for the reader).
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As far as the original context of the speech exchange is concerned, the information status of the agent of the imperative was 3a GIVEN situational and was Discourse-new, Hearer-old, referring to a new entity in the open “here and now” scenario, viz. the addressee. Thus the lack of a pronoun with Imperatives fits the general pattern of pronoun-drop (zero anaphora) for Hearer-old currently focal entities.

In summary then, the norm is:
Discourse-new item is marked by no article.
Discourse-old item is marked by the article.
Discourse-old item (currently focal) is marked by pronoun or zero.

Exceptions that prove the rule

Exceptions to this pattern can be explained in terms of two factors: information status and “salience”.

The article is used for Discourse-new items which are KNOWN, i.e. have the following information status:
2. KNOWN ENTITIES (Hearer-old but not previously in focus)
   a. unused
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in “whole world” scenario
   b. inferrable
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities from an open co-text scenario

Lack of the article with Discourse-old referents, or other Hearer-old referents, is statistically unusual, and so marks those referents as “salient.” I use “salience” as a broad cover term for something the author wishes to draw the audience’s attention to, which includes focus (highlighting) at clause level, and theme at higher levels of discourse.

The following sections deal with each of these issues in turn.

The article is used for all Hearer-old referents

On the basis of scenario theory and Greek New Testament examples, I make the hypothesis that the Greek article is used with Discourse-new referents when those referents are Hearer-old, i.e. the article indicates Hearer-old, not Discourse-old. Evidence for this is given below.

The article with abstract nouns referring to a class

The use of the article with Discourse-new abstract nouns is well known. Levinsohn even says it is “obligatory” to use the article “when the referent is a class” (1992:98). An example of this is in John 8:32, where the first reference is Discourse-new:

καὶ γνῶσοσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ η ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ἡμᾶς.

and you-will-know the truth, and the truth will-free you.
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A class is naturally a category which already exists in the hearer’s mind, i.e. 2a 
KNOWN unused. In other words it is the title of a mental scenario. As such it may be 
referred to as Hearer-old (hence the term “known particular”), even though it may be 
Discourse-new. However class words also occur without the article where emphasis is not 
on the specific identity as a Hearer-old class, but on the quality or characteristics 
associated with the noun. Black goes so far as to use this as the basic definition of the 
contrast between articular and non-articular nouns (1990:108):

In Greek, the presence of the article indicates specific identity, whereas the absence of the article 
indicates quality (characteristics).

Carson, in a more balanced summary, also notes the association between quality and 
anarthrousness (1984:83):

Articular = definite
Anarthrous = indefinite, i.e. qualitative
generic non-generic (individual)

This indefinite qualitative sense may explain the lack of an article with class nouns 
used in adverbial phrases, where the quality of the noun (attribute), rather than its identity 
(thing), is in focus. For example, in the phrase “by day and by night” exactly which day(s) 
or night(s) is not focal, but the quality of the day and night is focal, i.e. during the time 
when many people are moving around and can be seen easily, and during the time when 
few are moving but they are hard to see, e.g.

Acts 9:24b
παρετηροῦντο δὲ καὶ τὰς πύλας ημέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς ...
They-were-watching () also the gates by-day and also by-night ...

This “qualitative” sense should not be thought of as another factor affecting the use 
of the article. The anarthrous use of class nouns is simply an example of indefinite 
reference, i.e. not to a specific day or night, but to any day or night. However, to be 
categorized in the classes of day and night, the referents must show class similarity to the 
prototypical member of that class, i.e. be similar in quality.

This principle of “quality” may also explain the fact that abstract “class” nouns 
typically take the article when the Noun Phrase is in the role of “sphere”, but lack the 
article when in the role of “manner”, that is adverbial. For example (event concept 
underlined, abstract noun bolded):

Romans 12:6-8
έχοντες δὲ χαράματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα.
Having () gifts according-to the grace the given-to-us differing, 
ἐὰν προφητελῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, 
if prophecy according-to the measure of-the faith 
ἐὰν διακοινών εἰς τῇ διακοινώ, 
if service in the service 
ἐὰν δὲ δώδεκας εἰς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 
if the teaching-one in the teaching 
ἐὰν δὲ παρακαλῶν εἰς τῇ παρακλησίαν. 
if the encouraging-one in the encouragement 
ὁ μεταδιδός εἰς ἀπλότητα, 
the sharing-one in generosity 
ὁ προστάσεως εἰς σπουδή, 
the leading-one in diligence 
ὁ ἐλέους εἰς χαράτωτα, 
the showing-mercy-one in cheerfulness.
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In the last three lines above, but not elsewhere, the abstract nouns can be paraphrased by adverbs, viz. generously, diligently, and cheerfully, i.e. the reference is to the quality of the abstract noun, not its specific identity. I argue that, in terms of scenario theory, the links in these clauses between the initial noun and the following abstract noun are of different types. In the first five clauses the abstract nouns are connected to the explicit or implicit event scenario by *participant* links of “sphere” (or “extent”). In the last three clauses the abstract nouns are related to the event by *attribute* links showing “manner”. I therefore suggest that the semantic slot a noun occupies in a given scenario affects the likelihood of its being semantically salient in discourse, and thus being encoded as anarthrous.

The article with Discourse-new referents from Discourse-old scenarios.

Levinsohn notes in passing (1992:97):
(The definite article may be used also to refer to particular referents that are associated by a “script” with a known entity. For example, once reference has been made to a father, an anarthrous reference to his child is acceptable, even if previously unmentioned.)

The information status of such referents is 2b KNOWN inferrable, e.g.

John 17:1
Πάτερ, Ἐληλυθέν ἡ δια φόβου σου τῶν ἀνω
Father, it-has-come the hour, glorify of-you the son.

John 2:14b
τοὺς πωλήσαντας ... τοὺς κερατιστάς
the sellers ... the coin-dealers
(prototypical elements of the temple scenario opened in 2:14a by “the temple”)

Unfortunately, Levinsohn fails to capitalize on this insightful aside. He does not point out the common semantic element linking this usage of the article with its use for class reference (2a KNOWN unused) and for anaphoric reference (3 GIVEN), i.e. all are Hearer-old, and are part of an existing mental scenario, either in long-term memory or in short-term memory as created by the immediate text.

I suggest that the use of the article for KNOWN inferrable information plays a vital role in exegesis and translation. The presence of “unexpected” articles marks “hidden” scenarios which we, as today’s audience, do not share with the original audience, such as the article in Luke 5:14 for “the priest” in a leprosy scenario, and in Matthew 9:23 for “the pipe-players” in a death scenario. The use of the article in these verses matches what we know historically of the social situation of first-century Jews, and hence the concepts associated in their mental scenarios, but these scenarios are different from those of a modern day westerner.

The article with Discourse-new items from any Hearer-old scenario

The information status of most referents not included in the above exceptions is 2a KNOWN unused. An example of this is in Luke 4:40 where the first mention of “sun” in
the Gospel is with the article, since it is a known definite referent in the hearer’s “whole
world” scenario, e.g.
Δόκουτος ἐς τῷ ήλιῳ ...
Setting () the sun...
(All humans know the sun sets)
Matthew 1:11
ἐν τῇ μετακεχείρῃ Βαβυλῶνος.
at the deportation of Babylon
(All Jews would know of this famous historical event)

Other examples of Discourse-new items with the article belong to the category 3a
GIVEN situational. An example of this is in John 8:38 where the same phrase “the father”
first refers to the father of the agent of the main verb “I speak” i.e. Jesus’s father, God, but
then refers to the father of the agent of the main verb “you heard”, i.e. the Pharisee’s
father/ancestor, as is clarified by the next verse. Hence the NIV translation “the Father ...
your father”. These uses of the article link the noun to open scenarios which are GIVEN in
the situation, i.e. the people participating in the current speech act, who like all people
have fathers/ancestors.

In summary then, all the Hearer-old information status categories below may be
marked by the article:
2. KNOWN ENTITIES (Hearer-old but not previously in focus)
   a. unused
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in “whole world” scenario
   b. inferrable
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities from an open co-text scenario

3. GIVEN ENTITIES (Hearer-old and already in focus)
   a. situational
      Discourse-new, Hearer-old
      Refer to new entities in open “here and now” scenario
   b. textual - current
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to the last opened scenario
   c. textual - displaced
      Discourse-old, Hearer-old
      Refer again to a previously opened scenario

In contrast the category 1 NEW (Brown and Yule’s brand-new), which is
Discourse-new and Hearer-new, never occurs with the article in Greek.

So the article is used when the noun refers to specific non-salient Hearer-old
information. This definition explains the use of the article in Greek with Discourse-new
items from Discourse-old scenarios (such as “the son” John 17:1 above), with Discourse-
new items from the ever-present “world” scenario including classes (e.g. “the sun” Luke
4:40, “the truth” John 8:32 above), and also the “standard” anaphoric use with Discourse-
old items.
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This theory is backed up by statistical evidence of the percentage of nouns with and without the article in the New Testament (c. 50/50), compared to the percentage of certain nouns which clearly belong in the "whole world" scenario, such as sun, moon, earth or world. Such nouns, even when Discourse-new, refer to items which are KNOWN unused and thus Hearer-old.

For example, ηλιος "sun" occurs 32 times in the New Testament, 25 times with the article (78%), and only 7 times without (Matthew 13:6, Luke 21:25, Acts 27:20, 1 Co 15:41, Rev 7:2, 16:2 and 22:5). In the first reference, "sun" though in a Genitive Absolute clearly is the logical agent of "scorched" so can be regarded as salient. Rev 7:2 and 16:2 come in the phrase "from rising of sun" meaning "East" can reasonably be understood as salient being the only direction mentioned. The other four occurrences co-occur with another word or words of the same generic class in the same structure, where lack of the article probably indicates salience due to listing, or contrast (see below). Similarly, ουρανος "sky/heaven" takes the article 210/273 occurrences (77%), γη "earth" takes the article 206/250 occurrences (82%) some anarthrous uses meaning "land/region", e.g. Matthew 2:6, 20, 21, 4:15, κόσμος "world" takes the article 156/186 (84%), θαλασσα "sea/lake" takes the article 77/91 (85%), and ουρανος "moon" takes the article 7/9 (78%).

Similarly, nouns for body parts, even when Discourse-new, refer to items which are almost always KNOWN inferrable (from the open scenario of the people concerned) and thus Hearer-old. As expected for Hearer-old items, body parts are normally arthrous, e.g. 68% of those charted below are arthrous compared to the average of 49% (data from GRAMCORD):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body parts occurring over 20 times in the New Testament</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
<th>arthrous</th>
<th>anarthrous</th>
<th>% arthrous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σώμα body</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεφαλή head</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πόδος foot</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χέρι hand</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεξιά right hand</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρόσωπον face</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὖς ear</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύσμασις eye</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στόμα mouth</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλῶσσα tongue</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοιλιά belly/womb</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of listed items</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All nouns in the New Testament                           | 28977       | 14311    | 14666      | 49%        |

Only three of these body parts do not show significantly high arthrousness. However, 18 of the 44 anarthrous uses of πρόσωπον occur in idioms with πρό, ετι and κατά, e.g. Matthew 11:10 ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἀγγέλον μου πρὸ προσώπου σου "I send my messenger before your face" (i.e. ahead of you), Matt. 26:39 ἔπεσεν ἐτι πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ "fell on his face" (i.e. bowed low) and Luke 2:31 ᾧ ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν "which you have prepared before the face of all the people" (i.e. in the presence of). 16 of the 19 anarthrous uses of οὖς occur in variations of the idiom ὅ ἔχων ὄτα ἀκουέτω "He that has ears, let him hear!" where arthrousness might reasonably be explained as marking salience, here emphasizing the importance of the
preceding or following statements. 16 of the 35 anarthrous occurrences of γλῶσσα refer to language rather than the physical tongue, e.g. Mark 16:17.

This theory that arthrous nouns mark items as Hearer-old could be disproved by the occurrence of a Discourse-new noun with the article, where that noun could not be reasonably regarded as Hearer-old. So far I have not found any instance of this in the Greek of the New Testament.

See also:
 Appendix K  Texts showing the link between the article and information status

Lack of the article with Hearer-old items marks salience

As stated above, there are clear examples of Discourse-old and other Hearer-old items which are referred to anarthrously. Levinsohn notes this problem (1992:97):
Throughout the New Testament, nouns whose referents are "known, particular" (Blass, Debrunner and Funk, 1961, sec. 252) are at times preceded by the definite article (i.e. "arthrous") and at times appear without it (i.e. they are "anarthrous").

Levinsohn interprets this as due to "salience" (1992:99):
anarthrous references to particular, known participants either mark the participant as locally salient or highlight the speech which he utters.

I agree with Levinsohn’s basic conclusion, that the absence of the article for a "known, particular" referent (i.e. Hearer-old) shows salience or highlighting. However, I would like to draw a more broad-reaching conclusion, that all arthrous reference to "things" identifies them as Hearer-old, and all anarthrous reference to "things" identifies them as salient.

The presence of the article marks Hearer-old and says "this is the same old known particular item, don’t pay special attention to it, as you already know what it is".

The absence of the article marks salience and says "hey, pay attention" or in technical terminology "use extra processing-effort".

A Discourse-new Hearer-new item is always salient and lacks the article at first mention. This says "Pay attention. Make a new mental scenario for me." This new scenario will definitely be linked with, and perhaps become a subsection of, the scenario for the "category" it belongs in. For example, "a man" opens a new scenario for this particular individual, but this new scenario is linked to the general scenario for "man" which is a cluster of, cum generalization from, all previous knowledge (experiential or learned) about men. Thus if the speaker says "his feet" the audience will not respond "But you never said he had feet!". They expect feet, not from the new scenario "a man", but from its link to the
generic scenario “men”. Only in very restricted cases, such as science fiction or brand new knowledge, is a brand-new scenario opened unrelated to anything else, e.g. “Along came a zorn.” Even here, the audience assumes from the action, that a zorn is probably animate.

In contrast a Hearer-old item, whether Discourse-new or Discourse-old, typically has the article. So if the item is Discourse-old and Discourse-recent (assumed by the writer to be still in the audience’s short term processing memory) the article is expected, marking Hearer-old, e.g. Acts 18:12, 14, 17 (from Levinsohn, 1992:100), where Gallio is introduced anarthrously, but referred back to arthrously. Similarly Acts 12:1-17 where Herod and Peter are introduced anarthrously, but referred back to with the article.

However, if a Discourse-old and Discourse-recent item lacks the article it marks salience, and says “hey, pay special attention, even though I’m Hearer-old”, For example, Macedonia in Acts 16:10 (already mentioned in 16:9):

Διεστρέψας εἰς Μακεδονίαν βοήθησον ἡμᾶς
Having-crossed into Macedonia help us
εὐδοκήσας ἐξευθείας ἐξελθοῦν εἰς Μακεδονίαν
Immediately we-sought to-depart into Macedonia
Macedonia is a destination of God’s specific choosing. The text is explicit that the Holy Spirit prevents them from going to Asia (16:6) and to Bithynia (16:7), and Paul has a vision which he and his companions interpret as a clear call from God (16:9-10). Also Macedonia is the location of the next stretch of discourse 16:11-17:15. I therefore argue that Macedonia is semantically salient, and the absence of the article for this Discourse-old referent marks that salience grammatically.

If the item is Discourse-old but not Discourse-recent (i.e. assumed by the writer to be no longer in the audience’s short term processing memory), lack of the article marks salience and signals “use extra processing-effort” for the “reintroduction” of the item, e.g. in Acts 14:21b:

ὑπεστρέψαν εἰς τὴν Δόστραν καὶ εἰς Ἰκόνιον καὶ εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν
they-returned to the Lystra and to Iconium and to Antioch.

The article is used with Lystra, which is still regarded as focal in short-term memory, being the last place where Paul has been, mentioned by name in 14:8, and as “the town” in 14:19 (cf. Levinsohn, 1992:100-102). In contrast, Iconium and Antioch are reintroduced anarthrously, since, despite being mentioned in 14:19 as towns some Jews came from, they were last focal in 14:1 and 13:14 respectively.

As well as the use of anarthrous nouns for introduction and reintroduction of participants, there are several other types of “salience” marked by lack of the article. These different types of anarthrous salience function at different levels of discourse. The correlation between anarthrousness and salience can be shown statistically with regard to several factors related to semantic categories, participant roles and discourse function, as summarized below:
a) salience because of semantic category, proper nouns

Certain semantic categories are semantically salient, especially proper names of people who typically are participants in significant events, and to a lesser extent towns which are often locations of significant events, e.g. Saul is anarthrous 12/15 times (e.g. Acts 7:58, 8:1, 8:3, introduction, opposition, persecution; exceptions 9:1 referring back to persecution in 8:3, 9:24 non-agent, 13:2 non-agent), Jerusalem is anarthrous 58/62 times (exceptions John 2:23, 5:2, 10:22, 11:18). Anarthrous people and places are typically salient at EPISODE level.

b) salience because of semantic category and participant role, naming

Where a new character is named in a naming formula, such as ὁ ὅμοιος ὁ Ιδίος in Mark 5:22, such names are always anarthrous in the New Testament corpus (GRAMCORD shows 22/22 names are anarthrous in this formula). Such names are always semantically salient because they identify main participants in an EPISODE.

c) salience because of semantic category and participant role, addressee

Addressees are typically salient. GRAMCORD, which includes in its figures nominatives used in a vocative sense, shows that 92% of New Testament vocatives (581/631) are anarthrous. All unambiguous vocative case nouns are anarthrous. Vocatives mark salience at SENTENCE level and frequently PARAGRAPH or higher levels also. In the Epistles they often occur with imperatives or mitigated commands and introduce themes which are salient at TEXT level, e.g. Hebrews 3:1.

d) salience because of semantic category and participant role, addresser

Paul in the nominative is anarthrous 23/23 times in his Epistles where he is the addresser, but only 12/55 times in Acts where he is a narrative character. This suggests Paul is salient at TEXT level in the Epistles, but at EPISODE level in specific sections of Acts. In Acts, 22/37 nominative references to “Peter” are anarthrous, and of these 13 are used for the role of addresser.

e) salience because of semantic category and participant role, proper nouns in letters

100% of personal names as addresser or addressee in the Epistles are anarthrous, suggesting salience at TEXT level, e.g. 1 Timothy 1:1-2.

f) salience because of semantic category and participant role, place names

Names of towns are frequently anarthrous, whereas names of provinces are less frequently so. Combining GRAMCORD figures for the towns Jerusalem, Capernaum, Nazareth, Bethlehem, Bethsaida and Rome, out of 113 occurrences 8 are arthrous (7%)
and 105 anarthrous (93%). In contrast, combining figures for the provinces Macedonia, Asia, Syria, Galatia and Cappadocia, out of 54 occurrences 34 are arthrous (63%) and 20 anarthrous (37%). The high salience of towns is due to their significance at EPISODE level.

\textit{g) salience because of participant role, agent in the nominative}

Throughout the genealogy in Matthew 1:2-15) the first mention of all individuals is in the accusative case with the article, and the second mention is in the nominative case without. This can be explained as CLAUSE level salience since agents are naturally more salient than other participants.

\textit{h) salience because of participant role, agent but not in the nominative}

In the New Testament there are 225 occurrences of “Jesus” in the Genitive. In the Gospels only 12/41 (19%) are anarthrous, whereas in Acts to Revelation 172/183 (94%) are anarthrous. This genitive case frequently refers to Jesus as the agent of an action represented by another noun, e.g. Acts 10:36 “peace through Jesus Christ”. Whereas in the Gospels Jesus is “on stage” almost all the time (thus typically arthrous), in Acts and the Epistles Jesus is a salient agent who is not physically present.

\textit{i) salience because of participant role, being the predicate noun, or subject complement}

Predicate nouns are frequently anarthrous, even when the referent is definite, e.g. Hebrews 1:2 “whom he appointed as the heir over all” where κληρονόμος “heir” is anarthrous. They are naturally salient, since they are the new comment, rather than the given propositional topic.

\textit{j) salience because of participant role, manner/means versus sphere}

Abstract nouns in the semantic role of sphere typically take the article, and in the role of manner, i.e. adverbial usage, are typically anarthrous, e.g. Romans 12:7-8. This suggests that nouns in adverbial slots are salient at SENTENCE, PARAGRAPH, or even EPISODE level, since they affect predictability of outcomes. For example, “generously” in 2 Corinthians 9:6 is thematic throughout NIV’s section entitled “Sowing Generously” (2 Corinthians 9:6-15).

\textit{k) salience because of discourse role, named main participant in a TEXT}

Jesus is anarthrous 23% in the Gospels (127/563 times), but 74% in Acts (51/69), and 97% in the Epistles (262/280). Jesus is regularly referred to without salience marking in the Gospels as the naturally salient main character. In Acts and the Epistles, where he is not physically present, he is frequently given salience marking suggesting salience at TEXT level.
l) salience because of being a paragraph-level theme.
   In Luke's genealogy, 3:23-38, only two names occur without the article, Jesus and Joseph (3:23). These are marked as salient, since they have no article even though both are Discourse-old (3:21, 1:27). Here Jesus and Joseph are salient at PARAGRAPH level, i.e. throughout the whole genealogy, strongly suggesting that this is Joseph's lineage being listed.

m) salience because of being a higher Discourse-level theme
   In Matthew's genealogy, 1:1-16, there are four names which first occur without the article, Jesus Christ, David, Abraham (1:1), and Mary (1:16), all first occurring in the genitive case. These anarthrous names are all salient at levels of discourse above the paragraph, since the issue addressed here is that Jesus, the son of Mary, is son (i.e. descendant) of Abraham and of David, thus fulfilling Messianic promises. Jesus as Messiah is a TEXT level theme.

n) salience in the text initial paragraph marking theme at the level of TEXT
   The opening sentence of Matthew's Gospel 1:1 consists only of 8 anarthrous nouns, including "Jesus Christ son of Abraham, son of David". Marked salience in the opening paragraph of a book, or letter, indicates a theme at the level of TEXT. So the text-level theme of Matthew is Jesus as the Messianic king promised in the Old Testament.

o) salience marking co-occurring with fronting to mark discourse theme
   Anarthrous salience marking frequently co-occurs with fronting, e.g. "and the word was God (anarthrous and fronted)" in John 1:1. Here, in the book's opening lines, it marks "the divine Word" as the TEXT theme. Similarly, faith occurs 24 times in Hebrews 11, frequently fronted. Of these 23/24 are anarthrous, suggesting thematic salience at EPISODE level.

p) salience because of contrast, marking a discourse theme
   Where there is an explicit contrast, the contrasted elements are typically anarthrous, even when they are Discourse-old, and are thematic at the level of PARAGRAPH or EPISODE, e.g. "perfume", in Luke 7:37, 38 and 46, occurs first anarthrously, then arthrously, then again anarthrously, contrasted with "oil". The contrast between the action of the woman and the Pharisee is thematic at EPISODE level, Luke 7:36-50.

q) salience because of listing specifics, marking a discourse theme
   Lists are typically anarthrous and thus marked salient, whether lists of proper names or of specifics from a single generic category. Such lists occur when the generic
category is thematic at the level of PARAGRAPH, EPISODE or higher, e.g. the anarthrous list of sinners in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, comes in TEV’s section (6:1-11) “Lawsuits against Fellow-Christians”, in the second PARAGRAPH (6:7-11) where the theme is the contrast between Christians’ old lifestyle and new.

See also:
Appendix L Texts showing the link between article, information status and salience
Appendix M Types of salience in Greek discourse

The Greek article and Information Status Taxonomy

My analysis of the Greek use of the article can be diagrammed in the form of a grid, with one axis related to salience, and the other related to information status. The box Hearer-new/non-salient is blank, as Hearer-new information is by definition salient:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salient</th>
<th>Non-salient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearer-new</td>
<td>-article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearer-old</td>
<td>-article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So lack of the article in Greek marks salience, and must be used for Hearer-new entities of the category 1 NEW. In contrast, use of the article marks Hearer-old information, and occurs with every category except 1 NEW, unless the Hearer-old entity is being explicitly marked as salient. These Hearer-old categories can be thought of as “known, particular” where “known” means “expected by the speaker to be in the hearer’s short or long-term memory”, and “particular” means that the speaker expects the hearer to be able to identity which referent out of the potentially enormous number of possibilities is being referred to.

It should be noted that it is the speaker’s choice as to whether to present information as new or old. Baker (1982:155) says with respect to English:

Similarly, an element which has been mentioned before may be presented as new because it is unexpected or because the speaker wishes to present it in a contrastive light.

This comment is tantalizing since I have shown above that in Greek Hearer-new marking (anarthrousness) is also used for Hearer-old items which are salient. Baker’s “unexpected” category in English may well parallel Greek salience marking for participants reintroduced to the scene, and her “contrastive” category certainly parallels Greek “contrast salience”. Perhaps it is a language universal that what is unexpected or contrastive is conceptualized as salient and can be grammaticalized in the same way as new information.

Below I give examples from each information status category showing both normal Hearer-old articular use, with examples of anarthrous salience marking as applicable.
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1. NEW ENTITIES
Not yet stored in hearer’s memory
Discourse-new, Hearer-new
Open specific new scenarios

anarthrous noun for non-human and human participants
Luke 1:63 πνευκιδίου a writing-tablet
Luke 2:1 δόγμα a decree
Luke 1:27 παρθένον a virgin
Luke 2:25 ἄνθρωπος a person
Luke 1:11 ἄγγελος an angel

τίς + anarthrous noun for major participants
Luke 7:2 Ἐπαντσάρβου ... τίμος of a certain centurion
Here the centurion, not the slave, is the major character.
Luke 8:27 ἀνήρ τίς certain man

2. KNOWN ENTITIES (Hearer-old but not previously in focus)
2a. KNOWN unused
Long term memory
Discourse-new, Hearer-old
Refer to new entities in “whole world” scenario

In theory KNOWN unused entities could be from any scenario, all being encompassed in the “whole world” scenario of the long term memory. In practice there would seem to be a search path, i.e. a preferred order for discovering the referent, even within these unopened scenarios. The search path would be determined by the principle of “spreading activation” (Collins and Loftus, 1975) where the brain is primed to first identify referents which are most closely linked in the conceptual network of the open scenario.

Inalienable or prototypical possessions of people in general
Body Parts
James 3:5 ἡ γλῶσσα the tongue
The tongue is part of the natural world scenario. As humans, we assume a human tongue unless told otherwise. Alternatively, the tongue is taken to be “known definite” and human, rather than a horse’s tongue, since the topical scenario is human beings “teaching by speech”, James 3:1, 2. Alternatively, since Epistles have contextual participants, the writer and the addressees, “tongue” may belong in their scenario, i.e. 2b KNOWN inferrable. But in that case it would mean “your tongue” or “our tongue”.

Chronology
Luke 1:5 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως in the days of King Herod
Kings have reigns, which are used for keeping track of historical chronology.

Heredity
Luke 1:5 ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἁρών from the daughters of Aaron
People have daughters / descendants, and this is used to keep track of descendants.
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Family Relationships
Luke 12:53 τὴν νύφην αὐτῆς ... τὴν πενθεράν the daughter-in-law of her ... the mother-in-law
Girls marry.

Jewish history
Acts 13:17 τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αιγύπτου the sojourn in land of Egypt
Acts 13:21 τὸν Σαουλ Σαυλ
- Well-known historical character.
Acts 13:22 τὸν Δαυίδ Δαυιδ
- Well-known historical character.

marked salient
Acts 7:45 Ἰησοῦς Ἰησοῦ

Christian religion
Acts 1:1, ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἰησοῦ
- Unique reference to a known person in the opening of a Christian book. Contrast Matthew 1:1
where Jesus is one of 8 anarthrous nouns, each marked salient in the book's opening heading, a verbless
sentence.

Gentile religion
Acts 7:43 τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ the tent of Moloch
- Pagans had a tent for worshipping Moloch.

Gentile literature
Acts 17:28 τῶν καθὸ ἡμᾶς ποιητῶν some of your poets
- People groups have poets.

Gentile history
Acts 18:18 τὸ διατεταχθὲν Κλαύδιον Claudius's commanding
- It was generally known that Claudius had banished Jews from Rome. I regard infinitives with
articles as Hearer-old, like any other Noun Phrase.

Jewish religion
- The "Jewish religion" scenario is always “ready to be opened” in New Testament
texts by virtue of the particular Gospel or letter being a religious text set in a largely
Jewish context, and for the Gospels, the central character being a Jewish religious teacher.
Luke 1:6 τὸν θεόν God
- There is one God.
Luke 1:6 τὰς δικαιώματα τοῦ κυρίου the commands and ordinances of the Lord
- God has given commands.
Luke 6:4 τὸν οἶκον τὸν θεοῦ the House of God
- There is one Temple, in Jerusalem.
Luke 16:29 τῶν προφητῶν the prophets
- Jewish prophets, not including Epimenides, Titus 1:12.
John 1:17 ὁ νόμος the law
- Jews have a divine law.

marked salient
Luke 16:29 Μωυσέα καὶ τῶν προφητῶν Moses and the prophets
- Only Moses is marked salient, perhaps as the archetypal prophet.
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Jewish scripture

The “Jewish scripture” scenario is always “ready to be opened” in New Testament texts by virtue of the particular Gospel or letter being a religious text set in a largely Jewish context, and for the Gospels, the central character being a Jewish religious teacher.

Matthew 24:15 τὸ βυθανηγμα τῆς ἐρωμωσας the abomination of desolation (from the “scripture” scenario).

This is immediately clarified as “the (one) spoken (about) through Daniel the prophet” i.e. Daniel 9:27 and 11:31. The scripture scenario, especially the prophets, is already linked to the “end of the world” scenario opened in v. 3.

Mark 13:14 τὸ βυθανηγμα τῆς ἐρωμωσας the abomination of desolation (from the “scripture” scenario).

In Mark this is immediately followed by “let the reader understand”. If this is Jesus’s parenthetical comment, “reader” means “reader of scripture” and is a request for the reader of Daniel 9:27, and 11:31, to correctly understand this in relationship to the pagan Roman army desecrating the Temple. If this is Mark’s parenthetical comment, “reader” may mean “reader of scripture” and be a request for the reader of Daniel 9:27, and 11:31, to correctly understand this in relationship to the pagan Roman army desecrating the Temple, or may mean “reader of this Gospel” and be a request for the reader to correctly discern the “known particular” reference of “the abomination of desolation”. This process here involves not only correctly identifying “scripture: Daniel” as the search path to discover the known particular referent, but also requires the addressees (disciples or readers) to interpret that in the light of the context of Jesus’s speech to the disciples, i.e. the Roman occupation of Judea. In such a context, does Jesus (or possibly Mark) identify which army in the current real-life context the army of Daniel 11:31 referred to?

Luke 7:19 ὁ ἐρχόμενος the coming one (from the “scripture” scenario).

John’s disciples have reported to John that Jesus, main character of a religious book, has raised a dead man and given him back alive to his grieving mother (Luke 7:15, 18), and is being considered a prophet (Luke 7:16). John sends them to ask Jesus if he is “the one to come”. This means that “one to come”, in a religious context, is probably a prophet, and must be someone who can raise the dead. Where would one search for such a character? Naturally the “scripture” scenario. Here one would find Deuteronomy 18:15 “The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me”, and Isaiah 61:1-3, the anointed one who “preaches good news to the poor, binds up the broken hearted, and comforts those who mourn” as in the immediate context of Luke 7:11-15. Jesus answers the question with a visual demonstration of Isaiah 35:5-6, making the blind see, the lame walk, and the deaf hear, and referring to Isaiah 61:1 “the gospel is preached to the poor”. Jesus’s answer, by relying on scriptural criteria to judge who he is, confirms that the scenario which includes “the one to come” is indeed scripture and is indeed “God’s anointed” of Isaiah 61:1.

It is also possible that John expected Jesus to know that he identified the “one to come” with the person who would baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire (Luke 3:16), but it is not stated in the New Testament that John knew Jesus had heard this, nor does Jesus directly refer to this in his reply, although the Isaiah 61:1 allusion would open a scenario including “the Spirit of the Lord is upon me”. Hence it is safer to assume that John expected Jesus to interpret his statement based on the context (the real life situation), rather than the co-text (John’s previous words, which Jesus may or may not have heard). In either case John’s own understanding of the character to come is based on the scriptural references.

John 1:1 δὸ λόγος the word (from the “scripture” scenario).

John’s Gospel is a religious text, which makes the “scripture” scenario “ready to be opened”. The words ἐν δρακόντι “In the beginning” (LXX and John 1:1) as the opening words of a scriptural book would open the creation story, Genesis 1:1ff, in the “scripture” scenario. “Was” gives the expectation that the next Noun Phrase will be “the God”. “The word” would come as a shock, and would need to be closely identified with God as “the” says it is “known particular” belonging to an existing scenario, i.e. the word you would expect. “The word” should probably be therefore identified with God’s creative word Genesis 1:3 “And God said”. “The word was with the God” (John 1:1) confirms that we are indeed talking of the Creation time, God-related word. “The word was God” emphasizes that this word is indeed God, i.e. shares the divine nature. (Emphasis is given by preposing “God”.) The identity of this word with the creative word is confirmed in John 1:3 “All things were created through him” (cf. Genesis 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26).
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Natural world

Levinsohn (1983:98) mentions that the use of the article is obligatory “when the referent is a class”. This would apply to “horses”, “ships” and “grace” in the three categories of the natural, man-made and metaphysical world.

Luke 12:49 τὴν γῆν the earth
Unique referent.

James 3:3 τῶν ἵππων the horses
Generic, i.e. all class members of horse scenario.

Marked salient

Matthew 13:6 ἡμέραν δὲ ἀνατέλλων ἐκκλησίας, when the sun rose [the plants] were scorched
Unique referent, since only one thing has this name. “Sun” marked as salient presumably because it is the implicit agent of “scorched”.

Man-made world

James 3:4 τὰ πλοῖα the ships
Generic, i.e. all class members of ship scenario.

Marked salient

Matthew 2:13 εἰς Ἑλλάδα into Egypt
Unique referent. Only one geo-political unit has this name. Thematically salient at paragraph level, occurring 2:13, 2:14, and 2:15, also 2:19.

Metaphysical world

John 1:17 ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία the grace and the truth
Generic, i.e. these abstract nouns are titles of class scenarios.

2b. KNOWN inferrable

Long term memory

Discourse-new, Hearer-old
Refer to new entities from an open co-text scenario

As shown above, scenarios may be opened by their titles, by groups of items from within a scenario, or by titles of other linked scenarios.

Co-text scenario already opened by its title

Mark 2:14 τὸ τελώνιον the toll-booth
From Capernaum scenario opened in v. 1.

Luke 1:8 τὰ λειτατερία the performing of priestly duties
From priest scenario opened in v. 5.

Luke 6:4 τὸς δρότος τῆς προδέρμως the consecrated bread
From House of God scenario opened in v. 4.

Luke 10:35 τὸν πρώτον the innkeeper
From inn scenario opened in v. 34.

John 2:5 τῶν διακόνων the servants
From wedding scenario opened in v. 1 by wedding.

John 2:8 τῶν ἄρχων τοῦ θείου the master of the feast
From wedding scenario opened in v. 1 by wedding.

John 2:9 τὸ ὕδωρ the water
From waterpots scenario opened in v. 6 by waterpots.

John 2:9 τὸν νυμφίου the bridegroom
From wedding scenario opened in v. 1 by wedding.
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Acts 14:13 ὁ θερεύς τοῦ Δίως the priest of Zeus
   From Zeus scenario opened in v. 12 by Zeus.
Acts 14:13 τοῖς πόλεσι the gates
   From city scenario opened in v. 8 by Lystra, and referred to in v. 13 as the city.

Acts 16:13 τῆς πόλεως the gate
   From city scenario opened in v. 12 by Philippi, and referred to in v. 12 as the city. Contrast ποταμὼν river, not “the” river, as not all towns have rivers.

James 3:3 τοῖς χαλινοῖς the bridles
James 3:3 τὰ στόματα the mouths
James 3:3 τὸ σῶμα the body
   All from horses scenario opened v. 3 by the horses.

James 3:4 τοῦ εἰναύοντος the steerer
   From ships scenario opened v. 4 by the ships.
James 3:4 ἡ ὀρύα the impulse
   From steerer scenario opened v. 4 by the steerer. Probably steerers have impulses in their scenario as their role is to steer according to their “impulses”. It is possible that the “steerer” scenario links to the “human being” scenario which includes “impulse”.

A particular grouping in this category is inalienable or prototypical possessions of participants. Frequently these are “triggered” i.e. grammatically linked to an item already mentioned in the text (the title of the scenario in which they belong), typically in the genitive case, e.g.
Luke 1:5 τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς the name of her
   People have names.
Luke 1:7 τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν the days of them
   People have days, i.e. their life span.
Acts 7:23 τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ the heart of him
   People have hearts.

Often however there is no genitive Noun Phrase, but the relationship to the participant is implicit, e.g.
Luke 22:41 θελεῖ τὰ γόνατα having placed the knees
John 8:38 ἡ ἡκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς παιδεύετε you do what you heard from the father
   This means “your father”, not “God, the father” see 8:39.

This category “inalienable possessions of participants” is listed here as part of the specific scenario opened by mentioning specific participants. However, these “inalienable possessions” are accessed by a link from the particular current scenario of “this participant” to a generic scenario of “human beings”, so that the information of having names, life spans, bodily parts is not stored separately for each individual. Rather a “distortion from the norm” would be stored in the “current participant” level such as “nameless” “lame”, “blind” etc. In all other matters not-mentioned, the new participant would be assumed to be a prototypical human being. Thus characters are not normally introduced as “not blind”, “not lame” etc.

co-text scenario already opened by words linked to that scenario
Luke 1:10 τοῖς πλήθοις the crowd
   When the priest is burning incense in the temple v. 9, a scenario of “important worship time” is opened, which includes common people gathered outside the shrine.
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Luke 4:33 τῇ συναγωγῇ the synagogue

Synagogue scenario is opened in v. 31 by town, teaching, sabbaths. The synagogue is the place in a town where one teaches on the Sabbath. All three nouns are linked to the synagogue scenario.

scenario already opened by title of linked co-text scenario
Luke 5:14 τὸ ἵππος the priest (from ritual impurity scenario opened in v. 12 by “leprosy”, a linked scenario)

3. GIVEN ENTITIES (Hearer-old and already in focus)

3a. GIVEN situational

Current perceptual experience
Discourse-new, Hearer-old
Refer to new entities in open “here and now” scenario

Non-embedded, in Gospels
Luke 1:1 τῶν περιτροφοφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων the things which have happened among us
This refers to the events concerning the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, taken from the situation of a Christian leader writing to someone who has had some Christian teaching (1:4).

Non-embedded, in the Epistles
Romans 16:22 τὴν ἐπιστολὴν the letter
This refers to the letter being written and later read, i.e. Paul’s letter to the Romans.
Colossians 4:16 ἡ ἐπιστολὴ the letter
This refers to the letter being written and later read, i.e. Paul’s letter to the Colossians.

Embedded, within direct speech in narrative
John 2:7 τὰς ὕδατιν the waterpots
These waterpots were physically present, as stated in v. 6. The real life context of the original speaker and addressees is here included by the Gospel writer for the addressees of the Gospel in the narrative co-text.

Marked salient
Mark 9:41 Χριστὸς Christ
“Christ” refers to the speaker. The real life context, “Jesus said,” is included for the Gospel’s audience in the narrative co-text, Mark 9:39.
Acts 12:11 Ἡρῴδης Herod
The real life context is included for the Gospel’s audience in the narrative co-text, Acts 12:1, 6.

3b. GIVEN textual - current

Short term memory
Discourse-old, Hearer-old
Refer again to the last opened scenario

Same noun, same referent
John 1:1b δὲ λόγος the word
The “word” scenario is opened in v. 1a by “the word”.

Marked salient
Hebrews 11:24 Μωυσῆς Moses
The “Moses” is also salient in the preceding verse.
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Different noun, same referent
(generic / specific)
Luke 8:29c τὰ δέσμια the bonds
The “bonds” scenario is opened in v. 29b by “chains and fetters”.

3c. GIVEN textual - displaced
Short term memory
Discourse-old, Hearer-old
Refer again to a previously opened scenario

Same noun, same referent
John 2:2 τὸν γάμου the wedding
The wedding scenario is opened in v. 1 by wedding.

Acts 16:16 τὴν προσευχὴν the place of prayer
The place of prayer scenario is opened in v. 13 by place of prayer.

Marked Salient
Luke 17:11 εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ ... διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας to Jerusalem, through border area of Samaria and Galilee.
Jerusalem is salient as TEXT theme, where Jesus will die, cf. 9:31, 51, 53, 13:22, 33, 34, 17:11, 18:31, 19:11, 28. Samaria and Galilee are salient at PARAGRAPH level, see 17:16-17, the thankful leper is a Samaritan, the other nine lepers implicitly Galileans, cf. Samaritan in 9:52, 10:33, Galilee in 4:44.

Acts 12:19 Ἰερώνυμος Herod,
Herod is salient at EPISODE level, cf. 12:1, 6, 11, and Herod’s death in 12:20-23.

Different noun, same referent
(generic / specific)
Luke 8:29 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου the person
The “person” scenario is opened in v. 27 by a certain man.

(plural / singular, alternative)
Luke 8:29 τῶν πνεύματων τοῦ ἀκαθάρτου the unclean spirit
The “unclean spirit” scenario is opened in v. 27 by demons.

(Proper noun / noun)
Acts 14:13 τῆς πόλεως the city
The “city” scenario is opened in v. 8 by Lystra.

Where a different noun is used to refer back to a GIVEN textual entity, the referent is only understood correctly as GIVEN textual if the audience knows that both nouns refer to the same element in the same scenario. For example, if the audience do not know Lystra is a city, they will search for “the city” in Acts 4:13 under “inferrable” and “unused” entities.

Speaker choice
Note that the speaker has a degree of choice as to how he presents information (Halliday, 1994:298). Take for example Luke 12:53 referring to family members (nouns bolded, pronouns underlined):
The anarthrous nouns are Hearer-new, 1. NEW, referring to any unknown member of the millions of possible referents fitting the known category father, son, mother, etc. The arthrous nouns are Hearer-old, and here are 2b KNOWN inferrable, since a mother prototypically has a daughter, etc. This is made explicit by the possessive pronoun in line 5 "her mother-in-law".

Compare the parallel passage Matthew 10:35-36:

Here the second item in every line is Hearer-old information of the category 2b KNOWN inferrable, as shown by the possessive pronouns. The article in line 4 probably does not refer back to the indefinite person in line 1, but is a generic reference of the type 2a KNOWN unused, and refers to the prototypical person, any one of the above, or anyone else, who will find opposition from their nearest and dearest.

Search path for identifying items from existing scenarios

Since arthrous nouns may mark any type of Hearer-old referent, and anarthrous nouns may mark either Hearer-new referents or salient Hearer-old referents, there is inherent ambiguity in the reference system. This suggests there might be a search path, i.e. a sequenced approach to searching in the brain, which enables the audience to find the most likely referent (Collins and Loftus, 1975).

Relevance theory states (and personal experience confirms) that the hearer does NOT search for all possible referents and then make a decision which is correct, but takes the first relevant one as correct, unless and until proved incorrect, e.g. Sperber and Wilson (1986:167):

the principle of relevance does not generally warrant the selection of more than one interpretation for a single ostensive stimulus. We will show that the interpretation whose selection it warrants is the first one tested and found to be consistent with the principle.

Nida and Louw emphasize that assigning meaning depends on both context and co-text, but give no indication as to how to prioritize them (1992:12):

The correct meaning of a word within any context is the meaning which fits that context best. That is to say, languages maximize the importance of context, since verbal signs are always defined by other signs, either within the linguistic context (i.e. by other words in the same verbal environment) or within the practical context of the setting of the communication.

Sperber and Wilson, however, argue that co-text, real life context, and also unopened scenarios provide the possibilities for a context, but it is the search for relevance which determines which context the audience chooses (1986:141):
We have so far suggested that the choice of a context for inferential processes in general, and for comprehension in particular, is partly determined at any given time by the contents of the memory of the deductive device, those of the general-purpose short-term memory store, and those of the encyclopaedia, and by the information that can be immediately picked up from the physical environment. These factors determine not a single context, but a range of possible contexts. What determines the selection of a particular context out of that range? Our answer is that the selection of a particular context is determined by the search for relevance.

In terms of scenario theory the most relevant context for determining meaning is typically the scenario which is currently open, since the prototypical contents of a scenario are stored there precisely because they have been frequently relevant in similar circumstances in past experience.

Schank and Abelson, in their computer program APPLY, use the following search path (1977:184):

APPLY's basic processing cycle is to call in these script contexts one at a time, and attempt to locate an input in the context invoked. The order in which scripts are called is as follows: first are those script contexts which were explicitly referred to by the input or which have concepts that are explicitly referred to; next are the currently active scripts; last are the scripts the system possesses but which have not been invoked.

In terms of Information Status Taxonomy this is:
1) open scenarios (3b GIVEN textual - current), and
   new items from open scenarios (2b KNOWN inferrable)
2) previously opened scenarios (3c GIVEN textual - displaced)
3) real-world scenarios (2a KNOWN unused)

Note that their search path does not include 3a GIVEN situational.

Based on scenario theory, I make the hypothesis that the search path for a Hearer-old entity would begin with currently open scenarios, move to previously opened scenarios, and then to closed scenarios. Experimental evidence shows that the more levels a search has to pass through, i.e. the greater number of links between conceptual nodes, the longer it will take to establish the relationship between concepts (Collins and Quillian, 1972). This supports the hypothesis that the mind begins its search with what is current and progressively searches further and further along neural networks until it identifies a relevant concept. The relationship between the search time and the number of conceptual links also supports my hypothesis that the category KNOWN inferrable is searched directly after the category GIVEN textual current to which it is directly linked.

Consequently, I suggest the following search path for an arthrous noun in Greek:

1) 3b GIVEN textual - current: short term memory, title of last opened scenario
2) 2b KNOWN inferrable: long term memory, in currently open scenario
3) 3a GIVEN situational: current perceptual experience
4) 3c GIVEN textual - displaced: short term memory, recently opened scenario
5) 2a KNOWN unused: long term memory, currently closed scenario
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The category GIVEN situational is a “wildcard” inasmuch as the act of communication is also current perceptual experience, whether visual (reading) or aural (hearing), and it is the intensity of the GIVEN situational input which would determine whether it becomes more in focal consciousness than the current communication input.

I also make the hypothesis that the search path for an anarthrous noun would follow the same path, and if it found a relevant item would mark it salient, otherwise it would open a new scenario.

See also:
Appendix N Greek evidence for the order of the search path

An etymological note

I have argued above that use of the article in Greek indicates that the word so marked is linked to an existing scenario, whether that scenario is explicit in the text or not. The article, then, identifies a link between concepts, linking the concept marked with the article to another concept, or rather cluster of concepts, already in the mind of the hearer. As a marker of Hearer-old information, it indicates “you can identify this item, it is already linked in your memory to an open scenario”.

In Greek the article is called ἀρθρον which also means a joint in the body (Liddell and Scott, 1843):

ἀρθρον ... a joint ... II. the article in grammar, Arist. Poët. 21,7, Rhet. Al. 26,4, Dion. H. de Thuc. 37, al.

The relevant quotation is from Aristotle’s “Poetics”, Kassel’s numbering 1457a 5 (Perseus Project, Internet):

A joint is a sound without meaning which marks the beginning or end of a phrase or a division in it, and naturally stands at either end, or in the middle.

Unfortunately “The text from 1456b38-1457a10 is highly uncertain” (Barnes, 1984:2331), so translations differ as to where the definition of “article” begins, and what examples are given. Bywater translates (Barnes, 1984:2331):

An article is a non-significant sound marking the beginning, end, or dividing point of a sentence, its natural place being either at the extremities, or in the middle. E.g. ἄρθρο, ἄρθρο, ἄρθρο etc. Or a non-significant sound which neither prevents nor makes a single significant sound out of several, and which is naturally placed both at the end and in the middle.

Else translates (1976:54-5):

An article is a non-meaningful sound which marks the beginning or end or transition point of an utterance, being naturally suitable to put at either end or in the middle

And Twining translates (Moxon, 1955:39):

An article is a sound without signification which marks the beginning or end of a sentence; or distinguishes, as when we say the [word] ἄρθρο, the [word] ἄρθρο etc.

Since this “joint” occurs at “the end” of a sentence/utterance/phrase, it cannot refer only to the article, and seems to include pronouns also, which are common at the end of a noun phrase, and hence also sentence final, e.g. John 1:7 ὅποτες πειτετεθείσωςοιν οὐ' αὐτῷ. The use of ἀρθρον “joint” for both article and pronoun makes good etymological
sense, however, since both refer back to Hearer-old information, linking the current referent to a previous referent or scenario.

Robins states that the article was part of Aristotle’s class of *syndesmoi* “links” together with conjunctions, pronouns, and probably prepositions (1998:32). If this is true, it supports the view that the name δρθρον for the article is not arbitrary, but refers to its semantic role as a link or joint.

Whatever the ambiguity of the term δρθρον in Aristotle (fourth century BC), Dionysius Thrax (c. 100 BC), in his *Techne Grammatike* (Bekker, 1816), distinguishes the article clearly from conjunction, pronoun, and preposition, defining δρθρον as “a part of speech inflected for case and preposed or postposed to nouns” which also included the relative pronoun as having similar morphology to the article but following the noun (Robins, 1998:41).

So then, early Greek grammarians referred to the Greek article as δρθρον “joint”. Although their definitions concern the form of the article, not the function, the term they chose suggests that they may have recognized its function as a link between the concept so marked and some other concept or cluster of concepts, i.e. to an open scenario, or to a concept within an open scenario. It is also worth noting that the article originally functioned as a demonstrative pronoun (Robertson, 1934:693-5) which correlates with this theory that its function is anaphoric.

**Chapter summary**

The Greek article with a noun marks that the referent is Hearer-old, which may be either Discourse-old, or Discourse-new and part of an open scenario. Lack of the article with a noun marks that the referent is salient, which may be either Discourse-new and Hearer-new (so naturally salient), or Hearer-old but marked as salient due to some higher discourse function, such as marking clause level focus, marking theme at higher levels of discourse, or highlighting interpersonal relations.
Since Greek marks Hearer-old information by Participles in the Verb Phrase and by the article in the Noun Phrase, this chapter investigates other grammatical structures which mark that information is Hearer-old, categorizing examples according to information status. Where Hearer-old information is Discourse-new, belonging to the categories KNOWN unused and KNOWN inferrable, it would have been understood by the original audience by their referring to their mental scenarios. However today’s audience does not share the original author’s culture, so may not have the relevant information in their own culturally determined scenario bank to enable them to correctly understand the meaning.

“When” clauses and Hearer-old event scenarios

Some time-related subordinating conjunctions are regularly used with verb phrases expressing Hearer-old-information, i.e. information already stated explicitly in the text (3b GIVEN textual-current), or inferrable from the previous text (2b KNOWN inferrable). For example:

δὲ "when"

The word δὲ “when” is frequently used to introduce information which, though not explicitly mentioned in the text previously, is completely predictable, since it follows logically from what is already explicit, or is a common result of what is already explicit (new information is bolded, old information predictable from this is underlined), e.g.

Matthew 5:2, 7:28
καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῖς λέγον... 
And having-opened the mouth of-him he-was-teaching them saying...

Kal ἐγένετο δὲ ἔτελεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους... 
And it-happened when finished the Jesus the words these...

Since Jesus began teaching, it is predictable that eventually he will stop.

Compare Matthew 10:5 and 11:1, 13:3 and 13:53, 18:3 and 19:1, 24:4 and 26:1

Luke 2:7, 21, 22
καὶ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον  
And she-bore the son of-her the first-born

Kal δὲ ἐπήλαθαν ἡμέραι ἀκτῶ τοῦ περιτεμεὶν αὐτῶν... 
And when were-completed days eight of-the to-circumcise him...

Kal δὲ ἐπήλαθαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν... 
And when were-completed the days of-the purification of-them...
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After a child is born, it is predictable that time will pass until post-childbirth ceremonies are due. Note that the birth, on which the predictability is based, also provides the temporal reference point for the predictable events i.e. eight days "after the birth".

ως “when” “while”

The word ως can have the sense “when” with Aorist or “while” with Present or Imperfect (Arndt and Gingrich, 1979:898, IV a and b). This is due to the Perfective Aspect of the Aorist symbolizing an Event, and the Imperfective Aspect of the Present and Imperfect symbolizing a Process. In these senses ως is frequently used to introduce Discourse-old or predictable information (new information is bolded, old information predictable from this is underlined), e.g.

with Aorist

Luke 1:40b-41a
καὶ ἡγεῖτο τὴν Ἑλισάβετ.
and she-greeted the Elizabeth.

καὶ ἐγένετο δὲ ηκουσε τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας ἡ Ἑλισάβετ
And it-happened when heard the greeting of the Mary the Elizabeth.

Since Mary greeted Elizabeth it is predictable that Elizabeth heard.

Luke 2:15
καὶ ἐγένετο δὲ ἀπήλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐλς τὸν ὀφρανὸν ὁ ἄγγελος
And it-happened when went-away from them to the heaven the angels

Since the angels had appeared (v. 13) and made their announcement (v. 14) it is predictable they will leave.

Luke 2:39
καὶ ὁ ἐτέλεσεν πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον κυρίου
And when they-completed all the[ceremonies] according-to the law of-lord

It is predictable people will complete what they intend to do (Luke 2:22-24).

Compare:

Luke 5:3b-4a ἐδίδασκεν ... ὁ ως ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν. he was-teaching ...When () he-stopped talking.

Luke 7:11-12a ἐπορεύθη ἐλς πόλιν ... ὁ ως ἔγγυσεν he-journeyed to town ...When () he-neared

Luke 23:25b-26a παρέδωσεν ... ὁς ἀπῆγαγεν αὐτὸν he-handed-over ... when they-led-away him ...

Acts 26:32-27:1a ἐπεκέκλητο Καισαρά ... οἱ δὲ ἐκρίνη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν he-has-appealed to-Caesar When () it-was-decided of-the sailing us to the Italy

with Imperfect

Luke 24:32
οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καὶ μένην ἡμῶν [ἐν ἡμῖν]
Not the heart of-us burning was [in us]

ὁς ἐλάλησε ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ ὁς ἐπήλθον ἡμῶν τὰς γραφὰς; while he-was-speaking to-us in the way, while he-was-opening to-us the scriptures

Jesus’s talking with them is already stated in 24:27.

John 2:23
ὁς δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχῃ ἐν τῇ κορτῆ ... while () he-was in the Jerusalem in the Passover in the feast ...

Jesus’s going to the festival in Jerusalem is already stated in 2:13.

John 8:7
ὁς δὲ ἐπειμενον ἐρωτώντες αὐτὸν while () they-were-keeping questioning [him]

They asked Jesus in 8:5 but he made no reply, so their continuing to ask is predictable.

“When” clauses and information status taxonomy

“When” clauses, those beginning with ως, δετε, δταυν or ποτε in Greek, regularly mark Hearer-old information. A clause introduced with “when” often contains Discourse-old information, and marks that this information is the time setting for the following clause
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containing Discourse-new information. If a clause introduced with “when” contains Discourse-new information, it marks that the Discourse-new information is regarded as Hearer-old, since it is expected within the open scenario.

There is, however, a rare marked use of “when” clauses when they function as the Comment. This occurs when the following clause contains Hearer-old information and is the Topic, and where the question has already been raised as to “when” this Hearer-old event will occur. In such instances, the “when” clause may contain Hearer-old information (e.g. Matthew 24:15 below), or even Hearer-new information (e.g. Luke 21:20 below).

Examples of each category follow (“when” bolded):

1. NEW


Luke 21:20

"Orav 88 iSqTe KUKXoupii/qv O tto orpaTOTreSwv 'I epoucraXfip,
then know that has-drawn-near the desolation of-it.

Luke 21:6-7

electousaTa ημερας en alis ouk afetoChatai lidos epi lidos de ou katauloChatetai.
will-come days in which not will-be-left stone on stone which not will-be-overthrown.

'Επηρώτησαν δε αυτων λεγοντες, Διδάσακα, They-asked () him saying, Teacher
ποτε ουν ταυτα εσται καθ τη το σημειον διαν μελλη ταυτα γινεσθαι;
When therefore these[things] will-be and what the sign when is-going these[things] to-happen?

2a. KNOWN unused

This information is taken from the always open “whole world” scenario in long term memory.

*Expected actions of participants:*

Luke 2:15

Kal. έγενετο δε απηλθουν αν' αυτων εις των οδρων οι διδειοι ...
And it-happened when went-away from them into the heaven the angels ...


*Chronology*

Luke 2:42

kal. διε γενεστο ετων διδεικα,
And when he-became of-years twelve

People get older.

Acts 7:23

τη δε επηρωτησα αυτω τεσσερακονταετης χρονος,
When () was-fulfilled to-him of-forty-years time

People get older.


*salient*

Mark 1:32

Ουλας δε γενομενης, δο εδο δ θηλος
Evening () having-occurred, when set the sun
This "when" clause is redundant as the preceding Genitive Absolute already makes the time explicit. I argue therefore that it marks the time as salient. The timing is culturally very significant, since nobody could travel far or carry the sick until sunset, as that would constitute “work” on the Sabbath.

**Christian history**

Acts 22:20

δτε ἐξεχώρησεν τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου

when was-flowing-out the blood of Stephen the witness of-you

This is a fact already known to the addressee, God.

**Christian religion**

John 2:22

δτε οὖν ἤγερθη ἣ νεκρῶν

When therefore he-was-raised from dead

This is presented as a fact known to the hearer, for time reference only.

Romans 2:16

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ δτε κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν αὐθώπων ... διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

on day when judges the God the hidden[things] of-the people ... through Christ Jesus.

This is a fact known to the Christian audience.

**Jewish religion**

Jude 1:9

ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος,

The () Michael the archangel,

δτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος

when with-the devil contending he-was-arguing about the of-Moses body

**Jewish scripture**

Matthew 24:15

"Ὅταν οὖν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐρμοκέως

When therefore you-see the abomination of-the desolation

tὸ ἡρῴδεω διὰ Δαυίδ τοῦ προφήτου ἔστας ἐν τῷ ἅγιο, the spoken through Daniel the prophet standing on-the place holy

This is Hearer-old since Jesus’s audience, the disciples, know that this was predicted, i.e. in Daniel 9:27, 11:31, 12:11. However, this is also a marked use of a “when” clause as comment, focussing on when the Discourse-old topic, the destruction of the Temple, will take place, see 24:2-3, cf. Mark 13:14, 13:4.

2b. KNOWN inferrable: long term memory, new item from currently open scenario

Matt. 11:1

Καὶ ἐγένετο δτε ἐτέλεσαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων

And it-happened when finished the Jesus commanding

Refers back to the commands in 10:5-42.

Luke 7:12

ὡς δὲ ἠγάπησεν τῇ πόλις τῆς πόλεως

When () he-drew-near to-the gate of-the city

Refers back to 7:11 he went to Nain.

Luke 23:42

Ἰησοῦ, μνησθῆτι μου δταύ ἐλθείς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου.

Jesus, remember me when you-come in the kingdom of-you

The “Christ” scenario is open, see 23:38, 39.

Compare:

Acts 8:36 (Acts 8:29, 8:31 commands)

Acts 8:39 (8:38 they went into the water)

Acts 10:17 (People who see strange visions, 10:11-16, wonder about the meaning)

Acts 13:25 (13: 24 John announced baptism. What one does always has a finish)

Acts 16:15 (16:14 The Lord opened her heart. When your heart is open you believe and are baptized)

Acts 17:13 (people find out what happens nearby)

Acts 18:5 (people obey orders 17:15)

Acts 20:18 (20:17 they were summoned)

Acts 21:1 (people who board ships, 20:38, set sail)

Acts 27:1 (people who appeal to Caesar, 26:32, go to Caesar in Italy)
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3a. GIVEN situational: current perceptual experience
Romans 13:11
νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία ἢ δῦτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν.
now for nearer of-us the salvation than when we-believed.
This is an inference from the current situation, Paul is writing to Christians.

1 Corinthians 12:1
δῦτε ἔδωκεν ἡτί ... when gentiles/pagans you-were...
This is an inference from the current situation, Paul is writing to first generation non-Jewish Christians.

3b. GIVEN textual - current: short term memory, last opened scenario
Luke 1:41
καὶ ἔγνετο δὲ ἡμουσίων τῶν ἀστασιμῶν τῆς Μαρίας ἡ Ἑλλάβη,
and it-happened when heard the greeting of-the Mary the Elizabeth
Refers back to 1:40 Mary greeted Elizabeth.

Acts 1:12, 13
Τότε ὑπεστρέφας ἐλι σερουσιακή ... καὶ δῦτε εσθιόδον ...
Then they-retumed into Jerusalem ... and when they-entered ...
Also Acts 21:35, Romans 6:17, 20

3c. GIVEN textual-displaced: short term memory, recently opened scenario
Mark 3:11
καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάδαμα, δῦταν αὐτῶν ἐθεώρον,
And the spirits the impure, when him they-were-seeing,
προσεπεττόν αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες δῦτς. ἠμ. ἐλ τ. ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ,
were-falling-before him and were-yelling saying that You are the son of-the God.
The fact that demons would see Jesus may be expected from the original audience’s KNOWN unused category of real life. However, this is also explicit in the text, Mark 1:23-24. The Imperfect verb from (Past Tense Imperfective Aspect) is used here to refer to Aktionsart which is both Distributive (involving many people) and Iterative (repeated many times), i.e. this kind of thing was happening time and time again, but the demons concerned were different ones each time.

Acts 8:12
δῦτε δὲ ἐπιστεύσαν τῷ Φιλίππῳ.
When Q they-believed the Philip
8:6 the people heeded what Philip said.

Romans 6:17, 7:5
δῦτε γὰρ ήμεν ἐν τῇ σάρκι,
When for we-were in the flesh
cf. Romans 3:23 “All have sinned”.

The choice of “when”, rather than a Genitive Absolute or Prepositional Phrase, may be made for reasons of discourse connections. For example, Levinsohn (1992:184) says that the “when” clause in Acts 7:23 “When forty years had passed” is a temporal point of departure, i.e. the grammar marks a temporal relationship to the previous section. I agree that “when” means “at the time an event (which is known or predictable from the current scenario) happened” but does not imply that this event is related to the following event other than temporally, e.g. it does not imply a causal relationship. In contrast, the use of a Genitive Absolute in Acts 7:30 “when 40 years had passed” suggests that the time elapsed was relevant in the timing of the angel’s appearance.
Verbal forms and nouns referring to Hearer-old event scenarios

In Greek an event may be referred to without making the agent explicit, by a Passive verb form, an Active verb form with no explicit or anaphoric subject, an infinitive, or an abstract noun. I make the hypothesis that such agentless constructions are used when the implicit agent is Hearer-old, i.e. the agent is prototypically present in the open event scenario and so is expected to be correctly identified by the audience.

Abstract nouns and Hearer-old event scenarios

Abstract nouns are frequently used to refer to Discourse-old events, i.e. scenarios with acting or interacting participants. Louw (1982:80) points out that “the baptism of John” in Matthew 21:25 (τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου) is grammatically ambiguous, since John may be either the agent or the goal of “baptizing”. He argues “From the context of Matthew 21.25 it is clear that John is the implied agent...” Whilst agreeing with his conclusion, I disagree with his logic, unless “context” is taken to refer right back to the context of Matthew 3:6 where people are baptized by John. I argue that, in Greek, a noun in the genitive case linked to an abstract noun for an event marks the genitive noun as a participant belonging to that event scenario, but does not encode grammatically what semantic role the participant has. The audience has to refer back to their mental scenarios (here the Hearer-old scenario Ἰωάννου as indicated by the neuter article τὸ) for participant roles. In this instance, for the author’s audience, the information is GIVEN textual - displaced (Matthew 3:6). For the original speaker’s audience (chief priests and elders) this information was KNOWN unused, since this is the first mention in the dialogue of John the Baptist, or baptism.

Similarly, in ἐπὶ τῆς μετοχεσίας Βαβυλώνος “at the exile of Babylon” in Matthew 1:11, the genitive of Babylon merely shows it is a participant in the event scenario for “exile”. The fact that it is in the role of Location comes from the original (Jewish) audience’s KNOWN unused scenario “exile in Babylon” (as indicated by the article τῆς in Greek). Today’s target audience, even if they know Babylon is a city, might reasonably take this to mean the time when the inhabitants of Babylon went into exile.

Infinitives and Hearer-old event scenarios

Similarly infinitives are regularly used to encode Discourse-old information, e.g.

(Infinitives bolded)
Matthew 13:4
καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτῶν
And in the to-sow him
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Here the infinitive is marked with the Hearer-old marker, the article, and is GIVEN textual - current, referring back to 13:3 ἔξῆλθεν δ ο σπέερων τοῦ σπέερευν “The sower went out to sow.” The article in 13:3 τοῦ σπέερευν is best understood as referring to KNOWN inferrable information, from the “sower” scenario. The article with δ σπέερων may be KNOWN unused, a generic reference, or perhaps GIVEN situational, referring to Jesus himself (cf. Gerhardsson, 1967-68:175).

However, sometimes the infinitive encodes information which is Discourse-new but Hearer-old and totally predictable, e.g.

Matthew 27:12
ἐν τῷ κατηγορεσθαι αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἄρχερεων καὶ πρεσβύτερων
in the to-be-accused him by the chief-priests and elders

Since the Jewish leaders wanted Jesus dead, and had taken him to the governor, 27:1-2, it is predictable that they will accuse him (KNOWN inferrable).

Matthew 13:25
ἐν δὲ τῷ καθέθειν τῶν ἀνθρώπων
in () the to-sleep the people

Prototypically people sleep at night, and since time always passes, people sleeping is predictable from the real life situation we live in (KNOWN unused)

Passives and Hearer-old event scenarios

The use of a passive does not mean the agent is unknown or not topical. Sometimes the agent is so topical, that the very mention of the agent is unnecessary. This can be compared with zero anaphoric reference where the subject of a verb is the same as the subject of a preceding verb so already topical. For example:

Luke 11:9
ἀρετέτε καὶ δοθήσεται ἦλιν
Ask and it-will-be-given to-you

Here the “prayer” scenario has already been opened in 11:1, and in this scenario God is the prototypical giver in response to a request. This interpretation is confirmed in 11:13 “How much more will your heavenly Father give ...?”. I propose that prototypicality of participants in the open scenario is a factor in the use of Passives where God is the agent. The Jewish desire to avoid saying the Holy Name in vain (Hagner, 1993:47-8) may account for some of this passive usage, but the texts we have use “heaven”, “God” and “Lord” frequently, so that alone cannot easily explain all Passive usage (e.g. GRAMCORD data for occurrences in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John respectively: οἱρανὸς 82, 18, 35, 18; τῆς 51, 49, 122, 83; κύριος 80, 18, 104, 52). A general principle would be that, where a scenario is open, and the prototypical agent in that scenario is God, and where no other agent is specified, the passive refers to God.

Similarly, where a scenario is open, and the prototypical agent in that scenario is people in general, and where no other agent is specified, the passive refers to a generalization about people.
Also significant to the disambiguation of passive forms is what Schank and Abel say about the way a hearer reconstructs an implicit causal chain (1997:35):

Inferential concepts like causal propensity are ‘quick-and-dirty’ and thus useful heuristics. They help the understander make rapid sense of causal ambiguities. The short-cut principle of causal propensity says that in cases of causal ambiguity, pick the causal chain originating from the generally most causally active actor. Principles such as this enable people to read and understand quickly.

Since in the Jewish and Christian world-view God is by definition the “most causally active actor”, in cases where the causal chains are not determined by a current scenario, the most likely solutions to implicit causal chains are those involving God as actor.

In many languages, translations will need to make explicit when God is the agent for reasons of clarity or naturalness. In some languages there is no passive, so the target language grammar demands that agents are made explicit. The translator must decide whether agents were left implicit in the source text because they were predictable, unknown, or being concealed, and translate accordingly, e.g. “God” or “someone”.

Subjectless verbal forms and information status

The agents of subjectless verbal forms (whether events encoded as abstract nouns, infinitives, passives or transitive verbs with no explicit subject) may belong in any information status category, e.g. (relevant “event” word bolded)

1. NEW:

agent unknown to the speaker
John 20:2b
Γενέτο ο ημερο και προσπερεθεν \\

They took the Lord from the tomb, and not we know where they put him.

agent deliberately hidden by the speaker
Matthew 26:2
ο άπειρος των ανθρωπων
The son of the mankind is being betrayed.

2a. KNOWN unused: long term memory, currently closed scenario

In this category are several “back-burner” scenarios, with a high degree of natural relevance, to be searched first, even though they may not be currently open.

Expected actions of potential participants:

God as agent
Luke 8:18
δε γενετο ο ημερο και προσπερεθεν αυτο
Who ever for has, it will be given [by God] to him.

God is the archetypal giver, e.g. James 1:5 “God who gives generously to all”.

Luke 9:22
to προσπερεθεν αυτο
on the third day to be raised [by God]

Acts 1:2
ανεληφθη
he was taken up [by God]
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**People in general as agent**
Matthew 6:10
γεννήσεις τὸ θελημά σου
may-occur the will of-you
The clause “your will occurs” grammaticalizes an event “A does your will”, i.e. May people do your will.

Luke 3:3
βάπτισμα μετανοεῖται εἰς αἰματαινοῦν
baptism of-repentance for forgiveness of-sins
The noun “baptism” grammaticalizes an event “A baptizes B” and the noun “repentance” grammaticalizes an event “A repents”, i.e. John baptizes people (see 3:7 “crowds going out to be baptized by him [John]”).

People repent.

John 1:38
Ῥαββί, δὲ λέγεται μεθερμνευόμενον Διδάσκαλε
Rabbi, which is-said being-translated Teacher
People translate Rabbi as teacher.

**Chronology**
Matthew 14:6
γενέας δὲ γενομένος τοῦ Ἰωάννου
birthday.celebrations () having-occurred of-the Herod
The hearer is expected to know that birthday celebrations are annual events, based on a cultural chronology splitting each year into months and days.

**Heredity**
John 9:2
ἐνα τυφλός γεννηθῇ;
that blind he-be-born

**Family Relationships**
Matthew 1:18
μητροθέλειστοις τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωάννῃ
having-been-betrothed the mother of-him Mary to-the Joseph
Mary’s parents betrothed her to Joseph.

**Christian history**
Mark 1:14
Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθέατο τῶν Ἰωάννην
After () the to-be-handed-over the John
Herod had John arrested. Mark expects his Christian audience to know about John’s imprisonment.

**Jewish history**
John 1:38
τὴν μετοικείαν τοῖς Βαβυλῶνος
the exile of-Babylon
The noun “exile” or “deportation” grammaticalizes the event “A deported B to C”.
The Jews were deported to Babylon, in various deportations c. 605, 597 and 586 BC.

**Jewish religion**
James 5:17
προσήγαγα τοῦ μὴ βρέχαι
he-prayed of-the not to-rain
The infinitive “the to-rain” grammaticalizes the event “God causes rain to fall”.
He prayed to God that God would not cause rain, cf. Matthew 5:45.
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Jewish scripture
Matthew 4:4
Γέγραπται
it-has-been-written
People wrote it in scripture by divine guidance. This refers to a very complex scenario “God caused a human to speak God’s message by the power of the Holy Spirit and God caused a human to write this message in Holy Scripture”. Compare Matthew 1:22 where more of this complex scenario is explicit.

Natural world
Acts 27:27
διαφερομένων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ Ἀδριατίκῳ
being-driven-along us in the Adriatic
Wind and waves drive ships along.

Man-made world
John 2:20
Τεσσαρόκοντα καὶ ἔτεσιν ἀκοδημηθῆ 东海
In-forty and six years was-built the shrine this
People build shrines.

Metaphysical world
Mark 6:2
τὸ ἐν τούτῳ ὁ δοθέα ὁ πατήρ
what the wisdom the given to-this[man]

2b. KNOWN inferrable: long term memory, currently open scenario

God as agent
Luke 3:3
βαπτισμὸς μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν
baptism of-repentance for forgiveness of-sins
The abstract noun “forgiveness” grammaticalizes an event “A forgives B”.
God forgives. The “message from God” scenario is opened in v. 2 “the word of God came to John”, which gives a co-text for the readers of the Gospel to understand the agent of the message to be the agent of its contents.
Luke 3:7
φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλόντος ὀργῆς
to-flee from the coming wrath
The abstract noun “wrath” grammaticalizes an event “A is angry”. Wrath is God’s wrath. The “God’s wrath” scenario is part of the “repentance” scenario opened in 3:3 by “baptism of repentance”.

People as agent
Luke 6:18
διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ laθναρ
which came to-hear him and to-be-healed
Jesus heals, “him” opens Jesus scenario.
Luke 18:32
παραδόθηται γάρ τῶς ζωνοὺς
will-be-betrayed for to-the gentiles
Gentiles mock etc., “Gentiles” scenario opened in previous clause.

Compare:
Luke 23:26 ἄπηγαγον they-led-away = Roman soldiers
Luke 24:7 οἱ ταυροθῆκαι to-be-crucified = by Roman soldiers
Luke 24:47 κηρυχθήσεται to-be-proclaimed = by Christians
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other

Mark 4:5-6
καὶ ἄλλο ἦτεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ὅπου οὐκ ἦχεν γῆν πολλὴν,
and other fell in the rocky where not was-having earth much
... διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.
... due-to the not to-have root...
Lack of deep roots is inferrable from the shallow soil.

3a. GIVEN situational: current perceptual experience
Acts 8:36
τί κολάσει με βαπτίσαι;
what prevents me to-be-baptized?
Philip, the only Christian there, must be the Agent of baptizing.

3b. GIVEN textual - current: short term memory, last opened scenario
Mark 4:5
καὶ ἄλλο ἦτεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ὅπου οὐκ ἦχεν γῆν πολλὴν ...
and other fell in the rocky where not was-having earth much ...
διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.
due-to the not to-have deep earth ...
Here “not having deep roots” refers directly back to “did not have much earth”.
Luke 18:14
κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος
went-down this[one] being-justified
God is the Agent of justifying, 18:13 “God be merciful to me a sinner”.
Compare:
Luke 23:55 ἔρεθη was-placed cf. 23:53 “he [Joseph] placed him in a tomb”
Acts 2:20 μετατραφοῦσαται will-be-turned cf. 2:19 “I [God] will give wonders in the heaven above”

3c. GIVEN textual - displaced: short term memory, recently opened scenario
Luke 3:21
ἐν τῷ βαπτίσαι ἄπαντα τὸν λαὸν
in the to-be-baptized all the people
“John baptizes” scenario is opened in 3:7 “to be baptized by him”, and repeated 3:16 “I baptize you with water”. After that 3:19-20 is Herod’s imprisonment of John.
Acts 11:19
ὅπως τὸς Θεὸν τὰς γενομένας ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ
by the persecution the having-occurred over Stephen
“Persecution occurred” grammaticalizes “A persecuted B”. This refers back to 8:1 “a great persecution occurred against the church in Jerusalem” where the Agents are KNOWN inferrable, the Sanhedrin 6:15, 7:59 and like-minded Jews, e.g. Saul 8:1, 3.

Quotations and Hearer-old event scenarios

Quotations from the Old Testament are often used in the New Testament without any explicit clarification of who originally spoke or wrote the quotation.
As in the previous section, a general principle to determine the speaker or writer of a quotation would be: where no agent is specified, choose the prototypical agent of the open scenario. In the case of the scenarios “speak” or “write” within a religious context or a religious co-text (i.e. New Testament book or letter) the prototypical agent, i.e. the
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speaker of the quotation, is God, and the place that quotation may be found is in scripture
(i.e. Old Testament), e.g.

Matthew 4:4 (quoting Deuteronomy 8:3)
Γέγραπται, ὅτι ἐπὶ ἀρτιὶ μόνῳ ζητεῖ ὁ θεός ὁ ἀνθρωπος
It-is-written, not on bread only will-live the person

God is to be understood as causal agent of the writing, some prophet or other human being
as the actual writer, and scripture as the place this is written. Hence a translation may say
“Scripture says,” “It is written in God's holy book,” or “God has caused this to be written,”
etc. making explicit whatever elements of the “scripture” scenario are necessary for the
reader to be able to reconstruct the original scenario, of a message originating from God,
written in a book, by a human.

This complex scenario for scripture is supported by the New Testament text itself,
which occasionally clarifies that God is the causal agent of scripture, especially prophecy,
e.g. Matthew 1:22 “what the Lord had said through the prophet” (cf. Matthew 2:15), Luke
“You [Lord] spoke by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of your servant, our father
David” and Acts 1:16 “the Scripture had to be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spoke long
ago through the mouth of David.”

Similarly, a general principle to determine the first person agent inside a quotation
would be: where no agent is specified, choose the prototypical agent of the open scenario.
In the case of a scriptural quotation, unless the specific verb suggests otherwise, the
prototypical agent is God, e.g.

Matthew 13:14, 15 (quoting Isaiah 6:9-10)
καὶ ἀναπληρωθήσεται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαάτου ἐν λέγουσα ...
And is-fulfilled for-them the prophecy of-Isaiah the saying ...
καὶ ἰαοῦμαι αὐτοῖς.
and l-will-heal them

Here, there is a mismatch between the explicit speaker of the quotation, Isaiah, and the
implicit agent of “I will heal”, God. Although the quotation is introduced as the prophecy
of Isaiah, in the source culture the scenario of “prophecy” includes God, not the prophet,
as the prime cause of whatever is spoken, so God is always a potential agent. Moreover,
the source culture scenario of “heal” has “God” as the prototypical agent. Thus the referent
of “I” would have been clear to the original audience.

Since, normally, the speaker and first person pronoun in the quoted speech are co-
referential, some clarification may need to be made in translation so that “I” does not refer
to Isaiah but to God, e.g. “the prophecy of Isaiah where it is written: ‘The Lord says... I
will heal them’.”, or “the prophecy of Isaiah where the Lord says: ‘... I will heal them’.”,
or “the prophetic message God spoke through Isaiah: ‘... I will heal them’.”
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**Rhetorical questions and Hearer-old scenarios**

Another grammatical structure where the explicit information is Hearer-old is the rhetorical question.

Rhetorical questions make up some 70% of the 1000 or so questions in the New Testament, and are used not to elicit information but rather “to convey or call attention to information and express the speaker’s attitudes, opinions, etc.” (Beekman and Callow, 1974:229).

The form and function of rhetorical questions in New Testament Greek, together with translation issues they raise, is well documented by Beekman and Callow (1974:353-357). I will therefore contrast real and rhetorical questions, and focus on the role of the hearer’s mental scenarios in the interpretation of rhetorical questions.

**real questions**

A speaker uses real questions to elicit information from others. Grammatically, real questions are typically followed by a change of speaker and a statement with ellipsis, where the missing elements can be understood from the original question, e.g.

(question or question word bolded, RSV translation in place of gloss)

Matthew 15:34

καὶ λέγει οὗτος δ' ἵππος, Πόσος ἄρτων ἔχετε;
And Jesus said to them, “How many loaves have you?”

οὐ δὲ εἶπαν, Ἔππα καὶ ὄλγα ἰχθύδια.
They said, “Seven, and a few small fish.”

“Seven” = “We have seven loaves”

With real questions, either the speaker does not know the answer, or the speaker is testing the hearer, forcing them to state what they believe or to acknowledge a truth, e.g.

Luke 20:24

Δείξατέ μοι δημάρχον τύχος ἐξελεικόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν;
“Show me a coin. Whose likeness and inscription has it?”

οὐ δὲ εἶπαν, Καίσαρος:
They said, “Caesar’s.”

“Caesar’s” = “The likeness and inscription is Caesar’s.”

With real polar questions (“yes/no” questions) the speaker can indicate the answer he expects by his choice of the negative particles, using μη for “no” and οὐ for “yes”, e.g.

John 18:25b (expecting the answer no)

ἐἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, Μη καὶ οὐ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶ;
They said to him, “Are not you also one of his disciples?”

i.e. “You are not one of his disciples, are you?”

Ηρῴσατο ἐκείνος καὶ εἶπεν, Οὐκ εἶμι.
He denied it and said, “I am not.”

John 18:26b-27a (expecting the answer yes)

Οὐκ ἔγνω σε εἶδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ’ αὐτῶν;
“Did I not see you in the garden with him?”

i.e. “I did see you in the garden with him, didn’t I?”

πάλιν οὖν Ἡρῴσατο Πέτρος.
Again Peter denied it.
It is the speaker who decides whether the question expects a positive or negative answer, "not the objective facts in and of themselves" (Porter, 1994:277-278). So, with a real question, even though the speaker may express their opinion as to the correct answer, the audience is still free to contradict it.

**rhetorical questions**

Whereas speakers use real questions to elicit information from others, they use rhetorical questions not to elicit new information, but to refer to information which the speaker and audience share. When using a rhetorical question, a speaker assumes three things:

1) the audience knows the correct "answer" to the "question"
2) the audience knows that the speaker knows the answer
3) the audience knows that the speaker knows that the audience knows.

In such situations, the audience knows the "question" is not eliciting information, and therefore infers some other pragmatic meaning from the speaker’s utterance.

Grammatically, whereas real questions are usually followed by a change of speaker and ellipsis, rhetorical questions are typically followed by continuation of the same speaker or switch to the narrator, and the following statement lacks ellipsis, e.g.

Matthew 18:12

δὶς γέγονεν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἕκατόν πρόβατα καὶ πλαύσθη ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν,
If a man has a hundred sheep, and one of them has gone astray,

οὐχὶ ἀφήσει τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἑννέα ἐπὶ τὰ δρῆ
does he not leave the ninety-nine on the mountains

καὶ πορεύεται ἦξερχεται τὸ πλαύσμαν;
and go in search of the one that went astray?

καὶ ἐδώκει ἑρείπειν αὐτῷ, ἄλων λέγω ἵματι διε χαίρει ἐπ’ αὐτῷ
And if he finds it, truly, I say to you, he rejoices over it

مةλλὰν ἡ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνενήκοντα ἑννέα τοῖς μὴ πεπλαύσμανοις.
more than over the ninety-nine that never went astray.

John 18:38

λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, Τί ἔστων ἀλήθεια;
Pilate said to him, "What is truth?"

Καὶ τοῦτο εἶπών πάλιν ἐξῆλθεν...
After he had said this, he went out...

Pragmatically, rhetorical questions are not questions at all, but statements which reinforce or express attitudes about shared information. Why then is a grammatical question form used? Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986) predicts that the more processing effort required, the more "contextual effects" such as information, emotion etc. are conveyed to the hearer. A rhetorical question requires more processing effort than a statement because the audience has to evaluate whether it is a real question or not. If the content is understood by the audience to be uncontroversial Hearer-old information, believed by both speaker and hearer, then it is evaluated as a rhetorical question. With Greek rhetorical questions, the extra "contextual effects" include strong assertion, strong
negation, and strong emotive force, such as rebuke, or surprise (Beekman and Callow, 1974:238; Barnwell, 1980:91).

Just as Greek marks grammatically whether the speaker expects the answer yes or no with real polar questions, so with rhetorical polar questions the speaker can mark grammatically whether the statement is negation or assertion (Beekman and Callow 1974:357):

In summary, it may be said that ou in a real question indicates that the speaker thinks a yes answer is in order, and in rhetorical questions it corresponds to either an affirmative statement or an evaluation; and that me in a real question indicates that the speaker thinks a no answer is in order, and in a rhetorical question it corresponds to either a negative statement or a statement of incertitude.

So, since real and rhetorical questions have the same form but different functions, the hearer must decide whether it is a rhetorical or real question, and the speaker must evaluate whether the hearer will interpret the question as intended by the speaker. This relies on speaker and hearer evaluating the status of the information, specifically “Is this propositional information, attitude, or evaluation Hearer-old and speaker-old?” This might be obvious from the co-text or real life context of the communicative act, but more frequently must be evaluated from the contents of mental scenarios in long term memory, e.g. (RSV translation in place of gloss)

Strong negation:

John 18:35
άπεκρίθη δ Πιλάτος, Μήτι εγώ Ιουδαίος είμι;
Pilate answered, “Am I a Jew?”
i.e. “I am not a Jew, as you well know.”
Pilate’s socio-religious affiliation would be known to all.

John 8:53
μή σοι μελζών εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ἢ τε μεθέμενεν;
Are you greater than our father Abraham, who died?
i.e. You are not greater than our ancestor Abraham, and he died.
Jesus in fact disagreed with the speaker’s “correct” answer to this statement, and stated his superiority to Abraham. However, the Jews used a rhetorical question in the belief that nobody would dare claim superiority to Abraham, and Jesus recognized that they would believe this, and so recognized that they were using a rhetorical question, not asking a real one. Since the Jews had already decided Jesus was demon-possessed (8:52) they would not be in any doubt as to who was greater, Jesus or Abraham.

James 3:11
μήτι ή πηγή ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ὄψης βρέει τὸ γλυκὸ καὶ τὸ πικρὸν;
Can both fresh water and salt water flow from the same spring?
i.e. Fresh water and salt water can not both flow from the same spring.
This is an uncontroversial statement about nature, obvious to all.


Strong Assertion:

John 7:19
οὐ Μωυσῆς δέδωκεν ἵμαν τοῖς νόμοις;
Did not Moses give you the law?
i.e. Moses gave you the Law.
All Jews would know this.
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Hebrews 1:14
οὐχὶ πάντες εἶσιν λειτουργικά πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν,
adωστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν;
Are not all angels ministering spirits sent to serve those who will inherit salvation?
i.e. Angels are all ministering spirits ...
All Jews except the Sadducees (Acts 23:8) would acknowledge this.

Similarly, with non-polar or content questions, the same grammatical form is used
for both real questions and for rhetorical questions which make strong statements of
negation or assertion. Again the presumption of shared old-information, i.e. shared mental
scenarios, allows the hearer to interpret a question as rhetorical, e.g.

Real Questions:
Luke 3:10 (crowds to John the Baptist)
Τί δὲν ποιήσαμεν;
"What then shall we do?"
John assumes they do not know what to do.

Luke 8:30 (Jesus to "Legion")
Τί σοι δεινόν ἐστιν;
"What is your name?"
"Legion" assumes Jesus does not know his name.

Rhetorical Questions:
Hebrews 1:5
Τί ἐστιν ἄγγελος ὦ πατέρας ἡμῶν, Πῶς μου εἶ σοῦ...
For to which of the angels did God ever say, “You are my Son...”?
i.e. God never said to any angel...
The implied negation relies on the Jewish audience knowing the answer “none”, from their Old Testament
knowledge.

Hebrews 1:5
Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὦ μιμήσις αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἴδιος ἄνθρωπον ὦ ἐπισκέπτη αὐτῶν;
“What is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him?”
i.e. Man is nothing of such great significance.
The implied negation relies on the Jewish audience knowing the answer “nothing much”, based on a
theology of God’s lordship over man.

Luke 1:66 (about John the Baptist)
Τί ἄρα τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἐστα; καὶ γὰρ χειρὶ κυρίου ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ.
“What then will this child be?” For the hand of the Lord was with him.
i.e. This child will become something very significant ..
The assertion relies on the audience knowing the answer “something great” on the basis of a theological
understanding of the significance of the miracle which had just occurred.

Correct understanding of a rhetorical question relies on more than grammatical
encoding. The hearer must first be able to evaluate the contents of the speaker’s scenario
including the degree of certainty they have about propositions in the scenario, in order to
evaluate whether the speaker is asking a real question or a rhetorical question. If rhetorical,
the hearer must then evaluate the contents of the speaker’s scenario in order to interpret the
meaning of the rhetorical question in the specific context. Frequently the hearer must
determine what value judgement the speaker is making concerning the open scenario. This
requires the hearer to utilize the contents of the open scenario stored in their own long-
term memory, including the kind of value judgments specific types of people prototypically make about it.

If the audience thinks that the speaker is uncertain about the matter in question, they will assume it is a real question, e.g.

John 1:19 (Jews to John)
"Who are you?"

If the audience thinks that the speaker is certain about the matter in question, and is not testing their knowledge about it, they will assume it is a rhetorical question. Beekman and Callow distinguish four principal functions of rhetorical questions in the New Testament (1974:238):

1. a statement of certitude;
2. a statement of incertitude;
3. a statement of evaluation or obligation;
4. to highlight and introduce a new subject or a new aspect of the same subject.

The audience must use their existing mental scenarios to determine the function intended.

If the audience thinks that the speaker is certain about the matter in question, and that the speaker believes that they share that view, they will assume it is a rhetorical question expressing strong negation or strong assertion, e.g.

John 18:35 (Pilate to Jesus)
"Am I a Jew?"
Speaker’s assumption: Everyone knows I am not a Jew.

Hebrews 1:5 (author to Jewish readers)
For to which of the angels did God ever say, “You are my Son...”? Speaker’s assumption: We all know God never said this to any angel.

John 7:19 (Jesus to Jews)
"Did not Moses give you the law?"
Speaker’s assumption: We all know he did.

If the audience thinks that the speaker is certain about the matter in question, and is amazed by it, they will assume it is an evaluation or expression of amazement (a type of incertitude), e.g.

Luke 8:25 (disciples to one another)
"Who then is this, that he commands even wind and water, and they obey him?"

If the audience thinks that the speaker expects the matter in question to apply in some, but not all, instances and that the speaker believes that they share that view, they will assume it is a rhetorical question specifying a condition (another type of incertitude), e.g.

1 Corinthians 7:27 (Paul to Corinthians)
i.e. If you are married, do not seek a divorce.

James 5:13 (James to hearers)
"Is anyone among you suffering? Let him pray.”
i.e. If anyone among you is suffering, let him pray.

If the audience thinks that the speaker is certain about the matter in question, and has a negative evaluation of it, they will assume it is a negative evaluation or rebuke, e.g.
Mark 4:40 (Jesus to disciples) “
Why are you afraid? Have you no faith?”

If the audience thinks that the speaker intends to turn the conversation to a new matter in question, and thinks that the speaker believes that the audience would recognize this, they will assume it is a rhetorical question introducing a new topic of conversation, e.g.
Luke 13:20 (Jesus to Jewish listeners)
“To what shall I compare the kingdom of God?”

Romans 4:1 (Paul to Jewish Christians in Rome)
“What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather, discovered in this matter?”

So then, when a speaker uses rhetorical questions to make strong assertions or denials, or for any other rhetorical function, he presumes that the propositional content is Hearer-old information. If that is not the case, rhetorical questions are not an effective form of communication, and may not communicate the speaker’s intended meaning.

When the audience do not share the speaker’s viewpoint, they may interpret such a rhetorical question as a real question (i.e. the speaker, whatever their current opinion, is expressing some doubt about the matter and seeking their answer or opinion), they may “mishear” the rhetorical question, re-interpreting the speaker’s viewpoint as their own, or they may simply reject the speaker’s viewpoint as wrong.

For example, many English people do not share Jesus’s shepherding scenario, and would disagree with Matthew 18:12:
If a man has a hundred sheep, and one of them has gone astray, does he not leave the ninety-nine on the mountains and go in search of the one that went astray?
Who in their right mind would leave 99 sheep alone on the mountains to chase after just one sheep? However Jesus is making a strong assertion that the owner would do this. The original scenario was of the owner of 100 sheep in Palestine, who would not have herded so many sheep alone, but have been accompanied by a relative or paid shepherd. The 99 would not have been left alone to wander off or be attacked, but left in the care of another (Bailey, 1983:149). In translation, then, unless we want our audience to think Jesus was twisting facts to buttress a weak argument, we must ensure that our audience fully agrees with Jesus’s evaluation of what the sheep owner would do. Relevant information from the original scenario may need to made explicit, in order for the audience to agree with the speaker, and the rhetorical question may need to be replaced or reinforced by an emphatic statement. For example, the Parkari translation says: “What do you think? If some person may have a hundred sheep, and from among them one sheep should get lost, then will the owner not search for it? He certainly will leave the other ninety nine sheep right there on the mountain with some shepherd and having gone will look for that lost sheep.”
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So even though Greek has markers with polar questions to express the speaker’s opinion, the same grammatical forms are used for both real questions and rhetorical questions. Since the grammatical form of the Greek rhetorical question does not specify the speaker’s meaning, the audience must rely on Hearer-old information already stored in their mental scenarios in order to interpret the probable attitudes and beliefs of the speaker, and hence the speaker’s meaning.

Comparative clauses and Hearer-old thing scenarios

Another grammatical structure where information is Hearer-old is in comparisons. The topic is compared to a Hearer-old item, usually assuming that the hearer not only knows the item, but also knows which characteristic of the item is intended by the comparison. This of course applies to all metaphors, which have no grammatical marking of comparison. However similes and other comparisons are typically marked by a conjunction.

The word ὅς occurs 19 times in Mark with comparative meaning, always in a clause with Hearer-old information (KNOWN or GIVEN), and paralleled by another clause containing Discourse-new information which occurs in accordance with the Hearer-old information (bolded below). The ὅς clause is normally second, but is fronted once (10:1).
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Greek Hearer-old Markers and Scenarios

FRONTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Hearer-old</th>
<th>Discourse-new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3c. GIVEN textual - displaced</td>
<td>πάλιν ἐλθάσας εὐρίσκειν ἀντίς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(There are also two uses of ἀντίς before a round number where it is not comparative, but means “approximately”, 5:13, 8:9).

Καθὼς occurs 8 times in Mark, always in a clause with Hearer-old information, and paralleled by another clause containing Discourse-new information which occurs in accordance with the Hearer-old information. In all cases but 1:2, the καθὼς clause is second.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse-new</th>
<th>καθὼς Hearer-old</th>
<th>scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:13 καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ δοσα ἡμέραν,</td>
<td>καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ αὐτῶν</td>
<td>scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:21 δὲ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει</td>
<td>καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>1 Kings 19:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:33 τοιαύτας παραβολὰς πολλαίς ἐλάλει</td>
<td>2a KNOWN unused</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:6 οὐ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷς</td>
<td>καθὼς ἦδυναν αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>Isaiah 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:16 εὕρον</td>
<td>καθὼς ἠπεκείνα τὰ αὐτοῖς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:8 ὁ διὸς ἥκετο αὐτείςδαυ</td>
<td>καθὼς ἠποτελεί αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>15:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:7 ἔκεκα αὐτῶν δύσεεθε,</td>
<td>3c GIVEN textual - displaced</td>
<td>14:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRONTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>καθὼς Hearer-old</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Discourse-new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a KNOWN unused - scripture</td>
<td>Isaiah 40:3</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ησαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ</td>
<td>Malachi 3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison clause is fronted to stress the importance of prophecy in the interpretation of John's ministry as preparing the way for Jesus as Lord.

Thus, as one would expect logically, since a comparison must be with a known item to be beneficial, we see that the comparative conjunctions καθὼς and ὀπίς introduce Hearer-old information. If such information is not Hearer-old for the target audience of a translation, due to mismatch of scenario contents, then a literal translation of comparisons may not communicate accurately.

Participial Noun Phrases and Hearer-old scenarios

Greek Participles, both arthrous and anarthrous, occur not only in Verb Phrases but also in Noun Phrases, and function like the relative clause in English, by defining the referent or providing information about the referent. These Participles are also used in accordance with information status taxonomy marking the referent as Hearer-old, and their
usage and definition is governed by the scenarios which are open, e.g. (head noun bolded, Participial Phrase underlined)

Nominal usage: Arthrous Participle

Descriptive (in apposition to a preceding noun)

Matthew 10:4
'Ἰδοὺ δὲ ἸΣαὰράκτης δὲ καὶ παραδόσει αὐτῶν.
Judas the Iscariot the[one] also having-betrayed him.
(2a KNOWN unused)

1 Peter 1:3
Εὐλογητὸς δὲ θεὸς ... ὅ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτῶ Θεὸς ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς ...
Blessed the God ... the[one] according-to the much of-him mercy having-regenerated us...
(2a KNOWN unused)

Roman 5:5b
διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸν ὑπεντόκος ἡμῖν,
through spirit holy the[one] having-been-given to-us
(2a KNOWN unused)

Restrictive (specific)

Matthew 10:20
οὐ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔστε ὁ ἀκαθάρτης
Not for you are the[ones] speaking
(3b GIVEN textual-current. Back reference to 10:19 μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τι καλήσητε)

Matthew 13:3 (cf. Mark 4:3, Luke 8:5)
Τὸν ἐξήλθην ὁ στέλλων τὸν στέλλων
Behold went-out the[one] sowing for-the to-sow
(2a KNOWN unused, and possibly 3a GIVEN situational (plus metaphor). According to my theory, the use of the article here indicates Hearer-old, yet there is no preceding reference. This, then, would be a GIVEN unused, a generic reference to a whole class “the prototypical sower”. Understanding it metaphorically, i.e. looking at the application of the parable, this may also be an example of GIVEN situational, Jesus giving a hint, by the grammar, that “the sower” has a unique referent, himself.)

Matthew 13:37
Ὁ στέλλων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα
The[one] sowing the good seed
(3c GIVEN textual-displaced. Back reference to 13:24 ἀνθρώπῳ σπείρατι καλὸν σπέρμα)

Luke 8:36
ὁ διασώσθησαί
the[one] having-been-demonized
(3b GIVEN textual-current. Back reference to 8:27 ἐξωθηκαὶ δαιμόνια)

2 Peter 1:3
τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς
of-the[one] having-called us
(2a KNOWN unused, meaning either God the Father or Jesus)

Restrictive (generic)

Matthew 10:28
μὴ φοβέσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενώντων τὸ σῶμα
not fear from the[ones] having-killed the body
(2a KNOWN unused. Refers to any agent of the Event “kill”)

Matthew 10:40 (cf. 10:42 “whosoever”)
Ὁ δεχόμενος ἡμᾶς ἐμε ἐβέθεται,
The[one] accepting you me accepts
(2a KNOWN unused. Refers to any agent of the Process “accept”)
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Adjectival usage: Anarthrous or Arthrous Participle modifying a noun

Descriptive
Matthew 7:11
εἰ δὲν θεοὶ τοιμαζοῦν κληματίσαντες ἐδαπάνα ἀγαθά ἀλάτοι ταῖς τεκνικοῖς ιμῶν
If therefore you evil being know gifts good to-give to-the children of-you
(2a KNOWN unused)
I would analyse “being evil” here as part of the Noun Phrase whose head is “you” (although grammatically it could be a Prenuclear Participle Clause) since it refers to permanent characteristics of those described, rather than a temporary Process with a temporal relationship to the main verb.

James 1:5
παρὰ τοῦ διακοσμοῦ θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἠμᾶς
from the giving God to-all generously
(2a KNOWN unused) NIV “God, who gives generously to all”

Sometimes, when a participle is used adjectivally like a descriptive relative clause, the information may be Hearer-new, but it is not treated as new material in the development of the plot, but rather as part of the already open scenario, i.e. the scenario of the character just introduced. In other words it belongs in the Noun Phrase, not the Verb Phrase, e.g.

Matthew 9:20
Καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ αἵματος δύσεκα ἐπὶ προελθόντα ὄπισθεν ἱματο...
And behold woman blood-flowing twelve years having-advanced behind touched
(2a KNOWN unused, representing a specific category of person known to exist, cf. Leviticus 15:25-30)
I analyse the first participle as adjectival and part of the Noun Phrase, but I analyse the second participle as part of the Verb Phrase, linked semantically to “touch” in a prototypical script, since it is not conjoined grammatically to the first participle by καὶ.

Compare Mark 5:25-27, where the Participles which are linked by conjunctions fill the same semantic slot, i.e. describing the head noun, and are part of the Noun Phrase, but the unconjoined Participles are part of the script for “say” in v. 28 and are part of the Verb Phrase.

Restrictive (specific)
Jude 1:6
ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ πιστευόντας τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχὴν
angels and the not having-kept the of-themselves rule
(2a KNOWN unused) NIV “the angels who did not keep their positions of authority”

Revelation 17:1
τῶν ἐπτά ἄγγελων τῶν ἐξώτων τὰς ἐπτὰ φιάλας
of-the seven angels the having the seven bowls
(3c GIVEN textual - current, 15:7 onwards)

Restrictive (generic)
Revelation 14:13
Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν κυρίῳ ἀποθανόντες ἀπ' ἀρτι
Blessed the dead the in Lord dying from now
(2a KNOWN unused)

Participial Noun Phrases are used for the same range of Information Status

Taxonomy as Arthrous nouns. As noted above, some Participial Noun Phrases refer back to an open scenario in the preceding text.
Similarly, some Participial Noun Phrases are generic, referring to a whole class by its scenario title. This may be singular, the prototypical class member, or plural, the sum of the class members. Such a class is part of the open “whole world” scenario (2a KNOWN unused), e.g.

**singular generic**

 Revelation 22:7

μακάρος ὁ πρόφητας τῆς προφητείας  τῶν βεβαίων τούτων.

Blessed the[one] keeping the words of the prophecy of the scroll this

**plural generic**

 Matthew 5:4

μακάροι οἱ πενθοῦντες

Blessed the[ones] mourning

Some Participial Noun Phrases refer to a specific item in the “whole world” scenario, e.g.

 2 Thessalonians 2:6, 7

τὸ κατέχων ... ὁ κατέχων

the[thing] restraining ... the[one] restraining

In many cases the relevant subsection of the world scenario is “religious beliefs”, e.g.

 Matthew 10:28

φοβεῖτε δὲ μάλιν τὸν δικτύων καὶ ψυχήν καὶ σώμα ἁπόλεσαι ἐν γεέννῃ.

Fear () rather the[one] being-able both soul and body to-destroy in hell. (i.e. God)

 Luke 7:19

Σὺ εἶ ὁ δικτύων

You are the[one] coming (i.e. the prophesied Messiah, see 7:22, cf. 4:18-19)

It is not surprising that many such referents, since most of the original real-life context of the New Testament involves interaction between a religious teacher (e.g. Jesus in the Gospels, an apostle in Acts, or the letter writer in Epistles) and a contact, and the written text which provides the co-text is clearly identified by its introduction and subject matter as religious.

Participles are not grammatically marked for tense but only for aspect: Imperfective Aspect (Present stem), Perfective Aspect (Aorist stem) or Stative Aspect (Perfect stem) (Porter, 1989). However, the use of these different aspects corresponds frequently to a change in time reference, with Aorist stems regularly relating to past time.

This is particularly noticeable in the use of Article plus Participle as head of a Noun Phrase referring to the agent or patient of some action. A test case of this is in Mark 5:15 and 16 where the demon-possessed man is referred to using the Present Participle τοῦ δαιμονίζομενον, linking anaphorically with 5:2 διθρωμος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτω. Here, when the man is being identified by the newcomers and spoken about to others, he is referred to using a Present Participle (Imperfective Aspect) since he is the one they think of as “being demon-possessed”. The narrator appears to be using “echoic” language here, referring to the man in the terms the participants would have used, since the man is already healed. However, in verse 18, after his healing has been clearly established both to the
narrator’s audience and to the participants present, he is referred to by the Aorist Participle διαμινωσθεῖς, grammatically encoding Perfective Aspect where the demon possession is seen simply as an undifferentiated Event, matching a real life past event “the one who had been demon-possessed”.

Again in Acts 1:21 we find the phrase τῶν συνελθόντων referring to “those who were with us for the whole time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us”. Moule (1957:99) remarks that this is unusual and he would expect the “linear” Present Participle as in Acts 9:28. However the Participle and main verbs in 1:21 are Aorist, and all refer to a bounded event in the past, no longer happening at the time of speaking. Thus it is appropriate for the Aorist Indicatives to mark past time and Perfective Aspect, and for the Participle to mark Perfective Aspect, all being used for a past time event.

In Acts 9:28, the Present Participles marking Imperfective Aspect refer to events which did not precede but were concurrent with the events of 9:29 and thus actually occurred in Present time relative to the main verbs. The Imperfect Indicatives, similarly marking Imperfective Aspect, and also past tense, function as a setting to 9:30 where Paul is removed from the situation (Aorists). Thus here too the choice of Participle, though formally marking Perfective or Imperfective Aspect, is pragmatically related to real life relative time differences.

Similarly, where Participles are used adjectivally, Present (Imperfective Aspect) is regularly used to refer to an action concurrent in time with the Main verb, and Aorist (Perfective Aspect) to an action preceding the main verb, e.g. Mark 5:25 οὐδα εἶν ἄρσει αἷματός (Present) “having a flow of blood”, and 5:26 παθοῦσα ... δαπανήσασα ... μηδὲν ωφέλησθείσα ... εἰς τὸ χείρον ἐλθόσα (Aorists) “having suffered, having spent, not having improved, having got worse”. Since there is no choice between Present and Aorist Participles of εὑλ, one might argue that the Present Participle οὐδα does not encode Imperfective Aspect. However, I would interpret the lack of Aorist contrast as a reflection of the fact that “being” is regularly encoded as Imperfective Aspect due to its Aktionsart, since “being” is typically experienced by humans as durative and in process, i.e. the grammatical restriction in verbal forms relates to the semantics of the lexical item.

So whilst Greek morphology only marks Aspect in Participles, it regularly uses Perfective Aspect pragmatically to refer to events preceding the main verb, and Imperfective Aspect to refer to events concurrent with the main verb. Temporal relationships, like Aktionsart (the way an event occurs in real-life), do not determine Aspectual choice, but do apparently influence it.
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Chapter summary

There are many grammatical constructions in Greek which not only communicate information but also encode that such information is regarded as Hearer-old. Such grammatical constructions include "when" clauses, infinitives, passives and subjectless verbs, quotations, rhetorical questions, comparative clauses, and participles used adjectivally. In many instances these forms underspecify the scenario they refer to, such as leaving implicit the participants of an event scenario, since the writer assumed that the audience would be able to identify such implicit information by referring to their own mental scenarios.

The same constructions are used for all categories of Hearer-old information, whether it is Discourse-old or Discourse-new. Apart from the GIVEN situational category, all Hearer-old information which is Discourse-new is KNOWN unused or KNOWN inferable and can only be correctly understood if the audience has such information in their mental scenarios. Thus accurate exegesis depends on interpreting the text in the light of the original author and audience's scenarios, and accurate translation depends on ensuring that implicit Hearer-old information in the source text is either retrievable by the target audience from their own scenarios, or is made explicit.
Scenario theory states that words are tagged to concepts, and each concept is stored in a structured mental network of interrelated concepts. This chapter explores the way that the semantic structure of scenarios provides the conceptual basis for understanding lexical cohesion and lexical reference in the Greek texts of the New Testament. I give evidence that the vocabulary found in a given pericope is better explained by lexical cohesion at scenario level, rather than the narrower category of Louw and Nida’s semantic domains (1988). I also show how scenario theory explains several lexical patterns in Greek: the conjoining of lexical items with καὶ to form lexical doublets, the use and omission of lexical marking for contraexpectation, and the use or omission of lexical marking for verbs with causative meaning.

**Lexical cohesion and scenarios**

Lexical cohesion “refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text” (Baker, 1992:203). The lexicon is a key means of maintaining cohesion and coherence in a discourse. Use of lexical items from a single scenario cues the audience to the open scenario, providing both lexical cohesion and semantic coherence.

Lexical cohesion is typical of connected text (Callow, 1974:31). For example, the word ἁλιεύς “fisherman” occurs only five times in the New Testament, within three pericopes, and lexical co-occurrences with “fisherman” are charted below (glosses from Louw and Nida, 1988):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἁλιεύς</td>
<td>fisherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θάλασσα</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λίμνη</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δαμφιβάλλω</td>
<td>cast a fishnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βάλλω</td>
<td>throw</td>
<td>4:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλάω</td>
<td>let down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλάσσω</td>
<td>wash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαρίσσω</td>
<td>rip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δαμφιβληστον</td>
<td>casting-net</td>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>5:2, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγγα</td>
<td>catch</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:4, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵθες</td>
<td>fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:6, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νύξ</td>
<td>night</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπανάγγειον</td>
<td>put out to sea</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:3, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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πλοϊόνιον small boat - - 5:2
πλοῖον boat - - 5:3 (x2), 7 (x2), 11
μετόχος companion - - 5:7
κοινωνός partner - - 5:10

Every time fisherman occurs in the New Testament there is the co-occurrence of “lake”, “net”, and at least one activity involving nets.

Sometimes the word “fisherman” does not occur, but other vocabulary from this scenario is present, e.g. δίκτυον “fishnet” which occurs in three other New Testament pericopes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αἷμενος fisherman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θαλασσα lake</td>
<td>(4:18)</td>
<td>(1:16)</td>
<td>21:1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λίμνη lake</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμφιθάλλω cast a fishnet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βάλλω throw (cast)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:6 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλάω let down</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύρω pull</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλοῦω wash</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαρίσσω rip</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σταῖσσω split</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταρτίζω make adequate</td>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐμβαλλασσόν casting-net</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίκτυον fishnet</td>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>21:6, 8, 11 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγαθανία catch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰχθός fish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:6, 8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσφάγιον fish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφάξωn fish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:9, 10, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄλεεω catch fish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νῆε night</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπανάγω put out to sea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλοϊόνιον small boat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλοῖον boat</td>
<td>4:21, 22</td>
<td>1:19, 20</td>
<td>21:3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετόχος companion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινωνός partner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μισθωτός hired-worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So even where the word “fisherman” is not present, wherever “net” occurs the participants involved are indeed fishermen, and the vocabulary is clustered accordingly, including the place, activity and equipment for fishing.

In these pericopes, the time for fishing, night, is explicit 2/6 times, and elsewhere is implicit from the activities being pursued by day, viz. washing and mending the nets. In two cases colleagues are explicit lexically, and elsewhere are implicit by naming at least two people. Thus, from lexical co-occurrence, we can begin to reconstruct the New Testament scenario for “fishing”.

However, these collocations, consistent in the New Testament corpus, are not mirrored by Louw and Nida’s semantic domains (1988), as shown by their categories for some of the key “fishing” vocabulary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Louw and Nida gloss and category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αἷμενος fisherman</td>
<td>44.10 Animal Husbandry, Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλεεω catch fish</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμφιθάλλω cast a fishnet</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θαλασσα lake</td>
<td>1.70 Geographical Objects and Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λίμνη lake</td>
<td>1.72 Bodies of Water (1.69-78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, the naturalness of the lexical groupings found in the Greek text is only apparent to those whose cultures are similar. If in someone's culture all fishing is done by rod and line from the shore, then for that person nets and boats would not be part of the same semantic domain as fisherman. The relationship between concepts in a scenario is prototypical not essential, as Danove, quoting van Dijk (1977b:21), makes clear (1993b:81, note 21):

van Dijk ... clarifies that frames join concepts which are not essentially but typically related:

Conceptually, there is no immediate or essential relationship between the concept ‘table’ and the concept ‘cereal,’ nor between ‘soap’ and ‘water,’ or between ‘waitress’ and ‘menu.’ They are distinct and do not presuppose each other. Yet they are organized by the frames of ‘breakfast,’ ‘washing,’ and ‘restaurant’ respectively.

Thus, I argue, lexical cohesion of the Greek text must be evaluated in the light of the culture of the original author and audience, because lexical cohesion between words is not a fixed abstract relationship which holds true regardless of language or culture, but is culturally conditioned. Words show lexical cohesion in as much as they belong to the same scenario, and scenarios are formed in the brain through interaction within a particular culture.

Even reference depends on a shared scenario. For example in John 5:17-28 Jesus says “My Father is always at his work to this very day” and the Jews accuse him of blasphemy “calling God his own Father” (NIV). This charge of blasphemy depends on understanding “my Father” as referring to God. For the original audience, a “father who is always at work” in the context of the Sabbath (5:16) presumably evoked the Creation scenario and God’s work in relation to the world. The Old Testament “God” scenario also has a metaphorical link to “father” (Psalm 103:13, Proverbs 3:12). Thus they (correctly) interpreted Jesus’s words “my Father” to mean God.

Similarly in John 12:34 the crowd say “We have heard from the Law that the Christ will remain for ever, so how can you say, “The Son of Man must be lifted up”? Who is this ‘Son of Man’?” (NIV). The logic depends on the expectation that Christ and Son of Man are coreferential. The crowd argue that, if one is going to live for ever, and the other going to die, then Jesus must be using Son of Man to mean someone other than the Christ. If so, who? Jesus explains that they have not fully understood the prophecies of scripture: Christ is the Son of Man, and he will indeed die.
Scenario theory also highlights another aspect of lexical cohesion, the expected ordering of the lexicon in a narrative. Danove (1993b:234) defines the basic elements of a narrative as Scene (establishing the “story world”), Introduction, Movement, Climax (establishing possibilities, probabilities and necessities respectively), and Denouement (establishing consequences of necessities).

Comparing this to a script for a healing scenario for example, we would expect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>story world</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>possibilities</td>
<td>characters, illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>probabilities</td>
<td>opportunity of healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climax</td>
<td>necessities</td>
<td>healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denouement</td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td>results of healing, health, sight, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charting a healing miracle shows how the lexicon fits into this “healing” script in a prototypical order (relevant vocabulary bolded):

Mark 1:29-31

Scene - location
29b τὴν οἶκον Σίμωνος καὶ Ἄνθρωπος
the house of Simon and of-Andrew

Introduction - characters, illness
30a ἦ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα
the () mother-in-law of-Simon was-lying fevering

Movement - opportunity of healing
30b καὶ εἰδὼς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς
and straightway they-say to-him about her

Climax - healing
31a καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγερεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τὴν χειρὸς
and having-approached he-raised her having-seized the hand
καὶ ἄφηκεν αὐτὴν ὅ πυρετὸς
and left her the fever.

Denouement - results of healing
31b καὶ διήκόνει αὐτοῖς
and she-served them

Here we see that disease vocabulary occurs in the Climax as well as the Introduction, but in the Climax the disease goes away. Similarly healing vocabulary may occur in the Movement as well as in the Climax, but in the Movement it occurs with verb forms expressing healing as a wish, possibility or request. A request for healing is implicit in verse 30 as the reason for telling Jesus about Simon’s mother-in-law.

I suggest that charting New Testament miracles shows a consistent patterning of lexical items into semantic domains in line with the script of the New Testament Greek “healing” scenario. Even the few examples below show clearly that the prototypical script elements of the Climax, viz. touching and commanding, do not match a prototypical modern English “healing” script of doctors, medicines and operations, e.g.

Mark 1:29-31 1:40-45 2:1-12 3:1-6

Scene - location
(Γαλιλαίαν) Καφαρναοῦμαν
(Galilee) Capernaum

Introduction - characters, illness
πενθερὰ λεπτός παραλυτικὸς ἄνθρωπος
mother-in-law leper paralyzed-man person
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\( \pi\upsilon\rho\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma \) 
fevering 

\( \varepsilon\zeta\pi\rho\alpha\mu\mu\mu\varepsilon\nu\nu\eta\nu \) 
withered hand

**Movement - opportunity of healing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>λέγουσιν</th>
<th>λέγων</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>they-say</td>
<td>saying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| καθαρίσαι |
| to-purify |

| καθαρίσθητι |
| be-purified |

| \( \gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\nu\varepsilon \) |
| he-raised |

**Climax - healing**

**healer:**

| \( \alpha\phi\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu \) |
| left |

| \( \delta\upsilon\pi\rho\tau\epsilon\upsilon \) |
| the fever |

| \( \varepsilon\kappa\alpha\beta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\theta \) |
| was-purified |

| \( \gamma\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\eta \) |
| he-rose |

**healed:**

| \( \alpha\phi\iota\theta\lambda\delta\epsilon\upsilon \) |
| lef |

| \( \eta\ \lambda\epsilon\pi\rho\alpha \) |
| the leprosy |

| \( \varepsilon\kappa\alpha\beta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\theta \) |
| was-purified |

| \( \gamma\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\eta \) |
| he-rose |

**Denouement - results of healing**

**healer:**

| \( \varepsilon\mu\beta\rho\mu\sigma\alpha\mu\varepsilon\nu\sigma \) |
| having-warned |

| \( \varepsilon\xi\beta\alpha\lambda\varepsilon \) |
| sent-out |

**healed:**

| \( \delta\nu\rho\kappa\alpha\epsilon\upsilon \) |
| she-served |

| \( \kappa\pi\rho\upsilon\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu \) |
| to-announce |

| \( \varepsilon\xi\beta\alpha\lambda\varepsilon \) |
| he-went-out |

**onlookers:**

| \( \varepsilon\xi\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\eta \) |
| to-be-astonished |

| \( \alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\varepsilon\sigma\omega\sigma\nu \) |
| they-might-kill |

The above chart is of the first four healing pericopes in Mark (excluding exorcism). Together they build up the core of a prototypical New Testament healing scenario. Note that the Scene for these pericopes has explicit or implicit location, either geographical (Galilee, Capernaum) or physical (house, synagogue). The Introduction has either a generic noun (mother-in-law, person) with the disease referred to either by a participle agreeing with the noun (fevering, having withered hand) or by a noun referring explicitly to disease (leper, paralyzed man). The Movement has the sick person or others asking Jesus to heal, or the sick person being, or being brought, physically close to Jesus, creating an opportunity for healing. The Climax has either physical contact (touch, raise) or a command by the healer, followed by a statement of the healing. The Denouement may have the healer warning the healed not to spread the news, the healed person resuming normal life, or telling others about being healed, and the onlookers responding either favourably or unfavourably.
Occasionally, however, we find that elements of this scenario are omitted in the text, e.g.

Luke 7:11-15

Scene - location
11, 12 εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναϊν ... τῇ πόλῃ τῆς πόλεως
in town being-called Nain ... the gate of the town

Introduction - characters, illness
12b τεθνηκός μονογενῆς υἱὸς
dead only son

Movement - opportunity of healing
13 οὗτος αὐτὴν ὁ κύριος ἐσπαγγυλήθη
having-seen her [the mother] the Lord was-moved

Climax - healing
14 ἔμαθο τῆς σοφιᾶς ... καὶ εἶπεν, Ἡσυχία, ... ἐγέρθητε.
he-touched the bier ... and said, youth ... arise/be-raised

Denouement - results of healing
15a καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς καὶ ἔμαθεν, And sat-up the dead and began to-speak
15b καὶ ἔκλεψεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρί αὐτοῦ.
and gave him to-the mother of-him.
16 ἔλαβεν δὲ φῶς πάντας καὶ ἔδειξαν τῶν θεῶν ...
Took ... O fear/awe all and they-were-praising the God...
17 καὶ ἔξηλθεν δὲ λόγος οὗτος ἐν δαί τῇ Τουβαλ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ ...
and went-out the word this in whole the Judea about him ...

Here the actual healing is not lexicalized. The New Testament “healing” scenario includes the expectation that healing follows the healer’s command, and that the healed person will then revert to normal behaviour, so we should regard the healing as implicit. For some cultures however, dead being healed is not prototypical, but ghosts are, so a literal translation of ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς as “the dead man sat up” will access the ghost scenario and be understood not as the result of healing but of ghostly, demonic or paranormal activity where a corpse sits up and speaks. In such situations, I suggest that the healing may need to be explicit in translation, e.g. “The dead man came back to life. He sat up and began to speak.”

Compare the script for the New Testament “exorcism” scenario:

Mark 1:21-28

Scene - location
21 εἰς Καπερναούμ ... εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν
in Capernaum ... in the synagogue

Introduction - characters, illness
23 ἀνθρώπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκάθαρτῳ
person in spirit unclean

Movement - opportunity of healing
23-24 ἀνέκραζεν
hel-yelled

Λέγων, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοι ...
saying, What to-us and to-you ...
οἶδα σε τίς εἶ, ὅ δὲ γίνοις τοῦ θεοῦ.
I know you who you-are, the holy[one] of-the God

Climax - healing
25 ἔπετιμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός
rebuked him the Jesus

Λέγων, Φιμώθητι καὶ ἐξελθεῖ εἰς αὐτοῦ.
saying, Be-muzzled and come-out from him
26 καὶ ἀπαράξεν αὐτῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον
and having-shaken him the spirit the unclean
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καὶ φωνὴσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ
and having shouted with-shout big
ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ.
it-came-out from him

Denouement - results of healing
27 καὶ ἐκαμβίζθησαν ἁπαντες ...
and became-amazed all ...
28 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ὄκος αὐτοῦ ἐδέθη πανταχώθ...
and went-out the fame of-him straightway everywhere ...

There are some clear differences between the New Testament scenarios for “exorcism” and “healing”. In the Movement stage of the exorcism scenario, the person yells and shows opposition to Jesus (rather than requesting healing). Also the demonized person clearly states they know Jesus’s divine authority. In the Climax, Jesus rebukes the demon, and commands that it be muzzled and come out (rather than the man be healed). In the second part of the Climax there is vocabulary showing the demon’s opposition, shaking and shouting, before it leaves. The exorcist does not use touch (unlike the healer).

Charting all three exorcisms in Mark we find a similar pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark 1:21-28</th>
<th>5:1-20</th>
<th>9:14-29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene - location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καφαρναούμ</td>
<td>χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν</td>
<td>(implied by 9:9 base of mountain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capernaum</td>
<td>land of the Gerasenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναγωγὴν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synagogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction - characters, illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώπος</td>
<td>ἀνθρώπος</td>
<td>τὸν ἴλον μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>the son of-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ</td>
<td>πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ</td>
<td>πνεῦμα διαλοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit unclean</td>
<td>spirit unclean</td>
<td>spirit dumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement - opportunity of healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνέκραζεν</td>
<td>κράζεις</td>
<td>συνεσταραζέων αὐτῶν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he-yelled</td>
<td>having-yelled</td>
<td>convulsed him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πέσιῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having-fallen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκκυλεῖτο ἀφόβων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was-rolling foaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγων</td>
<td>λέγει,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saying</td>
<td>he-says</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τί ἰθέν καὶ σοι</td>
<td>Τί ἐμολ καὶ σοι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to-us and to-you</td>
<td>What to-me and to-you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἱμάδ σε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>ὁ λεγομένου θεοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the holy of the God</td>
<td>son of the God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climax - healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπετίμησεν</td>
<td>ἐπετίμησεν</td>
<td>rebuked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebuked</td>
<td>rebuked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγων</td>
<td>λέγειν</td>
<td>λέγων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saying</td>
<td>he-was-saying</td>
<td>saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλοδέῃ</td>
<td>Φιλοδέῃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be-muzzled</td>
<td>Be-muzzled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔξελθε</td>
<td>ἔξελθε</td>
<td>ἔξελθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come-out</td>
<td>come-out</td>
<td>come-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρεκάλει</td>
<td>besought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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These Marcan exorcism pericopes show, in the Movement section, that the demons knew Jesus’s identity, cf. Mark 1:34 where Jesus stopped the demons speaking because they knew his identity. (In Mark, only the dumb spirit, 9:14-29, does not state who Jesus is.) They show, in the Climax section, that exorcism is prototypically performed by a command to the demon(s) to get out, the technical term being ἐπετίμησεν “rebuked” (or ἔζησεν “cast out” 1:34). They also show, especially in the Movement and Climax sections, that exorcism was typically met by temporary resistance on the part of the demon. This matches Guelich’s observations (1989:55) that Mark 1:23-28 “reflects the classic exorcism form of encounter (1:23), defense (1:23b-24), command to depart (1:25), exorcism (1:23), and reaction of bystanders (1:27).”

In contrast, in “healing” pericopes those healed are open and receptive to healing, the healer often touches as well as commands, and prototypically healing is immediate. Thus lexical patterns suggest a marked difference between the New Testament scenarios for “exorcism” and “healing.”
Louw and Nida’s semantic domain 53K Exorcism (1988) only has two entries, 53.102 ἔκβαλλω (Mark 1:34) and 53.103 ἔξορκιστής (not in Mark’s exorcism pericopes), and omits ἐπτυτιμῶ and πνεῦμα. So the vocabulary specified by Louw and Nida as belonging to this semantic domain does not match the textual collocations. I suggest that using lexical collocation (together with Hearer-old marking) to determine scenarios, and then relating semantic domains to scenario theory, would prove a more useful tool in the analysis of New Testament semantics.

The consistent patterning of lexical collocation in the above texts suggests that it is the use of vocabulary from a single scenario which produces lexical cohesion and provides semantic coherence. There are many types of relationship between such lexical items, corresponding to the types of links within scenarios described in Chapter 2. Some of the lexical items so linked would be part of the same semantic domain as classified by Louw and Nida (1988). Others would not, since the semantic relationships within scenarios are more far reaching than simply semantic domain. Examples of the semantic relationships which are stored in scenarios, both those within the same semantic domain and those not, are given below.

Semantic relationships within the same semantic domain:

Semantic relationships between items in the same semantic domain correspond closely to relationships identified in traditional lexical semantics, such as synonyms, antonyms and hyponyms (Crystal, 1997:105). For example, Cruse (1986:73) lists the following “meaning-relations” within a single semantic field: opposites, part-whole, coordinate parts, and superordinate-hyponym. Similarly, Louw and Nida (1988) cluster items into semantic domains in terms of “the number and type of shared semantic features” thus including generic-specifics and part-whole relationships and also antonyms which “often share a number of semantic features and only differ in polar values of positive and negative associations” (Nida and Louw, 1992:110). I suggest the following categories (glosses not word for word):

*specific-specific: specifics belonging to the same generic class, e.g.*

Luke 24:10

ἡ Μαγδαληνή Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου ...

Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the (wife) of James, ...

Matthew 15:19b

dιαλογισμοὶ πονηροί, φόνοι, μοιχεία, πορνεία, κλοπαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, βλασφημίαι.

thoughts, evils, murders, adulteries, immoralities, thefts, false-testimonies, slanders

cf. Mark 7:21-22, 2 Corinthians 12:20, Galatians 5:19-21, 1 Timothy 6:4-5

*specific-generic: specifics referred back to by a generic term, e.g.*

Luke 24:10

ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου

Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the (wife) of James, καὶ ἀλλοὶ κοίταζον αὐτὰς.

and the others with them
Philemon 1:24
Μάρκος, Ἀρισταρχος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συνεργοὶ μου
Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, the fellow-workers of me
Matthew 15:19-20a
διάλογοιων τοιούτω, φύσις, μοχθεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, βλασφημίαι.
thoughts, evils, murders, adulteries, immoralities, thefts, false-testimonies, slanders
παρά ταῦτα ἐστιν τὰ κοινωνία τῶν ἰδρυότων
These are the [things] corrupting the person
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generic-specific: generic followed by specifics of that class, e.g.
Luke 24:9, 12
tοῖς ἑνδεκα ... ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ...
the eleven ... Peter ...
Acts 13:1b
προφητεύει καὶ διδάσκαλοι ὁ τε Βαρνάβας καὶ Σιμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ, καὶ Λούκιος ...
prophets and teachers, Barnabas, Simeon the Black, Lucius...

part-whole: parts belonging to the same whole, e.g.
1 Corinthians 12:14-21
tὸ σῶμα ... ὁ ποίησις ... ὁ οἶχος ... ὁ διάθαλος ... ᾧ ἀκοὴ ... ἡ δοξήροισ ... ἡ κεφαλή ... the body (whole) ... the foot ... hand ... the ear ... eye ... the hearing ... the smelling ... the head
The items without the article occur in grammatical constructions indicating contrast.
Revelation 21:10b, 12, 19, 21
τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν ... τὰ τεῖχος ... τὰς πύλες ... οἱ θεμέλιοι τοῦ τεῖχους ... ἡ πλατεία ... the holy city (whole) ... wall ... gates ... the wall’s foundations ... the main street
The items without the article are qualified by “great and high” and “twelve” respectively, and since these attributes are not prototypical the items are not treated as Hearer-old, since that would imply that the audience already were aware of these attributes.

synonyms, e.g.
Luke 5:2, 3
πλοῖα ... τῶν πλοίων ...
boats
Luke 8:27, 29
dαιμόνια ... τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ
demons ... unclean spirit

corollaries, e.g.
Revelation 13:17
μὴ τῖς δώσῃ άγοράσαι ἢ πωλήσαι
buy, sell
Matthew 25:15, 16
ὁ ἰδρώκεν πέντε τάλαντα ... ὁ τὰ πέντε τάλαντα λαβὼν
give, receive
Semantic relationships in the same scenario but not in the same semantic domain:

The following semantic relationships correspond to prototypically related concepts within scenarios. They are therefore crucial for lexical cohesion, but are not generally recognized in classical lexical semantics.

vocabulary belonging to the same time-space-activity frame (linking times, places, participants and events), e.g.
times and related events,
Mark 1:21
τοίς σαββάσιν ... ἐδίδασκεν
on the sabbaths ... he-taught
1 Thessalonians 5:7
οἱ γὰρ καθέδρους νυκτὸς καθέδρους
the for sleeping at-night sleep

places and related events,
Mark 1:21
ἐλς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν
in the synagogue he-taught
Acts 8:27
προσκυνήσων ἐλς Ἰερουσαλήμ
[for]worshipping to Jerusalem

places and related participants,
Matthew 12:5
ὁ λεπτὸς ἐν τῷ λεπτῷ
the priests in the temple
Acts 16:19b
ἐλς τὴν ἁγορὰν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρχονται
in the market-place to the rulers (The law-courts were typically adjacent to the market-place.)

participants and related events,
Acts 14:12-13
δὲ τε λεπτοὺς τοῦ Διός ... ταῦτας ... στέμματα ... θύειν
the priest of Zeus (agent), bulls, wreathes (goal), sacrifice (event)
Acts 16:23-24
τῷ δημοφύλακα ... πρεσβύτευ ... ἐβάλεν ... τὴν φυλακήν ...τὸ ξύλον.
the jailer(agent), guard, threw (events), the cell, the stocks

vocabulary belonging to the sequential development of time-space-activity, e.g.
John 19:31, 20:1 (time)
παρασκευῇ ... ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ ...Τῇ δὲ μέσῃ τῶν σαββάτων ...
day of preparation, Sabbath, first day of the week
Acts 1:8 (space)
ἐν τῇ Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ [ἐν] πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ ἔως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.
Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, end of the earth
Luke 4:16, 17, 20 (activity)
ἀνέστη ἀναγνώσας ... ἐπεδέθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον ... ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον ἐδρευ ὁ τόπον ... πτύχας
to the book opened his eyes to the book opened his eyes to the book opened his eyes
το βιβλίον ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπέρτητο ἐκάθεν ... ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν
stand to read, receive scroll, unroll, find, (read), roll, hand back, sit, speak (i.e. teach)

vocabulary belonging to sequential stages of a script, e.g.
Matthew 27:59
λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ... ἐνέτυλεν αὐτῷ [ἐν] σινδόν καθάρῃ
take a corpse, wrap it in a shroud
vocabulary belonging to the sequential development of cause and effect, e.g.

Acts 1:18
πορεύεσθαι ἐλάκτησεν ... ἐξερήθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτῶν.
swell, burst open, bowels gush out

Acts 9:37
ἀσθενήσασαν ... ἀπόδανεῖν
sicken, die

vocabulary belonging to the sequential development of plot, i.e. problem and resolution,

e.g.
Revelation 3:17-18
τυφλὸς ... ἵνα βλέπῃς
blind, see

Revelation 3:17-18
γυμνὸς... ἵνα περιβάλη
naked, be clothed

vocabulary related metaphorically, e.g.

John 11:11, 13, 14
κεκοιμήθη... τοῦ θανάτου... τής κοιμήσεως τοῦ θανόν ... ἀπέθανεν
fall asleep, death, sleep, die

John 15:5, 8
τὰ κλήματα... μαθηταὶ
branches, disciples. As branches depend on the vine for sustenance, so the disciples must depend on Jesus.

I argue that scenario structure provides a framework which accounts for the lexical collocations found in New Testament pericopes, since scenarios are based on real-life co-occurrence, not theoretical classification, and provide semantic links between a much broader range of vocabulary than do semantic domains as classified by Louw and Nida (1988). This can be demonstrated by vocabulary found in “fishing” pericopes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louw and Nida classification</th>
<th>Scenario roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 Animal Husbandry, Fishing</td>
<td>FISHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Animal Husbandry, Fishing</td>
<td>event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Geographical Objects and Features</td>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Artifacts</td>
<td>location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Animals</td>
<td>instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Foods and Condiments</td>
<td>goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Foods and Condiments</td>
<td>result of event (food to eat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semantic domains are useful, so long as they are linked to scenario theory. For example, the “speak” scenario contains “hear”, “perceive” and “respond” as preceding elements in the script, since speaking is prototypically a response to something heard or perceived. Similarly, the “speak” scenario has “location change” and “physical
orientation” as prerequisites in the script, since (unless using modern communication devices) speaking to someone normally requires going to where they are, and facing them directly. Evidence was given in chapter 5 that prototypical preceding events in a script-type scenario are regularly encoded as Prenuclear Aorist Participles. This hypothesis is supported by ACCORDANCE data for occurrences of individual lexical items as Adverbial Participles with λέγω / εἶπον as the main verb, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical item</th>
<th>Prenuclear</th>
<th>Postnuclear</th>
<th>Prenuclear</th>
<th>Postnuclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δικτόνουμαι</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκούω</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 (2*)</td>
<td>0 (1*)</td>
<td>0 (1*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνώσω</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρχόμαι</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στρέφω</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Starred items are Participles found in the search but in nominal constructions.

The problem with such data is that the individual lexical items chosen for analysis may not be typical examples of the lexical items found in such a construction.

However, by sorting verbs into Louw and Nida’s Semantic Domains (1988), we can determine not only which verbs, but which semantic domains, collocate with certain Greek verbs within a given scenario. For example, searching Gospels and Acts (data from a search engine by M. B. O’Donnell):

| Semantic domains of Prenuclear Aorist Participles with λέγω as main verb. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Frequency                  | Percentage        | Domain               |
| 126/292                    | 43%               | (33) Communication   |
| 55/292                     | 19%               | (24) Sensory Events and States |
| 53/292                     | 18%               | (15) Linear Movement |
| 10/292                     | 3%                | (17) Stances and Events Related to Stances |
| 10/292                     | 3%                | (16) Non-Linear Movement |
| 7/292                      | 2%                | (28) Know            |
| 6/292                      | 2%                | (18) Attachment      |
| 5/292                      | 2%                | (85) Existence in Space |

Other domains <1% frequency.

These data show that the specific lexical items listed above are indeed representative of the semantic domains found in this construction, since Communication includes “respond”, Sensory Events and States includes “hear”, Linear Movement includes “location change” such as “come”, and Stances and Non-Linear Movement include “physical orientation” such as “turn”. Thus by using semantic domains to group lexical data one can make statistical observations which uphold or invalidate hypotheses based on the study of individual words.

Textual coherence and scenario mismatch

Although the use of vocabulary from a single scenario gives coherence to a text, in a translation, when the target audience does not share the same scenarios as the original audience, coherence may be lost, e.g. John 19:31, 20:1 “preparation, Sabbath, first of the week” (the time sequence is unclear), Acts 1:8 “Jerusalem, all Judea and Samaria” (the relative size and spatial position may be unclear), and Luke 4:16, 17, 20 “stood to read,
found place, sat down” (the sequence and significance of activities may be unclear. Did Jesus read? Why did he sit down?).

Consequently, English speakers experience problems in lexical cohesion and textual coherence when the Greek scenario is culturally or experientially distant. Vocabulary which for the original author was in one scenario or in linked scenarios seems to the reader of another culture to be unrelated or to refer to insignificant details.

For example, let us chart lexical items in the pericope of the woman with the issue of blood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αἷμα</td>
<td>bleeding</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄλμα</td>
<td>blood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:25, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάθημα</td>
<td>plague</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:29, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διπόθεμα</td>
<td>behind</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>5:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἅπτομαι</td>
<td>touch</td>
<td>9:20, 21</td>
<td>5:27, 28, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάκω</td>
<td>heal</td>
<td>9:21, 22 (x2)</td>
<td>5:28, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱάμα</td>
<td>heal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεραπεύω</td>
<td>heal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁγγέλλω</td>
<td>doctor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φοβηθείσα</td>
<td>fearing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρέμω</td>
<td>trembling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμβάνω</td>
<td>be hidden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλήλων</td>
<td>truth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, each Gospel relates several details which may seem irrelevant, or inconsistent with a healing story, since they do not belong to a Western healing scenario.

Matthew’s account seems to have two irrelevant details, “coming behind” and “touching the fringe”. However, Mark and Luke also mention “coming behind”, and each includes vocabulary quite inconsistent with the healing scenario, e.g. fear and trembling, telling the whole truth, not being hidden, declaring before all for what reason she had touched him. This vocabulary clearly belongs to a scenario which includes fear, trying to remain hidden, and trying to hide the reason for touching Jesus.

Also there is unusually frequent repetition of vocabulary which is expected within the New Testament healing scenario, i.e. the word touch. Matthew has “touch” twice (9:20, 21), Mark four times (5:27, 28, 30, 31), and Luke four times (8:44, 45, 46, 47). We know from the New Testament itself that healers regularly touched the sick at the time of healing, e.g. Matthew 8:3 (a leper), 8:15 (a woman with fever), 9:29 (two blind men). We also know there was a belief that if the sick merely touched the healer they would be healed, e.g. Matthew 14:36, Mark 3:10, 6:56, Luke 6:19.

Since sick people touching the healer to be healed was a normal element in the New Testament healing scenario, why is there so much repetition of the word touch? Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986) predicts that the speaker should only say the minimum necessary to be relevant, so one would expect prototypical material in the scenario to be left implicit, or mentioned once, but not repeated several times. Such repetition means that there must be some special significance of touching in this particular pericope.
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When we look beyond mere lexical frequency, we find that in Mark and Luke Jesus actually asks who has touched him, which the disciples think is a bizarre question as everybody is touching him. So again the issue of touch is highlighted in this pericope. Nowhere else in the Gospels does Jesus ask who touches him.

How does scenario theory apply here? We are now looking for a scenario, related to a woman who needs healing from an issue of blood, which includes fear, trying to remain hidden and hiding the truth, and where there is unusual stress on the fact of her touching Jesus. The answer, I suggest, is to be found in the link between the “woman’s issue of blood” scenario and the “ritual pollution” scenario. This link is explicit in Leviticus 15:25-30, especially verse 25 (NIV): “When a woman has a discharge of blood for many days at a time other than her monthly period or has a discharge that continues beyond her period, she will be unclean as long as she has the discharge, just as in the days of her period.”

In the New Testament Jewish context, the words “issue of blood” opened not only the “illness” scenario but also the “ritual-impurity” scenario. So the vocabulary such as “came behind”, “fear and trembling”, “hiding” etc., which at first glance seems unrelated to illness and healing, is in fact expected vocabulary in the “ritual-impurity” scenario, which was opened by the “issue of blood” scenario through a causal link. This also explains why the word “touch” is repeated. In this pericope “touch” is not an expected item in the “healing” scenario, but an unexpected item in the “ritual impurity” scenario.

Here is a woman who due to her illness is ritually-impure, so she approaches Jesus from behind so as to remain “hidden”, touches the edge of his cloak so that he would not even feel her touch, and hopes to get away before anyone knows the dreadful truth, that she, a ritually-impure woman, has just polluted not only large numbers of the crowd, but also the healer himself. When Jesus asks, “Who has touched me?” she fears the worst - Jesus knows. So she admits everything, in fear and trembling expecting the wrath of Jesus and of the crowd. But it’s OK. “Go in peace” says Jesus (Mark 5:34, Luke 8:48).

Why is Matthew’s version so truncated compared to Mark’s and Luke’s? Probably because, as Relevance Theory predicts, you do not tell people what they know. If Matthew was indeed written primarily for a Jewish readership (Davies and Allison, 1988:33), they would not need to be told of the emotions coursing through this woman’s mind as she approaches Jesus from behind and touches the edge of his cloak. Those facts show her desire to stay unnoticed, and the reason is obvious given her condition.

Mark and Luke’s audiences could be expected to be familiar with Jewish purity laws, just as white English are familiar with Muslims fasting in Ramadan. However this would be an impersonal knowledge, filed in an “other people’s world view” scenario rather than a “my own emotions” scenario. So Mark and Luke build up the emotions of the ritual-impurity scenario by using specific lexical items, whereas Matthew “said” all that merely by opening the “ritual-impurity” scenario by the words “woman with bloodflow”.
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Similarly the lexical co-occurrences with “leprosy” show a link to ritual impurity which does not match the modern English scenario for leprosy as a disease. Charting the leprosy episodes in parallel texts shows religious rather than medical vocabulary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPISODE</th>
<th>Matt. 8:1-4</th>
<th>Mark 1:40-45</th>
<th>Luke 5:12-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λεπτός</td>
<td>leper</td>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>1:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέπτοσ</td>
<td>leprosy</td>
<td>8:3</td>
<td>1:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁπτομαι</td>
<td>touch</td>
<td>8:3</td>
<td>1:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἑαυτός / σῶνσι</td>
<td>heal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαρίζω</td>
<td>purify</td>
<td>8:2, 3 (x2)</td>
<td>1:40, 41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαρισμός</td>
<td>purification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λεπτός</td>
<td>priest</td>
<td>8:4</td>
<td>1:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσφέρω</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>8:4</td>
<td>1:44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the same elements occur in each passage. Note also that, excepting the initial noun opening the scenario (leper Matthew 8:2, Mark 1:40, leprosy Luke 5:12), all the nouns in the Greek text, i.e. leprosy, purification, priest, have the article, since they refer to a Hearer-old item in an open scenario, that of leper.

However, Louw and Nida’s semantic domains (1988) do not account for this collocation, since the key lexical items are categorized in different domains, such that καθαρίζω may belong either in category 23 as a medical term, or in 53 as a religious term, but not both senses at once, and λεπτός is in a different semantic domain from λεπτός:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Louw and Nida category and gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λεπτός</td>
<td>leper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέπτοσ</td>
<td>leprosy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαρίζω</td>
<td>a make clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαρισμός</td>
<td>purification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λεπτός</td>
<td>priest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that Louw and Nida are trying to categorize semantic domains as if they were objective realities (hence classifiable according to modern Western categories), rather than based on scenarios (hence subjective, culture-dependent, and language-specific).

Perhaps, one might argue, these collocation patterns do not indicate underlying scenarios but are simply due to Matthew and Luke using Mark as a source (Nolland, 1989:xxix-xxxi and 225-226). However, compare the other leper passages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λεπτός</td>
<td>leper</td>
<td>10:8</td>
<td>11:5</td>
<td>4:27</td>
<td>7:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθαρίζω</td>
<td>purify</td>
<td>10:8</td>
<td>11:5</td>
<td>4:27</td>
<td>7:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λεπτός</td>
<td>priest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wherever a leper is healed in the New Testament, the verb purify is used, and in every pericope about lepers priests are mentioned. This lexical collocation matches what is known historically about leprosy in the Jewish worldview, as detailed in Leviticus 14:1-32. The fact that all references to priests are arthrous fits my theory that Discourse-new items...
belonging in Discourse-old scenarios are normally referred to using the Hearer-old marking, the article. Thus the priest referred to is not any old priest, but the priest who belongs in the leprosy scenario, i.e. the priest on duty at the temple in Jerusalem. The fact that “purifying” included healing is shown by Luke 17:14, 17 where ordinary healing vocabulary is also used. (The only New Testament references to leper or leprosy where “purify” is not mentioned are Matthew 26:6 and Mark 14:3 in the name “Simon the leper”.)

A third example of lexical collocation based on a specific source-culture scenario is between reclining and eating, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical item and verse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνανακείμαι</td>
<td>recline with</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δάνευμα</td>
<td>recline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατακείμαι</td>
<td>recline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άνακλημα</td>
<td>recline</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διανείμεθαι</td>
<td>recline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δείπνον</td>
<td>feast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12, 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δρόματα</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δρόμος</td>
<td>bread</td>
<td>17,19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάγει</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>16,20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐσθήλω</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21,26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρίσιμον</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For many cultures, however, reclining is not part of the eating scenario, but belongs in the scenario for resting. In contrast, sitting on chairs at tables or sitting cross-legged on the floor may be part of the “eating” scenario.

In general, there is no focus in the New Testament text on the fact that people reclined for eating, rather than sat. So usually, one might simply translate “sat” rather than specify “reclined”. This avoids introducing a culturally peculiar element, which being unusual would seem to the hearers to be significant to the plot, whereas in fact it has no bearing whatever on the story’s development. In such cases, it may be better to ignore the scenario mismatch rather than skew the focus of the passage.

Occasionally, however, due to scenario mismatch, it is essential to make reclining explicit in translation to avoid misunderstandings and particularly sexual innuendo, e.g. John 12:1-3. If Jesus is visualized by the hearers as sitting on a chair at a table (cf. TEV “sitting at the table with Jesus”), then Mary must be on the floor under the table wiping his feet with her hair. If Jesus is visualized by the hearers as sitting cross-legged, then Mary’s head is right against his genitals. In such cases the mismatch of scenario must be made explicit and made “normal”, e.g. “reclined to eat according to the custom”. Otherwise the hearers will attribute some motivation which is culturally appropriate to themselves, e.g. the guests were ill or totally fatigued, or maybe already drunk, or just plain disrespectful.
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Textual coherence and metaphorically linked scenarios

Lack of coherence in a translation is especially common where two Greek scenarios are related by a metaphorical link. Some Greek metaphorical links are not English metaphorical links. Like Lakoff (1980), I maintain that metaphors are not usually isolated new imaginative linkings of different items, but clusters of metaphors linked by a central metaphorical link (e.g. English “time is money”). Thus two distinct scenarios may be linked metaphorically in a given language, and both scenarios are therefore open at the same time. Vocabulary from the metaphorical scenario is linked to a literal scenario in the author’s mind, but to a reader from another culture this vocabulary may appear unrelated.

For example, the vocabulary of John the Baptist’s teaching, Luke 3:7-9, fits the following English scenarios:

Snakes: vipers
Punishment: flee, wrath, repentance
Heredity: Abraham, father, children
Environment: stones
Orchard: axe, root, tree, fruit, cut down, throw into, fire

Using lexical analysis, we would expect John’s message to be about orchards, yet, according to Luke 3:3, he preached “a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins”. This seeming mismatch of vocabulary and scenarios is explained by a metaphorical link between two scenarios in New Testament Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Literal Refs</th>
<th>Metaphorical Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“orchard owner”</td>
<td>“God”</td>
<td>Luke 3:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orchard owner</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>God’s people, the Jews, the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axe</td>
<td>Luke 3:9</td>
<td>punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chop down</td>
<td>Luke 3:9</td>
<td>punish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throw in fire</td>
<td>Luke 3:9</td>
<td>cast into eternal torment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>Luke 3:9</td>
<td>eternal torment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“trees and fruit”</td>
<td>“people and actions”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tree</td>
<td>Luke 3:9</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>Luke 3:8,9</td>
<td>deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good fruit</td>
<td>Luke 3:9</td>
<td>good deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td>bad deed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to this metaphorical link between the “God” scenario and the “orchard owner” scenario, Luke 3:9, “every tree not producing good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire” means “every person who does not do good deeds is punished by God and cast into eternal torment”. These two metaphorically linked scenarios explain many seeming inconsistencies between topic and vocabulary. However, where the audience does not share the same metaphorical link between scenarios, the result is a lack of coherence and possibly total failure to understand the text.

Other passages using the metaphorical “orchard owner” = “God” scenario include Luke 6:43-45 “No good tree bears bad fruit…” (where the metaphor’s meaning is made explicit “The good man brings good things out of the good stored up in his heart…”), Luke 23:31 “For if men do these things when the tree is green, what will happen when it is dry?” (the green tree is the good person, the dry tree the bad person due for punishment), and
Matthew 15:13 “Every plant that my heavenly Father has not planted will be pulled up by the roots” (such a plant is a person who does not belong among God’s people, uprooting is punishment).

The significance of metaphorically linked scenarios is also evident in Luke 3:17, where John again talks about God’s wrath, but this time using the “farmer” metaphor. Note that the metaphorical meaning is nowhere explicit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Literal Refs.</th>
<th>Metaphorical Refs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“farmer”</td>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>“God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>God’s people, the Jews, the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fan</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleanse</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gather into barn</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>keep in eternal bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barn</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>eternal bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burn in fire</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>cast into external torment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>eternal torment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>good person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaff</td>
<td>Luke 3:17</td>
<td>bad person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many other metaphors used which are part of larger metaphorical scenarios, e.g. Matthew 15:26 “it is not right to take the children’s bread and toss it to the dogs” is to be understood in terms of the metaphorical link between the scenarios for “father” and “God”, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Literal Refs.</th>
<th>Metaphorical Refs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Father”</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>“God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master</td>
<td>Matt. 15:26</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bread</td>
<td>Matt. 15:26</td>
<td>God’s blessings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td>Matt. 15:26</td>
<td>God’s people, the Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogs</td>
<td>Matt. 15:26</td>
<td>gentiles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Elsewhere “dogs” frequently refers not to gentiles per se, but to wicked people, who do not belong among God’s people, e.g. Matthew 7:6, Philippians 3:2, Revelation 22:15.)

Where such metaphors give wrong meaning or no meaning in the target language, the translator will need to make the literal meaning clear, either by using similes and clarifying the point of similarity, substituting a target language metaphor or simile with the same meaning, or simply making the literal meaning explicit. Metaphors are only part of the form of the message (which is always changed in translation), not the meaning of the message (which should not be changed).

Louw and Nida (1988) try to deal with metaphorical uses by assigning certain words to two semantic domains, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Louw and Nida category and gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ποιμήν</td>
<td>a shepherd 44.4 44 Animal Husbandry, Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάρτυς</td>
<td>b minister 53.72 53 Religious Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποιμήν</td>
<td>a flock 4.28 4 Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάρτυς</td>
<td>b follower of Christ 11.31 11 Groups and Classes of Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This classification, however, treats these words as isolated one-off metaphors. Since Louw and Nida classify neither the literal uses (shepherd, flock) nor metaphorical uses (minister, follower of Christ) in the same semantic domain, they obscure the fact that these metaphors are due to a metaphorical link between the whole scenarios of “shepherd” and “religious leader”. Thus they effectively misclassify at least one item:
Despite their own comment “in its only New Testament occurrence, a figurative reference to Christ”, in their semantic domain analysis they give no classification of ἀρχιπολίτης other than agricultural! I suggest that scenario theory, with its metaphorical links between whole scenarios rather than just individual concepts, accounts for the use of such shepherd vocabulary in a religious context.

A metaphorical link, linking many elements in parallel scenarios, may be very extensive. For example, in New Testament Greek the scenarios of religious leader and shepherd are joined by a complex metaphorical link as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIO</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>IMAGE</th>
<th>SIMILARITY</th>
<th>Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agent 1</td>
<td>religious leader</td>
<td>ποιμήν shepherd</td>
<td>carer</td>
<td>John 10:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>καλός good</td>
<td>good carer</td>
<td>John 10:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event 1</td>
<td>take authority</td>
<td>ελέησσωμεν enter</td>
<td>gain access</td>
<td>John 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>body of believers</td>
<td>αἱλή sheepfold</td>
<td>protection</td>
<td>John 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>divine authority</td>
<td>θύρα door, gate</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>John 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event 2</td>
<td>speak to individually</td>
<td>φιλεῖμα call by name</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>John 10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event 3</td>
<td>guide spiritually</td>
<td>ἐξάγω lead</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>John 10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event 4</td>
<td>look after</td>
<td>βοσκῶ tend, feed</td>
<td>supply needs</td>
<td>John 21:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal 2-4</td>
<td>disciples</td>
<td>προβάτα sheep</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>John 10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event 5</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>προβάτα sheep</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>John 10:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefitave</td>
<td>disciples</td>
<td>γινώσκω know</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>John 10:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal 6</td>
<td>disciples</td>
<td>προβάτα sheep</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>John 10:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

agent 2  false teacher  κλέπτης thief | destructive | John 10:1 |
| event 1  | harm            | μισωτός hirelling | destructive | John 10:12 |
| event 2  | harm            | κλέπτω steal     | harm       | John 10:10 |
| event 3  | harm            | θω kill          | harm       | John 10:10 |
| goal 1-3 | disciples       | προβάτα sheeps   | dependent  | John 10:8  |
| event 4  | abandon         | ἀφίνωm abandon  | abandon    | John 10:12 |
| goal 4   | disciples       | προβάτα sheep    | dependent  | John 10:12 |
| event 5  | save oneself    | φεύγω flee       | save oneself | John 10:12 |
| event 6  | not caring      | φεύγω no matter | does not care | John 10:12 |
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| agent 5 | people | προβάτα sheep | dependent | Matt. 9:36 |
| attribute | leaderless | no ποιμήν shepherd | vulnerable | Matt. 9:36 |
| attribute | vulnerable | not ἀπράξις savage | vulnerable | Matt. 7:15 |
| attribute | vulnerable | as προβάτα sheep | vulnerable | Matt. 10:16 |
| event 2 | be deceived | πλανώ | lead astray | “led astray” | 1 Peter 2:25 |

Metaphors are difficult to interpret when the audience does not share the same metaphorical links between scenarios as the speaker. A possible New Testament example is the parable of the Sower where seed represents God’s Word (Matthew 13:3-9, Mark 4:3-9, Luke 8:5-8). Although Jesus apparently explained all the parables to his disciples (Mark 4:34), only this parable is recorded along with its explanation in all the synoptics (Matthew 13:18-23, Mark 4:14-20, Luke 8:11-15). Irrespective of arguments concerning authenticity, it is clear that the explanation as recorded in the synoptics should have communicated clearly to the audiences of the Gospel writers, since it uses religious vocabulary typical of the Epistles (see Nolland, 1989:382-383). Perhaps the Gospel writers specifically included the explanation of this parable because the underlying metaphor was not familiar to their target audiences. The metaphor of seed representing God’s word is not a strong Old Testament theme. A possible example is Jeremiah 23:28 “‘Let the prophet who has a dream tell his dream, but let the one who has my word speak it faithfully. For what has straw to do with grain?’ declares the Lord”. Similarly, seed and God’s word both occur in Isaiah 55:10-11, but the explicit comparison is between rain and God’s word. Guelich (1989:222) also notes a parallel in 4 Ezra 9:31 where “the seed represents the Law that is sown in God’s people that will bring forth fruit”.

Metaphors, then, clearly show that scenario links are culture specific. Exegesis of metaphors must be done in the light of the original audience’s culture and scenarios, not one’s own. As with all text, the translator must be prepared to change the original form of the metaphor if necessary, to ensure that the original meaning is accurately conveyed.

Even when a metaphor is part of the target audience’s scenario structure, there may be misunderstanding due to ambiguity in the context, causing the audience to search for the referent in the scenario appropriate for the literal sense, rather than the scenario appropriate for the metaphorical sense. In this case, it is not that the audience automatically searches for a non-metaphorical referent first, but that the audience’s mind is already focussed on the scenario where the non-metaphorical referent is to be found.

An example is “leaven”:
Orατε καὶ προσεχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.
Watch-out and beware from the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees
Jesus was referring to the “morality” scenario where leaven is a metaphor for “evil”. He expected that the context would be clear to the disciples, since he had just called the Pharisees and Sadducees “a wicked and adulterous generation” (Matthew 16:1, 4).
However, the disciples searched for the referent in the “bread” scenario, since they had forgotten to bring any (Matthew 16:5). Since words which can have a metaphorical meaning can belong in two different scenarios, any context where both scenarios are open may result in the audience being confused by the apparent ambiguity or misinterpreting the text.

This misunderstanding of metaphorical language is a feature in John’s Gospel. Again, the problem is not an inability to understand the metaphor per se, but a failure to identify the correct context, i.e. the open scenario focal in the speaker’s mind, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Jesus’s meaning</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αυωβεν</td>
<td>John 3:3</td>
<td>born from above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>το θεο το ζαν</td>
<td>John 4:10b</td>
<td>life giving spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρεσιν</td>
<td>John 4:32</td>
<td>source of strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these examples, Jesus’ focal scenario was a religious one, but the scenario chosen by the audience was a secular, human, physical one. Since Jesus was acknowledged as a religious teacher, it was reasonable for him to expect his audience to assume he was speaking about religious matters. Had the correct scenario been identified, the meaning of the metaphor would have been clear, as shown by the following examples where the religious context was explicit and there was no misunderstanding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αυωβεν</td>
<td>John 3:31</td>
<td>from heaven</td>
<td>earth, heaven</td>
<td>John 3:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεατος ζωτος</td>
<td>John 7:38</td>
<td>Holy Spirit (7:39)</td>
<td>scripture (Isaiah 58:11)</td>
<td>John 7:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρεσιν</td>
<td>John 6:27</td>
<td>source of strength</td>
<td>Son of Man, eternal life</td>
<td>John 6:27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another type of link between scenarios is the link between the name of a person and the meaning of that name. I classify this as a metaphorical link, because it presupposes a relationship between the meaning of a name and the character, significance, or behaviour of the person so named. This link is common in the Old Testament (e.g. Genesis 3:20, 4:1, 4:25), being made explicit in 1 Samuel 25:25 “as his name, so is he”, and also occurs in the New Testament. In many cases the New Testament makes the significance of the name explicit in the following co-text, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Meaning, Ref</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>(Link) Character / Significance / Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>Matt. 1:21</td>
<td>God saves</td>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>(for) he will save his people from their sins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Matt. 16:18</td>
<td>rock</td>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>(and) on this rock I will build my church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td>Luke 16:20</td>
<td>God helps</td>
<td>16:25</td>
<td>he is consoled here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabas</td>
<td>Acts 4:36</td>
<td>encourager, 4:36</td>
<td>4:37</td>
<td>gave generously to the common fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onesimus</td>
<td>Phm. 1:10</td>
<td>useful</td>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>(the one) once useless ... but now useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchizedek</td>
<td>Heb. 7:1</td>
<td>just King, 7:2</td>
<td>7:1-2</td>
<td>gave blessing, received honour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Matthew 1:21, the semantic link between the name Jesus and his role as saviour is marked grammatically by γάρ (Hagner, 1993:19). Since Jesus is the Greek form of the Hebrew Joshua “which by popular etymology was related to the Hebrew verb ‘to save’ ... and to the Hebrew noun ‘salvation’ ... the saving character of Jesus (cf. 8.25; 9.21-2; 14.30; 27.42) is aptly evoked by his name” (Davies and Allison, 1988:209). The significance of this verse is underlined by the first of Matthew’s “formula-quotations” in 1:22-3 “The virgin will be with child ... they will call him Immanuel” - which means “God with us”. Moule argues that Matthew’s main use of such formula-quotations is merely “prediction-verification” by which “it could be proved that Jesus was Messiah by his performance of some obscure detail deemed to be a prediction about the Messiah” (1967-68:297). Nevertheless this prediction-verification only works if the meaning of both names is taken into account, since “God saves” and “God with us” can be seen as equivalent whereas Jesus and Immanuel as mere names cannot.

In Matthew 16:18, the semantic link between the name Peter and his role is marked grammatically by coordination καλί, and the anaphoric pronoun in ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρα “on this rock”. This link relies on the similarity in form and meaning between Greek Πέτρος “Peter” (cf. πέτρος “stone”), and πέτρα “rock”. The name Peter was probably thought of as the Greek equivalent of the Aramaic Kephas (Arndt and Gingrich, 1979:654, cf. John 1:42). Here the juxtaposition of Πέτρος and πέτρα seems to be deliberately used “to make a theological statement” (Davies and Allison, 1991:625-628) that Peter is “the ‘rock’ upon which Jesus the Messiah will build his community” (Hagner, 1993:470). The existence of word-play does not, unfortunately, clarify the referent of πέτρα, which may refer to Peter’s confession not Peter himself (Caragounis, 1990:57, 119).

Lazarus in Luke 16:20 is the only character in a parable to be named. A possible connection with Lazarus in John 11:44 is speculative (Fitzmyer, 1985:1129). However, since this name is a Greek form of the Hebrew or Aramaic Eleazar, meaning “God helps/has helped” it is “a fitting name for the beggar in this parable, who was not helped by a fellow human being, but in his afterlife is consoled by God” (Fitzmyer, 1985:1131, cf. Nolland, 1993a:828), i.e. Lazarus represents the stereotypical helpless man, in need of God’s help. This interpretation makes sense, since in a parable one expects not named individuals but social stereotypes (English Fairy Stories also use meaningful names, e.g. Prince Charming, Cinderella, Snow White, Beauty and the Beast).

The names Barnabas (Acts 4:36) and Melchizedek (Heb. 7:1) are translated into Greek in the text, emphasizing that their meaning, not just their phonological form, is significant. And the name Onesimus (Philemon 1:10), meaning “useful” (Arndt and Gingrich, 1979:570), is joined grammatically to its meaning by the article ὁ ὁνήσιμον, τὸν ποτὲ σοι ἄξιος τοῦν ὑνι δὲ [καὶ] σοι καὶ ἐμοι ἐξηρμηνεύσων “Onesimus, the [one] once useless to you, but now useful [both] to you and to me”. Here the word-play depends
on the juxtaposition of words involving “synonymity and antonymity” (Caragounis, 1990:56).

The following may also be implicit references to a name’s meaning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Meaning, Ref</th>
<th>Character / Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus</td>
<td>Luke 1:3</td>
<td>God-lover</td>
<td>Luke 1:4 know ...you have been taught (Nolland, 1989:29-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Acts 13:9</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>Acts 22:4 persecuted the Christian church, 1 Cor.15:9 least ... because I persecuted (so Augustine, see Barrett, 1994:616)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syzygus</td>
<td>Phil. 4:3</td>
<td>yoke-fellow</td>
<td>Phil. 4:3 loyal... help (O’Brien, 1991:480, contrast Fee, 1995:393)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buth (1981:29-33) argues convincingly that the very form of the name Boanerges has been adapted by folk etymology to suggest Greek roots podv-epyes* “shout-workers” or “loud-voiced”, which matches aspects of their character shown in the references above.

Further evidence of the importance of the meaning of a name (as opposed to its sound) in New Testament Jewish culture is the fact that some Aramaic names are given in two forms, one transliterated according to Greek phonology, the other translated according to meaning, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aramaic name</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Greek translation</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabitha</td>
<td>Acts 9:36</td>
<td>Dorcas</td>
<td>9:36, 39</td>
<td>gazelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephas</td>
<td>John 1:42</td>
<td>Petros</td>
<td>Matt. 16:18</td>
<td>rock, stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In John’s Gospel, Jesus gives Simon the name Cephas at the beginning of his own ministry. Brown (1966:80) comments on this naming: “As is known from the Old Testament, the giving of a new name has a direct relation to the role the man so designated will play in salvation history (Gen. xviii 5, xxxii 28)”.

Where there is an explicit grammatical link between the name and its meaning, e.g. Matthew 1:21 and 16:18, a translation will need to make the meaning of the name explicit, otherwise the author’s intention of linking name to character, shown by the use of conjunctions to link the relevant clauses, will be lost.

This metaphorical link between an individual and the meaning of their name, is not to be confused with the non-metaphorical scenario for the individual item referred to by a name. A specific single referent of any name will of course have a scenario including information about that referent, but this is based on the referent per se, not the meaning of their name. For example, when Nathaniel says in John 1:46 “Can anything good come out of Nazareth?” it is clear that the Nazareth scenario includes people’s negative attitude to the place. But this attitude is directly related to the referent, not due to the meaning of the name.
Lexical doublets and scenarios

As already stated, Greek regularly identifies a scenario by mentioning its title, or one or more items belonging within the same scenario. Greek also appears to mark a scenario by the use of lexical doublets. These doublets consist of normal lexical items which separately refer to distinct concepts belonging in the same scenario, but their occurrence in a set order conjoined by καί “and”, using the co-occurrence link, marks that together they refer not to distinct concepts, but to a single scenario. I suggest, therefore, that the co-occurrence link may be used as evidence of a single scenario.

Lexical doublets with “thing” words

In New Testament Greek the words “flesh” and “blood” σαρκα καὶ αἷμα regularly co-occur in that set order, conjoined by καί “and”. It is clear that the meaning in these passages is not the two physical elements of flesh and blood, but the whole “human” scenario of people, humanity and embodied existence, e.g.

(NIV translations of σαρκα καὶ αἷμα bolded)

Matthew 16:17 “not revealed to you by man”
1 Corinthians 15:50 “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable”
Galatians 1:16 “I did not consult any man”
Ephesians 6:12 “our struggle is not against flesh and blood ... but . . . spiritual forces of evil”
Hebrews 2:14 “Since the children have flesh and blood, he too shared in their humanity”
(John 6:53-56 has the same words in close proximity and the same set order, but not linked by the co-occurrence link.)

A special instance of Greek lexical doublets is where two nouns occur in a set order, are conjoined by καί “and”, and take a single article. The Granville Sharp rule discusses a subsection of such doublets, where the nouns are singular, but not proper nouns (Porter, 1994:110):

Granville Sharp’s rule states simply that if a single article links two or more singular substantives (excluding personal names) the second and subsequent substantives are related to or further describe the first.

As Porter points out (ibid.), this rule has been widely misquoted by ignoring the exclusion of plurals and proper names, and by adding a spurious corollary, e.g. Carson (1989:84) quoting Brooks and Winberry (1978:70):

Sharp’s rule states: if two substantives are connected by καί and both have the article, they refer to different persons or things ...; if the first has an article and the second does not, the second refers to the same person or thing as the first. [bolding mine]

Carson, noting that this rule (as misquoted) is patently false, states his own view (1989:84):

If one article governs two substantives joined by καί, it does not necessarily follow that the two substantives refer to the same thing, but only that the two substantives are grouped together to function in some respects as a single entity. [bolding mine]

Carson gives the example 1 Thessalonians 2:12 τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν stating (1989:85):
we are not to understand that kingdom and glory are identical, but that “kingdom and glory” must be taken together as a package, in this case a package referring to the eschatological blessing comprehensively summarized by the two nouns in tandem.

I agree with Carson, and suggest that conjoined nouns with a single article always open up a single scenario which includes both concepts.

For example the Pharisees and Sadducees are mentioned together six times in the Gospels, all in Matthew. Only once do they have separate articles, where they are in different participant roles:

Matthew 22:34a
Ol δὲ Φαρισαίοι δικαίωσεν δτι ἐφήμωσεν τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους
In all other cases they are combined as a single group, members of the main religious sects of Judaism, functioning together in the same role as “opponents of Jesus”, e.g.

(referents bolded, evidence for combined role underlined)

Matthew 3:7 “generation of vipers”
Ἰδὼν δὲ πολλοῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα αὐτοῦ ἔπεεν αὐτοῖς, Γεννήματα ἔχειδοι

Matthew 16:1 “testing, asking for a sign”
Καὶ προσέκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαίοι καὶ Σαδδουκαίοι περιάκουσαν ἐπιρρήτησαν αὐτῶν σμείες ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιθετέροι αὐτοῖς

Matthew 16:6 “Beware the leaven”
Ὅταν καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

Matthew 16:11 “Beware the leaven”
προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

Matthew 16:12 “Beware the teaching”
ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

Carson (1984:85) cites Acts 23:7 as the only place this phrase τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων occurs outside Matthew. Here again, although the following text emphasizes the dissension between the groups, they are introduced together in the same scenario role as “council members”, referring back to 23:1 “the council”. This passage contains the only other New Testament occurrences of Pharisees and Sadducees in the same verse, i.e. 23:6 and 23:8, where the two groups are explicitly contrasted.

Similarly the scribes and the Pharisees are mentioned together 21 times in the Gospels. They are distinct in nature, one being an occupation, the other a religious sect, yet on three occasions, where there is emphasis on these people as the super-religious and hyper-legalistic types, they are conjoined:

Matthew 5:20 “unless your righteousness exceeds”
ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ βίων ἡ δικαίωσις πλείου τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων

Matthew 12:38 “we want to see a sign”
Τότε ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ τίνες τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων λέγοντες, Διδάσκαλε, θέλων ἀπὸ σοῦ σμείες ἢ βίος.

Luke 14:3 “Is it lawful?”
καὶ ἀποκρίθησαν ὁ Ἰσαάκ σιέν πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους λέγοντες, Τέλεστι τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύσαι ή γὰρ;

Matthew mentions scribes and Pharisees together in Matthew 23:2, 13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29, as two distinct but known groups “the scribes and the Pharisees”, e.g.

Matthew 23:2
Ἐν τῷ Μωσῆσι καθέθα ἠκόασαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαὶ. Φαρισαίοι.

Matthew 23:13
Ὅταν δὲ ἐδή, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίοι ὑποκρίναν 211
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One might have expected the scribes and Pharisees to be conjoined as a doublet with a single article in 23:2, since they are accused of the same sins. However, in Matthew 23:6 the Pharisees are accused separately, Φαρισαίες τυφλέ "Blind Pharisee," which suggests that the two groups are not being treated as an undifferentiated whole.

All other references to scribes and Pharisees are as two groups, either both anarthrous Φαρισαίοι καὶ γραμματεῖς, Φαρισαίοι καὶ νομοδιδασκάλοι (Matthew 15:1, Luke 5:17) or botharthrous. Here there is no set order for the two groups, i.e. Pharisees and scribes (Matthew 15:1, Mark 7:1, 7:5, Luke 5:17, 5:30, 7:30, 15:2), scribes and Pharisees (Luke 5:21, 6:7, 11:53).

The Pharisees are also mentioned with the Herodians (Mark 12:13, each noun with the article), and with the chief priests. In the latter case the order is always “the chief priests and the Pharisees” but both nouns have the article (Matthew 21:45, John 7:32, 11:47, 11:57, and 18:3) except for John 7:45 which has the one article τῶν δραχμείτων καὶ Φαρισαίων. This, I propose, can be explained by the anaphoric reference to 7:32 where the two distinct groups, in cooperation, send attendants to arrest Jesus, and here those attendants report back to their senders, now conceptualized as a single group since they function together as opponents of Jesus in this paragraph.

Similarly, in Mark 2:16, there is the phrase μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ δικαιών ἔσθελεί “he eats with tax collectors and sinners.” I propose that the conjoining of nouns with a single article means that the two nouns belong to one and the same scenario - here despised people who had broken Mosaic law and so were regarded as outside the covenant people of God. Note that here “tax-collectors” are a specific class within the generic term “sinners”. This same phrase occurs again with a single article in Matthew 9:11 and Luke 5:30, also with no article in Matthew 9:10, 11:19, Mark 2:15, Luke 7:34, and with each noun having the article in Luke 15:1 (where only the topic of “sinner” is developed in the following text). The only time the order is different is in Mark 2:16a, perhaps being a kind of chiasm with the order of the elements tax-collector, sinner and recline/eat, reversed in the middle line:

Mark 2:15-16
καὶ πολλοὶ τελωνηματίαι καὶ δικαιών συγκατέλαβεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ·
ὅτι γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ φιλοσόφους αὐτοῖς.
καὶ ὅτι γραμματέσσας τῶν Φαρισαίων ἔσθελεν ὅτι ἔσθελε μετὰ τῶν δικαιών καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ὡς μετὰ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ δικαιών ἔσθελεν:

I argue that, where this “article noun and noun” structure occurs, two distinct and separate entities or groups are conjoined, and thus they are presented by the author as filling the same role slot in the scenario. Typically this also implies that they fill the same role in the whole episode, e.g. John 7:45-53 where the chief priests and the Pharisees operate together as enemies of Jesus.

Carson (1984:85) also notes as examples of one article governing two nouns “the defence and confirmation of the gospel” (Phil. 1:7) and “the Epicureans and Stoics” (Acts 212
17:18). Again, it is clear that these conjoined nouns fill a single role within a single scenario.

As noted above, the specific semantic relationship between plural nouns conjoined in this way varies. Wallace (1983:59-84) notes the following categories: entirely distinct though united groups (e.g. Matthew 3:7, the Pharisees and Sadducees), overlapping groups (e.g. Luke 14:21, the poor and crippled and blind and lame), first group contained within the second (e.g. Matthew 12:38, the scribes and Pharisees), second group contained within the first (e.g. 1 Corinthians 5:10 the greedy and swindlers), and identical groups (e.g. John 1:40, those hearing John and following him).

There are several examples cited where two conjoined arthrous nouns appear to be doublets. Carson notes Revelation 2:26 καὶ ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ πιπρῶν as an example of a doublet, or in his words “a slightly cumbersome idiom to invest this obedient conqueror with a weighty label” (1984:84):

καὶ ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ πιπρῶν ἄξιον τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου,
And the[one] overcoming and the[one] keeping until end the works of-me
δῶμαι αὐτῷ ἑξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῶν θεῶν
I-will-give to-him authority over the nations

However, I do not analyse these as conjoined nouns, but as restatement, with the second καὶ in the sense of “that is to say” (cf. Matthew 21:5 “on a donkey, even on a colt”). The two noun phrases cannot refer to two individuals or classes, as shown by the singular pronoun αὐτῷ. If they referred to a single generic category of everyone who both overcomes and does Jesus’s works to the end, on the basis of the above observations one would expect a single article. Moreover, the two events listed are co-referential “He who overcomes, i.e. he who keeps doing my will to the end”.

Another similar example is quoted by Moule (1953:116):

In John XX.28 ὁ κυρίος μου καὶ ὁ θεὸς μου, it is to be noted that a substantive in the Nominative case used in a vocative sense and followed by a possessive could not be anarthrous ... the article before θεὸς may, therefore, not be significant,

Here, whether or not Moule’s rationale is sound, both terms clearly refer to the same individual, Jesus. The article before θεὸς argues against Thomas’s words being a simple doublet, as does the repetition of μου. Either, then, Thomas identifies Jesus with two separate concepts, my Lord (whom I obey) and my God (whom I worship), or this is, like Revelations 2:26, a restatement “My Lord, that is to say my God.” I argue that the repetition of the article shows that it cannot be a doublet, two words referring to the same scenario, “my (Lord and God)”.

Although lexical doublets can be clearly identified by the use of a single article for both conjoined nouns, anarthrous conjoined nouns may also be doublets. In this case, as with “flesh and blood”, the key grammatical criterion is one of fixed order. For example, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. “in Holy Spirit and fire” (Matt. 3:11, Luke 3:16, cf. Acts 2:3,
4), if it should be exegeted as “the fire of the Holy Spirit”, would be a doublet, the two nouns together opening a single scenario.

Similarly “joy and crown” may be a Greek doublet, like the English “pride and joy”. Certainly, 2 of the 4 occurrences of όρενανός in Paul’s Epistles occur after χαρά, and in a similar context, i.e.

Philippians 4:1 χαρά καλ. όρενανός μοι joy and crown of-me
I Thessalonians 2:19 τας γαρ ήμων έλεις ή χαρά ή όρενανός καυχήσεως

Who for of-us hope or joy or crown of-boasting

So Greek doublets, although clearly identifiable by the “article noun and noun” construction, may also be identified by the occurrence of nouns in a fixed order and conjoined by καλ. The difficulty in applying the fixed order criterion for New Testament studies is the relatively small corpus, but even so some doublets do seem likely, e.g.

rule and authority = scenario of (supernatural) powers
1 Corinthians 15:24 τας αρχην καλ τας έξουσιας καλ δύναμιν
Ephesians 1:21 τας αρχησ καλ έξουσιας καλ...
Ephesians 3:10 τας αρχας καλ τας έξουσιας
Ephesians 6:12 προς τας αρχας, προς τας έξουσιας, προς...
Colossians 1:16 ... εις αρχα εις έξουσιαν
Colossians 2:10 προς της αρχης καλ έξουσιας
Colossians 2:15 τας αρχας καλ τας έξουσιας
Titus 3:1 αρχας έξουσιας υποτάσσεσθαι

Variant textual reading (KLP 69 pl lat sy ?) αρχας καλ έξουσιας υποτάσσεσθαι

These nouns only co-occur in the same sentence 10 times in the New Testament, always in the same order. The other references are:

Luke 12:11 τας αρχας καλ τας έξουσιας (human authorities)
Luke 20:20 της αρχης καλ τη έξουσια του θεουμόνος (authority of a human leader)

The frequent occurrence of the single adjective “all” modifying the conjoined nouns (1 Corinthians 15:24, Ephesians 1:21, Colossians 2:10) also suggests an inclusiveness compatible with these conjoined nouns referring to a single scenario (cf. “many” modifying “tax-collectors and sinners” in Mark 2:15-16).

The absence of καλ in Titus 3:1 is intriguing, as it parallels absence of a conjoinder with doublets in languages such as Urdu and Parkari (see chapter 13), and could be another grammatical indication that a single scenario is being referred to, rather than two concepts which are linked together.

Some doublets are conjoined by τε καλ. There are 33 occurrences in Gospels and Acts, 24 with nouns, 6 with verbs, and 3 with adjectives. The nouns are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conjoined people:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men + women:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Acts 5:14, 8:12, 9:2, 22:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews + proselytes:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acts 2:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentiles + Jews:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acts 14:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentiles + kings:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acts 9:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chiefpriests + scribes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Luke 22:66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us + others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acts 15:9, Acts 21:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εστι + oneself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Luke 14:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### conjoined things:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terrors + signs</td>
<td>Acts 9:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day + night</td>
<td>Acts 24:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in all + everywhere</td>
<td>Acts 26:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### conjoined places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 21:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 9:24, 2:10, 26:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, all these conjoined items belong to the same scenario, but only a few probably count as true doublets, i.e. two lexical items referring to one and the same scenario. Perhaps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>men + women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews + proselytes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews + Greeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentiles + Jews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chiefpriests + scribes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrors + signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in all + everywhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customs + questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical doublets with “event” words

In New Testament Greek eating and drinking regularly co-occur in that order linked by καί “and”, regardless of whether the verb for eat is ἐσθίω, φάγω or τρώω, e.g. Matthew 11:19, 24:38, 49, Luke 5:30, 7:34, 10:7, 12:45, 17:8, 1 Corinthians 9:4, 10:7, 11:22, 11:29, 15:32. They also occur in the same order without a conjoining word (e.g. Luke 17:27, 28), linked by “or” (e.g. 1 Corinthians 10:31), and linked by “nor” (e.g. Acts 9:9, 23:12, 21). Apart from consistent word order in all these Greek examples, there are other indications which substantiate the claim that eat and drink are joined by a co-occurrence link and belong to the same scenario.

In Matthew 24:38 “eating” and “drinking” are conjoined by the co-occurrence marker “and”, likewise “marrying” and “giving in marriage” are conjoined by the co-occurrence marker “and”, but the two pairs are not linked by “and” (τρώγοντες καὶ πίνουτες, γαμοῦντες καὶ γαμίζουσιν). This shows a closer link between the paired items than between other items in the same list, i.e. that of co-occurrence.

In Luke 12:45 the use of the particle τέ in ἐσθίεις τέ καὶ πίνεις καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι links eating and drinking more closely together than with getting drunk.

In Mark 2:16b, an alternative reading, which is judged as not original, adds “and drinks” after “eats”. The immediately preceding co-text (2:16a) says “seeing that he eats with sinners and tax collectors” with no mention of drinking. Metzger, in A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament comments (1974:67):
The addition of καὶ πίνει is a natural accretion inserted by copyists, perhaps under the influence of the parallel passage in Lk 5.30.

I suggest that the accretion is “natural” because eating and drinking prototypically fill the same central activity slot in the “meal” scenario, certainly for those in the cultural setting of the text itself and probably for the copyist also.
In 1 Corinthians 11:22 the Greek ἐσθιεῖν καὶ πίνειν "for eating and drinking" has only one article applying to both verbs. This links the two separate infinitives as one concept.

Similarly, 1 Corinthians 11:29 ὁ γὰρ ἐσθιων καὶ πίνων "for the one eating and drinking" has two present participles “eating and drinking” both linked to the same article. This shows that both actions belong to one scenario, associated with that same person. (A parallel example of a single article conjoining participles for prototypically co-occurring events is John 5:24 ο ὁ λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με. Here again, this refers to a single category of person who both hears Jesus’s word and believes in God who sent him.

Events with semantic relationships other than co-occurrence may also be conjoined by “and” and marked as belonging to the same scenario, e.g.

**synonyms and near synonyms:**
Matthew 5:12 χαίρετε καὶ γαλαξάσθε rejoice and be glad
Luke 6:25 πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε mourn and weep

Synonymous examples could be regarded as doublets where two or more separate lexical items refer to the same concept.

Typically, however, the words clearly refer to different concepts within a single scenario:

**specific specific (from same generic type of event)**
Matthew 11:4 ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε hear and see (perception)
Luke 5:30 ἐσθιεῖτε καὶ πίνετε eat and drink (having meals)

**generic specific:**
Matthew 23:34 ἀποκτενεῖτε καὶ σταυρώσετε kill and crucify
Luke 6:35 ἀγαπάτε ... καὶ γαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δαιλίζετε love and do good and lend
cf. Matthew 10:5

**precondition and action:**
Matthew 26:41 γηρνορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε watch and pray
cf. Mark 14:38

**sequential actions:**
Mark 1:15 μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε repent and believe
Acts 3:13 παρεδόθητε καὶ ἠμησίασθε handed over and denied
cf. Acts 13:41

**problem and solution:**
Matthew 25:35 ἔπεινασα γὰρ καὶ ἐδόξασε μοι φαγεῖν hunger and feed
Matthew 25:35 ἔφυσα καὶ ἐποτίσατέ με thirst and give drink
cf. Luke 7:22

**cause and result:**
Matthew 7:7 αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν ask and it will be given you
Matthew 7:7 ἐρώτησε καὶ εὑρήσετε seek and you will find
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Some doublets for "events" are realized by nouns. As with "things" the order appears fixed, they are conjoined by καλ, but there may be separate articles for each item, e.g.

weeping and gnashing of teeth = scenario of anguish and suffering

Matthew 8:12 ἔκει ἐστιν δ' κλαυθμὸς καλ  ὁ βρυχυμὸς τῶν δόκων.
There will-be the weeping and the gnashing of-the teeth

Of the 33 occurrences of τε καλ in Gospels and Acts, 6 conjoin verbs and of these 4 mark doublets:

*doublets referring to a single scenario:*

Luke 12:45 ἐσθήσειν τε καλ πίεσιν to-eat and also to-drink (i.e. "feast" scenario)
Acts 1:1 ποιεῖν τε καλ διδάσκειν to-do and also to-teach (i.e. scenario of Jesus's whole healing and teaching ministry)
Acts 9:29 ἔδακτε τε καλ συνεζήτησε he-was-talking and also was-discussing
Acts 19:27b εἶς οἴδην λογοθετήμεν, μέλεων τε καλ καθαριζόμεθα...
to nothing to-be-reckoned, to-begin and also to-be-diminished (i.e. scenario of loss of honour, influence and popularity)

*conjoining sequential events in the same scenario:*

Acts 9:18 ἀνεβάλετε εἰς ταν ἀναστάς ἐπιφανῆ
he-saw and also having-risen was-baptized

*conjoining different events in the same scenario:*

Acts 21:28 δ κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ ... πάντας πανταχῇ διδάσκον.

the[one] against the people ... all[people] everywhere teaching

ἐπὶ τε καλ Ἑλλήνας εὐθείαγεν εἰς τὸ λεπὸν ...
even and also Greeks he-led into the temple

ἐπὶ marks this as the worst event of many unnamed other events in the same scenario:

*Lexical doublets with “attribute” words*

In New Testament Greek a few attributes are regularly conjoined as doublets, e.g.

*common and unclean = ritually impure*

Acts 10:14 ὀφθαλμῶν ἐφαγων πᾶς κοινῆς καὶ ἄκαθαρτον
never I-ate all common and unclean

Also Acts 10:28, 11:8

The word κοινός occurs 14 times in the New Testament, 3 times conjoined with ἄκαθαρτος.

*holy and without blemish = (ritually and) morally pure*

Ephesians 1:4 ἐναδέωμεν ἄγιος καὶ ἄμωμος κατεύθυντον αἵτων
to-be us holy and unblemished before him

Also Ephesians 5:27, Colossians 1:22

The word ἄμωμος occurs 8 times in the New Testament, 3 times conjoined with ἄγιος.

Attributes may also appear in the surface structure as abstract nouns, often in adverbial phrases, e.g.

*with fear and trembling = respectfully, conscientiously*

2 Corinthians 7:15 μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ἐδέξασθε αὐτόν
with fear and trembling you-received him

Also Ephesians 6:5, Philippians 2:12, cf. 1 Corinthians 2:3

The word τρόμος occurs 5 times in the New Testament, 4 times conjoined with φόβος.
Attributes may also be conjoined as doublets by τε καί. Of 33 occurrences of τε καί in Gospels and Acts, 3 conjoin attributes:

**doublets, referring to a single scenario:**
- Matthew 22:10 οἱ τούτοι τε καί ἁγιοι wicked and also good
- Acts 24:15 ἀνάστασιν ... δικαίων τε καί ἁδικίων resurrection of just and also unjust
- Acts 26:22 μικρά τε καί μεγάλα to-small and also to-great

Although at first sight these appear to be just pairs of antonyms, I argue that they are doublets, since the class referred to includes the whole scenario of all people, not simply the extremes of evil and good, just and unjust, small and great, but normal average people too. Similarly, Hagner comments on Matthew 22:10 “the servants gathered all they found ... both bad and good” (1995:630), and Barrett comments on Acts 24:15 “it is the general resurrection that is in mind” (1998:1105) and on Acts 26:22 “to all, of whatever rank” (1998:1165).

**Lexical doublets with “relation” words**

Antonymous “relation” words are found conjoined, and may form a single scenario, e.g.
- before and behind = all over
  - Revelation 4:6 γῆμοντα ὄφθαλμων ἐμπροσθεν καί ὀπίσθεν being-full-of-eyes before and behind
  - This phrase also includes at the sides, cf. 4:8
- around and inside = everywhere, inside and out
  - Revelation 4:8 κυκλώθην καί ὠψεθήν γῆμοντα ὄφθαλμων around and within they-are-full-of-eyes
  - Revelation 5:1 βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ὠψεθήν καί ὀπίσθεθν scroll having-been-written inside and on-reverse

Similarly, there are instances where the contrastive element of conjoined verbs is the “relation” prefix, and the two verbs together seem to refer to a single concept, e.g.
- άνα- καί κατα- going up and down = inter-communicating
  - John 1:51 τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναβάλλοντας καί καταβάλλοντας ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανόν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον the angels of-the god ascending and descending on the son of-the Man
- εἰσ- καί ἐκ- going in and out = being around, inter-relating
  - Acts 1:21 ἐν πάσιν χρόνῳ ὡς ἑστήκεθεν καί ἐξήλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς in all time in-which went-in and went-out among us the lord Jesus
  - Acts 9:28 καί ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰσπροευμένος καί ἐκπροευμένος ἐλ' Ἰερουσαλήμ and he-was with them going-in and going-out in Jerusalem
Sometimes there is a non-typical co-occurrence of “relation” words due to their marking the different roles of a single participant, e.g.

εν “from” links to διά “through” by a contradictory link

ἐπί “above” links to διά “through” and ἐν “in” by a contradictory link

“above all, and through all, and in all” (Eph.4:6)

This conjoining of “relation” words may be a particularly Greek phenomenon. The first example above requires the same “thing” to have two separate participant roles. Green (1977:130) suggests “created by the divine fiat out of water, and sustained by water”. The second example, by changing the role slots of the same participants, indicates that the verb “to be” is to be understood three times, with three distinct participant frames and the different participant frames determine three different senses. Foulkes (1978:113) suggests “God-controlled, God-sustained, God-filled.” If translated literally, these Greek phrases certainly make for unnatural and obtuse English, perhaps because we expect a single participant to fill a single role in the participant frame of the one “event” scenario.

Occasionally the use of different “relation” words with the same verb and the same participant seems to indicate that the whole event scenario is inextricably connected with this participant, rather than the participant having several distinct roles, e.g.

Colossians 1:16

διενεκοδοτωσαν τὰ πάντα ... τὰ πάντα καὶ τούτον καὶ τούτον εἰς αὐτοῦ ... because in him was-created the all[things] ... The all[things] through him and to him have-been-created ...

Thus, Greek uses καὶ “and” to conjoin lexical items of the same semantic class which belong in the same scenario. In this way it marks that the separate lexical items are to be understood to form a single scenario and function together in a single semantic role.

Contraexpectation markers and scenarios

Since scenarios contain prototypical items related in prototypical ways, the absence of an expected item, the presence of an unexpected item, or an unusual relationship between items, may be marked explicitly in the lexicon by a contra-expectation marker.

English regularly marks expectation / contraexpectation in the choice between the conjunctions “and” (conjoining) and “but” (contrasting). Greek however is more sparing in the overt marking of contraexpectation, and δὲ joins clauses irrespective of the degree of expectation. Young (1939:132) gives four examples of δὲ translated “but” in contraexpectation circumstances (Matthew 1:20, 2:19, 2:22, 3:7), e.g.

Matthew 1:20

These[things] () him having-considered behold angel of-Lord

NIV “But after he had considered this ...”
In English, “but” explicitly marks the contrast between Joseph’s proposed action in 1:19 to divorce Mary, and the command of the angel in 1:20 to go ahead with the marriage. Greek δὲ however does not explicitly mark contraexpectation. For example, Porter (1994:208) notes not only adversative uses of δὲ but also connective and emphatic uses, and Levinsohn (1992:32-40) argues that δὲ marks development in the narrative (cf. Callow, 1992:192-3). So here, since contraexpectation is not lexically explicit in the Greek, the audience understand contraexpectation by comparing what is stated in the text with the prototypical events in their mental scenario.

Greek however does have certain lexical markers for contraexpectation, such as ἀλλά, which can be used as an emphatic although its “major usage is adversative” (Porter, 1994:205), and παρά which is “adversative” (Porter, 1994:215). These conjunctions are used in various constructions to mark contraexpectation, where English might use “but”, “nevertheless” or “rather than”:

not A but B (A is expected, B unexpected)

Matthew 4:4

Οὐκ ἐπὶ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

Not on bread alone will-live the person

ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ πάντι ἔργῳ ἐκπορευόμενῳ διὰ στόματος θεου.

but on every word proceeding through mouth of-God.

but himself emptied

Philippians 2:6, 7

δέ εἰς μορφήν θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ὅμως ἀρπαγοῦν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἵνα θεός,

who in form of-God being not thing-to-grasp deemed the to-be equal with-God

ἀλλά ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν

but himself emptied

although A nevertheless not B (B is expected in view of A)

Matthew 4:4

Εἰ καί πάντες σκανδαλίσθησονται, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐγώ.

If even all will-be-caused-to-stumble, but not I

1 Corinthians 4:4

οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνουσα, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι.

nothing for in-myself I-know, but not in this I-am-justified

NIV “My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent.”

Also 2 Corinthians 4:8a, etc.

although A nevertheless B (B is unexpected in view of A)

1 Corinthians 14:19

εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ, πάντων ἰδίων μᾶλλον γλῶσσας λαλῶ.

I-thank the God, than-all you more in-tongues I-speak

ἀλλὰ ἐν ἑκάστῳ θελεί νέντες λόγους τῷ νοὶ μου λαλῆσαι, ...

but in church I-wish five words by-the mind of-me to-speak...

ἡ μυρωδὸς λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ.

than myriads words in tongue.

Colossians 2:4

εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἀπεμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ἰδίῳ εἰμι.

If for even in-the flesh I-am-absent, but in-the spirit with you I-am

A rather than B (A is unexpected, B expected)

Luke 18:14

κατ’ ὑστος δεδικαίωμενος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ’ ἐκεῖνον

returned this[one] being-justified to the house of-him rather-than that.

The expectation of the hearers is that “this” sinful tax-collector would not be justified, but “that” religious Pharisee would be.
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But A (A is unexpected)


τὴν λέγω ἵματιν, Τούτῳ καὶ Ἐξικτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ ἵματιν;
But I say to you for Tyre and for Sidon more-tolerable will-be on day of judgment than for you.

The expectation of the hearers is that the pagan towns Tyre and Sidon would be punished harsher than Jewish towns.

Matthew 18:7b

οὐ τῇ ἄνθρωπῳ δὲ οὐ τῷ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται,

but woe to the person through whom the stumbling-block comes.

The expectation of the hearers is that if some event is necessary, the agent of that event is not guilty, cf. Luke 22:22

Also Luke 6:24, 6:35, 23:28

The examples above are all conjunctions, but other lexical items also indicate contraexpectation. For example, words in the semantic domain of surprise mark the related events as contraexpectation:

Matthew 21:20

καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμασαν λέγοντες, Πῶς παραχρῆμα ἐξηράνθη ἡ σκηνή;

and having-seen the disciples marvelled saying “How immediately withered the fig-tree?”

Acts 2:6b-7a

ἐμνευχθεὶς, διὶ ἠκούον εἰς ἐκαστὸς τῇ ἑωρῇ διαλέκτῳ λαλόντων αὐτῶν.

was-confused because they were hearing one each in the own language speaking them [GA]

ἐξισταντο δὲ καὶ θαμασαν

They became amazed and were marveling

Similarly, the words διὰ τὸ “why?” in direct speech show the speaker’s surprise and marks the situation referred to as one of contraexpectation, at least for the participant speaking, e.g. all the 7 occurrences in Matthew:

Matthew 9:11b

Διὰ τὸ μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἡμαρτωλῶν ἔσθει δὲ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;

Why with the tax-collectors and sinners eats the teacher of you?

Matthew 9:14b

Διὰ τὸ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν [πολλά], οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σου οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

Why we and the Pharisees fast [much], the disciples of you not fast?

Here it is the final statement which is contraexpectation.

Also Matthew 13:10b, 15:2a, 15:3b, 17:19b, 21:25b

Similarly, πῶς “how?” in direct speech shows the speaker’s surprise and marks the situation referred to as one of contraexpectation. Although the contraexpectation so marked is usually in the speaker’s mind, in Matthew 22:43 and 45 Jesus is aware of the resolution to this apparent contradiction in terms, but is presenting it to his audience as a paradox for them to think through. There are 11 occurrences in Matthew (excluding 6:28, 10:19 and 12:4 where πῶς is not in direct speech):

Matthew 7:4

ὁ πῶς ἔρεις τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ σου, "Αφες ἕκβαλλε τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἴδων ἡ δοκῶς σὺ τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου;

Or how you-say to brother of you, Allow I-take the speck from the eye of you, and behold the plank in the eye of you?

Matthew 12:26

καὶ εἰ δο Σατανᾶς ὅς Σατανᾶς ἐκβάλλε, ἐφ' ἐαυτὸν ἐμερλύθη πῶς οὖν σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ;

And if the Satan the Satan drives out, against himself he is divided. How therefore will stand the kingdom of him?
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Indeed, contraexpectation is so strongly marked by πῶς that many of the above are clearly rhetorical questions emphasizing that such a situation is totally impossible, e.g. 12:26b means “If that were the case, his kingdom could not possibly stand.”

Thus lexical items marking contraexpectation show what the prototypical expected items and relationships were in the mental scenarios of the original speaker and audience.

Causatives and scenarios

It has been stated above, in Chapter 3, that Greek does not always lexicalize or grammaticalize a causal chain. Thus the subject of a transitive verb may be the agent of that action, or the initiator of that action with some other agent as intermediary. The scenario, especially the real-life status of the grammatical subject and hence the participant role prototypically assigned to the grammatical subject within that scenario, determines whether the subject is the agent or the initiator of the action. An initiator, or “Causer” (Andrews, 1985:69-71), is typically someone with authority, who gets things done rather than does them personally. Sometimes, however, there is evidence in the grammar, the lexicon, or the co-text, to prove that the marked subject is initiator not agent.

Causatives marked lexically and grammatically

Causatives marked by ποιέω “to do” plus purpose clause

Matthew 5:32
ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι
makes her to-commit-adultery
Colossians 4:16b
ποιήσατε ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωρίσῃ
Make so-that also in the of-Laodiceans church may-be-read
Revelation 13:16
καὶ ποιεῖ πάντας ... ὑμᾶς δόσων αὐτοῖς χάραγμα ...
and he-makes all, so-that they-may-give to-them mark

Causatives marked with πέμπω, ἀποστέλλω “to send”

The use of the Aorist Participle of πέμπω or ἀποστέλλω preceding a main verb frequently denotes that the agent of the sending is the causer of the main verb, by the agency of those sent. Out of only 4 occurrences of πέμπω in Matthew, all four are Prenuclear Aorist Participles and all except Matthew 2:8 mark causation:

Matthew 11:2-3
πέμψας διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἔπεμψεν αὐτῷ. Σὺ εἶ ...
having-sent through the disciples of-him said to him, Are you...
NIV “He sent his disciples to ask him, “Are you ...”
John caused his disciples to say ...

Matthew 14:10
καὶ πέμψας ἀπεκδακλάκεν [τὸν] Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ.
And having-sent he-beheaded [the] John in the jail.
NIV “and had John beheaded in the prison.”
Herod caused someone to behead John.
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Similarly with ἀποστέλλω:
Matthew 2:16
καὶ ἀποστελλας ἥμελεν πάντας τοὺς παιδίας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεέμ.
And having-sent he-destroyed all the boy-children the in Bethlehem.
NIV “he gave orders to kill all the boys in Bethlehem”
Matthew 22:16
καὶ ἀποστέλλομεν αὐτῷ τὸς μαθήτας αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν Ἰησοῦν λέγοντες, Διδάσκαλε,
And they-send to him the disciples of-them with the Herodians saying Teacher
NIV “They sent their disciples to him along with the Herodians. “Teacher” they said...”
The Participle in Greek agrees with the subject of send, so “saying” means “causing (the disciples) to say...”

Causatives marked lexically
The suffix -ιζω is sometimes used to mark causation (Robertson, 1934:149) and may indicate the presence of both an initiating agent, i.e. causer, and an active agent, e.g.

Causatives marked with -ιζω suffix
Matthew 22:30, cf. 24:38
οὔτε γαμοδοτιν οὔτε γαμίζονται.
neither marry nor are-given-in-marriage (are caused to marry).
Matthew 27:48
ἐπότιζεν αὐτῶν.
he-gave-to-drink him (caused him to drink).

Causatives determined by the status of the grammatical subject:

Joseph, a rich man, has a tomb cut from the rock
Matt 27:59-60
καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα Ἰωσήφ ἐνετόλεξεν αὐτό ἐν σινθόν καθαρά.
And having-taken the body the Joseph wrapped it [in] sheet clean
καὶ ἐθηκεν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ καυμῷ αὐτοῦ μημελω δὴ ἔλατσαπεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ.
and placed it in the new of-him tomb which he-cut in the rock

Pilate, the Roman governor, orders someone to write a charge sheet
John 19:19
ἐγραφεν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος
wrote () also title the Pilate

The centurion pays to have a synagogue built
Luke 7:5
τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτὸς ψαλώσαν ἤμεν.
the synagogue he built for-us

Paul asks a fellow Christian to write a letter while he dictates
Romans 15:15
τολμηρότερον δὲ ἐγραφή ἦμι
More-boldly () I-wrote [Paul] to-you
Here I = Paul, see 1:1, so “I wrote” is causative “I caused to be written/dictated”
Contrast Romans 16:22
ἀσπάζομαι ημᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράφων τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν κυρίῳ.
I-greet you I Tertius the having-written the letter in Lord.

Herod has an executioner behead John
Mark 6:16
ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔλεγεν, ὅσον ἐγώ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην,
the Herod was-saying. Whom I beheaded John.
Herod caused John to be beheaded.
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Contrast Mark 6:27
άποστελλας δ' βασιλέως σπειρουλάτορα ...
having-sent the king executioner
καὶ ἀπέλθον ἀπεκεφαλίσθην αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ
and having-gone he-beheaded him in the prison

Causatives determined by explicit mention of other participants:
John 4:1, 2
Ἰησοῦς πλέονας μαθητάς πολεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἵ τοῦνης
Jesus more disciples makes and baptizes than John
καὶ τολγε Ἰησοῦς αὐτῶς ὥς ἐβαπτίζεν ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν
though Jesus himself not was-baptizing but the disciples of-him
In 4:1 "baptizes" is causative, unless we are to understand that this was a false rumour.

Chapter summary

Scenario structure provides the conceptual basis for understanding lexical cohesion. Greek lexical collocation within New Testament pericopes is better explained by lexical cohesion at scenario level, than by the narrower category of Louw and Nida’s semantic domains (1988).

Scenario theory also explains the occurrence of Greek lexical doublets which refer not to separate concepts but to a single scenario or conceptual cluster in which the discrete referents belong.

Scenario structure, by providing a mental framework where specific lexical items and concepts are stored in prototypically interrelated semantic slots, explains both the use of lexicalized contraexpectation markers and causative forms, and also how the original audience would understand contraexpectation and causation even where there is no lexical marking.

Lexical collocation, lexical doublets, contraexpectation markers and lexicalized causative verbs in the source text can therefore be used as criteria in reconstructing the specific content of source culture scenarios. However, the potential mismatch in the contents of specific scenarios between the source and target cultures means that translations may need to make certain concepts explicit which were left implicit in the source text.
Chapter 9
GREEK DISCOURSE
AND SCENARIOS

Since scenarios affect both grammatical structure and lexical co-occurrence in a
text, the combination of grammar and lexis enables the audience to identify which
scenarios the author is referring to and thus understand the discourse as semantically
coherent. In this chapter I investigate the interrelation between grammatical forms and
lexical items in Greek discourse, and show how this indicates the contents of scenarios in
the source culture. I also give examples of the way scenarios are used to identify key
elements essential for understanding discourse, and give an example of how scenario
theory affects the principles and practice of discourse analysis.

Scenarios and coherence in discourse

I argue that semantic coherence, the "underlying functional or logical
connectedness" of a text (Crystal, 1995:449), is based on the scenario, and scenarios are
identified by both lexical co-occurrence and Hearer-old grammatical marking.
Consequently, discourse boundaries and semantic relationships can be deduced not only
from explicit markers such as conjunctions, and from clusters of vocabulary from the same
semantic domains, but also from the patterning of Hearer-old markers, and from lexical
items which are not in the same semantic domain, but are in the same scenario.

For example, in the four New Testament leprosy pericopes, not only is there a co­
occurrance of certain vocabulary, as previously noted, but there is also the use of the
article to mark Discourse-new entities as Hearer-old:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>episode</th>
<th>Matt. 8:1-4</th>
<th>Mk. 1:40-45</th>
<th>Lk. 5:12-16</th>
<th>17:12-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leper</td>
<td>λεπρός</td>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leprosy</td>
<td>λέπρα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leprous (man)</td>
<td>λεπρός</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leprosy</td>
<td>η λέπρα</td>
<td>8:3</td>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>5:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest</td>
<td>δ λεπρός</td>
<td>8:4</td>
<td>1:44</td>
<td>5:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purity</td>
<td>καθαρίζω</td>
<td>8:2, 3 (x2)</td>
<td>1:40, 41, 42</td>
<td>5:12, 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The co-occurrence of vocabulary, "priest" and "purify", together with the Hearer-old
marker, the article, for the Discourse-new item "priest", is strong textual evidence that
these elements are part of the leprosy scenario (cf. Leviticus 14). Since "priest" is marked
Hearer-old, it refers specifically to the priest that is prototypically present in the open
“leprosy” scenario, i.e. the priest on duty at the Temple in Jerusalem. Moreover, the open “leprosy” scenario enables the audience to expect that the “priest” will be mentioned at the end of this pericope, since the priest’s role is to confirm healing from leprosy and offer appropriate sacrifices. Likewise, since καθαρίζω is in the “leprosy” scenario, it means purify ritually not clean physically. Moreover, the “leprosy” scenario enables the audience to expect that ritual purity is desired by the leper and is the solution to the leper’s most pressing problem. Since leprosy, purify and priest are each linked to ritual impurity, ritual impurity is the topic of the leprosy pericopes, even though it is never explicit in the text.

Thus the “leprosy” scenario, through its causal link with the “ritual impurity” scenario (Leviticus 13:2-3), not only provides lexical cohesion, but also gives semantic coherence and helps define the boundaries of the pericope.

Analyzing the pericopes about Jairus’ daughter, we find similar patterns of vocabulary and articular use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>episode and articular use</th>
<th>episode</th>
<th>Matt. 9:18-26</th>
<th>Mk. 5:22-43</th>
<th>Lk. 8:41-56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruler</td>
<td>ἄρχων</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synagogue ruler</td>
<td>ἄρχισυναγαγός</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uproar</td>
<td>θορήθυν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>θυγάτηρ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruler</td>
<td>ὁ ἄρχων</td>
<td>9:23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synagogue ruler</td>
<td>ἁρχισυναγαγόσ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:35, 36, 38</td>
<td>8:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>ἡ θυγάτηρ</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>8:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>τὸ θυγάτριον</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girl</td>
<td>τὸ κοράσιον</td>
<td>9:24, 25</td>
<td>5:42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>ἡ παῖς</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8:51, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>τὸ παιδίον</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:39, 40, 41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crowd</td>
<td>ὁ δίχλος</td>
<td>9:23, 25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipe-plaver</td>
<td>ὁ ἀλητής</td>
<td>9:23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trouble</td>
<td>θυρμωθέω</td>
<td>9:23</td>
<td>5:39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weep</td>
<td>κλαίω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:38, 39</td>
<td>8:52 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mourn</td>
<td>κόπτει</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wail</td>
<td>ἀλαλάζω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die</td>
<td>τελευτάω</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die</td>
<td>ἀποθησίων</td>
<td>9:24</td>
<td>5:35, 39</td>
<td>8:42, 49, 52, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about to die</td>
<td>ἐσχάτως ἔχω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>καθαύνω</td>
<td>9:24</td>
<td>5:39</td>
<td>8:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lay (hands)</td>
<td>ἐπιτύπωμι</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>5:23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heal, save</td>
<td>σώζω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5:23</td>
<td>8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live</td>
<td>ἔζω</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>5:23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raise, rise</td>
<td>ἑγερμόν</td>
<td>9:25</td>
<td>5:41</td>
<td>8:54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above data, despite the variety of lexical items, almost all the vocabulary clearly belongs in a limited number of semantic domains: child, death, mourning, and healing. We also see that, apart from the new participant, the (synagogue) ruler, most nouns are introduced with Hearer-old marking, the article. Exceptions are the “daughter”, introduced in Luke 8:42 as Hearer-new (whereas in the other accounts she is introduced as Hearer-old, since prototypically adult men have a daughter), and the “uproar”, introduced in Mark 5:38 as Hearer-new.
Matthew however introduces the people wailing and weeping with two nouns marked Hearer-old, “the crowd and the pipe-players” (9:23). This, according to my theory, is evidence that this crowd and these pipe-players are prototypically part of a first-century Jewish death scenario. This is in accord with the Jewish custom of hiring professional mourners, as evidenced in Jeremiah 9:17-18. If, as is commonly supposed, Matthew writes as a Jew to Jews, he can assume that professional mourners are part of his audience’s death scenario and accordingly mark these Discourse-new items as Hearer-old. In contrast, Mark and Luke, writing for gentiles, introduce the mourning as Hearer-new information.

Thus, although pipe-players are not in the same semantic domain as death, they are in the same New Testament scenario. Textual evidence for this is from lexical co-occurrence, and use of the article to mark Hearer-old information, thus marking pipe-players as part of an open scenario. In a scenario approach to semantic domain classification, pipe-players would need to be explicitly linked to the semantic domain of death. In this way a classification of the lexicon into semantic domains would provide evidence of lexical cohesion (rather than confusion) in this text, and be a powerful tool for determining semantic coherence and chunking the discourse into episodes.

Similarly, there is a correlation between co-occurrence of verbs and use of Participles. This corresponds to my theory that Participles refer to events in the same scenario as the main verb. The scenario of the main verb not only functions as a single chunk in discourse, but also determines the sense of the verb in participial form, and its semantic relationship to the main verb.

For example, the computer program GRAMCORD finds 15 Aorist Participles nominative of πέπτω “fall” in the New Testament, all Prenuclear, which cluster in a limited number of scenarios, as follows:

**Deliberate - respect (x8/15 = 53%)**
- Worship/obeisance scenario (x5/15)
  - Matt. 2:11, 4:9, 18:26, Acts 10:25, 1 Cor. 14:25 all with προσκυνέω
- Beseeching scenario (x3/15)

**Uncontrolled (x5/15=33%)**
- Tripping scenario (x2/15)
- Spirit possession scenario (x1/15)
  - Mark 9:20, with κυλίω “roll”
- Sudden death scenario (x1/15)
  - Acts 5:5, with έκτροχία “die”
- Dazzled scenario (x1/15)
  - Acts 9:4, with άκοῦω “hear” but predictable from “light from heaven” in 9:3

**Inanimate subject (x2/15=13%)**
- Sowing scenario (x2/15)
  - Luke 8:14 (part of a noun phrase) τό ... πεσόν with τελεσφορέω, “bear fruit to maturity”.
  - John 12:24 with ἀποθησίκω “die”, cf. e) above.
These collocations indicate at least three senses of πίπτω, deliberate obeisance, non-deliberate falling, and being deliberately caused to fall. (In contrast, πίπτω only occurs once as Present Participle nominative, in a Periphrastic Future construction, Mark 13:25.)

Similarly, according to GRAMCORD data, there are 18 Prenuclear Aorist Participles nominative of ἀποκρίνομαι, excluding Mark 13:34 where it functions adjectivally. In contrast, Prenuclear Present Participle Nominative never occurs. These belong to three distinct scenarios, indicating different senses:

a) physical departure (x14/18=78%)
- Matt.4:20, 4:22, Mark 1:18, Luke 5:11, 18:28 with ἀκολουθέω “follow” (x5)
- Matt.22:22, 26:44, Mark 1:20, 8:13, 12:12 with ἀπέρχομαι “depart” (x5)
- Matt.26:56, Mark 14:50 with φεύγω “flee” (x2)
- Matt.26:56 τούτῳ δὲ διὸν γέγονεν ἐνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν.
- Matt.13:36 with ἔρχομαι “go” (x1)
- Mark 4:36 with παραλαμβάνω “take” (x1)

b) abandon as a choice (x3/18=17%)
- Mark 7:8 with κρατέω “keep”, Rom. 1:27 with καίω “burn” (with lust), Heb. 6:1 with φέρω “bear”,

c) release (a cry) (x1/18=6%)
- Mark 15:37 with ἐκπνέω “die”

Collocations of vocabulary and Participle also help identify the components of meaning of lexical items, allowing better exegesis and translation. For example, the New Testament has 101 Prenuclear Aorist Participles nominative of ἀποκρίνομαι “respond” followed within 6 words by an Indicative main verb (45 in Matthew, 15 in Mark, 35 in Luke, 6 in Acts, none in John or the Epistles). In every occurrence the main verb is a verb of speech (data from GRAMCORD):

[VERB indicative] (102 total words)
Number of different forms = 3:
- εἶπον to say = 85
- λέγω to say, speak, tell = 14
- φημί to say = 3

There are no Present Participles nominative of ἀποκρίνομαι in the New Testament, Prenuclear or Postnuclear. Thus when this verb occurs as a Prenuclear Participle nominative, it is always Aorist and always in a “speaking” scenario.

Although commonly glossed “answer”, ἀποκρίνομαι may be used when the addressee is not the preceding speaker, e.g. Luke 8:50 (where Jesus addresses the addressee of the preceding speech act), and when the preceding event is not a speech act, e.g. Acts 3:12 (where Peter speaks in response to people gathering round) and Acts 5:8 (where Peter speaks in response to Sapphira’s arrival).

Thus lexical and grammatical collocations show that ἀποκρίνομαι is part of the “speak” scenario, but is only used when the speech act is in response to a verbal or non-verbal act. As a Participle, it only occurs as a Prenuclear Aorist with a speech verb. This correlates with my theory that Prenuclear Aorist Participles refer to events preceding, and in the same scenario as, the main verb. The gloss “respond” fits this contextual usage, and explains Prenuclear Aorist usage, as mental response will always precede the speech act.
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When ἀποκρίνομαι is used as a main verb, the speech act is implicit, i.e. “respond (by saying)”.

If, as I argue, Participles always refer to items in the same scenario as the main verb, then for every main verb there will be a specific patterning of Participles as regards both semantic domains and grammatical and syntactic forms. Participles from specific semantic domains will regularly co-occur with main verbs of a particular semantic domain, with the Participles showing distinctive Aorist or Present, Prenuclear or Postnuclear patterning. These patterns identify scenario units, and can be used to clarify the semantic relationship between main verb and Participle, e.g.

(data from M. B. O’Donnell’s search program)

Prenuclear Aorist Participles in Gospels and Acts by semantic domain
(only domains above 10% listed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With any main verbs</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414/1175</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193/1175</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161/1175</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With λέγω (including εἴπων) as main verb</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126/292</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55/292</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53/292</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in the Gospels and Acts, Prenuclear Aorist Participles with λέγω as main verb show a distribution into semantic domains which is significantly different from that of Prenuclear Aorist Participles irrespective of the main verb, i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>With any main verb</th>
<th>With λέγω as main verb</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15) Linear Movement</td>
<td>414/1175 = 35%</td>
<td>53/292 = 18%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) Communication</td>
<td>193/1175 = 16%</td>
<td>126/292 = 43%</td>
<td>+27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Sensory Events and States</td>
<td>161/1175 = 14%</td>
<td>55/292 = 19%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Gospels and Acts, the exceptionally high percentage of Prenuclear Aorist Participles in the domain of (15) Linear Movement can be understood by reference to Appendix H which charts the travelogue sections of Acts.

Similarly the exceptionally high percentage of Prenuclear Aorist Participles in the domain of (33) Communication with λέγω as main verb can be understood by the frequent use of ἀποκρίνομαι “respond” in narrative (though not in the Epistles). This one verb, in the domain of Communication, accounts for 36% of all Prenuclear Aorist Participles preceding λέγω / εἴπου (data from GRAMCORD):

Prenuclear Aorist Participles with λέγω or εἴπον as main verb (i.e. Indicative within 6 words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gospels and Acts</th>
<th>whole New Testament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Prenuclear Aorist Participles</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenuclear Aorist Participles of ἀποκρίνομαι</td>
<td>98 (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omega$ as Postnuclear Present Participle shows a significant correlation with Domains of main verbs in the Gospels and Acts, i.e. (data from M. B. O'Donnell’s search program, only domains above 5% listed):

**Semantic domains of all verbs in Gospels and Acts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4038/18649</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>(33) Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3321/18649</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>(15) Linear Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2198/18649</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>(13) Be, Become, Exist, Happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974/18649</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>(57) Possess, Transfer, Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945/18649</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>(24) Sensory Events and States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semantic domains of main verbs in Gospels and Acts with $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omega$ as Postnuclear Present Participle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106/234</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>(33) Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49/234</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>(15) Linear Movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Gospels and Acts, the Present Participle of $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omega$ follows a verb of Communication in 45% of occurrences, whereas Communication verbs constitute only 22% of all verbs. After a verb of Communication, $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omega$ as Postnuclear Present Participle is pragmatically SPECIFIC, introducing the specific words referred to generically by the main verb, e.g. Luke 1:67. After a verb of Linear Movement, $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omega$ as Postnuclear Present Participle is pragmatically PURPOSE and RESULT, giving the message for which the movement was undertaken, e.g. Luke 7:19.

This correlation between semantic domains and different participial forms is in line with my theory that Participles represent prototypical elements in the scenario of the main verb. These main verb and Participle clusters represent single scenarios, providing lexical cohesion and semantic coherence in discourse, and dividing the discourse into conceptual chunks.

**Scenarios and discourse analysis**

We saw in Chapter 3 that writers communicate more than is explicit in the written text, by expecting their audience to interpret the explicit form of the text in the light of their mental scenarios. Thus, scenario theory not only explains certain elements of grammar, syntax and lexicon, but it predicts that certain concepts, some central to the understanding of the message, including facts and relationships between facts, will be implicit, i.e. NOT written in the author’s text, but intended by the author to be part of the communicated message. In Chapter 4, we saw how lexical collocation, and hence textual cohesion, depends on the author’s mental scenarios which he expects his audience to share. In Chapter 5, we saw how Participles and main verbs cluster according to scenarios, and how this can be used for chunking the text into units. We have also seen how a single text
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chunk can be highlighted by conjoining main verbs belonging to a single scenario script by καὶ, or by using a statistically marked verb form (such as Present in past time narrative), or a combination of both. This marks out the text chunk as highlighted or significant at a higher discourse level than clause or sentence. In Chapter 6, we saw how the article is used to refer to Hearer-old entities in information status taxonomy, and how those categories also depend on scenario theory. We have also seen anarthrous nouns mark salience, either introducing a totally NEW item, or referring to a Hearer-old entity but marking it salient. Such salience may be only at clause level, but frequently identifies salience or theme at higher discourse levels.

All these factors play a role in discourse analysis. There are many different approaches to discourse analysis (see Mann and Thompson, 1992, which shows different approaches to the analysis of a single text). However, there are several factors which are fundamental in discourse analysis regardless of the specific model used, as listed below (Nida and Taber, 1982:152):

1. the marking of the beginning and end of a discourse
2. the marking of major internal transitions
3. the marking of temporal relations between events
4. the marking of spatial relations between events and objects
5. the marking of logical relations between events
6. the identification of participants
7. the highlighting, focus, emphasis, etc.
8. author involvement

Often there are grammatical, syntactical, or lexical markers in the text itself which help in determining these factors, but frequently such relationships are implicit and must be inferred by the audience in order to produce a coherent text (Mann and Thompson, 1987:3). Only reference to the prototypical scenario, which the original author assumed to be in the mind of the original audience, will clarify such matters, as the following examples show.

1. the marking of the beginning and end of a discourse

Romans 1:1 Παύλου δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ... “Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus...”

The marking of the beginning of a letter with the sender’s name depends on a culturally dependent “letter” scenario (Reed, 1997:181), which a) gives the author’s name letter-initial (as opposed to the English pattern for personal letters, of addressee’s name letter-initial, and sender’s name letter-final), and b) allows an unmodified third person noun to have a real life first person referent, so that “Paul” Παύλου in 1:1 = “I” of εἷς χαριστῶ 1:8.

Mark 16:8 ἐφοβοῦτο γάρ “For they were afraid” has been dismissed as the end of the Gospel as it appears to be an unfinished sentence. Afraid of what? Reed strongly argues (1997) that this is the original ending of Mark’s Gospel. That conclusion relies on the original audience having a scenario for “fear” which included prototypical REASONS for such fear, but allowed the reasons not to be grammaticalized, but left implicit. Thus, “For they were afraid” can be regarded as both grammatically and semantically complete,
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since the reason for their fear, though not stated in words, is adequately communicated to the audience by the author through the combination of the facts of the text and the prototypical expectations of the “fear” scenario. Mark’s audience is traditionally taken to be Christians in Rome during the second half of the first-century (e.g. Lane, 1974:12-17). Such Christians, themselves under persecution or suspicion, would readily identify appropriate reasons for the women’s fear.

2. the marking of major internal transitions

Luke 4:1 marks the beginning of a major internal transition between EPISODES, separating 4:1-13 “The Temptation of Jesus” from 3:21-38 “The Baptism and Genealogy of Jesus”. Although both sections focus on Jesus as Son of God who is anointed by the Holy Spirit there is a shift in scenarios from baptism and genealogy to temptation. This “temptation” scenario is opened explicitly in 4:2 by both the event and the prototypical agent πείραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου “being tempted by the Devil” and explicitly closed in 4:13 using an abstract noun for the event Καὶ συντελέσας πάντα θείας πείρασιμον ὁ διάβολος... “And having completed the whole temptation, the Devil...” The “temptation” scenario is also evoked by three specific temptations, by the quotation of scripture to rebut the temptations, and by the location “the desert” (4:1) as the prototypical location of temptation for the Israelites, evoked in 4:4 by Jesus quoting Deuteronomy 8:3 where the context (8:2-3) is testing by God when hungry in the wilderness, and again in 4:8 quoting Deuteronomy 6:13 where the context (6:16) again mentions the wilderness temptations.

Luke 3:9 “The axe is already at the root of the trees” appears to be a major internal transition, marked by a change in vocabulary from that of wrath, repentance and salvation 3:3-8, to trees and axes, and by both a temporal marker and a development marker ἢ δὴ δὲ. This analysis is false, however, since the original audience had a metaphorical link between the scenarios for “God punishing people” and “man chopping down trees”. Thus the lexical items, although worlds apart in terms of Louw and Nida’s semantic domains (1988), belong to one and the same scenario for the original target audience.

3. the marking of temporal relations between events

Acts 25:13 κατήμνησεν... διαπεσόμενος τοῦ Φίλου is translated by NIV as “arrived... to pay their respects to Festus”. Here “paying respects”, encoded by a Postnuclear Aorist Participle, follows “arriving” in real time. Compare Colossians 1:3-4 ἐκπαιδεύσατε τῷ θεῷ... δικαιοσύνες “We... thank God... because we have heard” (NIV), where “hearing”, which is also encoded by a Postnuclear Aorist Participle, precedes “thanking” in real time. The temporal relationship between the event marked by the Aorist Participle and that marked by the Indicative is not determined on the basis of grammatical, lexical, or syntactical markings alone, but depends on the prototypical
relationship between those two events when they occur in the same scenario, that of the main verb.

4. the marking of spatial relations between events and objects

Acts 26:32b-27:1a “This man could have been set free if he had not appealed to Caesar ... When it was decided that we would set sail for Italy...” The text contains no explicit spatial connection between Caesar and Italy. The original audience’s scenario, of course, had Italy as “location” within the “Caesar” scenario, thus linking these verses both spatially and logically. Without such extra-textual information from this scenario, there is no way for the audience to know whether going to Italy brings Paul closer to, or further from, his goal.

5. the marking of logical relations between events

Acts 16:38 “when they heard that Paul and Silas were Roman citizens they were alarmed.” The logical relationship between the officers finding out that they were Roman citizens and becoming alarmed only makes sense by supplying information from the original audience’s scenario that it was illegal to beat a Roman citizen, but legal to treat non-Romans this way (Barrett, 1998:801).

6. the identification of participants

Revelation 17:9 “The seven heads are seven hills.” The link between seven hills and Rome was in the location section of the author and audience’s Rome scenario, and thus “seven hills” would be “instantly recognizable as a metaphor for Rome” (Aune, 1998b:944).

Matthew 5:4 “Blessed are those who mourn for they will be comforted.” Comforted by whom? The scenario set up by μακάριος “blessed” is of being blessed by God (cf. LXX Psalm 1:1). Similarly “kingdom of heaven” in (5:3) is coreferential with kingdom of God, since “heaven” is the prototypical location in the God scenario. Thus God, even though not lexicalized until 5:8 and 9, is the agent throughout the beatitudes, and is the one who comforts in 5:4.

7. the highlighting, focus, emphasis, etc.

Hebrews 1:2 ἐλάλησεν θεὸς ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ “[God] spoke to us by means of [his] son.” Not only does the Hebrew Christian audience’s scenario of “God”, as agent, determine the referent of son as God’s son, i.e. Jesus, but once the referent is established, through the scenario, as Hearer-old, the grammatical marking anarthrous, shows salience.
8. *author involvement*

Romans 1:8 *εὐχαριστῶ* “I thank.” The involvement of the author in this text depends fundamentally on identifying “I” here as coreferential with Παῦλος “Paul” (1:1), rather than being ambiguous and possibly referring to the scribe who wrote the letter. Given a “letter writing” scenario which allows for two “writers”, one who dictates and controls the content, and another who merely transcribes what is dictated, identifying which is which depends on the original audience’s “letter” scenario, which determined whether, where, and how each “writer” might introduce themselves. Reed comments on how prototypical participants in the “letter writing” scenario are grammaticalized in a Hellenistic Greek letter (1997:181):

The prescript - namely superscription (sender, ‘implied author’) and adscription (recipient, ‘implied reader’) - was obligatory for the epistolary genre. To it was typically added a salutation ... The prescript and salutation (and other opening elements such as the thanksgiving) set the social and interpersonal context for the entire discourse. They often take the the form of ‘A (nominative) to B (dative), greetings...’

Thus the initial proper noun in the letter clearly referred to the “sender” or “implied author” rather than to the scribe of the letter. Consequently, the introduction of a second “writer” in 16:22 (*ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν “I, Tertius who wrote this letter”) would not have caused the original target audience to wonder who the sender of the letter was or whether the previous first person references were to Paul or Tertius.

Examples of using scenario theory in discourse analysis

Scenario theory is not only applicable to basic issues which are fundamental to all types of discourse analysis, but can also be used to complement and refine specific methodologies for analysing discourse. This is illustrated by applying scenario theory to the methodology used by Danove for analysing Mark’s Gospel (1993b) and then using the modified criteria to re-evaluate parts of his analysis.

Danove (1993b) takes Fillmore’s theory of semantic frames (1968), a seminal concept for the development of scenario theory, and applies it to Greek discourse in Mark. He gives certain factors for determining the boundaries of episodes (1993b:101):

- Criteria for isolating constituent macro-events are the recognition of
  1. patterns of referents in the semantic functions associated with the subject and object complements of predicates
  2. place indicators, usually in prepositional phrases
  3. the repetition of vocabulary associated with a particular theme
  4. parallel narrative units with the *passion prediction complex* and its constituents, *passion prediction*, *conflict*, and *teaching*, a special case
  5. *intercalations* which employ a combination of the first, third and fourth criteria

Danove’s criteria are similar to those used by many discourse analysts (see Mann and Thompson, 1992, for several analyses of the same text). These criteria rely on scenario theory to determine such matters as co-referential terms (1), the relationship between place
indicators (2), determining whether vocabulary refers to the same theme (3), and whether units are parallel (4).

Danove limits the significance of referents to certain semantic roles, which fails to take into account that scenarios may be cued by less focal referents, and that focal referents such as subject or object may be implicit. Surprisingly, Danove also omits place indicators (2) as a criterion for intercalation, which I believe is a mistake, given that location is a prototypical element in scenarios and prototypically occurs in narrative as a significant element of the setting.

Consequently, I propose a modification of Danove’s criteria which incorporates insights from scenario theory (modifications in bold):

1. patterns of referents in all semantic functions associated with predicators whether explicit or implicit
2. place indicators, usually in prepositional phrases, including implicit locations
3. the repetition of vocabulary associated with a particular theme, and explicit or implicit reference to any items from the same scenario.
4. parallel narrative units with the passion prediction complex and its constituents, passion prediction, conflict, and teaching, a special case, noting that there may be parallel concepts without lexical parallels or repetition.
5. intercalations which employ a combination of the first, second, third and fourth criteria

In Greek open scenarios are also indicated by Hearer-old markers such as Participles and arthrous nouns. Clusters of Participles and main verbs always belong in a single scenario, so must always be in the same macro-event. Articular nouns of all categories, except 2a KNOWN unused and 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, must be in the same macro-event as the noun or concept they refer back to.

**Donahue’s intercalations**

Danove, quoting John Donahue (1983:58-59), defines intercalations as follows:

(1993b:100):

a literary technique “whereby Mark breaks the flow of a narrative by inserting a new pericope after the beginning of an initial story.” Intercalations present occasions of inherently parallel constituents in that a given set of referents of the complements of predicators and a given vocabulary establish an inclusio around a central “interrupting” event.

Danove accepts 5 of the 7 intercalations which Donahue identified in Mark (1983:58-59), viz. (with interrupting event in square brackets):

3:20-21 [22-30] 31-35,
5:21-24a [24b-34] 35-43
6:6b-13 [14-29] 30-32

But he rejects 2 of Donahue’s intercalations on the grounds that the first and last section do not share a majority of the same referents, viz.:

14:10-11 [12-16] 17-21 Judas, high priests / Jesus, twelve disciples, Judas
14:54 [55-65] 66-71 Peter / Peter, maid, cock, those present

I will investigate these disputed intercalations in the light of scenario theory, taking into account all participants (not only those in subject and object slots), plus Hearer-old markers of Participles and article, and the significance of time and location in a scenario.
Charting participants in Mark 14:10-11 and 14:17-21 we find (NB [ ] means implied):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14:10-11</th>
<th>Judas</th>
<th>the twelve</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>high priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>[Judas]</td>
<td>one of the twelve</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>to high priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Judas</td>
<td></td>
<td>to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETRAY</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
<td>they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETRAY</td>
<td>Judas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJOICE</td>
<td>[because Judas will betray]</td>
<td></td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMISE</td>
<td>him</td>
<td></td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETRAY</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
<td>him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14:17-21</th>
<th>Judas</th>
<th>the twelve</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>high priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COME</td>
<td>[Judas]</td>
<td>with the twelve</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECLINE</td>
<td>[Judas]</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT</td>
<td>[Judas]</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY</td>
<td>[to Judas]</td>
<td>to [to them]</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY</td>
<td>[to Judas]</td>
<td>to you</td>
<td>zero 1st person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETRAY</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>of you</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td>with me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIEVE</td>
<td>[because Judas]</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>[will betray Jesus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td></td>
<td>to him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETRAY</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>[you]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY</td>
<td>to them</td>
<td></td>
<td>he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETRAY</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>of the twelve</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIP</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td>with me</td>
<td>Son of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concerning him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOE</td>
<td>to that man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETRAY</td>
<td>through whom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD if NOT BORN</td>
<td>that man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Danove ignores Jesus as a participant in the first section (14:10-11), presumably because he is not physically present in the scene. Yet Jesus is the object of the verb betray twice explicitly (14:10 “in order to betray him” and 14:11 “how he might betray him”), and twice in an implicit clause (14:11 “having heard” [that Judas would betray Jesus] and “they rejoiced” [because Judas would betray Jesus]). Also, by restricting participants to those in subject and object slots (criterion 1), Danove omits “the twelve” as participants in the first section, although they are explicit in 14:10. Thus the participants in the scenarios evoked in these sections are not as Danove states (line 1 below), but as in lines 2 and 3:

| 14:10-11 [12-16] 17-21 | Judas, high priests / Jesus, twelve disciples, Judas |
| 14:10-11 | Judas, twelve disciples, Jesus, high priests |
| 14:17-21 | Judas, twelve disciples, Jesus |

Regarding Danove’s third criterion “the repetition of vocabulary associated with a particular theme”, it is hard to see how he disregards the repetition of Judas betraying Jesus as thematic. This occurs four times in each section, twice explicit and twice grammatically implicit. The references to betrayal in the first section (14:10-11) have been listed above; those in the final section (14:17-21) are 14:18 “one of you will betray me”, 14:19 “It is not me is it [who will betray you]?”, 14:20 “one of the twelve [will betray me]”, and 14:21 “that man by whom the son of Man is betrayed”. Although Judas is not named in 14:17-21, the narrative’s audience already knows, from 14:10, that the betrayer
is Judas. There is also a clear lexical and semantic link between “one of the twelve” (14:10), referring to Judas in the first section, and “one of you” (14:18) and “one of the twelve” (14:20), referring to Judas in the last section. In contrast, the interrupting section (14:12-16) has no reference, explicit or implicit, either to Judas or to betrayal. Thus I believe that by taking Danove’s own criteria for determining discourse boundaries, and expanding them to include implicit scenarios, not simply explicit surface forms and lexicon, the intercalation proposed by Donahue is justified.

Regarding Danove’s fourth criterion about parallel narrative units, he fails to recognize several significant parallels in these sections:

14:10-11
a) 14:10 Judas is one of the twelve
b) 14:10 Judas goes to the high Priests
c) [implicit] [Judas says “Judas will betray Jesus” ]
d) 14:11 high priests rejoice [because Judas will betray Jesus]
e) 14:11a high priests respond by promising a reward [because ...] 
f) 14:11b Judas responds by seeking an opportunity [to ...]

14:17-21
a) 14:17 [Judas is one of] the twelve
b) 14:17 Judas goes with Jesus and the twelve
c) 14:18 Jesus says “one of you [Judas] will betray Jesus”
d) 14:19a disciples grieve [because Judas will betray Jesus]
e) 14:19b disciples respond by asking Jesus for information [about ...] 
f) 14:20-21 Jesus responds by giving shrouded information [about ...]

Note that [...] above always means the thematic clause “Judas will betray Jesus” which is implicit. Thus there is a strong parallel structure here, highlighting the contrast between the reaction of the high priests and the disciples to the same thematic news:

a) WHO Judas is one of the twelve apostles
b) WHERE Judas is with high priests/Jesus and disciples
c) WHAT Judas/Jesus say Judas will betray Jesus
d) RESPONSE high priests/disciples respond emotionally with joy/sadness
e) RESPONSE high priests/disciples respond behaviourally promise/ask
f) RESPONSE Judas/Jesus respond behaviourally seek opportunity/warn

Note also the narrative device of letting the narrative audience know that “one of you” is Judas, whilst all the disciples but Judas, as the original audience of Jesus’s words, are unaware of the referent. This also highlights the significance of the betrayal in the narrative.

The second intercalation which Donahue proposed but Danove disputes is found in Mark 14:54 [55-65] 66-71. Danove again rejects this because the first and last sections show different patterns of referents (criterion 1):

14:54 [55-65] 66-71 Peter / Peter, maid, cock, those present

Danove, by limiting significant referents to subject and object slots (criterion 1), and by ignoring “place indicators” (criterion 2) as a factor in determining intercalations, also skews his analysis of this section.

Charting participants, including non-human, in Mark 14:54 and 14:66-71 we find:
By charting the participants, both explicit and implicit, regardless of their case role (see lines 2 and 3 below), we see that Danove’s analysis of participants (line 1) is misleading:

14:54 [55-65] 66-71 Peter / Peter, maid, cock, those present
14:54 Peter, Jesus, high priest, court, servants (attendants)
14:66-71 Peter, Jesus, high priest, court, servants (maid, bystanders), cockerel

In contrast, the participants in 14:55-65, although including Jesus and the high priest as in the other two sections, also include the chief priests, the whole council, and witnesses, but do not include Peter, servants or the cockerel.

If we look at Danove’s second criterion for analysis of episodes, i.e. place indicators, we see that each of these two sections begins in the same place, “the court of the high priest”. Moreover, Mark 14:66 presents the location with Hearer-old marking, the article, referring back to the first section, and so leaves “of the high priest” implicit (relevant item bolded):
Chapter 9 - Greek Discourse and Scenarios

Kal ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου κατώ ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ
And being the Peter below in the court
cf. Mark 14:54
εἰς τὴν ἀυλὴν τοῦ ἄρχερεως καὶ ἦν συγκαθῆμεν...
to the court of the high priest and was sitting-with...

In fact this opening clause of the third section of the intercalation has three Hearer-old markers referring back to the first section:

Section 1  14:54 ὁ Πέτρος Peter
1b KNOWN inferrable, see 14:50 “all”
14:54 ἦν was
Hearer-new, main verb
14:54 τὴν ἀυλὴν τοῦ ἄρχερεως the h.p.’s court
2b KNOWN inferrable

Similarly the third clause of the third section of the intercalation uses the Hearer-old participle to refer back to the first section:

14:54 ἦν ... θερμαίνομενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς. was warming himself by the fire.
Hearer-new, main verb
14:67 ἴδον τὴν Πέτρου θερμαίνομενον seeing Peter warming himself
Hearer-old, participle

Thus there are four items grammatically marked Hearer-old, linking the person, place and circumstances of the third section to those of the first.

Taking Danove’s third criterion, repetition of vocabulary associated with a particular theme, we see repetition of place “the court” (14:54, 66), and of setting “warm” (14:54, 14:67), but these hardly seem thematic. However, if we move beyond vocabulary repetition to the opening of scenarios we see a marked theme emerging in both sections, a contrast between concepts which are prototypical elements in the “disciple” scenario and those which are not:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>disciple scenario</th>
<th>non-disciple scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:54 Peter [disciple of Jesus]</td>
<td>high priest [opponent of Jesus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow [like a disciple]</td>
<td>far off [unlike a disciple]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>court of the high priest</td>
<td>court of the high priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendants [of the high priest]</td>
<td>maid of the high priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:66-71 Peter [disciple of Jesus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:66 be with Jesus [as a disciple]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:68 deny [being a disciple]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:69 one of them [Jesus’s disciples]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:70 deny [being a disciple]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:70 one of them [Jesus’s disciples]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:70 Galilean [like Jesus and disciples]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:71 deny knowing Jesus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:72 weep [for denying Jesus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking Danove’s fourth criterion, that of parallel narrative units, we can see a parallelism also in the two sections here, Peter’s ambivalence as to whether he is or is not a true disciple of Jesus. This is heralded in the first section by the oxymoron (in terms of discipleship) “followed afar off”, and is repeated in the second section time after time by the accusation of Peter being Jesus’s disciple followed by his denial, and finally his repentance for his actions.
There is however another significant marker of the discipleship / non-discipleship theme, which Danove seems to miss. Danove notes how in Mark 6:20 Herod’s “listening gladly” to John sets up a specific new scenario link in Mark’s Gospel, linking “hearing gladly” to “turncoat” (1993b:113-14):

The phrase “listen to X gladly,” has the potential to evoke the Passion Narrative frame. This explains the implied reader’s ambiguous emotional response to the only other occurrence of the phrase, “And (the) great crowd listened to [Jesus] gladly (12:37c),” ... even in isolation this event engenders a negative emotional response and places the crowd in a potentially villainous perspective. This receives confirmation in 15:13-14.

It is surprising then that Danove does not note how Mark uses “the cock crowing” here, not to refer to a new referent in this section, but to evoke the thematic “discipleship / non-discipleship” scenarios, by referring back to the text-specific link already made by Jesus’s prediction of Peter’s betrayal in Mark 14:27-30. There also we find vocabulary which does not fit neatly into either disciple or non-disciple scenarios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>disciple scenario</th>
<th>non-disciple scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:27</td>
<td>you all [disciples of Jesus] will fall away [unlike a disciple]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strike the shepherd [Jesus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sheep [disciples] will scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:29</td>
<td>Peter: “I will not fall away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>before cock crows twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you will deny me thrice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus I argue that Donahue’s suggested intercalations in Mark are justified in the light of scenario theory, which suggests a modification of Danove’s criteria. This modification takes into account not simply the obligatory case frames associated with lexical items in the text but also the mental scenarios evoked by those explicit lexical items, and accepts that parallel narrative units may be shown by associations of concepts and scenarios, regardless of whether they are implicit or are indicated by lexical repetition and explicit parallelism in the text.

The need to note scenarios, rather than simple lexical repetition, is shown in Mark 14:61b-62, where the hearer must understand that lexically distinct terms (underlined) are coreferential:

πάλιν δὲ ἀρχηγεῖς ... λέγει αὐτῷ.  
Again the highpriest ... says to-him
Σὺ εἶ δὲ Ἰησοῦς δὴ ὁ λύω τοῦ εὐφωνίου;  
You are the Christ the son of-the Blessed[one]?
ὁ δὲ Ιησοῦς εἶπεν, Εὐχῶ εἰμι.  
The () Jesus said, I am,
καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τῶν ὕδων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δικάμεως  
and you-will-see the son of the Man on right[side] sitting of-the Power
καὶ ἔρχομαι μετὰ τῶν νηφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.  
and coming with the clouds of-the heaven

Note that all three Noun Phrases underlined have Hearer-old marking, the article, referring to a Discourse-new item from the category 2a KNOWN unused, although the context of high priest and Sanhedrin meeting narrows the likely first search path to a religious one. The phrase τῶν ὕδων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου “the Son of Man” opens the Christ scenario due to the article, which suggests a unique reference, and the intertextual allusion
to Daniel 7:13-14. Identifying "the Son of Man" within the "Christ" scenario is confirmed as correct by the phrases "coming with the clouds of heaven", as in Daniel 7:13, and "seated on the right of the Power", which echoes "authority, honour and power" in Daniel 7:14. The identification of Daniel's "Son of Man" with the "Christ" is implicit here in Mark 14:61-62, as it is in John 12:34, since semantic cohesion depends on "Christ" and "Son of Man" being coreferential. Similarly, the one who sits at God's right hand is identified as the Christ in Mark 12:35-36 and as the Son of Man in 14:62 above.

If Mark 14:54 [55-65] 66-71 is indeed an intercalation, as I argue, then Peter's discipleship/non-discipleship forms an inclusio around the high priest's trial of Jesus. This is especially poignant. Whilst the non-disciples (high priest and Sanhedrin) pursue their scenario's script to its conclusion (death sentence for blasphemy) in the light of Jesus's claim to be Messiah (stressed thrice - the Christ, the Son of God, the Son of Man), the disciple par excellence (Peter) pulls back from the "disciple" scenario's script, which he himself has articulated (Mark 14:31 "Even if I have to die with you, I will never disown you").

Danove's pericopes

Danove lists several places where his analysis of pericopes in Mark differs from that of UBS (1993b:257), e.g. UBS 1:1-8, Danove 1:1, 1:2-3, 1:4-8. Whilst agreeing with Danove that 1:1 is a title giving the theme of the whole book, I disagree with Danove's division of 1:2-8 into two sections, given the common scenarios involved. I base my analysis on the 6 criteria above, as modified from Danove:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark 1:2-3</th>
<th>Mark 1:4-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>referred</strong></td>
<td><strong>referred</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 [God] I</td>
<td>1:4 [God] agent of &quot;forgiveness&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 [John] my messenger</td>
<td>1:4 John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 [Jesus] before thy face</td>
<td>1:7 [Jesus] one stronger than me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 [Jesus] Lord</td>
<td>1:8 [Jesus] ho aistrokés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 in the wilderness</td>
<td>1:4 in the wilderness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>locations</th>
<th>locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:3 in the wilderness</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 one shouting</td>
<td>1:4 proclaiming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 prepare your way</td>
<td>1:4 preach baptism of repentance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 prepare the Lord's way</td>
<td>1:7 after me comes one more powerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 make his path straight</td>
<td>1:4 for forgiveness of sins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>implicit repetition of theme - Elijah</th>
<th>implicit repetition of theme - Elijah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:2 I will send my messenger</td>
<td>1:4 John came [sent by God]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi 3:1 I will send my messenger</td>
<td>1:4 cf. 1:2 As has-been-written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi 4:5 I will send ... Elijah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 1:8 garment of hair, leather belt, it is Elijah</td>
<td>1:6 camel's hair, leather belt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parallel narrative units (plus chiasm centred on verses 3 and 4)</th>
<th>parallel narrative units (plus chiasm centred on verses 3 and 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:2 As it is written Káthw ... 1:4 John came</td>
<td>1:2 I baptize with water he will baptize with Holy Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 prepare your way before you 1:8</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3 crying in the wilderness prepare the way 1:4 in the wilderness proclaiming baptism of repentance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Káthw occurs 8 times in Mark. Of these 3 relate to scripture, 1:2, 9:13, 14:21, and link an event in the narrative to an Old Testament prophecy.
In the passage above the only lexical repetition is “in the wilderness” (1:3 and 1:4) and there is no formal repetition of structure, but there is constant repetition of scenarios, both explicit (proclamation in 1:3 and 1:4, preparation in 1:2-3 and 1:7-8, and repentance in 1:3 and 1:4) and implicit (Elijah in 1:2 and 1:6), plus an explicit comparison marker καθώς linking these sections, which points strongly to 1:2-8 being a single pericope.

The same can be said for Mark 9:2-13, which UBS analyzes as one pericope but Danove divides into 9:2-8, 9:9-13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark 9:2-8</th>
<th>Mark 9:9-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>referents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 Jesus</td>
<td>9:9 [Jesus] agent of διεστελεχατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 Peter, James, John</td>
<td>9:9 [Peter, James, John] αὐτῶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:4 Elijah (also 9:5)</td>
<td>9:11 Elijah (also 9:12, 9:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:4 (with) Moses (also 9:5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 up a high mountain</td>
<td>9:9 on the [high] mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition of theme -(i.e. same scenario)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 privately alone</td>
<td>9:9 ordered them tell nobody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2-3 transfiguration</td>
<td>9:9 what they saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:3 Elijah with Moses</td>
<td>9:9 what they saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit repetition of theme - rising from the dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:3 Elijah and Moses [risen from the dead]</td>
<td>9:9 Son of Man risen from the dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:6 they were terrified [at seeing dead alive]</td>
<td>9:10 they were discussing what is rising from the dead?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel narrative units (opening and closure of the sections)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 leads them up a high mountain privately alone</td>
<td>9:9 As they were coming down ordered them tell nobody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:7 This is my beloved Son</td>
<td>9:11 They questioned him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:12 He said to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Elijah comes Son of Man will suffer as written [in scripture]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elijah has come [i.e. John] John suffered as written [in scripture]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearer-old marking (in second section)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 takes them up a mountain</td>
<td>9:9 καταβαῖνοντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὀροσυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 Jesus, Peter, James, John</td>
<td>9:9 Participle “descending” cf. 9:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2 high mountain δροσὶ ὑψηλῶν</td>
<td>9:9 Pronoun “them” cf. 9:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2-4 transfiguration etc.</td>
<td>9:9 Article “the mountain” cf. 9:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:9 Relative pronoun αὐτον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I argue that Mark 9:2-13 may reasonably be analyzed as a single pericope, as UBS suggests, because of the continuation of participants and themes, especially secrecy and the scenario of “rising from the dead”. These three disciples had been given a glimpse not so much of the glory Jesus had before with the Father, but of the glory Jesus was going to enter after death. Jesus was in effect saying “Do not tell anyone you have seen me in glory, or you have seen Moses back from the dead, or Elijah returned to earth alive, until I myself have risen from the dead, and you see me back on earth alive.” Jesus is not therefore introducing a new topic in 9:9, but continuing the unspoken topic on the disciples minds “How can we be seeing Moses and Elijah alive?” There are also many Hearer-old markers in 9:9 linking it to the preceding section. Mark also highlights Elijah in his first mention in 9:4 Ἡλας σὺν Μωσῆτ “Elijah with Moses” (contrast the word order “Moses and Elijah” in Matthew 17:3 and Luke 9:30), which prepares the narrative’s audience for the
resumption of the Elijah theme in 9:11. Subsidiary support for this being a single pericope comes from the parallel passage in Matthew, where the Elijah discussion (17:9-13) is directly linked to the Transfiguration (17:1-8) by καὶ καταβαίνοντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ δρόου “And as they were coming down the mountain” which contains two Hearer-old markers, the Participle in the Genitive Absolute construction and the article with “mountain”, suggesting a strong semantic link between the sections.

Determining parallel narrative units

As already demonstrated, scenario theory can help determine discourse units at the higher levels of discourse hierarchy. In large TEXTS, such as the Gospels and indeed almost every book of the New Testament corpus, it is essential to correctly identify the boundaries of macro-events, i.e. EPISODES and THEME UNITS. One criterion for determining such macro-events is the existence of parallel narrative units (Danove, 1993b:101). Although such units may sometimes be marked formally by grammatical or lexical parallelism, essentially they are identified by conceptual parallelism which depends on parallel scenario structures, e.g. (main verbs bolded, Participles underlined, units numbered according to main verbs)

Mark 1:16-20

1 καὶ παρὰ τῷ παρακλάσαν τῆς Γαλileeς
And going-along beside the sea of-the Galilee
εἶδεν Σιμώνα καὶ Ἀθανάσιον τοῦ ἀδελφον Σιμώνος ἔμφασαν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
he-saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting in the sea
Ἅρων γάρ ἄλεις.
they were for fishermen

2 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅ ἤρων,
And said to-them the Jesus,
Δεῦτε ὅπισώ μου, καὶ ποιήσω ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι ἄλειμεν ἄνθρωπων.
Come after me, and I-will-make you to-become fishers of-men

3 καὶ εἴδες ἄφεντες τὰ δίκτυα ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.
And immediately having-left the nets they-followed him.

4 καὶ προῆλθεν ὁ λύγον
And having-walked-on a-little
εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τοῦ τοῦ Ζεβεδείου καὶ Ἰωάννην τοῦ ἀδελφον αὐτῶν
he-saw James the of-the Zebedee and John the brother of him
καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ καταρτίζομεν τὰ δίκτυα,
and them in the boat mending the nets,

5 καὶ εἴδες ἔκδεσαν αὐτοῖς.
And immediately he-called them.

6 καὶ ἄφεντες τοῦ πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδείου ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ μετὰ τῶν μηδεινῶν
And having-left the father of-them Zebedee in the boat with the hired-workers

Lexically, there is repetition only of εἶδεν “he saw” and ἄφεντες “having left”, but in terms of the scenarios evoked, 1-3 parallels 4-6 exactly:

1 Jesus sees Simon and Andrew fishing.
2 Jesus said “Follow me”.
3 They left nets and followed him.
4 Jesus sees James and John mending nets.
5 Jesus called them (to follow him).
6 They left father and went after him.

Thus scenario theory enables us to focus on underlying semantic similarities, rather than merely surface features such as repetition of lexicon or grammatical structures.

243
Chapter 9 - Greek Discourse and Scenarios

Determining focus and main events

Charting participle and main verb clusters identifies scenarios and hence discourse chunks, and anarthrous marking of Hearer-old items, marking them as salient, helps identify the focus of a pericope, e.g. Mark 6:14-29 (main verbs and καί joining main verbs in the same scenario bold, units numbered according to main verb clusters, anarthrous nouns bold underlined, subordinating conjunctions and prepositions underlined, Participles underlined):

1. Kai ἦκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰδωμῆς.
   1.1 φανερῶν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ δύομα αὐτοῦ.
   1.2 καὶ ἔλεγον
     ὃτι Ἰδωμῆς ὁ βασιλικὸς ἐγέρθερα ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τὸτε ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ.
   1.2.1 ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον
     ὃτι Ἰδωμῆς ἐστὶν.
   1.2.2 ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον
     ὃτι προφήτης ὦς ἐστὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

2. ἔκοψας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔλεγεν,
   ὥσπερ ἐγέρθη ἰδωμῆς τὸ βασιλεῖα.

2.1 καὶ ἦκουσεν τὸ βασιλεῖα τοῦ Ἰδωμῆς καὶ ἦλθεν αὐτῷ ἐν φιλακτί
     διὰ Ἰδωμῆδος τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου του ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτῷ.

2.2 ἔλεγεν καὶ ἦκουσεν τὸ βασιλεῖα τοῦ Ἰδωμῆς καὶ ἦλθεν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, οἶκος αὐτοῦ ἄδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἁγιόν, καὶ συνετῆρε αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐκόψας αὐτῷ πολλὰ ἡμέρες, καὶ ἦλθεν αὐτῷ ἦκουσεν.

2.3 καὶ γεγραμμένος ἰδωμῆς εἰκαλρου
     ὃτε Ἰδωμῆς τοῦ γενεσίας αὐτοῦ θείπαν ἐποίησεν τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν αὐτὸς καὶ τοῖς χιλάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρῶτοις τῆς γαλαλαίας, καὶ εἰσῆλθον ἐκ τῆς γαλαλαίας αὐτοῦ Ἰδωμῆδος καὶ ὀρθοσυμένος ἠρεσεν τῇ Ἰδωμῆς καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένωσιν εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ, Ἀντίπαθιν γε σὲ σὲ ἐν θέλησιν, καὶ δόσω σοι.

2.4 καὶ ἔμοισεν αὐτῇ πολλαὶ,
     ὃ τι ἔδωκεν με τοῖς δοξῶσι τῆς βασιλείας μου.

2.5 ἀνατίθεσα ἐπὶ τῇ μητρί αὐτῆς,
     ὧν αὐτής οὐκ ἄρα τῆς.

2.6 ἔπηκεν τῇ μητρί αὐτῆς
     Θέλω ὅτι ἐξαίνης δῶς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακα τῇ κεφαλῇ Ἰδωμῆς τοῦ βασιλικοῦ.

2.7 καὶ περὶ λόγους γεγραμμένος ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τοῖς ὁρκοὺ καὶ τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις οὐκ ἠρεσθήσαν δέστησιν αὐτῶν
     καὶ εἶπεν ἑποτεῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὀπεκοουλότοιο ἐπέταξεν ἑνὲγκαι τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ.

2.8 καὶ ἀπέκεφαλίσαν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ φιλάκτι καὶ ἦλθεν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακα καὶ ἦλθεν αὐτὴς τῷ κορασίῳ.

2.9 καὶ τῷ κορασίῳ ἦλθεν αὐτὴς τῇ μητρί αὐτῆς.

2.10 καὶ ἐκοσμήσατε αὐτῷ μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἰδόνος καὶ ἦραν τῷ πῦρι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠρεσαν αὐτῷ ἐν μυθεῖοι.
Summarizing the story from verb forms, anarthrousness (bold, and underlined if human), co-ordination and subordination markers:

**Herod** heard (about Jesus)
People were saying its **John, Elijah, a prophet**

**Herod** was saying (about Jesus)

**John**, whom I beheaded, has risen.
For Herod had John arrested and bound in prison
due to **Herodias**, his brother **Philip’s** wife
because Herod married her.
For John was saying to Herod, it is wrong.
Herodias hated John, wanted to kill him, but could not
because Herod feared John,
knowing John was a **righteous and holy man**
and protected him, was troubled, listened to him.

A suitable day came
when **Herod** had a feast.
and **Herodias**’s daughter pleased Herod.
Herod said he would grant her wish, and swore an oath.
She asked her mother what to request.
Mother said, the head of **John**.
Girl with haste requested the head of **John** on a platter.
Herod did not want to refuse
and ordered an **executioner** to bring John’s head.
He beheaded John and brought his head on a platter,
and gave it to the girl.
And she gave it to her mother.
John’s disciples came and took the corpse
and placed it in a tomb.

All Discourse-new participants are marked anarthrous (1 NEW), but those which are Discourse-old and anarthrous (3b GIVEN textual - current), are salient at PARAGRAPH or EPISODE level. For example, on the “suitable day” (unit 2:3 in Greek above) the anarthrous salient agent in this story switches from Herod (who initially restrains Herodias’s evil intentions) to Herodias (who tricks Herod into fulfilling them). John is marked as in overall focus (anarthrous 4 times by name and once by description “righteous and holy man”), and John’s shift of location, going from bad to worse, is marked by anarthrous nouns. First he is “in prison,” then his head is “on platter” (x2), and finally his corpse is “in tomb”. The non-subordinated clauses to the left (lines 1 and 3 above), show that this passage is primarily about Herod believing Jesus to be John come back to life. The subordination of the other clauses marks them as supportive material, with units 2.1-2.10 being an explanatory flashback.

There are no Present Indicatives in the narrative of this episode, Mark 6:14-29. This is in line with my thesis that Present Indicatives in narrative highlight the whole EPISODE at TEXT level (see Chapter 5 “Exceptions that prove the rule: conjoined main verbs in a single scenario” and also Appendix G). The events of John’s imprisonment, beheading, and burial (6:17-29), although important, are here presented not as a mainline event in the narrative “backbone” but as an explanation of Herod’s reaction to Jesus (6:16). 

As Johnson says (1984:71):
this story is backgrounded in Mark’s narrative, and this is reflected in the absence of HPs [Historic Presents] in these verses.

Another example of anarthrous nouns from open scenarios marking discourse salience is in the EPISODE James 2:14-26, NIV’s “Faith and Deeds”. Charting the nouns for faith and works (with NIV translation):

2:14 πίστις ... ἐργασίας claims to have faith but has no deeds
2:14 ἡ πίστις can such faith save him
2:17 ἡ πίστις ... ἐργασίας faith by itself, if it is not accompanied by action

2:18 πίστις ... ἐργασίας someone will say, “you have faith; I have deeds”
2:18 τὸν πίστιν ... τὸν ἐργασίαν show me your faith without deeds
2:18 τὸν ἐργασίαν ... τὸν πίστιν I will show you my faith by what I do
2:20 ἡ πίστις ... τὸν ἐργασίαν faith without deeds is useless

2:21 ἐργασίας Abraham considered righteous for what he did
2:22 ἡ πίστις ... τοῖς ἐργάσισι his faith and his actions were working together
2:22 τὸν ἐργασίαν ἡ πίστις his faith was made complete by what he did
2:24 ἐργασίας ... πίστις justified by what he does and not by faith alone

2:25 ἐργασίας Rahab ... considered righteous for what she did
2:26 ἡ πίστις ... ἐργασίας faith without deeds is dead

Faith and works are paired 10 times: 5 arthrous pairs, 3 anarthrous pairs, and 2 pairs where faith is arthrous and works anarthrous. Faith occurs once alone, arthrously, whereas works occurs twice alone, both anarthrously. Thus both nouns are salient, but works occurs four more times anarthrously than does faith, identifying works as the theme of this EPISODE. This is in line with James’s focus on “works” proceeding from faith, not on some empty “faith” which does nothing, as shown in 2:16.

The first section of this episode, 2:14-17, opens with both nouns anarthrous, marked salient to show contrast, and ends with ἐργασίας “deeds” marked salient. The next section, 2:18-26, introduces an imaginary debater. This section also begins, 2:18, with both nouns anarthrous, marked salient to show contrast. Then two examples are introduced, 2:21 and 2:25, each with ἐργασίας “deeds” marked salient. The first example finishes with both nouns anarthrous, again marked salient for contrast, and the second example finishes with ἐργασίας “deeds” marked salient, thus concluding this episode on the importance of “deeds”.

Chapter summary

Scenario structure, with concepts stored in prototypically interrelated semantic slots, accounts for the correlation found in New Testament Greek texts between lexical co-occurrence and grammatical Hearer-old marking, such as Participles and arthrous nouns. Thus, grammar and lexis help the audience identify open scenarios within the discourse.

Scenarios, once identified, provide the structure which produces semantic coherence within a discourse. Even where participants, events or relationships are not explicit, the prototypical participants, events and relationships stored within scenarios help
the audience to correctly identify discourse boundaries, temporal, spatial and logical relationships, participant reference, marked highlighting, and interpersonal relationships.

Scenario theory, by taking account of implicit as well as explicit information, combined with Greek grammatical marking of Hearer-old entities which indicates open scenarios, can be used to provide theoretical criteria and practical procedures for the analysis of discourse structure in New Testament texts.
Chapter 10
PARKARI VERB PHRASES
AND SCENARIOS

In this chapter I make the hypothesis that Parkari, like New Testament Greek, uses specific grammatical forms to mark Hearer-old information, which is either Discourse-old or Discourse-new and part of an open scenario. Specifically I give evidence for the hypothesis that Parkari main verbs encode Discourse-new events, whereas Parkari Nonfinal forms encode either Discourse-old events, or Discourse-new events which belong as Hearer-old items in the script sequence of the main verb’s scenario. Thus Parkari Nonfinal verb forms function like Greek Prenuclear Aorist Participles in the Nominative.

Evidence for scenarios in Parkari

If information is indeed stored in experientially related clusters in the brain, then it is reasonable to expect that the grammar and lexical collocations of all languages reflect this in some way. I argue that Parkari, like New Testament Greek, shows patterns of grammatical and lexical use which are fully consistent with the theory of mental scenarios, but are hard to explain by other theories. Since mental scenarios provide a cultural classification of experience into prototypical chunks, and since languages often mark in their grammar and vocabulary what is prototypical and what is contraexpectation, the grammar and lexicon of a language provide insights into the cultural world of the speakers.

The norms for evaluating this theory are the transcultural scenarios which are part of all human experience. The test cases of the theory are those instances where the grammar or lexicon presents as prototypical what we as a “foreign” audience, regard as unexpected. This mismatch in expectations shows up areas where culture affects how we link, or fail to link, specific information in our minds.

Parkari, like New Testament Greek, uses specific grammatical forms both for Discourse-old information and for Discourse-new information which belongs to an open or accessible scenario. In other words, the speaker’s criterion for grammatical choice is not whether the information is Discourse-old, but whether the speaker judges it to be Hearer-old. This grammatical usage is in line with scenario theory, since all Hearer-old information, whether Discourse-old or Discourse-new, is already stored in a mental scenario.
Chapter 10 - Parkari Verb Phrases and Scenarios

The contrast between Hearer-new and Hearer-old information will be demonstrated from seven Parkari texts. These are given in full in Appendix O, transcribed in IPA with a morpheme gloss and English translation. Lines are numbered for easy reference. The two short Parkari texts which are quoted most frequently are given in translation below:

"My farmwork" - by Arzan Bhadoni Sawan
1 Having got up early in the morning
   I will go to take a walk round the land.
2 After taking a walk round I come back home again.
3 After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.
4 The ox-team goes.
5 After ploughing the land then I go and cut the sugarcane.
6 After cutting the sugarcane then having chopped it into sections
   then again, back on the land, having made trenches
7 I plant sugarcane in the trenches.
9 After planting the sugarcane
10 then I fill it in, fill the trenches in.
11 After filling them in then I let the water into it.
12 After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.
13 After closing it then I er take another walk round the land.
14 Then I close off the channel from the upper mouth.
15 After closing the channel I come back
16 and take a tour round the land.
17 Then if there are field-walls I trim the walls.
18 After trimming the walls I keep the walls straight.
19 If there is a mound, then I dig away the mound and level it up.
20 And I do fields in turn, trimming them well.
21 I make all the fields level,
22 in which the water may come really evenly
23 and the water may lie in the field just the same amount all over.
24 So in this way according to my own plan
25 I do my work in a good manner.

"Michael" - by John Hemoni Rathor
1 Once there was a boy.
2 His name was Michael.
3 This boy used to go every day to study in school.
4 But he used to go to school on the train.
5 But he always used to travel without paying his fare.
6 And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,
7 then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.
8 One day the inspector caught hold of him.
9 When he checked his pockets
10 he found his Identity Card in his pocket.
11 and on the card was written "Michael Christian".
12 Then the inspector said to Michael
13 "You have become a Christian, but do what's wrong.
14 Christian people don't behave like this.
15 So why are you doing wrong like this?"
16 Then this boy became very ashamed,
17 and became very embarrassed.
18 Then Michael became a good Christian.
19 We should all
20 give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,
21 just as this boy became a good Christian.

See also:

Appendix O  Parkari texts and glosses
Discourse-new and Discourse-old events

Parkari, like New Testament Greek, regularly uses different verbal forms depending on whether events are Discourse-new or Discourse-old.

Discourse-new events are encoded by main verbs

Parkari regularly uses main verbs for Discourse-new events (information status category 1 NEW). Main verbs can be marked for Tense (Past, Present, Future), Aspect (Perfective, Imperfective, Progressive) and Mood (Indicative, Imperative, Subjunctive). Past Tense Indicatives (Perfective, Imperfective, and Progressive) are marked for gender (masculine or feminine, singular or plural). Present Tense Indicatives (Imperfective and Progressive), Future Tense Indicatives, Imperatives and Subjunctives are marked for person (1st, 2nd, or 3rd, singular or plural), with the exception of Present Indicatives in the negative which are marked for gender. The Present Indicative Progressive has both person and gender suffixes. Thus main verbs in Parkari are always marked for person (glossed -P), gender (glossed -G) or both, e.g. (relevant verbs bold)

"My farmwork"

1 fit hovar r-o vel-o uțö-en za-ifi ban-l mânh de-v-a ljokor
I morning of-G early-G get up-nonf go-fut,P land-G on give-inf-G tour
Having got up early in the morning I will go to take a walk round the land.

"Michael"

1 fiek sokr-o fiat-o.
one child-G was-G
Once there was a boy.

"The lame man and the blind man"

8b maț-o ri-o k-e-fi r-i-o, k-e-fi "ôdö-a.
lame-G topic-G say-P-pres stay-pf-G say-P-pres blind-G
it’s the lame man talking, he says "Blind man,

Discourse-old events are encoded by Nonfinal forms

In contrast to the use of main verbs for Discourse-new events, Nonfinal verb forms are regularly used when referring to Discourse-old information (information status category 3b GIVEN textual - current). These Nonfinal forms mark neither person nor gender. This pattern occurs in all Parkari genres, but especially in procedural texts which are characterized by the repetition of a Discourse-old event as a time setting for the subsequent Discourse-new event. This grammatical pattern is known as tail-head linkage, where the “tail” from the previous sentence is repeated at the beginning or “head” of the new sentence (Levinsohn 1992:169). This use of Parkari Nonfinal forms corresponds to the Greek use of Prenuclear Participles (especially Aorist) to refer to Discourse-old information.
In the examples below, relevant main verbs, giving Discourse-new information, are bolded, whereas Nonfinal forms, repeating what is now Discourse-old information, are underlined. The Nonfinal forms in Parkari have either the final morpheme -e (glossed -nonfinite) or -en (glossed -nonf or -nonfinal) which is probably a combination of -e plus on "and". The Nonfinal suffix -e is given a distinct gloss since it also occurs on lexical verbs when they occur with an auxiliary verb, e.g.

\[ u \text{ can-e } \text{ hike-e-f.} \]
He dance-nonfinite can-P-Pres
He can dance.

From "My farmwork" (a procedural text of habitual behaviour using Future and Present tense forms):

"My farmwork"

1 h\text{\`ı} h\text{\`ı}ar r-o vel-o ut\text{\`ı}-en za-i\text{\`ı}h ban-i m\text{\`ı}nh de-u-a \text{\`ı}jakar
I morning of-G early-G get up-nonf go-fut.P land-G on give-inf-G tour
Having got up early in the morning I will go to take a walk round the land.

2 \text{\`ı}jakar g\text{\`ı}-en passe wa\`le pas-o aw-\text{\`ı}-h g\text{\`ı}ar-e.
tour give-nonf then again back-G come-P-pres house-loc
After taking a walk round I come back home again.

And again:

8 q\text{\`ı}-\text{\`ı} mo\`e w\`ale k\text{\`ı}am\text{\`ı}dh \text{\`ı}ver-\text{\`ı}-h.
trench-G in again sugarcane plant-P-pres
I plant sugarcane in the trenches.

9 k\text{\`ı}am\text{\`ı}dh \text{\`ı}ver-e par-e sugarcane plant-nonfinite result-G
After planting the sugarcane

10 on p\text{\`ı}h u-a ne w\`ale u-a q\text{\`ı}-\text{\`ı} w\`ale pur-\text{\`ı}h.
and then that-G to again that-G trench-G again fill in-P-pres
then I fill it in, fill the trenches in.

11 pur-e par-e on p\text{\`ı}h u-a m w\`ale sad-\text{\`ı}-\text{\`ı} poni.
fill in-nonfinite result-G and then that-G in again leave-P-pres water
After filling them in then I let the water into it.

12 poni sad-en
water leave-nonfinal
After letting in the water,

b\text{\`ı}ar-e-en w\`ale u\text{\`ı}tar ne b\text{\`ı}\text{\`ı}dh \text{\`ı}kar-\text{\`ı}-h.
fill-pass-nonfinal again channel to closed do-P-pres
after it has filled, then I close the channel.

13 b\text{\`ı}\text{\`ı}dh \text{\`ı}kar-en passe w\`ale \text{\`ı} ban-i m\text{\`ı}nh \text{\`ı}jakor dj-\text{\`ı}-h.
closed do-nonfinal then again er? land-G on tour give-P-pres
After closing it then I er take another walk round the land.
It should be noted that it is the concept that is Discourse-old, not the lexical item, e.g. “Malo’s wedding” (a narrative text, in the Past tense):

27 ... ḏarsan me sār-e ṯi-a.
... Datsun in climb-nonf went-pf-G
... we climbed into the Datsun.

29 pāsē ḏarsan len ...
then Datsun take-nonf ...
Then having taken the Datsun ...

Occasionally the Nonfinal Discourse-old form refers back to a verbless clause with an implied verb “to be”, e.g. “Michael”:

11 an kar(Jh mah lakh-al ftat-o maekal uijuaji.
and card on write-ed was-G Michael Christian
and on the card was written “Michael Christian”.

13 “tu uijuaji ṯ-en cfalat kom kar-e-fi.
you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
“You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.”

Thus Parkari regularly uses main verbs for Discourse-new events, but Nonfinal verb forms for Discourse-old events. These Nonfinal forms may refer to habitual events as in “My farmwork”, to future events as in “Breadpan”, or to past events as in “Malo’s wedding”. In all cases the Nonfinal form refers to an event which temporally precedes the event of the following main verb.

Such events marked by tail-head linkage can be understood as the prototypical sequential events in a script-type scenario. Indeed all procedural texts simply relate the key events of a prototypical script, and arguably all narratives are simply variations on a theme based on one or more prototypical real-life scripts.

Nonfinal forms are used for all Hearer-old events

We have seen that Parkari regularly uses different grammatical forms for introducing Discourse-new events, and for referring back to Discourse-old events. However the grammatical forms marking Discourse-old events in Parkari can also be used for certain Discourse-new information not mentioned previously in the text. Such marking shows that the information, though Discourse-new, belongs in an open or accessible scenario.

Since Discourse-new information from an open scenario is treated grammatically as old information, the grammatical distinction is not between Discourse-old and Discourse-new, but between Hearer-old and Hearer-new. In other words, the speaker
chooses grammatical forms according to whether he judges the information to be in the hearer's mental scenario bank or not.

Main verbs in main clauses introduce an event as Hearer-new. Such events are always Discourse-new. (Main verbs in subordinate clauses such as “when” clauses are usually Hearer-old).

Nonfinal forms introduce an event as Hearer-old. Such events may be either Discourse-old (3b GIVEN textual-current, or 3c GIVEN textual-displaced) or Discourse-new (2a KNOWN unused, 2b KNOWN inferrable, or 3a GIVEN situational) as shown below.

**Nonfinal verb forms for 2b KNOWN inferrable events**

We have seen above that Parkari regularly uses a Nonfinal verb form when repeating Discourse-old information (type 3b GIVEN textual-current). This Nonfinal verb form is also frequently used for Discourse-new events which belong in an open or accessible scenario (type 2b KNOWN inferrable). Such Discourse-new events are Hearer-old since they are already present in the hearer's mental scenario for the main verb, e.g. “My farmwork”

1  
fih houver i-o vel-o u^h-en  
I morning of-G early-G get.up-nonf  
Having got up early in the morning

za-i^h ban-i moh de-u-a fjakar  
go-fut.P land-G on give-inf-G tour  
I will go to take a walk round the land.

Here “getting up” is Discourse-new, but is given the same Nonfinal grammatical form as Discourse-old information. I argue that this is because “getting up” is a prototypical element in the “taking a walk round the fields” script, being a precondition to the main event. As all Parkari farmers tour the land first thing in the morning, these events are closely linked culturally.

“My farmwork”

2  
fjakar d-en passe wale pass-o aw-d-fi g^a^c-e.  
tour give-nonf then again back-G come-P-pres house-loc  
After taking a walk round I come back home again.

3  
g^a^c-e gw-en wale d^a^g-a fakal-en za-i^h b^e^d-u-a d^f-or-o.  
house-loc come-nonf again ox-G drive-nonf go-fut.P tie-inf-G ox-team-G  
After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.

In 3 “driving oxen” is Discourse-new, yet is given the same Nonfinal verb form as “coming home” which is Discourse-old referring back to the main verb in 2. This is because “driving oxen” is a prototypical element in the “yoking the ox-team” script, being a precondition to the main event. The Hearer-old verb form indicates that this event is a prototypical part of the script in the scenario of the following main verb.
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It can be seen, then, that the use of the Parkari Nonfinal form parallels the use of Greek Prenuclear Aorist Participles in the nominative case. These constructions are both used to refer back to Discourse-old events as a setting for the following main verb, and also to refer to Discourse-new events in the script of the following main verb.

The subject of a Parkari Nonfinal form is normally the same as the subject of the main verb. However, there are exceptions, e.g.

“My farmwork”

11  
\[ \text{pur-e par-e an pa\-}\text{f u-}\text{o m wa\-}\text{le suf-\-}\text{f poni.} \]

fill in-nonf result-nonf and then that-G in again leave-P-pres water

After filling them in then I let the water into it.

12  
\[ \text{poni suf-}\text{en bharc-}\text{-en vale vator ne bhad-}\text{b kar-}\text{-f.} \]

water leave-nonf fill-pass-nonf again channel to closed do-P-pres

After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.

Here the event “being filled” is Discourse-new, yet is given the same nonfinal verb form as the Discourse-old information “letting in the water”. This is because “being filled” is a prototypical element in the “closing the channel” script, being a precondition to the main event. The Hearer-old verb form indicates that this event is a prototypical part of the script in the scenario of the following main verb.

The logical subject of “being filled” is not “I” but “the field”. Nevertheless the verb form simply indicates that this is a prototypical event in the “closing the channel” script.

The subject “the field”, even though different from the subject of the preceding and following events, need not even be mentioned since it is understood by the audience from the scenario of the main verb.

The same pattern occurs in narrative, e.g.

“Michael”

3  
\[ \text{e sokr-}\text{o tarik tarik iskul mo\-}\text{b hwar-}\text{-u-}\text{a zo-t-o.} \]

this child-G daily daily school in study-inf-G go-impf-G

This boy used to go every day to study in school.

4  
\[ \text{pan rel gorf-i m\-e sar-en iskul zo-t-o.} \]

but rail cart-G in climb-nonf school go-impf-G

But he used to go to school on the train.

Here the Discourse-new information “climbing” on the train is presented as Hearer-old information, since climbing aboard various types of transport is a prototypical script event in the scenario “going somewhere.”

“Michael”

19  
\[ \text{am-}\text{f bad-}\text{-f ne khip-}\text{e ke} \]

us-G all-G to must-P that

We should all

20  
\[ \text{amarc-}\text{a bhuf-}\text{-a kom suf-}\text{en fauk-a kom kar-}\text{-}\text{f.} \]

our-G bad-G work leave-nonf good-G work do-P

give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,
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Again the Discourse-new information “giving up bad deeds” is presented as Hearer-old information, since this is a prototypical script event in the scenario “doing good deeds.”

As in Greek, scenario contents and hence grammatical links in Parkari are prototypical, e.g.

“Mongoose”

6 an u-e fiék nolj-i z⁵al-i-o
   and that-erg one mongoose-G grasp-pf-G
   and he caught a mongoose

7 an u nolj-a c-o baʃ-i-o len
   and that mongoose-G of-G child-dim-G take-nonf
   and he took the mongoose’s baby

8 apr-e g⁵ar-e a-i-o.
   own- loc house-loc come-pf-G
   and came home.

The Discourse-new information “taking” is presented grammatically as Hearer-old information, since it is a prototypical event in the scenario “coming”. This does not mean that “taking” something always co-occurs with “coming” but simply that such a combination of events is common or uncontroversial. Here, however, “taking” is also part of a larger prototypical script of “seize, take, come home”, since the purpose of catching an animal is prototypically to take it home, dead or alive. By grammatically linking “taking” with “coming” the speaker shows that the two events are chunked together as a separate information chunk from “catching”. Indeed if someone catches an animal and then returns home, taking the animal along is presupposed in Parkari culture.

In summary, then, the use of the same grammatical form, i.e. Nonfinal, for both information status categories 3b GIVEN textual - current and 2b KNOWN inferrable suggests that what the speaker is encoding by his grammatical choice is not the distinction between Discourse-new and Discourse-old information, but rather the hearer’s ability to process information, whether it be Discourse-old or Discourse-new. The ability to process information depends on the hearer’s previous knowledge and understanding. What the speaker regards as Hearer-new is presented by main verbs, showing some combination of Tense, Aspect, Mood, Person and Gender, and indicates to the hearer that this needs to be explicitly remembered in the “current discourse” scenario being created. What the speaker regards as Hearer-old is presented grammatically in Nonfinal form, and this indicates to the hearer that this information can be retrieved, without new memorization, by referring to the elements already stored in the related mental scenario. At most, the hearer will need to mentally tick an existing scenario entry as relevant, but will not need to create a new entry.
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Evidence that Nonfinal verbs are part of the main verb’s scenario

Just as Greek has a restricted occurrence of conjunctions between participles, and between participle and main verb (see Appendix F), so Parkari has a restricted occurrence of conjunctions between consecutive Nonfinal forms, and between Nonfinal forms and main verbs. This is added evidence that the semantic relationship between these forms is determined by the prototypical relationship within the main verb’s scenario, rather than needing to be specified by explicit conjunctions.

In the Parkari texts cited we find the following conjunctions, all of which mark coordination of consecutive time:

Between Nonfinal forms:

no conjunction
“My farmwork”
12 ponji sad-en b'ar-o-en ...
  water leave-nonfinal fill-pass-nonfinal ...
  After letting in the water, after it has filled ...

then
“My farmwork”
15 voqna ne bod-en pass vele qu-en
  channel tie-nonfinal then again come-nonfinal
  After closing the channel I come back

again (marking a consecutive event)
“My farmwork”
3 g'ar-e qu-en wale q'ag-o hokal-en za-in bod-u-a djor-o.
  house-loc come-nonf then again ox-G drive-nonf go-fut.P tie-inf-G ox-team-G
  After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.

Between Nonfinal form and main verb:

no conjunction
“My farmwork”
1 hif huvr e-o vel-o up-en za-in ...
  I morning of-G early-G get.up-nonf ...
  Having got up early in the morning I will go ...

then
“My farmwork”
2 fokar of-en pass wale pas-o aw-5-fi g'ar-e.
  tour give-nonf then again back-G come-P-pres house-loc
  After taking a walk round I come back home again.

“Breadpan”
3 to qh e u tam-5 ne fhaul deuq kar-en
  then selves indeed they you-G to below fire do-nonf
  Then they will make the fire below [the breadpan] for you

4 pah u-a moe qf-o-f-e u-a ne taur-a ne.
  then that-G in flour-G wash-fut-P that-G to bread-pan-G to
  then in it flour ... they will wash the breadpan.
Between nonfinite form and main verb:

and

"Breadpan"

8 qo par-o kwarc-e
flour-G result-G move-nonf
After swilling the flour around,

9 an u-a moé zaé hé hé hú oq laq-f-e, and that-G in when below from fire seem-fut-P inside it, when the fire touches it from below,

10 ḥen-i taróh tap-f-e taq-o, good-G way heat-fut-P bread-pan-G the breadpan will heat up really well,

and then

"Breadpan"

5 taq-o ne d'o-en sop-q par-o kar-e
bread-pan-G to wash-nonf clean result-G do-nonf
After washing the breadpan and making it clean.

6 an pase u-a ne poqi e^-J-e par-o.
and then that-G to water spill-fut-P result-G they will then pour away the water from it.

"My farmwork"

11 pur-e par-e on poñ u-a m wałe saq-f-hi poni.
fill in-nonfinite result-nonfinite and then that-G in again leave-P-pres water
After filling them in then I let the water into it.

There are no occurrences in the cited texts of any conjunctions within the Nonfinal and main verb cluster which do not match the semantic category of expected sequence, i.e. there are no conjunctions marking contraexpectation, temporal disjunction, or logical relationships. This supports my hypothesis that these Hearer-old verb forms in Parkari refer to prototypical sequential events belonging to the script of the main verb’s scenario.

Further evidence that Nonfinals belong in the same scenario as the main verb is the fact that they are not marked for tense and mood, but pragmatically have the same tense and mood as the main verb, e.g.

Present Imperfective:

“My farmwork”

7 pah wałe bon-i mání wałe k'amódd u-a oq-ó par-e káq-f-e
then again land-G on again sugarcane that-G trench-G result-G extract-nonfinite then again, back on the land, having made trenches

8 oq-ó moé wałe k'amódd wec-f-hi.
trench-G in again sugarcane plant-P-pres I plant sugarcane in the trenches.
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Past Imperfective:

"Michael"

4 paŋ rel guq-i mē sar-en iskul za-t-o.
but rail cart-G in climb-nonf school go-impf-G
But he used to go to school having climbed on the train.

Past Perfective:

"Mongoose"

28 uth-e au-en apr-ol pʰaŋ sar-ol.
there-loc come-nonf own-G hood raise-G
it [snake] came there and raised its hood.

Future:

"Breadpan"

15 bal-en u kʰatom tʰ-e za-f-e at-o.
burn-nonf that finished become-nonf go-fut-P flour-G
it will burn up, and the flour will be totally consumed.

Future Imperative:

"Breadpan"

19 pʰad-ol-e par-ai an pase fek sʰdk-o gʰar-ia rot-i r-o-o
throw-nonf result-G and then one scone-G make-fut.imp bread-G of-G
throw it away, then make a scone out of bread.

Subjunctive:

"Michael"

20 aŋar-a bʰuq-a kom sauf-en tʰauk-a kom kar-ə,
our-G bad-G work leave-nonf good-G work do-P
give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,

Chapter summary

Parkari, like Greek, uses different grammatical forms for encoding Hearer-new and Hearer-old events. Whereas main verbs in Parkari are used to encode Discourse-new events, Nonfinal forms are used to encode both Discourse-old events which function as the setting for the following main verb, and also Discourse-new events which are prototypical elements in the script of the following main verb. This parallels the function of Greek Prenuclear Aorist Participles in the Nominative, and further suggests that scenario structure, specifically the sequencing of prototypical events in a script, directly affects grammatical choice.
Chapter 11
PARKARI NOUN PHRASES AND SCENARIOS

Since scenarios affect the grammatical structure of the Noun Phrase in Greek, this chapter explores how scenarios affect the Noun Phrase in Parkari. I give evidence that Parkari uses a specific salience marker with nouns that encode major Discourse-new participants, whereas the noun alone is used for minor Discourse-new participants, Discourse-old participants, and Discourse-new participants which belong as Hearer-old items in an open scenario. Thus, as in Greek, the grammatical form used for reference is affected by both the distinction between Hearer-new and Hearer-old information, and the marking of salience.

Discourse-new and Discourse-old referents

In the Noun Phrase Parkari uses different grammatical encoding for referents depending on whether they are Discourse-new or Discourse-old.

Discourse-new major participants are marked by “one” with the noun

In Parkari, Discourse-new major participants (information status type 1 NEW) are introduced by a noun qualified by “one” (or “two” etc.). Such participants are both Discourse-new and Hearer-new. My hypothesis is that this special marking signifies that those participants are “salient” within the discourse. Typically this salience marking of participants occurs at the start of a narrative, e.g. (relevant noun phrases bolded)

“Michael”

1 fick sokr-o fiat-o.
one child-G was-G

Once there was a boy.

“The lame man and the blind man”

1 fick-o gom me fick madh-o fiat-o an fick fiat-o odh-o.
one-G town in one lame-G was-G and one was-G blind-G
In a certain town there lived a lame man and a blind man.

A further example comes from the text “Mongoose”, where a pet mongoose saves a baby from a snake, but is killed when found with blood on its mouth, on the assumption that it has killed the baby. Note how all Discourse-new major participants are referred to
by a noun with fek “one”. This device cues the audience to significant Discourse-new information, which must be stored in the new mental scenario of “this story”, e.g.

(relevant noun phrases bolded, pronouns underlined)

“Mongoose”

Friends, it’s like this.
In a certain town there was a house.
And that house-holder’s name was Premo.

Prem-o r-o sokr-o fek konji fiat-o.
Prem-G of-G child-G one Konji was-G
Premo’s son was one Konji.

One day he went in order to graze his livestock

and that-erg one mongoose-G grasp-pf-G
and he caught a mongoose

And several days later

that-G of-G brother one small-G be.born-pf-G
his baby brother was born,

After a little while

one black-G snake that-G house in come-pf-G
a cobra came into the house.

A seemingly surprising example of this Hearer-new salient marking occurs at the end of the narrative of “Michael”, immediately before the moral:

Then Michael became a good Christian.
One might argue that Michael is not Discourse-new since he is the main character of the story. However, it is not Michael, but the “good Christian”, which is new and significant. So far, Michael has been a “bad” Christian, not obeying the teaching he claims to follow.

A parallel example comes in the “Mongoose” text, where the mother realizes that the mongoose she has just killed had not murdered her son:

I.erg one innocent sinless to kill-nonf result-pf-G
I have killed an innocent sinless creature.

Again, the referent, the mongoose, is Hearer-old for the mother, but until this point she has considered it “guilty sinful”. She has just realized that the mongoose is a “different character” from what she had thought.

Perhaps it is overstretching the point to think of these referents as “Discourse-new”, but undoubtedly the word fek “one” is being used here to mark salience, since these lines are each focal in the conclusion of the story.
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Discourse-new significant places and times are marked by “one” with the noun

In Parkari, just as Discourse-new major participants are marked salient, so Discourse-new significant places and times (information status type 1 NEW) are similarly marked salient by the use of fek “one” with a noun, e.g.

place
“The lame man and the blind man”
1 fek-a gom më fek maq-o hat-o an fek hat-o òdh-o.
   one-G town in one lame-G was-G and one was-G blind-G
   In a certain town there lived a lame man and a blind man.

In this text (see Appendix O), this town is significant as it provides a place for the setting of the story. By opening up the “town” scenario with its prototypical contents, specific details of the story, such as the place of the robbery (implicit in lines 3 and 10 as “somewhere in town”), the police station (line 30) and policemen (line 32), become expected non-controversial items and can thus be introduced into the text as Hearer-old.

“Mongoose”
2 fek gom më fek g-var hat-o.
   one town in one house was-G
   In a certain town there was a house.

This house is significant as the setting of the story. The boy who caught the mongoose lived here, and here the snake attacked his brother:

26 fek kul-o hap n-a g-var më a-i-o,
    one black-G snake that-G house in come-pf-G
    a cobra came into the house.

This pattern of “one” with the noun is also used to mark significant places in the middle of the narrative, e.g.

“Sparrow”
45 masr-o ne k-e-fi,
    mosquito-P to say-P-pres
    He says to the mosquitoes,

    fial-o fek-a maq fati ub-o, k-e-fi.
    come.along-G one-G place elephant stand-G say-P-pres
    “Come along, there’s an elephant standing over there.

In this story, the sparrow loses a grain of rice down a crack in a log and then tries to get various characters to help him retrieve it, but to no avail. Here in line 45, this “one place”, where the elephant is, provides the starting point for the whole series of the sparrow’s problems to be solved, one by one. The place per se is not particularly significant, but the use of “one” marks this whole new event as crucially significant in the discourse.

Similarly:
“The lame man and the blind man”
16 “fiek d’en par-al-fi” k-e-fi “dpk-ò r-al.”
   one pile fall-G-pres say-P-pres stem-G of-G
   There is a pile of stalks lying there.
This place is significant, both in the direct speech and in the discourse, as the place where
the main characters hide with their stolen loot. Compare line 44 “one tree” where “one
snake” appears.

**time**

The phrase “one day” signifies a major event will follow, e.g.

“Michael”

8 fiek dī bōbu i-a ne zəal-e lidb-o.
   one day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
One day the inspector caught hold of him.

Here “one day” not only marks the beginning of a new paragraph, where the action starts,
but is significant at discourse level, because the events which occurred then changed the
course of Michael’s life, and that is what the story is about.

“Mongoose”

5 fiek dī u q̱-i-o apr-a mol sar-i-a haru
   one day he went-pf-G own-G livestock graze-pf-G for
One day he went in order to graze his livestock

6 and he caught a mongoose

Again “one day” marks the time setting of a significant event at discourse level, the
finding of the mongoose, the central character of the story.

The adjective fiek “one” is never used for Hearer-old information, except to
contrast or compare two or more items one with another (e.g. Parkari texts 3:22-23, 4:31-
32, 7:37, and 7:64, see Appendix O). This supports the hypothesis that it is indeed a
salience marker for significant Discourse-new and Hearer-new participants.

**Discourse-new props and minor characters are marked with noun alone**

Whereas salient Discourse-new items are introduced by “one” with a noun, as a
NEW information marker, Discourse-new props (i.e. inanimate participants) are regularly
introduced by noun alone, e.g.

“Sparrow”

1 fiek sakl-o fiat-o.
   one sparrow-G was-G
Once there was a sparrow.

2 u la-i-o sokb-o, u-a ne zaq-i-o.
   he fetch-pf-G rice.grain-G he-G to find-pf-G
He fetched a grain of rice, he found it.

3 pən fiərb-o mən əəfiəb-o.
   then that log-G on sat-G
Then he sat on a log.

Note that the sparrow, as main character, is introduced by “one”, whereas the grain of rice
and the log are not. The grain of rice and the log are significant, reappearing in the
conclusion, line 66:
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So the carpenter went having taken his axe ... chopped up the log, and gave the grain of rice to the sparrow.

However, as props (inanimate participants), they are not given salient NEW marking. They might perhaps be regarded as prototypical items in the “sparrow” scenario (KNOWN inferrable), but they are clearly not KNOWN as specific individual referents, i.e. they refer to previously unidentified items (“a grain of rice” and “a log”) rather than specific identifiable items (“the grain of rice” and “the log”).

Similarly Discourse-new minor characters are regularly introduced by noun alone, without the salience marking “one”, e.g.

“Sparrow”

Possibly the minor characters in this story are introduced as KNOWN inferrable items in the “sparrow” scenario. Certainly “carpenter” here means “the local carpenter” not just “a carpenter”. Compare lines 16, 19, 21, 25, 28, 31, 35, 39, 41, and 44, where all but the last participants, “mosquitoes”, are introduced as vocatives in direct speech, suggesting they are assumed to be prototypically present.

**Discourse-old items are marked with noun, pronoun, or zero**

As we have already seen, significant Discourse-new items are introduced by “one” plus noun (shown bolded below). In contrast, Discourse-old participants (information status type 3b GIVEN textual - current, and 3c GIVEN textual - displaced) are never referred to in that way, but may be referred to using the noun alone, or deictic plus noun (underlined below). Discourse-old participants which are currently focal (i.e. 3b GIVEN textual - current) may also be referred to by third person pronoun (underlined), or by zero anaphora (marked by *), e.g.

“Michael”

1

\[ \text{fiek sokr-o hot-o.} \]
\[ \text{one child-G was-G} \]
Once there was a boy.

2

\[ \text{u-o t-o nom hot-o maekol.} \]
\[ \text{that-G of-G name was-G Michael} \]
His name was Michael.

3

\[ \text{e sokr-o tarik tarik iskul mo\tilde{e} b\tilde{a}n-u-a za-t-o.} \]
\[ \text{this child-G daily daily school in study-inf-G go-impf-G} \]
This boy used to go every day to study in school.

4

\[ \text{pan} * \text{ rel \tilde{a}n\tilde{a}i m\tilde{a} sar-en iskul za-t-o.} \]
\[ \text{but * rail cart-G in climb-nonf school go-impf-G} \]
But he used to go to school on the train.
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“The lame man and the blind man”

1 feik-a gom mē feik mad-h-o hat-o on feik hat-o ṣal-h-o.
   one-G town in one lame-G was-G and one was-G blind-G
   In a certain town there lived a lame man and a blind man.

2 mad-h-o ṣal-h-o ne k-e-fi “ape sor-ai kor-w-a faj-f-o.”
   lame-G blind-G to say-P-pres we.inc theft-G do-inf-G go.along- fut-P
   The lame man says to the blind man “Let’s go and steal something.”

3 tō “tō ne ker-l-e huz-a-e-fi ki?” * k-e-fi.
   so “you(s) to where-loc know-pass-P-pres question * say-P-pres
   So the blind man says “Do you know where something is then?”

In line 3 the subject is different from line 2, yet expressed as zero anaphora. This is not ambiguous since “tō” “so” functions as a switch reference marker, showing a change in subject from the previous clause.

Noun alone is used for all Hearer-old referents

It has been shown above that Discourse-new major characters are typically introduced with the formula “one” plus noun. In contrast Discourse-old nouns are referred to by a noun or deictic plus noun, or, where focal, by a pronoun or zero anaphora. However Discourse-new items may be introduced by single nouns, using the same marking as for Discourse-old items, where they belong in a currently open or accessible scenario. This indicates that grammatical choice is based not on the distinction between Discourse-new and discourse old, but between Hearer-new and Hearer-old.

Noun alone for Discourse-new KNOWN inferrable items

Discourse-new items of the category KNOWN inferrable are introduced by a noun alone, as shown below.

Discourse-new major characters, if KNOWN inferrable, are marked by noun alone

Sometimes Discourse-new major characters are introduced using the typical Discourse-old marking of noun alone. This indicates that this Discourse-new character is regarded as Hearer-old, since he or she belongs prototypically in an already open scenario, e.g. (relevant noun bolded)

“Michael”

4 But he used to go to school on the train.
5 But he always used to travel without paying his fare.

6 an zae-o bābu tiket zo-ū-a av-t-o
   and when inspector ticket see-inf-G come-impf-G
   And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,
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The “ticket inspector” is a major character in this story, being the one who challenges Michael to live up to the tenets of his faith. Yet he is introduced without the Discourse-new marker “one”. This is because line 4 has already opened the “train” scenario, in which the ticket inspector is prototypically present (information status type 2b KNOWN inferrable), so he is treated as Hearer-old. His arrival does not need to be heralded by a Discourse-new important character marking, since the audience do not need to make a new scenario entry for him. This individual can be fitted into the existing “ticket inspector” slot of the open “train” scenario.

The use of a noun alone to introduce a major character which is KNOWN inferrable is also shown in the “Mongoose” text (relevant noun bolded, pronouns underlined):

“Mongoose”

9 zœo u gʰe-e a-i-o, to u-a r-i ma kidh-o ke
when that house-loc come-pf-G then that-G of-G mother said- G that
When he came home his mother said

The “mother” is a major character in this story, being the one who kills the mongoose, believing it has harmed her child. Indeed, the final section of the story, lines 54-70, almost a quarter of the text, consists of her soliloquy reflecting on the benefits of thought before action. Nevertheless, although she is a major character and Discourse-new, she is introduced with Hearer-old marking, i.e. a noun without “one”. Moreover she is linked grammatically, by the genitive postposition, to the scenario of which she is a part. “His mother” shows she belongs in the “he” scenario. Since “he” is a child, his mother is prototypically present in his scenario. So in information status terms, “mother” is type 2b KNOWN inferrable.

Thus the use of “one” in Parkari marks not Discourse-new, but Hearer-new information, and Hearer-old information is not determined solely by what has been mentioned in the text, but also by the speaker’s estimate of what is already stored in the hearer’s mental scenarios.

Discourse-new minor characters, if KNOWN inferrable, are marked by noun alone

“The lame man and the blind man”

21 tœ k-e-fi “(guf-i ɾ-o) guf-i 1-en ɾ-e-fi ɾ-i-o
so say-P-pres (cart-G of-G) cart-G take-nonfinal come-P-pres stay-pf-G
d’aŋi dok-ɾ o ɾ-o” k-e-fi.

owner stem-G of-G say-P-pres
So he says “The owner of the stalks is coming with his cart.”

The only significance of this “owner” in the story is that he comes on a cart which the main characters then steal, and so he tells the police. He is grammatically linked to the scenario of “stalks” which are Discourse-old:

17 “There is a pile of millet stalks lying there” he says, “Let us go and hide in that” he says.
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**Discourse-new props, if KNOWN inferrable, are marked by noun alone**

Whereas Discourse-new major participants, and significant places and times are introduced with “one” plus noun, Discourse-new props (inanimate participants) are generally introduced by noun alone, e.g.

“Michael”

3 e sokr-o tarik turik iskul moe bʰan-u-o za-t-o.
   this child-G daily daily school in study-inf-G go-impf-G
   This boy used to go every day to study in school.

4 pən rel gūf-i mē saq-en iskul za-t-o.
   but rail cart-G in climb-nonf school go-impf-G
   But he used to go to school on the train.

Here “school” and “train”, although clearly Discourse-new when first mentioned, may well be being treated here as 2b KNOWN inferrable, since they are prototypical elements in the Parkari “environment” scenario, opened by the presence of Michael. For example “school” here does not mean “any school in the world”, but “the local school”. Similarly “train” does not mean any train, but the train that travels between Michael’s home and the school.

By not marking these props with “one”, they are being regarded as prototypically present, non-controversial items, whose existence at this time and place is not sufficiently unusual to warrant the NEW information encoding.

Compare:

“Mongoose”

47 u-a r-a matʰ-a mən mat hat-o
   that-G of-G head-G on waterpot was-G
   On her head was a waterpot,

48 on u-e zor hə u mat u-a noj-i-a mən pʰæʃol-i-o
   and that-erg force from that waterpot that-G mongoose-G on throw-pf-G
   and she threw that pot hard onto the mongoose.

Here the waterpot is certainly important in the story, since it is the item with which the mongoose is killed. Nevertheless, as an inanimate object it remains a mere prop. On the level of the predictability of the plot and the intention of the characters, it is the mother who killed the mongoose. The weapon used is relatively incidental.

Again, the waterpot may be regarded as 2b KNOWN inferrable, since lines 22-23 say “And that boy’s mother went outside to fetch water.” Since Parkari women fetch water in waterpots on their head, “a waterpot” could equally be translated as “her waterpot”, i.e. the waterpot you would expect in this scenario.

Once a scenario is explicitly opened, props and participants from that scenario are regularly introduced by noun alone, i.e. as prototypical Hearer-old elements of the open scenario, e.g.

“Michael”

4 But he used to go to school on the train.
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5. but always without fare-loc go-impf-G
   But he always used to travel without paying his fare.

6. And when inspector ticket see-imf-G come-impf-G
   And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

7. then this child-G toilet in or indeed seat under hide-nonf go-impf-G
   then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

It is clear that the meaning of these nouns is determined by the “train” scenario, “fare”
means the train fare, “inspector” the ticket inspector for the train, “tickets” the train tickets,
“toilet” the toilet at the end of each railway carriage, and “seat” the long bench-like seat in
the railway carriage where he was sitting.

Similarly, Discourse-new items related to a farming life are introduced in the text
“My farmwork” using the Hearer-old pattern of a noun alone, e.g.

3. house-loc come-nonf again ox-G drive-nonf go-fut.P tie-inf-G ox-team-G
   After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.

In a Parkari context, ploughing is typically done by oxen. The speaker then refers to oxen
as Hearer-old, being part of the “farmer” scenario opened up by the real life situation of
this discourse, where I, knowing the speaker and his occupation, asked him about his daily
work. Note “oxen” does not refer to any old oxen, but to the farmer’s own pair of oxen
which he keeps for ploughing. Again such items are information status type 2b KNOWN
inferrable.

Compare:

12. water leave-nonfinal fill-pass-nonfinal again channel to closed do-P-pres
    After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.

In a Parkari context, in the irrigated area where this discourse took place, all crops are
irrigated by an elaborate system of huge canals feeding into smaller canals, feeding into
irrigation channels alongside the fields. Thus although “channel” is here Discourse-new it
is grammaticalized as Hearer-old as part of the “irrigation” scenario. In context, this does
not mean “a channel” but “the channel which is alongside my fields.”

Noun alone for Discourse-new KNOWN unused items

Similarly a Discourse-new item of the category 2a KNOWN unused is treated as
Hearer-old, since it is prototypically part of all human experience, regardless of time,
place, and culture, e.g.

“My farmwork”

1. I morning of-G early-G get.up-nonf
   Having got up early in the morning
Here “morning” means the morning of the given day being spoken about. It is not defined with reference to any open textual or contextual scenario, other than the “real world” scenario, where mornings happen.

Similarly:

“The lame man and the blind man”

9  tō k-e-fi haue ope rat pəč-ai, tsea k-e-fi
   so say-P-pres Now we.inc night fall-G then say-P-pres
   So he says “Now, when night falls,

then we will go stealing.”

11b  di ufg-i-o par-o, həvar b-i-o par-o
   day rise-pf-G result-G morning become-pf-G result-G
   the sun rose, morning came

NB The one Parkari word is used for both day and sun.

Noun alone for Discourse-new GIVEN situational items

Discourse-new items belonging to the 3a GIVEN situational category are also Hearer-old and may be referred to by a noun, e.g.

“The lame man and the blind man”

66  vorta kəstem b-i-o-fi
   story finish become-G-pres
   That’s the end of the story.

Here “story” is co-referential with lines 1-65. However the noun “story” does not refer back to any specific words in the text (3b GIVEN textual - current or 3c GIVEN textual - displaced), but rather refers to “what I have just said and you have just heard” (3a GIVEN situational).

Similarly, Discourse-new items belonging to the 3a GIVEN situational category may be referred to by a deictic with a noun, e.g.

“The lame man and the blind man”

5  The blind man says “We won’t go stealing just like that.

6  “o melau-pəi bol-e-fi r-oj, ut b-e za-en” k-e-fi
   that bird.type-G sing-P-pres stay-G there-loc go-nonf say-P-pres
   Go over there where that bird is singing”

Here the “melavri” bird is not in the narrative co-text, nor was it in the co-text of the supposed conversation between the lame man and the blind man, but the narrator presents the bird as being in the original situational context of the speaker and hearer, i.e. a bird that the speaker and hearer could hear at the time.

As noted above, Discourse-old items may be referred to not only by noun phrases, but by pronouns and zero anaphora. However Discourse-new items of types 2a KNOWN unused and 2b KNOWN inferrable are typically introduced by a noun. This is because pronouns and zero anaphora are used for items already focal in the hearer’s consciousness, and, by definition, a Discourse-new item is typically not already focal.
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Pronoun or zero marking for Discourse-new GIVEN situational items

We have seen above that pronouns and zero anaphora may be used for items which are GIVEN, i.e. focal in the hearer’s consciousness. Items of types 3b GIVEN textual-current and 3c GIVEN textual-current refer back to items in the text, so they are Discourse-old by definition. Hence, the only Discourse-new items which can normally be focal belong to the category 3a GIVEN situational. Someone or something in the real life situation becomes focal or GIVEN due to its presence, its arrival, its sound, or its smell etc. In such cases pronouns or zero anaphora can be used, e.g. “What’s that?” or “Fantastic!” with reference to a sound, sight, or scent, not previously mentioned but part of the perceptual environment of speaker and audience.

First and second person pronouns are particularly common for 3a GIVEN situational information, often occurring at the beginning of a text referring to the characters present, or at the end, introducing a moral, e.g.

(pronouns bold, * is zero anaphora)

“My farmwork”
1  fii havar t-o vel-o u-th-en
   I morning of-G early-G get_up_nonf
   Having got up early in the morning, I ...

“Michael”
19  am-o l-aad-o ne k-wap-e ke
   us-G all-G to must-P that
   We should all

20  give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,

“Breadpan”
1  zae-o * fiae taup-o sqo-o
   when * this breadpan-G raise-P
   When you put this breadpan onto the fire,

2  tae-o pase dgev-o ne zOjomu ne haaf kar-ka.
   then then Jevon to or Shomu to call do-fut.imp
   then [you] give Jevon or Shomu a call.

The second person plural reference in “Breadpan” lines 1 and 2 are marked by the person suffix on the verb, with no pronoun, since the I-you relationship in communication is always highly focal. However the third person reference in line 2 is with proper nouns, otherwise the referents could not be identified.

An example of a third person pronoun for 3a GIVEN situational information, comes at the very end of the “Mongoose” text where the pronoun refers to the whole story which has just been related (3a GIVEN situational), not to any item referred to in the text itself, i.e.

71  fiae s-e az t-ai varta.
   this(near) be-P today of-G story
   This is today’s story.
Thus, although Parkari has neither definite nor indefinite article, it marks referents differently according to information status, which depends on culturally influenced scenarios. Significant Discourse-new items, which are both Hearer-new and salient, it treats as NEW, and marks by “one” plus noun. KNOWN items, whether KNOWN inferrable or KNOWN unused, are referred to by a noun alone. GIVEN items can also be referred to by noun alone, but GIVEN items which are highly focal, i.e. textual-current or situational, are regularly referred to by pronoun or zero anaphora.

**Noun for GIVEN referents marks salience**

The choice of nouns as opposed to pronouns and zero anaphora for GIVEN items is also significant. Throughout the “Michael” text, the same character, Michael, is focal. Once introduced in line 1 by the Discourse-new major character formula, he remains GIVEN textual-current throughout. Yet he is referred to in different ways, e.g.

(Discourse-new information is bolded, Discourse-old is underlined, * is zero anaphora)

“Michael”

1. *fiek sokr-o fiat-o.*
   *one child-G was-G*
   Once there was a boy.

2. *u-g r-o nom fiat-o maekal.*
   *that-G of-G name was-G Michael*
   *His name was Michael.*

3. *e sokr-o tarik tarik uskul moē b'arn-u-a za-t-o.*
   *this child-G daily daily school in study-inf-G go-impf-G*
   This boy used to go every day to study in school.

4. *poņ * rel ġač-i mē sāc-en uskul za-t-o.*
   *but * rail cart-G in climb-nonf school go-impf-G*
   But he used to go to school on the train.

5. *poņ * forĕf vōgar b'ārn-e za-t-o.*
   *but * always without fare-loc go-impf-G*
   But he always used to travel without paying his fare.

6. And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

7. to *e sokr-o kakus mē ya to sit fiēl'nāf-e za-t-o.*
   then *this child-G toilet in or indeed seat under hide-nonf go-impf-G*
   then *this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat .*

8. *fiek di ṭahu i-g ne z'hāl-e lidh-o.*
   *one day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G*
   One day the inspector caught hold of him.

9. *zaēi i-g r-a qhōz-a zo-i-a,*
   *when this-G of-G pocket-G see-pf-G*
   When he checked his pockets
to 1*a c-o $57-a m-e sanak*ti kard*za-r-i-o.
then this-G of-G pocket-G in identity card find-pf-G
he found his Identity Card in his pocket.

and card on write-ed was-G Michael Christian
and on the card was written “Michael Christian”.

then inspector Michael to said-G
Then the inspector said to Michael

“you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
“You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.

Christian people don’t behave like this.

So why are you doing wrong like this?”

Then Michael became a good Christian.

References to Michael as “boy” are in line 1 (“one boy” the introduction of the main character), lines 3 and 7 (“this boy” at the beginning and end of the setting giving his typical behaviour), line 16 (“this boy” showing his reaction to being challenged), and line 21 (“this boy” - with a different anaphoric marker - in the last line of the text, as someone we should imitate.)
In other words, the use of a noun phrase, rather than a pronoun or zero anaphora, to refer to the main character of a story appears to be marked, indicating a discourse boundary or significant event. Thus, as posited for New Testament Greek, Parkari appears to mark salient Discourse-old items differently from those which are merely Discourse-old and focal.

Use of a noun phrase to mark Discourse-old items as salient is clearly seen in the story “Sparrow”. Here a sparrow finds a grain of rice, loses it in the crack of a log, and then seeks the help of numerous characters in order to get it back. The sparrow is the central character throughout, but is only mentioned by a noun three times, line 1 (the introduction), line 44 (the turning point of the plot) and line 66 (the resolution, and last line of the story proper). Elsewhere the sparrow is referred to by a pronoun (as in line 2), or more commonly zero anaphora (as in line 3), i.e.

1  fiek sōkl-o fət-o.
   one sparrow-G was-G
   Once there was a sparrow.

2  u la-i-o sōk³-o, u-g ne zər-i-o.
   he fetch-pf-G rice grain-G he-G to find-pf-G
   He fetched a grain of rice, he found it.

3  pəñ * ʃə̃l³-o məñ beqt³-o
   then * log-G on sat-G
   Then he sat on a log

44 fiaue sōkl-o uth³-e ubb³-en vałe ʃə̃l³-o məñ sər̃ o ne ter⁶-u-o
   now sparrow-G there-P stand-nonf again went-pf-G mosquito-P to fetch-inf-G
   Now the sparrow stood there, then went off to bring the mosquitoes.

66 So the carpenter went having taken his axe, chopped up the log,
   an sōk³-o u-a ne sōk³-o ne did⁵-o pət-o.
   and rice grain-G he-G to sparrow-G to gave-G result-G
   and gave the grain of rice to the sparrow.

67 And that's the end of the story.

Using nouns for Discourse-old main characters to mark salience is consistent with scenario theory. Only minimal marking is required to refer to Hearer-old items in an open scenario, hence the frequent use of pronouns and zero anaphora. Use of fuller encoding, such as a noun, or deictic plus noun, is therefore marked.

Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986) holds the twin maxims “the greater the contextual effects, the greater the relevance” and “the smaller the processing effort, the greater the relevance”. Thus, by choosing any form of reference other than the normal or minimal form required, the speaker is deliberately increasing the “processing effort” and hence promising more “contextual effects”, i.e. some extra element of meaning with significance for the hearer. In Parkari, use of a noun phrase where a pronoun or zero
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anaphora would suffice for reference, gives the added "contextual effects" that this section of text is significant at higher levels of discourse, i.e. important to the plot in a narrative.

This parallels the use of anarthrous nouns for Hearer-old items in New Testament Greek. The lack of the Greek article for Hearer-old referents is statistically unusual, so promises extra "contextual effects" in terms of the significance of the particular referent or section of text at higher levels of discourse.

Chapter summary

The Noun Phrase in Parkari, as in Greek, is affected by two factors: whether the speaker judges the referent to be Hearer-old, and whether the speaker wishes to mark the referent as salient. Parkari uses the salience marker fiek "one" with nouns that encode major Discourse-new participants, places or times, but uses the noun alone to refer to minor Discourse-new participants, Discourse-old participants, and Discourse-new participants which belong as Hearer-old items in an open scenario.

Items which are already highly focal in the hearer's consciousness, i.e. GIVEN textual-current or GIVEN situational, are regularly referred to by pronoun or zero anaphora. When these highly focal items are referred to by a noun (with or without an anaphoric demonstrative adjective) then they are being marked as salient, and this indicates the beginning of a significant event in the discourse.
Chapter 12
PARKARI HEARER-OLD MARKERS AND SCENARIOS

Parkari, like Greek, uses a variety of grammatical structures which mark that information is Hearer-old. Accurate interpretation of the information encoded by these Hearer-old markers depends on the audience’s ability to correctly infer implicit information by retrieving it from the contents of their own mental scenarios. This chapter explores some of these Hearer-old markers in Parkari, using parallel sections to those used for Greek in Chapter 7, since despite the difference in form of Hearer-old markers in Greek and Parkari, their functions are remarkably similar. For translation, it is essential to recognize these forms in both source and target languages, since implicit information in the source text must be identified, and if it cannot be retrieved from the target audience’s mental scenarios it must be made explicit in the translation.

“When” clauses and Hearer-old event scenarios

In Parkari, “when” clauses are frequently used to refer back to Discourse-old information. Whereas Nonfinal verb forms typically have the same subject as the following main verb, “when” clauses typically have a different subject from that of the main verb. Thus they function, like the so called “Genitive Absolute” construction in Greek, as switch reference markers, e.g.

(relevant Discourse-new elements bold, Hearer-old elements underlined)

“Mongoose”

7 and he took the mongoose’s baby

8 ane g^bar-e a-o-i-o.
own-loc house-loc come-pf-G
and came home.

9 zae® u g^bar-e a-o-i-o, to u-o r-i ma kid®-o ke
when that house-loc come-pf-G then that-G of-G mother said- G that
When he came home his mother said

Verb forms in 7, 8 and 9a have the boy as agent, but in 9b the mother is agent.

In Parkari, a “when” clause may also be marked simply by the correlative “then” conjunction “to” “t®” or “te” in the following clause. Again this typically is a switch reference marker with the second clause having a different subject from the first:
"Malo’s wedding"

2 an pass ame kar-i-o uiua mal-o r-o.
and then we do-pf-G wedding Malo-G of-G
and then we held Malo’s wedding.

3 uiua kar-i-o te paifi-a am-5 kan kaø naif.
wedding do-pf-G then money-G us-G with anything not
When we held the wedding we had no money at all.

In Parkari, the subject of clause 3b is “money”, so there is a switch of grammatical subject.

"When" clauses are also used for Discourse-new information where the information is expected due to the open scenario. All such information is treated as Hearer-old, e.g.

“Michael”

4 But he used to go to school on the train.
5 But he always used to travel without paying his fare.

6 on zaeø sasu tiket zo-u-a ao-t-o
and when inspector ticket see-inf-G come-impf-G
And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

Line 6 introduces both a Discourse-new character, the ticket inspector, and a Discourse-new event, checking the tickets, yet both have the same marking as is used for Discourse-old information - a noun without “one” for the character, and a “when” clause for the event. This indicates that these items are being presented as Hearer-old, since they are KNOWN inferrable. The open scenario is the train (line 4), and specifically travelling without buying a ticket (line 5). In the “train” scenario, in the section of the conceptual network entitled “ticketless travel”, there is a prototypical entry “ticket inspector arrives to check tickets”.

Similarly:

“Michael”

8 One day the inspector caught hold of him.

9 zaeø i-a r-a qitz-a zo-i-a,
when this-G of-G pocket-G see-pf-G
When he checked his pockets

Here line 9 introduces a Discourse-new event, looking through Michael’s pockets, but with the Hearer-old marking “when”. Again, this marks the frisking as 2b KNOWN inferrable, being a prototypical element of the scenario “catching a fare-dodger” opened in line 8.

The scenario in which the Discourse-new item belongs need not be recently opened in the text, but may have been opened some time before, i.e. GIVEN textual-displaced, e.g.

“Mongoose”

41 A little while later, the boy’s mother came.
42 And she came to the doorway and saw ...

50 mar-en pass zaeø g'or me g'-oi
kill-nonf then when house in went-G
After she had killed it, when she went inside the house
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The mother's going inside (line 50) is prototypical, given her arrival home in line 41. The intervening occurrences, seeing and killing the pet mongoose on suspicion it has harmed her baby, do not weaken, but rather strengthen, the likelihood of her entering, as she is now desperate to see what has happened to her baby.

The open scenario, within which the "when" clause information is prototypical, need not even be part of the spoken or written co-text, but may be part of the real life context, i.e. 3a GIVEN situational, e.g.

"Breadpan"

1  zacäñ hue ūar-o sar-o
   when this breadpan-G raise-P
   When you put this breadpan onto the fire,

2  then give Jevon or Shomu a call.

Here, the speaker knew we had just bought a new clay breadpan for cooking chapattis, and so could speak of our first using it as Hearer-old, predictable information. If you buy a breadpan, then of course you will use it. Thus "when" clauses are used for all Hearer-old categories, both Discourse-old and Discourse-new.

Verbal forms referring to Hearer-old event scenarios

Verbal nouns

In the Parkari language verbal nouns may be formed from any verb stem by adding either the Infinitive suffix, or the Perfective Aspect suffix before a Postposition, followed by the masculine singular Gender ending. This means that an event can be referred to by a Noun Phrase rather than a Verb Phrase. In such cases, the event is being referred to as Hearer-old. Such events are typically Discourse-old, and always Hearer-old.

I have no examples from the recorded Parkari texts cited, but give examples from a letter written to me by my work colleague Malo dated 5/10/95 while I was in England (verbal nouns underlined):

tamar-a a-i-a mor mor imtafion khatam th-e za-e, to thik.
your-G come-pf-G before before exam occur-nonf, then fine.
It will be good if (my) exams are finished before your return.

This is 3c GIVEN textual-displaced (Discourse-old and Hearer-old), since the conversation (oral text) about my return occurred before I left for England, and was repeated in my previous letter. Similarly:

tamar-a zo-i-a kēr mē apr-o medjkol ūest kar-a-i-o
your-G go-pf-G after I.erg own-G medical test d-caus-pf-G.
After your departure I had my medical test done.

This event is 3a GIVEN situational (Discourse-new, but Hearer-old) since I was physically absent at the time of writing.

276
Passives and subjectless verbs

In Parkari, the use of passives, or verbs with no subject specified, typically indicates that the agent is Hearer-old, since the hearer is expected to understand the referent even where it is not grammatically or lexically marked. (The only exceptions to this are when the speaker does not know the agent or wishes to hide the agent’s identity.) Frequently, the agent will be found in an open scenario, belonging to the category 3b GIVEN textual-current, e.g. (relevant verb bolded)

“Farmwork”

11 After filling them in then I let the water into it.

12 poqi sacf-en b harassment-are-n subjectless fill-pass-pass pass-again channel to closed do-P-pres
After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.

In line 12, the Nonfinal verb form b harassment-are-n is passive. As argued above, the Nonfinal form marks that this event is prototypical in the open scenario “closing the irrigation channel”, occurring after irrigating the fields. The implicit agent of the event “fill” is “I” the narrator, inferrable from the open “irrigation” scenario, where he lets in the water (line 11) and closes the channel (line 12). However, the grammatical subject of the passive verb, “b harassment” the field, is also left implicit, and is not lexicalized until line 20. This subject is also inferrable from the open “irrigation” scenario. When Parkari farmers open and close channels it is always for irrigating fields.

Past Participles of transitive verbs are semantically Passive in Parkari. Here the agent is inferrable from the open scenario (2b KNOWN inferrable), e.g.

“Michael”

10 he found his Identity Card in his pocket.

11 on card-makes write-ed was-G Michael Christian
and on the card was written “Michael Christian”.

The open scenario is “Identity Card”, a compulsory legal document for all adults in Pakistan, so the audience, by referring to that scenario, know that the name has been written by a government official and is proof of Michael’s identity, rather than being any old name that someone has happened to write on it.

Parkari frequently uses main verbs with no grammatically explicit subject. Again the subject is treated by the speaker as Hearer-old information, which may be GIVEN or KNOWN, and must be supplied by the hearer from their mental scenarios, e.g.

(subjects marked by zero anaphora are starred)

“Malo’s wedding”

2 an pass-am we-kar-i o viva mol-o r-o
and then we do-pf-G wedding Malo-G of-G
and then we held Malo’s wedding.
Chapter 12 - Parkari Hearer-old Markers and Scenarios

3 * uivo kar-i-o te paib-a am-5 kon kē naif.
* wedding do-pf-G then money-G us-G with anything not
When we held the wedding we had no money at all.

13 pase * kar-i-o uivo
then * do-pf-G wedding
Then we held the wedding

18 whoever was a true relative of ours, they came.

19 pase * au-en * bhat rodh-i-o, * uivo kar-i-o
then * come-nonf * rice cook-pf-G * wedding do-pf-G
Then when they had come we cooked the rice and * held the wedding.

20 hōz r-o nimtar suf-i-o, * tak-e r-i-a.
evening of-G wedding-money get loose-pf-G * stay night-nonf stay-pf-G
In the evening the wedding money was raised, they stayed the night.

The lines above have an impressive number of implicit subjects all of which are thus
trated by the speaker as Hearer-old, to be supplied by the hearer from appropriate
scenarios.

In line 3 the implicit subject is GIVEN textual-current, and must be supplied by the
hearer from the scenario “holding the wedding”, opened in line 2 where the pronoun “we”
makes the subject explicit. In line 13 “we” must be supplied from the same scenario, but
now the referent is of the information type GIVEN textual-displaced.

In line 19, the subject of the Nonfinal form “come” is “our relatives”, which is
GIVEN textual-current, referring back to the previous line 18.

The subject of “cooked the rice” in line 19, though glossed as “we” in English, is
not the same “we” as in line 2, i.e. the groom’s parents. In the Parkari wedding scenario,
the groom’s parents will buy food to feed their guests and call on a few neighbours or
close friends to do the cooking. So the implicit subject is KNOWN inferrable, to be found
in the “wedding” scenario (line 13), under the script event “cook rice” in the slot
“participant: agent”.

Finally in line 20, the implicit subject of “stayed the night” is “our relatives”
introduced in line 18, and implicit in line 19. Due to the intervention of different implicit
subjects in line 19, this is categorized as GIVEN textual-displaced.

It may seem strange that Parkari simply omits all these subjects, especially as they
are not simply zero anaphora for a single agent of a consecutive string of verbs. Yet
scenario theory provides a rationale for implicit participants being focal, and thus referable
to by zero anaphora, since they are focal within the scenario, whether mentioned
previously in the text or prototypical participants in that scenario in long-term memory.

Granted that these participants can be retrieved by the hearer from the hearer’s
scenario bank, why should the speaker rely on the hearer to do this, rather than simply
state the participants clearly? Grice’s Conversational Maxims, which Sperber and Wilson
develop into the single over-riding principle of “Relevance”, provide the rationale (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:33-34):

Make your contribution as informative as required
Do not make your contribution more informative than required
... Avoid ambiguity
Be brief

The speaker’s role is to be as brief as possible without producing ambiguity. The prototypical nature of mental scenarios allows brevity without ambiguity, by enabling the hearer to accurately fill in the gaps the speaker has left. So long as the scenarios are culturally shared then communication is maximally efficient. Only when the speaker’s cultural scenario bank is not shared by the audience, as with us as westerners trying to fill in the gaps in Parkari texts, does the speaker’s brevity cause ambiguity and a desire for more information to be made explicit.

Sometimes the scenario in which a subjectless verb belongs is totally generic, i.e. relating to all people everywhere. In such instances, the subject to be supplied by the hearer is also generic, i.e. all humans. Such agents are not found in the co-text, but are of the information type 2a KNOWN unused. In English, the subjects of such verbs might be translated “you” or more formally “one”, e.g. “Mongoose”

65 But then she thought in her heart

66 er-o kom no kar-u-o kɔap-e.
this sort-G work not do-inf-G must-P
One should not act like this.

67 fameɓa sabɓar kar-u-o.
always patience do-inf-G
One should always be patient.

69 perfí sɔfí-u-o, uifoar-u-o,
first think-inf-G think-inf-G
First one should think, one should ponder

70 u-a ker biz-o kom kar-u-o.
that-G after other-G work do-inf-G
and after that one should take other action.

Quotations and Hearer-old event scenarios

In Parkari, as in Greek, the speakers are not necessarily made explicit where there are direct quotations in a text. I argue that a general principle to determine the speaker or writer of a quotation would be: where no agent is specified, choose the prototypical agent of the open scenario.
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Parkari stories involving dialogue typically change the speaker by using a switch-reference conjunction tö rather than naming the speaker. This of course requires the hearer to have available in their open mental scenario of “this discourse” the list of current participants, including who was the last subject, e.g. (speaker and speech verb bolded, switch-reference marker underlined)

“The lame man and the blind man”

2. maf-o oof-a ne k-e-fi “ape sor-ai kar-u-a haf-f-ğ.”
lame-G blind-G to say-P-pres we-inc theft-G do-inf-G go.along-fut-P
The lame man says to the blind man “Let’s go and steal something.”

3. tő “tů ne kẹ-fẹ huz-o-e-ni ki?” k-e-fi
so you(s) to where-loc know-pass-P-pres question say-P-pres
So [the blind man] says “Do you know where something is then?”

4. tő k-e-fi “hoe”
say-P-pres yes
So [the lame man] says “Yes”.

In line 2 the speaker and addressee are made explicit, but in lines 3 and 4 the speaker is indicated simply by the switch-reference conjunction, with no explicit subject.

Similarly:

“Sparrow”

1. Once there was a sparrow.
2. He fetched a grain of rice, he found it.
3. Then he sat on a log
4. so he says to the log, “give me the rice grain.”
5. There was a crack in it, wasn’t there.
6. In the log.
7. “Give me the grain of rice.”
8. tő k-e-fi sokb-o naf dʒ-f
so say-P-pres rice grain-G not give-P
So he says, I will not give you the grain of rice.

In line 8 the subject of “says” is the log. This is shown simply by the switch-reference marker “tő” at the beginning of line 8. This is KNOWN inferrable information, from the current “this story” scenario, by comparison with the long-term memory “dialogue” scenario, where addressees prototypically respond.

This pattern of marking subject switch by the switch-reference marker occurs throughout this story (the noun sparrow is only mentioned 3 times, lines 1, 44 and 66), e.g.

“Sparrow”

14. So he [the carpenter] says, “Go away!
15. What wrong has he done me, that I should take the grain of rice from the log.”

16. tő k-e-fi, bʱutja, bʱutsa, tů u-a ne waqb-a ne hazam-au, k-e-fi
so say-P-pres king king you(s) he-G to carpenter-G to understand-caus say-P-pres
So he says, “King, king, you explain to the carpenter
to get me the grain of rice from the log!”

17. tő k-e-fi, mor-o kek-o dɵk kar-i-o,
say-P-pres my-G what.sort-G wrong do-pf-G
So he says, “What wrong has he done,
that I should say so to the carpenter?"

In line 16 the sparrow is speaking. This is marked by switch-reference “tō” following the carpenter’s speech in line 14. In line 17, another switch-reference marker shows the subject of “says” must be different from the subject in 16, i.e. not the sparrow. In the current scenario opened in line 16, there are only two characters “on stage”, the sparrow and the king. So the king is the speaker in line 17. Again, identification of the speaker is achieved by cross-referencing the grammatical switch-reference marker with the currently open discourse scenario of which characters are “on stage”.

Sometimes the switch-reference conjunction is absent, and the subject of the verb is to be deduced simply from the content of what is said, e.g.

“The lame man and the blind man”

3  tō "tū ne kel'-e huz-c-e-fi kiʔ?” k-e-fi
so you(s) to where-loc know?-pass-P-pres question say-P-pres
So [the blind man] says “Do you know where something is then?”

4  tō k-e-fi “hoe”
so say-P-pres yes
So [the lame man] says “Yes”.

5  am näl fiol-ø upe sor-ai kær-v-a” k-e-fi.
thus not go along-P we.inc theft-G do-inf-G say-P-pres
[The blind man] says “We won’t go stealing just like that.”

There is no switch-reference marker in line 5, yet the strongly negative statement “we won’t go...” contrasts with the positive statement “yes”, indicating that the speaker must be different. Again, the hearer must cross-reference what is in the text with the currently open discourse scenario of which characters are “on stage”.

The switch-reference marker is also used when one of two current participants becomes subject:

“Merchant”

2  Once there was a merchant and his wife.
3  They had no children, none at all.
4  Neither son nor grandson, nothing at all.

5  tó k-e-fi vonj-a ne k-e-fi “have” k-e-fi “...
so say-P-pres merchant-G to say-P-pres now say-P-pres ...
So she says to the merchant: Now ...

The Parkari verb form here only specifies third person, not number or gender. The addressee, however, is made explicit by the noun “merchant”. The speaker is left implicit, being KNOWN inferrable, the only other participant from the open “story participants” scenario, line 2.
Rhetorical questions and Hearer-old scenarios

Another grammatical structure where the explicit information is Hearer-old is the rhetorical question. Whereas real questions are used to elicit information, rhetorical questions are used to refer to information known by both speaker and audience. In Parkari rhetorical questions are used to convey Hearer-old information with strong emphasis or emotion. In Parkari, as in Greek, when a speaker uses a rhetorical question, he assumes three things:

1) the audience knows the correct “answer” to the “question”
2) the audience knows that the speaker knows the answer
3) the audience knows that the speaker knows that the audience knows.

In such situations, the audience know that the “question” is not eliciting information, so they infer some other pragmatic meaning from the speaker’s utterance.

The grammatical form of rhetorical questions in Parkari is the same as for real questions. (As questions are rarer in monologue than dialogue, some examples are quoted from typical usage, rather than from the chosen texts), e.g.

Real Questions:

kəm “why?”
  kəm nat'i a-i-o?
  why not-Pres come-Perf-G
  Why hasn’t he come?

kuŋ “who?”
  tane kuŋ s-o?
  you(p) who be-P
  Who are you?

ki “what?”
  tane az ki rōdh-i-o-fi?
  you(p) today what cook-Perf-G-Pres
  What have you cooked today?

ki (sentence final) = question marker
“The lame man and the blind man”
  3 tō “tī ne kuts'e huz-o-e-fi ki?” k-e-fi.
  so “you(s) to where-loc know-pass-P-pres question say-P-pres
  So the blind man says “Do you know where something is then?”

4 So the lame man says “Yes”.

na “no” (sentence final) = question tag, expecting an answer in agreement with the proposition in the question, e.g.
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"The lame man and the blind man"

22b "ghogh erg-a fœhr-œi melœur-œi to mkœr-œi t-œi na?" k-e-fi.
   potšer-G through-G bird-type-G indeed exit-G past-G no say-P-pres
   The bird did go through the pot-rim, didn’t it?"

23 So the lame man says yes.

Rhetorical Questions:

kœm “why?” - expressing criticism = should not ...

"Mongoose" (woman speaking to herself)

62 mœ kœm na sošœr kœr-i-o?
   I.erg why not patience do-pf-G
   Why was I not patient?

63 kœm na mœ perfœl za-en gœr mœ zo-i-o?
   why not I.erg first go-nonf house in see-pf-G
   Why did I not first look inside the house?

The speaker knows that there is no good reason for not being patient, cf.

67 One should always be patient.

“Michael”

13 “You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.

14 Christian people don’t behave like this.

15 to kœm fer-œ gœlœt kœm kœr-e-fi c-i-o.
   so(result) why like this-G wrong work do-P-pres stay-pf-G
   So why are you doing wrong like this?”

16 Then this boy became very ashamed,

17 and became very embarrassed.

The ticket collector had already stated that the boy, as a Christian, should not behave this way, and the boy obviously knew this too, hence his shame. Again, the “answer” to “why” is “no good reason”, so the rhetorical question functions as a rebuke.

kœn “who?” - used for strong denial

“Sparrow”

(The log is speaking to the sparrow)

8 So he says, “I will not give you the grain of rice.

9 Go away!

10 tœ ne kœn k-e-fi ehi fefi?
   you(s) to who say-P-pres here sit
   Who says you can sit here?”
   i.e. Nobody has given you permission to sit here.

The sparrow and the log both know that the “answer” to the rhetorical question “who” is “nobody”.
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ki “what?” - expressing negative evaluation
“Mongoose”
55 b’ale b’agfon, me e ki kor-e nak-h-i-o.
oh.my! God, Lerg this what do-nonf put.in-pf-G
Oh God! What have I gone and done?
i.e. I have done a very bad thing.

64 ki, ki, ker-o kon s-e?
what what what.sort-G work be-P
What, what, what sort of deed is this?
i.e. This is a very bad thing (I have done).

The speaker knows that the “answer” to the rhetorical question “what” is “something bad”,
witness the sentences following these examples:
56 I have killed an innocent sinless creature.
66 One should not act like this.

ki (sentence final) = question marker - expressing strong denial
to mar-o sah s-e, ki?”
you(s) my-G boss be-P question
Are you my boss?”
i.e. You should not boss me about.

This type of rhetorical question is used when the addressee has no authority due to age,
kinship, or status to be ordering the speaker about. Moreover the addressee already knows
this, and knows that the speaker knows.

na “no” (sentence final) = question tag, expecting an answer in agreement with the
proposition in the question - expressing irony
uafi te uafi! te gh q-o thauk-o kom kar-i-o-h, na?
wow indeed wow! you(s) very-G good-G work do-Perf-G-Pres, no?
Bravo! You have done an excellent job haven’t you?
i.e. You have made a terrible mess of this!

This type of rhetorical question is used when the addressee is already aware that he has
done something badly, and knows that the speaker will consider it as bad. Thus the
addressee rejects the straightforward interpretation of a compliment, since this would not
be relevant to the real-life situation.

In all these examples of rhetorical questions, the hearer must recognize that the
speaker is not eliciting information, but referring to information which both the speaker
and hearer already know. The hearer must also recognize, from the current context and
from previous knowledge stored in mental scenarios of prototypical reactions to such
information, the specific strong attitude or opinion which the speaker is expressing by
using the grammatical question form.
Comparative clauses and Hearer-old thing scenarios

The use of comparative clauses indicates that the speaker regards the information in that clause as part of the hearer’s mental scenario bank. Otherwise it would not be reasonable to expect the hearer to derive any benefit from the comparison. Such information in comparative clauses, therefore, may belong to any information status type except NEW.

Comparative clauses containing GIVEN textual information frequently occur in the closure of discourses, as part of the “moral of the story” or summary statement, e.g.

(relevant NEW information bolded, comparison marker bolded and underlined, Hearer-old information underlined)

“Michael”

18 pose maekal fek saldo au"baj fu i-o. Then Michael one good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G
then Michael became a good Christian.

19 We should all
give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,

20 zem fiae sokr-o ruluk-o ujuaji tll-e cf-i-o. just.as thisCnear) child-G good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G just.as this boy became a good Christian.

Here the comparative clause in line 21 contains Hearer-old information of the type GIVEN textual-current, referring back specifically to line 18 where it is NEW information.

Similarly:

“My farmwork”

24 so eu-a namun-a t\i kom apr-a k\i jel t\i so thus-G manner-G by work own-G thought by So in this way according to my own plan

25 I do my work in a good manner.

The comparative clause in lines 24 and 25 also contains Hearer-old information of the type GIVEN textual-current (and also arguably GIVEN textual-displaced), since it refers back generically to all the specific activities mentioned in lines 1 to 23.

Another example of a Discourse-final comparison comes from the mother’s soliloquy in “Mongoose”, lines 54-70, where, having killed the innocent mongoose in haste, she reflects on the wisdom of thinking first and acting later:

“Mongoose”

66 er-a kom na kor-u-o k\aep-e. this.sort-G work not do-inf-G must-P One should not act like this.

Here the adjective “like this” makes a comparison between any sort of hasty action, and the specific hasty action mentioned in lines 41-49, where she kills the mongoose. As far as the speaker is concerned, the action she is referring to is GIVEN situational. As far as the audience of the story is concerned, the information type is GIVEN textual-displaced.
Comparative clauses may also occur in the initial stages of the plot, e.g.

“The lame man and the blind man”
2 The lame man says to the blind man “Let’s go and steal something.”
3 So the blind man says “Do you know where something is then?”
4 So the lame man says “Yes”.

5 “am naT ftal-o ape sor-si kar-u-a” k-e-fi.
   thus not go along-P we inc theft-G do-inf-G sav-P-pres
The blind man says “We won’t go stealing just like that.
6 Go over there where that bird is singing and put a broken pot-rim there.
7 just keep looking whether the bird goes through the broken pot-rim or not.”

The adverb “thus” in line 5 indicates that the event is Hearer-old. At first glance it appears that this information is simply GIVEN textual-current, referring back to the NEW information in line 2 “going stealing”. However, “thus” does not refer to going stealing per se, but to the real life situation in which the suggested theft was taking place, i.e. “without consulting omens”, which is information type GIVEN situational.

The action suggested in line 7, seeing whether the bird will fly through the broken pot rim, is a way of checking whether their actions are auspicious. In fact, the bird does fly through the pot rim, and the blind man takes this as an auspicious omen. Later on in the story, in lines 22 and 34, when the situation seems hopeless, the blind man reminds the lame man of this auspicious omen, and they keep on going, finally escaping with the loot and being healed.

One might object that GIVEN information is categorized as focal, and something NOT occurring in the context can hardly be focal. However the absence of something prototypical is indeed focal. For example, in John 4:11 when Jesus offers the Samaritan woman living water, she responds “you have nothing to draw water with and the well is deep.” Getting water from deep wells prototypically requires a container.

In the Parkari context, any new venture or journey prototypically requires consulting omens to check whether that venture will be successful or not, so “need to check omens” is KNOWN inferrable information from the open scenario “theft” and highly focal. Even though the Parkari text does not contain the word for “omen”, nor explain the significance of the bird flying through the pot rim, the “omen” scenario is opened by the very situation of embarking on a new venture, and the explicit mention of a specific omen, the bird’s flight, confirms to the Parkari audience that this “omen” scenario is indeed focal to the story.

A similar situation for a western audience might be: “Let’s get in the car and drive round the world”, with the response “We’re not going just like that”, implying that first the car should be serviced, insurance arranged, visas and inoculations obtained, etc. The lack of suitable preparation for the task in hand is focal, not in the grammar, but because the hearer has cultural presuppositions as to what preparation is appropriate.
In translation, if the target audience cannot identify what prototypical expectations in the open scenario are being violated, then a generic comparison “just like that” will need to be made specific, e.g. “We are not going stealing without first checking the omens”, “We’re not going round the world without first making proper preparations”. Failure to make the comparison clear will cause the audience frustration. Relevance theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986) predicts that the more work involved in decoding an utterance, the more contextual effects the speaker is promising. When a comparison is left vague, even if the audience manage after careful thought to decode the intended meaning, they gain no extra contextual effects beyond what could have been stated directly. Only if the speaker intended to confuse his audience would a vague comparison offer extra contextual effects, i.e. that the author intended to be vague and confusing.

Comparative clauses or phrases may also occur elsewhere in a narrative, but they always mark Hearer-old information, e.g. “Michael”

But he always used to travel without paying his fare.

14 But he always used to travel without paying his fare.

In the original speech interchange, the adjective “like this, such” in line 14, as spoken by the ticket inspector, refers to the real life situation of Michael’s travelling without a ticket, i.e. information status GIVEN situational.

For the audience of the narrative, the adjective “like this, such” in line 14 refers back to the information in line 5, travelling without paying, which is GIVEN textual-displaced.

Relative clauses and Hearer-old scenarios

Parkari relative clauses, like Greek adjectival Participles, can be used to define a specific referent. In Parkari, as in Greek, the use of such restrictive relative clauses indicates that the speaker regards the referent as part of the hearer’s mental scenario bank. Otherwise it would not be reasonable to expect the hearer to identify the correct referent. Such referents may belong to any information status type except 1 NEW, e.g.

(relevant Hearer-new items bolded, relative pronoun bolded and underlined, Hearer-old items underlined):

“Mongoose”

The mongoose kept gradually growing bigger
Chapter 12 - Parkari Hearer-old Markers and Scenarios

16 on u-a d'or mē re-u-a laq-i-o.
   and that-G house in dwell-inf-G begin-pf-G
   and began to live in that house.

17 on d'eqeke d'or b'otot hat-a
   and whoever house of-G members was-G
   And all the members of the family.

18 it became friendly with them all.

Here “house” is first introduced as Hearer-new in line 2 (information status NEW). In line 16 it is referred to as “that house” (GIVEN textual-displaced). In line 17 the restrictive relative clause “whoever were members of the house” is a Hearer-old form and refers to the people already prototypically present in the “house” scenario (KNOWN inferrable).

Similarly:

“Malo’s wedding”

2 and then we held Malo’s wedding.

18 d'eqeke amar-a aziz had-a hat-a, u a-i-a
   whoever our-G relative true-G was-G that come-pf-G
   whoever was a true relative of ours, they came.

In line 18 the restrictive relative clause “whoever were our true (i.e. close) relatives” is a Hearer-old form (KNOWN inferrable) referring to people prototypically present in the open “we” scenario (line 2), since humans prototypically have living relatives.

Plural of respect and Hearer-old scenarios

An aspect of Parkari grammar not found in either New Testament Greek or English is the use of plural forms for singular referents to mark respect. In Parkari, the plural of respect is especially common in second person reference, but also occurs in third person reference. Similar patterns of respect marking are found in other Indo-Aryan languages, such as Urdu (Barker, 1967, Volume 1:20). This grammatical form interrelates with scenarios in as much as certain mental scenarios in Parkari must include the information “plus respect, use plural form of address”.

Status may not be a prototypical element in a westerner’s mental scenario, except for a limited number of categories, such as royalty, judges etc. where the status requires special forms of address. However the absence of grammatical marking does not mean that the information “plus respect” is not stored in the brain, since respect and disrespect can be shown lexically in English, e.g. “Do you want something, then?” as opposed to “Could I get you anything, sir?”

In Parkari, the plural of respect is used when the addressee is singular in number, but the speaker wishes to show that person respect. This typically occurs when the speaker
is of lower social status than the addressee, or when someone of roughly equal status to the
addressee is asking for a favour, since showing respect encourages compliance. In
requests, the plural of respect functions similarly to the way “please” is used in English,
e.g. (verb bolded, plural morpheme underlined)
“Sparrow”
50  tò k-e-fi deuta k-e-fi më ne më ozom-in
    so say-P-pres fire say-P-pres me to don’t douse-fut.imp
    So the fire says, Don’t put me out!
51  I will burn up the stick.
52  dòk-o k-e-fi më ne më bal-in
    stick-G say-P-pres me to don’t burn(tr)-fut.imp
    The stick says, Don’t burn me!
53  I will go and beat the dog, he says.
54  kutr-o k-e-fi më ne më mac-in
    dog-G say-P-pres me to don’t beat-fut.imp
    The dog says, Don’t beat me!
Line 50 is spoken to a river, line 52 to a fire, and line 54 to a stick, all singular. The plural
forms show that the speaker is giving respect to the addressee, who is currently in a
position of power and threatening the welfare of the speaker, in the hope that the addressee
will be merciful.

Because Parkari uses a plural of respect, the second person singular in Parkari
conveys more information than the second person singular in English, viz. “not plus
respect”, e.g. (singular forms bolded)
“Michael”
12  Then the inspector said to Michael
    you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
    “You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.”
The use of the singular here is expected from the social situation, where the adult ticket
inspector has a higher social status than a child who is a passenger. In certain situations,
the relative status marked in Parkari would need to be made explicit in translation
otherwise the attitude of the speaker to the addressee might be lost.

Similarly, parents would not use the plural form to one of their children, e.g.
“Mongoose”
9  When he came home his mother said
10  Child, this baby mongoose
11  tò vapas saq-e av (apr-a) apr-i më kan
    you(s) back leave-nonf come (own-G) own-G mother to
    you take back to its own mother.
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Note that the use of the singular does not show disrespect unless the speaker is clearly inferior in status to the addressee. An example of this is found in the “Sparrow” story, where the sparrow manages by his craftiness to get everyone else, including the king, to do his bidding. The sparrow shows no respect to anyone, regardless of status, e.g.

so say-P-pres king you(t) he-G to carpenter-G to understand-caus say-P-pres
So he says, King, king, you explain to the carpenter

Where the addressees are plural in number, the second person plural form is always used and shows neither respect nor disrespect, e.g. (second person plural morphemes bold and underlined)

“Sparrow”

so say-P-pres queen-G queen-G you(s) from sulk-nonf go-P
So he says, Queens, queens, you get angry with the king!

“Breadpan”

When you put this breadpan onto the fire,

then then Jevon or Shomu a call.

Then they will make the fire below [the breadpan] for you

This “Breadpan” text was spoken by a middle-aged man, Arzan, to myself and my wife, hence the plural form.

In contrast Arzan’s wife, addressing me alone, used the singular form, e.g.

“Malo’s wedding”

Richard went-pf-G result-G you(s) your(s)-G country in
Richard went, you went back to your home country

and then we held Malo’s wedding.

As noted above, the singular form here shows no disrespect since the speaker, being a generation older than me, would not be expected to accord me higher status than herself.

Chapter summary

In Parkari, as in New Testament Greek, there are many grammatical constructions which not only communicate information but also encode that such information is regarded as Hearer-old. These include “when” clauses, infinitives, passives and subjectless verbs, quotations, rhetorical questions, comparative clauses, relative clauses, and plurals of respect. These constructions regularly omit information necessary for accurate understanding, since the speaker assumes that the audience will be able to identify such information by referring to their own mental scenarios.
The use of such grammatical constructions corresponds partly to Discourse-new and Discourse-old distinctions. However, the surface marking in Parkari can only be explained by Hearer-old categories including KNOWN inferrable and KNOWN unused, both of which refer to information in scenarios stored in long-term memory. These mental scenarios, due to culturally and experientially shared cognition, form part of the mutual cognitive environment of Relevance Theory, and provide the basis for efficient communication. Thus a speaker can treat all the contents of these mental scenarios, which he shares with his audience, as Hearer-old. Where speaker and audience do not share the same cultural scenarios, the speaker will need to make more information explicit in order to complement his audience’s existing knowledge.
Chapter 13
PARKARI LEXICON
AND SCENARIOS

In Parkari, as in Greek, scenarios affect lexical collocations as well as grammar. This chapter shows how scenario structure provides the conceptual basis for understanding lexical cohesion and lexical reference in contemporary Parkari texts. I give evidence that the co-occurrence of vocabulary in Parkari reflects the scenarios open in the speaker’s mind, and hence indicates to the audience which scenarios are currently open in the discourse. I also show how scenario theory explains certain lexical patterns in Parkari: the conjoining of lexical items to form lexical doublets, the use and omission of lexical marking for contraexpectation, and the use of causative verbs without making all the participants explicit.

Lexical cohesion and scenarios

Lexical cohesion “refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text” and includes both reiteration and collocation (Baker, 1992:203). The cohesion which depends on reiteration is achieved by coreferential marking, whether noun, pronoun, or zero anaphora, whereas the cohesion which depends on collocation is achieved by the use of vocabulary which belongs together in organized relationships. On the face of it, one would assume that this would be vocabulary from a single semantic domain, but this is not true if we restrict semantic domain in the way Louw and Nida have for New Testament Greek (1988). In order to have a role in “organizing relations within a text”, vocabulary must belong within a single scenario, where the semantic relationships are already prototypically present.

For ease of reference I give lexical examples from the English gloss. The Parkari text can be found in Appendix 0.

Clear examples of lexical cohesion occur in the text “Michael”, where the use of vocabulary from a specific scenario helps the audience to recognise which scenario is open, thus allowing accurate identification of reference, and the switch to lexical items of a different scenario not only opens a new scenario but corresponds to a development of the narrative, usually marking the beginning of a new semantic paragraph, e.g.

(reiteration underlined, collocation bolded)
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the "boy" scenario:
1 Once there was a boy.
2 His name was Michael.
3 This boy used to go every day to study in school.

the "train" scenario:
4 But he used to go to school on the train.
5 But he always used to travel without paying his fare.
6 And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,
7 then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

the "inspector" scenario:
6 And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,
7 then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.
8 One day the inspector caught hold of him.
9 When he checked his pockets
10 he found [his] Identity Card in his pocket.

the "identity" scenario:
10 he found his Identity Card in his pocket.
11 and on the card was written "Michael Christian".
12 "You have become a Christian, but do what's wrong.
13 Christian people don't behave like this.

the "morality" scenario:
5 But he always used to travel without paying his fare.
7 then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.
13 "You have become a Christian, but do what's wrong.
14 Christian people don't behave like this.
15 So why are you doing wrong like this?"
16 Then this boy became very ashamed,
17 and became very embarrassed.
18 Then Michael became a good Christian.
19 We should all
20 give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,
21 just as this boy became a good Christian.

It can be readily seen in the examples above that throughout the text lexical cohesion is achieved by reiteration of Michael as the main narrative character, using his name, a noun with demonstrative adjective, or a pronoun. In lines 4, 5 and 15, where the English gloss has a lexical pronoun, the Parkari text has a null pronoun (zero). It can also be seen that cohesion is achieved by the collocation of specific lexical items which belong in the same scenario and which have a prototypical semantic relationship one to the other, which may or may not be explicit in the text.

Lexical cohesion in terms of organizing relations within sections of the text is achieved by the lexical items opening a specific scenario in which the prototypical semantic relationships between concepts help the audience interpret relationships left implicit in the text. For example, line 4 opens the "train" scenario, in which "fare" (line 5) means "train fare", "inspector" and "tickets" (line 6) means "ticket inspector" and "train
tickets”, and “toilet” and “seat” (line 7) means “toilet at the end of the railway carriage” and “seat in the railway carriage”.

Lexical cohesion in terms of organizing relations between different sections of the text is achieved by the interlinking or chaining of related scenarios. Typically one element of an open scenario becomes the core element of a new scenario in the text. Hence the “boy” scenario in line 1 leads to “school” in line 3; the “school” scenario leads, somewhat untypically (note “But”) to “train” in line 4; the “train” scenario leads to “inspector” in line 6, and foreshadows the “morality” scenario by ticketless travel and hiding in lines 5 and 7; the “inspector” scenario leads to “identity” in line 10; the “identity” scenario leads to “Christian” in lines 11, 13 and 14; and the word “Christian” opens the “morality” scenario which dominates the final part of the story.

Interestingly, the “morality” scenario is shadowed way back in line 2 for the Parkari audience by the name “Michael”, which is postposed for emphasis:

2 u-a r-o nom hat-o maekal.
that-G of-G name was-G Michael
His name was Michael.

Among Parkaris, “Michael” is a name used only by Christians, whereas the majority of Parkaris are Hindu/animist. So the boy’s name itself opens the “Christian” scenario which has “morality” as a central element.

Another example of lexical cohesion, both between the lexical items within individual sections of the text, and between the different sections of the text, comes in the text “My farmwork”. In this procedural text, reiteration is shown by the frequent use of Nonfinal forms to refer back to the preceding main verb as the time setting for the next set of events, and by use of the first person throughout either as an independent pronoun or verbal suffix in the Parkari. To achieve lexical collocation, as in the text “Michael”, lexical items within each section are related to a single scenario, and successive sections of text are closed and opened by the interlinking or chaining of scenarios. However, in this procedural text, the change between scenarios is not plot driven, but time driven, e.g.

(reiteration using Parkari Nonfinal forms underlined, collocation bolded)

the “morning” scenario:
1a Having got up early in the morning

the “field tour” scenario (also in lines 13 and 16):
1b I will go to take a walk round the land.
2 After taking a walk round I come back home again.

the “ploughing” scenario:
3 After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.
4 The ox-team goes.

NB This is reiterated in 5a with explicit ploughing vocabulary “After ploughing the land”
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the “planting sugarcane” scenario:
5 After ploughing the land then I go and cut the sugarcane.
6 After cutting the sugarcane then having chopped it into sections
7 then again, back on the land, having made trenches
8 I plant sugarcane in the trenches.
9 After planting the sugarcane
10 then I fill it in, fill the trenches in.

the “watering the crop” scenario:
11 After filling them in then I let the water into it.
12 After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.
13 After closing it then I er take another walk round the land.
14 Then I close off the channel from the upper mouth.
15 After closing the channel I come back
16 and take a tour round the land.

the “keeping the fields neat” scenario:
17 Then if there are field-walls I trim the walls.
18 After trimming the walls I keep the walls straight.
19 If there is a mound, then I dig away the mound and level it up.
20 And I do fields in turn, trimming them well.
21 I make all the fields level,
22 in which the water may come really evenly
23 and the water may lie in the field just the same amount all over.

the “evaluative” scenario:
24 So in this way according to my own plan
25 I do my work in a good manner.

The use of vocabulary from a single scenario produces lexical cohesion, and such vocabulary, by opening a specific scenario allows the audience to interpret implicit semantic relationships between explicit items. For example, in 11-16 “let in the water”, “channel”, “open” and “close” are lexically cohesive, as they all belong in the same “irrigation” scenario. These lexically cohesive vocabulary items show that the “irrigation” scenario is open, and this scenario allows the hearer to understand “it has filled” as “the field has been filled to a level of a few inches”, to understand “channel” as the “water channel for irrigating the fields” and to understand “upper mouth” as the “upper mouth of the irrigation channel where it joins to the irrigation canal”.

Such lexically cohesive items do not necessarily belong in the same semantic domain. For example, “water”, “field” and “field-wall” are not in the same semantic domain as “trimming”, “straight” “level”, and “evenly”, but they all belong in the one scenario of “keeping the fields neat”. These scenarios are clearly experiential. The difference in agriculture between Parkaris and Westerners make the contents of several Parkari scenarios appear unusual. For example, “field-walls” are not stone boundary markers but earth banks around each field which allow irrigation water to flood the field evenly without flowing away. Thus lexical cohesion through collocation is achieved by the
juxtaposition of vocabulary items which refer to concepts stored in the same mental scenario, since they co-occur in real life as culturally related concepts.

The lexical collocations in a text enable the audience to identify which scenarios are open, and this enables them to link the vocabulary to semantically interrelated concepts in their own mental scenarios. This conceptual relationship between lexical items is what produces lexical cohesion throughout a text. This is clearly shown in “Mongoose”, e.g. (collocations bolded)

the “town” scenario:
2 In a certain town there was a house.

the “household” scenario:
3 And that house-holder’s name was Premo.
4 Premo’s son was one Konji.
9 When he came home his mother said
17 And all the members of the family,
20 his baby brother was born,

the “baby mongoose” scenario:
6 and he caught a mongoose
7 and he took the baby mongoose
10 Child, this baby mongoose
11 you take back to its own mother.
13 and kept that baby mongoose in his own home
14 and looked after it.
15 The mongoose kept gradually growing bigger
16 and began to live in that house.

Here again, in the “baby mongoose” scenario, the vocabulary items such as “mongoose,” “look after” and “house” do not belong to the same semantic domains, but they do belong conceptually in a single scenario, that of a “pet”, and it is this scenario which provides lexical cohesion. In other words, lexical cohesion is simply the natural by-product of conceptual coherence, and conceptual coherence is based on repeated reference to the same mental scenario, since that is where conceptually related concepts are stored in the brain.

So the content of scenarios cannot be limited to a small number of items with fixed culturally independent relationships, since the scenario is an idealized conceptual representation of real life relationships. Nevertheless there are certain conceptual relationships typically found within scenarios, and these are reflected in the semantic relationships between words which regularly co-occur in discourse. This means that there are two categories of lexical collocation: lexical items which belong in the same semantic domain and are related by a limited number of fixed semantic relationships, and lexical items which do not belong in the same semantic domain and are related by whatever
Semantic relationships occur in real life experiences. These will be illustrated in turn with Parkari examples.

**Semantic relationships within the same semantic domain:**
Relevant items are shown bolded. With specific-generic relations the generic is underlined, and with part-whole relations the whole is underlined.

*Specific-specific, specifics belonging to the same generic class, e.g.*

"Mongoose" - family members
3 And that house-holder’s name was Premo.
4 Premo’s son was one Konji.
9 When he came home his mother said

"Malo’s wedding" - foodstuffs
10 Then we got rice. We got three maunds (120kg) of rice.
11 We got some spices.
12 However we didn’t get a buffalo, we got half a maund of potatoes.

*Specific-generic, specifics referred back to by a generic term, e.g.*

"Mongoose"
3 And that house-holder’s name was Premo.
4 Premo’s son was one Konji.
9 When he came home his mother said
17 And all the members of the family

"Malo’s wedding"
10 Then we got rice. We got three maunds (120kg) of rice.
11 We got some spices.
12 However we didn’t get a buffalo, we got half a maund of potatoes.
19 Then when they had come we cooked the rice and held the wedding.

NB The Parkari word for “rice” in line 10 means “uncooked rice grains”. The different word in line 19 means “cooked rice” and is used in the sense of the whole meal, including the potatoes and spices, which are mixed in it.

"The lame man and the blind man"
56 He had opened it, and having opened the pan and the pot he was looking in it.

NB The word for “pan” in 56 means “a small pan for cooking curry or rice” whereas the word glossed “pot” is generic for any kind of vessel.

*Generic-specific, generic followed by specifics of that class, e.g.*

"Malo’s wedding"
3 When we held the wedding we had no money at all.
4 There was not even five rupees in the house.

"Malo’s wedding"
20 In the evening the wedding money was raised, they stayed the night.
22 and in Richard’s house here only the women stayed.
23 The men stayed in the tent.

*Part-whole, parts belonging to the same whole, e.g.*

"Michael"
4 But he used to go to school on the train.
7 then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.
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"Mongoose"
2 In a certain town there was a house.

"Mongoose"
26 a cobra came into the house,
28 it came there and raised its hood.

"Malo's wedding"
19 Then when they had come we cooked the rice and held the wedding.
20 In the evening the wedding money was raised, they stayed the night.
26 Then we gave the bridegroom the ritual showing.
28 Then the drum went and got forgotten.
29 Then having taken the Datsun we went anyway straight to the church.
34 and then we held the wedding, read the marriage.
NB In line 19 "wedding" is used in the generic sense of all the activities involved, i.e. the whole script from the "wedding" scenario. In line 34 "wedding" is clarified by the loan word "nika" glossed "marriage" i.e. the formal legal and religious ceremony as performed by the Church.

synonyms, e.g.
"Michael"
16 Then this boy became very ashamed,
17 and became very embarrassed.

"My farmwork"
1b I will go to take a walk round the land.
16 and take a tour round the land.

"My farmwork"
20 And I do fields in turn, trimming them well.
25 I do my work in a good manner.

c o - r e f e r e n t i a l  n o u n s ,  o r  n o u n  p h r a s e s ,  e . g .
"Michael"
1 Once there was a boy.
12 Then the inspector said to Michael

"Mongoose"
6 and he caught a mongoose
7 and he took the baby mongoose

"Mongoose"
41 A little while later, the boy's mother came.
45 The lady thought in her heart that this mongoose

"Mongoose"
4 Premo's son was one Konji.
10 Child, this baby mongoose

Note that the same noun used in line 10 for Konji is used again in line 53 to refer to his baby brother:
"Mongoose"
10 Child, this baby mongoose
53 and the child is there playing.
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This shows that the assignment of reference must be made not at word level, but at scenario level. The same lexical item in the same text may have different referents, depending on the scenario currently open, which is determined from the events and items mentioned in the text. Since the audience relies on the scenario in order to identify reiteration, achieving lexical cohesion by reiteration also depends on the scenario.

**antonyms, e.g.**

"Michael"
20 give up our **bad** deeds and do **good** deeds,

"My farmwork"
1b I will go to take a walk round the land.
2 After taking a walk round I come back home again.

It is of interest that Parkari has several pairs of rhyming antonyms, where the "positive" one of the pair has the initial consonant h (possibly related historically to the Sanskrit prefix su “good”), thus resulting in the lexical cohesion being paralleled by phonological similarity, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>dok</strong>h</td>
<td><strong>hak</strong>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doro</td>
<td>horo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qeto</td>
<td>havo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olo</td>
<td>holo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mõgõo</td>
<td>hõgõo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kõputer</td>
<td>hõputer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**corollaries, e.g.**

"Mongoose"
36 Finally the mongoose **killed** the snake.
52 there is a snake lying dead at the side of the cot.

"Mongoose"
10 Child, this **baby** mongoose
11 you take back to its own **mother**.

**Semantic relationships in the same scenario but not in the same semantic domain:**

**vocabulary belonging to the same time-space-activity frame, e.g.**

times and related events:

"Michael"
3 This boy used to **go every day** to study in school.

"My farmwork"
1 Having **got up** early in the **morning**

"Malo’s wedding"
20 In the **evening** the wedding **money was raised**, they stayed the night.

NB In Parkari culture, the bridegroom’s guests arrive at his village in the evening, and give wedding money to the groom’s father to help cover the wedding costs.
places and related events:
"Michael"
3 This boy used to go every day to study in school.

"Michael"
4 But he used to go to school on the train.
6 And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

places and related participants:
"Michael"
3 This boy used to go every day to study in school.

"Michael"
4 But he used to go to school on the train.
6 And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

participants and related events:
"Michael"
3 This boy used to go every day to study in school.

"Michael"
6 And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

vocabulary belonging to the sequential development of time-space-activity, e.g.
"Malo’s wedding” (time)
20 In the evening the wedding money was raised, they stayed the night.
25 Then early in the morning at eight o’clock the Datsun came.

"Mongoose” (space)
23 went outside to fetch water. [i.e. to a well]
41 A little while later, the boy’s mother came.
42 And she came to the doorway and saw ...
50 After she had killed it, when she went inside the house

"My farmwork” (activity)
12 After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.

vocabulary belonging to sequential stages of a script, e.g.
"My farmwork"
6 After cutting the sugarcane then having chopped it into sections

"Mongoose”
13 and kept that baby mongoose in his own home
14 and looked after it.

vocabulary belonging to the sequential development of cause and effect, e.g.
"Michael”
6 And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,
7 then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

"Michael”
9 When he checked his pockets
10 he found his Identity Card in his pocket.
vocabulary belonging to the sequential development of plot, i.e. problem and resolution,
e.g.
“Michael”
7 then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.
8 One day the inspector caught hold of him.

“Michael”
15 “So why are you doing wrong like this?”
18 Then Michael became a good Christian.

vocabulary related metaphorically, e.g.
“Mongoose”
66 One should not act like this. [Literally: do such work]
67 One should always be patient.
68 since the fruit of patience is always sweet.

The word “fruit” is linked metaphorically with the word “work” in the “patience” scenario, as is shown by the Parkari saying “The fruit of patience is sweet”. Here, the “work” of killing the innocent mongoose is the “fruit”, i.e. result, of lack of patience. Had the woman first patiently checked the facts, she would not have done this evil deed, and the “fruit” of her patience would have been “sweet fruit”, i.e. a good response to the situation.

Textual coherence and scenario mismatch

Research into human cognition has shown that the time taken to verify the semantic relationship between two lexical items depends on the strength of the experiential link between the concepts those lexical items refer to, and this suggests that concepts are stored in semantically and hierarchically structured mental networks which consequently link the lexical items tagged to those concepts (Collins and Quillian, 1972; Collins and Loftus, 1975). This evidence suggests that the link between lexical cohesion and scenarios is part of all human cognition.

However the specific concepts which are related within a given scenario vary from culture to culture. Many scenarios include elements common to all humanity, e.g. the “childbirth” scenario must include a mother, a child, and an umbilical cord. Yet even this scenario has elements which are culturally determined, e.g. probable age of mother, place and mode of delivery, presence or absence of a professional medical person, etc. Consequently, where the audience does not share the scenarios of the writer, for example non-Parkaris hearing a Parkari text, the speaker’s lexical cohesion is not perceived by the audience, but rather they see the lexicon as random, and both lexical cohesion and semantic coherence is lost.

A clear example of this is in the “wedding” scenario, which is very different for English and Parkari people, due to different cultural backgrounds (items in both Parkari and English “wedding” scenarios are underlined, items not in the English “wedding” scenario are bolded), e.g.
"Malo's wedding"

2 and then we held Malo's wedding.
10 Then we got rice. We got three maunds (120kg) of rice.
11 We got some spices.
12 However we didn't get a buffalo, we got half a maund of potatoes.
14 The feeding of the groom (at different houses) went on for eight days.
20 In the evening the wedding money was raised, they stayed the night.
21 The tent was pitched
25 Then early in the morning at eight o'clock the Datsun came.
26 Then we gave the bridegroom the ritual showing.
28 Then the drum went and got forgotten.
29 Then having taken the Datsun we went anyway straight to the church.
31 one bridegroom came there from Matli.
32 My son Malo's wedding party went.
34 and then we held the wedding, read the marriage.
35 The vicar came, Bashir Din from Hyderabad.

The marriage, church, bridegroom, and vicar are part of the "wedding" scenario in both Parkari Christian culture and English culture (though the detailed scenario for each element is by no means identical). However, rice, spices, buffalo meat or potatoes are not in the "wedding meal" section of an English "wedding" scenario. Nor does an English "wedding" scenario include pre-wedding meals for the groom throughout the neighbourhood, wedding money, tents for the guests, open-backed Datsun vans to take the guests to the wedding, ritual "showings" of the groom, drums for the dancing, or groom's wedding parties travelling to the wedding en masse. Yet all these items are prototypically present in the Parkari wedding scenario. Indeed, most of the similar elements, such as reading the marriage ceremony, churches, and vicars, are only part of the "wedding" scenario for the minority of Parkaris who are Christians.

It is, of course, possible to change the audience's scenarios by the lexical collocations within the text. No doubt, as you read this, your scenario for "weddings" is being altered by the addition of a Parkari subsection, containing new conceptual links and lexical collocations. However, when a speaker is trying to create a new scenario or alter an existing one, he cannot assume that the audience is able to correctly infer implicit information or implicit semantic links between explicit items. Consequently, he must be more explicit than when he and his audience share scenarios, e.g. instead of "The tent was pitched" he may say "The tent was pitched for accommodating the wedding guests overnight".

As with the "wedding" scenario, the Parkari "farming" scenario contains not only elements common to the English scenario (underlined) but also elements which are clearly different (bolded), e.g.

"My farmwork"

1 Having got up early in the morning
   I will go to take a walk round the land.
3 After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.
4 The ox-team goes.
After ploughing the land then I go and cut the sugarcane. I plant sugarcane in the trenches. After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel. Then if there are field-walls I trim the walls. If there is a mound, then I dig away the mound and level it up.

Getting up early, looking round the fields, and ploughing belong in the “farming” scenario of both languages and cultures, but in the English scenario oxen are not used for ploughing, sugarcane is not a crop planted, and the whole planting method is different. The Parkari scenario for watering crops is by irrigation, so fields have earthen walls surrounding them, trenches are made in the fields, and after planting, water is run from irrigation channels into the fields to fill the bottom of the trenches. If the fields have humps and hollows, the water will not flow everywhere. Even the word for “plant” in line 8 refers only to the transplanting of a crop, such as rice seedlings or sugarcane sections, into a field which is, or will be flooded.

Such scenario mismatch makes the flow of discourse unpredictable for a foreign reader. The unusual may seem normal, e.g.

"Michael"
3 This boy used to go every day to study in school.
4 But he used to go to school on the train.

Michael’s travelling to school by train is marked as contrary to expectation, but this is not an uncommon way to travel to school in the South of England. For Parkaris however, this is very unusual, since almost all live in rural areas, away from roads and railways, and most children must walk to school if they go at all.

And again the normal may seem unusual:

"Michael"
10 he found his Identity Card in his pocket.

Parkaris would expect a schoolchild of secondary age to carry an Identity Card, as legally required. But Identity Cards are not part of a UK schoolboy scenario, but belong to a police or military scenario. Someone may use a student card or driver’s licence to prove identity, but they would not carry an “identity card” in their pocket.

Some Parkari texts seem to Westerners to lack lexical cohesion altogether, e.g. the opening of “The lame man and the blind man”:
2 The lame man says to the blind man “Let’s go and steal something.”
3 So the blind man says “Do you know where something is then?”
4 So the lame man says “Yes”.
5 The blind man says “We won’t go stealing just like that.
6 Go over there where that bird is singing and put a broken pot-rim there.
7 Just keep looking whether the bird goes through the broken pot-rim or not.”
8 So he says “Blind man, the bird did go through the pot-rim.”
9 So he says “Now, when night falls, then we will go stealing.”
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Here, the lame man suggests going to steal something, but the blind man refuses to go "just like that" and tells the lame man to see whether a bird flies through a broken pot rim. Once assured that the bird does, the blind man agrees that "now" they will go stealing. Parkari has two words for "now", fomqe meaning "at this time" and hove meaning "in this situation". The use of hove "now" in line 9 indicates that the situation has been changed by the bird's action.

These diverse elements do not belong together in any English scenario, so the text seems to lack lexical cohesion. However Parkari Hindus do not start any activity without first consulting the omens, and the behaviour of birds is a typical omen. Thus these words all fit naturally into the Parkari "omen" scenario providing lexical cohesion.

In this story, the bird's flying through the pot rim is a good omen for the central characters, and thereafter, every time they meet an obstacle, the blind man reminds the lame man of this good omen, and they carry on undaunted. These opening lines, then, provide the setting of an auspicious omen which is a recurring theme throughout the story. Yet the word "omen" is never explicitly mentioned. Consequently, the story is hard for a Westerner to make sense of, since textual coherence relies heavily on lexical cohesion to indicate which scenarios are open.

In translation, where there is scenario mismatch, it will often be necessary to make explicit the relationship between lexical items and the scenario they are part of, e.g. "Malo's wedding".

Then the drum went and got forgotten.

A meaning-based translation might well say "Then we forgot the drum, which we needed for accompanying the traditional wedding dances."

Similarly:

The lame man and the blind man

The blind man says "We won't go stealing just like that."

A meaning-based translation might well say "We won't go stealing just like that, without checking the omens."

Such adjustments in the form of the text do not alter the meaning or cohesion of the original text. Rather they are compensating for the mismatch of scenarios between the original speaker and the new audience, by making explicit in the translation the same cohesion which was implicit in the original text.

Textual coherence and metaphorically linked scenarios

Parkari discourse containing metaphorical language may seem to lack lexical cohesion to an English audience, since Parkari metaphorical links are not the same as English metaphorical links. Metaphors are not usually individual creative linkings of different items, but whole scenarios are linked by a central metaphorical link, and this spawns whole clusters of related metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). So in a Parkari
text, vocabulary from a metaphorical scenario would be automatically linked to a literal scenario for the author and for a Parkari audience, but to a Western reader this vocabulary may appear unrelated.

For example, Parkari sayings frequently contain metaphors. Parkari has a common metaphorical link between people and their actions and trees and their fruit, e.g.

"tree" scenario:
- a tree produces fruit
- a good tree produces sweet fruit
- a bad tree produces sour fruit

"person" scenario:
- a person produces actions
- a good person produces good actions
- a bad person produces bad actions

This connection is shown in the common saying:

δενιαστευόμενον follow a tree, so a tree's fruit.

As the tree, so the fruit.

= As the person, so the deed, i.e. a person's actions reveal their nature.

New Testament Greek also uses this “tree and fruit” metaphor, though typically it uses specific terms from a Palestinian setting, rather than generic terms. The Parkari saying can be used in translation to clarify the New Testament metaphor, ensuring that it is understood metaphorically not literally, e.g.

James 3:12

εις τον δενιαστηνενοσ ποιησαντι η χειριστης σεικα;

fig-tree olives will-produce or grape-vine figs?

Parkari: As the tree, so the fruit. Can the fruits of olive occur on the tree of fig? Or can can the fruits of fig occur on the vine of grapes?

As noted above, there is a similar saying which uses another word for fruit as a metaphor:

σεβασμός of-O patience fruit sweet-G be-P

The fruit of patience is sweet.

= The result of patience is good, i.e. a patient person does good actions and receives good rewards.

This saying is the basis for the “fruit” metaphor in the “Mongoose” text:

"Mongoose"

56 I have killed an innocent sinless creature.
62 Why was I not patient?
63 Why did I not first look inside the house?
64 What, what, what sort of deed is this?
65 But then she thought in her heart
66 One should not act like this.
67 One should always be patient.
68 take σεβασμός of-O patience fruit always sweet-G be-P

so that patience of-G fruit always sweet-G be-P
since the fruit of patience is always sweet.

Note that the act of killing the innocent mongoose is the result or “fruit” of lack of patience. Had the woman first patiently checked the facts, she would not have done this
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evil deed, and the result or “fruit” of her patience would have been “sweet fruit”, i.e. a good response to the situation. The two Parkari sayings above show that “patience” is metaphorically regarded as a “good tree”. These metaphorically related scenarios are charted below in parallel, with the explicit references bold:

“tree” scenario:
- a good tree produces sweet fruit (68)
- a bad tree produces sour fruit

“patience” scenario:
- patience (62, 68) produces good actions
- impatience produces (bad) actions (56, 64, 66)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) also point out that scenarios are linked metaphorically due to a perceived similarity, and some of these perceived similarities are rooted in physiological realities, such as anger increasing the blood supply near the skin’s surface, so creating extra surface heat. This metaphorical connection of anger and heat also occurs in Parkari, though not in the texts quoted here:

“heat” scenario “anger” scenario
- literal metaphorical
- bolwo to burn to be angry
- garam hot angry
- tʰarwo to cool down to calm down

The parallel scenarios may be charted as follows:

“heat” scenario:
- burning makes things hot
- time makes things cool down

“anger” scenario:
- becoming angry makes people angry
- time makes people calm down

Similarly, there is a metaphorical connection in both English and Parkari between death and shame, based no doubt on physical feelings. The English phrase “die of embarrassment” is exactly paralleled in Parkari, e.g.

“Michael”
16 Then this boy became very ashamed,

17 an luŋe mor-o, and become very embarrassed (literally “died in embarrassment”).

This is just one example of a metaphorical connection between death and negative feelings, physical or emotional, in both English and Parkari, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>literal</th>
<th>metaphorical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>marwo to die</td>
<td>to be strongly affected by a negative feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luŋe marwo to die in embarrassment</td>
<td>to be very embarrassed and ashamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bʰuke marwo to die in hunger</td>
<td>to be very hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tarfe marwo to die in thirst</td>
<td>to be very thirsty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although some metaphors are common to many languages, metaphorical links between scenarios are not universal. The same metaphorical form does not necessarily have the same meaning across languages, so metaphors must be recognized as such, and translated according to their meaning, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parkari</th>
<th>Literal translation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u-o r-o had pq-e g-f-i-o.</td>
<td>His voice dropped.</td>
<td>He lost his voice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lexical doublets and scenarios**

Parkari, like Greek, has lexical doublets. Indeed the use of doublets is a very noticeable characteristic of Parkari, along with Urdu and several other Indo-Iranian languages (see Appendix P). These doublets consist of two words, at least one of which is an independent word, combined in a set order. I argue that such doublets, as in Greek, refer not simply to the referents of the individual words, but to the whole scenario to which those referents belong.

**Urdu doublets**

Barker comments on the form and derivation of doublets in Urdu (1967 Volume 1:474). He notes the fixed order of elements, and the irregular conjoining, where (instead of the regular Urdu copula /aur/ “and”) doublets derived from Persian have an explicit copula /o/ and Urdu doublets have no copula at all. Barker lists 3 types with examples (here transcribed in IPA):

a) “Persian Copulative Compounds”:

Some are written as single words in Urdu, functioning “as a unitary word in the intonation pattern” (ibid.), e.g.

/abfiau/ F1 [np] climate.

[Two nouns: /ab/ “water” (which does not occur independently in Urdu with this meaning) + /fiau/ “air, wind,” which does occur as a separate Urdu word.]

/amodoraf/ F1 [np] communication, transportation.

[Two past stems: /amadh/ from the root /ama/ “come” and /raf/ from /raf/ “go”.]

/bandobast/ M1 [np] arrangement, management.

[Present and past stem of the same verb root /bas/ “tie, bind”...]

Others are written as separate words, e.g.

/dard/ o /yam/ “pain and grief” (/dard/ M1 “pain” and /yam/ “grief, sorrow”)

b) Urdu doublets:

These conjoin two nouns with no copula, e.g.

/£ur yo kito/ knife [and] fork
/din raf/ day [and] night
/kano pina/ food [and] drink
c) “Echo compounds”:

These “consist of a word preceded or followed by a jingling, rhyming repetition of itself. The repeated portion is always modified in some fashion: the first consonant may be replaced by another, the first vowel of the word may be substituted by another, or the whole stem may be altered in some manner” (ibid.), e.g.

\[ /\text{j}ae \text{ vae}/ \text{“tea and things, tea and all that goes with it, tea etc. etc.”} \]

Barker comments briefly on the semantic aspects of these doublets. He notes that conjoined items “are almost synonymous” or “share some common semantic feature” and that “echo compounds” signify “vague inclusiveness”. I would go further, and say that the conjoined items in Urdu doublets always belong in a single scenario, and doublets always refer to that whole scenario. This is especially clear in Barker’s example /ablofo\text{\wca}/ “climate” which literally means “water and air”.

Reference of Indo-Iranian doublets to a single scenario is beautifully illustrated by the following example from Pashtu:

\[ /\text{yae o ure}/ \text{“mountains and doors” = variety of topics, no particular topic} \]

At first glance, this doublet seems to disprove my hypothesis, since there is no single prototypical scenario where mountains and doors belong. However, the meaning of the doublet reflects this fact, since it means “miscellaneous, anything at all”, i.e. it refers to a scenario in which anything at all may fit.

Barker’s definition of the compound /\text{j}ae \text{ vae}/ (from /\text{j}ae/ “tea”) as “tea and things, tea and all that goes with it, tea etc. etc.” comes close to my own definition of its meaning as “the tea scenario”. He recognizes that /\text{j}ae \text{ vae}/ means more than just “tea”, but assumes tea must be included. However, I am informed by mother tongue Urdu speakers, that /\text{j}ae \text{ vae}/ need not include tea at all, since one can accept the offer of /\text{j}ae \text{ vae}/ and then request a cold drink. This proves that the meaning is not “tea etc.” but “anything which is prototypical within the tea scenario”. Similarly the couplet /\text{k}h\text{ana} \text{ vana}/ from /\text{k}h\text{ana}/ “food” can refer to snacks like samosas. Such snacks cannot be referred to as /\text{k}h\text{ana}/ “food” since they are not a proper meal. So /\text{k}h\text{ana} \text{ vana}/ does not mean “food etc.” but “whatever belongs in the food scenario”, including light snacks.

**Parkari doublets**

I argue that the function of doublets in Parkari, as in Urdu, is to lexicalize the scenarios in which the discrete items naturally belong, rather than to refer to the discrete items themselves. This parallels the use of lexical doublets in New Testament Greek.

In Parkari, as in Urdu and Greek, doublets are formed from two independent words which belong in a single scenario (usually nouns, but also verbs, adjectives and adverbs). These words occur in a fixed order with no copula, and the resulting doublet does not simply refer to those two words combined, but to the whole scenario they belong to, e.g.
/mal/ = livestock, domestic animals
/miljf/ = wealth, money
/mol milcfst/ = property, possessions, cash, clothes, houses, cars.
  Clothes, houses and cars are not part of either /mal/ or /miljf/.

/nom/ = name
/nijon/ = sign
/nom nijon/ = any trace (e.g. re a town, no memory or trace of it will remain)

/az/ = today
/kal/ = yesterday
/az kal/ = nowadays.

However, in Parkari, as in Urdu, doublets may also be formed in which only the
first word exists independently, and the second part is a nonsense element. Such doublets
refer not to the first noun alone, but to the whole scenario of which the first noun is the
title, or prototypical element.

This nonsense element is characterized by either alliteration or rhyme, e.g.

**Doublets with alliteration:**
/paifio/ = paisa (a coin, now no longer in use)
/paifio paifio/ = money (including coins and notes)

/b³o²p²/ = shaman
/b³o² p³o²p³/ = shaman, magician etc.

**Doublets with rhyme:**

In these doublets the independent word is repeated, with a different initial
consonant substituted, to make a reduplicated nonsense word. This reduplication can occur
with any noun, and also with verbs, though less frequently. In Parkari, the normal
reduplicative consonant is an implosive b /b/. Again, the effect of this kind of reduplication
is to make clear lexically that the reference is not to an individual item, but to the scenario
of which it could be considered a title, e.g.
/[tʃɒfɔ]/ = tea
/[tʃɔfɔ ʃɔfɔ]/ = the whole scenario of drinking tea, including whatever else prototypically is related to that

This allows the following conversations:

"Will you drink /tʃɔfɔ/ (tea)?" "No, I'll have a cold drink."

"Will you drink /tʃɔfɔ ʃɔfɔ/ (tea reduplicated)?" "Yes, I'll have a cold drink."

Other examples include:

/lug⁴q⁴/ = clothes
//lug⁴q⁴ buq⁴q⁴/ = clothes and other items of apparel, such as shoes, hats etc.

/ʃæn/ = singing
/ʃæn buʃæn/ = singing and/or other entertainment

/ʃɔ/ = Joe
/ʃɔ ʃɔ/ = Joe and other like minded people

/upaʃqa mæ/ = in lifting
/upaʃqa bupaʃqa mæ/ = in lifting or any similar physical activity
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A few common nouns have different fixed forms or reduplication, but the function is still to refer not to the independent noun, but to the wider scenario of which it is the prototypical element, e.g.

/b^imaro/ = illness, disease
/b^imaro jimaroi/ = illness, disease, or similar catastrophe

/zat/ = caste, ethnic group
/zat pat/ = the caste system, racial discrimination

Examples of doublets from Parkari texts:

"Mongoose"
14  u-a r-ai palen pof kar-ai.
that-G of-G tending nourishing do-G
and looked after it.

69  perfi sofj-u-o uitjar-u-o,
first think-inf-G ponder-inf-G
First one should think carefully,

Also (from texts not included in Appendix 0):

"Devu’s TB"
17  an pof-a baA-a zo-i-a,
and side-G (rhyme)-G look-pf-G
and looked at her sides and so forth,
Here a doctor was checking a girl over for signs of TB, including listening to her rib cage with a stethoscope.

"Devu’s TB"
100  fiaue sokr-ai mar-ai haz-ai hor-ai s-e.
now child-G my-G complete-G easy-G be-P
Now my daughter is fit and well.

"Why I’m a Christian"
69  am-o ne sokr-o to am-o ne tauk-o telc-e-fi.
us-G to child-G emph us-G to good-G fine seem-P-pres
Our boy seems good and fine to us.

There are some doublets which might appear to refer simply to the two discrete named items, rather than to a single scenario. These doublets consist of two meaningful words referring to items that prototypically belong together, e.g.

Urdu:
/tir koman/ “arrow bow” = “bow and arrow”
/Jaluar qamis/ “baggy-trousers long-shirt” = “shalwaar qameez”, traditional Pakistani wear of baggy trousers and long shirt

Parkari:
/bar dhano£/ “arrow bow” = “bow and arrow”
/huthai£ khamis/ “baggy-trousers long-shirt” = “shalwaar qameez”,

There is, however, evidence that these are indeed couplets signifying a single scenario, rather than simply the conjoining of two items, i.e.

Grammatical form: there is no copula between the nouns
Syntactic order: the word order of the two lexical items is fixed
Semantic clues: in some contexts more than the two individual items is indicated
For example, in both Urdu and Parkari, using the above doublets, “He killed his enemies with bow and arrow” would not imply that only a single arrow was used. Similarly, although “He is wearing shalwar qameez” means he is wearing baggy trousers and a long loose shirt, “She is wearing shalwar qameez” means she is wearing baggy trousers, a long loose shirt, and a “dupatta” or headcloth, i.e. traditional women’s clothing for the majority community in Pakistan.

The appropriate use of doublets in translation not only makes the translation more natural, but can be used to alert the target audience to important scenarios in the text.

See also:
Appendix P Types of doublet used to lexicalise scenarios

Contraexpectation markers and scenarios

Contraexpectation markers are clear pointers to mental scenarios, since the contraexpectation clause is contrasted with the hearer’s expectation, i.e. the prototypical item in the hearer’s pre-existing mental scenario, e.g. “Michael”

3 This boy used to go every day to study in school.

4 \textit{pan} rel $\textit{gur}^{-i}$ m\$ \textit{saq}^{-e}$ \textit{iskul} za-t-o.  
\textit{but} rail cart-G in climb-nonf school go-impf-G  
\textbf{But} he used to go to school on the train.

5 \textit{pan} hamej vaqar b\textit{\textit{a}q}^{-e}$ za-t-o.  
\textit{but} always without fare-loc go-impf-G  
\textbf{But} he always used to travel without paying his fare.

As already noted, the “but” in line 4 shows that travelling by train is \textit{not} prototypical in the Parkari scenario “going to school”. Travelling to school by train presupposes that both village and school are near a railway station, and that the parents have enough money to pay the fares. Since most Parkari children live out in rural areas, far from roads and railway lines, those that go to school usually walk. Due to poverty, few could afford to use public transport to get to school, even if it were available. Clearly then, travelling by train is not a prototypical element of the “going to school” scenario in the Parkari context, hence the speaker marks the contraexpectation lexically. Similarly, the “but” in line 5 shows that “travel without paying” is contraexpectation to the scenario of line 4 “travel by train”. Again “but” marks lexically that this element is \textit{not} prototypical in the open scenario. Often, as in this story, it is these non-prototypical elements of a narrative which give clues to the development of the plot.
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To an English audience, “but” in line 5 seems natural. However, “but” in line 4 seems awkward, since the English “going to school” scenario includes travel by train as one of several options, and is not markedly unusual.

So contraexpectation is in light of the speaker’s and audience’s mental scenarios, which are based on their cultural experiences. The following example concerns preparations for a pre-wedding-feast for the speaker’s son:

“Malo’s wedding”

12 pacfo to na lidh-o, ad.hours pa@at-o lidh-a. buffalo-G contraexp not took-G half maund potato-G took- G

However we didn’t get a buffalo, we got half a maund of potatoes.

To understand the contraexpectation marker here, one needs to know that in Parkari culture, a young male water-buffalo is the ideal food for a big feast such as this - if you can afford it. Unfortunately, the speaker could not.

The word to, glossed as contraexpectation, and translated here as “however”, never occurs clause initial since it marks that the preceding word is unexpected in relationship to the co-text or situational context. Line 12 could be overtranslated as “Although you would have expected us to get a buffalo, we didn’t. We got half a maund of potatoes instead”. In contrast, the word poq “but”, as in “Michael” lines 4 and 5 above, always occurs clause initial and marks that the following clause is unexpected in relationship to the preceding clause or sentence.

Another common marker of contraexpectation is the use of the question word kom “why?” in rhetorical questions, showing the speaker’s surprise at the situation, and implying rebuke, e.g.

“Michael”

14 Christian people don’t behave like this.

15 to kom fiec-o @olat kom kar-e-h r-i-o.
so(result) why like this-G wrong work do-P-pres stay-pf-G

So why are you doing wrong like this?”

Here the contraexpectation marking shows that the speaker (the ticket-collector) expects Christians to live up to their beliefs.

Compare:

“Mongoose”

61 She thought in her mind

62 mē kom na sab$ar kar-i-o?
I.erg why not patience do-pf-G
Why was I not patient?

63 kom na mē perfin za-en g$ar mē zo-i-o?
why not lerg first go- nonf house in see-pf-G
Why did I not first look inside the house?
Here the contraexpectation marking shows that the speaker expects people, including herself, to be patient and find out the facts before acting, rather than acting rashly.

Although contraexpectation is often lexically marked, the phenomenon of contraexpectation can exist without formal markers, since contrast between the current event and the prototypical contents of the open scenario itself can provide the semantic element of contraexpectation, e.g. (Hearer-old open scenario underlined)

"Michael"

11 and on the card was written “Michael Christian”.
12 Then the inspector said to Michael
13 “tu uifuafi i’en golat kom kar-e-fi.
   you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
   “You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.
14 Christian people don’t behave like this.
15 So why are you doing wrong like this?”

In line 13 Michael’s being a Christian is presented as Hearer-old, since the inspector discovered this in line 11, and Michael knew it all along. Why then is this Hearer-old information introduced in line 13 as part of the scenario “doing wrong”? Lines 14 and 15 make it quite clear that Michael’s actions are wrong, and the kind of behaviour which Christians do not (prototypically) do. Clearly then, the collocation of “Christian” and “wrong” in line 13 is intended to show contraexpectation implicitly, due to the incompatibility between what is actually happening and the audience’s culturally conditioned scenario of a “Christian”.

As argued above, Nonfinal forms in Parkari, like participles in Greek, refer to Hearer-old information in the nuclear scenario. Where these devices are used to mark contraexpectation, the lexical items do belong in the nuclear scenario, but the prototypical relationship is marked as negative, i.e. “Christians do not do wrong”. (This parallels the Greek usage in John 9:25 “being blind, now I see” where the mere juxtaposition of contradictory elements provides implicit contraexpectation.)

Causatives and scenarios

Causative verb forms lexicalise the fact that the causal agent, or Causer, is distinct from the actual doer of the action. Although New Testament Greek and modern English regularly use the same verbal form for both direct action and causation, Parkari regularly marks semantic causatives in the lexicon, by using a verb form with a causative morpheme. This shows up clearly in translation:

Matthew 27:60b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIV</th>
<th>Parkari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μνημείω δ έλατώμην εν τῇ πέτρᾳ</td>
<td>makom ... dij-a ne u-e ... cfìfar më k’otae-a-i-o t-o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomb that he had cut out of the rock</td>
<td>tomb which G to he-erg ... mountain in dig-causative-pf-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tomb which he had caused to be dug in the mountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, it is not sentence level grammar which enables the translator to interpret whether a Greek verb form has causative meaning, rather it is the scenario in which the grammatically marked agent and the verb belong. In the above reference, it is the fact that Joseph of Arimathea is a rich man (Matthew 27:57) which enables the audience to disambiguate the meaning of dig. In a rich man’s scenario, unless there were other factors such as secrecy involved, dig prototypically means command (and pay) others to dig. Similarly, it is by reference to the scenario that the Parkari audience must fill in the missing participants, the active agents of the digging. These will be correctly interpreted by Parkaris as the slaves, servants or employees of the rich man, due to the similarity here between the source text scenario and their own.

Causatives are frequently found in Parkari texts, lexicalizing the semantic relationship appropriate to the open scenario. The active participants, however, are often not explicit in the text, but must be supplied from information stored in long term memory in the open scenario, e.g.

"Malo’s wedding"

39 an pose ame zon au-ai r-ai g'or-e pərn-au-ene.
and then we wedding.party come-G result-G house-loc wed-caus-nonf
and then we the wedding party came home after marrying them.

In Parkari, the bride and groom “marry” (pərn), the parents “cause (the bride and groom) to marry” (pərn-au), so the verb form makes explicit that there are two participant roles in this event. The subjects of the causative verb “marry” are referred to in the text by the exclusive first person plural pronoun “ame”, which means the speaker, plus one or more others, but not the addressee(s). The identity of the speaker, the groom’s mother Shomu, was obvious from the original real life communicative situation (GIVEN situational), but the identity of the other participant(s) included in “we”, here the groom’s father, must be retrieved from the hearer’s “wedding” scenario (KNOWN inferrable). The direct objects of the causative verb “marry”, the bride and groom, are also KNOWN inferrable. They are not lexicalized at all in this sentence. Indeed, the bride is not mentioned at all in the text, and the groom was last mentioned in line 32, inferrable from his relationship to “wedding-party”:

32 mor-a dikr-a r-ai zon mal-a r-ai g-ai.
my-G son-G of-G wedding party Malo-G of-G went-G
My son Malo’s wedding party went.

So here again, it is the hearer’s mental scenario for “wedding”, not the explicit references in the text, which allow the hearer to fill in the actual participants.

Some Parkari causatives are formed from transitive verbs, so that there are three or more participant slots in the event. Examples are from “Dewu’s TB”, a text not included in the Appendix:

20 “But now” he said “go and get her treatment

21 za-e matl-i kər-av-o, zə bızel ter-e za-o.
go-nonf Matli-G do-caus-P or elsewhere bring-nonf go-G
go and get it done at Matli, or take her somewhere else.”
Here the causative agents are explicit, viz. “you (plural)” as shown by the -P suffix which is 2nd person plural, “her” marks the beneficiary, and “treatment” is the explicit direct object, but the active agents, the people who will actually give the treatment, are implicit, and must be understood by the hearer referring to their mental scenario of “treatment”, especially as it links to their mental scenario for Matli. “Matli” is a small town with various small clinics, “treatment” is medical treatment, so the active agent, the one who actually “does the treatment”, will be a doctor. Again, it is the mental scenario not the text which provides information about the missing participants.

Later in the same text, both the causative agent and the active agent of the verb “cause to drink” are left implicit, but again both are retrievable from the open “treatment” scenario, since prototypically it is the relatives who give the medicine, and the sick person who drinks it:

\[ \text{an u dhao didh-ai, pi-ar-ai,} \]
\[ \text{and that medicine gave-G drink-caus-G} \]
\[ \text{and the medicine they gave, [we] had [her] drink [it].} \]

Chapter summary

In Parkari texts, the co-occurrence of vocabulary reflects the culturally conditioned scenarios in the speaker’s mind, and hence indicates to a Parkari audience which scenarios are currently open in the discourse. Lexical cohesion is achieved by patterns of reiteration, using nouns, pronouns, zero anaphora, verbal suffixes and Nonfinal forms. Lexical cohesion is also achieved by patterns of collocation. However lexical cohesion relies on the audience correctly identifying referents and interpreting lexical collocations as semantically coherent, which itself is dependent on recognizing the prototypical contents and relationships within Parkari scenarios. Consequently, some Parkari texts may appear to Western readers to lack lexical cohesion, due to a mismatch of source culture and target culture scenarios, and this results in the loss of semantic coherence.

Parkari can refer explicitly to scenarios, as opposed to concepts, by forming lexical doublets either from two independent words or by using a single word with reduplication. The Parkari lexicon also includes contraexpectation markers and causative verbs, but contraexpectation markers and participants in the causative chain are often left implicit in a text, since the relevant information can be retrieved from the prototypical contents of Parkari scenarios.
Chapter 14
PARKARI DISCOURSE
AND SCENARIOS

Since scenarios affect both grammatical structure and lexical co-occurrence in Parkari, grammar and lexis each play a part in identifying which scenarios are open. The scenarios thus identified provide semantic coherence in the discourse due to the prototypical semantic links already formed both between concepts within a single scenario and between scenarios. In this chapter I show the correlation between grammatical forms and lexical items in Parkari discourse, and demonstrate not only how this correlation indicates open scenarios but also how those scenarios function to “chunk” the discourse into coherent semantic units. I also give examples of how scenario theory can be used in the discourse analysis of Parkari texts.

Scenarios and coherence in discourse

As argued above, lexical co-occurrence and Hearer-old marking are both related to the scenario, so one would expect these lexical and grammatical elements to show patterns of correlation. The text “Michael” shows how lexicon and Hearer-old marking together indicate which scenario is open and in focus as the text proceeds. In Parkari, as in Greek, a single unit of discourse is characterized by a specific scenario being open throughout that unit. Thus grammatical and lexical clues for identifying single open scenarios are also clues for identifying the semantic units which together make up the discourse. Typically, scenarios are linked together as the text develops, so that at the switch between discourse units there is a link or overlap between scenarios, e.g. (lexical items from the same scenario bolded, Hearer-old marking underlined, zero anaphora marked by asterisk)

the “boy” scenario:

1 fek sokr-o hat-o.
   one child-G was-G
   Once there was a boy.

2 u-o e-o nom hat-o maekal.
   that-G of-G name was-G Michael
   His name was Michael.

3 e sokr-o tarik tarik takul moe b'eq-upt-o za-t-o.
   this child-G daily daily school in study-inf-G go-impf-G
   This boy used to go every day to study in school.
The story opens with aek "one", marking "boy" as NEW, i.e. the focal scenario for the whole narrative. The Hearer-old information markers, the pronoun (line 2) and demonstrative adjective plus noun (line 3), both refer to this boy, showing how lexis and grammar combine to track the referent. In these lines, where the "boy" scenario is open, the main character of the discourse is introduced, suggesting a discourse function of setting or introduction to the narrative.

the "train" scenario:

3 e sokr-o tarik tarik iskul mo$b^aq-u-a za-t-o.
   This child-G daily daily school in study-inf-G go-impf-G
   This boy used to go every day to study in school.

4 pan rel goc-f-i m$e sac-en iskul $ za-t-o.
   but rail cart-G in climh-nonf school go-impf-G
   But he used to go to school having climbed on the train.

5 pan famef vo$ar b^aq-e $ za-t-o.
   but always without fare-loc go-impf-G
   But he always used to travel without paying his fare.

6 an zocb bus ticket zo-u-a av-t-o
   and when inspector ticket see-inf-G come-impf-G
   And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

7 to e sokr-o kokus m$e ya to sit-hef na$t-e za-t-o.
   then this child-G toilet in or indeed seat under hide-nonf go-impf-G
   then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

The null pronoun (lines 4 and 5) and demonstrative adjective plus noun (line 7) both refer to the boy as the ongoing central character.

Line 3 links the "boy" and "train" scenarios. School (line 4) is repeated from line 3, and provides the Hearer-old context for the contraexpectation (line 4) "but he used to go ... on the train." The "school" scenario functions as the link between the "boy" and "train" scenarios, though the link between "school" and "train" is weak, as shown by the contraexpectation marking. The Hearer-old verb form "having climbed" is used with "used to go" (line 4), even though boarding the train is Discourse-new. This is because boarding a vehicle is a prototypical element of the "travel" scenario.

In lines 5 and 6, "fare" "inspector" and "ticket" clearly show the "train" scenario is focal. The contraexpectation marker "but", and the Hearer-old marker "when", must both be interpreted in the light of prototypical scripts in this "train" scenario. "But" indicates that travelling without paying is not prototypical, and "when" indicates that the inspector’s checking tickets is prototypical.

In this section, where the "train" scenario is open, a problem is introduced into the narrative, suggesting this may be a discourse unit functioning to introduce a Problem.
When the inspector is introduced as a new character, it is in the context of the “train” scenario, and there is no special new character marking fiek “one” as there was for the boy (line 1):

the “inspector” scenario:

6  an zaen bobu tiket zo-b-a au-t-o
   and when inspector ticket see-inf-G come-impf-G
   And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

7  to e sok-o kakus me ya to sit fieb* nohi-e za-t-o.
   then this child-G toilet in or indeed seat under hide-nonf go-impf-G
   then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

8  fiek di bobu i-a ne z*al-e lidb-o.
   one day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
   One day the inspector caught hold of him.

9  zaen * i-a r-a glu-z-a zo-i-a,
   when this-G of-G pocket-G see-pf-G
   When he checked his pockets

10 to i-a r-a glu-z-a me sanokhit kardb zaf-i-o.
    then this-G of-G pocket-G in identity card find-pf-G
    he found his Identity Card in his pocket.

Although “inspector” is introduced in line 6 as part of the “train” scenario, in line 8 it becomes the focal scenario, focus zooming in, as it were, from “train” as a whole, to the section within the “train” scenario’s conceptual network which it entitled “inspector”. Thus the noun “inspector” (line 8) and the null pronoun (line 9) both refer back to the inspector of line 6, who is the main actor in this section of the story, whereas the demonstrative pronoun (lines 8, 9, 10) and demonstrative adjective plus noun (line 7) both refer to the boy as the ongoing central character of the story as a whole.

The marker for salient Hearer-new information, fiek “one”, in the phrase “one day” (line 8), marks that significant action in the story now takes place, with the inspector on centre stage. The Hearer-old “when” (line 9) refers to the prototypical action of an “inspector”. In lines 8-10, where the “inspector” scenario is focal, the problem of Michael’s ticketless travel is addressed, suggesting these lines may belong within a discourse unit functioning as Problem Resolution.

the “identity” scenario:

10 to i-a r-a glu-z-a më sanok*ti kard* zaf-i-o.
   then this-G of-G pocket-G in identity card find-pf-G
   he found his Identity Card in his pocket.

11 an kard* mëh lak* al fiat-o maekeal ufvoj. 
   and card on write-ed was-G Michael Christian
   and on the card was written “Michael Christian”.

12 taen bobu maekeal ne kidb-o
   then inspector Michael to said-G
   Then the inspector said to Michael
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“tū ufufi[^a]-en dalat kom kar-e-fi.
you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
“You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.

ufufi manak[^b] to her-a kom natöi kar-t-a.
Christian people indeed like this-G work not do-impf-G
Christian people don’t behave like this.”

Here “identity card” is introduced (line 10) as part of the “inspector” scenario and provides the link to the “identity” scenario. “Card” (line 11) refers back to “identity card” (line 10).

“Michael” (line 11) refers back to line 2 where the boy is named, and the name “Michael” is repeated in line 12. In a Pakistani context, the name also implies his identity as a Christian. “Christian” (lines 13, 14) refers back to line 11. So there is much Hearer-old lexical use here, mainly of information type 3b GIVEN textual-current, which puts heavy emphasis on this identity scenario

The words “wrong work” (line 13) refer back to travelling without a ticket (line 5), and “such work” (line 14) refers back to both line 13 and 6. These items belong in both the “identity” and “morality” scenarios and facilitate the switch to the new focal scenario of “morality” in lines 13 on.

These lines, where “identity card” is an open scenario, also seem to have a discourse function as Problem Resolution.

the “morality” scenario:

“tū ufufi[^a]-en dalat kom kar-e-fi.
you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
“You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.

ufufi manak[^b] to her-a kom natöi kar-t-a.
Christian people indeed like this-G work not do-impf-G
Christian people don’t behave like this.

14 uijuaji manakh to fier-a kom nathi kar-t-a.
Christian people indeed like this-G work not do-impf-G
Christian people don’t behave like this.

Christian people don’t behave like this.

15 to kom her-a dalat kom kar-e-fi r-i-o.
so(result) why like this-G wrong work do-P-pres stay-pf-G
So why are you doing wrong like this?”

16 taeö i-o sokr-a ne göön-si jaram au-öi,
then this-G child-G to much-G shame come-G
Then this boy became very ashamed,

17 an locöe mar-i-o.
and embarrassment-loc die-pf-G
and became very embarrassed.

18 pase maekal fek ëuuk-o ufufi[^a]-e gô-i-o.
then Michael one good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G
Then Michael became a good Christian.

19 amö-d bôd[^b]-ö ne këap-e ke
us-G all-G to must-P that
We should all
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20 amar-a b’ai-f-a kom sad-en ðauk-a kom kar-δ, our-G bad-G work leave-nonf good-G work do-P give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,

21 zam fiae sok-o ðauk-o vaqojo iθ-e g-l-o. just as this(near) child-G good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G just as this boy became a good Christian.

Lines 13 and 14 mark the bridge between the “identity” scenario and the “morality” scenario. The words “Christian” and “wrong work” together open the “morality” scenario which dominates the final part of the story.

This “morality” scenario was foreshadowed way back in line 2 for the Parkari audience by the name “Michael”, a specifically Christian name, and in lines 5 and 7 by his unethical behaviour.

But he always used to travel without paying his fare.
then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

The Hearer-old verb forms (lines 13, 20) both belong in the “morality” scenario. In “You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong” (line 13) the relationship between the two propositions is contraexpectation, but in “give up our bad deeds and do good deeds” (line 20) the relationship is prototypical. However, in both cases, the nature of the relationship as contraexpectation or prototypicality is not marked by the grammar, but must be retrieved from the hearer’s own “morality” scenario.

In the last section, (lines 19-21) there is a shift to the “moral of the story” marked by the pronoun “we”, the shift away from Past Perfective verb forms, and the use of the verb “should”. Here the old-information marker “this boy” is used to refer back to the central character of lines 1-18.

These lines, where the “morality” scenario is open, function as Problem resolution in the discourse, line 18 showing complete resolution, with lines 19-21 offering a moral to the story, based on the Problem Resolution. Throughout the discourse, scenarios interlink, with an element of one scenario becoming the focal scenario for a following section of discourse.

Another example of the sequential “chaining” of scenarios comes in the procedural text “My farmwork”. Again, within each section lexical items are related to a single scenario, but here the change between scenarios is according to time and activity, not plot driven as in narrative. This switching between scenarios also parallels what appear to be discourse units in the overall structure of the text. Throughout this procedural text there is a pattern of “chaining”, using a main verb for first mention of an activity, and a Hearer-old Nonfinal verb form for its repetition. Such anaphoric Nonfinals mark that a new script is beginning within the open scenario of the total “procedure”, here “farmwork”. Typically each new script represents a new discourse unit.
As in narrative, Hearer-old Nonfinal forms referring to Discourse-new events are part of a script leading up to the event of the main verb. Such scripts are characteristic of procedural texts, hence the large number of Nonfinal forms, e.g. (lexical cohesion bolded, Nonfinal verb forms and other Hearer-old markers underlined)

the “field tour” scenario (1):
1 Having got up early in the morning
   I will go to take a walk round the land.
2 After taking a walk round I come back home again.

the “ploughing” scenario:
3 After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.
4 The ox-team goes.

the “planting sugarcane” scenario:
5 After ploughing the land then I go and cut the sugarcane.
6 After cutting the sugarcane then having chopped it into sections
7 then again, back on the land, having made trenches
8 I plant sugarcane in the trenches.
9 After planting the sugarcane
10 then I fill it in, fill the trenches in.

the “watering the crop” scenario (a):
11 After filling them in then I let the water into it.
12 After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.

the “field tour” scenario (2):
13 After closing it then I er take another walk round the land.

the “watering the crop” scenario (b):
14 Then I close off the channel from the upper mouth.

the “field tour” scenario (3):
15 After closing the channel I come back
16 and take a tour round the land.

The motif of the “field tour” comes in lines 13 and 15-16, but the following event is introduced simply by vale “then, again” without “chaining” (lines 14, 17). This marks the field tour as an interlude rather than an event in the script of the open scenario.

the “keeping the fields neat” scenario:
17 Then if there are field-walls I trim the walls.
18 After trimming the walls I keep the walls straight.
19 If there is a mound, then I dig away the mound and level it up.
20 And I do fields in turn, trimming them well.
21 I make all the fields level,
22 in which the water may come really evenly
23 and the water may lie in the field just the same amount all over.
the "evaluative" scenario:
24 So in this way according to my own plan
25 I do my work in a good manner.

Most of the Nonfinal forms in this text are "chaining", restating the event of the previous main verb. The exceptions are:
1 Having got up early in the morning I will go to take a walk round the land.
3 After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.
5 and then I go and cut the sugarcane.
6 After cutting the sugarcane then having chopped it into sections
7 then again, back on the land, having made trenches
8 I plant sugarcane in the trenches.
12 After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.
15 After closing the channel I come back
16 and take a tour round the land.
19 If there is a mound, then I dig away the mound and level it up.

Note that these Nonfinal forms, used for chaining, are always followed by a main verb. According to my theory, presenting these Discourse-new items in Hearer-old grammatical form marks that the events are prototypical elements in the following scenario, i.e.

- getting up early prototypically precedes the morning walk round
- driving the oxen prototypically precedes yoking the ox-team
- going prototypically precedes cutting the sugarcane
- chopping cane prototypically precedes making trenches and
- making trenches prototypically precedes planting sugarcane
- filling with water prototypically precedes closing the channel
- coming back prototypically precedes taking a walk round
- digging away mounds prototypically precedes levelling up the ground

Thus both lexical items and Hearer-old grammatical marking help identify which scenario is currently open, and these open scenarios, due to their prototypical contents and prototypical links with other scenarios, divide the discourse up into "chunks", or semantic units, which are already semantically connected, thus helping the audience to follow the flow of the text.

Scenarios and discourse analysis

As shown above, in a typical text, as the discourse progresses, a series of different scenarios are opened. These scenarios are interlinked, as shown by both lexicon and
grammatical "chaining", since certain elements belong in both the preceding and following scenario. However, it is these major shifts from one scenario to the other which show discourse boundaries, i.e. boundaries between semantic paragraphs.

By semantic paragraphs I mean high-level semantic units, functioning within a hierarchy, which have a semantic relationship one to another in terms of the structure and purpose of the discourse as a whole (Reed, 1997:46):

Despite the close correlation between open scenarios and semantic paragraphs, there is not a one-to-one correspondence. Within a given span of text lexical collocations may indicate that a single scenario is open, and yet that span of text may consist of more than one semantic paragraph, since the semantic paragraph is defined solely in terms of its discrete role in the overall structure of the discourse. Semantic paragraphs should be reflected in orthographical paragraph divisions, although orthographical paragraphs are often partially determined by visual factors, so that long semantic paragraphs may be split at minor semantic and grammatical boundaries within the semantic paragraph, and short semantic paragraphs may be combined into a single orthographical paragraph.

The following semantic paragraphs are suggested for the two texts analysed above.

Since "Michael" is a narrative text, the discourse role of each semantic paragraph is given according to the "schema roles", i.e. categories of narrative schematic structure, used by Callow and Callow (1996), with HEAD roles labelled in upper case, and supporting roles in lower case (glosses of Parkari main verbs are bolded, Nonfinal forms underlined):

"Michael"  
problem-resolution text  
Setting  
1           Once there was a boy.  
2           His name was Michael.  

PROBLEM  
3           This boy used to go every day to study in school.  
4           But he used to go to school having climbed on the train.  
5           But he always used to travel without paying his fare.  
6           And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,  
7           then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.  

Partial resolution  
8           One day the inspector caught hold of him.  
9           When he checked his pockets  
10         he found his Identity Card in his pocket.
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11 and on the card was written “Michael Christian”

Partial resolution
12 Then the inspector said to Michael
13 “You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.
14 Christian people don’t behave like this.
15 So why are you doing wrong like this?”
16 Then this boy became very ashamed,
17 and became very embarrassed.

RESOLUTION
18 Then Michael became a good Christian.

Moral
19 We should all
20 give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,
21 just as this boy became a good Christian.

In this text the lexicon plays a major role in determining scenarios, and hence chunking the text into paragraphs.

Lines 8-18 might be understood as a single semantic paragraph, with the schema role RESOLUTION, since the participants, time and location are identical throughout. However, the division at line 12 is based on the switch from “identity” to “morality” as the open scenario, although, as mentioned above, there is an overlap caused by one element, here “Christian”, being in both scenarios. The division at line 18 is due to the role of this paragraph in the whole text, i.e. the complete resolution of the problem.

The three-fold resolution could be summarized as: caught and identified (8-11), challenged and shamed (12-17), and reformed (18). In each section these aspects are emphasized by marked prominence, as shown below (prominence markers bolded):

caught and identified
8 ñeke di ñoði i-a ne zol-e lid-o.
One day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
One day the inspector caught hold of him.
11 on kàr leh jol-i wàl i-wot-o maekol utfojí.
and card on write-ed was-G Michael Christian
and on the card was written “Michael Christian”.

Prominence markers:
The verb “take” (line 8) as an auxiliary verb is a salience marker which emphasizes the ongoing result of the action. Actions with ongoing results are naturally highly significant in a discourse.

The postposing of the words “Michael Christian” after the verb also indicates salience, or special significance at a higher level of discourse, in this case his identity as a Christian, which is key to the plot.

challenged and shamed
12 ñeke ñoði maekol ne kid-o
then inspector Michael to said-G
Then the inspector said to Michael
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    you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
    “You have become a Christian, but do what’s wrong.

14 ujuaji monak³ to her-a kom nothi kor-t-a.
    Christian people indeed like this-G work not do-impf-G
    Christian people don’t behave like this.

15 to kam her-a goalat kom kar-e-fi r-i-o.
    so(result) why like this-G wrong work do-P-pres stay-pf-G
    So why are you doing wrong like this?”

16 tae6 i-o sokr-a ne 3anq-a aqam au-aq,
    then this-G child-G to much-G shame come-G
    Then this boy became very ashamed.

17 on laabj-e mor-i-o.
    and embarrassment-loc die-pf-G
    and became very embarrassed.

Prominence markers:
Full noun reference for both characters (line 12) indicates a significant event, since with only two characters on stage only one needs to be marked by a full noun phrase for reference.

Repetition of the word Christian (x2, lines 13, 14) lexically reinforces the significance of Michael’s religious identity, which is the basis for the challenge and the cause of his shame.

Repetition of wrongdoing, wrong (x2, lines 13, 15), like this (x2, lines 14, 15), lexically reinforces the reason why he should feel ashamed.

Rhetorical question “why” (line 15) expresses rebuke, and assumes that the person addressed is well aware of the incongruity of his behaviour, so should be ashamed.

Repetition of shame (x2, lines 16, 17), each with an intensifier, stresses the significance of shame as a social constraint on behaviour.

reformed
18 pose maekal fek fuuk-o ujuaji t³-e g-i-o.
    then Michael one good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G
    Then Michael became a good Christian.

Prominence markers:
The verb “go/went” as an auxiliary verb (line 18) emphasizes the ongoing result of the action, suggesting high discourse significance.

The number fek “one” marks salience, and since here it does not introduce a new narrative character, it marks Michael’s change of behaviour as salient.

It is this complete resolution “reformed” which is referred to again in the Moral, where the pronoun “we” shows the shift to a personal application of the narrative.
Procedural texts do not have any characteristic schema roles, because temporal sequence and change of activity are the main factors in the discourse development of such texts. In procedural texts, as well as lexical cohesion, the patterning of Hearer-new and Hearer-old verb forms plays a significant role in determining scenario boundaries, and hence semantic paragraphs. Since both lexical cohesion and Hearer-old marking are linked to the scenario, they function together in marking discourse chunks and boundaries, e.g. (semantic paragraphs separated by blank lines, glosses of Parkari main verbs bold, Nonfinals underlined)

“My farmwork”

1. Having got up early in the morning I will go to take a walk round the land.
2. After taking a walk round I come back home again.
3. After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.
4. The ox-team goes.
5. After ploughing the land then I go and cut the sugarcane.
6. After cutting the sugarcane then having chopped it into sections then again, back on the land, having made trenches
7. I plant sugarcane in the trenches.
8. After planting the sugarcane then I fill it in, [fill] the trenches in.
9. After filling them in then I let the water into it.
10. After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.
11. After closing it then I er take another walk round the land.
12. Then I close off the channel from the upper mouth.
13. After closing the channel I come back and take a tour round the land.
14. Then if there are field-walls I trim the walls.
15. After trimming the walls I keep the walls straight.
16. If there is a mound, then I dig away the mound and level it up.
17. And I do fields in turn, trimming them well.
18. I make all the fields level.
19. in which the water may come really evenly
20. and the water may lie in the field just the same amount all over.
21. So in this way according to my own plan
22. I do my work in a good manner.

The final verb of each paragraph is always a main verb, which typically refers to the last event in the procedural script of the open scenario, and also functions as the “title” of that scenario. In lines 17-23, the final main verb in a main clause is “make level” (line 22), and this is the scenario’s title. The verbs in subordinate clauses (lines 22-23) belong within that scenario. It would also be possible to link lines 3-8 as a single paragraph, which would then contain the three core activities for planting sugarcane: ploughing the field, cutting the cane, and the actual planting.

It can clearly be seen that Parkari frequently marks the overlap of scenarios by “chaining” verbs, especially in procedural texts, so the same event occurs as a main verb at
the end of one paragraph and in Hearer-old form at the beginning of the next, e.g. lines 2-3, 4-5, 5-6, 8-9, 14-15 above.

According to my theory that Hearer-old verb forms link information to the scenario of the main verb, paragraph divisions cannot possibly occur after a Hearer-old verb form and before the main verb it relates to. This explains why paragraphs typically end in a main verb, though they may begin with a Hearer-old Nonfinal verb form. As is clear from the analysis of “My farmwork” above, lexical cohesion is produced by the collocation of vocabulary from a single scenario, and the clustering of such vocabulary typically correlates with the chunking of the text into “Nonfinal and main verb” units, since both the lexicon and the grammar are linked to the same conceptual scenario.

Marked salience

Hearer-old Nonfinal verb forms normally precede the main verb, just as the events they refer to precede the final and main event in the script. Occasionally, however, Hearer-old verbs are postposed to occur after the main verb, even though they refer to a preceding event. This postposing is statistically marked, and indicates salience, which for Nonfinal forms suggests the special significance of what is normally just a prototypical event, e.g.

(relevant main verbs bolded, and relevant Hearer-old Nonfinal forms underlined)

“Sparrow”

45 He says to the mosquitoes,

fial-o fiek-a mag fiat[i ubh-o, k-e-fi.
come.along-G one-G place elephant stand-G say-P-pres
“Come along, there’s an elephant standing over there.

46 fial-en u-a r-o kon-o moe peh-en, k-e-fi.
come.along-nonf he-G of-G ear-G in enter-nonf say-P-pres
Come along, go inside his ears

loi pi-ia u-a r-o, fial-en, k-e-fi.
blood drink-fut.imp he-G of-G come.along-nonf say-P-pres
and drink his blood, when you’ve come,” he says.

The verb “come along” occurs 3 times, first as a command (line 45b) and then twice in Hearer-old Nonfinal form, once preceding the main verb “drink”, and once sentence final. Since “coming along” must precede “drinking”, the postposing is not time related. Here “coming along” has special significance at discourse level. The sparrow has asked a whole series of characters for help, but all have refused. If the mosquitoes will not come along now, when it is in their own interests, the sparrow has nowhere else to turn.

Compare the following postposed Nonfinals “having gone”:

“Sparrow”

52 The stick says, “Don’t burn me!”
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53  hū kute-a ne mar-5 za-en k-e-fi.
   I dog-G to beat-P go-nonf say-P-pres
   I will go and beat the dog," he says.

"Sparrow"

64  So the king says, "Don't be angry with us, and I

   vaq* a ne be-k za-en mosar mel-0, k-e-fi, op za-en.
carpenter-G to two-or so go-nonf shoe slap place-P say-P-pres self go-nonf
   will go to the carpenter myself," he says,

   "and give him a couple of whacks on the head with my shoe."

Again, “going” has special discourse significance here. These characters had previously refused to go and help the sparrow. Now, under pressure, they finally go.

Similarly:

"Sparrow"

66  tō vaq* a 6i-o koar-0 l-en, sok* o par-o,
   so(new S) carpenter-G went-pf-G axe-G take-nonf rice grain-G result-G
   So the carpenter went having taken his axe (the grain of rice)

   chopped up the log, and gave the grain of rice to the sparrow.
Here “the grain of rice”, shown bracketed in 66a, occurs out of sequence with a resultative marker. It occurs again as grammatical object in the final clause. The whole story is about recovering this “grain of rice”, found in line 2, lost immediately, and recovered here. Its mention out of sequence is a Parkari device, used at the narrative Climax, highlighting its importance in the discourse.

Here again, the Hearer-old Nonfinal form 1-en “having taken” refers to expected information in the “go” scenario, since the whole purpose of the carpenter’s going was to chop open the log (lines 11-13). The postposing marks that “taking the axe” has special discourse significance, here the carpenter’s change from downright refusal (“Go away!” line 14) to finally fulfilling the sparrow’s original request to cut open the log (lines 11-13).

Discourse boundaries

We have seen above how “chaining”, repeating the event of a main verb in Nonfinal form, marks a discourse boundary, the Nonfinal form marking the setting of the new script. We have also seen that use of lexical items from a single scenario produces lexical cohesion, which frequently marks the extent of a single semantic paragraph. Conversely, a switch to lexical items from a new scenario suggests the opening of a new semantic paragraph. As has been shown above, semantic paragraphs usually overlap in some way, i.e. there is a shift from one scenario to another by means of some referent present in both. In written text, the formatter must choose whether to make the new paragraph before or after the “switch”.

There are also certain specific lexical items which are used to mark discourse boundaries, such as semantic paragraph breaks, since they refer to specific elements of a scenario or script. For example, the lexical item fek “one” is used to mark a Discourse-
New and Hearer-new referent as salient. This type of salience marking indicates a new character, place, time or situation of special significance in the narrative, and as such marks discourse boundaries.

Frequently fiek marks the beginning of a new narrative, introducing the main participant, e.g.
“Michael”
1 fiek sokr-o fKat-o.
   one child-G was-G
   Once there was a boy.

“Sparrow”
1 fiek sakl-o fKat-o
   one sparrow-G was-G
   Once there was a sparrow.

The new character marked by “one” is established by the speaker as the title of a new scenario. All the rest of the narrative is to be linked to this character and stored in the brain as part of this scenario. This enables the hearer to recall information such as “What happened to X? What did X do?”

Similarly, marking a location by “one” at the start of a narrative identifies that place as the setting for the main character(s) and the ensuing story, e.g.
“The lame man and the blind man”
1 fiek-a göm mër fiek mašt-o fKat-o on fiek fKat-o ödö.
   one-G town in one lame-G was-G and one was-G blind-G
   In a certain town there lived a lame man and a blind man.

“Mongoose”
2 fiek göm mër fiek ghar fKat-o.
   one town in one house was-G
   In a certain town there was a house.

3 And that house-holder’s name was Premo.

4 prem-a r-o sokr-o fiek kondji fKat-o.
   Premo-G of-G child-G one Konji was-G
   Premo’s son was one Konji.

The new place marked by “one” is established by the speaker as the title of a new scenario, within which all events of the story are linked. This enables the hearer to recall information such as “What happened at/in X?” Often the location will be very generic, as in the examples above, “in a certain town,” “a house”.

The use of “one” with a time word frequently marks a discourse boundary after the introductory setting of people and place, beginning a new semantic paragraph in which significant actions, the on-line “backbone” events of the plot, will occur, e.g.
“Michael”
8 fiek dès bobu i-o ne zul-e lidö.
   one day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
   One day the inspector caught hold of him.
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"Mongoose"

5  fie aq-i-0 apr-o mal sar-i-a haru
   **one** day he went-pf-G own-G livestock graze-pf-G for
   **One day** he went in order to graze his livestock

6  and he caught a mongoose

The time frame marked by "one" is established by the speaker as the title of a new time frame scenario, which is linked to the larger scenarios of character(s) and/or place(s) already established in the narrative. All the following narrative, until the establishment of a new time frame, is to be linked to this temporal scenario. This enables the hearer to recall information such as "What happened on that day?"

Occasionally the use of "one" comes later in the narrative, but still marks the beginning of a new significant narrative section, e.g. in the sparrow story "in one place" marks the beginning of the resolution section.

"Sparrow"

44 Now the sparrow stood there, then went off to bring the mosquitoes.

45  mosr-o ne k-e-h hol-o fie-a moj fat-hi ub-o k-e-h
   mosquito-P to say-P-pres come along-G one-G place elephant stand-G say-P-pres
   He says to the mosquitoes, Come along, there's an elephant standing over there.

Scope of conjunctions

Conjunctions are a closed class of lexical items (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1979:18-19), whose scope or span is related to a whole scenario rather than necessarily to a single proposition or verb. Conjunctions typically link related sections of a scenario. Frequently they link sequential events in a script, either by time (e.g. "then"), or by causality (e.g. "so").

Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson, in their Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST), make the point that relationships in text are between chunks or units (1992:47):

The key elements of RST are relations and spans. Essentially, the relation definitions identify particular relationships that can hold between two text spans.

A text span is any portion of text that has an RST structure (and thus has a functional integrity, from a text-organizational point of view), or that is realized by a unit.

Similarly, Callow discusses the importance of knowing the span of a relation word with respect to Greek δέ, pointing out that "δέ occurs at a variety of different discourse levels" (1992:184) and "the span or domain of a δέ in any instance is a considerable clue to its function" (1992:185).

So the audience must be able to recognize not only the function or meaning of a conjunction, but also the text span over which it operates. This is usually straightforward if the conjunction joins two clauses which are closely related within a single scenario, e.g. "Michael"

3  This boy used to go every day to study in school.
4  But he used to go to school on the train.
5  But he always used to travel without paying his fare.
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Here line 4 contrasts with the expectations of the scenario in line 3, and line 5 contrasts with the expectations of the scenario in line 4.

Where larger discourse units are joined, the audience must match grammatical clues with prototypical relationships in their mental scenarios to determine the span of units joined.

For example, a Parkari draft of a simple English booklet based on Genesis 2:15-25, included these lines (Parkari main verbs bolded):

1. But there was not any helper with Adam.
2. Therefore God sent a very heavy sleep on Adam.
3. Then he removed one of Adam’s ribs.
4. God made one woman from Adam’s rib.

Line 2 was understood as a non sequitur, “Why did God send Adam to sleep because there was no helper for him?” In this Parkari draft the span of “therefore” only extended as far as the first main verb in line 2.

The solution was to link lines 2-4 into a single scenario, using Nonfinals in 2 and 3 climaxing in a main verb for the making of woman, i.e. (Nonfinal verb forms underlined):

1. But there was not any helper with Adam.
2. tjam bh9cfbon adorn mafi alafie ghai-ai ugh mel-en therefore God Adam on very much-G sleep send-nonf
   Therefore God having sent a very heavy sleep on Adam,
3. adam f-ai fiek pafif-ai kacfyen Adam of-G rib-G extract-nonf
   having removed one of Adam’s ribs.
4. adam r-i pafif-i thi fiek cfofi £hau-ai.
   Adam of-G rib-G from one woman make-G.
   made one woman from Adam’s rib.

This was understood correctly, since “therefore” now links line 1 to the whole 2-4 unit.

Change of state markers

Certain lexical items in Parkari are used only with verbs whose Aktionsart category is change of state. These verbs prototypically occur script-final in people’s mental scenarios, and occur in text as main verbs with explicit change of state marking.

In narrative, main verbs with change of state marking typically occur at discourse boundaries. At the very beginning of a discourse unit, they indicate that a new situation has occurred which affects the plot, e.g. “Michael”

8. fek di bobu i-a ne z’al-e lidk-o.
   one day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
   One day the inspector caught hold of him.

This marks the start of the mainline events, after the setting (lines 1-7).

At the very end of a discourse unit, they indicate that the current script-type scenario has run its course, e.g.
Chapter 14 - Parkari Discourse and Scenarios

"Michael"

18 pase mækæl fek t'auk-o u[uoji t'æ g'i-o.
then Michael one good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G
Then Michael became a good Christian.

This marks the end of the whole narrative, the culmination of the confrontation script (lines 12-17).

The Parkari language has various lexical ways to mark final elements in a change of state script, i.e. the particles poro, ro, and t'ö following a main verb (glossed “result” since they emphasize the resulting change of state), as well as the verbs zauo “to go”, levo “to take” and devo “to give”, which can be used as auxiliary verbs following a content verb in non-finite form.

These change of state markers are frequently used in Past Perfective, Future and Subjunctive verb forms, where the result of an event is in focus, e.g.

(content verb underlined, main verb bold)

Past Perfective

"Michael"

8 fek di 6a6u i-a ne z'æl-o lið-o.
One day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
One day the inspector caught hold of him.

18 pase mækæl fek t'auk-o u[uoji t'æ g'i-o.
then Michael one good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G
Then Michael became a good Christian.

Future

"Breadpan"

15 6at-en u k'atam t'æ za-f-e q-t-o.
burn-nonf that finished become-nonf go-fut-P flour-G
It will burn up, and the flour will be totally consumed.

Subjunctive

"Breadpan"

22 fek pæc u-o r-o dqæl-o t'æ za-e
one surface that-G of-G hard-G become-nonf go-P
One of its surfaces will become hard.

The same content verb may be marked as change of state by both a particle and an auxiliary verb, e.g. (particle bold and underlined)

"Breadpan"

30 nikær-e za-f-e par-o
exit-nonf go-fut-P result-G
It will come right out.

31 u-a ne røt-i ne søt-e za-f-e par-o hoë
that-G to bread-G to stick-nonf go-fut-P result-G completely
It will completely stick to it, to the bread.

Change of state particles can also occur with Nonfinal forms. Use of these particles with Hearer-old Nonfinal forms indicates that the change of state is merely part of a larger ongoing script, i.e. the event is itself a change of state, but is also part of a chain of events,
and must be completed before the next event takes place. In such strings, the script-final verb will always be a main verb, e.g.

"Breadpan"

5   tau-t-a ne d[o]-en sop b par-o kar-e
   bread-pan-G to wash-nonf clean result-G do-nonf
   After washing the breadpan and making it clean,

6   an pase u-a ne ponj er-f-e par-o.
   and then that-G to water spill-fut-P result-G
   they will then pour away the water from it.

When a change of state particle marks a script-final event, it occurs after the verb (line 6). However, when it marks a preceding event in the script, it occurs before the verb (line 5). Typically then, change of state particles come after main verbs, but before Nonfinal verb forms.

Exceptions occur where the full script has several sub-scripts, as in the example below. In the sub-script about cleaning out the ash, lines 18-19a, the marker por-o (feminine to agree with "ash") comes before the first Nonfinal, but after the second non-final at the end of that sub-script. The Nonfinal form of the verb "throw" shows that the main "scone making" script is continuing, and this script is completed by the main verb "make".

"Breadpan"

18  u fel-a i k^arpi-a t^i hek aol par-o koeg en
    that ash-G topic-G scraper-G from aside result-G extract-nonf
    Shift that ash with a potscraper

19  p^adol-e par-o an pase hek s^adk-o g^or-i-a r^o-i r-oo
    throw-nonf result-G and then one scone-G make-fut.imp bread-G of-G
    throw it away, then make a scone out of bread.

Change of state markers rarely occur in Imperfective or Progressive verbal forms (Imperfective Aspect), since conceptualization of an event as Imperfective is usually semantically incompatible with a change of state. These texts show one rare use of a change of state marker in the Past Imperfective verb form:

"Michael"

7   to e sokr-o kokus m^e ya to sit helb nof e zo-t-o.
    then this child-G toilet in or indeed seat under hide-nonf go-impf-G
    then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

Here the change of state, from being visible to being hidden, occurred only once per occasion. The Imperfective form here indicates iterative Aktionsart, i.e. this sequence occurred once on many different occasions, rather than frequently on a single occasion (for which Aktionsart these change of state markers are not used)

Change of state markers never occur in the negative in Parkari, since negative forms, showing that something does not happen, are semantically incompatible with changes of state, e.g.
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The choice of appropriate change of state markers is determined by semantic elements in the scenario of the verb as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>away from speaker</th>
<th>towards speaker</th>
<th>stationary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paro</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>t'o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levo</td>
<td>devo</td>
<td>zavo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example (change of state markers bolded):

**Particles:**

u gj-o par-o.
that go-pf-G result-G
He went away.

u a-i-o r-o.
that come-pf-G result-G
He came.

u beth-o t'h-o.
that sat-G result-G
He sat down.

**Auxiliary verbs:**

"Michael"
8 fek di bausi i-a ne z'au-e lfdh-o.
one day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
One day the inspector caught hold of him.

k'bath lakh-e dj-o.
letter write-nonf give-P
Write a letter for me.

"Michael"
18 pase maekol fek t'auk-o utfoaji t'h-e gj-i-o.then Michael one good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G
Then Michael became a good Christian.

The particle paro also functions as a neutral particle, e.g.

"Breadpan"
31 u-a ne ro-i ne sot-e za-if-e par-o hoe that-G to bread-G to stick-nonf go-fut-P result-G completely
It will completely stick to it, to the bread.

There is evidence that it is the scenario, not the specific verb form, which determines which particle is used, since the verb meluo “put, place, send” takes different change of state particles depending on the scenario being referred to, e.g.

me k'at mel-i-o par-o.
I-erg. letter put-pf-G result-G
I sent the letter.

I-erg. letter put-pf-G result-G
I put the letter down.

Switch marking

Parkari has a particular conjunction, to or tō, glossed “so,” which signals a grammatical switch of some type.

Commonly it operates at sentence level and marks the beginning of the second clause, where two clauses are semantically related, e.g.

“Michael”
6 an zaeō baubu tiket zo-u-a au-t-o
and when inspector ticket see-inf-G come-impf-G
And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,
7 to e sokr-o kokus mē yu to siq fēh nañ-e za-t-o.
then this child-G toilet in or indeed seat under hide-nonf go-impf-G
then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

“Sparrow”
20 tō k-e-fi, omar-o keq-o doñ kar-i-o,
so say-P-pres our-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G
So they say, “What wrong has he done us,

so ame rīña-ō bhatja hū.
so we sulk-P king from
that we should get angry with the king?”

This same conjunction, to or tō, is also used to mark switches at higher discourse levels. For example it may mark a new paragraph or development in the “story grammar”, such as a switch from the Setting to the Partial Resolution, e.g.

“Sparrow”
1 Once there was a sparrow.
2 He fetched a grain of rice, he found it.
3 Then he sat on a log.
4 tō tūth-o ne k-e-fi sokh-o de
so log-G to say-P-pres rice grain-G give
So he says to the log, “Give me the rice grain.”

Perhaps the most significant use, however, of this conjunction, to or tō, is as a switch reference marker, signalling a switch of grammatical subject. This is particularly frequent in narratives where the development of the plot depends on interchange, especially speech, between two or more characters, such as in the text “Sparrow”, e.g.

4 So he [the sparrow] says to the log, “Give me the rice grain.”
8 to k-e-fi sokh-o nañ djō.
so say-P-pres rice grain-G not give-P
So he [the log] says, “I will not give you the grain of rice.
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9 Go away!
10 Who says you can sit here?"

11 to ʊf-i-o uuɗɛ-kə kon.
so went-pf-G carpenter-G at
So he [the sparrow] went to the carpenter.

12 He says, "Carpenter, get me that grain of rice!
13 The log won't give it me."

14 to k-e-fi, b'uf-g-e zo.
so say-P-pres flee-nonf go
So he [the carpenter] says, "Go away!"

It is quite apparent that use of the switch reference marker at discourse level, marks a section of text as the span during which a single character commands attention. However the text itself frequently does not mark who that character is. This information must be retrieved from the potential candidates in the text, in the light of expectations stored in relevant scenarios, such as the "dialogue" scenario, where the person just addressed will prototypically be the next to speak or act.

The "Sparrow" text regularly has the switch reference marker as the only sign of who is speaking throughout the first half of the narrative, e.g. in lines 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26 etc.

Occasionally, however, switch reference is not explicit, but must be determined by the content of the speech itself, e.g.

"Sparrow"

21 ūfɪ-d, ūfɪ-d, tome, k-e-fi, ron-ti r-o luq-hr-a k*bstr-o par-a.
rat-G rat-G you say-P-pres queen-G of-G cloth-G cut-G result-G
"Rats, rats, you gnaw up the queens' clothes!"
NB "Queens" is plural. The Parkari "king" scenario includes more than one queen as prototypical.

Chapter summary

In Parkari, the combination of Hearer-old grammatical marking and lexical collocation clearly indicates which scenarios are currently open in a text. The scenarios thus opened provide the audience with a framework for understanding the discourse. The openness of a single scenario often correlates with a single semantic paragraph. A discourse typically consists of a series of consecutive interlinked scenarios, and the shift from one scenario to another often indicates the discourse boundary between consecutive semantic paragraphs. Thus scenarios interrelate with discourse structure at both the micro and macro level.

Scenario theory also provides a tool for formal discourse analysis of Parkari texts. Particularly, the recognition of prototypical relationships stored within specific Parkari scenarios allows the discourse analyst to identify semantic relationships which are left implicit in the text, and the analysis of how different semantic elements of the scenario are regularly encoded allows the discourse analyst to note deviations from normal encoding, which mark semantic highlighting showing significance at higher levels of discourse.
This thesis accepts the validity of certain translation principles which are widely held by professional translators of modern secular materials, and by scripture translation organizations. Translating according to these principles is variously known as dynamic translation, functional equivalence, or meaning-based translation. In this chapter I briefly outline these translation principles and then demonstrate how the theory of scenarios both validates these principles of translation theory and helps the translator to meet their demands.

Basic translation principles

Translating meaning rather than words

Translation is not the transfer of an original communicator’s words into another language. This can be clearly demonstrated with modern languages. The French “J’ai soif” is translated into English as “I am thirsty.” Translating the words individually would produce the sentence “I have thirst”, and this would be comprehensible. But “I have thirst” is a bad translation, because it is not natural English.

Translation, then, is the transfer of an original communicator’s meaning into another language. Translation does not communicate the original meaning by reproducing the form of the source language, but by expressing that meaning in the natural form of the target language. Nida puts it thus (1969:12):

- Translating must aim primarily at “reproducing the message” ... The translator must strive for equivalence rather than identity. In a way this is just another way of emphasizing the reproduction of the message rather than the conservation of the form of the utterance.

- Meaning-based translation assumes that “author intent” is what determines the meaning of a text (Callow, 1998) and that this meaning can normally be adequately recovered from the text itself and adequately communicated in any language and culture. Determining the author’s intended meaning necessarily requires interpretation of the text through careful exegesis. Such exegesis involves discourse analysis of the source text, based on studying the author’s use of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary, and making plausible judgements as to the author’s intended meaning in the light of what is known about the author, the original audience, and the context of the original communication (Mann and Thompson, 1987:4-5).
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Meaning-based translation is sometimes referred to negatively as “free” translation or “paraphrase”. Each of these terms is accurate if used to refer to the way a meaning-based translation is free to use a different “form” of grammar or lexicon from the Source Language, i.e. by paraphrasing, stating the same message in different words. However, the terms as popularly used imply that the translation has been free in changing the “meaning” of the text, by ill-advisedly “paraphrasing” rather than being “strictly accurate”. Undoubtedly, once a translator attempts to make a writer’s meaning clear, some people will disagree with the translator’s exegetical choice, or success in phraseology, but this does not destroy the fundamental principle that the meaning of the Source Language should not be changed in translation, whereas the form can be.

Catford gives a simple but telling example of this principle, SL standing for Source Language and TL for Target Language (1965:26-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL text</th>
<th>It's raining cats and dogs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL text 1</td>
<td>Il est pleuvant chats et chiens. (Word-for-word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL text 2</td>
<td>Il pleut des chats et des chiens. (Literal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL text 3</td>
<td>Il pleut à verse. (Free)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No-one who speaks French can doubt that only one of these three options can be regarded as “good” translation. Catford defines the different translation approaches in terms of the level at which equivalence of meaning is sought, where word-for-word translation seeks equivalence at word level, literal translation seeks equivalence at group level (i.e. phrase level), and free translation seeks equivalence up to the highest level (clause, sentence, right up to discourse). Developments in text linguistics and discourse analysis support the need for meaning-based translation to seek equivalence right up to discourse level, changing form where necessary, to preserve equivalence of meaning. Catford (1965:27) defines a good translation as one which “is interchangeable with the SL [Source Language] text in situations”. Thus good translation is concerned with the transfer of the contextual meaning, not the form, of a source text, whether oral or written.

This understanding of translation is not new. Sluiter (1997:216) notes that “Jerome (4th century CE), who translated the Bible into Latin ... firmly places himself in the tradition of Horace, Cicero and Seneca, rejecting a literalistic approach in favour of one aiming to convey the intention of the words.” Sluiter quotes:

For not only do I admit, but I even freely proclaim that when I translate Greek texts, with the exception of Holy Scripture where even the word order is a mystery, I do not translate word-for-word, but meaning for meaning (Letters 57:5)

Somehow, as Jerome himself felt, Bible translation has often been regarded as an exception to the rule that translation transfers meaning not form.

Translation and the culture barrier

In simultaneous translation, this transfer of meaning is at the same time, usually in the same place, and sometimes to members of the same audience, as the original communicator’s message. The need for translation however implies a language barrier, and
therefore to some extent a culture barrier, between the original communicator and the audience.

With written translation, this transfer of meaning is always at a different time, and almost always in a different place and to a different audience from that which the original communicator was addressing. Typically, this new audience not only differs in time, place and language from the original audience, but also in culture.

In the case of Bible translation, this transfer of meaning is at the least almost 2000 years distant in time, almost always in a different place, and always to a different audience from that which the original communicator was addressing. The huge time difference and the different audience means that the knowledge, attitudes and assumptions of the new audience are likely to be hugely different from the knowledge, attitudes and assumptions of the original audience.

It is this huge cultural difference between the original author and audience on the one hand, and the new target audience on the other hand, which makes Bible translation such a complex task. If translation were simply a matter of transferring words, then the difference in cultures would be of minor significance, affecting only the lexicon and grammar. But translation is about transferring meaning, and the meaning of everything that is read or heard is interpreted through the cultural grid of one’s own personal experiences. Words are not culturally-accepted symbols equating one to one with universal concepts, but are culturally-accepted symbols related to culturally-defined concepts. As Tyzmoczko says (1978:43)

Knowing the semantic structure of a language, I have argued, depends upon knowing about the speakers, their environment, their society and their beliefs.

Consequently, not only must the form of the source text be altered to match the grammar and lexicon of the target language, but also information implicit in the source text must be made explicit, so that members of the new target audience, whose knowledge and assumptions are different from those of the original audience, can correctly understand the original message.

In normal communication, as Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986) makes clear, the speaker regularly encodes less than he means, on the assumption that the hearer possesses enough shared knowledge to accurately “read between the lines” and correctly understand the message. The more knowledge is shared by speaker and hearer, the more is left implicit. The less shared knowledge, the more explicit the text must be. This shared knowledge provides a “mutual cognitive environment” for speaker and audience, and consists of the real-life communication situation together with all the shared information stored in culturally-based mental scenarios.

Thus communication is not achieved by a text alone, but also requires the communicator and audience to have a “mutual cognitive environment”, in the light of which the communicator adapts the mode of expression and degree of explicitness to the
audience’s knowledge and the audience makes assumptions as to the communicator’s meaning (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:137-138):

We assume that a crucial step in the processing of new information, and in particular of verbally communicated information, is to combine it with an adequately selected set of background assumptions - which then constitutes the context - in the memory of the deductive device.

The chief responsibility for ensuring accurate communication lies with the communicator, as Sperber and Wilson explicitly state (1986:43):

- It is left to the communicator to make correct assumptions about the codes and contextual information that the audience will have accessible and be likely to use in the comprehension process. The responsibility for avoiding misunderstandings also lies with the speaker, so that all the hearer has to do is go ahead and use whatever code and contextual information come most easily to hand.

- The original authors of scripture had to “make correct assumptions about the codes and contextual information” that their audience would “have accessible and be likely to use in the comprehension process”, and they wrote their text accordingly. Similarly, translators, in trying to pass on those authors’ original messages to new audiences, must strive to make correct assumptions as to what their own audiences will understand, and adjust the text of their translations in order to communicate the original meaning accurately and avoid misunderstandings. This conforms to Grice’s first maxim of quantity (1975:45) “Make your contribution as informative as required”. Since people’s understanding is based on information stored in their culturally-based mental scenarios, and since the target audience of a Bible translation never shares the same culture as the original authors and audiences, translations regularly must be more explicit than the original texts in order to successfully communicate the meaning of the original message.

Using the appropriate level of explicitness in translation does not only affect whether the target audience can understand the translation but also affects whether they will try to understand it. Sperber and Wilson, the proponents of Relevance Theory, make two fundamental observations about relevance (1986:125):

- Extent condition 1: an assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that its contextual effects in this context are large.
- Extent condition 2: an assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that the effort required to process it in this context is small.

In other words, when an audience hears a message, the degree of relevance they assign to it does not depend simply on the content of the message, “its contextual effects”, but also on how easy the message is to follow and understand. If the text seems unnecessarily obscure, the audience may simply give up trying to understand it. As Sperber and Wilson point out (1986:157):

- An addressee who doubts that the communicator has chosen the most relevant stimulus compatible with her communicative and informative intents - a hearer, say, who believes that he is being addressed with deliberate and unnecessary obscurity - might doubt that genuine communication was intended and might justifiably refuse to make the processing effort required.

Accuracy, clarity and naturalness

As is evident from the discussion above, translation, as a specific type of communication, has three fundamental strands: accuracy, clarity, and naturalness.
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(Barnwell, 1986:23). Accuracy means accurately communicating the original author’s intended meaning as evaluated through exegesis of the original text. Clarity means that ordinary members of the target audience can clearly understand that meaning. Naturalness means that the form of the translation is the natural form of the target language, including not only basic grammar and lexicon, but also word order, metaphor, idiom, language level and discourse features, etc. as appropriate for the specific genre being translated. These elements are weighted in order of importance, but a good translation should include all three.

Unfortunately, translations based on this three-point ideology, such as the Good News (1986:vii-vii), which attempt to be clear and natural as well as accurate, are sometimes singled out for criticism. Some criticism concerns the style of translation, lamenting its low literary merits. The appropriateness of language level and style, however, can only be evaluated by the intended audience which includes “all who use English as a means of communication” (1986:vii). Some criticism concerns a particular exegetical point which the critic believes has been oversimplified, ignored, or wrongly expressed. Yet often it is only because the translators have attempted to be clear and natural that this point has come to the critic’s attention. Other more literal translations may well be unclear and unnatural and even miscommunicate to the majority of ordinary readers, yet because they stick closely to the words of the original text they can be judged (in the eyes of the critic at least) to be accurate. However, if only a very few academically and theologically astute people correctly understand the “accurate” translation, then the translation fails in its role as a means of communication.

For example, high level vocabulary, such as “propitiation”, cannot accurately communicate if people do not understand it. Compare translations of 1 John 2:2: “he is the propitiation for our sins” (AV), “He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins” (NIV), “And Christ himself is the means by which our sins are forgiven” (TEV). Likewise Greek idioms do not accurately communicate if people understand them to mean something different from what the original text meant. Compare translations of Romans 12:20: “thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head” (AV), “you will heap burning coals on his head” (NIV), “you will make him burn with shame” (TEV).

Such technical vocabulary and foreign idioms rarely cause problems in comprehension for academics and theologians. However, by definition, such people are not typical members of the target audience of most Bible translations. This helps explain the paradox that those most able to evaluate the exegetical accuracy of a translation may at the same time be less aware of the need for clarity and naturalness. This, I suspect, comes in part from seeing a translation as primarily a kind of crib-sheet to the original wording of the original text, and in part from being inured to unnatural expressions through long exposure to reading fairly literal translations of foreign literature, such as the scriptures, and through a very literal approach to the practice of translation such as used to be the
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norm in Classics. I bear personal witness to the fact that an English classical education can desensitize one to normal good English style, since in translating say Caesar’s Gallic Wars, one could quite happily write “Caesar having thrown a bridge across the river...” Such a translation proves that the translator has correctly identified the words and grammatical structures of the original text, but it is nevertheless unnatural English both grammatically and lexically.

It has long been recognized by theorists on translation that the word-for-word approach to translation serves only a very limited academic purpose (Catford, 1965:25):
A word-rank-bound translation is useful for certain purposes, for instance, for illustrating in a crude way differences between the SL [Source Language] and the TL [Target Language] in the structure of higher-rank units - as in some kinds of interlinear translation of texts in ‘exotic’ languages.

Yet, as Porter points out, in a paper concerning the Contemporary English Version, the tendency to equate “good” translation with literal translation is widespread (1999:38):
The CE is a dynamic or functional equivalence translation, as noted above. This method of Bible translation runs contrary to the British tradition, inherited from the study of classical languages, with its emphasis upon translation as the sign of understanding.

However even some classical scholars were aware of the need for accuracy, clarity and naturalness. Porter (1999:40) quotes Jowett in his preface to his translation of Plato’s dialogues (from Grant, 1961:136):
It [the translation] should be read as an original work, and should also be the most faithful transcript which can be made of the language from which the translation is taken, consistently with the first requirement of all, that it be English. Further the translation being English, it should also be perfectly intelligible in itself without reference to the Greek, the English being really the more lucid and exact of the two languages.

Whilst few today would take the extreme ethnocentric (glossocentric?) view that English, or any other language, is “really the more lucid and exact”, Jowett’s point holds good, that a translation should be “perfectly intelligible in itself.” According to Paul (2 Timothy 3:15) the holy Scriptures “are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus” (NIV). Unless Paul’s comment applies only to the scriptures in the original language, then any translation of the Scriptures must also be “perfectly intelligible in itself” so that those who read and hear it may themselves also become “wise for salvation.”

Acceptability

A further quality of a good translation, which relates as much to sociolinguistics as to linguistics proper, is acceptability. A translation may be exegetically accurate, clearly understood, and in natural language, but if it is not accepted by the people for whom it is intended, then it will not be used.

Some of the factors involved may relate to the text itself. For example, Christian terminology borrowed from the national language may be acceptable and desired by the literate Church hierarchy, but not understood by the majority of believers. Unless the translation team is in dialogue with Church leaders about who the translation is for, and how it might be used, then the use of vernacular terms instead of familiar “Christian” vocabulary may gain clarity at the expense of official opprobrium. Likewise, the use of
terminology from traditional religions may make the translation clear to the wider community, but be unacceptable to churchgoers who already use the Christian jargon. Again there is the need for dialogue about the intended use of the translation.

Some factors may relate to the actual production of the translation. Is the type too small to read at night by kerosene lamp for village worship? Is the paper quality too poor for a religious book? Is the colour of the cover inauspicious? Is the book too heavy to hold comfortably? Does it cost too much? Are the verses shown the same way and in the same place as in national language Bibles? Are verse numbers combined (e.g. 1-3) so you cannot find a specific verse if asked?

Other factors relate to social issues within and outside the community. Is the vernacular perceived as a language “unfit” to convey a religious message? If traditional religions use “holy” languages in the domain of worship and religious teaching, then there may be a perception that religion is meant to be mystical and obscure, not revealed to ordinary people in their own language. Is a meaning-based vernacular translation likely to be criticized as “different therefore wrong” by Christians outside the group, who use a national language literal translation? Are the Christian leaders who speak the vernacular prepared to face that criticism, and justify the vernacular translation. Unless such leaders have themselves been involved in the translation programme, advising and checking, then it is unlikely that they would take on such an onerous task.

Whereas accuracy, clarity and naturalness can be achieved by the translation team’s diligence in exegesis, linguistic research and comprehension testing, acceptability can only be achieved by involving others, in discussion of the aims and objectives of the translation project, the style of translation, the members of the translation team, the people who will be involved in checking, and even printing details such as font size and verse numbering.

**Target audience and target use**

The first decision one must make as a translator is to define the target audience. This is obvious, inasmuch as it determines the language into which the translation will be made, e.g. French or Russian. However, the decision is much more far-reaching than that. Who is intended to understand this translation. Adults only, or also children? If children, children of what age? Men only or also women? Town people only, or also rural people? Educated only, or also illiterates? Christians only, or also non-Christians? Mother-tongue speakers, or also those for whom it is a second language?

Once this decision has been made, the translator can consider, and indeed check by comprehension testing, how far the translation meets the criteria of clarity and naturalness. Moreover, since the criterion of accuracy includes accurate comprehension as well as accurate exegesis, a translation can only be evaluated as to how well it communicates with a specific audience in its intended use. Thus a translation intended for private study by the
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Educationally elite will be different from a translation intended for reading aloud in a non-literate setting, and each must be evaluated in its own context.

Pike points out that the relationship between the communicator and the audience is fundamental in communication (1992:233):

Underlying every text is the relation, actual or potential, of the encoder to the decoder. That relation is the I-Thou-Here-Now Axis in which I is the encoder, thou is the decoder, both in the same place and time. For communication to take place all four elements are required. The significance of here and now for speaking and hearing is modified somewhat for writing/filming and reading/viewing.

In translation, of course, there is a special problem, since the translator is not the original I, the target audience is not the original thou, and the original here and now have become a there and then.

Pike points out the responsibilities of encoder and decoder in the normal communication situation (1992:233):

Encoders choose the topic appropriate to their interests and to those of their chosen audience (decoder). The audience can choose whether to continue the decoding process or not; hence the success of the communication is dependent on both parties.

How close the decoder’s understanding is to the encoder’s intent differs from person to person. As a decoder of the ZPG letter, I can state only what I understand the message to be. In order to understand some messages the study of many other texts is often required - that is what education is all about.

This places a great responsibility on translators, who act as pseudo-authors (appropriating the original author’s “I”) and thus must take into account their own target audience. Yet they do not change the original author’s topic or message to match it to their own target audience’s interests. Rather they translate because they believe that the text written for a very different audience still meets the needs of their own audience.

So how can translators take their own audience into account? First, by taking seriously Pike’s comment that “In order to understand some messages the study of many other texts is often required.” In the case of bible translation, these other texts include other biblical and extra-biblical texts in the original languages, grammars, lexicons, word-studies, commentaries, books on the history, archaeology, daily life, beliefs of the original author and audience. As translators, they have access to such books. But in many cases, their target audiences do not. Translators, then, should take advantage of all such materials to decode the text accurately. Scholarship is the touchstone of the accuracy of the translation.

Secondly, by taking seriously Pike’s comment that “Underlying every text is the relation, actual or potential, of the encoder to the decoder. That relation is the I-Thou-Here-Now Axis in which I is the encoder, thou is the decoder, both in the same place and time.” Translators are communicating with people whom they know in the I-thou-here-now reality of life. They can test their audience’s understanding of the message, and they can ensure that the message is communicated in a way that is clearly understood. So it is the target audience’s understanding and perception that is the touchstone of the clarity and naturalness of the translation.
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Translation by its nature is not only transferring a message to a different language, but also to a different culture. And this fact greatly affects the clarity of the text. The more different the culture of original author and current target audience, the more different their scenarios, and the more implicit information will need to be made explicit. Pike comments from personal cross-cultural experience (1992:234):

The notion of script is important here (Schank and Abelson, 1977). A larger event may be made up of smaller, predictable events which are expected by members of a cultural group. Hence the closer the referential structure of the decoder to that of the encoder, the fewer will be the details needing to be addressed overtly. In this regard, when I was working with a text in India, being ignorant of many such scripts, I had to address much more detail, in order to understand, than would a local person; in the process, my referential structure was greatly enlarged!

The way that shared cultural knowledge affects the form of communication cannot be overstated. Without knowledge of the original author and audience’s cultural scenarios accurate exegesis of a text is impossible. Similarly, without knowledge of the target audience’s cultural scenarios effective communication is impossible. Typically the translation will need to be more explicit than the source text, precisely because the target audience does not share all of the original communicator’s mental scenarios.

**Scenario theory’s contribution to translation theory**

The strength of the meaning-based approach has been the fact that it has allowed ordinary people to read and understand scripture, just as they would any other book. The weakness of the meaning-based approach has been a lack of theoretical underpinning from linguistic theory.

For example, Nida’s approach to translation as “functional equivalence” (is widely acknowledged for its communicative power (Pearson, 1999:82):

Indeed, it can be very convincingly argued that this method of translation, along with many of the warnings that go with it concerning how to handle style and idiom that exist in the source language, is the best way to communicate the most meaning to the largest possible audience.

Yet Pearson also says that there needs to be “serious re-examination of the theory” (1999:83). There are four basic assumptions of Nida’s theory of functional equivalence which Pearson believes need evaluating as to whether and to what extent they are true (1999:83-4):

1. A translation cannot be said to be a good translation unless it communicates the meaning as understood by the original author to the receptor in his own language, and does it well.
2. The original meaning as understood by the original author is apprehendable and communicable by the translator.
3. ‘Anything that can be said in one language can be said in another, unless the form is an essential element of the language.’
4. ‘To preserve the content of the message the form [of the source language] must be changed.’

I believe that modern linguistic insights in discourse analysis, and particularly the application of scenario theory to discourse analysis, provide at least partial answers to theoretical problems such as these.
Author intent

As to point 1, that a translation should communicate the meaning of the original author, there is strong support for this both in everyday language use, and in linguistic writings. In an everyday situation the addressee assumes author intent whenever he or she questions the speaker “What do you mean by such and such?” Similarly the speaker has the right to refute the hearer’s interpretation, “That’s not what I mean.” In the linguistic world, authors emphasize the primacy of the author’s intended meaning, e.g. Callow and Callow (1992:5):

It is the intended meaning of the speaker which controls the selection of specific verbal forms, and any analysis of the resultant discourse which does not give due weight to that intended meaning will be inherently incomplete and defective.

Similarly Sperber and Wilson state (1986:34):

Thus, to communicate efficiently, all the speaker has to do is to utter a sentence only one interpretation of which is compatible with the assumption that she is obeying the co-operative principle and maxims.

Also Baker, whilst discussing the use in speech of the first and second person pronouns as givens, stresses indirectly the interdependence of speaker and addressee, each being conscious of the other, which presupposes that the addressee will take speaker intent into account (1976:31-2):

The fact that the speaker and addressee themselves are regularly treated as given (and pronominalized as I and you respectively) stems from the same consideration. The speaker is conscious of the addressee, and the addressee is conscious of the speaker.

Baker again, in stressing that grammatical choices are the speaker’s prerogative, implies that these choices, and their intended effect, are part of the meaning of the message (1976:155):

Similarly, an element which has been mentioned before may be presented as new because it is unexpected or because the speaker wishes to present it in a contrastive light.

Similarly Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson state that it is the author who is in charge of structuring his material to achieve his own purposes, implying that the translator should also strive to structure the material to fulfil the original author’s original purposes (1992:45):

Text structuring relations are functional; the character that they all share can be stated in terms of the categories of effects that they produce. They can be described in terms of the purposes of the writer, the writer’s assumptions about the reader, and certain propositional patterns in the subject matter of the text. The text structuring relations reflect the writer’s options of organization and presentation...

Scenarios, as mental structures, affect the way that the speaker or author structures the text, including both grammatical and lexical choice, as shown above for both Greek and Parkari. Since the source text for translation is itself structured in accordance with the author’s mental scenarios, the meaning of the text must be the meaning in the author’s mind which that text reflects.

Recoverability of author intent

As to point 2, that one can know what the original author meant, this thesis demonstrates that, in addition to other documented linguistic data for determining the author’s intended meaning (such as word order, and boundary markers), there are both
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grammatical and lexical indications of the presence of certain scenarios, which give clear markers in the text as to the author's intent. It is true that "uncertainty exists concerning the meaning (and, in the case of textual criticism, content) of the documents upon which Christian (and for the Hebrew Bible, Jewish) faith and practice are based" (Pearson, 1999:81). However, scenario theory provides a theoretical basis for believing that the original author's intent can be plausibly reconstructed from the text. Scenario theory helps identify Hearer-old and Hearer-new information, helps "fill in the gaps" of the explicit text, helps understand implicatures, and helps illuminate what was focal in a given scenario, and thus clarifies what the translator must make explicit in translation to preserve the original focus.

Scenario theory, along with other theories used in discourse analysis, should defuse the argument that author intent cannot be known. Jordan states (1992:200):
In my view we cannot possibly know - or reliably guess - what was in the writer's mind (even if we asked her) in composing each part of the text, and we must analyze instead what she did write.

Even if we accept so radical a view, we do have biblical texts recording (substantially) not only what the original authors actually wrote, but the way they chose to write it. What we can deduce from their choice of semantic structure, grammar and lexicon is at least a sound basis, in the text itself, for determining author intent. I believe that scenario theory demonstrably links explicit grammatical and lexical markers with implicit scenarios, and thus provides a means of distinguishing what is implicit, that is deliberately communicated.

Determining meaning (i.e. the author's intended meaning) is not an issue restricted to scripture translation. Even in ordinary conversation, or writing, as Sperber and Wilson point out, the text is frequently ambiguous, but the message is rarely so, since the speaker and audience share a basic assumption about what is relevant (1986:34):

Recall, for instance, our example (16-18):

(16) Jones has bought the Times.
(17) Jones has bought a copy of the Times.
(18) Jones has bought the press enterprise which publishes the Times.

Usually only one meaning will seem true or only one will be relevant. Hence the maxims and the inferences they give rise to make it possible to communicate an unambiguous thought by uttering an ambiguous sentence.

Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson point out a necessary caveat, in the context of analysing the rhetorical structure of the text, that we can never be "certain" of author intent (1992:50-1):

Since the analyst has access to the text, has knowledge of the context in which it was written, and shares the cultural conventions of the writer and the expected readers, but has no direct access to either the writer or other readers, judgments about the writer or readers must be plausibility judgments rather than judgments of certainty.

It is true that, in exegeting biblical texts, we do not have all the background information about speaker, addressee, and situation to resolve all ambiguity, but we can resolve much of it, by applying our knowledge of grammar, historical background, and linguistics. But in the end we must realize that we are sometimes making "plausibility
judgments rather than judgments of certainty”, just as we do in our interpretation of everyday communication.

However, the fact that our understanding of author intent will be imperfect, does not argue against making our best efforts to determine it, and use it as the yardstick against which to evaluate the “accuracy” of our translation. As Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson point out, to understand a text we must inevitably move beyond what is explicit and make judgments as to what the writer intended the text to mean (1992:66):

The abundance of unsignalled relations highlights the importance of the differences between text understanding, which involves recognition of text structure and relations, and a symbol decoding task. Recognizing relations requires that the reader make judgments about the writer, including judgments about the plausibility of intentions. Symbolic decoding proceeds on the basis of the conventional import of symbols and their compositions, without judging such factors.

If translators, who have access to the best theoretical and exegetical helps, do not make plausibility judgments as to what the original author meant, then their target audiences will make such judgments, and will make them both more hastily and on less evidence. Scenario theory provides a strong theoretical basis for evaluating what meaning may be plausibly deduced from the text.

Translatability

As to point 3, that any thought can be expressed in any language, there is no doubt that cultures and languages are very different from each other, and that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between languages in either concepts, grammar or lexicon. Nevertheless, scenario theory is based on the fact that although people categorize their experiences and perceptions in different ways, there is such an enormous overlap of human experience that within any one culture people’s categories are remarkably consistent (that is they have essentially the same scenarios in their minds), and across cultures their experiences are still so remarkably similar that they have stored in their minds enough world-knowledge that similar experiences to the author’s can be accessed. Callow and Callow say (1992:6):

The meaning expressed in verbal communication is a universal, i.e. it is capable of multiple realisation in words, but is independent of those realisations, which are specifics. ... In analysing discourse we are analysing a specific realisation of an underlying meaning which is a universal; it is capable in principle of realisation in any language.

Modern theories of communication do not try to say “My words mean this”, as if words had discrete, abstract, unchangeable definitions, but rather “My words are able to trigger similar thoughts in your brain to the thoughts in mine, because you share some of my life experience.” Callow and Callow say (1992:6):

The kind of meaning with which we are concerned here is the meaning the speaker intends to convey. As he communicates he is using verbal forms as signals of his inward thoughts, attitudes, emotions, purposes, etc. Words do not have meanings, they signal meanings.

Thus communication is not about stating in unambiguous lexical and grammatical forms 100% exactly what the author intended but being “good enough for the job in hand” i.e. good enough to signal to the hearers the inward thoughts, attitudes, emotions and
purposes etc. of the speaker. This “good enough” is attainable in translation, and is, in fact, all that is attainable in any form of communication. As Lakoff and Johnson say about the audience’s role in communication (1980:179):

We understand a statement as true in a given situation when our understanding of the statement fits our understanding of the situation closely enough for our purposes.

There is also experimental evidence, from Schank and Abelson, in support of the claim that the same meaning can be communicated adequately in different languages. They use computers to analyse texts and reduce them to language independent concepts, relying on scenario theory, especially scripts, plans and goals. Two axioms of Schank’s Conceptual Dependency Theory are especially relevant (1977:11):

A For any two sentences that are identical in meaning, regardless of language, there should be only one representation.
B Any information in a sentence that is implicit must be made explicit in the representation of the meaning of that sentence.

Based on this theory they have analyzed texts, reduced them to their explicit conceptual format, and translated them back successfully into Chinese, Russian, Dutch, and Spanish, all using computer programs (1977:177).

Similar, but less documented or verifiable experimental evidence in favour of translatability, is the fact that the New Testament has been translated into some thousand languages. I personally have been involved in one such translation, and the translation team never had a problem such as “Can this be said?” but rather “How can we best say this?”. The barrier to translation in the remaining languages is largely due to lack of personnel, training and resources. I have never heard of any project being abandoned due to the inherent untranslatability of the message into that particular language.

Scenario theory, whilst acknowledging the differences in people’s mental concepts due to different cultural and individual experiences, also argues that people can understand new concepts and make sense of new ideas by making generalizations and inferences based on previous experiences. Since scenarios are formed by experience, they can also be modified by experience. This means that new concepts can be communicated, so long as they are communicated within the framework of existing scenarios, thus allowing the audience to categorize the new concepts appropriately and modify their mental scenarios accordingly.

Priority of meaning over form

As to point 4, that “To preserve the content of the message the form [of the source language] must be changed”, nobody argues that the form must always be changed otherwise meaning will not be preserved, but that sometimes, indeed frequently, the form must be changed in order to preserve the meaning. The only alternative approach is for the translator to preserve the form and ignore the meaning, thus leaving the reader to decipher the meaning. This form-based approach has two major flaws.
First, the form cannot be preserved. The translator has to tamper with the form. At the very least, the language used must be changed, else it is not translation. Word orders may have to be changed where they are fixed, e.g. SOV to SVO, adjective noun to noun adjective, or preposition to postposition. Verbal forms may have to be changed, at least where there are fewer tense/aspect distinctions in the target language than in the source language. Gender of nouns and hence agreement of adjectives and pronominal references may have to be changed. Words may have to be changed to phrases, or verbs to nouns, where equivalent words are not available for the same concept, etc. etc. Having made these changes, some of the clues as to meaning which were encoded in the original text, such as juxtapositions, tense usage, disambiguation due to gender markings etc. will not be preserved in the translation.

Secondly, the reader has far less chance than the translator of correctly deciphering the meaning. (I am presuming that the reader does expect to get meaning from the text, which is why they are reading it, and that they expect to get the original author’s meaning, whether they take that as the human writer’s or the Holy Spirit’s meaning.) The reader no longer has access to all the linguistic clues encoded in the original text, since the use of word order, tense and aspect markings, gender and person markings etc. to keep track of participants, show prominence, resolve ambiguity and so on, will almost certainly be different between the source language and target language. Moreover, understanding a literal translation requires background knowledge. This is shown practically by the existence of commentaries and Bibles with notes, and theoretically by scenario theory and relevance theory. The reader and author need to have a “mutual cognitive environment”, i.e. the reader must share with the author similar mental scenarios encoding their understanding of the world, if they are to correctly understand the message of the text. The average readers who do not know about the author and his world, or share his linguistic and cultural presuppositions, cannot understand the author easily or accurately.

The task of understanding and expressing the author’s meaning is indeed hard, and some may doubt it is possible. However, the problem is not solved by leaving the total burden of understanding (i.e. exegesis) to the readers, who have neither specialist knowledge nor time. It is better to see exegesis as the rightful preserve of the translator, who, fallible though he or she is, has the time to use not only their own knowledge but draw on the expertise of others, including linguists, translation theorists and theologians, in order to make good justifiable exegetical decisions about the author’s meaning.

Whilst we cannot ever completely know the original author’s total intended meaning, we can be sure, on the theoretical basis which scenario theory provides, that a meaning-based translation can more accurately convey the author’s meaning than a form-based translation. This is because meaning is communicated not by the form of words alone, but through the grid of the author’s and audience’s scenarios, and where those
scenarios are demonstrably different, the original form of the text will indeed need to be changed to compensate for the different grid through which the text will be interpreted.

**Meaning-based translation - a con or linguistically responsible?**

In response to the concern that meaning-based translations, since their stated aim is clear and accurate communication of the original message, may be wrongly perceived as being “the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth”, I heartily recommend a reminder in every translation, that it is a *translation*, i.e. an attempt to make the meaning of the original author’s message clear. Whilst acknowledging that any attempt at meaning-based translation will inevitably fail in places in terms of accuracy, clarity and naturalness, I maintain the attempt is still worth making, and is the most linguistically responsible approach the translator can take.

As I hope I have already demonstrated, it is the mismatching of scenarios between different languages and cultures which frequently causes either non-communication, or miscommunication. This mismatch of scenarios, involving as it does the world-views and presuppositions of differing cultures, is simply not addressed in the “modified literal” style of translation represented by such major Bible translations as the Authorized Version, The Revised Standard Version, and the New International Version. Only a meaning-based approach to translation, seeing meaning as applying not merely at word, phrase, or clause level, but right up to discourse level, can accurately convey the message of the biblical texts to today’s audience.

**Chapter summary**

Translation is the transfer of meaning across languages, and so requires the translator to interpret the meaning of the original text based on plausible judgments as to what the original author of a text intended to communicate. With all translation, but especially with the translation of ancient documents, such as the Bible, the difference in culture between the original and new target audiences means that the form of the message may need to be adjusted to make explicit what was implicit in the source text, quite apart from changes of form due to using a different language, such as grammatical, syntactic and lexical differences. A translation should be not only accurate but also clear and natural so that the target audience can understand the meaning. Acceptability of a translation depends on sociolinguistic as well as linguistic issues. Apart from exegetical decisions, every other aspect of a translation depends on the target audience.

Scenario theory provides theoretical justification for meaning-based translation. Scenario theory emphasizes that thinking and communication is fundamentally conceptual, so that the meaning to be translated is not the words of the original text but the thoughts of the original author, as indicated by the text he wrote. Scenario theory provides a conceptual framework for recognizing Hearer-old and Hearer-new marking and for
identifying implicit participants, events and relationships, which allows for better discourse analysis and thus a clearer evaluation of the author's intended meaning. Scenario theory provides a theoretical basis for translatability, since scenarios as mental constructs are not only used to categorize new information but are also modified to include such information making new conceptual categories and links as appropriate. Scenario theory recognizes that conceptual structure is mirrored by language structure, thus enabling the translator not only to analyse the conceptual meaning of the source text by studying its linguistic form, but also to choose the appropriate linguistic form for re-expressing those concepts in the target language.
Since scenarios are experientially and culturally based and affect the grammar, lexicon and discourse structure of both New Testament Greek and modern Parkari, a translation must take into account not only the linguistic differences between the source and target languages but also the experiential and cultural differences between the author and audience of the source text and the target audience of the translation. In this chapter I demonstrate the problems caused by scenario mismatch in translation, especially as regards the target audience’s ability to follow the flow of the text and understand it accurately.

Problems of scenario mismatch

Since scenarios contain interrelated chunks of information, including probabilities of certain events co-occurring, a mismatch of scenarios between source and target languages causes a mismatch of information communicated and a reduced ability to evaluate what is normal and what is contraexpectation. Since the grammar and lexicon in both Parkari and Greek is influenced by scenarios, a mismatch of scenarios between those languages will affect the grammar and lexicon used in translation.

The most radical, and obvious, problem of scenario mismatch is when the target language and culture completely lacks a scenario found in the source language. This creates classic translation problems such as “How do you translate camel for an Eskimo?”.

There are several standard approaches for translating unknown items, as listed by Beekman and Callow (1974:191):

- EQUIVALENCE BY MODIFYING A GENERIC WORD
  Modified with features of form / a statement of function /
  both form and function / a comparison

- EQUIVALENCE BY USING A LOAN WORD
  Modified with a classifier / form or function or both

- EQUIVALENCE BY CULTURAL SUBSTITUTION

Cultural substitution is “the use of a real world referent from the receptor culture for an unknown referent of the original, both of the referents having the same function” (ibid.). To these one might add the use of a generic alone, if specific aspects of the source language referent are not focal in the context.
For example, if English had no equivalent for ἄρμα “chariot”, in Acts 8:28 and Revelation 9:9, one might translate by:

- a generic word: e.g. vehicle
- a modified generic word: e.g. horse-drawn vehicle (form), war cart (function), horse-drawn war cart (form and function), vehicle like a tonga (comparison)
- a modified loan word: e.g. vehicle called “harma” (generic), horse-drawn “harma” (form), war “harma” (function)
- a cultural substitute: e.g. carriage, cart

Note that ἄρμα belongs in two different source language scenarios, first-class travel, and war. Similarly, each word or phrase in the target language evokes its own scenario, which must be compared to the original source language scenario and co-text, to determine its appropriateness. For example, English “chariot” fits both scenarios, but the “cart” scenario does not include “high-class”, and the “carriage” scenario does not include “war”. Therefore such translation requires sensitivity to context.

In Acts 8:28, ἄρμα represents a concept unknown in Parkari and is translated ḡōrə ḡōdoi “horse cart” meaning horse-drawn vehicle, whereas ἄρμα “war-chariot” in Revelation 9:9 is a known concept (through story-telling) and is translated ṭātə, which refers either to a war chariot, or a ceremonial vehicle for transporting deities. A common Parkari word for a horse-drawn vehicle, tōgō, was avoided in both cases, as its scenario includes “available cheaply for hire” which is clearly inappropriate.

If the missing scenario is a recurring theme throughout the text, it will be harder to translate, especially if it occurs both in historical contexts and in metaphorical language. For example, how might one translate John 10:11 “I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep”, for a culture where sheep are unknown?

Different approaches have different advantages and disadvantages:

**Generic term with simile:**

I am like a good herdsman, who lays down his life for his animals. This is fine here, but loses the clear connection with other “sheep” imagery since all would become generic.

**Different specific term with simile (cultural substitute):**

I am like a goat herder, who lays down his life for his animals. This is fine here, but causes problems elsewhere. What about separating sheep from goats in Matthew 25:32? Perhaps one could translate separating good goats from bad goats. What about historical references to sheep, e.g. in sacrifice, where “goat” is historically incorrect (unless it functions as a generic term in the target language)? Obviously, the issue needs addressing in terms of the whole Biblical corpus.

**Generic term plus loan word with simile (usually from the language of wider communication):**

I am like a good herdsman of animals called “sheep”, who lays down his life for his animals. Although connection with other “sheep” passages can be maintained, the emphasis is skewed here. What is special about a herdsman of animals called “sheep” as opposed to other herdsmen?

**Direct statement:**

I am the good teacher. I am ready to die for those who follow me.
The meaning is clear, but there is no thematic link to other "sheep" passages, whether historical or metaphorical.

**Direct statement with generic simile:**

I am the good teacher. I am ready to die for those who follow me. I am like a good herdsman, who lays down his life for his animals.

In all cases, not only the target language words but their whole scenarios must be compared with the scenarios evoked by the source language words.

Simply using a loan word in a metaphor is rarely communicative, since neither the literal nor metaphorical meaning is clear, e.g.

(treating Greek προβατον “sheep” as a loan word)

**Loan word as metaphor:**

I am the good herder of probatons, who lays down his life for his probatons.

---

**Scenario mismatch causes information loss**

As discussed earlier, scenarios are information chunks in the brain, and allow information to be communicated in chunks. So if the source language scenario is different from the target language scenario, the same chunk of information will not be communicated, e.g. the leprosy scenario:

New Testament Greek:

- Leprosy is a very bad disease.
- Leprosy causes ritual impurity and untouchability.
- Healing must be validated by a priest at Jerusalem.

Parkari:

- Leprosy is a very bad disease.

The word “leprosy” in the Greek New Testament opened up the whole content of the leprosy scenario for the original audience, due to the author and audience’s “mutual cognitive environment”. But for Parkaris the word leprosy merely communicates a serious disease.

Consequently, certain focal information, which the author left implicit in the source text since the audience could supply it from their similar mental scenarios, must be made explicit in translation. Unless this is done:

- lexical items will appear unrelated to the open scenario and coherence will be lost.
- information marked grammatically as Hearer-old will appear surprising.
- facts needed to make inferences will be unavailable.

Where scenario mismatch causes the loss of information needed for following the logic of the text, the translation will need to make this information explicit, e.g.

Luke 5:12 in Parkari:

(information made explicit from the “leprosy” scenario is underlined)

The word “leprosy” in the Greek New Testament opened up the whole content of the leprosy scenario for the original audience, due to the author and audience’s “mutual cognitive environment”. But for Parkaris the word leprosy merely communicates a serious disease.

Consequently, certain focal information, which the author left implicit in the source text since the audience could supply it from their similar mental scenarios, must be made explicit in translation. Unless this is done:

- lexical items will appear unrelated to the open scenario and coherence will be lost.
- information marked grammatically as Hearer-old will appear surprising.
- facts needed to make inferences will be unavailable.

Where scenario mismatch causes the loss of information needed for following the logic of the text, the translation will need to make this information explicit, e.g.

Luke 5:12 in Parkari:

(information made explicit from the “leprosy” scenario is underlined)

In that very place was a man who had the disease of leprosy. **Therefore that man was ceremonially-unclean.**

When he saw Jesus, then having fallen at feet, having pleaded he said “Holyman, if it be your will, you (p) having made me fit and well can make me pure.”

---
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Similarly in Luke 7:1-10 the word ἐκατοντάρχης "centurion" might be defined as a military officer in charge of a hundred men. But the New Testament scenario for "centurion" includes prototypical ethno-religious information such as non-Jew, normally polytheist. This information is vital for understanding Jesus's punch line in 7:9 "I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith." So again, if this essential information is missing from the target audience's scenario, it must be made explicit in translation. Where implicit information is focal throughout a pericope, it may be made explicit in the title, e.g. The title of Luke 7:1-10 in Parkari: (information made explicit from the "leprosy" scenario is underlined)
"An army officer of another race trusts on Jesus"

Proper nouns

Proper nouns often cause information loss in translation, since the source language speakers frequently have a detailed scenario for a name, but the target language speakers have a very reduced one.

For example, the scenario of a specific name in the target language may not include whether it refers to a person or a place. Even if sentence level semantics clarifies that it is a place, it may be unclear whether it is a town, province, river or mountain. In such cases, making explicit the generic category of a name's referent gives the audience the same level of information as was available to the original audience, e.g. (information made explicit from the open scenario is underlined)

1 Peter 1:1
RSV: To the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia
Parkari: ... scattered in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia provinces.

Acts 11:19
RSV: traveled as far as Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch ...
Parkari: some reached as far as Phoenicia area, some Cyprus island and some Antioch town.

If the category of the name as used in the text is different from the commonly known category, failure to make it explicit will lead to misidentification, e.g. Luke 3:3a
RSV: and he went into all the region about the Jordan...
Parkari: Therefore John having come to the surrounds of the Jordan River ...
Jordan commonly refers to a country.

Acts 21:1
RSV: to Cos, and the next day to Rhodes, and from there to Patara.
Parkari: to the island named Cos. On the next day from there came to the island named Rhodes, and from there again having gone to Patara town we descended.

These categories should be made explicit when, and only when, they are not part of the target audience's scenario for the name. Too much information is as disruptive to communication as too little, as noted by Grice (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:33):
1 Make your contribution as informative as required.
2 Do not make your contribution more informative than required.
Personal names

The scenario for personal names includes not merely “human”, but frequently the gender and ethnic origin of the referent, and also, in the case of identifiable referents, their role or status. Such information, where focal, should be made explicit in translation so that the new audience can file the name in an appropriate scenario slot, predict what might happen, and recognize conceptual and lexical cohesion, e.g.

Gender:

Colossians 4:15
RSV: and to Nympha and the church in her house.
Parkari: and lady Nymphas, and the Christian circle which gathers at her house

The name Nympha(s) indicates a female, as does the Greek pronoun. Since the name is unknown in Parkari, and Parkari pronouns show no gender, the gender is made explicit in the translation, otherwise the referent would be understood as male.

Ethnic origin:

Acts 10:1
RSV: At Caesarea there was a man named Cornelius, a centurion ...
Parkari: In Caesarea town there was one person of another race named Cornelius. He was one officer of the army of Rome land, ...

The name Cornelius, together with his rank in the Roman Army, indicates that this man was a gentile. This name is unknown in Parkari, so the non-Jewishness is made explicit, since the fact that Cornelius in not a Jew is of key importance in understanding Acts 10:1-11:18, as shown by Acts 10:28.

Role in society:

Luke 3:1
RSV: In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar
Parkari: In the 15th year of the kingship of Tiberius Caesar king of Roman government
Caesar’s status is significant here as the most important ruler of the time. His name is followed by a list of lesser local rulers.

Luke 18:38
RSV: Jesus, Son of David
Parkari: Jesus, descendant of King David
David’s status is significant as “Son of David” is a title of honour. A literal translation would be understood as simply naming the father.

In some cases, the person referred to is less well known than a different person of the same name, and this may lead to misidentification, and hence inability to see the lexical cohesion, e.g. Joshua / Jesus:

Acts 7:45
μετὰ Ἰησοῦ
RSV: with Joshua
Parkari: our ancestors ... having taken that tent came here with Joshua

Although the Greek form of the names Joshua and Jesus is identical, the original audience had the time frame of Jewish history to disambiguate the referent as Joshua.
Fortunately, English and Parkari have different forms of the name for the different referents, so the translation is unambiguous.

John the Baptist / John the disciple
Luke 3:2 John the son of Zechariah
Luke 5:33 The disciples of John
Acts 1:5 for John baptized with water
Luke 5:10 James and John, the sons of Zebedee
Luke 6:14 Peter, and Andrew his brother, and James and John
Acts 1:13 Peter and John and James and Andrew

Here, although John the Baptist and John the disciple overlap in time, they are still distinguished by the scenario they belong to, John the Baptist’s scenario including: son of Zechariah, teacher, baptized, and John the disciple’s scenario including: son of Zebedee, disciple of Jesus.

For target audiences where scenarios for these referents do not include these basic details, the translation would need to make the referent explicit, e.g. Luke 5:33 “The disciples of John the Baptist”.

Occasionally the source text includes nonfocal information with a personal name simply to disambiguate the referent. This may require even more explicit disambiguation in the target language than in the original language, e.g.

Acts 13:14 'Αντιόχειαν την Πίσιδιαν
RSV: Antioch of Pisidia
Parkari: Antioch town of Pisidia area
i.e. not Antioch in Syria

 John 14:22 Ἰούδας, οὗ οὐκ ἦν Ἰσκαριώτης
RSV: Judas (not Iscariot)
Parkari: Judas, not Judas Iscariot but the other disciple named Judas

This is the only mention in John’s Gospel of any Judas other than Judas Iscariot, so simply saying “not Iscariot” does not clarify the referent for the Parkari audience, even if they have read the Gospel throughout. Therefore the translation makes explicit that this Judas was one of the disciples.

Sometimes the source text includes contextually focal information with a personal name, which also disambiguates the referent. If the translation needs to be more explicit than the source text in order to disambiguate the referent, such explicit information should be contextually focal, e.g.

Acts 14:26 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, ὅπου ἦσαν παραδεχόμενοι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ
RSV: they sailed to Antioch, where they had been commended to the grace of God ...
Parkari: they set off back to their own Antioch town, where the Christians had given them into the care of God ...
(cf. 13:1-3)
Occasionally the source text uses a personal name metaphorically. Here again the translation may need to be more explicit than the original in order to open the correct scenario, e.g.

Matthew 17:12

RSV: But I tell you that Elijah has already come

Parkari: But I tell you with assurance that the one doing the preparation for my coming, whom (one) has called Elijah in scripture, he indeed had come.

Making John the Baptist explicit here would make nonsense of 17:13 “Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist.” Jesus was apparently leaving the audience to think out who he meant, so Parkari makes explicit the contextually focal elements of the Elijah scenario which the original audience knew from Malachi 4:5.

**Scenario mismatch reduces lexical cohesion**

Where the scenarios of source and target languages do not match, a literal translation may provide less lexical cohesion for its own target audience than the source text did for the original target audience.

For example, in Luke 10:13 “sackcloth” and “ashes” belong in the New Testament Greek scenario of “repentance”. However, they are not in the Parkari scenario of “repentance”, so the connection needs to made explicit, otherwise textual cohesion is lost. In Parkari, sitting in dust or ash and wearing dark clothes are signs of grief, such as bereavement, so the Parkari “grief” scenario can be used to fill out the Greek “repentance” scenario, e.g.

Luke 10:13

RSV: they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.

Parkari: the people of there would early having abandoned their bad works have done repentance, and having put on clothes made from goats’ hair have sat in grief on ash, and have gone on God’s matter.

The Parkari word glossed “repentance” expresses an emotion, not a radical change of behaviour, so the action of abandoning wrong and embracing right behaviour, included in the Greek scenario of “μετεναρσον”, must also be made explicit “having abandoned their bad works ... have gone on God’s matter”.

**Metaphorical scenarios**

If a source language metaphor, which is not used in the target language, is translated literally, lexical cohesion and logical coherence are lost. The reader is left confused, since the metaphorical link to the open scenario is severed, and the literal meaning does not fit the context. For example, John the Baptist’s teaching in Luke 3:9, 17:

RSV:

Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire... His winnowing fork is in his hand, to clear his threshing floor, and to gather the wheat into his granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire.
Such language is never used metaphorically in Parkari, and the literal meaning has no relevance to the context of repentance. In translation, the meaning of such metaphors must be clarified, e.g.

Parkari:
But now God is about to punish men, as if someone is standing with axe poised at the stump of the tree. And just as in whichever tree there is no fruit, a person chops it down and throws it into the fire, so God will punish those who do not walk on his matter... As someone stands with his winnowing-fork on the threshing floor, and having cleaned his grain keeps it in his barn, but the chaff he burns in fire, so he [God] is about to judge people. He will keep those walking on God’s matter with him, but those not walking [on his matter] he will burn in such a fire as is never extinguished.
(The Parkari phrase “walk on God’s matter” means “obey God”.)

Sometimes, especially if the metaphor is not part of extended imagery, the best solution is to drop it altogether, e.g.

Luke 3:7
RSV: You brood of vipers!
Parkari: O evil minded [people]!

Occasionally, the source language metaphor is not used in the target language, but the literal meaning of the metaphor fits the open scenario. For example, in John 21:15-18, Jesus asks Peter to “feed my sheep”. Since many Parkaris keep sheep, but “sheep” is not a Parkari metaphor for “followers”, the literal understanding of “feed my sheep” seems coherent. In translation, this miscommunication must be avoided, e.g.

John 21:17
Parkari: As a herdsman pastures the sheep, so you look after my people.

Wherever lexical cohesion is achieved by mixing literal and metaphorical scenarios, there is always a potential translation problem. For example puns, where the same words have both literal and idiomatic meaning, cannot normally be translated (Catford, 1965:94; Baker, 1992:70).

Name scenarios and wordplay

Similar problems occur in the New Testament when trying to translate wordplay on names. Names are generally used referentially, without any “sense” meaning. Consequently, names are usually transliterated, rather than translated according to meaning, so the scenario of the name in translation no longer contains the original meaning.

Scripture, however, frequently connects the meaning of a name with the character or significance of the person so named, either based on the genuine etymology of the name, or by producing a new folk-etymology. Since the meaning of the name (or its phonological connection to the folk-etymology) was part of its Source Language scenario but is not in the Target Language scenario, where context shows that the meaning of a name is implicit, it should be made explicit in translation, e.g.

Genesis 3:20
Adam named his wife Eve, which means “living”, because she would become the mother of all the living.
Genesis 4:1, she became pregnant and gave birth to Cain. In the Hebrew language Cain sounds like “brought forth”. She said, “With the help of the LORD I have brought forth a man.”

Matthew 1:21 you are to give him the name Jesus, meaning “the LORD saves”, because he will save his people from their sins.

Philemon 10-11 I appeal to you for my son Onesimus ... Although his name means “useful”, formerly he was useless to you. But now he really has become useful both to you and to me.

Philippians 4:3 Yes, and I ask you Syzygus, loyal co-worker as your name suggests, help these women ...

Scenario mismatch skews expectations

If the target language scenario does not contain the same elements as the source language scenario, then the audience will have different expectations as to what is likely to occur. This means that unexpected elements may appear normal, and normal elements may appear surprising or controversial. Since both Greek and Parkari grammatically mark Hearer-old expected information and Hearer-new unexpected information differently, failure to note scenario mismatch may result in information which is unexpected for the hearer being grammatically marked as expected.

For example, a Prenuclear Aorist Participle in Greek is regularly translated by a Nonfinal verb form in Parkari, since both mark a prototypical event in the script of the main verb’s scenario. If, however, an event is part of the prototypical script in the source language, but not in the target language, use of a Hearer-old verb form miscues the audience, presenting what is strange to them as if they should have expected it. Somehow, the translation must show the target audience that this seemingly strange event was normal for the original audience.

In Mark 14:63, the Prenuclear Aorist Participle marks that the high priest tearing his robe is a prototypical element of the scenario of declaring a blasphemy charge proven, e.g.

δὲ ἄρχεται διακρίνειν τὸν κλήρον αὐτοῦ λέγει, Τί ἐτι χρείαν ἐχομεν ἀμνίαρων;
The () highpriest having torn the clothes of him says What yet need we have of witnesses?
And the high priest tore his garments, and said, “Why do we still need witnesses?

For Parkaris, tearing ones clothes is not prototypical in any scenario except madness. The translation must therefore avoid presenting this as Hearer-old (because it is not part of the open Parkari scenario), yet present it as natural in the circumstances, not a sign of madness. To do this, Parkari uses a main verb and makes the purpose of this act explicit, i.e.
Then the chief priest to show himself grieved tore the robe he wore and said: “Now what need do we(incl) have of other witness bearers?

The Parkari translation is based on the exegesis that the appropriate response to blasphemy is an expression of deep grief and horror that others have shown disrespect to God, yet the high priest is inwardly pleased at Jesus’s blasphemy as it seals Jesus’s fate. In support of this exegesis Cole (1989:307) states that the “symbolic tearing of garments, by now traditional on hearing blasphemy, was in origin a sign of grief ... (e.g. Lv. 10:6). Here it had been distorted into a sign of joy at a wicked purpose successfully accomplished” (cf. Hendriksen, 1974:612-3).

Old Testament evidence for the prototypicality of tearing clothes on hearing blasphemy is found in Numbers 14:6 where Joshua and Caleb tear their clothes because the people refuse to follow God’s leading, 2 Chronicles 34:19-21 where King Josiah tears his clothes because (unwittingly) his ancestors had not “kept the word of the Lord”, and most significantly in Jeremiah 36:24 where King Jehoiakim systematically cuts up the scroll of Jeremiah’s prophecy and burns it, but “the king and all his attendants who heard all these words showed no fear, nor did they tear their clothes”. The author, by recording what people did not do, shows clearly that their actions were not prototypical. In all these cases people tore, or were expected to tear, their clothes on hearing that others had failed to show God proper respect. Compare also 2 Kings 18:37-19:1, again in response to blasphemy (Davies and Allison, 1997:533).

The charge of blasphemy against Jesus is presumably for “wrongly claiming for oneself divine prerogatives” as in John 10:36 (Davies and Allison, 1997:533), here by implicitly claiming in Mark 14:62 to be “the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One”.

Similarly the Greek article marks nouns as Hearer-old, i.e. prototypical elements of the open scenario. Where the Parkari scenario differs, not only may the referent need to be clarified, but the expectedness of the information may need to be explicit, e.g.

Luke 5:14
καὶ αὐτὸς παρῆγγελεν αὐτῷ ... ἀπελθὼν δεξίων σεαυτὸν τῷ λεπρῷ
RSV And he charged him ... go and show yourself to the priest

The article shows that the priest is prototypical in the open “leprosy” scenario. In Parkari culture there is no priest in the leprosy scenario, so this is unexpected. Moreover, priests are found at every place of worship, not just at a single centre. The Parkari translation makes explicit the location and identity of the priest:

Then Jesus said to him ... having gone into God’s house, show (fut) your body to the priest who should be doing the work of ritual-worship there ...

Similarly:

Matthew 9:23
Καὶ ἔλθων δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἄρχοντος καὶ ἤδω τοὺς ἄνθρωπος
RSV And when Jesus came to the ruler’s house, and saw the pipe-players
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The Greek article shows that the pipe-players are prototypical in the open "death" scenario. In Parkari culture there is no music when a death has occurred, so this is unexpected, indeed shocking. The Parkari translation makes explicit the rationale for their presence:

When Jesus reached the house of the leader, there he saw those people who according to own custom were playing pipes on the death of the girl ...

Even where Greek has no grammatical Hearer-old marking, it may be necessary to make prototypicality explicit in translation, e.g.

Acts 16:3

he-circumcised him because of the Jews the[ones] being in the places those knew for all that Greek the father of-him was.

Since Parkaris know circumcision as an Islamic practice, the translation makes explicit that it is also a Jewish practice and was performed here, not under duress, but to avoid causing offence:

Therefore he got Timothy's circumcision done according to the rites and customs of the Jews so that it would not strike the Jews as bad, because all the Jews of that area knew that his father was of a different race.

Scenario mismatch prevents correct inferences

If the target language scenario does not contain the same elements as the source language scenario, then the specific facts needed for making correct inferences may be unavailable. Where the author intends the audience to infer information which is not explicit in the text, such information is called an implicature. These implicatures will need to be made explicit in translation, otherwise the target audience will either miss the inferences altogether, or make false inferences on the basis of the contents of their own scenarios. e.g.

Matthew 27:34

wine ... mingled with gall; but when he tasted it, he would not drink it.

Intended implicature: He would not drink because it was an anaesthetic and he needed to be conscious.

Apparent implicature: He would not drink because it tasted foul.

Parkari translation:

the juice of grapes ... in which bitter drug was mixed for reducing pain. But having tasted that he refused to drink in order to remain in consciousness.

(Wine is unknown in Parkari culture, hence the translation “juice of grapes”.)

Matthew 4:4

It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone ...

Intended implicature: It is written in scripture and therefore is authoritative.

Apparent implicature: This is someone's opinion, written down.

Parkari translation:

It is written in scripture ...


His disciples plucked and ate some heads of grain, rubbing them in their hands ...

"Why are you doing what it is not lawful to do on the Sabbath?"
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Intended implicature: The disciples are "working", which is forbidden on the Sabbath.
Apparent implicature: The disciples are stealing, which is forbidden on the Sabbath.

Parkari translation:

His disciples were plucking heads of grain, and rubbing them in their hands eating their grains...
"Why are you doing work like harvesting today? In our (incl) religion one should not do any work on the holy day."

John 12:34
We have heard from the law that the Christ remains for ever. How can you say that the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?

Intended implicature: The "Son of man" is not the "Christ".
Apparent implicature: The "Son of man" is not Jesus.

Parkari translation:

We (excl) have heard from scripture that God's chosen saver Christ will remain alive for ever. And we indeed are understanding thus that the son of the human race and the saver Christ are one and the same. So then why are you saying, that the son of the human race having been raised high will go from the world? If the meaning of the son of the human race is not Christ, then what is its meaning?

Scenario mismatch means the source text may lack information required by the target language

Since scenarios are culturally-based, both the real-life experiences they contain and the categorization of those experiences will differ from culture to culture and language to language. A particular problem for translation is the level of hierarchy at which lexical items are formed and used in text. If the source text uses a generic term where the target language only has a specific, or would naturally use a specific, then the translator needs more information than is in the text.

For example, Greek has a generic term δακτύλιον "ring". Parkari has no generic term, but three specific terms, one for a plain band, one for a ring with a stone, and one for a ring made of coiled wire. When a "ring" is put on the prodigal son's finger, Parkari must specify what kind of ring it was. Exegesis, based on the apparent function of this ring within the parable as signifying restored status as a son, together with extra-textual historical evidence about the form of rings, favours a ring with a stone, possibly used as a signet ring of authority. Hence:

Luke 15:22
δότε δακτύλιον εἰς τὴν χειρὰ αὐτοῦ
RSV: put a ring on his hand
Parkari: put him a signet-ring on hand

The point is, one cannot just translate "ring" into Parkari. "Rings" exist in Parkari culture, but the different types are not categorized as one kind of thing, except at the higher hierarchical level of "jewelry". There are actual rings, but there is no single mental scenario for "ring", only three distinct scenarios, one for each type.

Parkari kinship terms are also very specific. Whereas English "uncle" may mean the brother of one's father or mother, or the husband of the sister of one's father or mother,
each of these four types of “uncle” has a distinct kinship term in Parkari, with no generic
term “uncle”. Consequently, Greek kinship terms frequently give insufficient information
to identify which Parkari term is correct, e.g.

Colossians 4:10
Μάρκος δ’ ἀδελφὸς Βαρναβᾶς
RSV: Mark the cousin of Barnabas
Parkari: Mark, who is Barnabas’s brother in relationship

Parkari has no generic term “cousin”, but four distinct terms: “brother” (or “sister”) qualified by an adjective showing whether the relationship is through the father’s or mother’s brother or sister. Since the exact relationship is unknown here, Parkari uses a vague term indicating “not true brother”.

Similarly, Greek ὅλος refers to a descendant regardless of the number of intermediate generations. The Parkari word for son, however, only covers a single generation difference, so ὅλος must be translated contextually, e.g.

Matthew 26:37
ὑός Ζεβεδαίου
RSV: sons of Zebedee
Parkari: sons of Zebedee

Matthew 1:1
ὑὸς Ἀβραάμ
RSV: son of Abraham
Parkari: descendant of Abraham

Greek ἐγέννησεν “begat” also seems to include any number of generations. Thus, in the genealogies in Matthew 1:1-17 and in Luke 3:23-38, regardless of whether the relationship is lexicalized or not, it is not always certain how many generations separate consecutive names in the list (Hagner, 1993:8; Davies and Allison, 1988:166; Hendriksen, 1974:116, 119). Since the Parkari word for son only applies to one generation removed, the genealogies in Parkari are translated using the term “descendant”, which covers any number of generations, e.g.

Luke 3:23
ἐν ὅλος, ὃς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἡλί
RSV: being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph, the son of Heli,
Parkari: According to people’s understanding Jesus was Joseph’s son. He was the descendant of Heli

Matthew 1:2
Ἀβραάμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, ...
RSV: Abraham was the father of Isaac, ...
Parkari: Abraham’s descendant was Isaac ...

Sometimes the Greek text uses a generic term where the equivalent generic term in Parkari is inappropriate. For example, the good Samaritan puts the injured man on his κτήνος “beast”. Parkari has a generic word for “beast”, ζώον, but “humans ride them” is not a prototypical element of this scenario. Moreover, in Parkari a generic term would not be used to refer to a single specific animal. Extra-textual evidence suggests “donkey” as the likely referent. Hence:
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Luke 10:34

RSV: he set him on his own beast

Parkari: having lifted him onto his donkey

Again, scenario mismatch means that the translator needs specific information which is not explicit in the text.

**Personal pronouns and affixes**

Scenarios relate not to reality, but to perceptions and categorizations of reality. This is apparent in the pronouns and affixes of a language.

For example, the degree of respect due to certain people affects both lexicon and grammar in Parkari. When addressing a religious leader as “guru” it is obligatory, unless one intends disrespect, to add the honorific particle “ji”. Similarly when addressing an individual who is due greater honour than oneself, a Parkari uses the second person plural pronoun and verb forms. In other words, the Parkari scenario linked to second person plural pronoun and suffixes includes both plural referents, and singular referent plus respect.

The problem in translation is not just that singular and plural forms are mismatched where respect is a factor, but also that the source text may not mark whether respect is intended or not. As Catford comments (1965:91):

An English youth may easily address his father in casual style; an oriental youth on the other hand may have to use honorific forms in such a situation. Both respect and affection may be present in the situation, but respect may not be a stylistically relevant feature for the English son, while it is relevant for the Asian son.

Thus, when translating into a language which marks respect, one must look for clues as to the relationship between the characters involved in dialogue. First one should establish the expected social relationship between the characters and then decide whether any character deliberately shows disrespect or exaggerated respect. The choice of pronouns depends on these exegetical decisions.

Often relative status can be deduced from the source text due to age, kinship relationship, or social role. The attitude of the speaker can usually be deduced from the immediate co-text of what is said, and the wider co-text of their character and other actions. The appropriate use of respectful forms in the translation depends on the natural usage in the target language.

Here are some Parkari examples, where use of plural for a singular addressee shows respect (> means greater than, < less than, = equal to):

**Singular, with normal respect:**

Mary to Jesus (mother > child)

Luke 2:48 “Son, what is this you have done to us?...”

God to Jesus (using the father/son analogy, father > son)

Luke 3:22 “You are my dear son. I am very happy with you.”

Jesus to Peter (teacher > disciple)

Luke 5:10 “Fear not!”
Philip to Nathaniel (friend = friend)
John 1:46 “Come along and see for yourself!”

Singular, with disrespect:
Satan to Jesus (Satan < God’s son)
Luke 4:3 “If you are God’s son ...”

Demons to Jesus (demons < God’s holy one)
Luke 4:34 “What relationship have you with us?”

Plural, with respect:
disciples to Jesus (disciple < teacher)
Luke 22:9 “What is your(pl) wish that we make preparation where?”

Jesus to Pilate (subject < ruler)
Luke 23:3 “As you(pl) are saying I am.”

Jesus to Centurion (religious leader < secular leader in secular sphere)
Matthew 8:13 “Go(pl) home.”

Centurion to Jesus (secular leader < religious leader in religious sphere)
Matthew 8:8 “Holyman, I am not such that you(pl) should come into my low-caste home.”

It is too simplistic just to note the social relationship between speaker and addressee, or even the speaker’s feelings about the addressee. In some cases the speaker is deliberately disguising their real feelings, e.g.

Plural, with pretended respect:
spies to Jesus (ordinary people < religious leader)
Luke 20:21 “we know indeed that whatever you(pl) say and teach...”

Similarly there is mismatch between Greek and Parkari first person plural pronouns. Parkari has two first person plural pronouns, “ape” we inclusive, i.e. speaker and addressee(s), and “ome” we exclusive, i.e. speaker and some other(s), but not the addressee(s). Thus the first person plural scenarios include different combinations of first, second and third persons, i.e.

Greek scenario:
we = 1st singular and any other(s)

Parkari scenarios:
we inclusive = 1st singular and 2nd singular/plural
we exclusive = 1st singular and 3rd singular/plural

Before translating, therefore, the referents of Greek first person plural forms must be determined from the scenarios of potential referents, e.g.

we inclusive:
Crowd to each other
Luke 5:26 “Today we(incl) have seen astounding works.”

Disciples to Jesus
Luke 8:24 “Guru ji, o guru ji, we(incl) are drowning!”
Jesus is also liable to drown.

Father to prodigal son
Luke 15:23 “We (incl) having eaten will make merry!”
we exclusive:
The crowd in their own minds
Luke 3:8 “Do not reckon thus ‘We(excl) indeed are descendants of Abraham’ ...”
John is verbalizing the thoughts of the crowd. Thoughts have no second person addressee.

Peter to Jesus
Luke 5:5 “Guru ji, the whole night we(excl) indeed cast nets”

John’s disciples to Jesus
Luke 7:19 “Are you(pl) God’s chosen saver ..., or should we(excl) wait for someone else?”

These exegetical decisions are often more complex in the Epistles, where even in one verse the first person plural may have different referents, e.g.

Romans 3:8a
Greek: καὶ μὴ καθὼς βλασφημοῦμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασίν τινες ήμᾶς λέγειν διτ
Πολλοί οὖν τὰ κακὰ, ίνα δλη τὰ ἄγαθα;
NIV: Why not say—as we are being slanderously reported as saying and as some claim that we say—“Let us do evil that good may result”?
Parkari: If someone were to say thus, that would be just an excuse that “Let us(incl) by all means do evil works, so that good result may come out.” Some people criticizing us(excl) accuse us(excl) of this that we(excl) ourselves teach thus. But we(excl) indeed do not say thus.

Here “we” who are criticised, must include Paul and may include “other apostles” (Moo, 1996:195), but does not include the addressees of Paul’s letter. The “we” in “let us do evil”, however, is inclusive, since this is an encouragement for the hearers to accept the speaker’s viewpoint and join in doing evil.

Sometimes it is necessary in translation to clarify the referents even further, especially if the identification depends on extra-textual knowledge of the scenarios of speaker or audience, e.g.

1 Corinthians 8:5b-6a
Greek: διὸ καὶ πολλοὶ τοὺς κύριους πολλοὶ, δὸς ἡμῖν ...
NIV: (as indeed there are many “gods” and many “lords”), yet for us ...
Parkari: and there are many such things which people call God and lord, nevertheless for us(incl) Christians ...

Romans 3:9a
Greek: Τί οὖν; προεξήγησα; οὐ τίμω?
NIV: What shall we conclude then? Are we any better? Not at all!
Parkari: So then what should we(incl) Jews understand? Are we(incl) Jews better than other race folk?
No no, absolutely not.

Exegesis here depends on both the co-text and the original interpersonal and cultural context of the letter. On this basis, “we” is best understood as “we Jews”, rather than “we Gentiles”, “we Christians”, “we apostles”, or “I” (Paul himself) (cf. Moo, 1996:199; Morris, 1988:164).

Some argue that Greek first person plural can also refer to first person singular, e.g. in Romans 3:9b προηγησάμεθα, which RSV translates “for I have already charged” (cf. Morris, 1988:166). If so, this would be yet another mismatch between Greek and Parkari first person plural forms.

Lack of a grammatical category does not mean unawareness of that category. For example, English speakers are well aware from contextual clues whether “we” includes or excludes the person addressed, and when in doubt, can ask for clarification. However, the
presence of a grammatical category shows a clear awareness of it, and failure to use an appropriate category in translation results in miscommunication.

Chapter summary

A translation must preserve the meaning of the original text, but not necessarily the form. The meaning of the text is the original author’s intended meaning, which must be assessed by exegesis. A good translation is accurate, clear and natural, and must be understood correctly by the intended target audience.

Scenario mismatch between source and target cultures causes potential miscommunication in translation. This includes loss of information, reduction of lexical cohesion, skewing of expectations, inability to make correct inferences, and insufficient textual evidence for exegetical choices required by the target language’s grammar or lexicon.
Although scenario mismatch between source and target cultures causes problems in translation, scenario theory can be used to provide principles for solving those problems. In this chapter, I suggest translation principles to address specific types of scenario mismatch, giving examples from the Parkari translation of the New Testament. Since scenarios are opened in the source text by either their title or their contents, I suggest ways to translate source text scenario titles when there is mismatch between languages of scenario titles and their contents, and ways to open the correct scenario when there is mismatch between languages in the contents of scenarios. Since scenarios provide a framework for the audience to understand a text, I also suggest ways to translate when there is mismatch between languages of predictability and expectation due to scenario mismatch.

Handling mismatch in scenario titles and contents

The title of a scenario can be used in discourse to open up the whole scenario. However, across languages, what is essentially the same scenario may have different titles. More commonly, the same title will open similar scenarios in both source and target language, but the contents or scope of those scenarios may be different. Sometimes, a single scenario with one title in one language corresponds to more than one scenario in another language. Whenever there is a mismatch between languages in the titles and the contents of the scenario, there will be problems in translation.

Same scenario, different title.

Source and target language sometimes use different titles for the same scenario. It is the communicator’s task to use the means of communication most relevant for his target audience (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:164):

The ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one the communicator could have used to communicate. Therefore, in translation, when source and target language use different titles for the same scenario, it is the target language title which should be used to open that scenario.
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For example, what New Testament Greek calls “looking at the face”, English calls “favouritism”, and Parkari calls “taking someone’s side”. These are different titles for the same scenario of treating people differently according to external factors, such as race, dress, social status, etc., e.g.

Colossians 3:25b:
Greek: οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολογία “there is no looking at face / appearance”
English: there is no favouritism (NIV)
Parkari: j̲a r̲o p̲o̲h̲o n̲a̲li̲e̲t̲o “does not take anyone’s side”

Examples of the same scenario but a different title are common with euphemisms.
New Testament Greek uses “sleep” as a euphemism for “die”, but Parkari does not, e.g.
1 Corinthians 7:29
Greek: ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ δ ἀνήρ “if the man should sleep”
Parkari: ἔσε αὐ ρο ὀμφι more zae “if her man should die”

Similarly New Testament Greek uses “know” as a euphemism for “sexual intercourse”, but Parkari uses other euphemisms, e.g.
Luke 1:34
Greek: εἰπὲ ἄνδρα οὐ γυνὰκο “since I do not know a man”
Parkari: ἀπὸ τὸ κυρίατ ὅ “I indeed am a virgin”

In all the above examples a literal translation of the Greek would communicate wrong meaning.

Mismatch of titles and scope of a scenario:
Where the same title opens a given scenario but the contents differ across languages, the translation may need to make explicit the contextually focal elements of the scenario which are implicit in the source text.
For example, the New Testament Greek “leprosy” scenario contains “ritual-impurity”, including untouchability and purification rituals. However, the Parkari “leprosy” scenario only concerns disease, and these other elements belong in the “ritual-impurity” scenario. Cohesiveness can be kept in translation by making this second scenario explicit and linking it to the original scenario, thus matching the contents of the source language scenario, e.g. (implicit information made explicit is underlined)
Luke 5:12
RSV: there came a man full of leprosy; and when he saw Jesus, he fell on his face and besought him, “Lord, if you will, you can make me clean.”
Parkari: In that very place was a man who had the disease of leprosy. Therefore that man was ceremonially-unclean. When he saw Jesus, then having fallen at feet, having pleaded he said “Holyman ji, if it be your will, you (p) having made me fit and well can make me holy.”

Mismatch of form and referents:
Another area of mismatch between scenario titles and contents is in the forms and referents of personal pronouns and verbal suffixes. A personal pronoun functions as the “title” of a scenario with a limited number of semantically defined “slots”, but an almost infinite number of possible real life referents. These “titles” and “slots” differ from language to language. We have seen in the previous chapter that the Parkari plural of
respect and we inclusive / exclusive distinction results in the translator having to make exegetical decisions in order to choose the contextually appropriate pronouns and verbal suffixes. However, both Greek and Parkari have mismatch between form and referent, raising issues of exegesis and restructuring.

a) First person forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek form</th>
<th>Greek referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st singular</td>
<td>1st singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plural</td>
<td>1st singular (&quot;editorial&quot; we?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st singular + 2nd/3rd singular/plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parkari form</th>
<th>Parkari referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st singular</td>
<td>1st singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plural inclusive</td>
<td>1st singular + 2nd singular/plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plural exclusive</td>
<td>1st singular + 3rd singular/plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before translating into Parkari one must make an exegetical decision as to whether the referent(s) of the Greek first person plural form is singular, plural inclusive or plural exclusive, e.g.

1 Corinthians 10:17b
singular
plural inclusive
plural exclusive

Romans 3:9b
singular
plural inclusive
plural exclusive

In Romans 3:9b, Moo (1996:201) by relating this to “the comprehensive indictment of humanity in 1:18-2:29” implies “we” has first person reference. Certainly it does not include the recipients of the letter so is not “we inclusive”. However, it is notoriously difficult to prove first person reference. Paul might be re-stating a basic truth taught to everyone by the apostles as a group and previously taught to the Roman Christians by other members of that group (“we apostles”). Paul might even be including some of his companions, listed in 16:1-23, as senders of this letter. Certainly Timothy (16:21) is listed as co-author/co-sender of six other Pauline Epistles (2 Corinthians 1:1, Philippians 1:1, Colossians 1:1, 1 Thessalonians 1:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:1 and Philemon 1:1). Compare “we” in 1:5, which Moo accepts as an “editorial” plural whilst noting other options (1996:51).

b) Second person forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek form</th>
<th>Greek referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd singular</td>
<td>2nd singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd plural</td>
<td>2nd plural (notional individual = everyman)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parkari form</th>
<th>Parkari referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd singular</td>
<td>2nd singular (treated as equal or lower in respect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd plural</td>
<td>2nd singular (treated with respect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd plural (irrespective of respect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before translating into Parkari one must make an exegetical decision as to whether the referent of the Greek second person singular is singular without respect, singular plus respect, or plural, e.g.

Luke 1:13
singular
$\delta\varepsilon\gamma\iota\zeta\sigma\varsigma$  οὖν
Parkari  your(s) supplication (The angel is more important than Zechariah.)

Luke 1:3
singular
$\sigma\alpha\iota\upsilon$  γράψαι
Parkari  write ... for you(pl) (Luke addresses Theophilus with respect.

Luke 6:41
singular
Τι δὲ βλέπεις
Parkari  Why do you(pl) ... each look (This is addressed to all the listeners.)

Where cultures use honorific forms, failure to mark respect appropriately in translation causes severe problems. For example, Urdu has an honorific plural ap “you (respectful)” which is used for both singular and plural referents to show them respect. However, the standard Urdu translation simply follows the Greek form of second person singular, irrespective of respect. Jesus’s disciples, therefore, by addressing him using singular forms, appear to show Jesus no respect whatever.

Second person forms rarely cause problems for translation into English, since “you” can be singular or plural, with or without respect. However this ambiguity can cause misunderstanding, e.g. Luke 22:31-32 where Greek switches from plural to singular. RSV makes no distinction. NIV clarifies the singular in the translation, but uses a footnote for the first “you” noting that the Greek is plural:

“Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for you, Simon, ...”

I would suggest clarifying both referents:
“Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you all as wheat. But I have prayed for you, Simon, ...”

c) Third person forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek form:</th>
<th>Greek referent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd singular</td>
<td>1st singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd plural</td>
<td>1st singular + 3rd plural ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkari form:</td>
<td>Parkari referent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd singular</td>
<td>3rd singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd plural</td>
<td>3rd plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before translating into Parkari one must make an exegetical decision as to whether the referent of the Greek third person singular is first person or third person, and whether the referents of the Greek third person plural are first person plus third person, or third person plural alone, e.g.

1 Corinthians 3:5
1st singular
$7\iota \delta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\nu$ Παῦλος
Parkari  What am I Paul?
The name “Paul” occurs 30 times in the Epistles. Apart from 2 Peter 3:15, all are in the Pauline Epistles: 13 are Epistle initial naming the sender of the letter, 2 are in quoted speech (1 Corinthians 1:12, 3:4), 10 occur in some kind of apposition to a first person form (1 Corinthians 16:21, 2 Corinthians 10:1, Galatians 5:2, Ephesians 3:1, Colossians 1:23, 4:18, 1 Thessalonians 2:18, 2 Thessalonians 3:17, Philemon 1:9 and 1:19), but 3 occur with a third person verb (1 Corinthians 1:13, 3:5 and 3:22). In the Parkari translation, every time the name Paul occurs in the Pauline Epistles, apart from in quoted speech, first person forms are used with the name Paul in apposition.

Similarly, in 2 Corinthians 12:2, Paul says “I knew a man in Christ ... caught up to the third heaven”. Parkari takes the exegesis that Paul is referring to himself, but with humility (Barrett, 1973:307). Since Parkari third person forms cannot include first person reference in this genre, the translation uses first person reference: “I am a mere man who keeps relationship with Christ, but ... I was taken up...”.

The term “Son of Man” causes particular problems since it frequently occurs in a third person construction in the Gospels. This term has at least two senses in the New Testament, “human being” and “divinely appointed ruler”, and its historical development and usage has engendered much debate (Johnson, 1962:413-420; Colpe, 1972:400-477). However, irrespective of the sense of “Son of Man” in a given passage, the reference is first person, since, in the Gospel texts, Jesus uses this term to refer to himself. Although one may question whether the Greek text as we have it accurately reflects Jesus’s own use of this title, the translator’s task is to translate the meaning of the text as the Gospel writer presents it. In languages where third person forms never refer to the speaker, a literal translation using third person forms would not communicate the author’s intended meaning, but would communicate that the referent “the Son of Man” is not the speaker, e.g.

Luke 9:58

\[ \delta \varepsilon \ \tau \nu \ \delta \varepsilon \ \tau \nu \ \delta \varepsilon \ \tau \nu \ \varepsilon \chi \varepsilon \iota \ v \tau \mu \ \kappa \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \nu \ \kappa \lambda \nu \iota \nu. \]

RSV: but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head.
Parkari: but for me the son of human race there is no such place where I may rest.

Luke 9:26

\[ \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \nu \ \delta \varepsilon \ \tau \nu \ \delta \varepsilon \ \tau \nu \ \varepsilon \tau \mu \alpha \chi \mu \theta \sigma \zeta \tau \eta \alpha \iota \nu. \]

RSV: of him will the Son of man be ashamed
Parkari: I also the son of human race will be ashamed of him

Even when the phrase “Son of Man” is clearly “echoic”, i.e. is used to refer specifically to the figure in Daniel 7:13 by echoing the wording used there, the decision as to whether the translation should use first or third person forms depends on patterns of reference in the target language, not the source language, e.g.

Luke 21:27
RSV: And then they will see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.
Parkari: And then they will see me the son of human race coming in a cloud with great power and great glory.

The authorship of Matthew’s Gospel and John’s Gospel also presents a particular problem. For example, if the author of Matthew’s Gospel is actually Matthew the apostle, as some scholars maintain (e.g. France, 1989:50-80; Hendriksen, 1974:95-97; cf. Davies and Allison, 1988:129), then certain third person singular and plural forms have first person reference to the author, e.g.

Matthew 9:9 ἀναστάσεως ... Μαθατοῦ λεγόμενον καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ
1st singular Possibly “said to me” (if Matthew is the author)
3rd singular Parkari one person ... Matthew. And Jesus said to him

Matthew 26:27 ἐκδόθη αὐτῶν
1st singular + 3rd plural Possibly “gave to us” (if Matthew is the author)
3rd plural Parkari gave it to them

Similarly, if John’s Gospel is written by John the apostle, “the other disciple” and “the disciple whom Jesus loved” have first person singular reference, and “the disciples” has first person plural reference.

Although questions of authorship may seem to be a matter for scholarly research with little or no impact on the task of translation per se, where the translation of a Gospel is published in book form with a title, it is important that the title and text do not appear to contradict each other. In English, the title “Matthew” or The Gospel according to Matthew” is understood by most people to mean that Matthew wrote it, yet the text also refers to a Matthew in third person. A natural assumption would be that this Matthew is not the same Matthew as the author. The translator of a published Gospel needs therefore to decide on authorship, and ensure that the the title and text tell the same story.

Few English translations address this apparent mismatch between the text and the title, but there is a problem. Although English can use third person forms with first person reference, this seems restricted to a few select genres, such as baby talk, technical writing, or echoic use, e.g. “Mummy loves you”, “It is the opinion of this author”, “Quiet now! Teacher’s back”. Typically English authors recording historical events refer to themselves using first person forms, e.g. Defoe in A Journal of the Plague Year and Churchill in The Second World War. In many languages third person forms never have first person reference, so if the book is entitled “Matthew’s Gospel” and the translation refers to Matthew in third person, the title will affirm Matthew’s authorship and the text will deny it. In such languages, a decision on authorship must be made and applied consistently, so that title and text are not in conflict.

Where translations are made under the auspices of a particular church, the church’s view of authorship must also be taken into account. The Parkari translation, in its title to the Gospel, accepts the local church’s view that Matthew was the author. However, in the light of current theological debate, the foreword to Matthew’s Gospel notes that Matthew’s
authorship is traditional, not proven. In Parkari, proper names used with third person verb forms only have third person reference, except in the one genre of worship songs where the original author refers to himself in the third person. Nevertheless, third person forms are retained in Matthew 9:9 etc. in the Parkari translation, largely due to the sociolinguistic pressure of major language translations, which all retain the third person. The Parkari preface to Matthew's Gospel also explains why the use of third person forms in Greek to refer to Matthew does not prove that he is not the author. It notes that the use of third person forms with first person reference is a feature of the Greek language, and Parkari worship songs are cited as a kind of parallel for this Greek usage.

The works of Thucydides and Xenophon provide evidence that Greek authors did indeed use proper names with third person verb forms to refer to themselves as significant participants in historical events. Using a search in the Perseus Project database (www.perseus.tufts.edu) shows that in The Peleponnesian War Thucydides refers to himself by name using third person forms 20 times. Many of these refer to himself as the historian (e.g. 1.1, 2.70, 2.103 etc.), but several refer to himself as a participant in the events (i.e. 1.117, 4.104, 4.105, 4.106, 4.107 and 8.98, with 4.104 explicitly linking the historian with the participant). Thucydides only seems to use first person forms when he is making a personal comment (e.g. 2.48). Thucydides is acknowledged as both author and participant in these events (Connor, 1993:xiv). Similarly in Xenophon’s Anabasis the name Xenophon occurs 307 times (Perseus Project search). Some of these occurrences are in direct speech (e.g. 3.1.45, 3.2.9), but most simply name Xenophon as a participant in the events and refer to him using third person forms (e.g. 4.1.6, 4.1.15). So Xenophon also, as an author recording historical events in which he took part (Stone, 1965:ix-xi), refers to himself by name using third person forms.

Using target language titles for scenarios

As shown above, the same scenario may have different titles in different languages. In translation, the important thing is not keeping the source language title, but opening the correct scenario in the target language.

Euphemistic title:

As noted above, in Greek “sleep” is the title of both the “sleep” and the “death” scenario. RSV wisely translates “sleep” as “die” in 1 Corinthians 7:39: “If the husband dies, she is free to be married to whom she wishes...”. However RSV keeps the Greek title in 1 Corinthians 15:6 “Then he appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have fallen asleep”. Although contrast with “alive” gives a clue to the meaning here, the natural target language title “died” would be preferable. Any unnaturalness in the translation works against the communication process, and may ultimately short-circuit it (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:157):
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An addressee who doubts that the communicator has chosen the most relevant stimulus compatible with her communicative and informative intents ... might doubt that genuine communication was intended and might justifiably refuse to make the processing effort required.

In both these passages Greek “sleeping” is translated into Parkari as “dying” since Parkari does not use this euphemistic meptaphor.

Metaphorical title:
Luke 1:64

RSV: And immediately his mouth was opened and his tongue loosed, and he spoke
Parkari: Then Zechariah’s tongue immediately opened, and he began to speak

Here, “his mouth was opened” is a metaphorical title for the scenario “regaining the ability to speak”. RSV adds the verb “loosed”, which collocates with “tongue” in this scenario, yet unnaturally retains “his mouth was opened”. Parkari uses its natural title for this scenario, i.e. “his tongue was opened”.

Title of a scenario with content mismatch:
Galatians 6:4

RSV: and then his reason to boast will be in himself alone and not in his neighbor.
Parkari: And then if he should have done good works, he can be pleased in his heart about his good works.

The Greek καύχημα scenario includes “bad” boasting (James 4:16) and “good” boasting, which is being happy about something genuinely good (James 1:9). RSV miscommunicates, since the source language scenario title “boast” is always negative in English. (TEV’s “pride” is a better translation since “pride” can be used both positively and negatively in English). Since Parkari has two distinct scenarios for good and bad “boasting”, it uses both titles.

Compound title:
Acts 23:16

RSV: the son of Paul’s sister
Parkari: Paul’s sister’s-son [bhoqezo]

Greek refers to this scenario by combining discrete elements of meaning. Parkari uses its normal one word title.

Generic title:

Sometimes the source text refers to a specific scenario by a very generic term. If the target language has a specific title for that scenario, then that normal target language title should be used. If the target language does not have a specific title for that scenario, then the element of the scenario which is focal in the context should be made explicit, e.g.

John 4:9

RSV: For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans.
NIV: For Jews do not associate with Samaritans.
The RSV and NIV translations are misleading, since the disciples have just gone into a Samaritan town to buy food (4:8), and are presumably “having dealings with” and “associating with” Samaritan shopkeepers. In this context συγχρόνως refers to eating and drinking together and sharing vessels. Since English has no similar scenario, TEV wisely makes explicit the contextually focal element of the scenario: “Jews will not use the same cups and bowls that Samaritans use.”

The source text uses a generic term, since specifying the contextually focal element was unnecessary for the original target audience, who were familiar with this cultural practice (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:218):

A speaker aiming at optimal relevance will leave implicit everything her hearer can be trusted to supply with less effort than would be needed to process an explicit prompt.

In Parkari, John 4:9 reads “Now the Jewish race does discrimination (jep) against the Samaritan race.” In Parkari, “jep” is the title of a scenario which includes not eating or drinking from the same vessels as lower-caste ethnic groups who do not observe the same religious rules, and not entering their homes in order to avoid ritual impurity. This is virtually identical to the contents of the source language scenario, so Parkari, like Greek, can use a generic, expecting the audience to understand what is contextually focal.


Title with mismatched secondary senses:

Sometimes source and target language titles and scenarios match for the primary sense of the title, but there is mismatch for secondary senses. The appropriate target language title for each specific sense must be used, e.g.

son:
Greek “son” scenario
male offspring (1 generation removed)
male descendant (more than 1 generation removed)
someone having any close relationship with someone or something else

Parkari “son” scenario
male offspring (1 generation removed)

Primary sense
Luke 3:2
Ἰωάννη τῶν Ζαχαρίου ὦν
RSV: John the son of Zechariah
Parkari: John son of Zechariah

Secondary senses
Luke 18:38
Ἰησοῦ ὑπὲρ Δαυὶ
RSV: Jesus, Son of David
Parkari: descendant of King David
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Acts 4:36
Barnabas ... θεραπευτὴν κυρίαν ἐν παρακλήσεως
RSV: Barnabas (which means, Son of encouragement)
Parkari: Barnabas, the meaning of which is "encouragement giver".

τοῦ Ἰακώβου τοῦ θεοῦ.
RSV: Adam, the son of God.
Parkari: and Adam God had made.

Luke 4:41
Σὺ εἶ δὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ... τὸν Χριστὸν
RSV: "You are the Son of God!" ... the Christ.
Parkari: "You(s) are God's son." ... God's chosen savior Christ.

Despite the literal translation, the Parkari "son of God" is intended as a metaphorical title, which the text equates with "the Christ". It is important to realize that "son" here is not used in its primary sense, and any literal translation must be checked with the target audience to ensure that it is not misunderstood.

Title with overlapping secondary senses:

Sometimes source and target language scenarios and titles match almost completely, with only a small area of mismatch. In such cases the source language title can be used in translation, except when the contextual focus is on that area of mismatch, e.g.

woman:
Greek "woman" scenario
any adult female
with possessive = wife
vocative = an adult female

Parkari "woman" scenario [δοσί]
any adult female
with possessive = wife
vocative plural = adult females as opposed to other humans
NOT vocative singular (Names, honorifics, kinship terms etc. are used)

Mismatch in vocative use

Luke 13:12 (vocative, to unknown adult female)
προσέβλησεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ: γύναι
RSV: he called her and said to her, Woman
Parkari: having called her to him said: Madam

John 2:4 (vocative, to mother)
τί ἔηολ καὶ σοι, γύναι;
RSV: O woman, what have you to do with me?
Parkari: Mother, why do you say that to me?
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Idiomatic titles:

If the title for a scenario is idiomatic the meaning must be clearly identified, and the target language title used, e.g.

Matthew 12:40

οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ανθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας.

RSV: so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Parkari: in that way the son of the human race will be three days in the grave/tomb.

Matthew 16:21

καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται.

RSV: and on the third day be raised.

Parkari: and on the third day God will raise me alive again.

Matthew 27:63-64a

ἐμνήσθημεν δὲ τι ἐκείνος ὅ πλάνος ἐίπεν ἐν τῇ ζωῇ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρωμαι. ἰδέαν εἶπεν σφαλμαθήσομαι τοῦ τάφου καὶ τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας ...

RSV: we remember how that imposter said, while he was still alive, ‘After three days I will rise again.’ Therefore order the sepulchre to be made secure until the third day ...

Parkari: we remember that when that false person was alive, he said thus that God will raise me on the third day. Therefore you have a watch put on his tomb until three days ...

Jesus’s prophecy in Matthew 16:21 refers to the same event as his prophecy in Matthew 12:40, so Jesus apparently uses “on the third day” to refer to the same time span as “three days and three nights”. Similarly, the statement of the chief priests and the Pharisees in Matthew 27:63-64a seems to refer back to Matthew 12:40, where Jesus made a public claim, with Pharisees and scribes present, that he would rise from the dead. If this is so, “after three days” and “until the third day” refer to the same time span as “three days and three nights”. The Pharisees would hardly forget Jesus’s words “three days and three nights” as they echoed the Jonah story, nor would they report a shorter time span to Pilate, since that would defeat their purpose of setting a watch on the tomb. So, in Matthew’s Gospel, these terms seem to be co-referential. One may argue, of course, that Jesus originally said “three days and three nights” and his words were “regularized” by the Gospel writers to match the historical timing of Jesus’s burial and resurrection, but this would still suggest that the Gospel writers were intending these time references not to contradict each other.

In English, however, Jesus’s time in the tomb, including parts of Friday evening and Sunday morning, was 3 days and 2 nights at most, so in English “three days and three nights” matches neither Jesus’s own predictions elsewhere, nor the Pharisees’ recollections, nor the recorded facts after the event. The RSV translation of Matthew 12:40 is misleading. A natural English translation might be “two nights”. This one time span, however it is referred to in the original texts, should be translated using a natural target language title, hence the Parkari “three days”.
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Lexicalizing scenario titles:

Since Parkari regularly uses doublets to refer to scenarios as distinct from concepts, whenever the source text, lexically or contextually, suggests that a whole scenario is being referred to, such doublets should be used in translation. This ensures both accuracy and naturalness, e.g.

Revelation 18:17
πλούτος wealth
mal milgōt livestock wealth = wealth (possessions and money)

Revelation 18:21
ὁ στενοχώρας affliction or distress
dokh teklēf pain trouble = all kinds of trouble and difficulty

Luke 5:12
RSV: a man full of leprosy
Parkari: a man who had the disease of leprosy. Therefore that man was ritually-polluted.

Luke 8:43
RSV: a woman who had had a flow of blood for twelve years
Parkari: one woman, to whom there was a female illness for twelve years and therefore she was ritually-polluted.

Parkari translates “flow of blood” by a euphemism meaning “menstrual problem” since to mention menstrual blood explicitly is culturally unacceptable. The important thing is that this euphemism opens the appropriate scenario.

Explicitly linking scenarios in the target language

Sometimes the source language scenario title opens a complex scenario, the contents of which belong in two separate target language scenarios. In such instances, the translation will need to make both of the target language scenarios explicit, together with the semantic relationship between them. This can be done by explicit grammatical or lexical linking between the titles of the relevant scenarios, e.g.

linking cause and result:

Luke 5:12
RSV: a man full of leprosy
Parkari: a man who had the disease of leprosy. Therefore that man was ritually-polluted.

Luke 8:43
RSV: a woman who had had a flow of blood for twelve years
Parkari: one woman, to whom there was a female illness for twelve years and therefore she was ritually-polluted.

linking action and significance:

Mismatch of scenario contents is common for symbolic acts, such as wearing sackcloth, or tearing ones robes. In such cases the translation needs to make explicit the motivation behind such an action, and/or what that action symbolizes, e.g.

Luke 9:5
RSV: shake off the dust from your feet as a testimony against them.
Parkari: shake off even the dust from your feet, so that proof occurs that they did not listen to your matter.
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Matthew 26:65

τότε ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς διέρρηξεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ λέγων, ἔβλασφημῆσαι.

RSV: Then the high priest tore his robes, and said, “He has uttered blasphemy...”

Parkari: Then the chief priest to show himself grieved tore the robe he wore and said:

“... he having called himself equal to God has done dishonour of God...”

The Greek Prenuclear Aorist Participle shows that the tearing of robes belongs in the same scenario as the words spoken. This connection, however, needs to be made explicit in Parkari. It is not necessary to make everything explicit, just enough for the target audience to connect the explicit text to the contents of their existing mental scenarios in a meaningful way.

 linking metaphor and meaning:

Where the source language uses a metaphor which is not used in the target language, or has a different meaning, the appropriate non-metaphorical scenario must be opened in the translation. The source text metaphor could be dropped completely, but if retaining it gives extra insight, or maintains intertextual links, meaning and metaphor can be linked, e.g.

Acts 26:14

σκληροὶ σοι. πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν.

RSV: It hurts you to kick against the goads.

Parkari: Why do you split your head? When the owner is driving the ox with a stick, then what advantage will happen to the ox by kicking?

The Parkari idiom “Why do you split your head?” means why do you fruitlessly try to resist a stronger force. This opens the appropriate scenario, in which the original metaphor can be understood as an analogy, since it matches everyday Parkari life.

John 1:29

RSV: the Lamb of God

Parkari: God’s chosen person who will give his life on God’s name like a ram raised on God’s name (i.e. sacrificed)

Since Greek uses “lamb” here as a metaphor for “sacrifice”, Parkari makes the sacrificial function explicit. Parkari uses the word “ram” rather than “lamb” since one year old lambs are categorized as “rams”. Rams are not sacrificed in Parkari culture, so using “ram” as a simile here makes new links between “ram” and “sacrifice” in the Parkari target audience’s scenarios, and preserves the intertextual relationship between this text and the Old Testament sacrificial system.

Explicitly stating the discrete elements of an explicit scenario

Often the source language scenario title opens a roughly equivalent target language scenario, with few mismatches. But if a mismatched element is contextually focal, it will need to be made explicit in the target language, e.g.

Luke 23:53

καὶ ἐθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μυχῇ τοῦ λαξευτῆ.

RSV: and laid him in a rock-bewn tomb

Parkari: and placed it in a cave-like tomb
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Since Parkaris either cremate their dead, or dig a grave, their prototypical "tomb/grave" is a hole in the earth. So the clause "where no one had ever yet been laid", and the stone across the entrance, clash with the Parkari scenario. In translation, therefore, the type of tomb needs to be made explicit so that the text is semantically coherent.

Elsewhere, where another element of the "tomb" scenario is contextually focal, viz. the splendid building above the tomb, Parkari translates with a different word altogether:

Luke 11:47
διακοσμεῖτε τὰ μνήμητα τῶν προφητῶν
RSV: for you build the tombs of the prophets
Parkari: because you get built mausoleums of God's messengers

Sometimes contextually focal participants must be made explicit in translation, even though they are so prototypical in the source language scenario that they are left implicit in the text. If these participants are not prototypical in the target language scenario, they must be made explicit, e.g.

Luke 11:9
ἀπετέθη καὶ θανάσταται
RSV: Ask, and it will be given you
Parkari: ask and God will give you

In New Testament Greek the Passive often implies God as agent, since he is prototypical agent par excellence. Compare:

Luke 24:51
δει<φ>πεταὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
Parkari: and God lifted him up into heaven.

If the source language title opens a scenario with a broad scope and many elements, but the target language has no single title to refer to all these different elements, the individual contextually focal elements will need to made explicit in translation, e.g.

Matthew 26:65
ἐβλασφήμησεν
RSV: He has uttered blasphemy.
Parkari: he having called himself equal to God has done dishonour of God.

Matthew 26:64b
δει<φ>πεταὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ... ἔρχομεν ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
RSV: you will see the Son of man ... coming on the clouds of heaven.
Parkari: you will see me the son of the human race ... coming within the clouds of heaven, and the matter will be clear that I am the ruler from God's side. (i.e. sent from God)

Where contextually focal elements of the source language scenario are not included in a limited target language scenario with the same title, then as well as retaining the title those focal elements should be made explicit, e.g.

Matthew 3:2
Μετανοεῖτε.
RSV: Repent
Parkari: Having abandoned your bad works do repentance and walk on God's matter!

The focus here is on a complete change of lifestyle. This, however, is not part of the Parkari scenario for τοβόθα "repentance", which refers to repentance for a single wrong action.
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Hebrews 11:34

ταρεμβοδας έκλων αλλοτριων

RSV: put foreign armies to flight.

Parkari: having defeated other-race enemies armies caused [them] to flee

The Parkari “cause to flee” scenario has animals, children, thieves etc. as prototypical fleers. Foreign armies belong more prototypically in the “defeat” scenario, which is a possible element in the script of the “cause to flee” scenario. Thus Parkari connects armies with defeat, and then defeat with fleeing. The event “defeat” is implicit in the Greek text.

Sometimes discrete elements of the source language scenario belong in different target language scenarios. In such cases, the target language title should be chosen according to the contextual focus, and other focal elements not in the target language scenario will need to be made explicit, e.g. “wine”:

Greek “wine” scenario: Wine is good. Wine is fermented.

Parkari “alcohol” scenario: Alcohol is bad. Alcohol is fermented.

Parkari “grape juice” scenario: Grape juice is good. Grape juice is not normally fermented.

Matthew 9:17

οδεκ βάλλον μον νέον ελ άρον σαλιεν ταλάμον τι δε μή γε, βήγνιται αι σκολ...

RSV: Neither is new wine put into old wineskins; if it is, the skins burst...

Parkari: And people do not put new juice of grapes into old water-skins, otherwise the new juice having ripened [i.e. fermented] will burst the water-skins...

Sometimes the source text has an explicit scenario title, but only one contextually focal element of that scenario is actually being referred to. In such cases only the focal element should be made explicit, e.g.

Matthew 19:12

καλ ελοι ευκοχον αετυες ευκοχοσαε καυτος δια την βασιλεαν των αθρανων.

RSV: and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.

Parkari: and some people do not marry for this reason so that they may walk according to the Lord’s rule with full attention.

This saying comes in response to the disciples’ comment “If this is the situation between husband and wife, it is better not to marry”, which shows that “not marrying” is the contextually focal element of the “eunuch” scenario.

Sometimes source language and target language scenarios are similar, but the target language has no one word title for that scenario. The normal target language title should be used, even if the one word title in the source language becomes a whole phrase or clause, e.g.

Hebrews 7:27

θυσιας ἀναφέρεται

RSV: to offer sacrifices

Parkari: should raise livestock on the name of God

Since the normal title of the Parkari “sacrifice” scenario includes the prototypical participants “livestock”, the identical phrase cannot be used of Jesus’s sacrifice, e.g.

Hebrews 9:26

δια της θυσιας αδροθ

RSV: by the sacrifice of himself.

Parkari: so that he may give his life on God’s name
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The focal element of the Parkari “sacrifice” scenario is its purpose, lexicalized as “on the name of God”.

If the source language scenario is completely absent in the target language there will be no existing title to refer to it, so a new scenario must be created in the target language by making the contextually focal elements explicit in translation, e.g.

Luke 13:21

ὁμοίωσις ἑτοιμοῦ...  

RSV: It is like leaven...  

Parkari: It is like sour kneaded flour... having taken a little for making double-bread

Normal Parkari bread is unleavened. Leavened bread (“double-bread”) is only available in towns. Parkaris know that dough (“kneaded flour”) goes sour if left overnight, and causes the dough to puff up, but they do not use this for making bread. However, they do use sour milk for making yoghurt. Hence the “leaven” scenario must be created by stating its discrete elements and making its function explicit.

Biblical key terms

Biblical key terms are titles of very specific socio-religious scenarios and often lack an equivalent scenario in the target language, so translation will often involve linking one or more scenarios whose discrete elements best match those of the source language scenario, in order to make a new term. I list several New Testament key terms, each with their reconstructed source text scenario and the Parkari scenarios which partially overlap it, finally giving an example showing how that key term has been translated into Parkari by explicitly linking two existing scenarios to form a new term, e.g.

baptism

Greek “baptism” scenario:

R ritual washing gives ritual purity.

Mark 7:4 “they do not eat unless they purify themselves”

R ritual washing symbolizes moral purity.


R ritual washing as a symbol of purity typically involves total immersion.

John 3:23 “John also was baptizing in Aenon, ... because there was plenty of water in that place.” Compare Acts 8:36

Parkari “baptism” scenario (some Christians only):

Baptism is a necessary rite of passage for Christian infants and new adult Christians.

Baptism for adults is a symbol of becoming a Christian.

Baptism involves being sprinkled with water.

Parkari “bathe” scenario:

Bathing involves total immersion in water.

Bathing gives physical purity.

R ritual bathing gives ritual purity.

R ritual bathing symbolizes moral purity.

Parkari “holy/pure” scenario:

God is morally holy.

R ritual bathing gives ritual purity.

R ritual bathing symbolizes moral purity/holiness.

Good actions produce moral purity/holiness.
Acts 2:38  

RSV: be baptized every one of you...  
Parkari: you all take a holy bath

**apostle**

Greek "apostle" scenario:  
An apostle is sent by a higher authority.  
Luke 9:2 "and he sent them out"  
An apostle speaks according to the teaching of that higher authority.  
An apostle acts according to the teaching of that higher authority.  
Luke 9:6 "So they set out ... preaching the gospel and healing people everywhere"  
An apostle has delegated authority.  
Luke 9:1 "he called the twelve together and gave them power and authority..."  
An apostle is a specially chosen disciple (in the New Testament).  
Luke 6:13 "and chose from them twelve, whom he named apostles"

Parkari "send" scenario:  
Any person may be sent by a higher authority for any purpose.

Parkari "disciple" scenario:  
A disciple obeys a higher authority, his teacher.  
A disciple speaks according to the teaching of his teacher.  
A disciple acts according to the teaching of his teacher.

Parkari "chief" scenario:  
A chief has authority.  
Luke 6:13  
RSV: whom he named apostles  
Parkari: And them he also called [his] own chief disciples.

**angel**

Greek "angel" scenario: (not including human messengers)  
An angel is sent by a higher authority, God.  
Luke 1:26 "the angel Gabriel was sent from God"  
An angel speaks the message given by God.  
Matthew 1:20 "the angel of the Lord ... saying"  
An angel acts according to God's command.  
Hebrews 1:14 "ministering spirits sent forth to serve..."  
An angel is a spiritual being.  
Hebrews 1:14 "Are they not all ministering spirits..."  
An angel usually appears in human form.  
Mark 16:5 "they saw a young man ... dressed in a white robe"  
An angel can appear and disappear suddenly.  
Luke 2:13 "And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host..."

Parkari "messenger" scenario:  
A messenger may be sent by a higher authority to give a message.

Parkari "death-messenger" scenario:  
A death-messenger is sent by a higher authority, God.  
A death-messenger speaks the message given by God, that the addressee is about to die.  
A death-messenger is a spiritual being.  
A death-messenger appears in demonic form carrying a spike.  
A death-messenger can appear and disappear suddenly.

Parkari "ambassador/angel" scenario: (not well known)  
An ambassador is sent by a king or country to another country.
An ambassador represents that king or country in words and deeds. God also has ambassadors who are spiritual beings sent to earth.

Parkari "heaven" scenario:
Heaven is outer space beyond the earth’s atmosphere.
Heaven is beyond human experience.
Heaven is where God lives.

Luke 1:11
واجبه بدأ هائلاً صغيرًا كرمل
RSV: And there appeared to him an angel of the Lord.
Parkari: Then one heavenly ambassador/angel of the Lord gave an appearance to Zechariah

prophet
Greek "prophet" scenario:
A prophet is sent by a higher authority, God.
Acts 3:22 “The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet...”
A prophet speaks the message given by God.
Matthew 1:22 “what the Lord had spoken by the prophet”
A prophet may speak a message about the future.
Matthew 1:22 “to fulfil what the Lord had spoken by the prophet”
A prophet is a human being.
Matthew 2:17 “the prophet Jeremiah”

Parkari “messenger” scenario:
A messenger may be sent by a higher authority to give a message.

Parkari “nabi/prophet” scenario:
A nabi/prophet is sent by a higher authority, Allah.
A nabi/prophet speaks the message given by Allah.
A nabi/prophet is a prophet belonging to Islam.

Parkari “soothsayer” scenario:
A soothsayer speaks the message discerned by their own special powers.
A soothsayer speaks a message about the future.

Parkari “God” scenario:
God is the creator.
God wants humans to live according to his will.
Some people are specially close to God.

Luke 4:24
ودوأا προφητὴς δεκτὸς εστὶν εν τῇ πατρίδα αὐτῶν.
RSV: no prophet is acceptable in his own country.
Parkari: the honour of none of God’s messengers becomes in his own land.

Historically, new scenarios have often been presented in translation by introducing a new word into the language, frequently a transliteration of the source language title (e.g. baptism, apostle, angel, prophet). However, the scenario of a new word is initially empty, so unless the target community has already adopted this foreign word or will be regularly exposed to it, it is usually preferable to create a new scenario and title by linking two or more existing scenarios which contain elements that are always, or typically, contextually focal.

As can be seen, there are often several target language scenarios which have partial overlap with the original source language scenario. Target language scenarios with
strongly contrasting elements should be avoided, e.g. “death-messenger” for angel. Ideally, at least one of the target language scenarios chosen should contain several major elements in common with the source language scenario. The other linked scenario should either add key elements or counteract possible misunderstandings caused by scenario mismatch.

Genitive constructions

I argue that the genitive case in Greek, and in many languages including Parkari and English, does not mean possession but means that the associated items belong in the same scenario. Where two nouns are linked in a genitive construction, the semantic relationship between the nouns is determined by the prototypical relationship between them in the scenario of the “possessor”. Exegesis, then, depends on identifying the prototypical contents of the scenario whose “title” is in the genitive case. I suggest that the more prototypical scenario contents differ, the more likely it is that the specific semantic relationship between nouns in genitive constructions will need to be made explicit in translation, as shown below, e.g.

Matthew 5:34  (possessive)
Θεός ... τὸν Θεόν
RSV: the throne of God
Parkari: the throne of God

Matthew 4:3  (kinship, here used as a metaphor)
υἱός ... τὸν Θεόν
RSV: the Son of God
Parkari: the son of God

Matthew 15:3  (agent)
τὴν ἑντολὴν ... τὸν Θεόν
RSV: the commandment of God
Parkari: the commands of God
(Parkari uses the plural because the reference is to both Exodus 20:12 and 21:17)

Matthew 3:16  (source)
[τὸ] πνεῦμα [τὸ] Θεόν
RSV: the Spirit of God
Parkari: the Holy Spirit sent by God (In Parkari if the Spirit of God left God, God would be dead)

Luke 1:19  (spatial orientation)
ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ
RSV: in the presence of God
Parkari: near God

Luke 3:2  (speaker)
ἐγένετο ἡμῖν θεόν
RSV: the word of God came
Parkari: God gave his message

Luke 2:40  (agent)
χαῖρες θεόν ἤπνευ ἐπ’ αὐτό.
RSV: the favour of God was upon him.
Parkari: God kept doing grace on him.

1 John 1:1  (event of which other noun is agent)
τὸν λόγον τῇς ζωῆς
RSV: the Word of life
Particularly confusing is the fact that a noun in the genitive construction may be

either agent or goal of the event indicated by the other noun, e.g.

1 John 2:15  (goal of other noun’s event, i.e. “objective genitive”)
οὸς ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ
RSV:  the love of the Father is not in him.
Parkari:  he does not love God the father

1 John 4:9  (agent of other noun’s event, i.e. “subjective genitive”)
ἐν τῷ ὑπερτύπωσεν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν
RSV:  In this the love of God was made manifest among us
Parkari:  By this the matter has become clear that God loves us

As shown above, the noun in the genitive may have a variety of semantic
relationships with the other noun. The relationship must be determined by evaluating what
prototypical element of the shared scenario is contextually focal, e.g.

Acts 1:22  (agent of other noun’s event)
ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτισμάτος Ἰωάννου
RSV:  beginning from the baptism of John
Parkari:  taken from John’s giving the holy bath

Acts 13:24  (prerequisite/significance of other noun’s event)
βάπτισμα μετανοίας
RSV:  a baptism of repentance
Parkari:  they should having abandoned their bad works do repentance and they should walk on
God’s matter, and take holy bath.

Acts 5:30  (agent of implicit event)
ὁ θεός τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν
RSV:  The God of our fathers ...
Parkari:  God whom our ancestors used to honour

Acts 7:2  (attribute of other noun)
Ὁ θεός τῆς δόξης
RSV:  The God of glory ...
Parkari:  God, who is like light

2 Corinthians 1:3  (event prototypically performed by other noun)
θεὸς πάντως παρακλησίως
RSV:  God of all comfort,
Parkari:  God who gives encouragement in all trouble

Using target language grammar for scenarios

The “title” of a scenario refers to a culture-specific cluster of concepts linked to
language-specific grammatical forms and lexical items. To communicate clearly a
translation should not only use the target language “title” for a source text scenario but also
use the normal target language grammar and lexicon associated with that scenario.
Scenarios for events contain set “frames” linking prototypical categories of participants
with each event, and formalizing the grammatical markers used for each of the prototypical
participant slots in the scenario of the event.
For example, the English frame for “die” has only one participant, the agent, which must be an animate “thing”. Since “die” does not have a participant as goal, there is no passive form, e.g.
The man died.
The man died a painful death.

**But not**
* It was died by the man.
* A painful death was died by the man.

Where the “frames” of source language and target language do not match, there will be a need to alter the grammar or lexicon in translation, e.g.

**conceptual mismatch in number of participants**
“dying to sin”

In many languages, including English, the frame for “die” has only one participant, yet literal translations include a “dative” participant in the frame, e.g. Romans 6:10 “he died to sin once for all” (RSV). Although the English idiom “dead to the world” includes a dative participant, this belongs in the scenario of sleep or unconsciousness. However, the Greek scenario “die” obviously has language and culture specific metaphorical links with other scenarios such as “sin”. Simply keeping the form of the original can be misleading. The translator must return to exegesis, then express the source language meaning in the grammar and lexicon of the target language. Moo (1996:379) states that this means “a separation or freedom from the power of sin”, and Dunn (1988:323) argues that Jesus’s death breaks sin’s “grip on human life”, cf. Hendriksen (1980:200) who compares this verse with Hebrews 7:27. Parkari therefore translates “by dying once he destroyed control of sins over people”.

Similarly, the concept of an individual Christian “dying to sin”, as in Romans 6:2, must be translated in the Kala Kawaw language of Papua New Guinea as becoming “blind to sin”, since “dead to sin” means morally lax (Rod Kennedy, “Idiom Skew”, NOT 11(1):37-39). In Parkari the phrase “dying to sin” is meaningless. In order to communicate a radical change of lifestyle, the Parkari translation of Romans 6:2 says “Our(incl) sin-doing life has indeed come to an end / been destroyed.”

**conceptual mismatch in participant type**
“drinking the Spirit”

In English, the “goal” of drink is typically inanimate, yet literal translations of 1 Corinthians 12:13 say “we were all given the one Spirit to drink”. Although English can use “drink” metaphorically, this translation is obscure if not misleading. When read aloud, the audience may understand a more prototypical “goal”: “we were all given the one spirit to drink” (fortified Communion Wine, perhaps?!).
This metaphor sounds ridiculous in languages where personal beings cannot fill the “goal” slot for “drink”. The Parkari translation reads “God has given us all the Holy Spirit”. The metaphor has been removed and the agent implicit in the Greek passive has been made explicit. It is true that the translation misses a nuance which is in the original Greek. However, simply retaining the Greek form in Parkari would not only miss that nuance but also fail to communicate the basic meaning.

**grammatical mismatch in number of participants**

“it rained”

The Greek frame for “to rain” has no grammatically marked agent, simply using third person singular suffixes. English uses a dummy agent “it”, so James 5:17 οὐκ ἔβρεξεν, is translated “it did not rain”. In Parkari, the frame for “to rain” has an overt agent “rain”, so Parkari translates “me να ωρφίο” “rain did not rain”. The event is the same, but the frames differ conceptually and grammatically.

“he sent”

In the Greek frame for “send” those sent need not be grammatically explicit, but in Parkari they must be explicit, e.g.

Matthew 14:10
καὶ πέμψας ἀπεκεφάλισεν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ.  
RSV: he sent and had John beheaded in the prison,  
Parkari: And having sent a person, he caused to cut off John’s head in the jail.

The Prenuclear Aorist Participle “having sent” in Greek is the overt marker that “beheaded” is semantically causative, as is made explicit in both RSV and Parkari.

**grammatical mismatch in frame and marking of participants**

“kissed him”

In Greek and English the event frame for “kiss” contains the same two participants, agent and goal, but the Parkari frame has different participants, i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English and Greek frame “kiss”</th>
<th>Parkari frame “kiss”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verb to kiss</td>
<td>verb to take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent kisser</td>
<td>agent kisser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal kissee</td>
<td>goal kiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benefactive kissee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So in Luke 15:20, κατεφάλισεν αὐτὸν is translated into English using the same grammatical slots, “kissed him.” In Parkari however this reads ua ne buska lidhα “took kisses to him.” Not only is the grammar different, but since the goal, “kiss”, must show number, the translator must make an exegetical decision as to whether the father kissed his son once or more than once!

Since commentaries normally deal with issues that relate directly to the source language text or to its translation into the language of the commentary, mismatch between
source and target language frames in minority languages may raise exegetical issues which
are not addressed by commentaries in major languages.

Using target language lexicon for scenarios

Once a scenario is identified, the lexicon used in translation should match that
scenario. Since the scenario often identifies the precise sense of a source language word,
the translation should use the normal target language word for that sense in that scenario.

For example, Luke 24:18 reads “Are you the only visitor to Jerusalem who does
not know the things that have happened there in these days?”. The words “visitor”,
“Jerusalem”, and “these days” (i.e. Passover) belong in the “pilgrimage” scenario. So
“visitor” (πατόκελος) here means “pilgrim”. Parkari translates this specific contextual
sense “are you the only pilgrim”, thus opening the “pilgrimage” scenario implicit in the
source text.

In contrast, the cognate word πατόκιος in Acts 13:17 is translated differently since
it belongs in a different scenario, the long term displacement of a whole people group:

Acts 13:17

εὐ τῇ πατοκίῳ ἐν γῇ Ἁγι.upper caseπούτα
RSV: during their stay in the land of Egypt
Parkari: when our race was expatriate/foreigner in Egypt land

The guiding factor in lexical choice is the appropriateness of a particular target
language lexical item in the open source text scenario.

Handling mismatch in the content of scenarios

In discourse, the collocation of lexical items belonging to the same scenario opens
up that scenario. However, where target language scenarios do not include the same
concepts and vocabulary as source language scenarios, it may not be clear to the target
language audience which scenario those lexical items all belong in, and so the appropriate
scenario will not be opened. Consequently, the vocabulary will appear to be random and
thematically unrelated and both lexical cohesion and semantic coherence will be lost.
Therefore the translation must always ensure that the appropriate scenario is opened, so
that the words in the text show lexical cohesion and the discourse has semantic coherence
for the target audience.

Explicitly stating the title of an implicit scenario

Sometimes the original speaker opens a scenario not by its title but by stating some
of its prototypical elements. However, if these are not prototypical elements of the
corresponding target language scenario, then the target language scenario title should be
made explicit.
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For example, in John 4:20-21, the woman at the well says “Our fathers worshipped on this mountain; and you say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship” and Jesus replies “Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father...” In the original context, “this mountain” (Mount Gerazim) and “Jerusalem” were the prototypical elements in the “places of pilgrimage” scenario. So Jesus is not saying that worship will cease in Jerusalem, as literal translations seem to suggest, but that the whole concept of having to worship at special places of pilgrimage will give way to the concept of a genuine spiritual relationship with God irrespective of location, cf. Brown (1966:180) “In vs. 23 the particular point in questions shifts from the place of worship (20-21) to the manner of worship”.

The Parkari “places of pilgrimage” scenario includes sacred rivers and water tanks for Hindus, and Mecca for Muslims, but not Jerusalem or any mountains. Consequently, references to “this mountain” and “Jerusalem” fail to open that scenario. So in Parkari the title of this focal scenario must be made explicit. The word “pilgrimage-place” is reduplicated to make a doublet, showing that it refers not to pilgrimage places per se, but to the whole scenario, i.e. the very concept that there are special holy places where worship has extra effect (material made explicit is underlined):

John 4:21

βαϊ, δομ υμών τ-αί βατ σαδ

lady, pilgrimage-place (rhyme) of G matter leave

Madam, forget that whole issue of special places of pilgrimage!

Believe my matter, that time is coming when you(pl) will worship God the father neither having gone on that mountain nor having gone in Jerusalem town.

Making the “pilgrimage-places” scenario explicit here, not only avoids miscommunication in this passage, but also enables the audience to modify their existing scenario to include the new items, Jerusalem and “this mountain”. This will then improve their ability to understand and remember other scripture passages. For example, in Luke 2:41-52, where Jesus’s family go to Jerusalem annually for the Passover, lexical coherence will be improved, since Jerusalem now belongs in the “pilgrimage-places” scenario which already includes special visits for religious purposes.

The need to be explicit here is not because the target audience lacks any reasoning power to move from specifics to generic. Had the text mentioned Mecca, or Ganges-Jumna, then the Parkari “pilgrimage-places” scenario would have been opened successfully. The ability to make correct inferences about the author’s meaning depends on the correct scenarios being opened, and those scenarios containing the contextually relevant information.

Similarly the scenario of “leavened bread”, which is implicit in Greek, must be made explicit in Parkari:

Luke 13:21

δια ὁ ζῶν τά κρισίν ἔλεγχων ἢς διέγραψεν τά τριά ἑως ὁ

Similarly the scenario of “leavened bread”, which is implicit in Greek, must be
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RSV: “It is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened.”
Parkari: “It is like sour kneaded flour, which one woman having taken a little for making double-bread put in half a maund (20kg) of kneaded flour. Finally its effect spread in all the flour.”

Since Parkaris do not make leavened bread at home, and are only aware of it as something which can be bought in towns, this culturally unusual scenario must be opened explicitly.

Another example where an implicit scenario must be made explicit is in the account of the widow of Nain’s son. The Greek only implies that he comes back to life, but Parkari must make it explicit:

Luke 7:15
Kal dveicdOiaev 8 veKp8?
RSV: And the dead man sat up, and began to speak.
Parkari: At this the dead boy became alive, and having risen sat and began to speak.

In Greek the combination of a healer, a dead person, and the command to “rise” would have opened the “raise from the dead” scenario. However, this verse only states explicitly “dead”, “sit up” and “talk”, and these belong together in the Parkari “ghost” scenario, suggesting the corpse sits up and begins to speak. This misunderstanding is cued by the word “dead” which here is used not for sense, but only for reference, i.e. “the one who up till this moment had been dead”. So Parkari must explicitly state the title of the implicit scenario.

Explicitly stating the discrete elements of an implicit scenario

Sometimes the original speaker opens a new scenario by stating some of its prototypical elements, but those explicit elements are not prototypical of any target language scenario, and the contextually appropriate target language scenario has no title. In this case the source language scenario must be opened by making explicit the prototypical elements of the corresponding target language scenario.

For example, the scenario of “spiritual powers”, both good and evil, has no one word title in either Greek or Parkari. In both languages it is regularly opened by a list of prototypical elements, but these prototypical elements do not match up. So the Parkari translation must add Parkari prototypical elements to the Greek ones listed so that the audience is able to recognize which scenario is in focus, e.g.

Colossians 1:16b
elre 0p6vot elTe kupi6TT|Te? elTe dpxal elTe ££ovatai
RSV: whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities
Parkari: whoever has rule, power, leadership, or authority whether they be angels or demons or gods deities.

Note that “gods deities” translates a Parkari doublet dev devb`ona, which indicates the whole scenario in which those elements belong, i.e. “any kind of deity” (except God).

However, the focal elements of the “spiritual beings” scenario differ according to context. Sometimes all spiritual beings are focal (Colossians 1:16b, 2:10b), sometimes
only a subsection (Colossians 2:15, Ephesians 6:12b). The translation should make explicit only those elements of the scenario which are contextually focal, e.g.

Ephesians 6:12

Δλα πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοὺς οὐρανῶν τούτων ...

RSV against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness ...

Parkari: against Satan and the angels of his side who exercise leadership and authority against God, and rule over this darkness-type world ...

Here, as well as translating the Greek words, the contextually focal referents are explicitly mentioned using normal target language terms.

It is clear from these examples that the greater the scenario mismatch, the more detail must be made explicit in translation about those elements of the source language scenario which are contextually focal.

Another example where Parkari must state an explicit element of an implicit scenario is where Jesus reads from Isaiah at Nazareth in Luke 4:16-30. As discussed above, the Greek text here accesses the “scripture reading” script by listing every detail except the actual reading (4:16b-17, 20), so we are to understand that the reading did take place in line with the prototypical script. But why does “read”, the normal “title” of this scenario, not occur as the main verb? I believe that Luke is placing special emphasis on the lexical item which is the main verb in Greek, i.e. εὑρεν “he found”. Luke is focussing his audience’s attention not on the reading per se, but on Jesus’s deliberate choice of this particular passage (Fitzmyer, 1981:532). Luke has already revealed to his audience that Jesus is the Son of God (1:32, 35, 3:22), and that the roles of saviour, Christ and Lord all come together in this one person (2:11 σωτήρ ὁ Χριστὸς κόσμος). Luke has also again linked Jesus as the Christ with salvation (2:26, 30), and has linked Jesus with the Holy Spirit’s empowering in the context of the Christ (3:15-16) and in the context of the Son of God (3:22, 4:1 and 4:14 as inclusio around the temptations). So here Luke seems to be stressing the Messianic significance of this Isaiah passage, which refers to someone empowered by the Holy Spirit and chosen and anointed by God to bring salvation through his words and deeds.

It is indeed possible that the passage Jesus read, Isaiah 61:1-2, was already regarded as Messianic by Jesus’s audience in Nazareth. A recently released Dead Sea Scroll text, 4Q521 (Vermes, 1997:391-92), seems to link this Isaiah passage to the role of the Messiah. Shanks (1998:65) quotes the translated text, adding in brackets the Old Testament passages which 4Q521 appears to be quoting:

[The heavens and the earth will listen to His Messiah ... Over the poor His spirit will hover and will renew the faithful with His power ... He ... liberates the captives, restores sight to the blind, straightens the bent]. (cf. Psalm 146:7-8) ... The Lord will accomplish glorious things which have never been ... He will heal the wounded, and revive the dead and bring good news to the poor. (cf. Isaiah 35:5-6; 61:1).

However, irrespective of whether Jesus’s audience already understood Isaiah 61:1-2 as Messianic, Luke uses this passage as Messianic in his Gospel, since Jesus as “the Christ” is
already Hearer-old information for Luke’s audience (GIVEN textual-displaced, 2:11) and Luke announces Jesus the Messiah’s mission by Jesus’s public reading of this Isaiah passage. Consequently, when John’s disciples ask Jesus whether he is the Messiah “the one who is to come” (cf. Luke 3:15-16), Luke simply records Jesus’s reply in terms of his work, as foreshadowed in this Isaiah text, giving sight to the blind, healing, and preaching good news to the poor (Luke 7:20-22).

The Parkari translation, therefore, makes explicit the title of the “Christ” scenario, which is left implicit in the Greek being opened by discrete elements in the Isaiah text, especially “anointed” (cognate with “Christ”):

Luke 4:17b-18a

εὑρεν τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν γεγραμμένον
Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ὡς ἐνεκεν ἐχρισεν ἐμ... 

RSV: found the place where it was written,

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me...”

Parkari: Having opened the scripture Jesus searched out this matter about God’s chosen saver and read:

“I have received the Lord’s Holy Spirit because ... the Lord has chosen me...”

Parkari cannot translate ἐχρισεν “anointed” by a word cognate with Christ. Moreover, most Parkaris have no scenario for Christ at all, and the contents of the quotation are not prototypical of any scenario. This means that Parkari must create a title for the Christ scenario using elements which are normally contextually focal, hence “God’s chosen saver”. “God’s chosen” parallels “he has anointed me” (4:18), and “saver” parallels “set at liberty” (14:18b).

Elsewhere, where the word “Christ” is explicit in Greek as a title or role, Parkari translates “God’s chosen saver Christ” (transliterated kʰrist), and where Christ is used together with the name Jesus, Parkari transliterates, i.e. Jesus Christ becomes isu kʰrist.

Another example of a “script” element being left implicit in Greek comes from a “punishment” scenario:

Acts 12:19

Ἠσθάνει δὲ ἐπιζητήσας αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ εὑρὼν, ἀνακάλυψε τὸν φύλακας ἐκέλευσεν ἀπαθήημα.

RSV: And when Herod had sought for him and could not find him, he examined the sentries and ordered that they should be put to death.

Parkari: When king Herod summoned Peter, then he was not found. Then he having questioned those keeping guard he ordered them to be taken to give the punishment of death.

The semantic sense of the final Greek word is “to be led away” or “arrested”. However, the implicit scenario “condemn to death” was opened by the script elements of not finding a prisoner, interrogating the guards, and then ordering that they be led away. The original scenario (cf. Acts 16:27) includes the Roman practice of guards receiving the escaped prisoner’s punishment (Barrett, 1994:588), as recorded in the Codex Justinianus 9.4.4 (Blass, 1895:142). In Parkari, as in English, this contextually focal element of the implicit scenario must be made explicit.
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Sometimes the original speaker not only opens a new scenario by stating some of its prototypical elements, but also expects the audience to use that scenario to determine what attributes of the explicit elements are contextually focal. For example, in Matthew 27:34 “wine and gall” opens a source language “anaesthetics” scenario including items which are anaesthetic, their effect, and why one might avoid them.

However, if the explicitly stated elements are not prototypical elements of the corresponding target language scenario, then a literal translation will fail to open the correct scenario, and so fail to provide the context for understanding which attributes are focal. Moreover, if the contextually focal attributes are not prototypical elements of the target language scenario, the translation will need to make explicit both the target language scenario title and the focal attributes, e.g.

Matthew 27:34
RSV: they offered him wine to drink, mingled with gall; but when he tasted it, he would not drink it. Parkari: then they gave Jesus the juice of grapes to drink, in which bitter drug was mixed for reducing pain. But having tasted that he refused to drink in order to remain in consciousness.

Even though Parkari makes the “drug” scenario explicit, it is a much broader scenario than “anaesthetics” and its most prototypical elements are “recreational” drugs such as hashish, opium and heroin, with medicinal drugs as fringe elements. Thus the anaesthetic attributes of drugs are not focal in the Parkari scenario and must be explicitly stated.

Similarly:
Mark 2:15a
RSV: And as he sat at table in his house, many tax collectors and sinners were sitting with Jesus and his disciples
Parkari: And many octroi-collectors and other people were there, whom people reckoning sinners ostracized. [i.e. did not eat with them as they considered them ritually-polluted]

The words “tax collectors” and “sinners” together opened the scenario of “people one should not mix with” for the original target audience. The contextually focal element of that scenario is “communal eating”, as shown by 2:16 “Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?”. However, in Parkari this scenario is not opened by those words, so the contextually focal element must be made explicit. The Parkari word translated “ostracized” is “jep” whose scenario contains the elements of discrimination, not eating together, and ritual impurity.

Leaving implicit the discrete elements of an explicit scenario

Naturally, the source text is written assuming that the audience have source language scenarios in their brains, so much of the original message is left implicit, since the audience can access the implicit information, attitudes, or relationships from their mental scenarios. This thesis has stressed that scenario mismatch between source and target languages means information implicit in the source text must often be made explicit in the translation. However, where the target language and source language do have very
similar scenarios, the target audience can correctly infer implicit information from these scenarios.

Consequently, the level of explicitness appropriate in the translation is determined by the new target audience, and occasionally what is explicit in the original text may be omitted and left implicit in the translation, so long as there is no information loss or miscommunication, e.g.

John 11:44

\[ \Delta ν σατε \ αυτών καὶ διψετε \ αυτών \ υπάγετε. \]

RSV: Unbind him, and let him go.
Parkari: Release him.

Jesus is commanding that Lazarus be freed from his grave cloths. Greek has two clauses “Release him and allow him to go”. In Parkari the scenario of “release” includes not only untlying, but the fact that the person released is free to go. If “allow him to go” is made explicit, it implies that there is some other restriction as well as the bandages, e.g. he is being held back by someone. So the Parkari translation simply says: “Release him!”. If the source language scenarios were similar, as seems likely, why does the Greek text, seemingly redundantly, use two main verbs? I argue that using two conjoined Aorist main verbs for a single scenario in Greek highlights that scenario at the episode level (see Appendix G). Here, the resolution of the problem (Lazarus’s death) is clearly the climax of the whole episode, and the Greek may be marking this grammatically. Parkari also marks this climactic event as salient in the discourse by the use of the change of state particle “προ” after the verb.

It is not necessary to mention the grave cloths in either Greek, English or Parkari, as they are already part of the currently open scenario. As Relevance Theory predicts, you do not tell people what they already know (Sperber and Wilson, 1986).

Similarly with the scenario of “wheat”. Over ninety percent of Parkaris are agriculturalists and pastoralists, so their scenarios for crops and livestock are extremely complex and detailed. Thus explicit elements in the Greek source text sometimes are so prototypical in the open Parkari scenario that they are best left implicit, since mentioning them suggests they have some specific contextual significance, e.g.

Matthew 13:24, 26

\[ \sigmaπελατρηκε \ καλόν \ σπέρμα \ εν \ τῷ \ φυτῇ \ αὐτῷ... \]

\[ \deltaτ\: \ δὲ \ εὐανόωσεν \ ὁ \ χόρτος \ καὶ \ καρποὺ \ εποίησεν... \]

RSV: who sowed good seed in his field...
So when the plants came up and bore grain...
Parkari: He sowed in his field good seed of wheat...
When the heads occurred in the wheat...

Here, the wheat “coming up” has no special contextual significance, being simply a natural stage of development before the ears appearing. By using conjoined Aorist main verbs, rather than Prenuclear Aorist Participle plus main verb, for a prototypical script, Matthew is highlighting the significance of this event in the episode, stressing that the weeds were only distinguishable once the heads of grain appeared, not before. To mention
the wheat sprouting not only sounds unnatural here in Parkari, but also takes the emphasis away from the script final event, the heads of grain appearing, so the translation leaves it implicit. No information is lost, since sprouting is a precondition in the script of “bearing grain”.

Contrast Mark 4:27-29, where each element of the “wheat” scenario is contextually focal as under God’s control, so each is explicit in the Parkari translation.

Sometimes an element of a scenario is so prototypical in all cultures and languages, due to physically determined real-life co-occurrence, that its explicit use in the source language seems to have some other function, often at discourse level. For example “open one’s mouth” appears in Participle form as an element of the “teach” scenario:

Matthew 5:2
καὶ ἔνοιξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐκδιδόσκειν αὐτοῖς λέγων
RSV: And he opened his mouth and taught them, saying:
Parkari: And Jesus began to teach them thus:

Since one cannot teach without opening one’s mouth, this information is totally redundant. According to Relevance Theory, causing the audience extra processing effort promises them extra “contextual effects”. Since this formula occurs when Jesus begins the first of his major blocks of teaching 5:3-7:27 and is followed by a verb in Imperfective Aspect, the extra “contextual effects” seem to be that the following speech will be a very significant block of teaching, hence the Parkari translation makes explicit “began” and “thus” to emphasize the beginning of a major speech.

This principle applies not only to “event” scenarios, but also to “thing” scenarios, e.g.

Matthew 6:26
ἐμπλέψατε ἐλέγκε τὰ πετελιὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
RSV: Look at the birds of the air.
Parkari: Look at the birds!

Since birds are normally “of the air”, i.e. they fly, this information is already prototypical in the “bird” scenario. If it were made explicit here in Parkari, it would cue the audience to expect some special contextual significance, such as “but not ground dwelling birds, or water birds”. Since there is no such contextual focus, it is best left implicit. Obviously, the Greek “bird” scenario must have had “of the air” as a prototypical characteristic of birds, so the mismatch may be due not to conceptual mismatch but to mismatch of the lexical items linked to concepts. Since 9 of the 14 New Testament occurrences of “birds” is qualified by “of the air” (GRAMCORD data) the phrase was obviously natural in New Testament Greek. It rarely, if ever, is used in Parkari.

Matthew 3:4
μέλι ἄγριον
RSV: wild honey
Parkari: honey
Parkaris are traditionally desert-dwellers. They themselves collect honey from wild bees, and know nothing of beehives. So “wild” is implicit, being prototypical in the Parkari “honey” scenario. Making “wild” explicit here would cue the audience to expect some extra contextual significance. However, the contextual focus, that John survived on basic desert foods, is already clear to a Parkari audience.

Luke 22:1

RSV: the feast of Unleavened Bread
Parkari: the festival of breads of the Jewish race

Since the normal Parkari word for bread refers to chapattis, i.e. flat unleavened bread, “unleavened” is prototypical and therefore left implicit. However, some implicit information is made explicit here, viz. that this is a Jewish festival, to avoid bewilderment - “What festival of chapattis?”.

Similarly, for groups with a strong belief that there is only one true and living God, literal translations such as “the one true God” or “the living God” seem to imply that there must be some other God who is not true, or not living. These attributes are so prototypical in the “God” scenario, that to make them explicit cues the audience to expect some extra contextual significance, such as contrast with some other kind of God. (Similarly, the sentences “Can I have some wet water?” or “Have you any cold ice?” sound unnatural in English, since “wet water” and “cold ice” suggest a potential contrast with “dry water” and “warm ice”.) Where these attributes are used simply to clarify the referent, then the best translation is simply “God”. Where these attributes are contextually focal, however, the translation should indicate this but avoid apparent tautology, perhaps by changing the adjective into a clause, such as “God, who alone is truly worthy of praise” or “God, who unlike false idols is alive”.

**Using a generic term to avoid false implicatures**

As has been stated above, all scenarios include a variety of discrete elements, and problems occur in translation when these do not match up across cultures. Often the more specific the scenario, the more it contains specific cultural elements, and the more generic the scenario, the more universal its contents. For example, everybody’s “food” scenario includes “eat”, but the “pig” scenario for some people includes “eat”, and for others “do not eat.”

If the scenario of a specific term contains prototypical elements which are contradictory between source and target language, then whenever those elements are contextually focal, the audience will misunderstand the text, because they will interpret it in the light of their own scenario. In such cases the specific term in the source text may be
best translated by a generic term in the target language, to avoid creating false implicatures.

For example, in the parable of the prodigal son:

Luke 15:23
καὶ φέρετε τὸν μόσχον τὸν σπειτούν, θέσατε
RSV: and bring the fatted calf and kill it.
Parkari: And the livestock-animal which is specially-chosen, slaughter it.

This verse is not about historical fact, i.e. which animals Jews did or did not kill. Here, the contextually focal element of the “calf” scenario is “ideal food for a feast”, so this is what must be communicated. The Parkari scenario for “calf”, however, due to their Hindu background, includes “killing cattle is sinful”. Simply translating “calf” would imply that the father, on his son’s return, committed a major sin. By translating with a generic term, which includes both cattle and buffalo, the focus is kept on the element “ideal food for a feast”, since Parkaris specially fatten buffalo for just that purpose. The specific term “buffalo”, although a good cultural substitute as regards function, was avoided as historically inaccurate.

Similarly, at the Passover meal:

Matthew 26:23
ἐν τῷ τρυπήλῳ ...
RSV: in the dish ...
Parkari: in the eating vessel...

The “dish” here is obviously a bowl containing “bitter herbs” into which the disciples and Jesus dipped their bread. Parkari has no word meaning just “bowl” but many more specific words whose scenarios include the size, use, and material of the bowl, and one more generic word “vessel”. Although Parkaris have a type of bowl which can be used for communal eating, it is thought of as particularly a Parkari vessel, and if used here would give the implicature that “The disciples long ago and in a different place amazingly had exactly the same kind of bowl that we have!” Consequently, the translation uses the very generic term “vessel” to avoid this false implicature.

A further example comes from the closure of a Pauline letter:

Romans 16:16
Ἀμαρτάσουσι διὰ ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλοματίᾳ ἀγίῳ.
RSV: Greet one another with a holy kiss.
Parkari: Greet one another in a holy way with love.

In Parkari culture, the only public kissing is between parent and child, when the child is very young, or after some major trauma or separation. For other participants or on other occasions, the Parkari “kiss” scenario includes “sexually immoral behaviour” and a literal translation would give this implicature. The contextual focus of Paul’s comments was the appropriate demonstration of love within the Christian “family”, hence the generic translation in Parkari, which similarly conveys the demonstration of love within the limitation of holiness.
Handling mismatch of predictability and expectation

The theory of scenarios as prototypical conceptual clusters relies on the fact that human beings naturally categorize events into expected and unexpected, and mentally link together people, attitudes, actions, causes, and intentions. Callow states (1998:132):

human beings are purposive. Speech and all other human activity has some purpose behind it. Usually we know the purpose or can make a good guess. When we are puzzled as to the purpose behind an utterance or action, we feel uncomfortable and want to enquire further.

One of the important functions of scenarios in discourse is to cue the audience as to what to expect. Consequently, where there is a mismatch of scenarios between source and target language, the audience’s ability to process the text is reduced, as they cannot accurately predict what is likely to occur.

For example, as we have seen above, the narrative of the woman with the issue of blood in Luke 8:43-48 contains some confusing elements: Why does she come trembling? What is so wrong with touching Jesus? Making the ritual-pollution scenario explicit in 8:43 enables the audience to recognize which facts are expected, and which are unexpected:

Luke 8:43
RSV: a woman who had had a flow of blood for twelve years
Parkari: one woman, to whom there was a female illness for twelve years and therefore she was ritually-polluted.

Scenarios provide, as it were, a row of prototypical pegs on which to hang the story. The pegs of “fear” and “untouchability” were in the source language scenario of “menstruation”, but are in the target language scenario of “ritual-pollution”. The explicit linking of these scenarios in the translation enables the new audience to access the original scenario and thus to predict the chain of expected events and spot whatever is unusual.

We may be tempted to think that a text, particularly a historical narrative, merely lists facts and we do not need to understand purposes. But Callow directly contradicts this (1998:133):

Purposes interest us intensely, and if we hear information given, or opinions and values expressed, our minds instinctively move along the chain to the purposes to which they lead.

So then, to preserve the chain of expectation in a text, and enable the audience to predict what is likely and evaluate what is usual or unusual, the translator may need to make explicit the motivation for certain events, and whether events are to be understood as expected or unexpected.

Making explicit the motivation behind events

Problems of exegesis, and therefore translation, frequently occur when the logic or reasonableness of some event depends on an element of the open scenario which is left implicit in the source text. Such elements typically concern a person’s purpose or motivation for performing a given action.
For example, in Luke 9:52-53, where the Samaritans refuse to give Jesus lodging, the motivation for their action is left implicit in the Greek text. Compare translations:
RSV:
And he sent messengers ahead of him, who went and entered a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him; but the people would not receive him, because his face was set toward Jerusalem.

Parkari:
And he sent people ahead of himself. They having set off in order to do preparation for Jesus’s lodging came into one village of other-race-people of the Samaritan nation. But the people of there did not allow Jesus to lodge, because he was travelling towards the pilgrimage-place of his own Jewish race Jerusalem.

The Parkari translation, like RSV, leaves the motivation implicit. However, Parkari does make explicit the facts behind the motivation, that these people were of a different race and religion to Jesus. These two elements open up the Parkari scenario of “discrimination” (fep), which includes racial or religious difference, not entering others’ homes, and not eating with them. Once the appropriate scenario has been opened, the Parkari audience can easily infer the motivation as ethno-religious discrimination.

Another example of motivation being left implicit in the source text is Luke 10:31. As previously discussed, it is nowhere stated why the priest and Levite avoid the half-dead man. However, every speaker uses scenarios as the background for their narrative, and every scenario has its own consistent logic to it, so the speaker expected the original audience to correctly infer the purpose behind the actions from the open scenarios. For a Jew, the two elements “priest” and “(possible) corpse” belong together in the “ritual purity/impurity” scenario. In the light of that scenario, the priest and Levite avoid the half-dead man in order to avoid ritual pollution from touching a dead body (Leviticus 21:1-3, Numbers 19:11).

Moreover, the scenario of ritual-pollution has already been opened by the question “Who is my neighbour?” since maintaining “purity” was one of the burning issues of the time (Neyrey, 1991: 271-304) and the specific issue here was whether “neighbour” meant ritually-pure Jews only, or included the ritually-unclean such as Samaritans (Nolland, 1993a:590; Fitzmyer, 1985:886). Thus “neighbour” and “priest meets corpse” are both directly linked to the “ritual-impurity” scenario. A Jew could not have failed to draw the conclusion that ritual-impurity was the issue in the priest’s mind. To drive home this point, Jesus introduces the archetypal “ritually-impure” person, the Samaritan, as the final character in the story.

If this concept of ritual-impurity is not made explicit in translation, the hearer will make their own judgment as to why the priest walks on by, based on their own conceptual framework and knowledge about the world. Thus most British people assume that the Jewish priest was proud and uncaring, but the Samaritan was compassionate. However, Jesus’s point is that regarding ritual-purity laws as most important causes the highest guardians of religion to break the command to love, a command which even the ritually-impure can keep.
But, one may object, ritual impurity is never even mentioned in the story, so cannot be focal and should not be added to the text. We have seen before, however, that scenarios are frequently opened by elements that prototypically belong together in that scenario, without the need for the title to be explicit. Regardless of how the "ritual impurity" scenario is opened in the source text, the target language translation must be sure to open that same scenario.

Hence the Parkari translation of Luke 10:27-33 (with implicit information made explicit underlined):

27 ... "one should love one's brother as oneself."
29 But he embarrassed in order to escape from his disgrace again said to Jesus "I am asking this, that in this command are only we Jews brothers, or are other people of low-caste race our brothers also?"
30 At this Jesus said "There was a man of the Jewish race..."
31 After that by fate one priest of God's house passed along that same way. When the priest saw him he reckoned thus that it is possible he is dead, and in this fear lest he having touched a corpse should be ritually-polluted and break the command of religion he passed by having avoided him.
32 In such a manner one servant of God's house came to that place, and having seen him, afraid of being-ritually-polluted by touching a corpse, he also passed by having avoided him.
33 Then one other-race man of the Samaritan race ...

Such a translation puts this thesis to the test. If scenario theory can be applied to translation as proposed in this thesis, then this translation is appropriate, so long as it is exegetically justified and clearly understood. People may object, however, that such a translation is too explicit, or they may be happy with making information explicit if it requires few words, but not if it requires whole clauses or sentences. However, the only people who can judge whether a text is too explicit, too wordy and long-winded, or indeed too brief and not explicit enough, is the target audience themselves. They will evaluate this according to Grice's maxims of quantity (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:33):

1 Make your contribution as informative as required.
2 Do not make your contribution more informative than required.

Naturally the more there is scenario mismatch, the less information can be communicated implicitly from the open scenario, so the more information will need to be made explicit in the translation. For Parkaris, as for most English speakers, unless the motivation is made explicit here the assumption is that the priest and Levite simply do not care. The translation issues are these:

1) Exegesis. Is the information really implicit in the source text? i.e. part of the original scenario, contextually focal, but not explicitly stated.
2) Restructuring. What is the most natural way to convey this information in the target language?

Making explicit the prototypicality of belonging to a scenario

Information is clustered together in mental scenarios precisely because those elements prototypically co-occur in the experience of members of a given culture. So the very fact that certain elements occur in a source language scenario indicates that they are prototypical, i.e. they are:
a) normal or typical (not unusual)
b) reasonable or logical (not unreasonable or illogical)
c) expected or non-controversial (not surprising)
d) unambiguous, clear, definite, known (not confusing or unclear)

As shown in section 2 of this thesis, this prototypicality may be marked in Greek by the use of old-information grammatical forms, or simply by the collocation of lexical items belonging to the same scenario. In either case, this prototypicality may need to be made explicit in translation.

It has long been recognized that a difference in culture between Source and Target Language communities can cause translated material to appear odd and lacking in cohesion. Catford, calling this “cultural untranslatability”, comments (1965:101):

In many cases, at least, what renders ‘culturally untranslatable’ items ‘untranslatable’ is the fact that the use in the TL text of any approximate translation equivalent produces an unusual collocation in the TL. To talk of ‘cultural untranslatability’ may be just another way of talking about collocational untranslatability; the impossibility of finding an equivalent collocation in the TL. And this would be a type of linguistic untranslatability.

Lexical collocations which belong to a single scenario in one language, do not necessarily belong together in another. Given the close connection between the conceptually linked structure of scenarios and the collocations of the lexicon associated with such scenarios, it is hardly surprising that this phenomenon can be analysed as a conceptual issue “cultural untranslatability”, or a linguistic one “unusual collocation”.

The translator should be aware of these unusual collocations and realize that they reflect an area of culture clash. It may be necessary therefore in translation to make explicit that such collocational clashes are not due to anything unusual about the situation but reflect the normal, expected prototypical situation in the source culture.

I give examples of making these types of prototypicality explicit:

a) normal or typical

Where some element is normal in the source language scenario, but abnormal in the same scenario of the target language, then the translation may need to state explicitly that it is a cultural norm, e.g.

Matthew 9:23

RSV: and saw the flute players

Parkari: there he saw those people who according to own custom were playing pipes on the girl’s death

The Greek verb is an Aorist Participle and the noun has the article, both of which mark this as normal Hearer-old information within the “death” scenario opened in 9:18. Parkari, however, uses a main verb to mark Hearer-new information, since this information is not part of the Parkari “death” scenario. Thus the normality of this information, as far as the source culture is concerned, must be conveyed in the target language by an explicit phrase. The reason for the pipe players’ activity is also made explicit, since that is contextually focal.
b) \textit{reasonable or logical}

Sometimes the problem for the target audience is not so much determining whether something is normal or not, but rather determining why it should be normal. In such cases the purpose or logic of the action needs to be made explicit, e.g.

Luke 10:13
\[\text{πάλαι ἀν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ στοάδι καθήμενοι μετενόησαν.}\]
RSV: they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.
Parkari: the people of there would early having abandoned their bad works have done repentance, and having put on clothes made from goats' hair have sat in grief on ash, and have gone on God's matter.

The Greek Present Participle marks that "sitting in sackcloth and ashes" is a prototypical element in the "repentance" scenario of the main verb. However, the Parkari "repentance" scenario does not include "sitting in sackcloth and ashes". By making "grief" explicit, this strange behaviour is made to seem reasonable, since wearing dark clothes and sitting in dust are linked with grief in the Parkari "bereavement" scenario, and grief because of one's sins is a prototypical element of the Parkari repentance scenario "going on God's matter".

c) \textit{expected or non-controversial}

Evaluating the expectedness and unexpectedness of events depends on the audience being able to access the prototypical contents of the open scenarios. Where focal elements of the source language scenario are missing in the target language scenario, they need to be made explicit, e.g.

Luke 17:12
\[\text{ἀπερίτησαν [αὐτῷ] δέκα λεπροί, ἀπόθεσαν, οἱ ἐπτύσαν πόρρωθεν}\]
RSV: he was met by ten lepers, who stood at a distance
Parkari: then ten people met him, who were ritually-polluted due to the disease of leprosy. Therefore they having stood afar off

Again, once the ritual pollution scenario is explicitly opened in Parkari and linked to leprosy, then their standing afar off is expected. Without this explicit element of the "leprosy" scenario made explicit, their action seems unusual, even rude.

d) \textit{unambiguous, clear, definite, known}

Sometimes the problem for the target audience is in identifying the intended referent, since there is no such referent in their open scenario, e.g.

Luke 7:19
\[\text{Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος}\]
RSV: Are you he who is to come
Parkari: Are you(p) God's chosen saver about whose coming it is written in scripture

The article with "he who is to come" marks this as Hearer-old, since it is a prototypical element of, and an alternative title for, the Greek "Christ" scenario. However, the Parkari audience do not know who this refers to, so the identity of this referent must be made explicit.
Chapter summary

Where the mismatch of scenarios between source and target languages causes information loss, the information implicit in the source text will need to be made explicit in the target language translation in order to accurately communicate the original message. Where a scenario is opened in the source text by its title and there is a mismatch between scenario titles and contents in the source and target culture, the translation must use target language titles, if they exist, to open the relevant scenario, and any implicit information lost because of the mismatch of scenario contents must be made explicit.

Similarly, where a scenario is opened in the source text by making explicit a number of discrete elements from that scenario, a mismatch between the contents of scenarios in the source and target culture may mean that those same elements fail to open the correct scenario in the target language. In such cases the translation should open the correct scenario by making the target language title explicit, and also make explicit any implicit elements from the source text scenario which are not inferrable from the contents of the target language’s scenario due to scenario mismatch.

Since scenario mismatch causes a loss of predictability for the new target audience it may be necessary to make explicit in translation what motivates certain behaviour and which elements are expected and which are unexpected, in order to guide the audience towards an accurate interpretation of the text.
CONCLUSION

Scenario theory has been developed in a variety of fields including linguistics, cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence. Despite variations in terminology, there is strong consensus as to the existence and nature of scenarios. Scenario theory is supported by psychological and neurological research.

Scenarios are networks of information in the brain, storing concepts in related clusters within an interlinked framework. We form scenarios by categorizing and organizing our experiences, grouping specific experiences together to form a general prototypical framework. Consequently, there is little variation between the scenarios of different individuals within a single culture, due to their shared experiences, environment and worldview. In contrast, however, scenarios may differ significantly from culture to culture.

Scenarios are structured by concepts which are themselves metaphorical, based on bodily experience, such as “container” and “link”. Scenarios function as “containers” storing information in chunks. Each chunk consists of a core concept, which functions as the “title” of that scenario, together with all the other concepts closely linked to it. These linked items include various things, events, attributes and relations which are prototypically related to the core concept through repeated experiences, and the links encode the semantic relationship between the concepts including directionality of space, time, and intention. Each scenario is also linked to other concepts in metonymic and hierarchical networks. Since scenarios are experiential, they have prototypical categories with fuzzy boundaries. Scenarios for different types of semantic class are structured differently, but all involve linking concepts according to experiential frequency and relevance.

We use scenarios to interpret new experiences and to understand and structure communication. Since scenarios are highly structured, the information contained in specific semantic “slots” within scenarios is used as a “default” in comprehension and communication.

The significance of scenario theory for communication

Successful communication theory relies on the communicator accurately assessing the degree of shared knowledge between himself and his audience, so he can speak in “shorthand”, giving enough explicit information for his audience to correctly understand his meaning. The audience must cross-reference the explicit text with their own pre-existing mental scenarios, not only to identify which scenarios are open but also to fill in
Conclusion

implicit participants, events, and relationships according to what is prototypically expected within those open scenarios.

Scenario theory provides a cognitive framework for understanding categories of information status, especially the distinction between Hearer-new and Hearer-old, and between KNOWN and GIVEN, which plays a major role in structuring communication. Grammatical patterns in English, Greek and Parkari reflect the cognitive distinction between these information categories, thus giving clues to the audience as to where in their mental filing system to find the information referred to.

Scenarios enable an audience to determine the contextual sense of a word by identifying the conceptual areas where the scenario of that word interlocks with other scenarios in the text. Encyclopaedic scenario contents enable an audience to predict the likely actions of characters and the likely sequence and result of events. Similarly the prototypical elements and interrelationships stored in scenarios allow the audience to correctly understand implicatures.

Scenarios can be opened by the explicit use of the scenario's title, or by the collocation of prototypical elements from a single scenario. Scenarios can be identified by the audience using both lexical and grammatical clues, whilst observing the principles of analogy, local interpretation and relevance.

The significance of scenario theory for discourse analysis

Since scenarios are the database for all Hearer-old information they affect the communicator's choice of grammar and lexicon. Scenarios enable the communicator to assess whether to use Hearer-old or Hearer-new marking in discourse, thus guiding the audience to understand what they should regard as prototypical and expected, and what they should regard as new and significant. Scenarios, by storing lexical items along with related concepts provide the structure for determining which lexical items naturally collocate.

Scenarios, as cognitive units in memory, also function as semantic units which allow the audience to divide a discourse into scenario chunks, thus facilitating comprehension, memory storage and recall. They provide the cognitive framework for tracking participants, identifying lexical cohesion, disambiguating reference, and interpreting idioms and metaphors. Scenarios also enable the audience to perceive semantic coherence in the text, even when semantic relations are not explicitly marked, by assuming the prototypical relationships from the relevant scenario.

Scenarios also act as a backdrop to a text, providing information as to what is expected in the development of the discourse. Predictability means the audience does not have to forge new connections between events in the story as it develops, but simply has to hang this information as expected onto the prelabelled pegs of the scenario, occasionally noting an item which is unexpected. Since the story unfolds in the light of expected norms,
it is easy to spot unexpected and thus significant events, and to memorize the story in scenario chunks, also related prototypically, plus significant deviations.

Thus the scenario structures of the original author and audience not only affect the lexical and grammatical form of the text, but also determine which presuppositions and assumptions must be made to correctly analyse the author’s intended meaning. The significance of scenarios in structuring both the explicit form and the implicit meaning of a text is vital for discourse analysis, enabling the analyst to understand the author’s choice of grammatical and lexical forms and to make plausible inferences regarding semantic relationships and discourse structures which are formally unmarked.

If the discourse analyst is a representative member of the text’s original target audience, then all these complex functions of scenarios, which facilitate accurate interpretation of the message, will take place automatically. If, however, the discourse analyst is from a different culture to that of the author and original audience, then it is essential that the analyst interprets the text in the context of the original author and audience’s scenarios, not his own.

**The significance of scenario theory for translation**

Since communicators must interface with their audience’s mental scenarios to achieve successful communication, and since scenarios are culturally conditioned, all communication across cultures is fraught with potential misunderstandings due to the difference between the scenarios of communicator and audience. In the cross-cultural context of Bible translation, scenario theory provides logical principles for determining the information implicit in the source text, for analysing both actual and potential miscommunication, and for restructuring the original message of the source text in the light of the target audience’s knowledge and worldview to ensure accurate comprehension.

Translation involves two discrete activities: determining the meaning of the source text (exegesis), and presenting that same meaning clearly and naturally in the target language (restructuring). To these should be added comprehension testing, to ensure that the target audience’s understanding of the translated text matches the exegesis. Scenario theory is directly relevant to each of these activities.

**Scenario theory and exegesis**

Scenario theory, by stressing that communication is culturally conditioned and what is communicated is more than what is explicitly stated, reminds the exegete to study not merely the grammar and lexicon of the text, but also the encyclopaedic world view of the original speaker/author and audience. Since the original author’s choice of grammar and lexicon reflected his own and his audience’s scenario bank, the source text itself, by its use of Hearer-old or Hearer-new forms and its lexical collocations, indicates whether scenarios are treated as currently open or closed, and shows what lexical items belong
together in a single scenario. This in turn provides insights into the original author and audience's world view.

The fact that certain grammatical forms signify which verbs or nouns belong to a single scenario (e.g. Greek participles and main verbs, nouns in genitive constructions) gives the exegete insight into the scenarios of the original author/audience, helping determine which elements in a text are presented as prototypical, and which as unexpected. Moreover, Greek anarthrous nouns with Hearer-old referents (i.e. referents in open scenarios) mark those referents as salient, and so give clues as to what is focal at clause or sentence level, or thematic at higher levels of discourse. Similarly, statistically marked verbal use, such as Present forms in past time narrative, mark the scenario they occur in as salient at higher discourse levels.

Understanding lexical collocations in terms of culturally-determined scenarios, rather than theory-neutral semantic domains (as in Louw and Nida, 1988), helps determine semantic paragraphs and pericopes. Recognition of the prototypical and culturally based nature of scenarios allows the exegete to interpret which participants, events, semantic relationships etc. are to be understood, when the source text leaves them implicit, on the basis of what was prototypical in the source culture (historical evidence) and what relationships are explicitly marked elsewhere in the New Testament corpus (textual evidence).

All these factors help the exegete to reconstruct the original author's meaning from the text, so improving the accuracy of the translation.

Scenario theory and restructuring

Scenario theory, by emphasizing that scenarios are culturally conditioned, reminds the translator to restructure the form of the text, not simply according to the grammar and lexicon of the target language, but also in the light of the target audience's world view. Just as the choice of grammar and lexicon in the source text reflected the original author and audience's scenarios, so the translation must use the appropriate Hearer-old or Hearer-new forms and lexical collocations of the target language, to indicate to the new audience which scenarios are to be understood as currently open or closed, and how lexical items which belonged in a single source-text scenario are semantically related. This will require careful discourse analysis of the target language.

Since certain grammatical forms in the source text signify which verbs or nouns belong to a single scenario, the translator has a textually-based rationale for making explicit such elements of the original author and audience's scenarios which are left implicit in the source text, but are nevertheless contextually focal. This may include explicit reference to implicit participants or events, reasons or motives, semantic relationships between participants, events, clauses or discourse units, and whether elements in a text are to be understood as prototypical or unexpected. Since there is a
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normal patterning between source culture scenarios and source text grammatical forms (e.g. use of the Article and Prenuclear Aorist Participle in Greek), deviations from this (e.g. anarthrous nouns for known referents, and Present forms in past time narrative) are marked forms. Recognition that these marked forms indicate salience of participants and event scenarios at higher discourse levels gives the translator a textually-based rationale for using corresponding high-level discourse markers in the target language.

Since lexical collocations in the source text opened appropriate scenarios in the original audience's mind, and thus provided textual cohesiveness due to the prototypical semantic relationships within those culturally-determined scenarios, there is a textually-based rationale for ensuring that those same scenarios are opened in the target language translation, which may mean making explicit the title of a scenario, implicit elements within a scenario, or implicit links between scenarios, such as causal links or metaphorical links. Understanding the prototypical and culturally based nature of scenarios, allows the translator to predict, in the light of the target audience's world view, which participants, events, semantic relationships etc. must be made explicit in the translation for correct understanding, and which will be correctly and easily understood even when left implicit.

All these factors help the translator to restructure the original message in an appropriate form of the target language, improving clarity and naturalness.

Scenario theory and testing

Since scenario theory shows how a text is intended to communicate far more than what is explicitly stated, comprehension testing must evaluate not simply the target audience's ability to repeat back the explicit words of a text, but also their ability to understand what is implicit, such as the motives of participants, the significance of events, and the implications of what is said or done. Misunderstanding of such issues may well be due to scenario mismatch, where the encyclopaedic world view of the new target audience differs significantly from the original speaker/author and audience, and so "reading between the lines" gives a different message from that the author intended. The mismatch between source scenarios and target scenarios must be identified, and the translation revised to address this problem.

Misunderstanding of the text may also be caused by inappropriate use of grammar and lexicon. For example, use of Hearer-old grammatical forms, and lexical collocations, may suggest that certain scenarios should be regarded as currently open, or certain lexical items should be regarded as part of a single scenario, when for the new target audience the relevant scenarios have not been opened, or those lexical items are not connected. The translation must be revised to ensure that the correct scenarios are opened, that Hearer-new items are not presented in Hearer-old grammatical forms, and that where lexical collocations from a single source-text scenario appear random to the new target audience the semantic relationship is made explicit.
Inability to correctly identify participants, events, reasons or motives, semantic relationships between participants or events, etc. may well be due to scenario mismatch. If such items were implicit in the source text and are left implicit in the translation, but are not prototypical elements in the scenarios of the new target audience, then the new audience cannot possibly cross-reference to their scenario banks to supply them, as the original audience would have done. Where such items are clearly implicit (i.e. not in the source text but contextually focal, and so intended by the original author to be understood by the original audience), then the translation will need to make them explicit.

Inability to judge the significance of events is often caused by failure to identify whether those events are to be understood as prototypical or unexpected. The source text may have marked prototypicality (e.g. using a participle or article) or left it implicit to be understood by the original audience by cross-referencing their scenario banks, but if it is not correctly understood by the new target audience, the translation may need to make it explicit. For example, Jesus reclining at a meal, though culturally normal in the source text, may appear culturally odd to a new target audience and thus be wrongly assumed to have some great significance in the discourse.

Failure to remember significant events, or to understand their significance, may be due to scenario mismatch, for example where the purpose of an event is implicit in the source text and so omitted in the translation, but cannot be recovered by the new target audience as it is not part of the open scenario. It may also be due to “flatness” in the translation. For example, Greek used anarthrous nouns and Present forms in past time narrative to mark salience at higher discourse levels, but the target language may lack such subtle devices, or the translators may have failed to recognize and use them. In such cases the source text, by using unusual grammatical forms for expected information, marked extra salience at discourse level, and the translation may need to use other devices to achieve the same results. For example, Matthew 4:10 “Then Jesus says to him...” might be translated “Then Jesus gave this crushing response...”

An audience’s inability to understand what a text is about, or to make a relevant summary of it, may be caused by a failure to identify the original scenarios. If the source text used lexical collocations to open scenarios, and there is scenario mismatch, then the same lexical items may not be understood as semantically linked and thus open no scenario at all, or a different scenario from the source text. This also makes it impossible for the target audience to determine semantic paragraphs and pericopes from lexical cues, and may lead to an inability to string the text together in a meaningful way. The translation may need to make scenario titles explicit, and perhaps make explicit the relationship between paragraphs.

Understanding the prototypical and culturally-based nature of scenarios allows the translator to understand that misunderstandings do not necessarily indicate actual mistakes in the translation, but are often due to scenario mismatch between source and target.
cultures. This means that the source of the problem may be discovered by asking the questionee to talk about his own culture, rather than by scrutinizing the text of the translation. Once the cultural presuppositions are understood, the translation can be revised to block misunderstandings, and steer the target audience towards accurate comprehension. This often involves making explicit some contextually focal elements of the source scenario.

All these factors help the checker understand the possible causes of misunderstandings, and seek appropriate solutions, so that the translation may not only be clear and natural, but understood accurately in line with the exegesis underlying the translation.

Thus scenario theory not only provides a conceptual model for explaining the storage and retrieval of data from memory, but also forms the basis for understanding the way communication works, by the audience interpreting the communicator’s text in the light of their own scenarios. Scenario theory is especially significant for understanding cross-cultural communication such as Bible translation. The insights of scenario theory can be applied in a formal structured way in both discourse analysis and translation, enabling interpretation of the source text in the light of the original author and audience’s scenarios, and restructuring of the original author’s message in the light of the target audience’s scenarios to ensure accurate comprehension.
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Appendix A
The content of scenarios for different types of concept

This appendix provides the sources and the rationale upon which I base the categories and contents listed in Chapter 2 "Scenario contents for things, events, attributes and relations".

One way of classifying concepts is by their conceptual nature. In this fourfold classification, every concept is either a "thing", an "event", an "attribute", or a "relation". Howard particularly notes the difference between concepts representing "things" (which he calls objects) and "events", two categories of scenario into which a fair amount of research has already been done (1987:23):

Concepts can be divided into a number of types. However there is no universally recognized taxonomy... Object concepts represent some physical thing at some location in real or imaginary space... Event concepts pertain to time. They represent a particular class or sequence of events... Some event categories are represented by scripts, because they constitute a more or less fixed sequence of events.

It is well established that grammatical parts of speech typically link with such different types of concept, e.g. nouns link with objects, verbs with events, adjectives and adverbs with qualities or attributes, prepositions and conjunctions with relationships between other types of concept (Carroll, 1964). However, it should be noted that "skewing" of this relationship between grammatical category and semantic category is also common. Some languages for example use grammatical verbs to convey attribute concepts. Similarly in any one language skewing is possible, e.g. English can use nouns to name "events", such as "birth" or "arrival".

In the fourfold categorization used here the typical link between concept and part of speech is as follows:
"thing" - noun (common, proper, or abstract) or pronoun
"event" - verb
"attribute" - adjective or adverb
"relation" - preposition or conjunction

As one would expect, the contents of scenarios vary significantly between "thing", "event", "attribute", and "relation" concepts, so they are treated separately.

The content of scenarios for "thing" words:

Typical contents of a "thing" scenario are detailed by Wierzbicka in her cognitive approach to making dictionary entries. She as it were spells out the contents of the scenario evoked by a particular word, e.g. for the word "tiger" (1988:495):

TIGER
A KIND OF ANIMAL
IMAGINING ANIMALS OF THIS KIND PEOPLE COULD SAY THESE THINGS ABOUT THEM:
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HABITAT
they live in the jungle
in places which are away from places where people live
in parts of the Earth where they don’t live people can see them in a zoo

SIZE
they are similar to cats in the way they look and in the way they move
but they are much bigger than cats
being more like people in size than cats

APPEARANCE
they have black stripes on a yellowish body
they have big sharp claws and big sharp teeth

BEHAVIOUR
they attack other animals and people and kill and eat them
they can move quickly and without noise like cats
and they can move easily in places where other big animals can’t
so that they can come close to people without people noticing them,
and attack people

RELATION TO PEOPLE
people are afraid of them, and think of them as fierce animals
[people also think of them as animals who know what they want and who know how to get it, and whom
one can’t help admiring because of that]

Note that Wierzbicka’s entry is not so much concerned with facts about tigers, but
rather with people’s beliefs about tigers, e.g. “people could say these things about them”.
As such it is both cognitive (i.e. based on people’s perceptions rather than absolute
“scientific” facts) and prototypical (i.e. based on generalities). For example there are white
tigers, and tame tigers. If the above entry were a strict definition of what tigers had to be,
then these would not be tigers at all. With Wierzbicka’s scenario-type entry for tigers,
these are tigers, because they fit the scenario in most ways, but they are not prototypical
tigers, which are black and yellowish, and fierce.

Contrast this to a typical dictionary definition of tiger, e.g. the Wordsworth Concise
English Dictionary (1994) which attempts to give a definition in terms of minimal
necessary conditions to qualify as a tiger: “a fierce striped Asiatic beast, one of the two
largest cats (Felis tigris); a ferocious or bloodthirsty person; a formidable opponent or
competitor (slang).” According to this kind of definition, it is impossible to have a tame
tiger, because once it is tame it no longer meets the criterion of “fierce”.

Wierzbicka’s entry, apart from being prototypical, not prescriptive, gives a wealth
of other information, and includes people’s understanding of tigers as “animals who know
what they want and who know how to get it, and whom one can’t help admiring because of
that.” This information explains the connection between a tiger and its metaphorical usage
as “a formidable opponent or competitor”. I propose that, for an English speaker, there are
metaphorical links between the scenario of “tiger” and the scenario of “human”,
specifically linking the concepts of a tiger’s ferociousness and ability to achieve its aims
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with similar attributes of humans, so that the tiger metaphor can refer to either a bloodthirsty person or a formidable opponent.

Thus in Wierzbicka’s dictionary entry for an animate object “tiger” we find several key concepts which would be found in the scenario. They are as follows:

- **TITLE**, i.e. tiger
- **GENERIC CATEGORY**, i.e. a kind of animal
- **HABITAT**
- **SIZE**
- **APPEARANCE**
- **BEHAVIOUR**
- **RELATION TO PEOPLE**

Similarly, in her dictionary entry for an inanimate object, “radish” Wierzbicka (1988:495) includes the following key concepts which would be found in the scenario:

- **TITLE** i.e. radish
- **GENERIC CATEGORY**: i.e. a kind of thing that people eat
- **ORIGIN**
- **SIZE**
- **APPEARANCE**
- **HOW EATEN**

By comparing these lists we can see that certain differences are due to the physical nature of the items being considered. Both lists include a title, generic category, size and appearance. However only the animate noun has the category of habitat, whereas the corresponding category for an inanimate object is origin. The animate object has the category behaviour, which is clearly inapplicable to an inanimate object. Similarly the animate object has the category relation to people, corresponding to the inanimate object’s category how eaten, which is a specific realization of the way that people interact with that specific object. Thus, in these two dictionary entries, Wierzbicka gives a brief glimpse at some of the contents of a scenario for a physical object. I suggest LOCATION as a more general category than HABITAT, and suggest that the category ORIGIN could be relevant to animate as well as inanimate things. Thus a typical scenario for a physical object would include these categories:

- **TITLE**
- **GENERIC CATEGORY**
- **LOCATION**
- **ORIGIN**
- **SIZE**
- **APPEARANCE**
- **BEHAVIOUR** if animate
- **RELATION TO PEOPLE** if animate
- **PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT** (e.g. how used)

These categories of information, which I propose are included in the scenarios of “things”, are very similar to lists of Michael Jordan and John Beekman, made in other contexts.

Michael Jordan, in the context of listing a “proposed system of clause relations in English”, lists under the heading “detail relations” types of relations which correspond closely to the categories suggested above for “thing” scenarios (1992:222):
Similarly Beekman, in the context of learning a foreign language, lists questions to ask for eliciting vocabulary relating to “things”. (Note that Beekman uses the word “objects” in the same sense as I am using “things”, “abstracts” in the same sense as I am using “attributes”, and “relationals” in the same sense as I am using “relations.”) In language learning one must discover not only individual words but their relationship with other words, the contexts they are used in, and the cultural suppositions and presuppositions associated with them. In other words, one must learn not only the word and its meaning as a minimal definition, but also its wider meaning, i.e. the whole scenario it evokes, and the other scenarios to which it is related. Thus Beekman suggests (1966:2):

2.1 To discover the meaning of object words

2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
   2.1.1.1 By kinship
   2.1.1.2 By role
   2.1.1.3 As a generic classifier or by class membership
   2.1.1.4 By part-whole relations
   2.1.1.5 By spatial relations
   2.1.1.6 By resemblance
   2.1.1.7 By opposition
   2.1.1.8 By causal agency

2.1.2 Ask for the event attributes of an object
   2.1.2.1 Behavioural attributes
   2.1.2.1 Functional attributes

2.1.3 Ask for the abstract attributes of objects
   2.1.3.1 Spatial attributes
   2.1.3.2 Temporal attributes
   2.1.3.3 Tactile attributes
   2.1.3.4 Visual attributes
   2.1.3.5 Audio attributes
   2.1.3.6 Olfactory attributes
   2.1.3.7 Gustatory attributes
   2.1.3.8 Quantitative attributes
   2.1.3.9 Qualitative or connotative attributes
   2.1.3.10 Sex attributes
   2.1.3.11 Substance attributes

It can be readily seen that these categories, which Beekman lists as helpful to discover the meaning of words, are closely related to the categories which Wierzbicka’s dictionary entries imply. i.e.

TITLE: the object in question

2.1 To discover the meaning of object words

GENERIC CATEGORY

2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
   2.1.1.1 By kinship
   2.1.1.3 As a generic classifier or by class membership
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LOCATION
2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
    2.1.1.5 By spatial relations

ORIGIN
2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
    2.1.1.8 By causal agency

SIZE
2.1.3 Ask for the abstract attributes of objects
    2.1.3.1 Spatial attributes

APPEARANCE
2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
    2.1.1.6 By resemblance
    2.1.3 Ask for the abstract attributes of objects
        2.1.3.2 Temporal attributes
        2.1.3.3 Tactile attributes
        2.1.3.4 Visual attributes
        2.1.3.5 Audio attributes
        2.1.3.6 Olfactory attributes
        2.1.3.7 Gustatory attributes
        2.1.3.8 Quantitative attributes
        2.1.3.9 Qualitative or connotative attributes
        2.1.3.10 Sex attributes
        2.1.3.11 Substance attributes

BEHAVIOUR if animate
2.1.2 Ask for the event attributes of an object
    2.1.2.1 Behavioural attributes

RELATION TO PEOPLE if animate
2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
    2.1.1.2 By role

PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT if inanimate (e.g. HOW EATEN, HOW USED)
    2.1.2.1 Functional attributes

This leaves only two of Beekman’s categories which are not included in Wierzbicka’s implicit or explicit categories, as below:
2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
    2.1.1.4 By part-whole relations
    2.1.1.7 By opposition

Beekman’s category 2.1.1.7, “objects related to the object by opposition” would consist of other members of the same generic category, and these would be accessible automatically from the current scenario through the link to the generic category. The generic category would be a separate scenario linked by generic-specific linkages to the scenarios for each of its members, of which the scenario for the object in question would be one.

To include all of Beekman’s categories then I propose that the scenario for a “thing” should include at least the following categories:

TITLE
GENERIC CATEGORY
PART-WHOLE RELATIONS (Beekman’s 2.1.1.4)
LOCATION
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ORIGIN
SIZE
APPEARANCE
BEHAVIOUR if animate
RELATION TO PEOPLE if animate
PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT (e.g. how used)

A similar range of information linked in one “thing” scenario is shown by Howard (1987:78-83). Howard comments on three theoretical models. First is the Teachable Language Comprehender (TLC) (1987:78-79):

It was put forward by Collins and Quillian (1969) basically as an artificial intelligence program. The model postulates that words and concepts exist in separate but connected systems. The concept system consists of nodes, each node representing one concept and linked to the word that labels it. The nodes in the concept system are connected to each other by lines called pointers. The concept node for robin connects to the node for bird with a pointer labelled ‘is a’. There are several other types of relation - ‘has a’ (a robin has a beak) ‘can’ (a robin can sing) are two.

The TLC includes categories such as generic (is a), part-whole relations (has a), appearance (is), and behaviour (can).

The second model is a revised version of TLC by Collins and Loftus (1975), called the ‘spreading activation’ model (Howard, 1987:80-81):

Their ‘spreading activation’ model has some of the TLC’s features but includes others to account for typicality, lack of complete cognitive economy, and the criticism of sparseness of relations. Each concept is again represented by a node, and the nodes are connected by labelled pointers. Concepts are, however, not organized hierarchically. They are organized by overall semantic similarity. The more similar two concepts are, the closer they are placed together in the network and the shorter the pointer becomes. Thus most people would perceive that cat and mouse are closer than cobra and typewriter.

This revised model allows for a wider range of relationships, such as location (lives on earth), and for semantic closeness to be marked by shortness of pointers, and “exemplar typicality” to be marked the same way, so robin is linked to bird by a shorter line that penguin is, since robin is closer to the prototypical bird that penguin is.

The third model, called “Elinor”, represents a mental network where the number of pointers is not limited (Howard, 1987:83-4):

This network model is quite a complex one that can represent large units of discourse (Norman and Rumelhart, 1975). It represents concepts by nodes and their relations by labelled pointers. The concept is represented by the word ‘tree’, but it is analogous to the concept node in the above models. There are a number of labelled relations from the concept to other nodes. Thus, a tree is a plant, has a trunk, has bark etc. Further labelled relations to other concepts can be specified and the network is again expansible in all directions.

Howard argues for a wide range of categories which could be linked to “thing” scenarios (1987:80):

Concepts can be related in many ways. Two relations looked at so far in this book are part inclusion and spatial/temporal order. Others include synonyms, antonyms and contradictories (see Chaffin and Herrmann, 1984). Semantic memory thus has an enormous number of possible relations.

These latter categories of synonyms, antonyms and contradictories can be defined in terms of links. Synonyms are words which are referentially linked to the same concept (e.g. iris, flag, fleur-de-lis). In practice most synonyms are words referentially linked to similar or largely overlapping scenarios (e.g. “woman” and “lady”, which share basic
elements in terms of componential analysis, i.e. +human +adult -male, but differ in terms of social situations they may be used in and collocations they may occur in). Antonyms and contradictories are related to another word by being linked to the same higher node but with one of their components of meaning being negative (e.g. “man” = +human +adult +male, “woman” = +human +adult -male), or by being at different extremes on a linear scale linked to the same higher node (e.g. “hot” and “cold” are at different extremes of a linear scale linked to the higher node “temperature”).

It should also be noticed that Beekman suggests the following procedures to determine the meaning of an “object” or “thing” word:

2.1.1 Ask for objects to which the object is related
2.1.2 Ask for the event attributes of an object
2.1.3 Ask for the abstract attributes of objects

This implies that the scenario for the “object” in question will be linked to the scenarios of all the objects, events, and abstracts which are discovered in this process.

The content of scenarios for “event” words:

Halliday (1994:106-175) states that scenarios for verb-type events, which he calls “the semantic framework for the representation of processes,” consist of three essential elements: the process itself (realized in texts by a verbal form), the participants (realized by actors or subjects, and goals or direct objects etc.), and circumstances (realized by adjuncts or circumstantial complements). In other words, whenever something happens, there are also people or things involved, and it also happens in a particular time, place and manner.

For certain events, there are very specific norms regarding the who, when, where and how of a given action. In many cases these norms are cultural not universal. One might for example see it as universal that the process “sing” could have as its participants people and birds, since (presumably) people sing in all cultures, and birds sing in all places. This may be true, but still the word used for people singing is not always used for the sound that birds make. For example:

English: sing, participants = people, birds, (whales?)
French: “chanter” sing, participants = people, birds
Parkari: “jauo” sing, participants = people

English: speak, participants = people
French: “parler” speak, participants = people
Parkari: “6olu” speak, participants = people, birds

Thus even where the actual action is identical, i.e. birds singing, the classification of that action is culture specific. Since the participants involved in “sing” and “talk” are different between English and French on the one hand and Parkari on the other, we cannot say that “sing” = “jauo” and “talk” = “6olu”. At the very basic level of participants, the scenarios for “sing” and “talk” are different in English and Parkari.
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Let look at some elements of the scenario for “obtaining drinking water”, comparing John 4 with Parkari and English scenarios.

Location:
- NT Greek: well (e.g. John 4:11)
- Parkari: well, canal (in irrigated areas only)
- English: tap, stand pipe (in emergencies)

Participants: agent
- Parkari: women and girls
- English: anyone (if tap), adults normally (if standpipe)

Participants: instrument
- NT Greek: waterpot (belonging to one’s own ethnic group) (John 4:28, 9)
- Parkari: waterpot (belonging to one’s own ethnic group)
- English: glass or jug (if tap), bucket (if standpipe)

Because of the mismatch between New Testament Greek and English expectations concerning obtaining drinking water, we are not naturally surprised to find Jesus asking a Samaritan woman to give him water (John 4:7). But the Samaritan woman was surprised (John 4:9), because he expected to use the wrong instrument, a waterpot belonging to someone else’s ethnic group. And a Parkari would be surprised, for the same reason, because their scenario matches the New Testament Greek one quite closely.

Similarly, because of the mismatch between New Testament Greek and English expectations about obtaining drinking water, we would not think there was enough information for the disciples to recognize the man Jesus sent them to, “a man carrying a pot of water” (Mark 14:13). But the disciples did not ask for more information, because the wrong participant, a man instead of a woman carrying a waterpot, was pretty distinctive. And a Parkari would think this description adequate, for the same reason, because their “semantic framework” matches the New Testament Greek one quite closely.

Similarly, let us compare just some elements of the scenario of “have a bath” between cultures.

Location:
- Parkari: river, canal (in irrigated areas only), behind hut
- English: bathroom

Participants: agent
- Parkari: men and boys (in river or canal) together
- women and girls (behind the hut) alone
- English: anyone (normally alone)

When Parkari men are talking together in the village after work, someone may say “Let’s go and have a bath!” Then they will leave the village and set off to the canal. The sentence is perfectly natural in the context of social friendship.

English men simply do not say “Let’s go and have a bath!” (unless they want to attract some odd looks), because bathing is normally done alone. Culturally, in England, only small children, or lovers share a bath. Consequently the “same” sentence in English has homosexual overtones. Also, when English men go for a bath, they normally go indoors, not outside.
So we can see that "the same sentence" spoken in different cultures does not in fact convey the same meaning, since it is inevitably spoken in the context of a whole inter-related series of cultural assumptions, which affect the way it is understood.

Because words evoke in our minds such scenarios, we do not understand what we hear or read in isolation. Take the sentence "John fired the gun at Harry." Lakoff and Johnson (1980:167) say about this:

We don’t understand sentences like these in vacuo. We understand them relative to certain larger categories of experience, for example, shooting someone, scaring someone, performing a circus act, or pretending to do any of these in a play or film or joke. Firing a gun can be an instance of any of these, and which is applicable will depend on the context. But there is only a small range of categories of experience that firing a gun fits into, the most typical of which is SHOOTING SOMEONE, since there are many typical ways to scare someone or perform a circus act but only one normal way to shoot someone.

In other words phrases such as "fire the gun" fit into one or more possible scenarios, larger chunks of information stored as a grouping in the brain. Lakoff and Johnson call these "experiential gestalts". This name emphasizes the fact that these scenarios are not limited culture-independent groupings, but ever-expanding experience-dependent groupings, which include a vast array of information, including participants, parts, stages, causation, and purpose. They state (1980:167):

We can thus view SHOOTING SOMEONE as an experiential gestalt with roughly the following dimensions, in this instance:

Participants: Shooter, target, instrument (gun) missile
Parts: Aiming, Firing, bullet hits target, target is wounded
Stages: Precondition: loaded
Beginning: aims
Middle: fires
End: bullet hits
Final state: target wounded
Causation: Beginning and middle enable end
Middle and end cause final state
Purpose: Goal: final state
Plan: meet precondition, perform beginning and middle

The sentence "John fired the gun at Harry" typically evokes a SHOOTING SOMEONE gestalt of this form.

Halliday’s “semantic framework for the representation of processes” (1994:106-175) had three elements:

- the process itself (realized in texts by a verbal form)
- the participants (realized by actors or subjects, and goals or direct objects etc.)
- the circumstances (realized by adjuncts or circumstantial complements).

However, the possible participants in an “event” scenario cannot be limited to just actors (agents) and goals. As Pike comments (1992:235):

Longacre (1983:174) has at least forty-eight different classes listed in his scheme of case frames for verbs.

If we combine Halliday’s “semantic framework” with the “dimensions” of the “experiential gestalt” as listed by Lakoff and Johnson above (1980:167) we get a rough framework for the scenario of an “event” word, e.g. “shooting someone”, as follows:
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TITLE: the process itself, e.g. "shooting someone"

PARTICIPANTS: actor or subject, e.g. "shooter" goal or direct object, e.g. "target" instrument, e.g. "gun" and "missile"

CIRCUMSTANCES: (adjuncts or circumstantial complements)

PART-WHOLE RELATIONS: parts: aiming, firing, bullet hits target, target is wounded

STAGES: (arranged in linear time order)
  precondition: loaded
  beginning: aims
  middle: fires
  end: bullet hits
  final state: target wounded

CAUSATION:
  beginning and middle enable end
  middle and end cause final state

PURPOSE:
  goal: final state
  plan: meet precondition, perform beginning and middle

To this could be added a GENERIC CATEGORY, e.g. "shooting someone" belongs to the generic category of "killing someone", "walking" to the generic category of "moving". Thus a fuller prototypical scenario pattern for an event would be:

TITLE
GENERIC CATEGORY
PARTICIPANTS
CIRCUMSTANCES
PART-WHOLE RELATIONS
  PARTS
  STAGES
CAUSATION
PURPOSE

This can be compared with a prototypical scenario for a "thing" word as developed above:

TITLE
GENERIC CATEGORY
PART-WHOLE RELATIONS
  LOCATION
  ORIGIN
  SIZE
  APPEARANCE
  BEHAVIOUR if animate
  RELATION TO PEOPLE if animate
  PEOPLE'S RELATION TO IT if inanimate (e.g. HOW EATEN, HOW USED)

The "participants" category for an "event" scenario would be linked to various "thing" scenarios. Likewise the "behaviour", "relation to people" and "people's relation to it" categories for a "thing" scenario would be linked to various "event" scenarios. For example, in the participant category of the "event" scenario "shooting someone" the instrument slot is linked to the "thing" scenario for "gun." Likewise in the "thing" scenario for "gun" the "people's relation to it (how used)" is linked to the "event" scenario "shooting someone."
The participant category for event scenarios is developed by Fillmore (1982b) as frames. The network model “Elinor”, mentioned above, has the participant category as a core element (Howard, 1987:84):

This network model is quite a complex one that can represent large units of discourse (Norman and Rumelhart, 1975). [Figure] B gives a network for the event concept help. Again the concept is shown in the labelled node, and it has pointers to other concepts. These are labelled: location, agent, time, and recipient. Thus the simple network gives a schema that can be instantiated by a given case of help. The subject can fill in the slot for location, the time the event occurred, who actually did the helping, and who was helped. More complex event concepts can again be represented with more pointers.

Jordans in his “proposed system of clause relations in English” lists several groupings which correspond closely to the above suggested contents of an “event” scenario (1992:222):

1.2. General Relations
ACTIVE, PASSIVE, AGENT, SOURCE.

1.3 Logical Relations
ASSEMENT, BASIS, CAUSE, EFFECT, EMOTIVE EFFECT, PURPOSE, MEANS, PROBLEM, SOLUTION.

1.5 Time Relations
TIME, BEFORE, AFTER, SIMULTANEOUS, INVERTED TIME.

1.6 Other Substantive Relations
ACCOMPANIMENT, CIRCUMSTANCE, INVERTED CIRCUMSTANCE, CONNECTION, ENABLEMENT, EXAMPLE, EXTENT, LOCATION, INVERTED LOCATION, MANNER, TRUE.

Jordan’s General Relations and Other Substantive Relations correlate to participant roles, or frames relating to “event” scenarios. His Logical Relations correlate to suggested purpose and cause/effect type categories within script-type scenarios. The Time Relations correlate to sequential events within script-type scenarios.

Similarly, just as Beekman made suggestions for discovering the meaning of object words, so he also made suggestions for discovering the meaning of event words, by eliciting information which belongs in the scenario for that event (1966:2):

2.2 To discover the meaning of event words
2.2.1 Ask for object participants of an event
2.2.1.1 Events have agents or actors
2.2.1.2 Events have goals (direct objects)
2.2.1.3 Events have benefactives (indirect objects)
2.2.1.4 Events have instruments by which the event is carried out
2.2.2 Ask for the events to which an event is related
2.2.2.1 As a classifier or by class membership
2.2.2.2 Antecedent (purpose, motive, intention, reason, occasion, grounds, cause or condition)
2.2.2.3 Simultaneous (means, manner, occasion)
2.2.2.4 Subsequent (event, result, consequence)
2.2.2.5 By synonymy
2.2.2.6 By antonymy
2.2.3 Ask for the abstracts to which an event is related
2.2.3.1 Temporal
2.2.3.2 Spatial
2.2.3.3 Intensity
2.2.3.4 Appraisive or evaluative
2.2.3.5 Manner

We can see that the information Beekman seeks to gain is closely related to the categories of Halliday’s “semantic framework” and Lakoff and Johnson’s “dimensions” of the “experiential gestalt” and, by adding a generic category as above, we can merge them as follows:
TITLE: the event
2.2 To discover the meaning of event words

PARTICIPANTS
2.2.1 Ask for object participants of an event
   2.2.1.1 Events have agents or actors
   2.2.1.2 Events have goals (direct objects)
   2.2.1.3 Events have benefactives (indirect objects)
   2.2.1.4 Events have instruments by which the event is carried out

GENERIC CATEGORY
2.2.2 Ask for the events to which an event is related
   2.2.2.1 As a classifier or by class membership

PART-WHOLE RELATIONS - PARTS - STAGES
2.2.2.4 Subsequent (event, result, consequence)

CIRCUMSTANCES
2.2.2 Ask for the events to which an event is related
   2.2.2.3 Simultaneous (means, manner, occasion)
   2.2.3 Ask for the abstracts to which an event is related
   2.2.3.1 Temporal
   2.2.3.2 Spatial
   2.2.3.3 Intensity
   2.2.3.4 Appraisive or evaluative
   2.2.3.5 Manner

CAUSATION
PURPOSE
   2.2.2.2 Antecedent (purpose, motive, intention, reason, occasion, grounds, cause or condition)

Only two of Beekman’s categories are not accounted for in the scenario structure formed by combining Halliday’s categories with Lakoff and Johnson’s categories. They are:
   2.2.2.5 By synonymy
   2.2.2.6 By antonymy

These however are related to the scenario by the GENERIC CATEGORY link. Synonyms and antonyms will belong to the same generic category at some higher level, with the scenarios of synonyms being linked to each other with an “A=B” linkage, and the scenarios of antonyms being linked to each other with an “A is the opposite of B” linkage.

Thus a full scenario for an “event” word would include the following types of category:
TITLE: the “event”

PARTICIPANTS:
   agent/actor
   goal/direct object
   benefactives/indirect object
   instrument

GENERIC CATEGORY:

CIRCUMSTANCES: (adjuncts or circumstantial complements)
   (including: means, manner, occasion: related to attributes such as temporal, spatial, intensity, appraisive or evaluative, manner)

PART-WHOLE RELATIONS:

PARTS: discrete elements of the “event”

STAGES: (arranged in linear time order)
   Precondition
   Beginning
   Middle
   End
   Final state

CAUSATION:
   Beginning and middle enable end
   Middle and end cause final state
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PURPOSE:
Goal: final state
(including: purpose, motive, intention, reason, occasion, grounds, cause or condition)
Plan: meet precondition, perform beginning and middle

The content of scenarios for “attribute” words:

Beekman lists questions for discovering the meanings of “attributes”, which he calls “abstracts”, as follows (1966:2):
2.3 To discover the meaning of abstracts
   2.3.1 Ask for the objects to which an abstract is related
   2.3.1 Ask for the events to which an abstract is related
   2.3.1 Ask for the abstracts to which an abstract is related

I propose that “attribute” words or “abstracts” have little information in their scenarios but multiple linkages to other scenarios, especially those of “things” or “events.” For example, the scenario of the attribute “loud” would be linked with:
“event” scenarios such as “shout”, “bellow”, “thunder”, “clatter”
“thing” scenarios such as “pop group”, “megaphone”, “amplifier”
“attribute” scenarios such as “noisy” by a synonym link
“soft” “quiet” by an antonym link
“raucous” by a co-occurrence link

The actual content of a scenario for “loud” would probably contain physiological information such as “makes this kind of impression on the ear drum” together with propositional information such as “easy to hear” “unpleasant to hear.”

The physiological information would be sensations that the word “loud” was as it were “attached to” so that one could identify the loudness of something. The propositional information contains prototypical concepts about loudness which are necessary for certain statements to be meaningful, e.g.
“Speak louder, I can’t hear you.” (“loud” = “easy to hear”)
“I can’t stand loud music.” (“loud” = “unpleasant to hear.”)

The content of scenarios for “relation” words:

Beekman lists no questions for discovering the meanings of “relation” words, which he calls “relationals.” However he makes some significant comments as follows (1996:10):
2.4 To discover the meaning or function of relationals ....
Study relationals as found within sentences and native texts. The semantic class known as relationals is not amenable to elicitation through questions. It is always preferable to study relationals in native text materials. After one has discovered explicit relationals from these sources, one may then ask the native to use the relational in various sentences.

Beekman’s advice for discovering the meaning of “relation” words gives some clues as to their possible relationship to scenarios. He comments that they cannot be discovered readily by straight elicitation. In other words we cannot readily ask: “What
does ‘because’ mean?” or “What is the meaning of ‘from’?” This would seem to mean that the “relation” words do not have a scenario as such.

Similarly Beekman advises that their meaning be studied in “various sentences”. This is a clue that “relation” words operate in a wider field than a single scenario. Whereas “thing” and “event” words can be conceived as central to a scenario involving related concepts which experientially co-occur, it is hard to think of “relation” words as having a core. For example, we cannot answer the question “What concepts naturally cluster with ‘because’?” The question is totally open-ended, since almost everything happens “because” of something else.

The very name of this semantic grouping gives us a clue. They are “relation” words, and as such their role is to link different concepts together according to the relationship between them. I propose therefore that the “relation” words are primarily attached to types of link, both between concepts in the same scenario, and between different scenarios. In other words “relation” words do not have scenarios attached to them, but name different types of internal links within scenarios, and external links between scenarios. How would this work?

*English “relation” words and other relation markers*

Taking a prototypical scenario for a “thing” word as developed above, the following “relation” words might function as markers of scenario categories, i.e. the internal links within scenarios:

**TITLE**

**GENERIC CATEGORY**

“of” “sort of” “kind of” “like” “similar”

**PART-WHOLE RELATIONS**

“of” “part of” “together with”

**LOCATION**

“in” “at” “on” “under” “near”

**ORIGIN**

“from”

**SIZE**

“like” “more” “less”

**APPEARANCE**

“like”

**BEHAVIOUR if animate**

“because” “in order to” “then”

**RELATION TO PEOPLE if animate**

“with” “against” “for”

**PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT (e.g. how used)**

The categories “BEHAVIOUR” and “PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT” are not typified in English by relation words, but by grammatical slot, i.e. BEHAVIOUR typically corresponds to the “thing” being in the subject slot, and PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT typically corresponds to the “thing” being in the direct object slot.

Taking a prototypical scenario for an “event” word as developed above, the following “relation” words might function as markers of internal links. (Some of these links may typically be marked by cases or varying word order in different languages):

**TITLE**

**PARTICIPANTS**

agent/actor “who” (or case, or word order)

goal/direct object “by” (with passive constructions)

benefactives/indirect object “to” “for” (or case, or word order)
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instrument  "with"

GENERIC CATEGORY: "of" "sort of" "kind of" "like" "similar"

CIRCUMSTANCES: (adjuncts or circumstantial complements)
(related to simultaneous events including: means, manner, occasion, and to attributes such as
temporal, spatial, intensity, appraisive or evaluative, manner)
"by" (adverb -ly) "through" "as" "whilst" "when" "because" "on" "in" "up" "down" "near" etc.

PART-WHOLE RELATIONS: "of" "part of" "together with"

PARTS: discrete elements of the "event" "and"

STAGES: (arranged in linear time order)
Precondition  "if" "then"
Beginning  "first"
Middle  "then" "next" "afterwards"
End  "finally"
Final state  "so" "therefore"

CAUSATION:
Beginning and middle enable end  "since" "in order to"
Middle and end cause final state  "therefore" "consequently"

PURPOSE:
Goal: final state
(include: purpose, motive, intention, reason, occasion, grounds, cause or condition)
"in order to" "so that" "since" "when" "because" "if"
Plan: meet precondition, perform beginning and middle
"if" "then" "thus"
# Appendix B

## Greek “relation” words and other relationship markers

This appendix gives examples of Greek “relation” words (such as prepositions) and other morphemes and syntactical devices which are used to mark semantic relationships within and between scenarios. The examples below are not meant to be exhaustive lists but are rather intended to show the way that Greek grammar and lexicon interlinks with the concept of semantically structured scenarios, described in Chapter 2 “Scenario contents for things, events, attributes and relations”.

Taking a prototypical scenario for a “thing” word as developed above, the following “relation” words, cases, or syntactic devices might function as markers of internal links within scenarios in New Testament Greek. Since we cannot use native intuition as guidance, we must rely on textual evidence. Here is a partial chart of “relation” words, taken mainly from 1 Corinthians 12:12-27 where the μέλος “bodily part” scenario is open. Cases and syntactic devices are given in parenthesis, and only verse numbers are quoted, unless the reference is elsewhere in the New Testament:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>μέλος “bodily part” occurs 13 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 x 2, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26 x 4, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περί “concerning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περί δὲ τῶν παρθένων “Now concerning virgins” (1 Corinthians 7:25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Category</strong></td>
<td>μέλος, ποδός, χείρ “bodily part ... foot ... hand” (14, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>όσος, ὀφθαλμός “ear ... eye” (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πάντα “all”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πάντα τὰ μέλη “all the parts” (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκαστὸς “each”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν ἐκαστῶν ἄντων “each one of them” (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἄλλης ὁμοιότης “one another”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὑπὲρ ἄλλης ὁμοιότης “for one another” (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-Whole Relations</strong></td>
<td>τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος “the parts of the body” (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκ “from” ἐκ τοῦ σώματος “part of the body” (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μέρος “part” μέρους “individually” (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πολλά, ἐν many, one πολλά μὲν μέλη, ἐν δὲ σώμα “many parts, one body” (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>συν “together” συνεκεφαλίσκον “blended together” (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>ἐν “in” ἐν τῷ σώματι “in the body” (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origin</strong></td>
<td>ὁ θεὸς ἐθέτο τὰ μέλη “God placed the bodily parts” (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δοσος “as much as” τὸ μήκος ἀντὶς δοσον τὸ πλάτος “its length as much as its breadth” (Revel 21:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appearance</strong></td>
<td>ἀσχημών “unpresentable” (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εὐσχημόνων “presentable” (23) (contrast of like/unlike)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviour if animate</strong></td>
<td>i.e. agent participant of verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τὸ οὖς ὀρχεῖ “the ear hears” (implied by 16, 17, cf. 1 Corinthians 2:9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation to People if animate</strong></td>
<td>ἔχει ὁμοιότητι τῆς χειρὸς ἀντὶο “a viper fastened onto his hand” (Acts 28:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People’s Relation to it</strong></td>
<td>i.e. how used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τιμῆν ... περιτίθεμεν “we honour” (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking a prototypical scenario for an “event” word as developed above, the following “relation” words, cases or syntactical devices might function as markers of internal links:

**TITLE:** (abstract noun) διάστασις “resurrection” (1 Corinthians 15:12)

**PARTICIPANTS:**
- agent/actor: τίς ὁ ποιήσας... “Who knew the Lord’s mind?” (Romans 11:34)
- partitive: τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν... “For who knew the Lord’s mind?” (Luke 11:13)
- verbal suffix: ἔπληκτος “I beseech” (Romans 12:1)
- ὑπὸ “by” (with passive): ἐπάθησε... “You will be betrayed by parents...” (Luke 21:16)

**goal/direct object**
- (nominative): τί “what” τί ὁ ποιήσας “What therefore should I do?” (Matthew 27:22)
- (acquisitive): τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν... “For who knew the Lord’s mind?” (Romans 11:34)

**benefactive/indirect object**
- (dative): δώσει... “will give... to those asking him” (Luke 11:13)

**instrument**
- (dative): ἐπέκτησε... “pierced... with a spear” (John 19:37)

**GENERIC CATEGORY:**
- (verbal prefixes) e.g. specific verbs from the generic ἐρχόμαι “come, go”
  - εἰς “into” εἰσέρχομαι “go into, enter” (Matthew 8:5)
  - ἀπὸ “from” ἀπέρχομαι “go away” (Matthew 8:18)
  - ἐκ “out from” ἐξέρχομαι “go out from” (Matthew 28:8)
  - κατὰ “down” κατέρχομαι “go down” (Acts 13:4)

**CIRCUMSTANCES:** (adjuncts or circumstantial complements)
- means
  - (post-verbal aorist participle): ὑπὸν σεαυτὸν καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ “save yourself by coming down from the cross” (Mark 15:30)

- manner
  - (post-verbal aorist participle): προσευκέθησαν... “let them pray... anointing (him) with oil” (James 5:14)
  - (adverbials -ος): ἀπεριστάτως “indiscreetly” (1 Corinthians 7:35)
  - ὑπὸς “thus” ὑπὸς ὁ προσευκέθησαν ὡς ἑαυτοίς “Therefore pray thus” (Matthew 6:9)
  - ὡς “as” ὡς μὴ κλαίετες “as if not weeping...” (1 Corinthians 7:30)
  - ἐν “in” ἐν λαύρῳ “with cheerfulness, cheerfully” (Romans 12:8)

- occasion
  - (dative): τῇ δὲ μὴν σαββάτῳ “on the first day of the week” (John 20:1)
  - ἐν “on” ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ “on the Sabbath” (John 19:31)

- temporal
  - δὲ “when” δὲ... “when he... took” (John 19:30)
  - ὡς “when” ὡς ἐδοξοῦν “When they saw...” (John 19:33)

- spatial
  - ἐν “on” ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ “on the cross” (John 19:31)

- intensity
  - ὡς δὲ... “greatly” ἐξεβιβάζοντο σοφὸν “they feared greatly” (Matthew 27:54)

- appraisive or evaluative
  - καλός “well” καλὸς “well...” “You do well in saying...” (John 4:17)

**PART-WHOLE RELATIONS:**

**PARTS:** discrete elements of the “event”
- (juxtaposition): ἔστησεν... “rest, eat, drink, be merry” (Luke 12:19)

**STAGES:** (arranged in linear time order)
- (lexical order)
  - (with καὶ “and”) ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἶναι τὸν βάλλεται “is chopped down and thrown into the fire” (Matthew 3:10)
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(with negative) οὗ σποilotouσαι οὔτε θερόλογον οὔτε συνάγων τοις ἀποθήκαις
“neither sow, nor reap, nor gather into barns” (Matthew 6:26)
(aorist participle plus verb) δὲ ἔγερθη καὶ παρελαβεν τὸ παιδίου
“He got up and took the child” (Matthew 2:21)

Precondition
εἰ “if” εἰ τὰ δύο, δοκήσαν ὡς “if you can, help us” (Mark 9:22)
(lexical order) δύο φθορίων βάλε τὸν στόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
“someone broadcasts seed on the earth” (Mark 4:28)

Beginning
πρῶτον “first” ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον
“the earth produces corn, first the stalk...” (Mark 4:28)

Middle
εἰτα “then” εἰτα στάχθην “... then the ear ...” (Mark 4:28)

End
εἰτα “then” εἰτα πληρώσαντες ἐν τῷ στάχθην
“...then the full grain in the ear.” (Mark 4:28)

ζητερον “lastly” ζητερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοῖς τῶν ὕλων αὐτοῦ
“lastly he sent his own son to them” (Matthew 21:37)

Final state
καί “and” ἐπευρεσαν αὐτοὶ καὶ προσεκοπῶσαν τῇ ὄλῃ ἑκκλησίᾳ, καὶ ἐπέσεν
“the winds blew and battered that house and it fell” (Matthew 7:27)

CAUSATION:
Mediated action
ἐν “via” ἐκάλησεν θημὶν ἐν ὑλῇ “he spoke to us by a son” (Hebrews 1:2)
διὰ “via” τὸ ἤτηθα ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου
“the word spoken by God through the prophet” (Matthew 2:15)
(with verb of sending) Ἡρῴδης ... ἀποστείλας ἄνευλεν πάντας τοῖς παιδας
(Lit. having sent killed) “had all the boys killed.” (Matthew 2:16)
(unmarked) Σολομῶν δὲ ἀκοδόμησεν αὐτῷ ὀλιγαν
“But Solomon built a house for him” (i.e. had it built) (Acts 7:47)

Direct causation
(imperative passive) καθαρίσθητε: “be made clean!” (Matthew 8:3)
ποιεῖ “make, cause” τὸς καφεῖας ποιεῖ ἅκοθεῖν
“he makes the deaf hear” (Mark 7:37)

Result: Beginning and middle enable end
δοτε (plus infinitive) “so” τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν ἔλε γὸ τὸ πλόον,
δοτε ἠπὸ γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλόον. “the waves beat against the boat,
so the boat was now filling” (Mark 4:37)

καί “and” καὶ ἧσαν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἄφηκεν αὐτὴν δὲ παρετέω
“and he touched her hand and the fever left her” (Matthew 8:15)

PURPOSE:
Goal: final state:
Plan: meet precondition, perform beginning and middle
purpose, motive, intention,
(infinite) δὲ Ἡρῴδης ἐκτίθη ἐλα τὴν ἐρημοῦ ... πείρασθηναι
“Jesus was led into the desert ... to be tempted” (Matthew 4:1)
(infinite in genitive) μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἐπιθύμει τὸ παιδίου τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτὸ.
“for Herod intends to seek the child to kill him” (Matthew 2:13)
δοτε (plus infinitive) “in order to” ἠρεγον αὐτῶν, δοτε κατακρίνεσαι αὐτῶν
“They led him ... in order to throw him down” (Luke 4:29)
καί “in order that” εἰπὲ ἵνα ἲτα αὐτοῖς ἄρτοι γενέσται,
“command that these stones become loaves” (Matthew 4:33)
εἰς “for” προσέδεχον τὸ δάρων ... εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτῶς.
“offer the sacrifice ... as a testimony to them” (Matthew 8:4)

reason
διὰ “because of, due to” γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ... διὰ τὸν λόγον
“when trouble ... arises because of the Word” (Matthew 13:21)

occasion
(present participle) οὗ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχουσαν πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν
“those running in a race all run” (1 Corinthians 9:24)
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grounds

διὰ “because of, on account of” διὰ δὲ τὰς πορείας
“(should be married) because of immorality” (1 Corinthians 7:2)

διὰ “because” διαστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, διὰ παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός
“he puts in the sickle because the harvest is near” (Mark 4:29)

γάρ “for” Φέρουμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὕριον γάρ ἀποθηκεύομεν.
“Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die” (1 Corinthians 15:32)

οὖν “therefore” Οὐκ ἐστιν νυκτὸς ... ἀρα οὖν μὴ καθεύδωμεν
“We are not of the night ... Therefore let us not sleep” (1 Thessalonians 5:5-6)

cause

(infinitive in dative) “because” οὐκ ἐσερα ἐνεργὸν ... τῷ μὴ αἵρεσι με Τιτόν
“I had no peace...because I did not find Titus” (2 Corinthians 2:13)

condition

ἐὰν “if” Ἐὰν ἦλθε εἰ τῷ θεῷ, εἶπὲ ... “If you are the son of God, command ...” (Matthew 4:3)

Just as there are labelled links within scenarios, so links between different
scenarios would also have relational labels, e.g. “leprosy” is linked to “ritual-impurity” by
a variety of labels such as conditional “if” ... “then”, and reason-result “because” ... “then”.
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English and Greek examples of relational links

This appendix gives examples of the relational links proposed in Chapter 2 “Links between items in scenarios and between scenarios”. I use English examples for argumentation, since these are readily open to evaluation. I also give examples from New Testament Greek, on the grounds that textual collocation provides evidence of semantic linking.

There are the following sections: Relational links between items in “thing” scenarios, “event” scenarios, “attribute” scenarios, and “relation” scenarios, plus the co-occurrence link, the metaphorical link, the metonymic link and the synonymy link, each of which can apply to any type of scenario.

Relational links between items in “thing” scenarios

**GENERIC CATEGORY:** (applies to “thing” and “event” scenarios)

**specific-generic link** “of” “sort of” “kind of”

(links “thing” to “thing” or “event” to “event”)

“tiger” links with “animal” by a specific-generic link

πῶς “foot” links with μέλας “bodily part” by a specific-generic link (1 Cor. 12:14, 15)

ἀστέρι “star” links with στοιχεῖα ἐπουράνιον “celestial body” by a specific-generic link (1 Cor. 15:40, 41)

This specific-generic link is directional, i.e. a generic-specific link is not a different kind of link, but the same link used in reverse, e.g. “animal” links with “tiger” by the same specific-generic link, but with “animal” at the generic end of the link.

**specific-specific link** “both are kinds of”

(links “thing” to “thing” or “event” to “event”)

“tiger” links with “elephant” by a specific-specific link (both wild animals)

πῶς “foot” links with χέρι “hand” by a specific-specific link (1 Cor. 12:15)

ἀστέρι “star” links with ἥλιος “sun” by a specific-specific link (1 Cor. 15:40, 41)

Possibly there is no separate specific-specific link as such, rather the items are simply joined to the same conceptual node by a specific-generic link, e.g. tiger, elephant, giraffe, zebra are all wild animals. This link is valid even if the shared generic node is several layers higher in the hierarchy, e.g.

“tiger” links with “jellyfish” by a specific-specific link (both animate, although not both wild animals)

**similarity link** “like” “similar”

(links “thing” to “thing” or “event” to “event”)

“cup” links with “mug” by a similarity link

κάλαμος “reed” links with ἄνθεος “staff” by a similarity link (Rev. 11:1)

λίθος “stone” links with μέλας “millstone” by a similarity link (Rev. 18:21)
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Typically "things" joined by a similarity link are in the same generic category and closely related in size, appearance, behaviour or function, i.e. "people's relation to it", e.g. "tiger" links with "leopard" by a similarity link (both belong to the cat family)

NOT "tiger" links with "elephant" by a similarity link (though both belong to the generic group "wild animal")

Possibly then the above examples are not linked by a similarity link as such, but rather they are simply joined to the same node or "family group" within the larger generic hierarchy, e.g. tiger, leopard, lion, panther, cheetah, cat, are linked by a specific-generic link to "cat family" as the next scenario or node, and "cat family" (along with "dog family", "pachyderms" etc.) is linked by a specific-generic link to "wild animals", and "wild-animals" is linked by a specific-generic link to "animals."

The specific-generic link is valid irrespective of the number of nodes, e.g.
- a tiger is a kind of cat
- a tiger is a kind of wild animal
- a tiger is a kind of animal

AND
- a cup is a kind of drinking vessel
- a cup is a kind of pot
- a cup is a kind of man-made article

However, the specific-generic hierarchy does not allow the similarity link as valid for more than one nodal group, e.g.
- a tiger is like a leopard (as both are a kind of cat)
  BUT NOT (normally)
- a tiger is like an elephant (though both are a kind of wild animal)
- a tiger is like a cow (though both are a kind of animal)

AND
- a cup is like a mug (as both are a kind of drinking vessel)
  BUT NOT (normally)
- a cup is like a plate (though both are pots)
- a cup is like a spade (though both are man-made articles)

The similarity link, whether direct, or implicit (by virtue of sharing the same node via specific-generic links) seems to presuppose a common form or function for the linked items, on the basis of which they are categorized in the same generic subset. One would expect the common form or function, if culturally relevant, to be formalized as a conceptual node in the generic scenario to which all the scenarios being regarded as similar are linked. Thus the categories of SIZE, APPEARANCE, and BEHAVIOUR, RELATION TO PEOPLE, and PEOPLE'S RELATION TO THEM will contain certain nodes which are shared by items in the same subset.

I propose this rule for an implicit similarity link: Where any two concepts have the same type of link to a common node, this functions as a similarity link. This definition allows similarity links between items which are not of the same generic subset, so long as they share a node. (See the sections entitled "similarity link" below.)

PART-WHOLE RELATIONS: (applies to "thing" and "event" scenarios)

part-whole link "part of"

(links "thing" to "thing" or "event" to "event")
- "bumper" links with "car" by a part-whole link
Appendix C - English and Greek examples of relational links

ὁφθαλμὸς “eye” links with σῶμα “body” by a part-whole link (1 Cor. 12:16)
στέγη “roof” links with ὀίκος “house” by a part-whole link (Mark 2:4, 1)

part-part link “together with”
(links “thing” to “thing” or “event” to “event”)
“tail” links with “leg” by a part-part link
ὁδὸς “road” links with ὁφθαλμὸς “eye” by a part-part link (1 Cor. 12:16)
στέγη “roof” links with θύρα “door” by a part-part link (Mark 2:4, 2)

Possibly there is no part-part link as such, rather the items are simply joined to the same node by a part-whole link, e.g. bumper, bonnet, engine, boot, chassis are each linked by a part-whole link to “car” as the larger scenario or higher node. Likewise, tail, leg, eye, ear, hand, foot are each linked by a part-whole link to “animal.”

There is a question here as to what level of scenario these items are linked to. Suppose it is a dog’s tail in question. Does the dog scenario contain the information “tail” filed in its “part-whole relations category”? Or is the information “tail” filed in the “part-whole relations category” of the scenario “animal”. I propose that this information is stored at both the “dog” and “animal” level. The former by direct experience, the latter by making generalizations from developing experience. If this is so then the fact that dogs (prototypically) have tails is available in the “dog” scenario and also retrievable via specific-generic links. The scenario “dog” is linked by a specific-generic link to “dog family”, which is linked by a specific-generic link to “wild animals”, which is linked by a specific-generic link to “animals.”

I propose that information which prototypically belongs to many linked scenarios is eventually stored in the highest hierarchical level available. It will probably be also stored from direct experience in many scenarios at lower levels, but for scenarios with no such entry, the information is made available through linking. For example, I cannot mentally picture an African wild dog, but I assume it has a tail since it is an animal. Where a particular specific does not share a given prototypical characteristic of its generic grouping, then that information is stored as an exception at the appropriate level.

For example, the nodal scenario with the title “ape” has a section which shows its generic category. The scenario “ape” is linked by a specific-generic link to “monkeys”, which is linked by a specific-generic link to “wild animals”, which is linked by a specific-generic link to “animals”. From this specific-generic link one would expect the prototypical ape to have a tail, like the prototypical animal, since everything in the higher generic category is assumed to apply to the lower specific categories. But no apes have tails, so the nodal scenario with the title “ape” has an entry in the category “part-whole” which simply states “no tail”. There is no need to store all the “part-whole” information in the scenario of each animal. All that information is available via the specific-generic links. What must be stored in the scenario is the exceptions, where the specific differs from the generic. Since this “no tail” information is stored at the generic level of “ape”, all scenarios...
linked to the “ape” scenario by specific-generic links (such as “chimpanzee” “gorilla” “orangutan”) do not necessarily have a “no tail” entry. If a person has seen any of these apes, or been told that they have no tail, then there will probably be a “no tail” entry in that scenario, but otherwise this information is probably retrieved from a higher level if required. This information is available since the scenarios for specific types of ape are linked to the nodal generic scenario of “ape”.

Similarly, although prototypically cats have tails, Manx cats do not. Since the scenario for Manx cat is linked by a specific-generic link to “cat family”, which is linked by a specific-generic link to “wild animals”, which is linked by a specific-generic link to “animals,” one would expect the Manx cat to have a tail. So the entry “no tail” must be stored in the “part-whole” category of the “Manx cat” scenario.

There is linguistic evidence to support this kind of information storage at the highest relevant level combined with linkage to lower levels, and exceptions stored at the highest relevant level. For example people say “Apes are like monkeys with no tail.” but are not so likely to say “Monkeys are like apes with tails.” Monkeys are perceived as the norm, because they share the characteristic of tailed-ness with most animals. Apes are the exception. Similarly people do not say, when asked to describe a thief, “He had hair and two legs.” That information is assumed, because a thief is prototypically human, and humans prototypically have hair and two legs. However people may well say, “He was bald and had one leg.” This information deviates from the prototypical. It negates prototypical assumptions about the thief which come simply by virtue of his being linked by a specific-generic link to the scenario “human”. As exceptions to the norm, such facts constitute relevant information.

**LOCATIVE** (applies to “thing” scenarios)

**locative link** “in” “on” “under” etc.

(links “thing” to “thing”)

“submarine” links with “sea” by a locative link “under”

πλοκῷπον “boat” links with λίμνη “lake” by a locative link παρά “by” (Luke 5:2)

Θηρίον “wild animal” links with ἔρημος “desert” by a locative link ἐν “in” (Mark 1:13)

**ORIGIN** (applies to “thing” scenarios)

**origin link** “from”

(links “thing” to “thing”)

“bird” links with “egg” by an origin link

οὐρος “grain” links with σπόρος “seed” by an origin link (Mark 4:28)

ἀνθρώπος “person” links with κοιλα “womb” by an origin link (John 3:4)

**SIZE, APPEARANCE, BEHAVIOUR, RELATION TO PEOPLE, PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT** relate to several types of link. First I will list the types of scenarios that may be joined, by what kind of link, then give examples of each kind of link.
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SIZE (applies to “thing” scenarios)
“things” may link with “things” by a similarity link
“things” may link with “attributes” by an attribute link

APPEARANCE (applies to “thing” scenarios)
“things” may link with “things” by a similarity link
“things” may link with “attributes” by an attribute link

BEHAVIOUR if animate (applies to “thing” scenarios)
“things” may link with “things” by a similarity link
“things” may link with “attributes” by an attribute link
“things” may link with “events” by an agent link

similarity link?
(links “thing” to “thing”)
“jackal” links with “vulture” by a similarity link (both scavengers)
\( \lambda \rho \varsigma \) “rainbow” links with \( \sigma \mu \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \beta \varsigma \) “emerald” by a similarity link
(Revelation 4:3) (similar appearance)
\( \chi _{d} \) “flesh, human body” links with \( \chi _{\rho \tau \sigma} \) “grass” by a similarity link
(1 Peter 1:24) (similar short existence)

The items in these examples do not belong to the same generic subset, and there is only one point of similarity in focus, e.g. for “jackal” and “vulture” the similarity link would connect only the information “scavenges” from the category “behaviour.”

The existence of a distinct “similarity link” however needs investigating. Possibly, as suggested above, any items linked by the same relationship to a common node are automatically given an implicit “similarity link.” Compare the following analyses:

Explicit similarity link:
“giraffe” links with “bus” by a similarity link
(connecting only the category “size: height”)
“lizard” links with “crocodile” by a similarity link
(connecting only the category “appearance: shape”)
“jackal” links with “vulture” by a similarity link
(connecting only the category “behaviour: eating”)

Implicit similarity link:
The “size: height” category for both “bus” and “giraffe” are each linked to the “attribute” scenario “height”, and specifically linked to a point on a scale at a value of roughly “three times a man’s height.” These links of the same type to the same point in a common node function as a similarity link.

The “appearance: shape” category for both “lizard” and “crocodile” are each linked to the “attribute” scenario “shape”, specifically linked to a mental image of “prototypical reptile shape” via the specific-generic links to the node for the “reptile” scenario which includes the category APPEARANCE. These links of the same type to the same point in a common node function as a similarity link.
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The “behaviour” category for both “jackal” and “vulture” contain an agent link to the “event” scenario “scavenge.” These links of the same type to the same point in a common node function as a similarity link.

attribute link (applies to “thing” and “event” scenarios)
(links “thing” to “attribute” or “event” to “attribute”)
“giraffe” links with “tall” by an attribute link
κάμηλος “camel” links with “very big” by an attribute link (Matt. 19:24)
τρίμα “eye of needle” links with “very small” by an attribute link (Matt. 19:24)
κάμηλος “camel” links with “very big” and “unclean” by attribute links (Matt. 23:24, see Leviticus 11:4)
κόνωπος “gnat” links with “very small” and “unclean” by attribute links (Matt. 23:24, see Leviticus 11:42)

Note that attributes are implied in the above New Testament passages. If the attribute links were not there, the meaning would not be clear.

RELATION TO PEOPLE (applies to “thing” scenarios)
“things” may link with “things” by a reciprocity link
“things” may link with “events” by an agent link

PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT (applies to “thing” scenarios)
“things” may link with “events” by a goal link
“things” may link with “events” by a benefactive link
“things” may link with “events” by an instrument link

reciprocity link
(links “thing” to “thing”)
There are two types of reciprocity link between “things”. One relates to
genealogical relationships, e.g.
“grandfather” links with “grandchild” by a reciprocity link
πατήρ “father” links with ἔμοι “son” by a reciprocity link (John 17:1)
πενθέρα “mother-in-law” links with νυμφή “daughter-in-law” by a reciprocity link (Luke 12:53)

The other relates to reciprocity due to reciprocal participant roles in events. Reciprocity links can be posited for pairs of “events” where participants are identical but their roles are swapped, and for single events, where the participants are defined by being agent or goal in the event, e.g.
“lender” links with “borrower” by a verbal reciprocity link
οἱ πωλοῦντες “the sellers” links with οἱ ἄγοραζοντες “the buyers” by a reciprocity link through πωλέω “sell” and ἄγοραζω “buy” (Mark 11:15)
οἱ κεκλημένοι “the guests” links with δι κεκληκός “the host” by a reciprocity link through καλέω “invite” (Luke 14:7, 10)
μαθητής “disciple” links with διδάσκαλος “teacher” by a reciprocity link through μαθάω “learn” and διδάσκω “teach” (Matthew 10:24)

Reciprocal “things” frequently co-occur in text. In Greek such nouns are often simply formed by article plus participle.
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participant-event links (apply to “thing” scenarios)
(link “thing” to “event”)

These are of several types corresponding to the different types of participant typical in an “event” scenario. Some of these links are statistically extremely strong, e.g. using GRAMCORD searches, out of 36 occurrences of the noun ὀ_Integer “ear” in the New Testament, 25 are linked with the verb ἀκοῦω “hear” (see Matt. 10:27, 11:15, 13:9, 15, 16, 43, Mark 4:9, 23, 8:18, Luke 8:8, 14:35, Acts 11:22, 28:24, 25, 26, 27, Rom. 11:7, 8, 1Cor. 2:9, Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29, 3:6, 13, 22, 13:9).

agent link (typically subject, Greek nominative case)
(links “thing” to “event”)

"shopkeeper" links with “sell” by an agent link
Φαρισαῖος “Pharisee” links with δέοςκατάλαθς “tithe” by an agent link (Matt. 23:23)
ἀλέω “fisherman” links with πλῶν ἡμι “wash” (nets) by an agent link (Luke 5:2)

goal link (typically direct object, Greek accusative case)
(links “thing” to “event”)

"victim" links with “torture” by a goal link
ὁρμός “mint” links with δέοςκατάλαθς “tithe” by a goal link (Matt. 23:23)
δίκτυον “fishing-net” links with πλῶν ἡμι “wash” (nets) by a goal link (Luke 5:2)

benefactive link (typically indirect object, Greek dative case)
(links “thing” to “event”)

"family” links with “cook” by a benefactive link
πτωχός “poor” links with εὐαγγελίζω “preach the good news”
by a benefactive link (Luke 4:18)
ὑπηρέτης "attendant" links with ἀποδίδωμι “give back”
by a benefactive link (Luke 4:20)

instrument link (typically “with” in English, Greek dative case)
(links “thing” to “event”)

"knife” links with “stab” by an instrument link
λόχλα “spear” links with νίσθω “pierce” by an instrument link (John 19:37)
ἐξοδος “chain” links with δειπνεῖω “bind” by an instrument link (Luke 8:29)

Relational links between items in “event” scenarios

PARTICIPANTS:

event-participant links (apply to “event” scenarios)

These are of several types corresponding to the different types of participant typical in an “event” scenario. They are not distinct from the participant-event links listed above, but are the same links used in reverse. The directionality is due to the nature of the scenarios in question, one always being an “event”, the other a “thing”. By assuming directionality in this link, one avoids the need to posit a separate type of link, running in
parallel in the opposite direction. Examples can be seen above, at the end of the “thing” scenario.

**agent link**  (links “event” to “thing”)

**goal link**  (links “event” to “thing”)

**benefactive link**  (links “event” to “thing”)

**instrument link**  (links “event” to “thing”)

**reciprocity link**  
(links “event” to “event” via the participant links)

Reciprocity links can be posited for pairs of “events” where participants are identical but their roles are swapped. Reciprocal verbs frequently co-occur in text, e.g. “lend” links with “borrow” by a reciprocity link

διδόω “give” links with λαμβάνω “receive” by a reciprocity link (Acts 20:35)

πωλέω “sell” links with ἀφορμάζω “buy” by a reciprocity link (Mark 11:15)

Reciprocity is sometimes thought of as a type of opposite, or “converse” (Black, 1990:127-8):

A ... type of opposite is when one word is the converse of the other. The choice of one converse over the other depends on the angle from which you view the situation being described, as in αἰτεῖο / λαμβάνω (“ask/receive”) and δανείζω / δανείζω (“lend/borrow”).

Black’s description of “converse” words as referring to the same event but from a different angle accurately defines reciprocity, of which “lend” and “borrow” is a good example. However, the example of “ask” and “receive” as converse is inaccurate. Their prototypical relationship is cause and effect, e.g. Luke 11:10 “Ask and it will be given to you; seek and you will find...”

(Passives are a grammatical, rather than a lexical, way to make pairs of reciprocal verbs, by encoding the semantic goal as the grammatical subject, and the semantic agent as the grammatical agent, marked with “by” in English and ὅτι in Greek, e.g. “He was tricked by the magi” ἐνεπαίω τῇ ὅτι τῷ μάγω (Matthew 2:16). In English, passives can also encode the semantic benefactive as grammatical subject, e.g. “I was sold a watch by a friend”.)

**GENERIC CATEGORY:**

**specific-generic link**  “of” “sort of” “kind of”

(links “thing” to “thing” or “event” to “event”)

“amble” links with “walk” by a specific-generic link

ἐλεύσυμα “go into, enter” links with ἐρχομαι “come, go” by a specific-generic link (Matt. 12:45, 44)

δέησις “petition” links with προσεύχομαι “pray” by a specific-generic link (Eph. 6:18)

(NB “Petition” though a grammatical noun is a semantic “event”.)

This specific-generic link, as Black (1990:126) points out, is the basis of the categorization of Roget’s Thesaurus, and applies also to New Testament Greek:
The Greek lexicon of the United Bible Society takes the same approach. It discusses, for example, the Greek terms for "ask" under the generic term ἀρέσκω, "I ask for." This term includes several hyponyms:

- ἀπατέω "I ask for something back" (Luke 6:30)
- ζητέω "I ask for something to satisfy a need" (Mark 8:11)
- δέομαι "I ask for with a sense of urgency" (Luke 8:28)

This specific-generic link is directional, i.e. a generic-specific link is not a different kind of link, but the same link used in reverse, e.g.

- "walk" links with "amble" by the same specific-generic link but with "walk" at the generic end of the link.

**specific-specific link "both are kinds of"

(links "thing" to "thing" or "event" to "event")

- "amble" links with "limp" by a specific-specific link εὐπρόσλεγµα "go into, enter" links with εὐπρόσλεγµα "go out from" by a specific-specific link (Matt. 12:45, 44)
- δέοµαι "petition" links with εὐχαριστία "thanksgiving" by a specific-specific link (1 Tim. 2:1)

(These, though grammatical nouns, are semantic "events").

This specific-specific link is implicit between items which have specific-generic links to the same generic node.

**similarity link "like" "similar"

(links "thing" to "thing" or "event" to "event")

- "amble" links with "saunter" by a similarity link (both belong to the generic group "slow walking")
- ἀπερχόµαι "go away" links with ἔξοδοµα "go out from" by a similarity link (Mark 7:24, Matt. 15:21 parallel passages)
- ἀνέµι "desert" links with ἐξόδοιµα "forsake" by a similarity link (Heb. 13:5)

A similarity link occurs between "events" in the same generic category which also share the same attribute or other semantic element, e.g.

- "amble" links with "saunter" by a similarity link (both belong to the generic sub-group "slow walking")

**NOT** "amble" links with "run" by a similarity link (though both belong to the generic group "move")

A similarity link between "events" can be regarded as implicitly formed due to two items having a specific-generic link with the same node, and also having some other semantic element in common, e.g.

- "amble" links with "walk" by a specific-generic link
- "saunter" links with "walk" by a specific-generic link
- "amble" links with "slow" by an attribute link
- "saunter" links with "slow" by an attribute link

**CIRCUMSTANCES**: (adjuncts or circumstantial complements)

The scenario category of CIRCUMSTANCES relates to several kinds of link, between "events" and simultaneous "events", between "events" and "attributes" and between "events" and "things."

First let us look at links between "event" and "event."

**means link** (links "event" to "event") "by" "through"

- "climb" links to "arrive" by a means link
Appendix C - English and Greek examples of relational links

Διπτομαι “touch” links to σώζω “heal” by a means link (Matt. 14:36)
μαντεύομαι “tell fortunes” links to έργαιταν παρέχω “bring gain”
by a means link (Acts 16:16)

The means link is directional, so that the means and result are encoded as distinct. You can
arrive by means of climbing, but you cannot climb by means of arriving.

manner link (links “event” to “event”)
“climb” links to “ascend” by a manner link
“mumble” links to “talk” by a manner link
διαχείλω “mock” links to λέγω “say” by a manner link (Acts 2:13)
κράζω “shout” links to διακοιλισθω “follow” by a manner link (Matthew 9:27)

The direction of manner-event must be encoded in the brain. You can talk in a mumbling
manner, but you cannot mumble in a talking manner.

Often the manner link consists of a combination of a specific-generic link (which is
already directional, manner being the specific element) and a means or attribute link
attached to the specific element, e.g.
“climb” links to “ascend” by a specific-generic link
and “grip” links to “climb” by a means link
so “climb” links to “ascend” as a manner link

“mumble” links to “talk” by a specific-generic link
and “indistinct” links to “mumble” by an attribute link
so “mumble” links to “talk” as a manner link

One might, then, analyse the manner link as implicitly formed by such a
combination. However, this cannot account for an example such as Luke 22:63 αὐτῶν
ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέρουτες “they were mocking him, beating him”, where beating
appears to encode the manner of mocking, yet would not normally be considered as a
specific type of mocking. I propose, therefore, that manner is a distinct semantic link
which also better fits the theory that links are formed experimentally. The explanation then
for the above data is that some verbs are a portmanteau of generic verb plus specific means
or attribute, and these verbs often occur in the manner slot with the generic verb, e.g.
climb (specific) = ascend (generic) + grip (means)
mumble (specific) = talk (generic) + indistinct (attribute)
mock (specific) = talk (generic) + scorn (attribute)

occasion link (links “event” to “event”) “whilst”
(event 1 is the occasion for event 2)
“work” links to “whistle” by an occasion link
“sit” links to “sew” by an occasion link
σταυρώω “crucify” links to λαμβάνω τὰ ἱμάτια “take the clothes”
by an occasion link (John 19:23)
καθήμαι “sit” links to προσφώνω “call to” by an occasion link (Luke 7:32)

I am calling this an occasion link rather than a co-temporal link, because it seems to have a
directionality to it, e.g. people whistle while working, rather than work while whistling.
This assumes that prototypically the duration of event 1 is greater than that of event 2. The
former event is more regular or typical, the latter more random. This explains the
following examples:
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Whistle while you work!
"work" links to "whistle" by an occasion link

Sew while you are sitting down!
"sit" links to "sew" by an occasion link

The events of sewing and sitting can also be related by a different semantic link, when they belong to a different scenario, e.g.
Agent: tired but conscientious housewife
Location: home
Prototypically "sit" links to "sew" by an occasion link
(event 1 “sit” is the occasion for event 2 “sew”)

BUT
Agent: professional tailor
Location: place of work
Prototypically "sit" links to "sew" by a purpose link
(event 1 “sit” is a necessary stage to achieve event 2 “sew”)

This explains the following examples:
Sit down to sew!
“sit” links to "sew" by a purpose link
(event 2 “sew” is the purpose of event 1 “sit”)

NOT Work to whistle!
“work” does NOT link to “whistle” by a purpose link

Secondly, let us look at links between “event” and “attribute.” These are listed above in the contents of an “event” scenario as temporal, spatial, intensity, appraisive or evaluative, manner.

attribute links: (links “event” to “attribute”)
temporal:
"flicker" links to "quick" by an attribute link
ἐγείρω "arise" links to ταχύς "quickly" by an attribute link (John 11:29)
ἀπέρχομαι "go away" links to εὐθές "immediately" by an attribute link (Mark 1:42)
spatial:
"lie" links to "horizontal" by an attribute link
πέπτω "fall" links to χαμηλά "on the ground" by an attribute link (John 18:6)
ἀνεττόμα "stand up" links to ὑπερχώ "upright" by an attribute link (Acts 14:10)
intensity:
"yell" links to "loud" by an attribute link
κραζεῖ "cry out" links to μεγας "loud" by an attribute link (John 19:23)
χαλω "rejoice" links to λειτον "greatly" by an attribute link (2 John 4)
appraisive:
"swear" links to "bad" by an attribute link
λαλεῖ "speak" links to κακος "evil" by an attribute link (John 18:23)
λέγει "say" links to καλός "well" by an attribute link (John 4:17)
manner:
"dissect" links to "near" by an attribute link
ἐλέει "be merciful" links to λατρείας "cheerfulness" by an attribute link (Rom. 12:8)
( NB abstract noun for semantic attribute)
προστήμα "lead" links to σπουδή "diligence" by an attribute link (Rom. 12:8)
( NB abstract noun for semantic attribute)

Thirdly, let us look at links between “event” and “thing.” These are similar to those listed above linking events to attributes which are spatial or temporal.

locative link: (links “event” to “thing”)
"swim" links to "swimming pool" by a locative link
Ἄλκεω "fish" links to ὕδας "sea, lake" by a locative link (John 21:3)
δίδακτος "teach" links to συναγωγή "synagogue" by a locative link (Luke 13:10)
Like all links, locative links can be either present or absent, e.g.

"whisper" links to "library" by a locative link
"whistle" links to "park" by a locative link

BUT "whistle" does NOT link to "library" by a locative link

The presence or absence of links affects our interpretation of collocations.

Compare the following questions:

Why were you whistling in the park?
Why were you whistling in the library?

"Why were you whistling in the park?" is normally understood as a genuine question, requiring an answer "I just felt happy." Here the phrase "in the park" is not focal, since there is a collocation link already established in the mind of the hearer. In contrast, "Why were you whistling in the library?" is normally understood as a rhetorical question implying criticism, requiring an answer "I'm sorry. I just forgot where I was for a moment." The phrase "in the library" is focal, since there is no collocation link. In speech the two questions above might well have different intonation and stress patterns, marking different elements as focal, e.g.

Why were you WHISTLING in the park?
Why were you whistling in the LIBRARY?

The lack of a locative link between an "event" and a "thing", such as "whistle" and "library" above, sets up a strong expectation that the collocation of the two is unexpected. In real life people do not normally whistle in the library, so these scenarios have never, or only rarely, been linked in the brain. Since people make mental links between mental scenarios as a result of perceiving links between those scenarios in their own experience, the sheer infrequency with which the two scenarios "whistle" and "library" co-occur in experience, means that their mental linking is nil or negligible.

Suppose, by pure chance, someone has only ever been to a library once, and only ever heard whistling once, and that was when they were in the library, then that person would form a 100% locative link between "library" and "whistle". However, as they lived a bit more, they would be in the library and not hear whistling, and they would hear whistling in places other than the library. Each occurrence would make a locative link, between "library" and the things which happened there, and between "whistle" and the places where it happened. Over time, the one co-occurrence of whistle and library would become such a small proportion of the total links that it would no longer be regarded as significant.

Thus, every co-occurrence of scenarios makes a link, but it is only the links between elements which frequently co-occur, or which for some other reason, such as heightened emotion, are marked as significant, that become prototypical.

For example, when I say "library", my audience thinks of "read" because the "library" scenario has a prototypical locative link with "read". If however, someone happened to have been attacked in a library by a man who whistled as he came towards them, the heightened emotion attached to that single co-occurrence of whistle and library
might be so burned into their memory that hearing the word “library” would make them think of the “whistle” of their attacker, and bring them out in a cold sweat.

Again, the locative link may in some cases be implicit, automatically formed through other links, e.g.

“swim” links to “water” by a locative link
AND “water” links to “swimming pool” by a part-whole link
SO “swim” links to “swimming pool” by a locative link
“wander” links to “open spaces” by a locative link
AND “park” links to “open spaces” by a specific-generic link
SO “wander” links to “park” by a locative link
“whisper” links to “quiet” by an attribute link
AND “library” links to “quiet” by an attribute link
SO “whisper” links to “library” by an attribute link

(temporal link (links “event” to “thing”) “at” “in”
“wake” links to “morning” by a temporal link
καθελθείσαν “sleep” links to νυκτ “night” by a temporal link (1 Thess. 5:7)
προσευχησαν “pray” links to ἑδρα ἑ ἐνα τῇ “ninth hour, 3 pm”
by a temporal link (Acts 3:1)

Temporal links may also link “things” (if indeed abstract time related nouns are “things” as opposed to “events”), e.g.
“sun” links to “day” by a temporal link
“lunch” links to “midday” by a temporal link

However, it seems that these links always imply some “event”, e.g.
“sun” links to “shine” by an agent link and
“sun shines” links to “day” by a temporal link
“lunch” links to “eat” by a goal link, and
“eat lunch” links to “midday” by a temporal link

PARTS, STAGES, CAUSATION and PURPOSE
As detailed above, Lakoff and Johnson give the following “experiential gestalt” for “shooting someone”:

- Parts: Aiming, Firing, bullet hits target, target is wounded
- Stages: Precondition: loaded
- Beginning: aims
- Middle: fires
- End: bullet hits
- Final state: target wounded
- Causation: Beginning and middle enable end
- Middle and end cause final state
- Purpose: Goal: final state
  Plan: meet precondition, perform beginning and middle

In Lakoff and Johnson’s analysis, the categories Stages, Causation, and Purpose all involve the elements listed as Parts. This presents a problem in that the Final State “target wounded” is here listed as a Part of the gestalt “shooting someone.” I propose that, whilst the Final State “target wounded” is indeed part of the gestalt, it is in a different relationship from the other Parts.

Whilst the other Parts “load, aim, shoot, hit” are necessary for the “event” of “shooting someone” to be prototypical, the Final State “target wounded” is only necessary for the success of the “event” (i.e. the fulfilment of its purpose, when Final State = Goal).
Naturally it is prototypical that the “event” succeed in its purpose, but even when the “event” fails in its purpose, the “event” has occurred prototypically.

Prototypically, the concept “shoot” has:
- Parts: load, aim, fire, hit
- Stages: load, aim, fire, hit (in this order)
- Result: target wounded
- Goal: target wounded

Prototypically, the experiential gestalt “shooting someone” has:
- Parts: load, aim, fire, hit, target wounded
- Stages: load, aim, fire, hit, target wounded (in this order)
- Chain of causation:
  - Cause: shoot
  - Result: target wounded
- Chain of purpose:
  - Plan: shoot
  - Goal: target wounded

In other words, the “experiential gestalt” of shooting someone is larger than the concept “shoot” since it includes not only the Parts of the core concept, but also the prototypical Goal and Result. The relationships can be diagrammed as follows:

\[
\text{load + aim + fire + hit = shoot} \\
\text{shoot > target wounded}
\]

I propose that the part-whole link, as used above to link “thing” with “thing”, should be applied at the level of the core concept, not at the level of the whole gestalt, i.e.

- “load” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link

**BUT** “wound” does **NOT** link to “shoot” by a part-whole link

(though it is a part of the “shooting someone” gestalt)

**PART-WHOLE**

For “event” scenarios, this category includes both part-whole links (shown above linking “things” to “things”) and also stage links. The difference is that stage links necessarily involve a temporal sequence. Stage links can be seen as a particular type of part-whole link which may only occur with an “event” scenario, where each part-whole link is labelled for sequence.

**part-whole link** (links “event” to “event”)

- “aim” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link
- \(\epsilon\sigma\theta\iota\omega\ “e\alpha\tau\” \text{links to } \epsilon\delta\varphi\alpha\omega\theta\gamma\omega\mu. “be merry” by a part-whole link} \)
- \(\delta\mu\phi\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega\ “c\text{lothe” links to } \pi\rho\sigma\sigma\tau\theta\eta\mu\mu. “give” (provide for} \)
  (providing for) by a part-whole link (Luke 12:28, 31)

**part-part link** (links “event” to “event”)

- “load” links to “aim” by a part-part link (each part of “shoot”)
- \(\epsilon\sigma\theta\iota\omega\ “e\alpha\tau\” \text{links to } \pi\iota\omega “drink” by a part-part link} \)
  ( PROVIDING FOR) \ e\sigma\theta\iota\omega “be merry (in this order) (Luke 12:19)
- \(\delta\mu\phi\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega\ “c\text{lothe” links to } \tau\rho\delta\phi\iota\omega “feed” by a part-part link} \)
  (each part of “give” (provide for)) (Luke 12:28, 24, 31)

Part-part links are formed automatically by the items being joined to the same node by the same type of link, e.g. “load” and “aim” are each linked to “shoot” by a part-whole link.
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**stage link** (links “event” to “event”) “first” “next” “finally”

Stage links must somehow be marked for sequence, perhaps with a number, e.g.

“load” links to “shoot” by a stage link 1
“aim” links to “shoot” by a stage link 2
“fire” links to “shoot” by a stage link 3
“hit” links to “shoot” by a stage link 4

δοκέω “chop down” links to “destroy fruitless trees” by a stage link 1
βάλλω “throw” (into the fire) links to “destroy fruitless trees” by a stage link 2

(Matthew 3:10, 7:19)

στέλεω “sow” links to “provide food for oneself” by a stage link 1
θεράπω “reap” links to “provide food for oneself” by a stage link 2
συνάγω “gather” links to “provide food for oneself” by a stage link 3

(Matthew 6:26)

It is unusual for the generic verb to be explicit where the specific verbs are listed. Verbs linked by stage links are part of a process which is conceptually one, but is not necessarily covered by any single verb since the process is often very generic.

However, stage links can be regarded as a portmanteau of part-whole links and sequence links, such that stage link 1 = part-whole link + sequence 1. For example:

**sequence link** (links “event” to “event”) “first” “next” “finally”

“load” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link + sequence 1
“aim” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link + sequence 2
“fire” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link + sequence 3
“hit” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link + sequence 4

An alternative analysis of stage links is that they are formed by a combination of part-whole links, and unnumbered sequence links. The part-whole links are with the core concept or higher node, but the sequence links are simply between the consecutive parts.

Sequence links are labelled “+1” which numbers the following element 1 higher than the previous element, showing it follows the previous element in temporal sequence. This avoids the need for any sequence link to have a value other than plus one, e.g.

“load” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link
“aim” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link
“fire” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link
“hit” links to “shoot” by a part-whole link

AND

“load” links to “aim” by a sequence link +1
“aim” links to “fire” by a sequence link +1
“fire” links to “hit” by a sequence link +1

Stage links, whether discrete or a portmanteau of part-whole and sequence links, are prototypical and are all expected to occur in order. However, in English the same verb can be used with different verb frames to mark whether the End stage is included or not. For example “John shot at Harry” contrasts with “John shot Harry”. The sentence “John shot at Harry” does not necessarily imply that he actually hit him. In this example, “Harry”, instead of being marked as the “goal” of “shoot” by being grammatically direct object (i.e. “John shot Harry”), has been marked as the “target” by being grammatically indirect object (i.e. “at Harry”). Thus stage 4 “hit,” which would involve the “goal” as a necessary participant, is not implied, and does not necessarily occur. However the
occurrence of stage 4 is still prototypical, allowing the use of the contraexpectation marker “but” for failure to complete that stage, e.g.

John shot at Harry, and missed him.
John shot at Harry, but missed him.
John shot at Harry and hit him.

NOT John shot at Harry but hit him.

In contrast, in the sentence “John shot Harry”, “Harry” is explicitly marked in the grammar as “participant goal” (in the Direct Object slot), so “hitting” is implicitly included as a stage, and can neither be refuted nor made explicit, e.g.

NOT John shot Harry, and missed him.
NOT John shot Harry, but missed him.
NOT John shot Harry and hit him.
NOT John shot Harry but hit him.

“John shot Harry” necessarily includes “hit” due to the part-whole links included in “shoot”.

next-stage links (link “event” to “event”) “next”

Next-stage links are implicit. They are formed automatically (like part-part, and specific-specific links) through being linked by the same type of link to the same node, e.g. “load” links to “aim” by a part-part link

AND “load” links to “aim” by a sequence link +1

κκόπτω “chop down” links to βάλλω “throw” (into the fire)
by a part-part link (each linked to “destroy fruitless trees”)

κκόπτω “chop down” links to βάλλω “throw” (into the fire)
by a sequence link +1 (Matthew 3:10, 7:19)

σπειρω “sow” links to θερίζω “reap” by a part-part link
θερίζω “reap” links to συλλέγω “gather” by a part-part link
(each linked to “provide food for oneself”) (Matthew 6:26)

CAUSATION:

causal link (links “event” to “event”) “since” “therefore”

Causal links are a special kind of sequence link, tagged for cause, e.g. “shoot” links to “wound” by a sequence link + cause

επιβάλλω “beat against” links to γεμίζω “fill” by a sequence link + cause (Mark 4:37)

πτολεμαί “touch” links to δαοσίζω “heal” by a sequence link + cause (Matthew 14:36)

The first element is the cause of the second, the second is the result of the first.

The causal link is prototypical. In the sentences “John shot at Harry” and “John shot Harry” the effect of “shoot” on Harry is part of the prototypical scenario. The use of “but”, together with the restrictions on its use, shows that “wound” is prototypically included in the “shoot” scenario, e.g.

John shot at Harry and killed him.
John shot at Harry and wounded him.
John shot at Harry but did not wound him.
John shot at Harry but only wounded him. (partial failure)
John shot at Harry, but the bullet glanced harmlessly off his bullet-proof body-armour.

NOT John shot at Harry but wounded him.
NOT John shot at Harry but killed him. (unless no intent to kill)
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John shot Harry and killed him.
John shot Harry and wounded him.
John shot Harry but did not wound him.
John shot Harry but only wounded him. (partial failure)
John shot Harry, but the bullet glanced harmlessly off his bullet-proof body-armour.

NOT John shot Harry but wounded him.
NOT John shot Harry but killed him. (unless no intent to kill)

A clearer example of the prototypicality of the result in an “event” scenario might be (in the case of a failed assassination attempt due to the target wearing a bullet-proof vest) “You can hardly say you shot him! He was not even wounded.”

PURPOSE:

purpose link (links “event” to “event”) “in order to” “so that”

Purpose links are a special kind of sequence link, tagged for purpose, e.g.
“shoot” links to “wound” by a sequence link + purpose
ζητεῖν “seek” links to φθάνειν “destroy” by a sequence link + purpose (Matthew 2:13)
ἀγω “lead” links to κατακρημνίζω “throw down”
by a sequence link + purpose (Luke 4:29)

The first element is the plan for effecting the second, the second is the goal of the first.

Relational links between items in “attribute” scenarios

The main links between items in attribute scenarios would appear to be of two types, both via a common link with the superordinate node.

gradation link (links “attribute” to “attribute” via the superordinate node)

Gradation links can be posited for “attributes” which belong on a graded linear scale, e.g.
“very” links to “extremely” by a gradation link (degree node)
ζευγεῖν “hot” links to χαταρά “lukewarm” by a gradation link (temperature node)
(Revelation 3:16)
ὁλίγος “little, few” links to πολύς “much, many” by a gradation link (amount node)
(Matthew 25:23)

Gradation links can be conceptualized as having length. Gradation links with minimal length are synonyms, and with maximal length are antonyms or contradictory.

Synonyms referring to “attributes” are lexical items linked to the same place on a graded linear scale, e.g.
“fat” links to “plump” by a gradation link of minimal length
πονηρὸς “evil” links to δίκαιος “unjust” by a gradation link of minimal length (Matthew 5:45)
ἀγαθὸς “good” links to δίκαιος “righteous” by a gradation link of minimal length
(Matthew 5:45)

Antonyms referring to “attributes” are lexical items linked to opposite extremes of a graded linear scale, and as such are also implicitly marked by a contradictory link, e.g.
“big” links to “small” by a gradation link of maximal length
ζευγεῖν “hot” links to ψύχος “cold” by a gradation link of maximal length (Revelation 3:16)
πονηρὸς “evil” links to ἄγαθος “good” by a gradation link of maximal length (Matthew 5:45)
contradictory link (links “attribute” to “attribute” via the superordinate node)

Contradictory links can be posited for “attributes” which belong on a discretely segmented linear scale, or on a polarized linear scale.

An example of a discretely segmented linear scale would be the colour spectrum, where individual colours are linked to the superordinate “colour” node, e.g.

“blue” links to “yellow” by a contradictory link

λευκός “white” links to πυρός “red” by a contradictory link (Rev 6:2, 4)

An example of a polarized linear scale would be the generosity scale, where “greedy” and “generous” although on a linear scale are conceived as polar opposites on a scale, with the superordinate node “degree of generosity”, e.g.

“greedy” links to “generous” by a contradictory link

πλούσιος “rich” links to πενήνχρος “poor” by a contradictory link (Luke 21:1, 2)

πρεσβύτερος “elder” links to νεώτερος “younger” by a contradictory link (1 Timothy 5:2)

Greek frequently uses the prefix α “un-” for polar opposites, e.g.

αδικός “unjust” links to δίκαιος “righteous” by a contradictory link (Matthew 5:45)

δίπλωτος “faithless, unbelieving” links to πιστός “faithful, believing” by a contradictory link (John 20:27)

In certain cases, particularly on the fringes of colour boundaries, the contradictory link may also have a notional length, e.g.

“blue” links to “green” by a contradictory link of minimal length

“In England all citizens, black and white, have the same rights.

“The rich and poor have the same rights.

Such sentences imply that not only the explicit contradictory attributes, but all gradations in between, are included.

Words conjoined by contradictory links frequently have a fixed order, e.g.

“rich and poor” conjoined contradictory link

“great and small” conjoined contradictory link

δίκαιος καὶ αδικός “righteous and unrighteous” conjoined contradictory link (Matthew 5:45)

ἀρσεν καὶ θηλυ “male and female” conjoined contradictory link (Matthew 19:4, Mark 10:6, Gal. 3:28)

οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ πτωχοὶ “rich and poor” conjoined contradictory link (Rev. 13:16)

In Greek, where there is an article used, each attribute has a separate article. I posit that unusual word order in conjoined contradictory links is “marked”, i.e. if the first item is not in its normal position, then it is in focus, e.g. in Rev. 20:12 below the emphasis is “even the great were judged”.


But οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ οἱ μικροὶ “great and small” conjoined contradictory link (Rev. 20:12).
Words with contradictory links may also be joined by either / or, neither / nor, or juxtaposition. I posit that here, too, unusual word order puts emphasis on the first word, e.g. in the second group of examples below the emphasis is on “slave”. These references concern Christian liberty and it is the slave who unexpectedly is included, e.g. in the second group of examples below the emphasis is on “slave”. These references concern Christian liberty and it is the slave who unexpectedly is included.

οὐ ἐλευθεροὶ καὶ οὐ δοῦλοι “free and slave” conjoined contradictory link

BUT δοῦλοι ἐτέρα ἐλευθεροὶ “slave or free” non-conjoined contradictory link
(1 Cor. 12:13, Ephesians 6:8, cf. Gal. 3:28 οὖν, Col. 3:11 (juxtaposed))

Similarly:

καλὸς τε καὶ κακὸς “good and bad” (Heb. 5:14)

ἀγαθὸς ἢ φαῦλος “good or bad” (Rom. 9:11)

ἐτέρα ἀγαθὸς ἐτέρα φαῦλος “either good or bad” (2 Cor. 5:10)

BUT ποιητὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ “bad and good” (Matthew 5:45)

ποιητὶ τε καὶ ἀγαθοὶ “bad and good” (Matthew 22:10)

In both the latter cases the emphasis is on “bad”, since it is surprising that the “bad” should be included with the “good”, either in receiving God’s blessings or being invited to a feast. Davies and Allison comment on Matthew 22:10 “The order, ‘evil’ before ‘good’, perhaps makes the former emphatic” (1997:203) and similarly Hagner says that the emphasis thus falls on “the bad” (1995:630).

In Parkari, conjoined contradictory links are marked by fixed order and may be marked by simple juxtaposition, or more commonly by ἀν “and”, e.g.


Conjoined contradictory links should not be confused with co-occurrence links, which may be identical in form, but where both attributes refer to the same thing or event, e.g.

“black” links to “white” by a co-occurrence link.

Penguins, zebras and pandas are black and white.

NOT Penguins, zebras and pandas are white and black.

Relational links between items in “relation” scenarios

Contradictory link (links “relation” to “relation” via the superordinate node)

Contradictory links can be posited for “relations” which belong on a discretely segmented linear scale, or on a polarized linear scale.

An example of a discretely segmented linear scale would be that of distance, where individual distances are linked to the superordinate “distance” node, e.g.

“near” links to “at” by a contradictory link
ἐν “in” links to ἐγγὺς “near” by a contradictory link (John 3:23)
(“In Aenon near Salim”)

ἐγγὺς “near” links to πόρρω “far” by a contradictory link
ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου γυναῖκειν “drawing near to the boat” (John 6:19)

ἐντὸν αὐτῶν πόρρω διὸς “while he was still far off” (Luke 14:32)

The cut-off point for determining “near” and “far” is arbitrary, and can be qualified, e.g.

ἐγγύτερον ἡμῖν ἡ σωτηρία ἡ ... “salvation is nearer to us than ...”
referring to distance in time (Rom. 13:11)

πορρῶτερον πορεύεσθαι “to go on further” (Luke 24:28)
Similarly, a single lexical item may refer to more than one segment of the linear scale so the same lexical item may have a contradictory pragmatic meaning, e.g.:

- elγων elγς "(near) to" links to elγς "into" by a contradictory link "they drew near to Jerusalem" (Matt. 21:11)
- cf. ἐκχυσάντως αὐτὸν ἐλγς ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ "when he had entered Jerusalem" (Matt. 21:10)

AND ἐρχέται ... elγς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας "he comes to a city of Samaria" (John 4:5)
- cf. ἐλημύνει ἡ πόλις ἡ λεων "Jesus went into the temple" (Matt. 21:12)

Here the one Greek word elγς has different referents, even in the single semantic domain of spatial relationships, depending on the real life scenario it is part of.

Sometimes there is a logical contradiction in temporal relationships in literal English translations, which may or may not represent a contradiction in the original Greek. In the following examples the formal contradiction in Greek seems to be a means of indicating that something is absolutely just about to occur, e.g.

- "soon" (implied by ἐρχέται) links to νῦν "now" by a contradictory link (John 4:23, 5:25)
- cf. Ἀν "The hour cometh, and now is" "The hour is coming, and now is" (John 16:32 where the contrast with "now" is implied by ἔλημύνεν.

An example of a polarized linear scale would be the containment scale, where "inside" and "outside" although on a linear scale are conceived as polar opposites on a scale, with the superordinate node "degree of containment", e.g.

- "to" links to "from" by a contradictory link ἐξωθεῖν "outside" links to ἐσωθεῖν "inside" by a contradictory link (Matthew 23:25)
- ἀνά "up" links to κάτω "down" by a contradictory link (John 1:25)
  ("ascending and descending")

In certain cases, particularly on the fringes of boundaries, this contradictory link may also have a notional length.

- "nearly at" links to "at" by a contradictory link of minimal length ἐξωθεῖν "outside" links to ἐσωθεῖν "inside" by a contradictory link of maximal length (Matthew 23:25)
- e.g. ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ... ἐλγς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξωθεῖν "in the kingdom of heaven ... into the outer / outmost darkness" (Matt. 8:11-12)

The co-occurrence link

(typically between "things", but also between "events", "attributes", and "relations")

Co-occurrence links are discussed here separately as a distinct type of link, since they do not relate directly to the internal structure of scenarios, but can occur within any given category in all types of scenario. The co-occurrence link shows particular syntactical and grammatical peculiarities. It is marked in English, Greek and Parkari by fixed word order. It is also typically marked by the word "and" in English and καὶ in Greek. In Parkari, it is typically marked by juxtaposition and absence of the word for "and".

As mentioned above, scenarios for "relation" words are distinct from other scenarios, applying, as they do, to a vast multitude of situations, and collocating with a vast number of events and things. Thus "and" as a relation marker is best thought of as the name of a kind of link, rather than a kind of scenario or information chunk. This is in line
with Sperber and Wilson, who see the concept “and” as having only a logical and a lexical entry (1986:92):

Occasionally an entry for a particular concept may be empty or lacking. For example, a concept such as *and*, which has no extension, may lack an encyclopaedic entry.

**co-occurrence link between “things”**

“bat” links with “ball” via a co-occurrence link “and”

πῦρ “fire” links to θεσμός “brimstone” via a co-occurrence link καὶ “and”

(Acts 17:29, Rev. 14:10, 20:10, 21:8; see also Rev. 9:17, 18, 19:20)

ἀνὴρ “man” links to γυνὴ “woman” by a co-occurrence link καὶ “and”

(Acts 5:14, 8:3, 12:9, 22:4)

Φαρισαῖος “Pharisee” links to Σαδδουκαῖος “Sadducee”

by a co-occurrence link καὶ “and” (Matthew 3:7)

The existence of specific co-occurrence links can be established by patterns of lexical collocation in the New Testament corpus. The word for brimstone occurs 7 times in the New Testament, each time in conjunction with fire, and 4 times conjoined by καὶ “and”. Similarly, the words for man and woman co-occur in the same semantic role 5 times in the New Testament, and in all cases both τέ and καὶ are used to conjoin them.

The word for Sadducees occurs 14 times in the New Testament. 5 times it occurs immediately after Pharisees, linked by “and” and with a single article τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων (Matthew 3:7, 16:1, 6, 11, 12), 2 times the Sadducees are mentioned in a new section after the Pharisees have been introduced (Matthew 22:23 see 22:15, Mark 12:18 see 12:13), 4 times the Sadducees are mentioned as in contrast with the Pharisees (Matthew 22:34, Acts 23:6, 7, 8), and 3 times the Sadducees are mentioned separately from the Pharisees, in the context of the Temple (Luke 20:27 see 20:1, Acts 4:1 see 3:11, Acts 5:17 see 5:12). Thus 11 out of 14 occurrences of the word Sadducee are in the context of Pharisees, and in 5 of these cases they are marked grammatically as having a co-occurrence link, i.e. conjoined by καὶ “and” and with a single article, since they are major religious parties. (This contrasts with a conjoined contrastive link where each noun phrase has an article, e.g. Revelation 13:16 “the small and the great” etc.).

The co-occurrence link does not necessarily identify two items as identical (either in sense or in reference) but shows that together they refer to a single scenario. Such conjoined items typically share the same participant role in certain event scenarios. For example, sellers and buyers are patently not the same people (except in barter cultures), yet they are linked by a co-occurrence link, a single article plus “and”, in Matthew 21:12, because here they have the same role, people misusing God’s Temple:

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἐξ τοῦ λευκοῦ
And entered Jesus into the temple
καὶ ἐξέβαλεν πᾶν τὸν πωλητὴν καὶ ἄγοραζοντας ἐν τῷ λευκῷ
and threw out all the buying-ones and selling-ones in the temple

This Greek usage, of a single article with two distinct nouns conjoined by καὶ “and” to mark a co-occurrence link, throws light on some of Moule’s examples (1957:107-8). In Acts 15:22 we have τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρναβᾷ “Paul and Barnabas” with a single article. The reason for the article at all is that there is anaphoric reference to Acts
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15:2a where Paul and Barnabas as two separate known individuals dispute with the Judaizers. In Acts 15:2b, where they are chosen to go to Jerusalem as envoys, and 15:12, where they speak as envoys, there is no article, which marks grammatically that they are "locally salient" i.e. they have special significance in this section of the discourse, i.e. in the episode 15:1-21 "The Council of Jerusalem" (Levinsohn, 1992:99 "anarthrous references to particular, known participants either mark the participant as locally salient or highlight the speech which he utters"). In 15:22 they are not "locally salient" being merely the people whom Judas and Silas will accompany, but they are marked as a co-occurring pair, since together they are the envoy team sent to Jerusalem.

Similarly in Mark 9:2 τῶν Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννη ὁμογενής "James and John" occur with a single article, in a list (according to Alexandrinus and Vaticanus, though Sinaiticus reads τῶν Ἰάκωβου καὶ τῶν Ἰωάννη). Given that they are brothers, this is perfectly normal, since the single article indicates that they are being conceptualized collectively (cf. "the sons of Zebedee" in Matthew 20:20). Like Pharisees and Sadducees, or Paul and Barnabas, they can function as a single scenario and fill the same scenario slots.

Thus Ephesians 2:20, τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν "the apostles and prophets" need not refer to the same individuals, or even a homogeneous group, but if it refers to two groups, they must be co-occurrent in the same scenario slot, i.e. have the same kind of role in some process. The context suggests that this role was the strengthening and establishment of the emerging church. Given the emphasis in the Gospels on Jesus explaining his death and resurrection from the prophets (e.g. Luke 24:25-27, Luke 24:44) and the Gospel writers' use of prophecy to understand the significance of what they knew personally (e.g. Matthew 1:22-23, 2:15, 17, 23 etc.), the interpretation of these as Old Testament prophets is quite natural. Apostles and prophets are co-occurrent in the role of proclaiming Christ's death and resurrection, the prophets before the events, and the apostles after. Paul specifically links his current role as "apostle" to the earlier role of "the prophets" in proclaiming the gospel (Romans 1:2). However, in Ephesians 4:11 (cf. 1 Corinthians 12:28, 29) prophets and apostles are listed together as different categories of contemporary Christians. Contemporary prophets also seem to be referred to in Ephesians 3:5, where "the mystery of Christ" has "now been revealed ... to God's holy apostles and prophets". However, regardless of whether "prophets" in Ephesians 2:20 refers to Old Testament or New Testament prophets, they are clearly not co-referential (e.g. Ephesians 4:11 contrasts the terms τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφητας), but should be regarded as together referring to the one scenario of "God's chosen agents in building the church".

In the light of this, in the more theologically weighted verses, Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1, where there is a single article for both "God" and "saviour Jesus Christ", we must apply the same principle that these conjoined items refer to a single scenario. Although such items need not be co-referential (e.g. fire and brimstone, Pharisees and
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Sadducees, Paul and Barnabas, which refer to distinct items, individuals or groups) it is natural for them to be understood as coreferential where they can both apply to the same item in a single scenario. For example, ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ “the God and father” occurs 13 times in the New Testament, alone (1 Cor. 15:24, James 1:27), with “of him [Jesus]” (Rev. 1:6), with “of the Lord Jesus” (2 Cor. 11:31), with “of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Romans 15:6, 2 Cor. 1:3, Eph. 1:3, 5:20, 1 Pe. 1:3), and with “of us” (Gal. 1:4, 1 Th. 1:3, 3:11, 3:13). In all these instances the two conjoined terms are undoubtedly co-referential, referring to a single scenario, here God. This conforms to the Granville Sharp rule (Porter, 1994:110):

Granville Sharp’s rule states simply that if a single article links two or more singular substantives (excluding personal names) the second and subsequent substantives are related to or further describe the first.

Hence the parallel construction in Titus 2:13 τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ “of the great god and saviour of us Jesus Christ” and in 2 Peter 1:1 τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ “of the god of us and saviour Jesus Christ” also refers to a single scenario, and the conjoined terms are most naturally understood as coreferential, Jesus Christ who is both God and saviour. Such an interpretation is supported by the similar phrase in 2 Peter 3:2 τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος “of the Lord and saviour” (i.e. Jesus), and by John 20:28 ὁ κυρίος μου καὶ ὁ θεὸς μου “the Lord of me and the God of me”, where the terms Lord and God are each applied separately to Jesus. Moule (1990:110) also states that “God and saviour” is a fixed co-occurrence of titles for a single deity, which provides further evidence for this interpretation.

In English also, the co-occurrence link is marked by a fixed order of lexical collocation and indicates that the two conjoined concepts belong together in a single scenario. Similarly, in English as in Greek, “things” which are joined by a co-occurrence link usually have only one article for both items, e.g.

I bought him a bat and ball for Christmas.
Pass me a knife and fork.
The bride and groom left in a Rolls Royce.

The use of a separate article for the second item suggests a sense of separation between the items, e.g.

I bought him a bat and a ball for Christmas.
(These two items are not specifically for use together. The ball could be a football)
Pass me a knife and a fork.
(These two items are not specifically for use together, e.g. the knife could be for carving, rather than eating with. The knife might be to complete one place setting and the fork another.)
The bride and the groom left in a Rolls Royce.
(These two items are not specifically a couple.)

Compare:
“There was a double wedding but only one bride and groom turned up. It was chaos. The bride and groom were left waiting while the vicar decided what to do.” (They are a couple)
“There was a double wedding but only one bride and one groom turned up. It was chaos. The bride and the groom were left waiting while the vicar decided what to do.” (They are not a couple)

Quirk and Greenbaum (1979:177) state that “A singular verb is used with conjoinings which represent a single entity”, giving the example “The hammer and sickle
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*was* flying from a tall flag pole." This example, however, is not a straightforward doublet but an example of metonymy, where “the hammer and sickle” means “the flag bearing the image of a hammer and sickle”, cf. “the skull and crossbones”, “the stars and stripes”. Nonetheless, some English doublets can take singular verbs in circumstances where they are clearly conceptualized as a single entity, e.g. “Where is my knife and fork?”, “Your knife and fork has fallen on the floor”, and possibly “Where is the bride and groom?”, but not “The bride and groom is already in the church”.

Although co-occurrence is marked by a fixed ordering of nouns, the ordering is not necessarily the same in different languages, e.g.

- **English** “bride and groom”
- **Parkari** “bridegroom and bride” ιαφω οι ιαφσι
- **Greek** “bridegroom and bride” νυμφίος καὶ νύμφη (Rev. 18:23)

In Parkari certain pairs of words which co-occur not only have a conventional order, but also the word for “and”, normally obligatory between nouns, is omitted, e.g. ἥς means “arrow”, ὁδοροί means “bow”, and ἥς ὁδοροί (literally “arrow bow”) means “bow and arrow”. Such conjoined co-occurrence pairs form lexical doublets in Parkari, i.e. the two words together function grammatically as a single lexical item, and refer to a single scenario.

Items linked by the co-occurrence link do not simply occur together in the same scenario, but are conceptualized as together forming a single scenario and function in the same participant role in “event” scenarios, e.g.

- A husband and wife are both responsible for the care of their children. (both agent)
- I bought fish and chips. (both goal)
- Eat with a knife and fork! (both instrument)
- He shot the deer with a bow and arrow. (both instrument)

**co-occurrence link** between “events”

- “come” links with “go” via a co-occurrence link “and”
- “eat” links with “drink” via a co-occurrence link “and”
- φόβος “fear” links to τρόμος “trembling” (semantic events) via a co-occurrence link καὶ “and” (2 Cor. 7:15, Eph. 6:5, Phil. 2:12, cf. 1 Cor. 2:3)
- τρόφω “eat” links to τίνω “drink” via a co-occurrence link καὶ “and” (Matthew 24:38)

The order of these words is fixed. In New Testament Greek, fear and trembling co-occur 4 times, always in the set order φόβος καὶ τρόμος. Likewise, γαμέω “marry” and γαμίζω “give in marriage” co-occur 5 times, always in that order. Similarly, eating and drinking co-occur 30 times, always in that order, regardless of whether the verb for eat is ἐσθίω, φαγεῖν or τρόφω.

In the Parkari language, the verb pairs “come” and “go” and “eat” and “drink” are used together in fixed order, but juxtaposed without any word for “and”, and with the same tense marking particle applying to both verbs, i.e. they are treated in many ways grammatically as a unit.
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It could be argued that in all the above examples there is a logical order between the events. In experience, people come first and then go, people eat first and then drink. I am indeed arguing that these words are grouped together in speech, because they are grouped together in the mind, and they are grouped together in the mind precisely because they are grouped together experientially. So it is natural that the order of the words should reflect the real life order of the concepts.

However, the ordering of words is not necessarily in direct relationship to real life. I propose that where concepts are grouped by a co-occurrence link they are usually marked by a fixed order in a given language, but that the order is not necessarily fixed the same way in different cultures, e.g.

"read" links with "write" via a co-occurrence link "and"

e.g. He can read and write.

NOT He can write and read.

However, in Urdu the same two verbs co-occur in the opposite order:

pa^na likhna asan hoi.

Writing reading easy is.

Reading and writing is easy.

NOT likhna pa^na asan hoi.

Reading easy is.

Urdu reverses the order of the two verbs, showing that the order of words linked by co-occurrence is not universal but language specific, and omits the word "and" (normally required grammatically between two verbs) showing that the two concepts co-occur in one scenario, i.e. together they form a single scenario.

We have stated above that the existence of a co-occurrence link in some way marks the separate words as belonging to a single scenario. Corollary evidence that the two concepts of "read" and "write" are so linked comes from Parkari where b^en^al "read" means educated, literate, able to read and write, i.e. the one word refers to a scenario containing both concepts.

Clearly, it is vital to observe the way co-occurrence links are marked, including word order and the presence or absence of a conjunction, both in the source text for accurate exegesis and in the target language for natural and accurate translation.

If, in a given language, the word order for a pair of conjoined items is not fixed, then I posit that there is not a specific co-occurrence link, but some other relationship, such as reciprocity, due to sharing a scenario and set of participants, e.g.

verb
sell
buy
merchandise
price
agent
benefactive
goal
amount

πωλέω "sell" links to ἄγοραννω "buy" (Matthew 21:12, Mark 11:15)

ἄγοραννω "buy" links to πωλέω "sell" (Luke 17:28, Rev 13:17)
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**co-occurrence link** between “attributes”

(links “attribute” to “attribute” via a single “thing” or “event” node)

Co-occurrence links for “attributes” rely on prototypical real-life co-occurrence of different “attributes” of a “thing” or “event”, e.g.

- “big” links to “strong” by a co-occurrence link joined to the “thing” node “human”
  e.g. “He’ll grow up big and strong”
- “old” links to “grey” by a co-occurrence link joined to the “thing” node “human”
  e.g. “When I’m old and grey”
- “loud” links to “clear” by a co-occurrence link joined to the “event” node “hear”
  e.g. “I can hear you loud and clear”
- ἅγιος “holy” links to ἀμαρτωλός “faultless” via a co-occurrence link καὶ “and”
  (Eph. 1:4, 5:27, Col. 1:22)
- πιστός “faithful” links to ἀληθινός “true” via a co-occurrence link καὶ “and”
  (Rev. 3:14, 19:11, 21:5, 22:6)

Co-occurrence links in English have a fixed collocational order and are linked by “and”, i.e. “big and strong” not “strong and big”, “loud and clear” not “clear and loud”.

The co-occurrence link does not necessarily apply in all contexts, which indicates that the scenario referred to is distinct, e.g.

- “black” links with “blue” via a co-occurrence link “and”
  (referring to bruising, but not say clothing)
  e.g. They beat him black and blue.
  NOT They beat him blue and black.
  BUT He wore a blue and black sweater.
  He wore a black and blue sweater.
  (I would avoid using “black and blue” in this latter sense)

Co-occurrence links in Greek can be identified by the recurrence of the same attributes conjoined in the same order. Another possible grammatical indicator is the use of a single article with καὶ “and”, e.g.

- ἄγαθος “good” links to εὐδαιμονίας “pleasing” and τέλειος “perfect” via a co-occurrence link καὶ “and” (Romans 12:2 re God’s will)

In Parkari co-occurrence links between “attributes” are also marked by a fixed collocational order but with the attributes juxtaposed with no word for “and”, e.g.

- ἅζος ἄρος “whole (and) easy” i.e. “fit and well”
- σίδω σαδός “straight (and) plain” i.e. “straightforward, ordinary”

**co-occurrence link** between “relations”

(links “relation” to “relation” via a single “thing” or “event” node)

Co-occurrence links for “relations” rely on prototypical real-life co-occurrence of different “relations” with a “thing” or “event”, e.g.

- “in” links to “around” by a co-occurrence link “and”
- κατά “down” links to εἰς “into, onto” by a co-occurrence link
  κατέβησαν ... εἰς τὸ ὅλον “they went down into the water” (Acts 8:38)
  καταβαίνων εἷς αὐτῶν “coming down onto him” (Mark 1:10)
- ἀνά “up” links to ἐκ “out from” by a co-occurrence link
  ἀνεβήσαν ἐκ τοῦ ὅλον “they came up out from the water” (Acts 8:39)
  ἀνεβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὅλον “coming up out from the water” (Mark 1:10)

As with all co-occurrence there is a fixed collocational order, i.e. “down into” and “up out from”.
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In English the conjunction "and" is used to conjoin relation words in a fixed order. For example, we find "in and around" not "around and in", as in "There was a huge crowd milling about in and around the stadium." Compare "to and fro" "hither and thither" "near and far" "far and wide". The order is conventional, e.g.
  "up" links with "down" via a co-occurrence link "and"
  e.g. She was throwing the ball up and down.
  NOT She was throwing the ball down and up.

One might argue that this order related to real life order, but this is emphatically not the case. For example, bouncing a ball is usually initiated by a downward throw, yet the conventional co-occurrence of "up and down" is fixed, e.g.
  She was bouncing the ball up and down.
  NOT She was bouncing the ball down and up.

Compare "in and out" in the sentence "She kept running in and out of the house to see if the postman was coming down the road." It is clear that she was primarily in the house, so in fact she kept running out, and back in again. But "in and out" represents a single scenario containing both events irrespective of order. I propose that the conventional fixed ordering of words which is not related to real life ordering of two separate concepts, marks that those two concepts are regarded as forming a single scenario.

The metaphorical link

The metaphorical link is treated separately because it is a link between scenarios, rather than within scenarios, and can apply to all types of scenario. Lakoff (1989) argues that it is only a kind of metaphorical link (the metaphorical ICM) which allows us to categorize and communicate at all, since our mental structures are based on a metaphorical relationship between the physical world and the conceptual world.

In this thesis, however, the term metaphorical link refers to the language-specific and culture-specific link between two distinct scenarios. One scenario contains a structured cluster of concepts used literally, the other scenario contains a structured cluster of concepts, which may be used literally in one semantic area, and metaphorically to refer to the semantic area which is literally covered by the first scenario. It is this type of metaphorical link which allows us to use similes and metaphors, allegories and riddles.

There must be some prototypical conceptual element in common between two scenarios for them to be linked by a metaphorical link. This will sometimes be made explicit, as in comparisons, and sometimes be implicit, as in most similes and metaphors, e.g.

Comparisons (explicit attribute):
"pig" links with "fat" by an attribute link, e.g. "fat as a pig"
"hatter" links with "mad" by an attribute link, e.g. "mad as a hatter"
δφίς "snake" links with φρόνιμος "wise, shrewd" by an attribute link
(Matthew 10:16) ("as shrewd as snakes")
περιστερά "dove" links with ἄκεφαλος "innocent" by an attribute link
(Matthew 10:16) ("as innocent as doves")
Note that these links are culturally conditioned. The link between pig and fat is perhaps prototypical for many countries and cultures. However the link between hatter and mad is not even prototypical for this country, relying on the fact that hatters used to use mercury in their trade which caused brain damage, yet the link still exists in this comparison.

It is important to realize that similes and metaphors will not “work” unless there is a conceptual link already existing between both the topic and the image with the point of similarity, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic</th>
<th>image</th>
<th>point of similarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fat person</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shrewd person</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td>shrewd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such conceptual links are the relational links within scenarios.

If the audience have no conceptual link already existing between both the topic and the image with the point of similarity, there will be a lack of comprehension. The statement may be taken as metaphorical, but still be meaningless since there is no existing connection between the two items. For example, in Urdu one can say “She is a taxi.” An English audience has a limited understanding, because the point of similarity is unclear, since there are no common conceptual elements in the scenarios for woman and taxi, i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic</th>
<th>image</th>
<th>point of similarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>taxi</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Urdu chart is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic</th>
<th>image</th>
<th>point of similarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prostitute</td>
<td>taxi</td>
<td>operates for hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In translation, such metaphors will need to be dropped and the meaning expressed literally.

It may even be unclear that the words are being used metaphorically. For example, Jesus’s words to Peter “Feed my lambs” (John 21:15) are naturally understood as literal by Parkaris, since these concepts have no metaphorical links to other more contextually relevant concepts. Compare the charts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic</th>
<th>image</th>
<th>point of similarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek disciples</td>
<td>lambs</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek look after</td>
<td>tend, feed</td>
<td>supply needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkari -</td>
<td>lambs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkari -</td>
<td>tend, feed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In translation, such hidden metaphors might be dropped or expressed as a simile if the connection between topic and image is conceptually valid, e.g. “Look after my followers as a shepherd tends the lambs.”

Similes (with implicit or explicit attribute):

“elephant” links with “clumsy person” by a metaphorical link
“elephant” links with “clumsy” by an attribute link
e.g. “He’s like a clumsy great elephant” (explicit attribute),
“He’s like an elephant.” (implicit attribute)
χρυσός “gold” links with υαλός “glass, crystal” by a metaphorical link
χρυσός “gold” links with καθαρός “pure” by an attribute link
υαλός “glass, crystal” links with καθαρός “pure” by an attribute link
e.g. (Rev. 21:18) “pure gold like pure glass” (explicit attribute)
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 règle θεοῦ “rule of God” links with μύη “yeast” by a metaphorical link
 règle θεοῦ “rule of God” links with “spread” by an agent link
 μύη “yeast” links with “spread” by an agent link
 e.g. (Luke 13:20, 21) “the kingdom of God ... like leaven” (implicit attribute)

Metaphors (with implicit or explicit attribute):
  “pig” links with “greedy person” by a metaphorical link
  “pig” links with “greedy” by an attribute link
  e.g. “You greedy pig!” (explicit attribute), “You pig!” (implicit attribute)
  “fox” links with “cunning person” by a metaphorical link
  “fox” links with “cunning” by an attribute link,
  e.g. “You cunning fox!” (explicit attribute), “You fox!” (implicit attribute)
  λύκος “wolf” links with “savage person” by a metaphorical link
  λύκος “wolf” links with βαρός “savage” by an attribute link
  (Acts 20:29) “savage wolves ... will not spare the flock” (explicit attribute)
  νόμισμα “flock” links with “group of dependent people” by a metaphorical link
  νόμισμα “flock” links with “dependent” by an attribute link
  (Acts 20:29) “savage wolves ... will not spare the flock” (implicit attribute)

A specific metaphorical link in one language and culture should not be assumed to exist in another language and culture. For example, the English metaphorical link between “fox” and “cunning” should not be used to exegete the meaning of the Greek metaphor “Go tell that fox” (Luke 13:32). This may perhaps be the correct meaning, but the exegesis must be based on appropriate evidence such as the metaphor’s use in classical and Hellenistic Greek and in Old Testament and rabbinical literature (Fitzmyer, 1985:1031).

The point of similarity is not fixed by the image, but is fixed by the common element between topic and image which is contextually appropriate. For example, “yeast” may be used not only as an image to denote “spreading” as above, but also “corrupting”, e.g.

  μύη “yeast” links with διδαχή “teaching” by a metaphorical link
  διδαχή “teaching” links with “corrupt” by an agent link
  μύη “yeast” links with “corrupt” by an agent link e.g. (Matthew 16:6)
  “beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees” (implicit attribute)
  (see Matthew 16:12 “leaven ... teaching”)

Typically, metaphorical links are not simply between two elements or concepts, but between two scenarios or concept clusters, as Lakoff and Johnson point out (1980:4):

To give some idea of what it could mean for a concept to be metaphorical and for such a concept to structure an everyday activity, let us start with the concept ARGUMENT and the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. This metaphor is reflected in our everyday language by a wide variety of expressions:

  ARGUMENT IS WAR
  Your claims are indefensible.
  He attacked every weak point in my argument.
  His criticisms were right on target.
  I demolished his argument.
  I’ve never won an argument with him.
  You disagree? Okay, shoot!
  If you use that strategy, he’ll wipe you out.
  He shot down all my arguments.

Although some similes and metaphors, especially in poetry and creative writing, are new and daring uses of language which the hearers must analyse for themselves, most metaphorical expressions are well-worn time-honoured culture-based conceptualizations of certain scenarios as related to other scenarios. Often the conceptualization is so complete
that the normal way to talk about something is by use of a metaphor, e.g. Ephesians 4:11, where the word ποιμήν “shepherd” is used as a technical term in a list of types of church worker.

The metaphorical link, since it depends on a cultural and lexical association between completely distinct scenarios, on the basis of a perceived similarity, perhaps causes more translation problems than any other. For example the English phrase “He gets through money like water” implies a profligate waste of money, as if it were a readily renewable resource. Whilst this point of comparison, between wasting money and using water with careless abandon, may be valid in many western countries, it makes no sense to those in the third world, where water is a precious commodity to be used sparingly. For them, the phrase might imply “He is careful with his money.”

Moreover, the concepts might not even link conceptually, e.g. “He spends money like he uses water.” I posit that a conceptual link in a culture is usually evidenced by a lexical term which covers both situations, either by being very generic (e.g. “gets through money/water” above), or by being used both literally and metaphorically (e.g. Genesis 49:4 re Reuben “turbulent as the waters” where “waters/people are turbulent”). Thus, a simile or metaphor can only be translated using the same image when the topic and image are perceived to have a common link. The common link will usually be apparent by the presence of generic words or metaphorical language applying to both topic and image. Specific conceptual links between the target audience’s mental scenarios are culturally determined, and cannot be assumed.

The metonymic link

The metonymic link is also treated separately since it applies to all types of scenario. Elements of a scenario which may stand for the whole scenario are marked by this metonymic link between the single element and the scenario title. Metonymic links cannot be formed unless there is already some existing semantic link within the scenario, e.g.

“thing” scenario

“keel” stands for “ship” by a metonymic link and part-whole link
δυνοτές “chains” stands for “handcuffs and chains” by a metonymic link and part-whole link (Acts 12:7)
κοιλία “womb” stands for “woman” by a metonymic link and location-agent link with γεννάω “bear” (Luke 23:29)
δόφθαλμος “eye” stands for “person” by a metonymic link and instrument-agent link with βλέπω “see” (Matt. 13:16)

“event” scenario

“put the kettle on” stands for “make a hot drink” by a metonymic link and stage link
ανάγω “lead away” includes “execute” by a metonymic link and purpose link (action implies purpose) (Acts 12:19)
ἀνακατέθω “sit up” includes “come alive” by a metonymic link and cause-result link (result implies cause) (Luke 7:15)
πίνω “drink” includes goal, here “wine” by a metonymic link and event-participant link (Matt. 11:18-19)
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"attribute" scenario

"Scottish" includes "mean" by a metonymic link
and (according to English prejudices) co-occurrence link

πλήρης λέξις "lepros" includes "ritually unclean" by a metonymic link
and reason-result link with "consider" (Luke 5:12)
(i.e. because he is leprous people consider him unclean)

πρεσβύτευς "old" includes "probably sterile" by a metonymic link
and co-occurrence link (Luke 1:18, cf. 1:13)
(i.e. old men do not often father children)

καμιστρωλός "sinful" includes "sexually immoral" by a metonymic link
a co-occurrence link and generic-specific link (Luke 7:39)
(i.e. the prototypical sinful women is a prostitute)

"relation" scenario

"or else" includes likely result by a metonymic link and result link, e.g.
"Come her now, or else!"
(Here the "relation" word marking the result link suggests likely slot fillers)

εἰ "if" condition clause includes likely result by a metonymic link and result link, e.g.
"if a sign will be given to this generation." (Mark 8:12)
"if they will enter into my rest." (Heb 3:11)
Perhaps the implicit result is "then my oath is worthless" or "then brand me a liar".
(Burton, 1987:110, calls this usage of εἰ "an emphatic negative assertion or oath"

ξένον "he came" includes "I came" by a metonymic link and part-part link with the person system
e.g. "The Son of Man came eating and drinking" said by Jesus (Matt. 11:19)
(i.e. the third person in Greek is linked to the first person)

ψαράστιτος "he built" includes "he got built" by a metonymic link
and causal agent-agent link with οἰκοδομέω "build" (Luke 7:5)
(i.e. the third person in Greek, marking agent, also links to the causal agent or initiator.
Where it refers to a causal agent or initiator, an active agent or intermediary is implicit.)
cf. Luke 1:70, ἐλάλησεν δίδωσαι υἱὸς τῶν ... προφητῶν
"he spoke by the mouth of the prophets" where both causal agent or initiator and
active agent or intermediary are explicit in the text.

ἐπί "above" stands for the "control" scenario (Eph.4:6)
διὰ "through" stands for the "sustain" scenario (Eph.4:6)
ἐν "in" stands for the "fill" scenario (Eph.4:6)

θεός ... δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν
"God ... above all, and through all, and in all"

In the last three examples, the "relation" word alone refers to the whole "event"
scenario in which it typically occurs. This may explain what Moule (1990:111) calls "the
extraordinary phrase" in 1 Corinthians 4:6, which he argues must be emended or taken as
"the quotation of some 'slogan' ... 'Not beyond what is written'." Perhaps the verb "learn"
is followed by an abstract noun (cf. Heb. 5:8) here consisting of a neuter article and
infinitive, but the infinitive is implicit, since the "relation" word stands for the verb by
metonymy. The use of μὴ "not" itself indicates that a verb is implicit, e.g.

ὑπὲρ "beyond" stands for the "go beyond" scenario (1 Cor. 4:6)
μάθητα τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἀ γεγραμματεύεσθαι
"you may learn not (going) beyond what is written"

All the words used as metonyms may refer to a single element in one context, but
in another context include other elements from the scenario or refer to the whole scenario
via a metonymic link.
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The synonymy link

The synonymy link also applies to all types of scenario. I suggest that the synonymy link is not a direct neural link between lexical items but an implicit link, being formed automatically whenever two or more lexical items are linked to the same concept.

In a very few cases, such words are identical in sense, but even then have different patterns of use, e.g. “violin” and “fiddle” refer to exactly the same instrument, but violin is used when referring to that instrument in the context of classical music and orchestras, and fiddle is used in the context of folk music and dancing.

Mostly synonyms are words which apply to slightly different conceptual scenarios, but the scenarios have a large degree of overlap within which either word is applicable. As Black comments (1990:125-6):

A biblical example of synonymy involves the Greek vocabulary for “love.” The relationship between the meanings of ἀγαπάω and φιλέω is such that the words may be used interchangeably in some contexts. We therefore need not be surprised that ἀγαπάω (popularly considered to refer to divine love) can describe Amnon’s incestuous relationship with his half-sister Tamar (2 Sam 13:15, LXX) or that φιλέω (popularly taken to refer to a lower form of love) can refer to the Father’s love for the Son (John 5:20). In these contexts, both words have components of affection, desire, attachment, and so on. Other New Testament examples of synonymy are:

- λόγος / ῥήμα — “word”
- ὁρώ / βλέπω — “I see”
- ἀκρα / γινώσκω — “I know”

Examples of synonyms due to overlapping scenarios are:

“thing” scenario

- λόγος “word” links to ῥήμα “word” (John 15:20, Matt. 26:75)
- δύναμις “mind” links to καρδία “heart” (Hebrews 8:10, 10:16; reversed)

“event” scenario

- ὁρώ “I see” links to βλέπω “I see” (Luke 13:28, 7:44)
- θέλω “I know” links to γινώσκω “I know” (Mark 1:24, Matt. 25:24)

“attribute” scenario

- πονηρός “evil” links to φαῦλος “bad” (Matthew 5:45, Rom. 9:11)
- δικαιός “good” links to δικαιοσύνη “righteous” (Matthew 5:45)

“relation” scenario

- εἰς “into” links to εν “in” (Mark 1:5, 1:9)
- πρὸ “before” links to πρὶν “before” (Matthew 6:8, 26:34)
- ἐπί “about, for” links to ὑπὲρ “on behalf of, for” (Matthew 26:28, 26:34 and 2 Thess. 3:1, Act 8:24)
Appendix D
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This appendix provides further evidence from the Greek text of the New Testament that lexical usage in discourse reflects the semantic links between concepts within scenarios, as described in Chapter 2 “Types of lexical links within scenarios”.

I assume, as one must for all text analysis, that the New Testament text was originally composed to be lexically cohesive and semantically coherent for its original target audience, and that this cohesiveness and coherence enabled accurate comprehension (except where the text itself specifically indicates that the original audience misunderstood, e.g. Matthew 16:6, 12).

Evidence in New Testament Greek of linked lexicon throughout a text

Let us also look at a short passage from the New Testament, Luke 4:16-21, to see how the lexicon is related to categories within scenarios, and so provides lexical cohesion.

(The Old Testament quotation from Isaiah 61:1-2 is bolded.)

4.16
Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέα, οὗ ἦν τεθαρμένος
And he-came to Nazareth, where he-was brought-up

καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν
and he-came-in according-to the custom to-him in the day of the sabbaths into the synagogue

καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνώρισαι.
and he-stood to-read.

4.17
καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαίου
And was-given to-him scroll of-the prophet Isaiah

καὶ ἀναπτύχασε τὸ βιβλίον εἰβεν τῶν τόπων οὗ ἦν γεγραμένον, and having-opened the scroll he-found the place where was written

4.18
Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ
Spirit of-lord on me

οὐ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελισάσαθι πτωχοῖς,
because he-anointed me to-preach-good-news to-poor

ἀπεσταλέν με, κηρύξας αἱμαλαίτως ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλῶς ἀνάβλεψιν,
he-has-sent me to-announce to-prisoners release and to blind sight,

ἀποστελαὶ τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἄφεσιν,
to-send-away oppressed in release,

4.19
κηρύξας ἐναυτῶν κυρίου δεκτῶν.
to-announce year of-lord favourable.

4.20
καὶ πτύχας τὸ βιβλίον ἀπόδοσις τῷ ὑπερτείρῃ ἐκάθευς.
And having-rolled-up the scroll having-given-back to-the attendant he-sat.

καὶ πάντων οἱ ὄφθαλμοι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀπενεκτότες αὐτῷ. And of-all the eyes in the synagogue were gazing to-him.
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4.21
ήρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς δὴν
He began ὅ to say to them that

Σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὅσιοι Ἰησοῦ.
Today has been fulfilled the scripture this in the ears of you.

Although Jesus is the semantic agent of the verbs in the narrative section above, there is no subject noun or pronoun, simply the third person singular nominative ending on participles. The word αὐτῷ “to him” in verses 16, 17, and 20 also refers to Jesus. This minimal anaphoric reference is possible because Jesus is the topical participant throughout.

In narrative, lexical links typically show the scope of different interlocking scenarios, by forming clusters of related information. For example, in verse 16 Jesus comes into Nazareth, which opens up a “town” scenario. This town is the LOCATION for “the synagogue” which is introduced in the same verse. Along with the “event” of Jesus entering the synagogue the temporal CIRCUMSTANCE is given “on the Sabbath day”. The collocation of these two elements of time and place open up the scenario of the synagogue “service” or assembly, since it was the custom to attend the service in the synagogue on the Sabbath. Verse 16 makes it explicit that this was also “the custom” of Jesus.

The synagogue service probably began with the singing of a Psalm and the recitation of the Shema (Deut. 6:4-9) and the “Eighteen blessings”. Then came scripture reading, first from the Law then from the Prophets, and exposition of the scripture, concluded by a blessing (Fitzmyer, 1981:531). Luke, however, does not mention the first part of the service, choosing to focus on the reading from the Prophets and its exposition. The events listed in the text follow the prototypical “script” for this section of the “service” scenario, already opened in the text, i.e. one of the congregation stands to read the scriptures, an attendant gives them the scroll to read, they read it, hand back the scroll, then sit to teach. This can be shown in sequential verb frames as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>event</th>
<th>agent</th>
<th>purpose</th>
<th>goal</th>
<th>recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 stand</td>
<td>adult member of the congregation</td>
<td>to read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 give</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 unroll</td>
<td>adult member of the congregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 find</td>
<td>adult member of the congregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 read</td>
<td>adult member of the congregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event 6</th>
<th>Roll up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Adult member of the congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event 7</th>
<th>Give back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Adult member of the congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event 8</th>
<th>Sit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Adult member of the congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To teach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event 9</th>
<th>Teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Adult member of the congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Message from the scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Congregation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the text follows the script extremely closely.

Event 1, καὶ ἄνεστιν ἀναγυάλων “and he-stood-to-read” (verse 16). Although the purpose of standing is made explicit as “to read”, “scriptures” is left implicit, being inferred from the contents of the “service” scenario.

Event 2, καὶ ἔπεσον αὐτῷ βιβλίου τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαίου “And was-given to-him scroll of-the prophet Isaiah.” (verse 17). The passive construction leaves the agent implicit, but it is recoverable from the “service” scenario.

Event 3, καὶ ἁναπτύσσει ἃν ἂν τὸ βιβλίον “and having-opened the scroll” (verse 17).

Event 4, εὑρεν τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν γεγραμμένον “he-found the place where was written...” (verse 17). It is implicit that he found this place actually in the scroll.

Event 5. The actual event of “reading”, the core event of this section of the script, is left implicit. By explicitly mentioning the preparation for this event (events 3 and 4, “opening the scroll” and “finding the place”), and mentioning the goal (the passage quoted in verses 18-19), the writer expects the readers to understand that the reading took place and the audience (first mentioned later in verse 20) were present. This requires the readers to refer to their existing mental scenarios to fill in the implicit details. It may seem surprising that the key event of a script can be left implicit, as in this example. However, since the script is so clearly evoked by so many of its sequential events the main event is assumed, unless there is explicit evidence to the contrary.

Event 6, καὶ πτύξασ αὐτῷ βιβλίου “And having-rolled-up the scroll” (verse 20).

Event 7, ἀπέστειλεν τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ “having-given-back to-the attendant” (verse 20). The goal of this event, the “scroll”, is implicit, being retrievable from the scenario.

Event 8, ἐκάθισεν “he-sat” (verse 20). The purpose is left implicit, being recoverable from the scenario. The expectation that Jesus was about to teach about this passage explains the comment in verse 20 καὶ ταῦτα οἱ ὁθολομοι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ “And of-all the eyes in the synagogue were gazing to-him.”

Event 9, ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι “He-began () to-say to them that” (verse 21). The fact that Jesus is “teaching” about the passage he has read, rather than just holding a conversation, is implicit, and must be recovered from the script of this scenario. The content of Jesus’s teaching is made explicit in the next part of the verse, Σημερον
The material within the Old Testament quotation shows lexical cohesion internally, but not externally with the surrounding narrative. The first obvious difference is that the third person singular marking of the verbs refers to “the Lord” since it takes its reference anaphorically from the noun phrase ἡ πνεῦμα κυρίου “Spirit of-lord”.

Normally, of course, first person pronouns refer to the speaker. Here however, Jesus is reading scripture, so the first person pronouns ἐμέ and με would grammatically seem to refer back to the original speaker/author, the prophet Isaiah. However, given the fact that Old Testament prophets may speak words from someone else’s standpoint, the reference of the first person is not as clear as grammar would suggest. There are examples of Isaiah’s words where first person refers to the speaker (e.g. Isaiah 6:5, 62:1), to God (e.g. Isaiah 60:22, 61:8), to the Jewish people (e.g. Isaiah 49:1-7), and, at least in later understanding, to the Messiah (e.g. this passage, Isaiah 61:1-4). This passage was evidently understood by those present in Nazareth as Messianic. Whether or not this was already an accepted interpretation, the phrase ἐχρισαντε μέ “he-anointed me” (4:18) suggests a reference to the scenario of the Messiah, God’s “Anointed One”. A Messianic interpretation of this Isaiah passage explains why the issue of proof of Jesus’s Messiahship is raised (verses 22-23). The audience comment (disparagingly) on Jesus’s humble birth, and Jesus himself expresses their unspoken challenge “If you really are the Messiah claiming to ‘proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord’ then show us the miracles to back up your claim!” (cf. John 7:31). A Messianic interpretation also explains why they try to kill him (verse 29), breaking God’s commandment not to murder, and risking punishment under Roman civil law. The only reasonable interpretation of their action is that they believed Jesus was committing blasphemy by claiming to be the Christ (cf. John 10:33).

In verse 21, Jesus expounds the meaning of “me” in this passage as referring to himself as the speaker, Σήμερον πεπλήρωσα ἡ γραφή αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν. “Today has-been-fulfilled the scripture this in the ears of-you”. Thus by identifying himself, the current speaker of these words, as the person this Messianic text referred to, he is stating, somewhat obliquely for modern day gentiles, “I am the Messiah.” The words πεπλήρωσα “has-been-fulfilled” and γραφή “scripture” belong in the same scenario as προφήτης “prophet” (verse 17), since a prophet speaks a message which is written down as “scripture” and will be “fulfilled”.

Verses 18-19, have specific vocabulary referring to the Messiah’s mission. There is a cluster of vocabulary related to divine commission: Πνεῦμα κυρίου “Spirit of-lord”, ἐχρισαντε “he-anointed”, ἀπέσταλκεν “he-has-sent”. There is another cluster of phrases relating to the Messianic mission, each of which consists of a positive event the Messiah will perform, and a downtrodden group who will benefit from this: εὐαγγελίσασθαι
πτωχοίς “to-preach-good-news to-poor”, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφέσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν “to-announce to-prisoners release and to blind sight”, ἀποστέλλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσιν “to-send-away oppressed in release”. These may be considered as specific items which come under the generic heading κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν “to-announce year of-lord favourable”. Alternatively, all these phrases are specific items which belong to the implicit generic term “the Messiah’s mission”.

This short quotation also has several key lexical items occurring twice: κύριος “Lord” (verses 18 and 19, forming an inclusio, being in the genitive case both times, and occurring second and penultimately), ἀποστέλλω “send” (verse 18, twice), κηρύσσω “announce” (verses 18 and 19), and ἀφέσις “release” (verse 18, twice). This also provides lexical cohesion and helps identify the theme of this passage.

All this vocabulary fits into the “Messiah” scenario, even though the word is not used. Only the two items in brackets, i.e. (Messiah) and (empower), are not explicitly referred to in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>agent</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>goal</th>
<th>benefactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Messiah)</td>
<td>(Messiah)</td>
<td>Messiah</td>
<td>Messiah</td>
<td>Messiah</td>
<td>Messiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Messiah)</td>
<td>(empower)</td>
<td>(Messiah)</td>
<td>(Messiah)</td>
<td>(Messiah)</td>
<td>(Messiah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit of the Lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several lexical items in this quotation reappear in Luke 7:22, where Jesus responds to John the Baptist’s question “Are you the one who is to come?” by listing items related to the Messiah’s mission: “The blind (τυφλοί) receive sight, the lame walk, those who have leprosy are cured, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the good news is preached to the poor (πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζωνται)”. Here, the first and last events exactly match two of the five events listed above which have the Messiah as agent, and the other events here can be seen as specific examples of the generic events listed above “announcing release to the captives” “releasing the oppressed” and “announcing the year of the Lord’s favour”.

Thus almost all the lexical items in this passage can be seen to belong to one or other of two distinct scenarios, either that of the “synagogue service” or that of the “Messiah”. This semantic relationship underlying the lexical items is what gives the passage lexical cohesion, and what enables us to understand that Jesus is here claiming to be the Messiah, even though the word never occurs in this text.
Evidence for the linked contents of a “thing” scenario

A “thing” scenario was shown above to contain at least the following categories:

**TITLE**

**GENERIC CATEGORY**

**PART-WHOLE RELATIONS**

**LOCATION**

**ORIGIN**

**SIZE**

**APPEARANCE**

**BEHAVIOUR if animate**

**RELATION TO PEOPLE if animate**

**PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT if inanimate (e.g. HOW EATEN, HOW USED)**

I give examples showing each of these links. The text is from the NIV (as a fairly literal translation) with the Greek root of key words in brackets:

**TITLE**

Matthew 16:6: “Be on your guard against the yeast (ζύμη) of the Pharisees and Sadducees.”

The disciples’ misunderstanding of this statement relies on the same title “yeast” applying to two scenarios, one literal, that of making bread, and one metaphorically linked to that same scenario, being the scenario of wrong teaching, which, like yeast, has a pervasive influence. The two scenarios opened by this title are referred to explicitly in Matthew 16:12 “not ... the yeast used in bread, but the teaching...”

**GENERIC CATEGORY**

Matthew 10:9 “Do not take along any gold (χρυσός) or silver (άργυρος) or copper (χαλκός) in your belts.”

Mark 6:8 “Take ... no money (χαλκόν copper) ...”

Luke 9:3 “Take ... no money (άργυρον silver) ...”

Matthew uses the three specific metals used for making coins to refer to the generic category of money. The parallel passages in Mark and Luke each use a single specific metal to refer to the generic category of money.

**PART-WHOLE RELATIONS**

1 Corinthians 12:16 “And if the ear (αυτής) should say, ‘Because I am not an eye (δύναμις), I do not belong to the body (οσμά),’ it would not for that reason cease to be part of the body.”

Not only does this verse mention two body parts, ear and eye, in relationship to the body, but the whole passage, verses 12-27, shows that this relationship is part to whole.

**LOCATION**

Luke 5:27: “After this, Jesus went out and saw a tax collector (τελώνης) by the name of Levi sitting at his tax booth (τελώνιον).”

Matthew 9:9: “As Jesus went on from there he saw a man (άνθρωπος) named Matthew sitting at the tax collector’s booth (τελώνιον).”

Whereas Luke explicitly states that the person in the tax collector’s booth was a tax collector, in Matthew the fact that this “person” (άνθρωπος) is a tax collector is implicit from the place where he is sitting (cf. Mark 2:14). The coherence of Matthew 9:10 relies on identifying Matthew as a tax collector (rather than a tax payer who just happened to be
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having a sit down at the tax booth when Jesus came along) thus explaining why many tax collectors were his guests.

**ORIGIN**

Luke 13:19: “It is like a mustard seed (κόκκος), which a man took and planted in his garden. It grew and became a tree (δέντρον).”

The connection between seed and tree relies on the understanding that they are in the same scenario, the seed being the origin of the tree. Without such a semantic link, one would expect “It grew and became enormous” (i.e. became an enormous seed).

**SIZE**

Matthew 19:24: “... it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.”

The disciples realized that this signified impossibility, as shown by their response in verse 25 “Who then can be saved?”. This understanding, however, relies on knowledge of the comparative size of a camel (big) and the eye of a needle (tiny).

**APPEARANCE**

James 2:2: “Suppose a man (ἄνδρος) comes into your meeting wearing a gold ring (χρυσόδακτυλός) and fine (αμπελός) clothes, and a poor man (πτωχὸς) in shabby (δυσμακάδας) clothes also comes in.”

James 2:6: “But you have insulted the poor (πτωχὸς). Is it not the rich (πλούσιος) who are exploiting you?”

In verse 2 “man” is contrasted with “poor man”, but in verse 6 “rich man” is contrasted with “poor man”. The coherence depends on the fact that the “man” in verse two is implicitly identified as a rich man by his appearance, i.e. his gold ring and fine clothes, which only fits the scenario of “rich man”.

**BEHAVIOUR if animate**

Matthew 4:18: “They were casting a net into the lake, for (γὰρ) they were fishermen (ἄλεθος).”

The conjunction γὰρ indicates that their being fisherman explains their behaviour, “casting a net”. This is because “fisherman” is the prototypical participant in the “agent slot” for the event scenario “caste a net”.

**RELATION TO PEOPLE if animate**

Luke 11:12: “Or if he asks for an egg, will give him a scorpion (σκορπίδος)?”

The point here is not that a scorpion is not good to eat (though it probably is not), but that instead of being beneficial (providing nourishment), it is downright harmful (prototypically stinging a child). Verse 13 picks up the theme of “good gifts”, reinforcing the implication that a scorpion is a bad gift. This information is not explicit in the text, so must be in the scenario for scorpion.
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**PEOPLE’S RELATION TO IT if inanimate (e.g. HOW EATEN, HOW USED)**

Matthew 5:13: "You are the salt (ἀλάτι) of the earth. But if the salt loses its saltiness, how can it be made salty again? It is no longer good for anything, except to be thrown out and trampled by men."

To understand this passage, one must not only realize that in the first statement salt is used metaphorically, but also one must know what salt is typically used for, i.e. preserving and flavouring food. Unless one knows the normal use of “salty” salt, one cannot appreciate the contrast with the abnormal “use” of “non-salty” salt, i.e. throwing it away, nor can one understand the point of the metaphor.

The categories above do not exhaust the possible linkages, which may extend into categories of interlinked scenarios, e.g.

Matthew 10:8 “Heal (θεραπεύω) the sick (ἀσθενέω) ... cleanse (καθαρίζω) those who have leprosy (λεπρός) ...”

Here lepers are contrasted with the sick, rather than being seen as a sub-group of the sick. Moreover they are to be cleansed, not healed. These anomalies are explained by a causal link between “leprosy” and “ritual impurity” which links those two scenarios. The scenario of “ritual impurity” is not explicit in the text, but is evident from the use of vocabulary from that scenario (cleanse), rather than from the sickness scenario (heal).

**Evidence for the linked contents of an “event” scenario**

An “event” scenario was shown above to contain at least the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>GENERIC CATEGORY</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>CIRCUMSTANCES</th>
<th>PART-WHOLE RELATIONS</th>
<th>PARTS</th>
<th>STAGES</th>
<th>CAUSATION</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I give illustrations of each:

**TITLE:**

John 13:10: “A person who has had a bath (λουω) needs only to wash (νιπτω) his feet; his whole body is clean.”

This passage relies on the two titles “λουω” and “νιπτω” activating two contrasting scenarios in the hearers’ minds, each of which includes details of participants which are not explicit in the word itself, but are recoverable from the scenario. Both scenarios include a person (agent) using water (instrument) for cleaning off dirt (purpose), but the parts of the body washed (goal, or object) are contrasted. The verb λουω prototypically involves washing the whole body, as shown by the other 4 occurrences in the New Testament, Acts 9:37 “a corpse”, Acts 16:33 “wounds” probably on most of the torso and legs (cf. 16:23 “severely flogged), Hebrews 10:22 “bodies”, and 2 Peter 2:22 “a pig”. Contrastingly νιπτω involves washing only a part of the body, as shown by the other 16
occurrences in the New Testament, i.e. "face" (Matt. 6:17), "hands" (Matt. 15:2, Mark 7:3), "eyes" (implied in John 9:7 (x2), 11 (x2), 15), "feet" (John 13:5, 6, 8 (x2), 12, 14 (x2), 1 Tim. 5:10) (data from GRAMCORD).

Hence after having a bath "his whole body is clean" but the feet, which then get dirty through walking, may need to be washed. These verbs, then, are titles of complete scenarios which differ as to the possible fillers of the goal slot. This is shown very clearly in the text of Sinaiticus which omits the words "the feet" altogether, reading "A person who has had a bath (λούω) needs only to wash (φεύγω); his whole body is clean." The contrast here is thus between elements which are not explicit in the text, but retrieved from the "event" scenarios whose titles are in the text.

**GENERIC CATEGORY**

Acts 22:4: "I persecuted (διώκω) the followers of this Way to their death, arresting (καταθηκάω) both men and women and throwing (τραπεζώμω) them into prison."

The main verb "persecute" is generic, and the two verbs in present participle form are specific exemplars of the category "persecute" which is at a conceptually higher node.

**PARTICIPANTS**

Mark 1:4 "... a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness (ἀφεναι) of sins."

James 5:15 "If he has sinned he will be forgiven (ἀφίημι)."

The examples above, using the abstract noun "forgiveness" and the passive form "forgiven", refer to the "event" scenario "forgive" without making the participant as "agent" explicit. However in both the above examples, God is implicitly the one who forgives, because the New Testament scenario for "forgive" has God as the prototypical agent, unless the context makes it clear that an individual is forgiving someone else for the wrongs he has done to him personally. The fact that God is the prototypical agent in the "forgive" scenario is shown by Mark 2:7 "Who can forgive (ἀφίημι) sins but God alone?".

**CIRCUMSTANCES**

John 21:7b "he wrapped his outer garment around him (for he had taken it off) (ἡ γάρ γυμνός) and jumped into the water."

The context is that Peter is fishing. The author clarifies why Peter had cause to put on his outer garment (he was naked/wearing only an undergarment), but does not bother to explain why Peter had taken it off in the first place. This indicates that such an explanation was unnecessary, and provides evidence that "stripping down to a loin-cloth or tunic" was appropriate for night fishing, and belongs in the circumstance slot of the fishing scenario.

**PART-WHOLE RELATIONS: PARTS**

1 Corinthians 3:6 "I planted the seed (φυτεύω), Apollos watered it (ποτίζω), but God made it grow (αὐξάνω)."

A part-whole relationship between "events" is unusual, as often events which belong together have a fixed sequence, and thus are better conceived of as stages (see
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below). In this example, however, the planting takes place once initially, the watering takes place on many separate occasions, and the growth happens continuously from beginning to end, so these events are better analysed as parts of the scenario “growing a crop”, rather than discrete stages in that process.

PART-WHOLE RELATIONS: STAGES

Mark 4:28 “All by itself the soil produces corn - first the stalk (χῶρτος), then the ear (σταχλός), then the full grain (στός) in the ear.”

Here the stages from an “event” scenario are listed sequentially. Note that although the words are nouns, the stages referred to are events.

CAUSATION

Matthew 7:27 “The rain came down, (καὶ) the streams rose, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and (καὶ) it fell with a great crash.”
Acts 7:47 “But it was Solomon who built (οἰκοδόμεω) the house for him.”
Contrast Matthew 7:24b “a wise man who built (οἰκοδόμεω) his house upon a rock.”

In the first example, there are two implicit causal links. The rising of the streams is caused by the rainfall, and the falling of the house is caused by the streams and the wind, but the explicit grammatical marking for each is merely καὶ “and”. An implicit causal link is one which is therefore recoverable from the mental scenario evoked, rather than marked in the text. We ourselves probably do not even notice that the text fails to mark the causal link, since we automatically supply it from our own scenario.

In the second example, causality is implicit in the Greek verb “build”. Although the wise man who builds the house may be understood as building it with his own hands (and this certainly fits the metaphorical meaning best), Solomon most certainly did not build the temple with his own hands, but rather caused the temple to be built. Again it is the scenario, rather than the grammar or the lexicon, which determines the chain of causality and establishes whether the grammatical subject of a verb is semantically the agent or the causal agent. “King” and “build” only show lexical cohesiveness and semantic coherence if “king” is understood as a causal agent or initiator, rather than a hands-on builder.

PURPOSE

John 15:2 “... every branch that does bear fruit he prunes (καθαίρεω), so that it will be even more fruitful (καρπός, φέρω).”
Matthew 10:14 “If anyone will not welcome you or listen to your words, shake (ἐκτυνάσαω) the dust off your feet when you leave that home or town.”
Luke 9:5 “If people do not welcome you, shake (ἀποτυνάσαω) the dust off your feet when you leave that town, as a testimony (μαρτύρον) against them...”

The first example makes the purpose of pruning explicit in the grammar. The second example shows that the reader is expected to understand the purpose of “shaking the dust off your feet” by referring to their own mental scenario. The purpose is made explicit in Luke, perhaps because his readership, being gentiles, would not all be familiar with this Jewish custom.
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This appendix provides evidence from the Greek text of the New Testament of the relationship between scenarios and grammar, as described in Chapter 3 “Scenarios affect information status and reference”.

Acts 9:36-41 shows how grammatical features in Greek, such as the choice of main verb or participle, and the use of the article, are directly linked to the information status of referents, specifically the opening of new scenarios, or reference to open scenarios and their contents. Each line is numbered consecutively for ease of reference:

Acts 9:36-41
1 'Εν Ἰώρα (ς τήν μαθητήρα ονόματι Ταβιθᾶ.
2 In Ἰωρά (ς τήν μαθητήρα ονόματι Ταβιθᾶ.
3 ἡ θερισμένεσσα λέγεται Δορκᾶς.
4 which being-interpreted is-called Dorcas
5 αὕτη ἦν πληρές ἐργὸν ἀγάθων καὶ ἐλεημοσύνην.
6 She was full-of-works good and almsgiving
7 ὅπως έπολει.
8 which she-was-doing
9 ἡ ὑμείρας ἐκεῖνος ἀποθνήσκασαν αὐτήν ἀποθάνειν.
10 It-happened (ς) in days those having-sickened she to-die
11 λοιποντες ὡς θηκαν (αὐτήν) ἐν ὑπερψω.
12 having-washed (ς) they-placed [her] in upper-room
13 ἐγγὺς δὲ αὐτῆς Λύδας τῇ Ἰώρα.
14 Near (ς) being Lyrrha to-the Ἰωρά
15 οἱ μαθηταί ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Πέτρος ἐστίν ἐν αὐτῇ
16 the disciples having-heard that Peter is in it
17 ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἀνδρας πρὸς αὐτὸν παρακαλοῦντες,
18 sent two men towards him requesting
19 Μὴ ἀνήγητης διελθεῖν ἐως ἡμῶν.
20 Don’t hesitate to-come to us
21 ἀναστὰς δὲ Πέτρος συνήθεν αὐτοῖς.
22 having-risen (ς) Peter went-with them
23 δὲν παραγενόμενοι ἀνήγαγαν ἐς τὸ ὑπερψω.
24 whom having-arrived they-led-up into the upper-room
25 καὶ παρέστησαν αὐτῇ πάσαν ἀλ ἱπατα κλαίωσαν.
26 and they-stood-beside him all the widows weeping
27 καὶ ἐπιδεικνύμεναι χιτῶνας καὶ ἱματία
28 and showing under-garments and over-garments
29 διὰ ἐπολέει μετ’ αὐτῶν ὅσα ἡ Δορκᾶς.
30 which she was making with them being the Dorcas
31 οἵτινες δὲ ἐξω πάντας δὲ Πέτρος
32 having-ejected (ς) outside all the Peter
33 καὶ θέλε τὰ γυναῖκα προσπέπτετο
34 and having-placed the knees he-prayed
35 καὶ ἐπιστρέφας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα ἐπένεν,
36 and having-turned towards the body he-said
37 καὶ ἔπεσεν πάντας καὶ ἀπεθάνει.
38 and having-fallen all and died.
39 Ἡ δὲ ἠκούσετο τοὺς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῆς.
40 She (ς) opened the eyes of her
41 καὶ ἱδονα τὸν Πέτρον ἀνεκάθαρσεν
42 and having-seen the Peter sat-up,
43 διὸς δὲ αὐτῇ χειρὰ ἀπέστησεν αὐτήν.
44 having-given (ς) to-her hand he-raised her,
45 φωνῆσας δὲ τοὺς ἀγάλμας καὶ τὰς χειρὰς παρέστησεν αὐτήν ὡσαν.
46 having-called (ς) the saints and the widows he-presented her living.
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This text provides evidence for the following links between grammar and scenarios:

a) Absence of the article with a noun opens a new scenario, whereas use of the article is a sign that the noun so labelled refers back to an open scenario, i.e. GIVEN information, or to a Discourse-new element belonging to an already open scenario, i.e. KNOWN information, e.g.

Opening a new scenario (anarthrous noun)
- good works and almsgiving ἔργα καὶ ἐκπίτασθαι line 3
- under-garments and over-garments καὶ ἑλπίδα line 14

Opening a new scenario (anarthrous noun) and referring back to it when open (arthrous noun):
- Opening a new scenario (anarthrous noun) and referring back to it when open (arthrous noun):
  - Joppa Ἕκτορες line 1, the Joppa τῇ Ἰερουσαλήμ line 7
  - Dorcas Ὑδρακάς line 1, the Dorcas Ἡ Ὑδρακάς line 15
  - upper room ἑπεκρόμω line 6, the upper room τῇ ἑπεκρόμω line 12
  - Peter Πέτρος line 8, the Peter ὁ Πέτρος line 16, 21

(in line 11, Peter Πέτρος occurs without the article. This is the point where Peter becomes active in the story, and I argue later that this anarthrousness indicates “salience”. See Chapter 6.)

Referring to a Discourse-new item in an open scenario (arthrous noun):
- those days εν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡκέλλευσαν line 5, refers to a Discourse-new time in the open scenario for the events of Acts 9:32-35.
- the widows αἱ ἠγάπας ἡκέλλευσαν line 13, refers to a Discourse-new group in the open scenario for the disciples ἡ μαθηται line 8.
- the knees τὰ γόνατα line 17, refers to a Discourse-new body part in the open scenario Peter ὁ Πέτρος line 16.
- the body τὸ σῶμα line 18, refers to a Discourse-new item in the open scenario Tabitha Ταβίθα, line 1 and following.

b) A third person pronoun refers to an open scenario which is currently in short-term processing memory, i.e. GIVEN, e.g.
- she αὕτη line 3 refers to the open scenario disciple μαθητής line 1.
- it αὕτη line 8 refers to the open scenario Lydda Λιβαδάς line 7.
  Line 7 has two feminine town names Lydda and Joppa
  Lydda is “salient” due to having no article, so αὕτη refers to Lydda.
- him αὐτὸν line 9 refers to the open scenario Peter Πέτρος line 8.
- them αὐτοῖς line 11 refers to the open scenario men ἀνδρας line 9.

c) A first or second person pronoun refers to an open scenario which is currently in short-term processing memory, i.e. GIVEN textual, or to a participant in the current real-life situation, i.e. GIVEN situational e.g.
- us ἡμᾶς line 10 refers to the open scenario two men δύο ἀνδρας line 9.

d) A null pronoun, first, second or third person, refers to an open scenario which is currently in short-term processing memory, i.e. GIVEN textual, or to a participant in the current real-life situation, i.e. GIVEN situational e.g.

GIVEN textual
- null pronoun (they) with sent ἀπέστειλαν line 9
  refers to the open scenario disciples μαθητής line 8.
- null pronoun (you singular) with hesitate ἠκούσας line 10
  refers to the open scenario Peter Πέτρος line 8, αὐτὸν line 9.
- null pronoun (you singular) with rise ἀνάστηθα line 19
  refers to the open scenario Tabitha Ταβίθα line 19.
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GIVEN situational
null pronoun (they) with having washed λοίπαντες and placed ἐθηκαν
line 6, refers to people expected to be in the current real-life situation, e.g. fellow disciples,
see female disciple μαθήτρια line 1.

e) Possessive pronouns frequently open new scenarios (for the thing possessed) which are
already part of an open scenario (the possessor), e.g.
her eyes τοις δραμαλιοῖς αὐτής line 20 opens a new scenario eyes
which is part of the open scenario Ταβίθα Ταβιθά line 19

f) Participles belong to an open, or about-to-be-opened scenario. They may refer to an
open scenario, or to Discourse-new elements of an open scenario, or may refer to
Discourse-new elements which belong in the scenario of the next main verb, e.g.

participle referring to open scenario
Example from John 9:11b where “go” and “wash” occur first as main verbs, then as participles:
ἐπίνειν μοι ὅτι ἡπαγε εἰς τὸν Σιλοαμ καὶ νῦναι:
he-said to-me that Go to the Siloam and wash,
ἀπέλθων οὖν καὶ νυφάμενος ἀνεβλεψα.
having-gone therefore and having-washed I saw.

participle referring to a Discourse-new element of an open scenario
requesting παρακαλοῦντες line 9 refers to a new element in the
open scenario send ἀπέστειλαν line 9
weeping κλαίοντας line 13 and showing ἐπηδεικνύμενα line 14 refer to new
elements in the open scenario stand beside παρέστησαν line 13
alive ζωαν line 23 refers to a new element in the open scenario
come alive which has been accessed by opened ἠρωξεν line 20,
and sat up ἀνεκδιάθεσεν line 21

participle referring to a Discourse-new element which is part of the scenario of the following main verb
having sickened ἀσθενήσασαν line 3 is part of the die scenario ἀποθαναν
having washed λοίπαντες line 6 is part of the place scenario ἐθηκαν
(which is the result of the open scenario die ἀποθαναν line 5)
having heard ἀκούσασαν line 8 is part of the send scenario ἀπέστειλαν line 9
having risen ἀνευράσας line 11 is part of the go scenario συνηθήσεν
having placed the knees ἔπεσε τα γώνατα line 17 is part of the pray scenario προσηπάτω
having turned ἐπιστρέφοντας line 18 is part of the say scenario ἐπίνειν
In all these cases of Aorist Participles preceding the main verb, the verbs are in the same
sequential order as in real time.

g) Main verbs usually open new scenarios, except in subordinate clauses where they
frequently refer to open scenarios, e.g.

main verb opening a new scenario
was ἦν line 1, opens a new scenario introducing a new character
it happened ... die ἐγένετο ... ἀποθαναν line 5, opens a new scenario
(of which having sickened ἀσθενήσασαν is a part)
placed ἐθηκαν line 6, opens a new scenario
sent ἀπέστειλαν line 9, opens a new scenario

main verb in subordinate clause referring to open scenario
is called λέγεται line 2 refers to the open scenario name διάματη line 1
she-was-doing ἔποτει line 4 refers to the open scenario
good works and almsgiving ἔργαν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἐλεημοσύνων line 3
led-up ἀνήγαγον line 12 refers to the open scenario went with συνηθήθεν line 11
she-was-making εὐπολεῖ. line 15 refers to the open scenario
under-garments and over-garments χίτωνας καὶ λμάτα. line 14
In all the above instances the verb in the subordinate clause is linked to a noun in the open
scenario by a relative pronoun.

Further evidence for the use of participle and article in relationship to scenarios is
given in Chapters 5 and 6 respectively.
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This appendix provides textual evidence to support the hypothesis that Greek prenuclear and postnuclear Participles are part of the main verb’s scenario, as summarized in Chapter 5 “Evidence that Greek Participial Clauses belong in the main verb’s scenario”.

I) Semantic feasibility:

In Chapter 4, I divided Acts 9:36-41 into chunks according to the participle and main verb clusters, and noted the following:
a) The string of main verbs, which represent the scenario titles, gave a plausible summary of the storyline. This conforms to my hypothesis that a sequence of scenarios makes up the storyline.
b) The individual clusters of Participles and main verb seemed to refer to concepts which would naturally belong together in the mental scenarios of the original author and audience.
c) The chunking of the text produced by this grammatico-conceptual approach fitted exactly with an analysis done independently by discourse analysts Callow and Callow (1996).

These factors suggest that it is semantically feasible that participles belong to the scenario of the main verb. Mark 1:16-20 provides further evidence to support this conclusion (chunked according to main verbs in non subordinate clauses):

1) Semantic feasability:

And going-along beside the sea of-the Galilee he-saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting in the sea they-were for fishermen

And immediately having-left the nets they-followed him.

And having-walked-on a-little he-saw James the of-the Zebedee and John the brother of-him, and them in the boat mending the nets, And having-left the father of-them Zebedee in the boat with the hired

And immediately he-called them.

And having-left the father of-them Zebedee in the boat with the hired
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Using the criteria above we see

a) The main verbs give a plausible summary of the story:

Jesus saw Simon and Andrew, he said “follow me”, they followed him.
He saw James and John, he called, they went off after him.

b) The scenario clusters are plausible, i.e. they relate to clusters of concepts which

prototypically, in the author’s cultural setting, might occur together:

going along, he saw, casting (nets), were fishermen
he said [follow, I will make]
having left ..., they followed
having walked on, he saw, mending
he called:
having left ..., they went off after.

c) Chunking the text by this grammatico-conceptual approach gives two sets of three

consecutive scenarios, each parallel with each other:

he saw Simon and Andrew, he said, they followed.
he saw James and John, he called, they went off after.

Although the words are different for the second and third scenarios in each set, they

are clearly co-referential titles for the same scenario. Lane (1974:69) says “The terms in

which they [James and John] were called is not explicitly stated, but the intimate

relationship of these two incidents indicates that they were also summoned to be fishers of

men.”

What is this “intimate relationship”? The text says Simon and Andrew were

fishermen casting in the sea, were told to come, so left their nets and followed Jesus. In

contrast James and John were mending nets in the boat, were called, so left their father and

went after Jesus. The only common vocabulary is εἶδεν “saw”, ἀδελφὸν “brother”,

δίκτυα “nets”, and ἀφέντες “having left”. But using scenario theory, we see that despite

different vocabulary, the scenarios opened are the same, and this links the two incidents

closely.

2) Grammatical indications:

As we saw in Chapter 4, there are certain other grammatical patterns, apart from

Participle and main verb clustering, which are found in these grammaticalized scenario

clusters.

a) The implicit subject of Nominative Participial Clauses is always the same as that of the

main verb. The subject may be explicit (i.e. noun or pronoun) or null. In any case, the

subject never occurs explicitly more than once per scenario, e.g.

Mark 1:16
Kal παραρχαὶ ... εἶδεν
And [Jesus] going-along ... he-saw

Mark 1:18
καὶ εὔθες ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἤκολοθοθησαν αὐτῷ.
And immediately [they] having-left the nets they-followed him.
b) Typically only one conjunction occurs per scenario, at the beginning of each scenario block. This was shown in Acts 9:36-41 (analysed in Chapter 4) where the conjunction δὲ occurred at the beginning of each section of narrative development, in line with its analysis as a developmental particle (Levinsohn, 1992:32-40). Such conjunctions operate at the level of the whole scenario, not the particular adjacent verb form. This supports the theory that scenarios are the chunks which the author joins together to make the story.

Similarly, in Mark 1:16-20 above, all six scenario blocks begin with the conjunction καί “and”. The only other conjunctions are in subordinated clauses, one introducing a REASON clause, the other within direct speech:

1. ἦσαν γὰρ ἄλεις. they were for fishermen
2. Ἀδεύτε ὑπέστην μοι, καί ποιήσατε γενέσθαι ἄλεις ἀνθρώπων. Come after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men

Since conjunctions operate at “chunk” level, they refer equally to the whole string of sequential events in a script-type scenario, e.g. δὲ marks development, and the scope of development is shown underlined:

Acts 19:22
ἀποστέλλεις δὲ εἶς τὴν Μακεδονίαν δὸς τῶν διακονούντων αὐτῷ, Τιμόθεου καὶ Ἑραστοῦ.
Having-sent () to the Macedonia two of the servers to him, T. and E.
aυτὸς ἐπισκέψεις χρόνον εἶς τὴν Ἀσίαν.
himself delayed time in the Asia.
δὲ He sent T. and E. to Macedonia but he himself stayed in Asia.
NOT He sent T. and E. to Macedonia but he himself stayed in Asia.

Romans 6:18
ἐλευθερώθητες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας
you have been freed from the sin
ἐδοξοῦσθε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ.
you have been enslaved to the righteousness.
δὲ You have been freed from sin and enslaved to righteousness
NOT You have been freed from sin and enslaved to righteousness

Similarly:

Matt 28:19-20
πορευόμενοι οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ θύμα ... Having-gone therefore disciple all the nations,
βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς ... διδάκτορος αὐτοὺς ... baptizing them ... teaching them ... 
οὖν Therefore go and make disciples ... baptizing ... and teaching ...
NOT Having therefore gone make disciples ... baptizing ... and teaching ...

Where the event of the Participle is Discourse-old or predictable from an already open scenario, or when the event of the Participle is in a non-temporal relationship with the main verb, the conjunction still applies to the whole scenario, but may directly apply only to the event of the main verb of the scenario, and not to the event of the Participle, e.g.

Acts 15.30
Οὐ μὲν οὖν ἀπολύθησας κατῆλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ...
They () therefore having been dismissed went down to Antioch ...
οὖν When they were dismissed, they therefore went to Antioch
OR Therefore when they were dismissed, they went to Antioch
Appendix F - Evidence that Greek Participial Clauses belong in the main verb's scenario

NOT  When they were therefore dismissed they went to Antioch
NOT  Therefore they were dismissed and went to Antioch

John 20:20
εὐδόκεσαν ὅτι καθήκοντος τοῦ κυρίου.
Rejoiced therefore the disciples having-seen the Lord
ὅτι Therefore the disciples rejoiced because they had seen the Lord.
OR  Therefore the disciples rejoiced, because they had seen the Lord.
NOT  Therefore the disciples rejoiced and saw the Lord.

The pattern of one conjunction per scenario can be seen clearly by comparing parallel passages. Each conjunction relates to one main verb's scenario. Luke thus emphasizes the evening coming as a development in narrative plot:

Matt. 14:15
ἐφίλας δὲ γενομένος
evening () having-occurred
προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες...
approached him the disciples saying ...

Mark 6:35
Καὶ ἦσαν ὄρασι πολλὰς γενομένοις
And already hour much having-occurred
προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔλεγον διὰ τοῦ
having approached him the disciples of him were-saying that ...

Luke 9:12
'Ελήμενός ὑμῖν Κλέαν.
The () day began to-decline.
προσῆλθον δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπαν αὐτῷ,
having-approached () the twelve said to-him ...

c) Typically there are no conjunctions between Participles and main verb, neither linking Participles to each other, nor linking Participles to the main verb. This is in line with the theory that the semantic relationships between events in a scenario are prototypically fixed, by common experience. The writer then has no need to specify semantic relationships explicitly, since the audience can retrieve them from the prototypical relationships in the scenario. (Note that postpositive conjunctions which occur second place in the clause, like γὰρ “for”, although they may occur after a Participle and before another Participle or main verb, do not link those elements to each other, but link them to what precedes).

Conjunctions between Participles are rare, the most common being the conjoining conjunctions καί, τε, or both τε and καί. In Matthew, Participles are conjoined by “and” words only 8 times, as below (references from Stephanie Black, personal correspondence 4/12/97):

Matthew 1:19
Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ αὐτῷ αὐτῆς, δίκαιος ὄν καί μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι, ἐβουλήθη λάβῃ ἀπολύσαι αὐτὴν.

Matthew 21:6
πορευόμενων δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πολλῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἰδὼν καὶ συνήταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Matthew 26:26
'Εσθίοντες δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ Ἰησοῦς ἀρτὸν καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δωδεκάς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν, λάβετε φέρετε, τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

Matthew 26:27
καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐναυστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγουσα, Πιετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,
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Matthew 27:48
καὶ εἴδεις δραμὼν ἐλήσ αὐτῶν καὶ λαβὼν στόγγυν πλήρας τε ὄξους καὶ περιβλέπει καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτῶν.

Matthew 28:12
καὶ συγκεκρίμεν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συμβολιῶν τε λαβωνεὶς ἀργύρια ἱκανά ἔδωκαν τοῖς στρατιώταις

Statistically, of the 4001 verbal forms in Matthew, 936 (23.39%) are Participles (data from Kwong, Verbal Forms, 1997:3). Even though almost a quarter of verbal forms in Matthew are Participles, conjunctions joining Participles are almost non-existent.

In the 2303 sentences in Matthew, there are 700 occurrences of καὶ as an intersentential conjunction (30%), but only 6 occurrences of καὶ conjoining Participles. Similarly, there are 471 occurrences of δὲ as an intersentential conjunction in Matthew (20%), but no occurrences of δὲ joining Participles. (Data from Stephanie Black, personal correspondence 4/12/97.)

Similarly, Reed gives data correlating asyndeton with verb forms in his discourse analysis of Philippians (1997:354):

approximately 123 clauses do not employ particles or conventionalized grammar to indicate clause relations; most of these are embedded (or rank-shifted) clauses and thus hardly unusual, though some other types are also asyndetic: participles (46), infinitives (10), verbless (26), indicatives (27), imperatives (13) and 1 subjunctive used as an exhortation.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>participle</th>
<th>infinitive</th>
<th>indicative</th>
<th>imperative</th>
<th>subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asyndeton</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in NT</td>
<td>6258</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2198</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(There are also 68 optatives included in the New Testament total)

We see that Participles, though constituting less than a quarter of all New Testament verbal forms, account for almost half the asyndeton in Philippians. Conversely, Indicatives constitute over half the New Testament verbal forms, but account for little more than a quarter of asyndeton in Philippians. Comparing Reed’s data with the distribution of verb forms in Philippians (from GRAMCORD) also shows that Participles have by far the highest percentage of asyndeton as compared to other verbal forms in Philippians.

Philippians participle infinitive indicative imperative subjunctive
Total 56 39 117 25 19
with asyndeton 46 = 82% 10 = 26% 27 = 23% 13 = 52% 1 = 5%

Similarly Healey and Healey state, concerning their large sample of participial clauses and ὅτε and ὡς clauses (1990:198-9):

It is very uncommon indeed (7/674, 1 percent) to find a conjunction separating a preceding subordinate clause from its main clause.
Similarly, it is very uncommon (6/153, 4 percent) for a following subordinate clause to be separated from its main clause by a conjunction.

These statistics are in line with my thesis that the Participle is normally asyndetic. Its relationship with other Participles or the main verb need not be marked, since it is prototypical, derived from the writer’s and intended audience’s shared mental scenarios.

Reed comments (1997:354):

It is not that these clauses may not have a functional relationship with the surrounding discourse (e.g. participles with a causal function) but that they are unmarked as to that relationship.
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Indeed one would expect such prototypical relationships to be unmarked given Grice’s principle (1975:45):

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

Since, as will be shown below, conjoined Participles belong in the same scenario slot, strings of unconjoined Participles fill different slots. This is clearly seen with Prenuclear Aorist Participles, which indicate distinct sequential events belonging in the script of the following main verb, e.g.

Matthew 14:19
καὶ κηρύσσων τοῖς ἄχλους ἀνακληθηναι ἐπὶ τῷ χῶρῳ, And having-ordered the crowds to-recline on the grass
λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἱερατικοῖς, ἀνακλήσθηνες εἰς τῶν ὑπαρχόν καθάγγελεν having-taken the five loaves and the two fish, having-looked to the heaven blessed
καὶ κλησις ἐθαυμαζον τῷ μαθηταῖς τοῖς ἄρτοις... and having-broken gave to-the disciples the loaves...

Such strings of Prenuclear Aorist Participles frequently include events changing the location or physical position of participants, e.g.

Matt.26:44
καὶ δόθην αὐτοῖς πάλιν ἀπεκλήθην προοπειθατ... And having-left them again having-gone-away he-prayed
Mark 8:13
καὶ δόθην αὐτοῖς πάλιν ἐσμέν ἀπαρθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. And having-left them again having-embarked he-went-away to the other-side
cf. Mark 14:45, 15:43

Similarly, there are frequently strings of Prenuclear Aorist Participles where the first is a verb of perception, which is predictable from the preceding discourse and influences the subsequent behaviour of the perceiver, and the second is a Discourse-new event belonging to the scenario of the following main verb, e.g.

Acts 14:14
Ἄκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι Βαρνάβας καὶ Παύλος Having-heard () the apostles Barnabas and Paul
διαμάχοντες τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν ἱερείων ἐξεπεισάθην τῶν ἄχλων κράζοντες... having-torn the clothes of-them they-rushed into the crowd shouting...
“When the apostles Barnabas and Paul heard this, they tore their clothes and rushed into the crowd yelling...”

Acts 28:15
καὶ κηρύσσον οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἄκούσαντες τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν ἠλθαν... From-there the brothers having-heard the[things] about us came...
ὅστις ὅσπις ὁ Παύλος εὐχαριστηθηνα τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐλαφεῖ γέρας... whom having-seen the Paul having-thanked the God took courage.
“When Paul saw them, he thanked God and was encouraged.”

Whereas Greek simply marks that these events belong sequentially in the script of the main verb, English uses different verb forms depending on how predictable the events are from the preceding discourse. Prenuclear Aorist Participles which refer to predictable events from a previous scenario are usually translated by “when” clauses or subordination, whereas those which simply refer to Discourse-new events in the script of the following verb are normally expressed as finite verbs, e.g.
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Mark 12:28

Alan προσέφευεν τοις γραμματείων ἰδανίζειν αὐτῶν συμπνοοῦντος.

And having-come-near one of-the scribes having-heard them debating


having-seen that well he-answered them asked him...

NIV “One of the teachers of the law came and heard them debating. Noticing that Jesus had given them a good answer, he asked him...”

It can be seen from the above examples that verbs of perception are often highly predictable, viz “When the apostles ... heard”, “When Paul saw them”, “Noticing ...”

d) When conjunctions occur between Participial Clauses and Main Verbs they do not mark the semantic relationship between the events but the degree of prototypicality or expectedness of those events co-occurring.

Conjunctions between Participial Clauses and Main Verbs are very rare, so they must be very significant when they do occur, as they are statistically “marked”. According to Healey and Healey (1990:199):

Although the use of a conjunction between a participle and its main clause ... is rare, it should not be regarded as ungrammatical. This usage is found in both classical and Hellenistic Greek. Such conjunctions were added, it is said (Blass and Debrunner, 1961:215, 219-20), to clarify the semantic relationship of the participial clause to the main clause.

But if, as I argue, the relationship between Participial Clauses and Main Verbs is prototypical, what semantic relationship is clarified? I argue that such conjunctions are not used to mark the semantic relationship between clauses, but to mark the degree of expectedness or predictability of that relationship, especially CONTRAEXPECTATION, e.g.

Hebrews 12:17


although with tears having-sought it (blessing or repentance)

Note that the concessive relationship is a combination of REASON and CONTRAEXPECTATION. Although there is exegetical uncertainty as to whether αὐτήν refers to εὐλογία or μετανοια, and whether μετανοια here is Esau’s repentance, or his father’s change of mind, it is clear that the prototypical relationship between seeking and obtaining is that of REASON and RESULT, i.e. normally you find something because you seek for it. I posit that unmarked relationships between elements in a text are understood in the light of the prototypical relationships of those elements within the open scenario. It is clear that contraexpectation relationships are not prototypical, hence the fact that contraexpectation is frequently marked in Participle clusters, whereas almost all other semantic relationships are grammatically and lexically unmarked.

Healey and Healey cite the following examples of conjunctions after participial or “when” clauses, before main verbs (1990:198):
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Lk 18:8 (ἀπά pertains to sentence boundary?); in 2 Pt 1:17 (no head/main clause, καὶ begins something new and unrelated grammatically); Lk 2:21; Mt 9:10; Lk 7:12, and Acts 1:10 (the last three have καὶ ἵνα).

Luke 2:21 and 7:12 concern “when” clauses. In the rest, the conjunction marks the degree of expectation.

In Luke 18:8 ἀπά does not clarify the relationship between clauses, but shows the degree of expectation of the second clause coming true in the event of the first, viz. unlikely.

In Matthew 9:10 καὶ ἵνα is statistically marked as unusual after a participial phrase in narrative. The word ἵνα occurs elsewhere 44 times in Matthew. 27/44 are καὶ ἵνα, all following a main verb in the previous clause. 16/44 are ἵνα alone, of which 10 follow Genitive Participial Clauses, and 6 follow main verbs, but in non-narrative text. 1/44 (23:34) is δὲ τοῦτο ἵνα after a main verb in non-narrative. In all cases ἵνα marks the following clause as contraexpectation, and in no way clarifies the semantic relationship between clauses. So in 9:10 both ἵνα (semantically) and καὶ (statistically) draw attention to the fact that what follows is unexpected, viz. the presence of tax-collectors and sinners at a feast for a rabbi. Such extra coding for unexpected material is predicted by Givon’s iconicity principle (1983a:18):

The more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more coding material must be assigned to it

The Aorist Participle ἔλθωτες before συνανέκειντο marks that “coming” is a prototypical preceding event in the “reclining to eat” script. This sequence of events is still marked as prototypical, even though the participants (tax-collectors and sinners) are unexpected.

In Acts 1:10, the first clause is ὅσ’ clause, and the second a Genitive Participial Clause. Again καὶ ἵνα marks the unexpectedness of the following clause, the sudden appearance of two men, apparently angels.

Healey and Healey also cite examples of conjunctions after main verbs and before participial clauses (1990:199 note):

In 2 Cor 5:20 and 1 Pt 4:12 the conjunction is ὅσ’ ‘as though’; in Heb 4:3 it is καὶ τοῦ ‘though’. In 2 Cor 9:14 there seems to be no main clause, so are the NCP and GCP both hanging participles linked by καὶ, or is the GCP clause ‘dependent upon’ the NCP clause? In Heb 11:12 the conjunction is part of an awkward conjunctive phrase καὶ ὅταν ‘and at that, although’ (Arndt and Gingrich οὕτως, 1957:601).

In 2 Pt 2:1a and b are the two NCP clauses linked by καὶ to the preceding relative clause and so made attributive, or is this καὶ adverbial?

Again the relationship marked by these conjunctions concerns, not the underlying semantic relationship between clauses, but the degree of predictability of the clauses being so related.

In 2 Corinthians 5:20 (“We are therefore Christ’s ambassadors, as though God were making his appeal through us.”) and 1 Peter 4:12 (“Do not be surprised at the painful trial you are suffering, as though something strange were happening to you.”) ὅσ’ “as though” indicates that the relationship between clauses (REASON) would be prototypical if the participial phrase were literally true, but it is not. There is contraexpectation here:
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God is not appealing (literally) through the apostles, yet Paul acts as ambassador. Trials are not unexpected, yet believers are surprised at them.

In Hebrews 4:3 (“God has said, “So I declared on oath in my anger ‘They shall never enter my rest’”. And yet (καὶ ταῦτα) his work has been finished since the creation of the world.”) the conjunction clearly marks contraexpectation, since the prototypical REASON relationship “they shall not enter my rest because it is not ready yet” is contravened. Perhaps “despite the fact that ...” would be a clearer translation, linking this clause more closely to the preceding text.

Similarly in Hebrews 11:12 (“And so from this one man, and he (καὶ ταῦτα) as good as dead, came descendants ...”) the conjunction shows CONTRAEXPECTATION since the prototypical REASON relationship “from one man, as good as dead, came no descendants” is contravened.

Healey and Healey’s other references, 2 Corinthians 9:14 and 2 Peter 2:1, are not clear examples, as they themselves note.

Since conjunctions (apart from contraexpectation markers) do not seem to occur between Participle and main verb, conjunctions can determine the parsing of the text, e.g. Luke 2:43b-44a must be parsed as follows, since δὲ never links main verb and Participle: καὶ ὅσον ἐγνωσάν ὁ γονεὶς αὐτοῦ. and not knew the parents of him. νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ ἦλθον ἡμέρας δύον ... Having-reckoned () him-to-be in the party, they-went-of-day journey...

NOT
καὶ ὅσον ἐγνωσάν ὁ γονεὶς αὐτοῦ νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ. and not knew the parents of him, having-reckoned () him-to-be in the party. ἦλθον ἡμέρας δύον ... They-went-of-day journey...

Similarly a possible example of conjunction between main verb and participial phrase is in Acts 20:2-3:
διέλθων δὲ τὰ μέρη ἑκείνα καὶ παρακάλεσε αὐτοῖς ... Having-crossed () the part that and having-encouraged them ... ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ποιήσας τε μήνας τρεῖς ... he-went to the Greece having-done also months three. [REASON] “he went to Greece and spent three months there.”

However, a far more likely analysis is that “having done” is a Prenuclear Aorist Participle before “he became minded”, i.e. διέλθων δὲ τὰ μέρη ἑκείνα καὶ παρακάλεσε αὐτοῖς ... Having-crossed () the part that and having-encouraged them ... ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. he-went to the Greece. ποιήσας τε μήνας τρεῖς Having-done also months three γενομένης ἐσπούδας αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῶν Τουμαλων μέλλων ἀνέγερθαι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν, having-occurred plot to-him by the Jews intending to-sail to the Syria, ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποτρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας. he-became minded of to-return via Macedonia.

“And when he had been there for three months, since a plot had been hatched against him by the Jews, as he was about to sail for Syria, he decided to return via Macedonia.”
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e) Where conjunctions occur between Participles they show that the two Participles belong in the same semantic slot within the scenario. Most commonly such Participles are conjoined by καί “and”, e.g.

Acts 20:2
εἰσῆλθεν δὲ τῇ μέρι ἐκεῖνα καὶ παρακαλέσας αὐτοῖς ... Having-crossed () the part that and having-encouraged them ...

Acts 9.39
καὶ παρέστησαν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ χήραι And stood-around him all the widows

Acts 9:40
ἐκβαλον δὲ ἐξο πάντας ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ἔκει τὰ γόνατα having-put-out () outside all the Peter and having-placed the knees

Acts 13:3
τότε ἐπεστάθησεν καὶ προσευχάμενοι καὶ ἐπεστάθησαν τὰς χειρὰς αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν. then having-fasted and having-prayed and having-laid-on the hands to-them they-dismissed

Fasting, praying and laying on of hands are all preconditions to sending Christians off on a special mission.


Participles may also be conjoined with τε, or both τε and καί, similarly marking they belong in a single scenario slot:

Acts 3:19
"Ἄγγελος δὲ κυρίου διὰ νυκτός ἐκβαλέως τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς Angel () of-Lord at night having-opened the doors of-the prison

Matthew 28:12
καὶ συνακολούθησεν μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συμβούλων τε λαβώντες And having-gathered with the elders, council also having-taken

Matthew 27:48
καὶ ἐθάνετο ὅρμων εἰς εἰς αὐτῶν καὶ λαβὼν στόχον And straightaway having-run one from-among them and having-taken sponge

he-gave-to-drink him.

All the actions of the Participles fill the “getting a drink” slot.
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Note that the author often has a choice whether to assign Participles to the same slot or to different slots. Compare these parallel passages:

Matthew 26:26

λαβὼν ὁ Ιησοῦς ἀρτὸν καὶ ἐλογίσας ἔκλασεν
having-taken the Jesus bread and having-blessed he-broke
καὶ δόθηκε τῷ μαθητᾷ εἶπεν
and having-given to-the disciples he-said
Here, taking and blessing are treated as filling a single slot, i.e. preconditions of breaking.

Mark 14:22

λαβὼν ἀρτὸν ἐλογίσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐβοκευν αὐτὸς καὶ εἶπεν
having-taken bread having-blessed he-broke and he-gave to-them and he-said
Here, taking and blessing are treated as sequential events in the breaking script, filling distinct slots.

Sometimes there will be several prenuclear or postnuclear Participles, some conjoined and others not. Conjoined Participles always fill the same semantic slot and have the same semantic relationship to the main verb, e.g.

Mark 5:33

ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθέτα καὶ τρέμουσα,
The (w) woman having-feared and trembling,
καὶ γέγονεν αὐτῷ,
knowing (Perfect) what has-happened to-her
ἡμένον καὶ προσέπεπεν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.
came and fell-before him and said to-him all the truth.
Afraid and trembling both belong in the same MANNER slot, telling how the woman came to Jesus and admitted what had happened. Knowing however is a prenuclear Participle of perception, which implicitly marks the REASON for her coming and telling all, so it is not conjoined to the other prenuclear participles since it fills a different relational slot.

Acts 12:19

Ἡρῴδης δὲ ἐπιστίγετος αὐτῶν καὶ μὴ εὑρὼν,
Herod () having-searched-for him and not having-found,
καὶ σφηκόρας τοῖς φίλακας ἐκέλευον ἀπαγόρευσιν,
having-interrogated the guards ordered to-be-led-away...
Searching and not finding both belong in event slot one, interrogating belongs in the next slot.

Acts 21:11

καὶ ἔλαβον πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄρας τὴν ζώνην τοῦ Παύλου,
And having-come to us and having-seized the belt of-the Paul
καὶ ἐξανατολίσας τοὺς κέρατα καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἶπεν...
having-tied of-himself the feet and the hands said...
Coming and taking the belt both fill the precondition slot, being necessary before he can tie anything in their presence.

A dramatic example of this occurs in Mark 5:25-27, where the conjoined Participles all belong to the setting (cf. Luke 8:43 with a relative clause), describing the new participant, and the absence of a conjunction with the Participle marks the development of the narrative action:

SETTING

καὶ γυνὴ σύν οὖσα ἐν βούσει ἀδιόματος δύσει ἔτη
And woman being in flow of-blood twelve years
καὶ πολλὰ παθήσασα ὑπὸ πολλῶν λατρῶν
and many[things] having-suffered from many doctors
καὶ διαπερίστειν τὰ πάρ’ αὐτῆς πάντα
and having-spent the with her all
καὶ μὴ ἔδοξεν ἐκείνη ἄλλα μᾶλλον εἶς τὸ χείρον ἐλθοῦν,
and nothing having-benefitted but rather to the worse having-come

And woman being in flow of-blood twelve years having-suffered from many doctors and having-spent the with her all and nothing having-benefitted but rather to the worse having-come
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**ACTION**

δικοῦσαν περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,
having-heard about the Jesus
ἐδέδωκαν ἐν τῷ ἄγλω ὅπως
having-come in the crowd behind
ἡφαίστος τοῦ ματιου αὐτοῦ: .
touched the robe of-him.

The close relationship between the relative clause and the Participle as alternative ways of describing a participant is also shown in Matthew 7:24, 26:

Πᾶς οὖν ὁ ἁρμάτως ἔκκαθη μοῦ τὸς λόγος τοῦτος καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτοὺς...
Everyone therefore who hears of-me the words these and does them
ὁμοιωθήσεται ἄνθρωπῳ φορῶν,...
will-be-looked to-man wise...
καὶ τὸς ὁ ἄρτος μοῦ τὸς λόγος τοῦτος καὶ μὴ ποιεῖ αὐτοὺς
And everyone the hearing of-me the words these and not doing them
ὁμοιωθήσεται ἄνθρωπῳ μορφῶ,...
will-be-looked to-man foolish...

This pattern of conjoining Participles which belong in the same slot, and using asyndeton (no conjunction) with Participles filling different slots, helps us analyse some complex examples (each Participle or main verb has a separate letter), e.g.

**Heb 11:24-26**

A Πιστεύει Μωϋσῆς μέγας κενόμενος
By-faith Moses big having-become

B ἦρεμάτως λέγεσθαι ὃς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ,
refused to-be-called son-of-daughter of-Pharaoh

C μᾶλλον ἐλάμβανον συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ
rather having-preferred to-be-ill-treated-with the people of-the God

D ἔχειν ἀμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν,
than temporarily to-have of-sin enjoyment

E ἡμῖν δοῦναι πλούτον γινάμενος τῶν Αλγύπτων θησαυρῶν
rather greater wealth having-deemed than-the of-Egypt treasures

**Col 2:13-14**

A καὶ ἡμᾶς νεκροῖς ὄντας
And you dead being

B συνεζωοποιημένοι ζῶν ἐκ αὐτῶ,
co-made-alive you with him

C χαρακτήμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα.
having-forgiven to-us all the trespasses

D ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ’ ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τῶν δόγμασιν
having-wiped-out the against us writing in-the ordinances

E δὲ ὃν ἐκεναντίον ἡμῖν,
which was opposed to-us
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F καὶ αὐτὸ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ μέσου
and it he-has-taken from the midst.

G προσπλεξομεθα αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ
having-nailed it to-the cross.

PP (A) = description of you, Verb (B),
AP (C) = means for previous Verb B,
AP (D) = means for previous AP C,
Verb (E) = description of writing
Verb (F),
AP (G) = means for previous Verb F,

You being dead
he made alive together with him
by forgiving us all our sins
by wiping out the charge against us ...
which condemned us
and he has got rid of it ...

The “and” at the beginning of line F marks the boundary between Participle and Verb clusters, so A-E are one cluster, and F-G another. Note too that although C, D, and G are all MEANS (in my analysis) they are each the means for a different event. Had C and D each been means for the same event B, then, according to my theory, they would have been conjoined by “and”.

A restriction on conjoining items with the same surface form but different semantic roles occurs in English also, e.g. Fillmore (1968:22):

in 18 the subject is in an Agent relationship to the verb; in 19 the subject is an Instrument; and in 20 both Agent and Instrument appear in the same sentence, but in this case it is the Agent which appears as the subject, not the instrument.

18. John broke the window.
19. A hammer broke the window.
20. John broke the window with a hammer.

That the subjects of 18 and 19 are grammatically different explains the fact that the combined meaning of the two sentences is not produced by conjoining their subjects. Thus 21 is unacceptable.

21. * John and a hammer broke the window.

Conjunctions between Participles are not only relatively rare (though not as rare as between participles and main verbs), but also the semantic range of such conjunctions is very limited. Almost all are coordinating conjunctions (like καὶ or ὁ “and”, μὴ δὲ “nor”) or contraexpectation conjunctions. Again, this is in line with the theory that relationships within scenarios are prototypically fixed, and thus need not be grammaticalized.

Healey and Healey give no statistics, but state (1990:198):

Conjunctions often coordinate two GCP, two NCP, or two Η clauses with the same deep subject

They give 15 examples of such conjunctions between participles preceding the main verb, of which 13/15 are καὶ or ὁ or a combination, 1/15 (Romans 9:11) is μὴ δὲ “nor”, and 1/15 (1 Peter 1:8b-c (μὴ ... δὲ) is contraexpectation. They also give 12 examples of such conjunctions between participles following the main verb, of which 11/12 are καὶ or ὁ, and 1/12 (Hebrews 11:13 μὴ ... δαλαί) is contraexpectation.

Contraexpectation relationships may be grammaticalized in a number of ways:

Simple conjoining καὶ “and”:
Luke 24:22-23

καὶ διήλθεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ μὴ εὑρότατον τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἥδη λέγονται ...

having-occurred early at the tomb and not having-found the body of-him they-came saying ...

“arriving early at the tomb but not finding his body, they came and said…”

Prototypically arriving at a tomb is followed by finding a body. The two events are here presented in the same semantic slot, i.e. the precondition to the women returning with their surprising news.
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John 20:29b
μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδὼντες καὶ προσεύχοντες,
blessed the not having-seen and having-believed.
“Blessed are those who do not see, and yet believe”

Acts 28:6
ἐξὶν πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσεδόκοντων
for much(time) () them expecting
καὶ θεωροῦντων μὲν άποστόλους εἰς αὐτῶν γυμνον
and seeing nothing amiss to him occurring
μεταβαλόμενοι ἔλεγον αὐτῶν ἐναὶ θεόν.
having-changed-mind were-saying him to-be god.
Although they waited expectantly, yet they saw nothing happen. Both events together are the REASON for their conclusion that Paul was a god.

With καὶ “and”, the sense of contraexpectation comes not from the conjunction, but from the prototypical relationship between these events in the scenario they open. The same construction may be used where there is no contrastive relationship, e.g.

Matthew 1:19
Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ ἀνήρ αὐτῆς, Δικαιος ὃς καὶ θεόν αὐτὴν δειματίσαν,
Joseph () the husband of-her, righteous being and not wishing her to-disgrace

Contrastive conjunctions:

Luke 24:22-23
τι γὰρ ὁφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ἄλλον
what for it-profits person having-gained the world whole
ἐαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἡ ζημίωσείς;
himself () having-lost or having-damaged?
“What does it profit someone, if they gain the whole world, but lose or damage their very self?”
cf. Luke 12:48 δὲ μὴ γνώσοι, ποιήσας δὲ ἀδίκα πληγών.. “The one who did not know (his master’s will), yet still did things worthy of a beating”

Acts 9:7
οὐ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εὐστήκεαν ἐνεκλ,
The () men the travelling-with him stood speechless,
δοκοῦντες μὲν τὸς φωνῆς μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες.
having-heard () the sound/voice, nothing () seeing.
“The men who were travelling with him stood there speechless, because they had heard the sound, but did not see anyone.”

Mark 5:26
καὶ οὐδεὶς ὁδηγεῖσαν ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χείλον ἐλθόντα,
and nothing having-benefitted but rather to the worse having-come
“having got no better, but rather got worse”

Other conjunctions:

Correlative relationships between Participles, such as “either/or”, may also be overtly marked:

Luke 24:22-23
τι γὰρ ὁφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ἄλλον
what for it-profits person having-gained the world whole
ἐαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἡ ζημίωσείς;
himself () having-lost or having-damaged?

Clarification or restatement, may also be overtly marked:

Gal. 4:9
νῦν δὲ γνώσετε θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ,
Now () having-known God, rather () having-been-known by God
πῶς ἐπιστρέψετε πάλιν...
how do-you-turn again...?
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f) Tense and Mood operate at the level of scenario chunk, not individual event (excluding those prenuclear Participles which refer to Discourse-old events or highly predictable events from an “open” Discourse-old scenario). This suggests that the Participles must belong to the same scenario as the main verb. Thus, in terms of pragmatic meaning, Participles usually take on the same tense (i.e. time frame) and mood of the main verb.

e.g.

**Irrealis - result of unfulfilled condition (ἄν with Aorist)**

Luke 10:13

Ἀδικήσετε...διὸ εἰς τέλη...

Woe to you...because if...

παλαι ἄν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σπόδῳ καθήμενοι μετενήσαν.

long-ago would in sackcloth and ash sitting they-repented

e.g. “If... they would have sat.”

**Infinitive**

Luke 14:18:b

ἐξῆλθον ἐκεῖνοι ἔχειν αὐτῶν.

I-have need having-gone-out to-see it

NIV “I must go and see it.”

The “going out”, though grammaticalized as Aorist Participle, is also an event which “I need to do”.

**Subjunctive**

Matt 2:8

ἐπέλευσεν δὲ εὐθύτατος, ἂπαγγελίαν μοι, διὸς καὶ ἔδωκεν προσκύνησιν αὐτῶν.

When () you-find, report to-me, so-that I-too having-come may-worship him.

NIV “so that I too may go and worship him.”

Acts 16:37

οὐ γὰρ, ἀλλὰ ἔδωκεν αὐτός ἡμᾶς ἐξαγαγότωσαν.

No indeed, rather having-gone-themselves us may-they-lead-out

NIV “No! Let them come themselves and escort us out.”

cf. Hebrews 10:36

**Imperative**

Matt 2:8

καὶ πέμψας αὐτοὺς εἰς Βηθλεὲμ εἶπεν, Πορεύσωμεν ἐκείνους ἀκριβῶς...

And having-sent them to Bethlehem said: Having-gone seek diligently ...

NIV “Go and make a careful search”

Matt 2:13

Ἐγέρθησεν...παραλαβεῖ τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξαγάγετωσαν.

Having-risen take the child and the mother of-him and flee...

NIV “Get up... take the child...”


**Interrogative**

Luke 10:25b

τι πάθησας τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ κρονομόντας;

what having-done life eternal I-may-inherit?

NIV “what must I do to inherit eternal life?”

**Future time (with Future Indicative main verb)**

Matt 24:46

μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος οὗτος ὑμῖν ἔγειρεν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει οὕτως ποιήτω.

Blessed the slave that whom having-come the lord of-him will-find thus doing

The master will come and will find him.
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Matt 25:40
καὶ ἀποκριθέντος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔρει αὐτοῖς...
And having-answered the king will-say to-them...
NIV "The King will reply..."

Past time (with Aorist Indicative main verb)
Luke 15:20a
καὶ ἀναστὰς ἔδειξεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εαυτοῦ.
And having-risen he-went to the father of-him.
NIV "So he got up and went to his father."


Past time (with Imperfect Indicative main verb)
Acts 1:6
Οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες ἠρώτων αὐτῶν...
They () therefore having-gathered were-asking him...
NIV "So when they met together, they asked him..."

Whereas the whole scenario takes its mood and tense from the main verb, the internal relationships between Participle and main verb, i.e. those within the prototypical scenario, remain unchanged. For example, in Luke 10:13 the sitting (Prenuclear Present Participle) is conceptualized as concurrent with the repentence, being grammaticalized by Process Aspect. In both Luke 15:18a and 20a, the rising (Prenuclear Aorist Participle) is conceptualized as prior to the going, whether that is in future time or past time. Similarly in Matthew 18:19-20, the going (Prenuclear Aorist Participle) is conceptualized as prior to the discipling, being grammaticalized as Event Aspect. Likewise the baptizing and teaching (Postnuclear Present Participles) are conceptualized as concurrent with the discipling (main verb), but, being postnuclear, also have a non-temporal semantic relationship, i.e. MEANS.

g) Negation can operate at the level of the scenario chunk, rather than at the level of the event. This again suggests an underlying conceptual unity between Participle and main verb, e.g.

single negative marker negating both Participle and main verb
Luke 8:12
οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἶς τοῦ ἄνω οἱ ἰδίοντες,
The () by the path are the having-heard
ἐξῆς ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ ἀρεὶ τοῦ λόγου ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν,
then comes the devil and takes the word from the heart of-them
γιὰ μὴ πληροῦσί τεδοὺς συμφόρον.
in-order-that not having-believed may-be-saved
NIV "so that they may not believe and be saved"
i.e. not (believe and be saved) = (not believe) and (not be saved)
Luke 18:5
γιὰ μὴ ἔση τέλος ἔξομεν ἧμεραι τῇ μέ.
so-that not to end coming may-weary me.
NIV "so that she won't eventually wear me out with her coming!"
i.e. not (come and weary) = (not come) and (not weary)
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In contrast, where two Participles are conjoined, and the first is marked negative, the second is affirmative, and contraexpectation. This contraexpectation comes from the prototypical relationships between these events in the scenario, and may be lexically unmarked, i.e. conjoined by καλ, or marked by δέ, e.g.

John 20:29b

μενάρχον ὁ μὴ ἰδὼνες καλ. προτεύοντες.
blessed the not having-seen and having-believed
i.e. the (not having seen) AND (having believed)
NIV “blessed those who have not seen and yet have believed”
The one article and the conjoining marker καλ here mark two contrasting Participles as belonging to a single scenario. NIV translates the contraexpectation which comes not from the grammar of the text, but the prototypical relationship within the believe scenario, that seeing often is the cause of belief.

1 Peter 1:8

ἐλας ὅτι μὴ ὑπάντησες προτεύοντες δὲ διαλλάσσει ... in whom yet not seeing believing () you-rejoice
i.e. ((not seeing) BUT (believing))
NIV “even though you do not see him now, you believe in him and are filled with ... joy”

As one would expect, if the second participle is marked negative, the first remains positive. The contraexpectation relationship may come simply from the prototypical relationships within the scenario, or be explicitly marked, e.g.

Matt 7:26

καλ. πᾶς δὲ ἀκούων μου τούς λόγους τούτους καλ. μὴ τού ἀυτοῦ.
And every the hearing of-me the words and not doing them
i.e. everyone ((hearing) AND (not doing))
cf. Luke 6:49

δὲ ἀκούοντες καλ. μὴ ποιήσας
The () having-heard and not having-done
i.e. anyone who ((hears) AND (does not do))

Luke 24:22-23

γενέσθαι ὁ ἅγιος ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ καλ. μὴ εὑρόθησα τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ
having-occurred early at the tomb and not having-found the body of-him
NIV “They went to the tomb early this morning, but did not find his body”

2 Corinthians 4:8a, cf. 4:8b-9

ἐν παντὶ ἀθάνατου ἄλλῳ οὐ στενοχώρουσιν,
in all being-afflicted but not being-constricted
NIV “We are hard pressed on every side but not crushed”
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This appendix provides evidence to support the hypothesis that grammaticalizing a “script” by conjoined main verbs, rather than a cluster of Aorist Participle(s) and main verb, is a “marked” usage which highlights that script as especially significant at higher levels of discourse. In narrative such conjoined main verbs are typically Aorist Indicatives with Present Indicatives being even more strongly “marked”, as summarized in Chapter 5 “Exceptions that prove the rule: conjoined main verbs in a single scenario”.

Aorist Indicative and Aorist Indicative

If script type events are typically encoded by Aorist Participle(s) plus main verb, what is the significance of them being presented as a string of main verbs in the Aorist Indicative conjoined by “and”? Such script-type events are events which occur in a prototypical order, share the same subject, and can be conceptualized as part of a single event. Louw recognizes that these different constructions have the same reference to a single activity (1982:109-110):

\[ \text{πρόσωπος και \varepsilonπεν \ refers to a single activity even as \πρόσωπος \varepsilonπεν \ would refer to a single activity ... a coordinate series.} \]

In terms of the New Testament corpus, we can theoretically specify certain lexical items which typically (i.e. to a statistically significant deviation from the average) appear in Aorist Participle form. I would suggest concepts such as “come”, “go”, “arrive”, “take”, “hear”, “respond”, “fall down before” as typical events occurring as stages of a New Testament script.

O’Donnell (1997), using Bibleworks, gives data for particular verb forms of certain verbs and compares it with the expected number of occurrences of that form, based on average occurrences for all New Testament verbs, together with a z-score, showing statistical significance (where plus or minus 3 is significant). He lists Aorist Participles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
<th>expected</th>
<th>z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\lambda\mu\beta\omega</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\delta\kappa\omicron\omicron</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to my theory, when main verbs sharing the same subject are conjoined by “and”, the conjoining would mark that the events belong in a single scenario, and the use of main verbs would mean “REMEMBER THIS”. In other words, the author would be drawing the reader’s attention to a particular scenario, marking it as unusually significant to the discourse. This could be visualized as “PAST-EVENT and PAST-EVENT and PAST-EVENT” as opposed to the normal pattern “Event, Event, PAST-EVENT”.
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For example, Mark 5:25-34 tells the story of the woman with the issue of blood.

Chunking it by Participles and independent main verbs we get:

1. And woman being in flow of blood twelve years
   having-suffered from many doctors
   having-spent the with her all

2. And immediately was-dried-up the fountain of the blood of her

3. And she-knew in the body

4. And immediately the Jesus knowing in himself
   the from him power having-gone-out
   having-turned in the crowd

5. said

6. And said to him the disciples of him

7. And he-looked-around to see the [female] this having-done

8. He said to her

Note that, apart from 7, every numbered chunk above has one main verb, i.e. independent finite verb, not in a subordinate clause or direct speech "bubble". Each chunk has a different subject: 1 the woman, 2 the bloodflow, 3 the woman, 4 Jesus, 5 the disciples, 6 Jesus, 7 the woman, and 8 Jesus. But chunk 7 has 3 main verbs conjoined by "and".

What is the significance of this? I believe that Mark is saying "REMEMBER THIS" three times in one scenario. What does this scenario lead up to? “She told him all
the truth.” What “truth”? The truth is that she, a ritually polluted woman who should touch nobody (Leviticus 15:25), has just ritually polluted all the people she has squeezed past in the crowd, and to crown it all has ritually polluted the visiting miracle-worker. Note that the verb “touch” occurs 4 times, once as an independent main verb (section 1), and three times as a main verb in a subordinate clause (sections 1, 4, and 5). She had behaved appallingly. This is why Mark draws attention to her action in section 7 as significant by conjoining three main verbs: she comes, shows her respect and admits publicly that she has willfully broken the Old Testament laws of ritual purity. Yet Jesus does not scold her as she expects (hence her fearing and trembling 5:33). Rather he praises her faith. Mark has carefully emphasized, by repetition of “touch” and using three main verbs in a single scenario, the significance of the woman’s actions.

Some other examples of conjoined Aorist Indicatives within a single scenario are related to burial (scenarios are numbered separately):

the burial of John the baptist
Matt 14:12
1 καὶ προσελθόντες ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ
And having-come the disciples of-him
ἡ εῤπαν τὸ πτῶμα καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸν
took the body and buried it[him]
2 καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ.
and having-gone reported to-the Jesus.

Mark 6:29
1 καὶ ἄκουσαντες ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ
And having-heard the disciples of-him
ἡ ὄλθον καὶ ἤραν τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ἐν μυμηλῷ.
came and took the body of-him and placed it in tomb.

the burial of Jesus
Matt 27:59-60
1 καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωάν
And having-taken the body the Joseph
ἐνεκουλῖσεν αὐτὸ ἐν συνθόνι καθάρι
wrapped it [in] sheet clean
καὶ ἐθήκεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μυμηλῷ ὁ ἔλατομη λεᾶς ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ
and placed it in the new of-him tomb which he-cut in the rock
2 καὶ προσεκολίσαντες λίθους μεγάλους τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μυμηλοῦ ἀπῆλθεν.
and having-rolled-forward stone big to-the doorway of-the tomb left.

Mark 15:46
1 καὶ ἀγοράσαντες συνθόνα κοβελῶν αὐτῶν
And having-bought sheet having-taken-down him
ἐνεκουλίσαν τῇ συνθόνῃ
wrapped in-the sheet
καὶ ἐθήκεν αὐτῶν ἐν μυμηλω οὗ ἐλατομή λεᾶς ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ
and placed him in tomb which was cut from rock
καὶ προσεκολίσαν αὐτῶν τῷ ἔπλε τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μυμηλοῦ.
and rolled-forward stone at the doorway of-the tomb.

Luke 23:52-3
1 οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἤτισαν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
He having-approached the Pilate asked-for the body of-the Jesus
2 καὶ κοβελῶν ἐνεκουλίσαν αὐτὸ συνθόνη
and having-taken-down wrapped it in-sheet
καὶ ἐθήκεν αὐτῶν ἐν μυμηλῳ λαξευτῷ ὁ δὲ ὁ διέλεις ὁ δὲν κείμενος.
and placed it in tomb hewn where not was anyone yet laid.
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John 19:38b-42
1 ἔδωκεν δὲ καὶ ἰηρεύν θύσια αὐτοῖς.
He came therefore and took the body of-him

2 ἐρχομένοις δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός αὐτῶν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον,
Came () also Nicodemus, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός αὐτῶν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον,
bringing mixture of-myrrh and aloes about pounds hundred.

3 Εἶδαν δὲ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
They-took therefore the body of-the Jesus
καὶ ἔθησαν αὐτὸ δόξης μετὰ τῶν ἀρωματῶν,
and bound it in-wrappings with the spices
καθὼς ἦθος ἦσθιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐνταφίαζειν.
as custom is for-the Jews to-bury.

4 ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου ἦσσεν, Κηπος,
Was () in the place where he-was-crucified garden,
καὶ ἐν τῷ κηπῳ μυμητὰς καὶ τοιούτων ἐν ὑ οὐδὲνοι οὐδεὶς ἠν τεθειμένοις.
and in the garden tomb new in which never nobody was put.

5 ἐκεῖ δὲν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων,
There therefore because-of the preparation[day] of-the Jews
ὅτι ἦγες ἦν τὸ μυμητᾶς,
because near was the tomb
ἐθηκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν,
they-placed the Jesus.

the burial of Stephen
Acts 8:2
1 συνεκόμισαν δὲ τὸν Στέφανον ἁγιασμένος εὐλαβεῖς
They-collected (together buried) () the Stephen men devout
καὶ ἐποίησαν κοπιτὰς καὶ μεγάλα ἐν αὐτῷ
and made lamentation great over him.

In the above accounts of burying important people we see that the “Aorist Indicative and Aorist Indicative” construction is used at least once in every case. This is consistent with the theory that such a structure emphasizes the importance of the scenario in which it occurs.

Contrast, the burials of Ananias and Sapphira, who are presented as evil people, where this construction is not used:
Acts 5:6
1 ἀναστάτωσε δὲ οἱ νεκτεροὶ συνέστελαν αὐτῶν
Having-risen () the young-men wrapped him
καὶ ἔφεραν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὸν νεκρὸν.
and having-carried-out buried.

Acts 5:10
1 ἔσεσθαι δὲ οἱ νεκτεροὶ εὗρον αὐτὴν νεκρὴν
Having-come-in () the young-men found her dead
2 καὶ ἔφεραν αὐτὴν πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρα αὐτῆς
and having-carried-out buried near the man of-her.

Note that we are not supposed to infer that Sapphira was not wrapped up in a shroud whereas her husband was. Simply, as with all scenarios, we are supposed to assume the prototypical events happened, unless we are told otherwise, or given indications to the contrary.

Talking of the burial of an anonymous father, Matthew uses a conjoined Infinitive construction (EVENT and EVENT), and Luke uses a Participle and Infinitive construction (Event EVENT). Matthew’s version then shows the speaker stressing the importance of burying his father:
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Matt 8:21
Κύριε, ἐπιτρέψω μοι πρῶτον ἀπεθανεῖν καὶ ἀναλάβειν τὸν πατέρα μου.
Lord, permit me first to-go-away and to-bury the father of-me.

Luke 9:59
[Κύριε] ἐπιτρέψω μοι ἀπεθανεῖν καὶ ἀναλάβειν τὸν πατέρα μου.
[Lord] permit me having-gone-away first to-bury the father of-me.

We have a similar usage of this structure, in the parable of Lazarus, Luke 16:22:
καὶ ἀπέθανεν δὲ ἀποθεμένῳ τῷ πτωχῷ
It-happened () to-die the poor[man]
καὶ ἀπεκχέθησαν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν διάγελων εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ.
and to-be-taken him by the angels to the bosom of Abraham

Here it seems the author presents two scenarios about the poor man: his death and his being taken to “heaven”. (I use “heaven” here as the normal English equivalent for the “place or state of bliss in the afterlife” which “Abraham’s bosom” refers to, whilst recognising that the contents of a modern English scenario for “heaven”, whether Christian or otherwise, will differ in details from the scenario here. Indeed, it appears that Jewish concepts about the afterlife were in flux at the time Jesus spoke this parable, which may be reflected in the variety of terms used in the New Testament to refer to such a state of bliss in the afterlife, e.g. “paradise” Luke 23:43, “eternal life” Matthew 19:16, “the kingdom of heaven” Matthew 19:23, “the kingdom of God” Matthew 19:24, “being saved” Matthew 19:25.)

The main evidence that Lazarus’s death and going to “heaven” are being treated as separate scenarios is that each has a separate subject marked (τὸν πτωχὸν and αὐτόν).
Also ἀποθανεῖν is Active Voice, whereas ἀπεκχέθησαν is Passive Voice, and semantically dying and being taken to heaven are not consecutive events in a script performed by the same agent. (However, certain scripts may include a prototypical switch between Active and Passive voice, since there is a real life change to passivity, e.g. dying, being prepared for burial and being buried.) We also have evidence that, for a Jewish audience of Jesus’s day, it was not a prototypical part of the going to “heaven” scenario that a poor man would be a participant (see Matthew 19:24-25).

If the name Lazarus is a Greek form of Eliezer “God helps” (Fitzmyer, 1985:1131), then this name cues the audience to expect a specific twist in this tale. This is the only parable where a character is named. Given the strong significance in both the Old and New Testament on the relationship between name and character, Jesus’s use of this name in a made-up story should be taken as “symbolic” (cf. Young, 1939:593), since it is patently not referring to a historical person.

In the case of the rich man, Luke has chosen to use the conjoined Aorist Indicative construction making a single significant scenario. Now the Pharisees whom Jesus was addressing had “rich Pharisees” as the prototypical participants in their “going to heaven” scenario (Luke 16:13-15). They had already heard the amazing statement that even this poor destitute man went to heaven. The PAST-EVENT and PAST-EVENT scenario they
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now expect is “The rich man also died and was carried into Abraham’s bosom”. But Jesus presents them with a completely different single significant scenario “The rich man also died and was buried.” No eternal bliss for him.

Another example of a conjoined main verb cluster to mark a single significant scenario is in Acts 2:1-4, the coming of the Holy Spirit, where verses 2-4 have 6 conjoined Aorist Indicatives. Here however the subjects are all different, although the causal agent, God, is implicit in all cases.

Present Indicatives in a string of Conjoined Indicatives

A more radical departure from the norm of “Aorist Participle, Aorist Indicative” chunking, is the use of one or more Present Indicatives in a string of Indicatives conjoined by “and”. Present Indicatives in past time narrative (the so-called “historic present”) are a common feature in Matthew, Mark and John, and it is widely regarded that they occur in contexts where we suspect the author intends a heightened dramatic effect.

Such Present Indicatives are most frequent with speech verbs. Black states (1999:121):

By my count, present tense-forms occur 79 times as the main verbs in past-referring narrative sentences in Matthew, 66 of these (84%) in sentences which introduce quoted speech.

More significantly Black points out that in Matthew’s Gospel the thirteen non-speech Present Indicatives are clustered around theologically significant events (1999:127-8):

12 of them are found in clusters at important points in the narrative: Jesus’ baptism (3.13, 15); Jesus’ temptation (4.5, 8 [two occurrences], 11); Jesus’ transfiguration (17.1 [two occurrences], and Jesus’ prayer in Gethsemane (26.36, 40 [two occurrences], 45). There is one other occurrence in narrative, when two thieves are crucified alongside Jesus (27.38).

Black concludes (1999:139):
In 4:1-11 and 26:36-46 Matthew uses the historic present in a manner best explained by an aspectual approach to verbal tense-forms. He intentionally juxtaposes present and aorist or imperfect tense-forms within these passages for dramatic effect. This helps create the narrative’s structure and makes his storytelling more engaging to his readers: in one passage, to indicate development to a climax (4.1-11), and in the other, to distinguish between two interwoven story lines (26.36-46).

I propose that Matthew can use the Present Indicative both to “indicate development to a climax” and to “distinguish between two interwoven story lines” because in past time narrative Present Indicative always signifies “PAY ATTENTION”, and thus highlights the scenario in which it occurs. It is this highlighting of a particular scenario which creates what Black calls “dramatic effect”.

I posit that this is achieved by the combination of three factors:
1) A finite verb in a non subordinate clause indicates a main event to be explicitly remembered, i.e. “REMEMBER THIS”.
2) Imperfective Aspect indicates that mental “time” should be given to conceptualizing this as a Process rather than an undifferentiated Event, i.e. “SLOW DOWN.”
3) Absence of Past Tense marking of the finite verb in past time narrative indicates “statistically unusual”, i.e. “PAY EXTRA ATTENTION”. This, as Black points out
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(1999:126), agrees with Lyon’s dictum (1968:415) that “The ‘meaningfulness’ of utterances (and parts thereof) varies in inverse proportion to their degree of ‘expectancy’ in context.”

Matthew 4:1-11 shows the patterning of Present Indicatives in Narrative. I have chunked the text below, keeping strings of main verbs with the same subject conjoined by “and” in the same chunk. The sections are my own analysis, but uncontroversial. (Aorist Participles are underlined, Indicatives bolded, Present Indicatives underlined and bolded, direct speech summarized):

**SETTING**

1. Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἐρήμων ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεῦματος. Then the Jesus was-led into the wilderness by the spirit.  
   to-be-tested by the devil.

2. καὶ ἠπτενὸς ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα, And having-fasted days forty and nights forty,  
   ὕπτερον ἐπενασε.  
   finally he-hungered.

**PROBLEM + RESOLUTION 1**

3. καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ ἡμέρας ἐπεν αὐτῷ, ...  
   And having-come-near the tempter said to him  
   [If you are the son of man, turn these stones to bread]

4. ὁ δὲ ἀποκαλεῖς ἐπεν, ...  
   He () having-responded said  
   [Man shall not live by bread alone, but by God’s every word]

**PROBLEM + RESOLUTION 2**

5. καὶ ἐπέσεθεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλις. Then takes him the devil to the holy city  
   καὶ ἐπενεπεσεν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρύματος τοῦ λεοβ,  
   and set him on the pinnacle of-the temple  
   καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτῷ, ...  
   and says to-him [If you are the son of God, jump off, for it is written...]

6. οὐκ ἀνεπλήρωσεν αὐτῷ ἡ ἡμέρα, ...  
   Said to-him the Jesus [Do not tempt God]

**PROBLEM + RESOLUTION 3**

7. Πάλιν προσελθὼν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλις. Again takes him the devil to mountain high very  
   καὶ ἐπενεπεσεν αὐτῶν πᾶσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν  
   and shows him all the kingdoms of-the world and the glory of-them  
   καὶ ἐπεν αὐτῷ, ...  
   and said to-him [I will give you all this, if you worship me]

8. τότε ἁγαγεν αὐτῷ ἡ ἡμέρα, ...  
   Then says to-him the Jesus [It is written, worship God alone]

**OUTCOME**

7. Τότε ἀπεστάλη αὐτῶν ὁ διάβολος,  
   Then leaves him the devil.

8. καὶ ἦσαν ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον  
   And behold angels came-near  
   καὶ ἔστησαν αὐτῷ,  
   and where-ministering to-him.

It is apparent that the first two sections, Setting and Problem+Resolution 1, follow the unmarked narrative pattern of Aorist Participle and Aorist Indicative. Subject switch is marked in chunk 4, by δὲ. Sections 3 and 4 have a marked pattern, with no Aorist Participles at all, but strings of finite main verbs, with events belonging in the same script, (same subject, temporal sequence), conjoined by καὶ “and”. The use of Present Indicative,
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as opposed to Aorist Indicative, presents the event as a Process rather than an Event, and so, as it were, slows the action down, cuing the listener to focus on this event.

The story could be summarized as follows, with the Present Indicatives marking the most significant events in the narrative (here underlined):

Then Jesus was led to be tested
And he fasted, he hungered
And Satan came, he said [magic up bread]
Jesus replied, he said [I obey God]
Then Satan takes & set & says [jump]
Jesus said [should not tempt God]
Again Satan takes & shows & said [yours]
Then Jesus says [worship God alone]
Then Satan leaves
And angels came & were ministering

As shown above, Present Indicatives are used for what seem to be merely locations and circumstantial settings for key events, as well as for significant events themselves, such as arrival or departure of characters, and key speeches. They seem not only to highlight the event itself, but the whole scenario of which that event is a part.

This use of Present Indicatives in past time narrative to highlight the importance of following events has been noted in Mark by others. Porter (1989:189-198) quotes Buth (1977:13), who regards uses of λῆγα in the Present Indicative as haphazard, but with other verbs states:
The historic present in Mark has a regular discourse function. It is used in the beginning sentence of a paragraph and describes a change in the geographical setting of participants already on stage, or introduces participants who were off-stage ...

Similary Porter (ibid) notes Levinsohn’s observations (1977:14):
[1] It is used only in connection with the interaction of two participants or groups of participants ... [2] Its use is always cataphoric, anticipatory, pointing to another action concerned with it. ... Levinsohn claims that “the historic present establishes the location in which an important interaction will occur”

I fully agree with the above observations that historic present can be used to change the settings for following events, to introduce new participants who will act, and to mark the significance of the following events. I argue that this is due to the very nature of the scenario. If preliminary events from a script-type scenario are highlighted (by Present Indicative) then the whole script must be highlighted, and specifically the “end” of the script is highlighted, since the end is prototypically more important than the events leading up to it. This is clear in Matthew 4:7-8 above, where the Present Indicatives of “take” and “show” precede the even more important speech act, where the Aorist is used. This passage is quoted by Levinsohn (1992:143) where he refers to the Presents as Preliminary Events, and the Aorist as Foreground Event.

However I disagree with Levinsohn (1977:14, above) that the historic present is “always anticipatory”. Indeed, Levinsohn himself later abandons that view. In Discourse Features of New Testament Greek (1992:141-6) he analyses the meaning of the “historic present” as “detachment” and divides its uses into “preliminary”, which put emphasis on the foreground events which follow, and “concluding”, which sometimes highlights an event and sometimes does not.
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Thus Levinsohn cites λέγει in Matthew 4:10 (section 6 above) as an example of a highlighted "Concluding Event", but regards ἀφίησαι in 4:11 (section 7 above) as not highlighted, but marking a transition, before the highlighted foreground events of 11b-12 (1992:144-5). Although I accept that a form can have a meaning such as "detachment". I fail to see how the reader is supposed to know when the detached item is significant in itself, and when it is simply a foil to the following events. Analytically, I find it hard to understand why Jesus’s statement in verse 10 is seen as concluding and highlighted, but the result of that statement in verse 11, Satan’s departure, is seen as transitional, and not highlighted. Exegetically also, why does Levinsohn say the angels’ ministry to Jesus is more significant than Satan’s departure?

I also disagree with Levinsohn’s analysis of ἀφίησαι in Matthew 3:15b as not highlighted (1992:144-5):

Surely John’s acceding to Jesus’s request to baptize him, is highlighted. Had this not happened, and it was “touch and go” whether it would, the rest of the script could not have followed. I agree with Levinsohn that “the event concerned acts as a transition between two sections. On the one hand it concludes the incident of vv. 13-15; on the other, it forms the background to the incident of vv. 16-17”. Indeed, I believe that scenario theory explains this usage. John’s agreeing to baptize Jesus is the final event of an argument script, and as such is highlighted. But this agreement to baptize is also the prerequisite initial event of the “baptize” script. Thus the rest of the “baptism” script is highlighted as significant, since the prerequisite has been highlighted. Moreover, the following “baptism” script is simply assumed to take place, and indeed is referred to as Hearer-old information using the Aorist Participle. This explanation assigns a single value, highlighting, to the use of Present Indicative, and explains the way highlighting is distributed by prototypical relationships between events in people’s mental scenarios, rather than the bewildering variety of special circumstances Levinsohn suggests.

If we see Present Indicative as highlighting a significant event, we need only look at the scenario to see whether it is a highlighted preliminary event, such as “going”, “seeing”, “showing” etc. or whether it is an end event, such as “saying”, “leaving”, changing one’s mind (e.g. “allowing” Matthew 3:15 above). If the highlighted event is preliminary, the whole of the following script is also highlighted. If the event is the end of a script, then that event alone is highlighted.

This can be shown visually as follows:
Aorist Participles (predictable part of script) are marked lower case, main verbs (backbone of narrative) are marked UPPER CASE, final verbs in each string (end of script, script title) are **bolded**, Present Indicatives (highlighted events) are S-T-R-E-T-C-H-E-D, from Present Indicative to the end of a script is underlined.

For example:
Matthew 4:1-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>WAS LED</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having-fasted HUNGERED</td>
<td>Aorist Participle, Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satan</td>
<td>having-come SAID</td>
<td>Aorist Participle, Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>having-replied SAID</td>
<td>Aorist Participle, Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>SAID</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satan</td>
<td>S-A-Y-S</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angels</td>
<td>CAME &amp; WERE MINISTERING</td>
<td>Aorist &amp; Imperfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This charting makes it visually clear that end events of a script in a scenario (always main verbs grammatically) are always the most prominent at discourse level, that the use of conjoined main verbs rather that Aorist Participles puts more emphasis on the scenario, and that Present Indicative has two functions, both emphasizing the the action of the verb itself by, as it were, slowing it down to a Process (Imperfective Aspect), and highlighting the whole scenario (by statistical rarity in past time narrative).

Thus a Present Indicative for preliminary script events, highlights the rest of the script of which the end event (script title) is naturally most prominent (which explains its usage to highlight following significant events). In contrast a Present Indicative for script final events highlights the event itself, both as an individual verb (Process aspect), and as a scenario (statistical markedness).

Using this visual charting we can see more clearly the patterning of the temptations as Matthew presents them, where each section shows absence of highlighting or different highlighting patterns:

**Setting**
Matthew 4:1-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>WAS LED</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>having-fasted HUNGERED</td>
<td>Aorist Participle, Aorist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satan</th>
<th>having-come SAID</th>
<th>Aorist Participle, Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>having-replied SAID</td>
<td>Aorist Participle, Aorist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 2** (highlighted - Satan attacks with scripture)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>SAID</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 3** (highlighted - Jesus wins the contest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>S-A-Y-S</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Outcome (highlighted - Satan departs)
Satan L-E-A-V-E-S Present
Angels CAME & WERE MINISTERING Aorist & Imperfect

The two present forms in Jesus’s final speech and Satan’s departure are appropriate for a climactic finale which includes Jesus’s “direct and unwavering” response “Get away from me, Satan”. Hagner notes “Only here at the end of the three testings does Jesus respond with a command ... Satan has tested Jesus and has failed. Jesus sends him away with a command that calls attention simultaneously to his victory and to his authority” (1993:68-9).

Charting Present Indicatives and Scripts in Past Time Narratives

Let us use the above marking to chart the use of Present Indicatives in other texts. First parallel passages to Matthew 4:1-11, the Temptation of Jesus (* marks differences from Matthew):

Mark 1:12-13
Setting
Spirit E-X-P-E-L-S (into desert) *Present Indicative
Situation
Jesus WAS (in desert) being-tempted *Imperfect, Present Participle
Jesus WAS with wild beasts *Imperfect
* No specific temptations

Outcome (or Situation ?)
* omitted Satan’s departure (which Matthew highlighted)
Angels WERE MINISTERING *(omitted came) Imperfect

It can readily be seen that Mark’s account is very abbreviated and contains only one Present Indicative, emphasizing the work of the Holy Spirit. This also seems to highlight the whole scenario or pericope, even though it is not a preliminary event in a script with a single agent. The arguments for this as one scenario are grammatical, i.e. all the verbs, despite having separate agents, are conjoined by “and”, and semantic, i.e. each event follows naturally from the one before in a single scenario linked either by cause or logical relationship, i.e.

The Holy Spirit sent Jesus into the desert
Because he was sent, Jesus was in the desert being tempted
Because he was in the desert, Jesus was among wild animals
Because he was being tempted and among wild animals, angels ministered to him.

There is no mention of fasting or of specific temptations. Imperfects (Imperfective Aspect, Process) are chosen presumably to emphasise duration. It is unclear from the text whether the ministry of angels is for the duration of the temptation, or after the temptation. The Exodus scenario might suggest a guiding ministry of angels throughout the time. However the scenario given in Matthew suggests a ministry of emotional and perhaps physical support after the temptations. In any case, Mark’s emphasis is on God’s leading
and support in temptation, not on details of exactly what, and when. Cranfield comments (1977:56) "He goes not by chance, nor by his own fancy, but by the leading of that Spirit ... in obedience to God ..." and is given "a special assurance of the divine presence”.

**Luke 4:1-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>RETURNED</th>
<th>Imperfect (not Aorist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>WAS BEING LED</td>
<td><em>Aorist &amp; Aorist</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>NOT ATE &amp; HUNGERED</td>
<td><em>Aorist (extra information)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satan</th>
<th>SAID</th>
<th><em>(omit coming)</em> Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>ANSWERED</td>
<td><em>Aorist (-Aor. Pt., Aor)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 2 (Matthew’s 3) (lightly highlighted - Satan attacks with scripture)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satan</th>
<th>having-led SHOWED &amp; SAID</th>
<th><em>Aorist Part, Aorist &amp; Aorist</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>having-replied SAID</td>
<td><em>Aorist Participle, Aorist</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 3 (Matthew’s 2) (lightly highlighted - Jesus wins the contest)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satan</th>
<th>LED &amp; SET &amp; SAID</th>
<th><em>Aorist &amp; Aorist &amp; Aorist</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>having-replied SAID</td>
<td><em>Aorist Participle, Aorist</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome (not highlighted - Satan departs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satan</th>
<th>having finished LEFT</th>
<th><em>Aorist Participle, Aorist</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It can be seen from the above chart that Luke does not use Present Indicative here, so there is no strong highlighting. However he does use the Aorist & Aorist pattern as a mild highlighting device in exactly the same places as Matthew uses the strong highlighting, i.e. Satan’s second and third temptations. He also uses it to emphasize Jesus’s hunger. If we accept the view that a scenario title alone is a “fleeting” script, whereas more than one mention “instantiates” the script and makes the hearer aware of the script’s contents (Schank and Abelson, 1977:47), then even the “Aorist Participle, Aorist” structure has more “weight” than an Aorist alone. Whether this is so or not, it is clear that Luke’s pattern of emphasis is similar to Matthew’s even though he is more restrained in his use of the strong highlighting device of “historic present”.

Luke also reverses the order of Matthew’s second and third temptations, possibly to achieve a “Jerusalem climax” where the “central motif ... is the facing of death in Jerusalem” (Nolland, 1989:179, 181). The conjoining of three Aorist Indicatives in Luke 4:9 supports the suggestion that this particular temptation is being deliberately highlighted. The Jerusalem temptation is also highlighted in Matthew’s account, not by order, since it appears second, but by the use of the Present Indicative “says” to introduce Satan’s words (4:6). Similarly, whereas Luke emphasizes Jesus’s final response by its order, i.e. coming after the climactic temptation, Matthew emphasizes Jesus’s final response by again using the Present Indicative “says”, this time to introduce Jesus’s words (4:10).

Now let us chart the synoptic accounts of Jesus’s prayers in Gethsemane:
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Matthew 26:36-46

Setting
Jesus  C-O-M-E-S &  S-A-Y-S  Present & Present

request for support
Jesus  having-taken  BEGAN-GRIEVE  Aorist Participle, Aorist
Jesus  S-A-Y-S  Present

prayer 1

prayer 2
Jesus  having-gone  PRAYED  Aorist Participle, Aorist
Jesus  having-come  FOUND  Aorist Participle, Aorist
(for eyes WERE heavy)  Imperfect in subordinate clause

prayer 3
Jesus  having-left  having-gone  PRAYED  Aorist Pt., Aorist Pt., Aorist
Jesus  C-O-M-E-S & S-A-Y-S  Present & Present

"my betrayer is here"

Black, whose research concentrates on the patterning of different conjunctions and asyndeton, comments on her own very similar analysis of this passage (1999:138-9):
Analysis of the narrative framework of Jesus’ prayer in Gethsemane (Mt. 26.36-46) suggests that the passage is one unit with two intertwining narrative threads. The first storyline, containing historic present verb forms, follows Jesus’ interactions with his disciples. The other storyline, recounted in aorist verb forms, focuses on Jesus in isolation - in his grief, in prayer to his Father, and as he walks away from his sleeping disciples.

Black points out that this analysis not only divides the two story lines, but marks the conflict between Jesus and his disciples as in focus at discourse level, referring to Matthew 26:30-35 in support of this.

Not only does the above chart support the theory that these interactive passages are strongly highlighted, but also the fact that the verb “say” is in the Present in both 26:31 (when Jesus predicts the disciples’ flight), and in 26:35 (when Peter categorically denies he will flee) supports the view that this conflict is a discourse theme.

Levinsohn observes (1977:14) that “historic present” is used only in connection with the interaction of two participants or groups of participants, which fits the above passage. If this is true, does it mean that a narrative must have interaction to be worthy of highlighting? It certainly seems intuitively reasonable. However, if one accepted Levinsohn’s concept of “historic present” marking “detachment” either highlighting or downgrading, it is harder to see why it should be restricted to interactions, and not used to separate of an individual’s actions from the rest of the narrative.

Mark’s version is very similar (* marks differences):
Mark 14:32-42

Setting
Jesus  (+ disciples)  C-O-M-E & (he) S-A-Y-S  *Present & Present

request for support
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| prayer 1 | Jesus having-advanced **FELL** | Aorist Participle, Aorist |
|          | Jesus WAS PRAYING & WAS SAYING | *Imperfect & Imperfect |

| prayer 2 | Jesus having-gone **PRAYED** | Aorist Participle, Aorist |
|          | Jesus having-come **FOUND** | Aorist Participle, Aorist |
|          | (for eyes WERE heavy) | Imperfect in subordinate clause |

| prayer 3 | Jesus C-O-M-E-S & S-A-Y-S | * Third prayer is missing |
|          | "my betrayer is here" | Present & Present |

There are several differences in the verb forms used. In the setting Mark conjoins two Present Indicatives "they come" and "he says" which highlights the whole following episode as especially significant. These verbs have no explicit subject, the first being 3rd plural (for Jesus and the disciples), the second 3rd singular (for Jesus). The referents are implicit due to the continuation of participants from 14:26-31, and the fact that disciples and teacher are prototypical participants with set roles in a given scenario.

Mark also highlights Jesus’s request for support by using two Present Indicatives “takes” and “says” to refer to this single interactive scenario.

Mark uses Imperfects to introduce the prayer. These are used to give details of the prayer scenario already opened by “fell on his knees.” Imperfective aspect marking Process is probably chosen here to emphasize duration (cf. v. 37 “one hour”).

Finally Mark completely omits reference to Jesus’s third leaving and praying. This is not because it did not happen, but because, to Mark and his audience, it was totally predictable from their existing scenario of prayer, combined with the details of this particular prayer session in the preceding text, and therefore totally redundant.

However it is clear that Mark, like Matthew, uses Present Indicatives to highlight the interrelational parts of the story.

Luke, however, uses different techniques to emphasize the separation between Jesus and his disciples:


| Setting | Jesus having-exited **WENT** | *Aorist Participle, Aorist |
|         | disciples FOLLOWED | *Aorist |
|         | Jesus having arrived SAID | Aorist Participle, Aorist |
|         | * (omitted request for support) |

| prayer 1+2+3 | Jesus WITHDREW | *Aorist |
|              | Jesus having knelt WAS PRAYING | Aorist Participle, *Imperfect |
|              | angel APPEARED | *Aorist |
|              | Jesus having-become WAS PRAYING | *Aorist Participle, Imperfect |
|              | sweat OCCURRED | *Aorist |
|              | Jesus having-risen having-come FOUND & SAID | *Aorist & Aorist (contrast Present & Present) |
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Once again Luke never uses Present Indicatives here. He does however use the highlighted Aorist & Aorist for Jesus’s last speech, which in Matthew was given the strong highlighting Present & Present. We saw that Matthew and Mark used highlighting (with Present) whenever there was interaction between Jesus and the disciples. Luke does the same, but in his narrative, there is only one such case, the last speech verb. Everywhere else the actions of Jesus and the disciples have been separated, e.g. Jesus went, the disciples followed (as it were separately), Jesus withdrew (as a main verb), contrasting with Matthew and Mark which both mention his taking three disciples with him, and talk of his withdrawal using Aorist Participles. Similarly, there is no mention during the time of prayer of Jesus going back to the disciples.

Thus Luke also, by different means, i.e. making withdraw a main verb, and not mentioning contact with the disciples, emphasizes the distance between Jesus, praying alone, and the disciples. Indeed, Luke states that it fell to an angel to give Jesus the support he needed. And Luke also highlights (albeit less strongly) Jesus’s interaction with the disciples, as in Matthew and Mark. So although the verbal forms are markedly different, the emphasis of the synoptics is the same, Jesus, lonely, struggling with his disciples’ intransigence. If indeed Luke has used a common source here with Matthew or Mark, he has not followed it slavishly for form, but used different devices to mark the same discourse emphases.

Evidence for Present Indicatives in Past Narrative as Highlighted

The above analysis of the Temptation and Gethsemane passages supports the hypothesis that Present Indicative forms in past-time narrative mark prominence at higher levels of discourse.

The role of the “Historic Present” as a marker of discourse prominence, emphasizing what follows, was argued by Levinsohn (1977:27):

It is inaccurate to say that the historic present is used in Mark’s Gospel to give heightened vividness to the narrative. Rather it is employed as a device to give prominence to the events that lead from and build upon the speech or event so introduced.

Johnson, in his analysis of Mark 6:6b-8:26, confirms Levinsohn’s conclusions, but discriminates between historic Presents in Introductions and elsewhere, so adds a rider (1984:95):

the use of speech HPs [Historic Presents] may also draw attention to the content of the speech itself as being significant.

Levinsohn also noted that “Historic Presents” did not simply highlight events within an EPISODE, but highlighted certain EPISODES within the whole TEXT (1977:17):

the incidents of the episodes in which the present tense occurs are being given prominence over against other episodes of the Gospel, thus reflecting Mark’s purpose in relating his narrative.

Johnson confirms this (1984:96):

the discourse function of the HP is to give prominence to certain themes, episodes, participants, speeches, etc. within Marks’s narrative, and therefore it is an important factor that needs to be taken into
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account if one is to properly understand the issues of discourse structure and prominence in the Gospel of Mark

Similarly Black (1999) shows that in Matthew also the “Historic Present” marks certain episodes as prominent at the level of TEXT, i.e. functions as a high-level marker of discourse prominence.

I argue that the statistical markedness of Present Indicative in past time narrative makes it a natural marker of prominence, and that where the prominence occurs depends on the role of the verb so marked in the scenario, including both the script for an event, and the script for a story. Present verb forms for preliminary stages of scripts highlight the following stages of the script, Present verb forms in Introductions of a story highlight the following stages of the story, Present verb forms in the end stages of scripts, or the Conclusions of stories, emphasize that stage itself, Present verb forms in any EPISODE highlight that episode in the whole TEXT.

This hypothesis that Present Indicatives in past time narrative mark highlighting or prominence is supported by patterns of usage. They occur only in the “backbone” of narrative, they introduce significant sayings, they occur with restricted lexical items, and they show patterns of collocation with anarthrous nouns. These factors are considered below.

Present indicatives only occur in the “backbone” of past narrative

If the Present Indicative in past narrative does not simply mark the Aspect of the verb as such (which Imperfect would), but rather marks that the event (and hence also the scenario it belongs to) is highly significant at discourse level, then we would expect it not to be used in explanatory clauses, or in subordinate clauses in narrative with past time reference, since such clauses are by their nature removed from the backbone of the narrative. This explains why, in the following examples, even when the narrative verb is in the Present, the explanation which refers back to it is not in the Present. I have tried to include all the examples in John where a Present Indicative of λέγω in narrative is referred back to:

Unmarked narrative: (both Aorist)

John 11:49, 51 (cf. 7:37, 39)

Narrative: εἷς δὲ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καίαφας... εἶπεν αὐτοῖς...
One () certain from them Caiaphas ... said to-them...

Explanation: τὸῦτο δὲ ἀπὸ ἐπαυτῳδ οὐκ εἶπεν,
This () from himself not he-said

but highpriest being of-the year that he-prophesied ...

Marked narrative: (Present Indicative)

with Aorist Indicative for explanation

John 12:4, 6

Narrative: λέγει δὲ ἴσως ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης εἷς [ἐν] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ...
One () certain from them Caiaphas ... said to-them

Explanation: εἶπεν δὲ τοῦτο οὐχ ὡτι ... ἀλλ' ὡτι ...
He-said () this not because ... but because ...
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John 13:10, 11
Narrative Νέεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς; ...  
Says to-him the Jesus, ...

Explanation ήδει γὰρ τὸν παραδίδοντα αὐτὸν  
He-knew[Pluperfect] for the one-betraying him
διὰ τοῦτο ἐλεηθὲν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τῶν καθαρῶν ἔστη. 
Because-of this he-said that not all clean are.

John 13:27, 28
Narrative Νέεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς; ...  
Says to-him the Jesus ...

Explanation τοῦτο [δὲ] ἐδήλω ἡγισμὸς τῶν ἀνακειμένων πρὸς τι ἐλεηθὲν αὐτῷ.  
This () nobody knew-of the recliners for what he-said to-him.

John 21:17, 19
Narrative Νέεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς; ...  
Says to-him [the Jesus] ...

Explanation τοῦτο δὲ ἐλεγεν σημαίνοντες πολὺ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν.  
This () he-said signifying by-what death he-will-glory the God.

John 21:22, 23
Narrative Νέεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς; ...  
Says to-him the Jesus...

Explanation οὐκ ἐλεγεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς διὶ οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκει διὰ', ...  
Not he-said () to-him the Jesus that not dies but ...

with Imperfect Indicative for explanation

John 8:4, 6
Narrative Νέεναι αὐτῷ; ...  
They-say to-him

Explanation τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον πειράζοντες αὐτῶν; ...  
This () they-were-saying tempting him ...

with Pluperfect Indicative for explanation (after intervening speech):

John 11:11-13
Narrative καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο Νέεν αὐτῶν; ...  
And after that he-says to-them...

Explanation ἐπαν οὐν αἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῷ; ...  
Said therefore the disciples to-him...

Explanation ἐφήκει δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς περὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ,  
Had-spoken [Pluperfect] () the Jesus about the death of-him

Does the use of Aorist for explanation as opposed to new highlighted actions explain the contra-intuitive example in John 11:21-27 where Jesus's great “I am” saying is not highlighted?

Narrative 1 ἐλεηθὲν οὖν ἡ Μάραθα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ...  
Said therefore the Martha to the Jesus ...

Narrative 2 Νέεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀναστήσεται δ ἀσθενὸς σου.  
Says to-her the Jesus, will rise the brother of-you.

Narrative 3 Νέεν αὐτῷ ἡ Μάραθα, 
Says-to-him the Martha,  
Οἶδα διὶ ἀναστῆσαι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.  
I-know that he-will-rise in the resurrection in the last day

Explanation of 2 ἐλεηθὲν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  
Said-to her the Jesus  
Ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή ...  
I am the resurrection and the life ...

Narrative 4 Νέεν αὐτῷ. Ναὶ κόρε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα διὶ σὺ ἐλ ὁ Χριστὸς  
She-says to-him, Yes lord, I-have-believed that you are the Christ  
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐλ ὁ κόσμου ἐρχόμενος.  
the son of-the god the into the world coming.
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This perhaps is matched by John 11:14-15 as an explanation of John 11:11. Note the close parallels between the contents of the speeches and the word παρρησία “plainly” at the start of the explanation:

**John 11:11, 14-15**

**Narrative**
καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει αὐτοῖς,
And after that he-says to-them
Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται.
Lazarus the friend of-us has-fallen-asleep.
ἀλλὰ πορεύομαι ὧν ἔξυπναυ ἄντων,
but I-go in-order-that I-may-waken him...

**Explanation**
τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέβη ὃ ἦν παρρησία,
Then therefore said to-them the Jesus plainly,
Λάζαρος ἀπέθανεν,
Lazarus died,
καὶ χαίρω δι' ἡμῶν ἵνα πιστεύσητε, ὅτι οὐκ ἦμεν ἐκεῖ,
and I-rejoice for you so you-may-believe, that we were not there.
ἀλλὰ ἰσχυρέτερος ὁ πρὸς ἅμοι.
But let-us-go to him.

If Present Indicative in past time is marked as discourse significant, we would expect narrative to show an unusually high occurrence of λέγω in the Present Indicative, as compared to the Aorist, but explanations to show an unusually low occurrence of Present Indicatives.

Looking at all the instances in John where Jesus says ἔγω εἰμι “I am” we find the Present tense of λέγω introducing Discourse-new statements, and Aorist introducing explanatory statements:

**Present Indicative** (new information)
John 4:26
λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔγω εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.
(I am the Christ, cf. 4:25)
John 6:20
ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, ἔγω εἰμι.
(I am Jesus, not a ghost, cf. Matthew 14:26)
John 14:6
λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς, ἔγω εἰμι ὁ δῆσα καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία καὶ ἡ ζωή.
(Although the way has been mentioned in 14:5, truth and life are Discourse-new, and this is the first time Jesus identifies himself as the way.)
John 14:6, 15:1, 15:5
λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ... ἔγω εἰμι ὁ διδάσκως ἡ ἀληθεία ... ἔγω εἰμι ὁ δίδακτος,
(See the same highlighted speech.)
John 18:5b
λέγει αὐτοῖς, ἔγω εἰμι.
(I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom you are looking for, 18:4b-5a.)

**Aorist Indicative** (explanatory)
John 6:35
ἐπειδὴ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔγω εἰμι ὁ ἀρτος τῆς ζωῆς.
(They were grumbling because he said “I am the bread from heaven”)
John 6:41
ἐφύγαν οὐ παρὶ ἑαυτὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀπεκοροῦσα καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐπειδὴ ἔγω εἰμι ὁ ἀρτος τῆς ζωῆς... ἔγω εἰμι ὁ ἀρτος τῆς ζωῆς.
(Explanation: “I am the bread of life ... the living bread come down from heaven.” Jesus “responded” to their query about his origin 6:42)
Appendix G - Exceptions that prove the rule: conjoined main verbs in a single scenario

John 8:12
Πάλνν οὐν αὐτός ἔδιδησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων, Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου.
(Explanation: “I am the light of the world”. The conjunction Πάλνν “again” links this to a previous occasion of public speaking, 7:37-44, which raised the issue of whether Jesus was the Messiah, 7:41-52. The conjunction οὐν “therefore” marks this as explanatory. Thus it should be understood as an explanation of how Jesus can claim to give “living water”, i.e. the Holy Spirit 7:39, cf. 1:4 Jesus, the Word, gives both life and light)

John 8:14-18
ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,... ἔγον εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ
(Explanation: “I am the one witnessing about myself”. Jesus “responded” to the Pharisees’ statement in 8:13 that witness about oneself did not validate the truth, adding that God also witnessed about him)

John 8:28
εἶπεν οὖν [αὐτός] ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἄραν ἐγὼ λέγων ἠμῖν, πρὶν ἅπασα γενεὰ ἐγώ εἰμι.
(Explanation, as indicated by the conjunction οὖν “therefore”. As in 8:24 (below), the “I am” statement is not new information, but embedded, “when ..., then you will know that I am,” meaning “I am the Christ” 7:41-52, or “I am God” if “I am” = YHWH)

John 8:58
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς, Ἄραν ἐγὼ λέγων ἠμῖν, πρὶν ἅπασα γενεὰ ἐγώ εἰμι.
(Explanation of how he could speak authoritatively about Abraham 8:56, queried in 8:57. “I am” here means “I existed (because I am YHWH)"

John 10:7, 9, 11, 14
Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἄραν ἐγὼ λέγων ἠμῖν ὥστε ἐγώ εἰμι, ἥθερα τῶν προσδέτων...
(Explanation of 10:1-5, which was not understood, see 10:6b. The conjunction Πάλνν “again” links this to a previous occasion of speaking, 10:1-5, which raised the issue of the door and the shepherd, 10:1-2. The conjunction οὖν “therefore” marks this as explanatory.)

John 11:25
εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμι ἄναστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή;
(Explanation of why he could say Lazarus would rise again 11:23, misunderstood in 11:24.)

John 18:6
ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐγώ εἰμι ...
(Explanation referring back to Jesus’s words in 18:5. The conjunctions ὡς οὖν “therefore” provide the time setting and reason for the mob to fall back 18:6b)

John 18:8
ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Εἶπον ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.
(Explanation referring back to Jesus’s words in 18:5 and 18:6. The word ἀπεκρίθη “responded” also marks this as a response, here explanatory.)

Imperfect Indicative (setting) plus Aorist Indicative (explanatory)

John 8:23, 24
καὶ ἐγέγεν αὐτοῖς,... εἶπον οὖν ἠμῖν ὅτι ἀποδείκτηκεν ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἠμῖν ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.
(“he-was-saying to-them ...” functions as a setting for 8:25b Jesus’s statement of frustration, that he cannot get through to them. Within that we have an Aorist, functioning as an explanation, with ὅτι “therefore”. The “I am” statement (meaning “I am the Christ” 7:41-52, or “I am God” if “I am” = YHWH) is not new, but embedded, “unless you believe that I am...?”)

Does this seeming restriction, that Present Indicative in past time narrative does not occur in explanatory clauses, also apply to responses, since a response is a type of explanation? If so, then we would expect no instances of Present Indicative with ἀποκρύπτομαι “to answer”, either as a main verb, or as an Aorist Participle followed by Present Indicative of “say”. A passage where this seems significant is John 4:7-26

(Indicatives bold, Present underlined):

4.7 Ἐρευναὶ γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας ἀντλήσατο ἰθαν. Ἰεροῦς, Ἄραν ἠμῖν, ᾧ ὡς μου πείν. Ἐδείκτηκεν αὐτοῖς ἠμῖν ἠμῖν ἀπανθηματίσατε βασιλεὺς τῶν ἁγίων. Σαμαρείταις. (Present time for the original author)
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4.10 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ...
4.11 λέγει αὐτῷ ἢ γυνὴ, ...
4.13 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ...
4.15 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ γυνὴ, ...
4.16 λέγει αὐτῷ, ...
4.17 ἀπεκρίθη ἢ γυνὴ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ...
λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ...
4.19 λέγει αὐτῷ ἢ γυνὴ, ...
4.21 λέγει αὐτῷ, ...
4.25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἢ γυνὴ, ...
4.26 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμί, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.

Here all the occurrences of λέγω are in the Present Indicative except when conjoined with ἀποκρίνομαι, when both verbs are Aorist. The distinction between verbal forms here is not related to the identity of the speaker, but to the presence or absence of “answer.” This perhaps indicates that verbs representing a new initiative (rather than an explanation or response) are more likely to be highlighted at discourse level.

Similarly John 7:45-50 shows a collocation of “answering” and Aorist verb form, whether or not ἀποκρίνομαι occurs alone or together with λέγω:

7.45 ἰδοὺ οὖν ὁ ἤπειρος πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίους, καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνοι, ...
7.46 ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ἤπειροι, ...
7.47 ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν αὐτοῖς οἱ Φαρισαίοι, ...
7.50 λέγει Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτούς, ...
7.52 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, ...

In the whole New Testament corpus the figures for verb forms of λέγω and ἀποκρίνομαι in 3rd Person Indicatives are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist (εἶπεν)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Present | - | - | 3 | - | - | 3 |}

In the Gospels there are only 3 occurrences of “having answered” in the Present Indicative, all in John, and all where Jesus makes significant statements, relating to his death, betrayal and denial. Only John 13:26 directly follows a question:

John 12:23 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς ἀποκριθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς λέγων.
The () Jesus answers to-them saying, Ἐλημένετε ὅταν ἢ ἐφαρμόζη δύσος τοῦ ἰδίου του ἀνθρώπου.
Has-come the hour so-that will-be-glorified the son of-the Man

John 13:26 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖνος ἄστυν ὡς ἔγω βάζω τοῦ φυματου καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ.
Answers [the] Jesus, That-one it-is to-whom I will dip the sop and will-give to-him.

John 13:38 ἀποκριθεῖς, Ἰησοῦς, Τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἵππερ ἐμοὶ θησεῖς; ... ἄρνησαι με τρίς.
Answers Jesus, The life of-you for me will-you-lay-down? ... will-deney me thrice.

Occurrences of “having answered say” (Aorist Participle followed by Present Indicative) are also rare. Here the Prenuclear Aorist Participle ἀποκριθεῖσα is better understood as meaning “in response”:

Mark 9:19 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεῖσας αὐτοῖς λέγει, ὃ γενεὰ ἀποκριθεῖσα, ...
He () having-answered to-them says, O generation faithless...

104
The previous speech is by one person, and states that the disciples could not heal his son. No question is asked. Jesus then "responds" to the people, rather than "answers" the man.

Mark 11:22
καὶ δισκοπρηθεὶς τῷ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἐχετε πίστιν θεοῦ.
And having-answered the Jesus says to-them, Have faith in-god.

The previous speech is by one person, Peter, and states that the fig-tree Jesus cursed has withered. No question is asked. Jesus then "responds" to the disciples, rather than "answers" Peter.

Mark 11:33
καὶ δισκοπρηθεὶς αὐτῷ τῷ Ἰησοῦς ὁ δὲ οἶδαμεν.
And having-answered to-the Jesus they-say, Not we-know.

The previous speech is by the Jewish leaders debating among themselves how to respond. The original question is in v. 29-30 and contains the command "answer me" twice. In the light of the above examples, this may be understood as meaning "in response to Jesus’s question they say...

As shown above, δισκοπρηθεὶς need not refer to the answer of a question. Rather it seems to refer to a response, either to a question, a statement, or even a situation, e.g.

Mark 10:51
καὶ δισκοπρηθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, ...
And having-answered to-him the Jesus said ...

Here the blind man starts calling for Jesus to have mercy on him in 47, Jesus calls him in 49, and he comes to Jesus in 50, so Jesus’s “response” is to the blind man’s action as much as to his words.

The Passive form of δισκοπρηθεὶς might even indicate grammatically that the grammatical subject is semantically a “patient”, affected by something else, rather than operating independently.

Again, this corresponds to a theory that Present Indicative in past narrative marks something out as especially significant. Responses, and especially replies to questions, are by their nature, expected, and their absence is explicitly stated and emphasized as unusual (e.g. Matthew 27:14 “not one word” “amazed”, Mark 14:61 use of “developmental particle” δέ marking a non-event as significant in plot development, conjoined scenario “was silent and answered nothing”, Mark 15:4-5 “amazed”, Luke 23:9 use of “developmental particle” δέ). Expected actions, such as responses, are not as significant, in terms of following a story line, as new independant actions, and so are less likely to be marked by Present Indicative.

Present Indicatives with significant sayings

It is widely recognized that most New Testament “Historic Presents” are with speech verbs, as shown by data from Johnson (1984:iii):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Historic Presents</th>
<th>Speech Verbs</th>
<th>Non-speech Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Present Indicative with speech verbs in past time narrative is so common, Lyon’s dictum (1968:415) that “The ‘meaningfulness’ of utterances (and parts thereof) varies in inverse proportion to their degree of ‘expectancy’ in context,” has led some to ignore their significance. However, it is the use of Aorist Indicative for Past narrative which is most expected, and Present Indicative which is most unexpected, and thus most meaningful. Present Indicative speech verbs are thus highly significant, especially since
the speech verb per se is so predictable that it is sometimes omitted entirely in the New Testament, e.g. (Imperfect italicized, Aorist underlined, Present bold, Implicit asterisked)
Mark 8:16b-20
Kai διαλογίζομαι πρὸς ἄλλοις ὅτι "Ἀρτοὺς οὐκ ἔχουμεν.
καὶ γνως ἐλέγει αὐτοῖς, 'Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;... ὥστε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς
toὺς πεντακαισχίλους, πόσας κοφίνους κλασμάτων πλήρεις ἔρατε;
ἐλέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Διώδεκα.
* [Jesus said to them] "Ὅτε τοὺς ἐπτά εἰς τοὺς τετρακαίσχίλους, πόσαν σπείρων πληρώματα κλασμάτων ἔρατε;
καὶ λέγουσιν [αὐτῷ], Ἐπτά.
καὶ ἐλέγεν αὐτοῖς, Ὄδηγο συνελεύσετε;
Luke 7:40-41
7:40 καὶ ἀποκρίθης ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔπειν πρὸς αὐτούς, Σίμων, ἔχω σοι τι εἶπεῖν.
δὲ δὲ, Διδάσκαλε, ἐπίτε, φησίν.
7:41 * [Jesus said to Simon] δῶ προφετεύεται ἡ σας διαστή τυν...'
19:25 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνάς -
19:26 * [Jesus said to the people/The master said to the bystanders] λέγω ἢ μὴ δὲ παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι
dοθήσεται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ δὲ ἔχει αρθησεται.
19:27 * [The master said to the bystanders] πλὴν τοὺς ἔχοντος μου τοῦτος τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντός με
βασιλεύσαι εἶτ’ αὐτοῖς ἀγάγετε δὲ δὲ κατασφάξατε αὐτοῖς ἐμπροσθέν μου.
The verse 19:25 is not found in DW 69 or syce bo(1). Such a text requires no implicit speech verbs. If
19:25 is included, and 19:27 is the master in the parable speaking, there is an implicit speech margin, either
before verse 26 or 27, depending on whether 19:26 is within the parable, or Jesus directly addressing his
audience.

If Present Indicative in past time narrative is marked as discourse significant, we
would expect there to be an unusually high co-occurrence of the Present Indicative of λέγω
with the statements of Jesus. Luz (quoted by Black, 1999:125) suggests that this is so
(1989:52):
Since Matthew in his narratives likes to tighten the narrative and thus lets the dialogue become
prominent, perhaps the historical present also is a means of directing the attention of the readers to the
most important element in the narratives, namely the sayings of Jesus.

In some passages this seems to be the pattern, e.g.
Matt 8:19-22
καὶ προσῆλθὼν εἷς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ,
And having approached one scribe said to-him
Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι διὸ ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ.
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς, And says to-him the Jesus,
And says to him the Jesus,
Αἱ Διδασκάλεις φυλεῖς ἔχουμεν καὶ τὰ πεπεισμα τὸν ὁμανοῦ κατακρινόμεθα,
οἱ δὲ τῷ μαθητῶν λατρεύοντον ἔεπεν αὐτῷ,
Other (ο) τῶν μαθητῶν λατρεύοντον ἔεπεν αὐτῷ,
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, λέγει αὐτῷ, λέγει αὐτῷ,
The (ο) Jesus says to-him,
Ὑκρίπτων μοι καὶ ὑπῆρξε τῶν νεκρῶν ἢ ὑπῆρξε τῶν ἐγείρων νεκρῶν.
"Ακολουθεῖ μοι καὶ ὕπερ ὑπῆρξε τῶν ἐγείρων νεκρῶν.

Similarly, if Present Indicative in past time narrative is marked as discourse
significant, we would expect there to be an unusually high co-occurrence of the Present
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Indicative of λέγω introducing especially significant statements, such as “follow me”. This phrase comes 11 times in the Gospels (Indicative bold and Present underlined):

**re unnamed person**

Matthew 8:22
ο δὲ ἦσας λέγω αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι...
The () Jesus says to-him, Follow me.
Luke 9:59
Ἐπεν δὲ πρὸς ἑτέρου, Ἀκολούθει μοι.
He said () to another, Follow me.

**re Matthew**

Matthew 9:9
καὶ λέγω αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦ, Ἀκολούθει μοι.
And says to-him, Follow me.
Mark 2:14
καὶ λέγω αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦ, Ἀκολούθει μοι.
And says to-him, Follow me.
Luke 5:27
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι.
And said to-him, Follow me.

**re Philip**

John 1:43
καὶ λέγω αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦ, Ἀκολούθει μοι.
And says to-him the Jesus, Follow me.

**re Peter**

John 21:19
καὶ τούτῳ εἶπεν λέγω αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι.
And this saying says to-him, Follow me.
John 21:22
λέγω αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦ, Ἐὰν αὐτόν θέλω μένειν ἐως ἔρχομαι, τὰ πρὸς σέ;
Says to-him the Jesus, If him I-want to-stay till I-come, what to you?
σέ μοι ἂν ἀκολούθεις.
You follow me.

**re rich man**

Matthew 19:21
ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
Εἶ ἰδεῖς τέλειος εἶναι,
ὕπαγε πῶλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὅσο [τοὺς] πτωχοῖς,
καὶ ἔχεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ὑδαίνοις,
καὶ δέδο ἂν ἀκολούθης μοι.
Mark 10:21
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,
'Εν σε οὐκ ἦσας ὑπάγε, δοσα ἔχεις πῶλησόν καὶ ὅσο [τοὺς] πτωχοῖς,
καὶ ἔχεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ὑδαίνοις,
καὶ δέδο ἂν ἀκολούθης μοι.
Luke 18:22
ἀκούεις δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ,
'Επὶ ἐν σοι λειτέπει πάντα δοσα ἔχεις πῶλησόν καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς,
καὶ ἔχεις θησαυρὸν ἐν [τοὺς] ὑδαίνοις,
καὶ δέδο ἂν ἀκολούθης μοι.

Matthew, Mark and John always have λέγω in the Present when the command “follow me” is speech initial (Matthew 8:22, 9:9; Mark 2:14; John 1:43, 21:19, and 21:22, when it follows a short initial sentence).

All Gospels have Aorist where there is other lengthy speech material preceding the command (Matthew 19:21, Mark 10:21, Luke 18:22).

Excluding Luke, this 100% usage (6/6) of Present Indicatives of λέγω immediately before “follow me,” compares with a 76% usage (59/78) of λέγω in “Historic Present” in Matthew, and a 48% usage (72/151) in Mark (figures from Hawkins, 1909:148). This is in line with my thesis that Present verb form for past time, being statistically marked, highlights the significance of the scenario (here including the contents of the speech).

Even though the number of examples is very small, this usage cannot be held to depend simply on sources. For example, in the last set of examples the speech margin and content is conceptually similar, but verbally very different. Also Hawkins notes that Matthew parallels only 21 of Mark’s 150 “Historic Presents” (1909:148-9), and Fanning notes that Matthew uses the “Historic Present” an additional 72 times independently of Mark (1990:238). (However the total figure of 93 “Historic Presents” in Matthew, 72+21, does not match Black’s total of 79). So use of the Present Indicative is obviously author choice, rather than simply dependent on the same source text.

Present Indicatives followed by conjoined Aorist Indicatives for significant sayings

The Present Indicative occurs together with conjoined Aorist Indicatives in the formula “A says... B responded and said...” This structure is not used for straightforward questions and answers. Rather it seems to highlight significant interchanges in the discussion, e.g. (with the gist of the speech added below)

John 4:9, 10
Δέιξεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἢ γυνῇ ἢ Σαμαρητής, ...
“How can you ask me for a drink?”
John 4:11, 13
Δέιξεν αὐτῷ ἢ γυνῇ, ...
“You have nothing to draw with...”
John 4:16, 17
Δέιξεν αὐτῷ, ...
“Go call your husband...”
John 7:50, 52
Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτός, ...
“Does our law condemn a man...?”

Διεκπέρασεν Ἡρῴδης καὶ ἐπιεῡ αὐτῷ, ...
“If you knew who asks you.”
Διεκπέρασεν Ἡρῴδης καὶ ἐπιεῡ αὐτῷ, ...
“The water I give...”
Διεκπέρασεν ἢ γυνῇ καὶ ἐπιεῡ αὐτῷ, ...
“I have no husband...”
Διεκπεράσαν καὶ ἐπιαν αὐτῷ, ...
“Are you from Galilee too”

The first three occurrences are all in the pericope of the woman at the well, which also has a constant stream of Present Indicatives of “say”. This highlighting seems appropriate since this conversation between Jesus and the woman, especially Jesus’s awareness of her life, led to the successful mission to the Samaritans (John 4:39). Similarly Nicodemus’ conversation with the Sanhedrin shows the audience that the Sanhedrin’s opposition to Jesus will continue to its logical conclusion.

This patterning occurs elsewhere in John, again confirming the interpretation that this speech interchange is particularly significant:
John 14:22, 23 (introducing the whole speech 14:23-16:16)
Δέιξεν ἵνα τοιοῦτος,...
“Why... show yourself to us?”
John 18:29, 30 (introducing the trial before Pilate)
ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος ἐξω... καὶ ὅπως, ἐπεκρήσετο καὶ ἐπίαν αὐτῷ.
“What charges are you bringing?”

Διεκπέρασεν Ἡρῴδης καὶ ἐπιεῡ αὐτῷ
“If anyone loves me, he will obey...”
Διεκπεράσαν καὶ ἐπιαν αὐτῷ
“If he were not a criminal...”
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John 20:27, 28 (introducing Thomas’s confession of faith)

eîta λέγει τῷ θωμᾶι, ἀπεκρίθη θωμᾶς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ
“Put your finger here; see my hands”
“My Lord and my God.”

According to my hypothesis the Present Indicative verb form, being statistically marked in Past time narrative, highlights the scenario of that speech act, and the conjoined Aorist Indicatives mark the “answer” scenario as extra significant, by using two main verbs for the one scenario.

As mentioned above, there are 3 instances in John (none in the other Gospels) where “answer” is in the Present, each time after “say” in the Present. These might be seen as super-highlighted. They are Jesus’s statement about his impending death, identification of his betrayer, and announcement that Peter will deny him:

John 12:22b-23

ἔρχεται Ἄνδρεας καὶ Φιλίππος καὶ λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.
ο ἔδει τῇ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῶν λέγων.
"Εἴπαμεν η δρα τις δοξασθῇ η υπὸ τοῦ άνθρώπου.
Has-come the hour so-that will-be-glorified the son of-the Man.

John 13:26

λέγει αὐτῷ Κύριε, τίς ἐστιν;

ἀποκριθεὶς ἦν Ἰησοῦς;

That-one it-is to-whom I-will-dip the sop and will-give to-him.

John 13:36-38

λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, Κύριε, τοῦ ὑπάγεις;

ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς;

"Οποιο ὑπάγω θέλω δυναστὶ μοι νῦν ἀκολουθήσαμεν ἀκολουθήσας δὲ ἔστερον.
λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος,

Κύριε, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαι σοι ἀκολούθησαι ἄρτι; τὴν προφητον μοι ὑπέρ σου θήσω.

ἀποκριθεὶς Ἰησοῦς;

Τὴν προφητον σου ὑπέρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις;

The life of-you for me will-you-lay-down? ...

Present Indicatives with Restricted Lexical Items

The specific range of lexical items which occur in the “Historic Present” also supports the hypothesis that its function is one of “highlighting”. Black (quoting Turner, 1963:61) notes that the Present Indicative in past time narrative is particularly associated with lexical items in a restricted number of semantic domains (1999:124):

Turner notes that in post-classical Greek there is an increasing tendency to find the historic present with λέγει and other verbs of speaking, as well as with verbs of seeing and verbs of motion.

Johnson also notes this tendency in Mark’s Gospel, dividing “Historic Presents” into speech and non-speech usage, and commenting (1984:19):

Most of the non-speech HPs [Historic Presents] in Mark’s Gospel are verbs of motion (arrival and departure), but the HP is occasionally found with verbs of perception and some active transitive verbs.

Black similarly notes the high frequency of λέγω as “Historic Present” in Matthew’s Gospel (1999:125):

In narrative ... 22% of the sentences functioning as speech margins have main verbs with present tense forms (66 of 299 clauses), while less than 4% of sentences in narrative that are not speech margins have present tense forms (15 of 417 sentences).

Black’s figure for speech margin Presents includes 6 occurrences of other verbs with the Present Participle “saying” i.e. Matthew 2:13 “appears ... saying”, 2:19-20
“appears ... saying”, 3:1-2 “arrives ... proclaiming ... saying”, 9:14 “approach ... saying”, 15:1 “approach ... saying”, 22:16 “send ... saying”.

However, I argue that several other Present Indicatives of non-speech verbs belong to a complex speech margin scenario: Matthew 4:5 “takes ... and stood ... and says”, 4:8-9 “takes ... and shows ... and said”, 26:36 “comes ... and says”, 26:40 “comes ... and finds ... and says”, and 26:45 “comes ... and says” (a total of 8). Thus, depending on exactly how Black’s figures are calculated, by including complex speech margins, up to 74 (66+8) of 299 speech margin sentences (25%) have Present Indicatives, and perhaps as few as 7 (15-8) of 417 Present Indicatives (less than 2%) occur outside speech margin sentences.

Similarly for Mark’s Gospel, Hawkins (1909:12f) comments that 24 of the 151 “Historic Presents” are from ἔρχομαι. However 11 of these 24 (46%) are part of a complex speech margin, i.e.

This correlates with scenario theory. We have seen above that a single event scenario contains not simply actions but the prototypical sequences, participants and motivations for those actions. We have also seen how correctly interpreting the intentions and motivations of participants is crucial to following the plot. What participants say is the clearest indicator of their intentions, feelings and motivations. What participants see is a major motivation affecting their actions. And where participants go is a major clue as to whether they have decided to act and what they have decided to do. So it is quite natural that such significant concepts should be regularly highlighted by the use of Present Indicatives in past time narrative.

Similarly, throughout the Gospels (omitting direct speech), the main verbs conjoined by καί to the Present Indicative of “say” come from a limited number of semantic domains, and can be grouped into the following scenario clusters (Present underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Verb and Verb</th>
<th>and</th>
<th>says</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 4:5</td>
<td>stood and stands</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 24:36 (variant)</td>
<td>stood and stood</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 20:19</td>
<td>came and stood</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 3:32</td>
<td>sat and satin</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 9:9</td>
<td>saw and saw</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 22:11-12</td>
<td>saw and saw</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:71</td>
<td>saw and saw</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 2:14</td>
<td>sees and sees</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:29</td>
<td>saw and saw</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:47</td>
<td>sends and sends</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 11:1-2</td>
<td>sends and sends</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:13</td>
<td>sends and sends</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>says</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Matthew 20:6  
John 1:41  
(John 1:43 (2 sentences ?))  
John 1:45  
Matthew 21:19  
Matthew 26:40  
Mark 14:37  
Mark 1:36  
Matthew 26:36  
Matthew 26:45  
Mark 2:18  
Mark 14:41  
John 12:22  
John 12:22  
John 20:2  
John 19:9  
John 4:28  
John 18:4  
John 18:38  
John 19:4  
Matthew 14:31  
Mark 1:41  
Matthew 21:12-13  
Mark 1:43  
Mark 4:38  
Mark 9:35  
John 2:9-10  
Mark 6:50  
Mark 7:28  
Mark 8:33  
Mark 14:61  
Mark 7:43  
Mark 14:34  
John 21:17  
John 20:22

Present Indicatives with anarthrous nouns

If Present Indicatives mark “highlighting”, and anarthrous nouns mark “salience” (see Chapter 6), we would expect a high co-occurrence of these two features, i.e. anarthrous nouns with known particular referents as subject of Present Indicatives in past time narrative. Certainly they can co-occur and the combination seems to mark a very significant event.
For example Philip occurs in 4 episodes in John, and each time there is interplay between Present Indicative verbs and anarthrous subjects (main verbs bold, highlighted Present underlined, nouns as subject underlined, anarthrous nouns bold):

John 1:43-48
... ἐρχόμενος Φίλιππος ... [Jesus] finds Philip ...
καὶ Μέγελος αὐτῷ ὅ ἦν Ναζαρηνός, ἀκολούθει μοι. And says to-him the Jesus, Follow me, ᾿Ιδοὺ ὁ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ Βηθσαίας ... Was () the Philip from Bethsaida ...

Finds Philip the Nathaniel καὶ Μέγελος αὐτῷ ... (We have found the Messiah, it’s Jesus)
καὶ ἐπένευ αὐτῷ Ναζαρηνῷ. And said to-him Nathaniel, Ἐκ Ναζαρητ ἔδωκε τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι; From Nazareth can anything good be? Μέγελος αὐτῷ ὅ ὁ Γέρον καὶ ἢστο. ... ? salient subject highlighted verb
Says to-him (the) Philip, Come and see... ἀπεκρίθη Ναζαρηνός καὶ ἐπένευ αὐτῷ. Answered Jesus and said to-him Πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι... Before the you Philip to-call...

The anarthrous nouns show the movement of participant focus from Philip, being called as a disciple and then telling Nathaniel, to Nathaniel, responding with doubt, and finally to Jesus, convincing him. Present Indicative verbs highlight Jesus finding and calling Philip, then Philip finding and telling Nathaniel, and finally inviting Nathaniel to see for himself. The explanation has nothing salient or highlighted. The salient subject and highlighted verb construction is used to introduce the focal statement, that Jesus is the Messiah.

John 6:5-8
... Μέγελος τριῶν Φίλιππων, [Jesus] says to Philip  (Where can we buy bread so these can eat?) τοῦτο δὲ Εὐγενὲς πείραζον αὐτῶν... (explanation)
This () he-was-saying testing him...
ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὅ ὁ Γέρον. ? salient subject
Answered him (the) Philip (Two hundred denarii of bread is not enough ...) Μέγελος αὐτῷ ἔλεγκε ἕκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶ, Αὐράμης ... salient subject highlighted verb
Says to-him one from the disciples of-him Philip, Andrew ... (There is a lad here ...)

The anarthrous nouns show the movement of participant focus from Philip, being tested by Jesus, and failing, to Andrew, who sees, albeit dimly, the possibility that Jesus might sort everything out, despite the meagre resources. The Present Indicative verbs highlight Jesus testing Philip, but Andrew responding. The explanation has nothing salient or highlighted. The salient subject and highlighted verb construction is used to introduce the focal speech, that there are some resources but “what are these among so many?” This speech is the starting-off point for Jesus’s miracle, which answers the question raised here.
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John 12:20-23
οὕτως οὖν προσῆλθον Φίλιππος ...  
These therefore came to-Philip ...

ἔρχεται οὖν Φίλιππος καὶ Δήμος τῷ Ἰσραήλ,  
Comes the Philip and says to-the Andrew,

Comm: The Philip and Philip and say to-the Jesus.
ο. δὲ Ἰπποῦς ἀποκρίνεται αὐτὸς λέγων
The () Jesus answers them saying ...

Here Andrew and Philip are marked salient (anarthrous) since they together effect the meeting between the Greeks and Jesus. The string of Present Indicatives highlights the whole sequence as significant, each being totally dependent on the previous one, and culminates in a rare occurrence of ἀποκρίνεται. in the Present, introducing a very significant statement, Jesus’s public declaration to Jews and gentiles of his imminent death on the cross.

John 14:8-9
Δέιγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος.  
Says to-him Philip,  
(Lord, show us the father, and we will be satisfied)

Δέιγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ιησοῦς.  
Says to-him the Jesus,

Here the combination of anarthrous noun and Present Indicative verb is used for Philip’s interaction with Jesus during the Last Supper. This is one of a whole series of similar interchanges of one disciple with Jesus, from John 13:31 onwards, until 16:17 where the disciples start to talk among themselves:

13*31 "Οτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν, Δέιγει Ἰησοῦς  
13*36a Δέιγει αὐτῷ Ἀρών Πέτρος  
13*36b ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ Ιησοῦς  
13*37 Δέιγει αὐτῷ Οὐδές  
13*38 ἀποκρίνεται Ιησοῦς  
14*5 Δέιγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος  
14*6 Δέιγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ιησοῦς  
14*8 Δέιγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος  
14*9 Δέιγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ιησοῦς  
14*22 Δέιγει αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης, υἱὸς ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης  
14*23 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ  
16*17 εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους  

Note that Peter in 13:37 is not marked salient, since he is continuing his interchange with Jesus. The rare Present of ἀποκρίνεται in 13:38 introduces the key statement, which the writer expects the audience to recall in 18:27, that Peter will deny Jesus thrice. The article with Jesus from 14:6 or 14:9, and the change from ἀποκρίνεται to λέγω is presumably because the pattern of disciple being answered by Jesus has been established by 13:36a/13:36b, and 13:37/13:38. The highlighted “Aorist and Aorist” structure in 14:23, together with Jesus salient again, introduces the major speech of this section 14:23-16:16. The simple Aorist of λέγω with no specific subject (16:17), marks a change to a section explaining and clarifying what has already been said.
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The co-occurrence of anarthrous subjects and Present Indicatives, in situations where it is semantically feasible that the participant is focal and the event is especially significant, supports the analysis that these forms mark salience and highlighting respectively.

Highlighted verb phrases with salient anarthrous nouns

If, as I argue in this thesis, conjoined Aorists, like Present Indicatives, also mark “highlighting” of a verb phrase, and anarthrousness marks “salience” of a noun, we would expect a high co-occurrence of these two.

The double name Simon Peter is particularly associated with anarthrous salience. Not infrequently it occurs first in a section, followed by Peter alone, e.g. John 13:6, 8; 13:36, 37; 18:10, 11; 18:15, 16-18; 18:25, 26-27; 20:2, 3-4. It also occurs at the end of a section where Peter’s action is particularly significant, e.g. John 13:9 “Not only my feet...”, or John 20:6 “comes ... and sees the gravecloths.” It occurs 18 times in the New Testament, 17 times anarthrous (compared to approximately 50% average for all nouns).

In John’s Gospel the name Simon Peter occurs 16 times. All 12/12 nominatives are anarthrous, and 3/4 non-nominatives are anarthrous (1:40, 6:8, and 13:6). The only anarthrous occurrence of Simon Peter in the whole New Testament is the dative in John 21:15, where Jesus challenges Simon Peter about the genuineness of his love, after Simon Peter has been 4 times anarthrous agent in the one episode (21:2, 3, 7, and 11). Thus grammatical marking parallels Simon Peter’s role as, for once, NOT a salient agent, but a humble listener.

In John, where Simon Peter is nominative

3 co-occur with Imperfect (all functioning as Setting):

18*15 ἤκοινοι δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος was following Jesus
18*25 θυμὸν ἢ Σίμων Πέτρος ἐστώς καὶ θερμαύσωμεν was standing warming himself
21*2 ἠγαυμ ὡμοί Σίμων Πέτρος ... There were together Simon Peter and ...

5 co-occur with Present:

13*9 Μέγελος αὕτη Σίμων Πέτρος asking Jesus to wash him thoroughly
13*24 νεκρὸν οὖν τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος asking John to ask Jesus re the traitor
13*36 Λέγει αὕτῃ Σίμων Πέτρος asking Jesus where he is going
20*6 ἔρχεται οὖν καὶ Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθὼν αὕτη καὶ ἠλιθήθει εἰς τὸ μυστήριον, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ δόμινα κελμένα, entering the tomb
21*3 Μέγελος αὕτος Σίμων Πέτρος announcing he is going fishing

4 co-occur with Aorist in a complex scenario:

“responded” = respond + sav (the one lexeme includes two semantic concepts)

6*68 δεκακλήθη αὕτη Σίμων Πέτρος acknowledging Jesus as Christ

Aorist and Aorist string

18*10 Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἔχων μαχαίραν ἐλέκουσεν αὑτήν καὶ ἐπαισκεν τὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως δοῦλον καὶ ἀπέκοψεν αὐτὸν τὸ ὄμορφον τὸ δέκτην cutting off ear
21*7 Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἀκολούθων ὁ δὲ κύριός ἦν τὸν ἐπενήργησεν διεξόστατο, ὥς γὰρ γνώμος, καὶ ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θαλάσσαν jumping into the sea
21*11 ἀνέβη οὖν Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἐλέκουσεν τὸ δίκτυον εἰς τὴν γῆν pulling in the fish
Thus in John, all the narrative events where Simon Peter is named as agent are highlighted (except perhaps 6:68), either by Present Indicative or Aorist strings.

Simon Peter occurs only twice in the synoptics, both nominative, both anarthrous, and both where, in different circumstances, he declares Jesus’s lordship:

Matthew 16:16
δισορκίεσιν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωτοῦ.

Luke 5:8
ἐκαίν ἄν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῦ γόνατον ἰησοῦ λέγων, Ἐξελθε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἰνήρ ἀμαρτωλός ἐμι, κόρε.

Although neither of the speech verbs are Present, both use complex scenarios “having-responded said” and “fell at Jesus’s knees saying,” thus highlighting the significance of the speech act.

In summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simon Peter</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>+Present</th>
<th>+Complex</th>
<th>+Other form</th>
<th>Other case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows a high correlation, 11/14 (79%), between anarthrous noun as agent and highlighted verb phrase.
Appendix H
Examples of Prenuclear Aorist Participles in discourse

This appendix provides evidence to support the hypothesis that the sequence of Aorist Participle(s) followed by a main verb, is the normal way to encode a “script” belonging to the main verb’s scenario, as described in Chapter 5 “Position relative to the main verb: Prenuclear or Postnuclear”.

Very frequently Prenuclear Aorist Participles encode events of motion, since the main actions of many scenarios cannot take place until the agent of such action is in the right place and position. Many such events of motion are predictable and form part of a prototypical “script” associated with the main verb. This can be seen clearly in the sections from Acts which show Paul’s travels on his missionary journeys:

FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY

13.3 \(\text{tote} \ldots \text{apèluous} \ldots\)

Then ... they-dismissed [Paul and Barnabas]

13.4 \(\text{autol} \text{ mev ovw ektupoufèntes ùpò toû ágion pneumatos} \ldots\)

Them () therefore having-been-sent-out by the holy spirit

13.5 \(\text{kai} \text{ veplugesov ën Xalanià katèfugèllon} \ldots\)

And having-arrived in Salamis they announced ...

13.6 \(\text{dèlèbontes òdèn òn toû nèforon áde} \Piáfo \text{ évrou ònu}rva \text{tivà} \ldots\)

Having-crossed () all the island up-to Paphos they-found man certain ...

13.13 \(\text{daiùbontes òdò òpò tô Páfo} \ldots\)

Having-sailed () from the Paphos

... they expelled them from the borders of-them.

14.8 \(\text{kai} \text{ tis ánthr ãðoatos ëv Lótois} \ldots\)

And certain man impotent in Lystra ...

14.20 \(\text{kal ti} \text{ òpatèrion ëðhèn wòv tòu Varnàbà ës òdeìv.} \ldots\)

And the next-day he-left with the Barnabas to Derbe...

14.24 \(\text{kali} \text{ dèlèbontes tòu Òpàlia ëvò òpò tòu Panìfulà} \ldots\)

And having-crossed the Pisidia went to the Pamphylia

And having-told in Perga the word they-went-down to Attalia ...

14.26 \(\text{kakèèvèn apèlplousov ës} \text{ 'Avtòxeià} 

And-thence they sailed-off to Antioch ...
Having-arrived and having-gathered the church they-reported...

Summary
The 14 Prenuclear Aorist Participles can be divided into certain distinct semantic fields (related main verbs are verbs of motion unless bracketted):

1) Motivation for travel (2)
   13.4 ἐκτευμόθεντες having-been-sent-out
   14.6 συνάγωντες Having-found-out (a plot)

2) Travelling (7)
   13.5 τεύχομενον having-arrived (κατήγγειλον they announced)
   13.6 διέλθοντες Having-crossed (ἐφίδρου they-found)
   13.13 Ἀπαλάθυτες Having-sailed
   13.14 διέλθοντες having-crossed
   14.24 διέλθοντες having-crossed
   14.27 παραγενώμενον Having-arrived (ἀνήγγελλον they-reported)

3) Actions before leaving (4)
a) abandoning (1)
   13.51 σταμάθομεν having-shaken (the dust from one’s feet)
b) preaching (3)
   14.21 ἐφήγγυσάμενοι Having-evangelized
   14.25 ἀληθύσαμεν having-told

4) Action before reporting success (1)
   14.27 συναγωγότες having-gathered (ἀνήγγελλον they-reported)

Half of these 14 Aorist Participles are directly concerned with the travel sequence. All are prenuclear.

As regards the textual variants in Acts 14:21, if one reads the Aorist Participle of “evangelize” (as in Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) then I would analyse it as prenuclear conjoined with the next Aorist Participle, with τε linking this whole sentence to the previous sentence:

14.20 ... καὶ τῇ ἑταρνίᾳ ἐξῆλθον σὺν τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ ἐλέγεται Δέρμην.
   And the next-day he-left with the Barnabas to Derbe.
14.21 ἐφήγγυσάμενοι τε τὴν πόλιν ἐκέλευσε καὶ μαθητεύσαμες ἰκανοῖς
   Having-evangelized and the town that and having disciplined several
   ὑπέστρεφαν ἐς τὴν Διαστραν καὶ ἐς Ἰκόνιον καὶ ἐς Ἀντιόχειαν ...
   they-returned to the Lystra and to Iconium and to Antioch...

If however the Present Participle of “evangelize” (as in the manuscripts ADEH) were original, then the most obvious analysis, based on prototypical semantic relationships within a “missionary journey” scenario, would be that it is postnuclear to the previous verb “left” indicating the PURPOSE + RESULT of going to Derbe:

14.20 ... καὶ τῇ ἑταρνίᾳ ἐξῆλθον σὺν τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ ἐλέγεται Δέρμην.
   And the next-day he-left with the Barnabas to Derbe
14.21 εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τε τὴν πόλιν ἐκέλευσεν,
   evangelizing also the town that, i.e. in order to evangelize that town also (which they did)
   καὶ μαθητεύσαμες ἰκανοῖς
   And having disciplined several
   ὑπέστρεφαν ἐς τὴν Διαστραν καὶ ἐς Ἰκόνιον καὶ ἐς Ἀντιόχειαν ...
   they-returned to the Lystra and to Iconium and to Antioch...
However, the position of τε makes this analysis unlikely. When τε occurs second in the clause it operates at clause level and links that clause to the previous one, e.g.

Acts 1:15  δή τε δόξος ὄνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡσεὶ ἐκατόν εἰκοσι.
Acts 2:33  τίνι τε ἐναγγέλεως τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς
Acts 15:4  ἀναγγέλεις τε δοα δ θεος ἐφοίτησεν μετ' αὐτῶν.

When τε occurs second in the phrase (underlined) it operates at phrase level, and typically co-occurs with καί to link the first item to the following item, e.g.

Acts 1:8  οὐ ήσαν καταμένοντες, δὲ τε Πέτρος καὶ Τιμόθεος καὶ ...
Acts 19:10  Τιμόθεος τε καὶ Ἔλληνας.

This pattern is clearly shown below:

Acts 17:14b  ἵππευμαν τε ὁ τε Σιλάς καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐκεῖ.

remained and the and Silas and the Timothy there and both Silas and Timothy remained there.

If εὐαγγελίζωμεν in Acts 14:21 were postnuclear, then τε would be a coordinating conjunction between main verb and participle, which is problematic grammatically, and the meaning would be “and in order to evangelize that town”, which is problematic semantically. Thus the position of τε suggests that the Aorist Participle is the correct reading and should be analysed as prenuclear. (See also Acts 20:3 below, where these same arguments apply.)

COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM

15.2  ἤτοι τινα ἀναβαίνειν Παύλου καὶ Βαρνάβας ... εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ...
15.3  Οἱ μὲν οὖν προπεμβάλλεις ἵππες τῆς ἐκκλησίας
They () therefore having-been-sent by the church
ἐπερυθότο τίνι τῇ Φωικτῇ καὶ Σαμαρίᾳ ἐκδημόομενον ...
were-going-through the both Phoenicia and Samaria describing ...
15.4  παραγενομένοι δὲ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ παρεδέχοσαν ... ἀνήγγειλάν ...

Having-arrived () to Jerusalem they-were-received ... they-reported ...
15.22  Τότε ἐκβαίνειν ... πάλιν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρναβᾷ, ...
Then seemed-good ... to-send to Antioch with the Paul and Barnabas ...
15.30  Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀποστέλλεις κατήλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ...
They () therefore having-been-dismissed went-down to Antioch ...

summary

The 3 Prenuclear Aorist Participles can be divided into two distinct semantic fields:

Motivation for travel (2)
15.3  προπεμβάλλεις having-being-sent (by the church)
15.30  ἀποστέλλεις having-being-dismissed

Travelling (1)
15.4  παραγενομένοι Having-arrived (παρεδέχοσαν ... ἀνήγγειλάν
they-were-received ... they-reported)

Here two of the Aorist Participles (15:3, and 15:30) emphasize the role of Paul and Barnabas as representatives, and only one is concerned with travel sequence. This fits the different scenario for this particular journey. All are prenuclear.
SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY

15.39 ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμὸς

Occurred () sharp-contention

ὡςτε ἀποχωροσθήσαν αὐτοῖς ἀπ’ ἄλληλαν,

so that to-be-separated them from one-another

τὸν τε Βαρνάβαν παραλάβοντα τῶν Μάρκων ἐκπλήθσαν εἰς Κύπρον,

the and Barnabas having-taken the Mark to-sail-out to Cyprus.

15.40 Παῦλος δὲ ἐπιλεξέμενος Σιλῆν ἐξῆλθεν

Paul () having-chosen Silas left

παραδείγμα τῇ χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἄδελφων,

paradigm in-the-grace-of-the lord by the brothers.

15.41 ἐπήρχετο δὲ τὴν Σιουράν καὶ [ἡ] Κυκλιάν ἐπιστρέφουσά τις ἐκκλησίας.

He-was-crossing () the Syria and (the) Cilicia strengthening the churches.

16.1 Κατήγγειλαν δὲ καὶ εἰς Δέρμαν καὶ εἰς Λατραν, ...

He-came-down () also to Derbe and to Lystra, ...

16.3 Διήλθαν δὲ τὴν Φοιγαλ καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν

They-crossed () the Phrygia and Galatian country

καταθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ 'Ασίᾳ.

had been-blocked by the holy spirit to-speak the word in the Asia.

16.6 ἔλθοντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Βυθίαν παρευθύναν,

Having-come () near the Mysia they-were-trying in the Bithynia to-go

καὶ ἔλαβαν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα 'Ἰησοῦν καὶ not allowed them the spirit of Jesus.

16.8 παρευθύναν δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν κατέβησαν εἰς Τρώαν, ...

having-bypassed () the Mysia they-went-down to Troas

16.9 Διὰδόθες εἰς Μακεδονίαν βοηθήσαν ἡμῖν.

Having-crossed to Macedonia help us.

16.10 ἔθεσαν δὲ εἰς Μακεδονίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Μυσίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Φοιγαλ καὶ τὸν Γαλατικὸν χώραν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Μυσίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Φοιγαλ καὶ τὸν Γαλατικὸν χώραν ἐκκλησίαν ...

straightway we-sought to-leave to Macedonia

concluding that has-called us the god to-evangelize them.

16.11 Ἀναράγαντες δὲ ἀπὸ Τρώαν ἐνδονευματέμεν εἰς Σαμοθράκην,

Having-sailed () from Troas we-went-straight to Samothrace,

16.12 καὶ ἐλθοντες εἰς Φιλήππους, ...

having-gone-out () from the jail they-entered to the Lydia

καὶ ἐκπερασάντες εἰς τὴν Μυσίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Φοιγαλ καὶ εἰς τὸν Γαλατικὸν χώραν ἐκκλησίαν ..., and thence to Philippi

16.14 ἔσβεσαν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς εἴσηγήσαν πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν...

having-gone-out () from the jail they-entered to the Lydia

举行了 ἐπιστρέφουσά τις ἐκκλησίαν τῶν ἄδελφων καὶ ἔβαλαν, and having-seen they-exhorted the brothers and left.

17.1 Διαδιώκαντες δὲ τὴν Ἀμφιπόλην καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν

Gone-through () the Amphipolis and the Apolonia

17.10 Οἱ δὲ ἄδελφοι ... ἐξῆλθον τῶν τε Παύλου καὶ τοῦ Σιλῆ Βέροιαν, The () brothers ... sent-out the both Paul and the Silas to Berea

17.11 αἱ ἀγία τιμία γοαγόν τοῖς ἀπομάκρυναν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπῆξαν, ...

who having-arrived into the synagogue of-the Jews went.

17.14 εἰδὼς δὲ τὸν τε Παύλου ἐξηπέτευλαν οἱ ἄδελφοι

Immediately () then the Paul[object] sent-away the brothers

17.15 ταράται αὐτοὺς τὸν Παύλου ἢγαγόν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων...

and remained also the both Silas and the Timothy there.

17.18 ὁ δὲ Παύλος ἔτι προσεμείωσεν ἡμέρας καὶ ἔτη ἀδελφοίς The () Paul more having-remained days several with-the brothers

17.18 ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Σιουράν, ...

having-went to the Syria

17.19 ὑπεμειναν τε δὲ τοῦ Σιλῆ καὶ ὁ Τιμοθέος ἕκει, and they remained also both the Silas and the Timothy there.

18.1 Μετὰ ταῦτα χορηγεῖς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔδειξεν εἰς Κόρινθον, ...

After those[things] having-left from the Athens he-went to Corinth ...

18.18 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ὑπὲρ Προφητείας ἡμέρας καὶ ἐτῶν ἀδελφοίς The () Paul more having-remained days several with-the brothers

18.18 ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Σιουράν, ...

having-bid-farewell sailed-off to the Syria
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The 17 Prenuclear Aorist Participles can be divided into certain distinct semantic fields:

2) Travelling (10)
   16.7 ἔλθωντες Having-come
   16.8 παρελθωντες having-bypassed
   16.9 Ἀλασθείς Having-crossed (Βοήθησον help)
   16.11 Ἀναχώρητος Having-sailed
   16.40 ἔλθωντες having-gone-out
   17.1 Ἀναθέσατος Having-gone-through
   17.10 παροικίζομενον having-arrived
   18.1 χωροθείς having-left
   18.22 κατέλθων having-gone-down
   18.22 δισάδ οικ having-gone-up

3) Actions before leaving (7)
   c) choosing companions (2)
      15.39 παραλαβόντα having-taken (Mark)
      15.40 ἔπειθόμενον having-chosen (Silas)
   d) staying a while (1)
      18.18 προσέμενας having-remained (many days)
   e) proper leave taking (4)
      18.18 ἀποταξάμενος having-bid-farewell
      18.21 ἀποταξάμενος having-bade-farewell
      18.22 ἀποταξάμενος having-greeted (the church)
      16.40 ἔλθως having-seen (παρεκκλέσαν they exhorted)

The majority of prenuclear Aorist Participles (9 out of 16) are related to the travel sequence and are predictable from the preceding or following main verb scenarios. Indeed, in 16:11b and 16:12 the verbal form for travelling is so redundant that it is omitted. In contrast, none of the 3 postnuclear Aorist Participles are of a verb of motion, but they relate to the main verb non-temporally, as shown below.

   15.40 ἔρχομεν παρασκευὴς left ... having-been-commended

Here the commendation by the church is postnuclear. According to my theory, this means it is not presented as merely a previous event in the prototypical script. Perhaps this marks
that this was not simply part of the departure script, but rather indicates MANNER, i.e. “with the affirmation of the church”. Certainly, whereas the church sent Paul and Barnabas on the first journey (Acts 13:3), this second journey was a result of Paul and Barnabas’ own desire to revisit their converts (Acts 15:36). Although in 15:39 Barnabas and Mark’s departure is presented in a subordinate Accusative and Infinitive construction, Paul and Silas’ departure in 15:40 is given as a main line event. This alerts the audience to the fact that Paul’s journey is focal and will be given in detail.

16.6 Διήθσαν καθεδριστής They-crossed... having-been-blocked
Here the postnuclear Aorist Participle most likely gives the REASON for the decision to travel through Phrygia and Galatia (Barrett, 1998:768-9), i.e. “because the Holy Spirit prevented them from preaching in Asia” (cf. TEV, New Living Translation), since going straight to Asia from Derbe and Lystra would have been a straight journey West through Phrygia, rather than a turn Northwards. It should be noted that in 18:23 where Paul is travelling from East to West (rather than South-East to North-West) the order is reversed, Galatia and Phrygia, suggesting that the individual geographical areas are in focus.

18.18 ἐξεπλεξαν... κοπάδοις he-sailed-off... having-shorn (his head)
Here the postnuclear Aorist Participle most probably gives the REASON for the main verb. Paul was going to Syria on route to Jerusalem, because he had cut his hair at the termination of a vow he had made, and needed to make the proper sacrifices in Jerusalem (see Numbers 6:1-21, Acts 21:21-26, also Marshall, 1980:300). Paul goes to Jerusalem, and presumably completes his vow, in Acts 18:22.

There is also one postnuclear Present Participle of REASON:
16.10 ἠρεῖημαν ἐξεπλεξαν... συμβιβάσαντες we-sought to-leave... concluding that..., i.e. because we concluded.

**THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY**

18.23 καὶ ποιήσας χρόνον τινὰ ἐξῆλθεν,
And having-spent time certain he-left
διερχόμενον καθεδριστῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγιαν,
going-through in-order the Galatian region and Phrygia
ἐπιστρέφοντας πάντας τοὺς μαθητὰς... ... strengthening all the disciples...

19.1 Ἐγένετο... Παῦλον ἔδειδαν τὰ ἀνωτέρω μέρη ἑκτελεῖν εἶς Ἐφεσον...
It-happened... Paul having-crossed the upper part to-come to Ephesus...

20.1 ... μετατρέψαμενον ὁ Παῦλος τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ παρακαλέσας... ... having-summoned the Paul the disciples and having-exhorted
ἀποστάζομενοι ἐξῆλθεν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Μακεδονίαν.
having-bade-farewell he-left to-travel to Macedonia.

20.2 ἔλθον δὲ τὰ μέρη ἑκεῖνα καὶ παρακαλέσας αὐτοὺς... Having-crossed () the part that and having-encouraged them...
ἵλεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα he-went to the Greece

20.3 ποιήσας τε μήνας τρεῖς... having-spent also months three.
γενομένης ἐπιβολῆς αὐτὸ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μέλλοντι ἀδίκεσθαι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν,
having-occurred plot to-him by the Jews intending to-sail to the Syria,
ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν ἀκατακατάλειπτον ἦς τῆς Μακεδονίας... ... he-became of-mind of-the to-return via Macedonia...
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20.5 οὗτος δὲ προελθὼν ἔμενον ἡμᾶς ἐν Τροάδα, These () having-gone-ahead were-waiting for-us in Troas,
20.6 ἦμεις δὲ εξεπέλευσαμεν ... ἀπὸ Φιλιππῶν We () sailed-off ... from Philippi,
               καὶ ἢμοιοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἷς τὴν Τροάδα ... and we-came to them in the Troas,
20.13 ήμεις δὲ προελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον ἰδνήθημεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσσον We () having-gone-ahead on the ship sailed to the Assos
               καὶ ἐξέκειθεν μέλλοντες αναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παύλον ... thence intending to-take-on-board the Paul
20.14 ὦς δὲ συνεβάλλαν ἦμας εἰς τὴν Ἀσσον, When () he-was-meeting us in the Assos,
               ἀναλαμβάνετο αὐτὸν ἢμοιοι εἷς Μιτυλήνην, having-taken-on-board him we-came to Mitylene,
20.15 κάκεθεν ἀποπλεύσακατ τῇ ἐπιοδοίᾳ κατηπνηθάμεσσαν αὐτῖκρας Χίου, And-thence having-sailed the next-day we-arrived off Chios,
               τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ παρεβάλομεν εἷς Ἐδέμνου, on-the () next-day we-crossed to Samos,
               τῇ δὲ ἑκομενίᾳ ἢμοιοι εἷς Μιλητίουν, on-the () next-day we-came to Miletus.
20.38 ... προείπεσιν δὲ αὐτῶν εἷς τὸ πλοῖον. They-escorted () him to the ship.
21.1 ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἀποσπασθέντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, When () it-happened to-sail us having-been-torn-away from them,
               ἀνασταθέντας ἢμοιοι εἰς τὴν Καῖσαρειαν having-gone-straight we-came to the Cos,
               τῇ δὲ ἔτης εἰς τὴν Ρόδον κακέθην εἰς Πάταρα' on-the () next-day to the Rhodes and-thence to Patara.
21.2 καὶ ἐλθὼν πλοῖον διαπερνόν εἷς Φοινίκην And having-found ship crossing to Phoenicia
               ἐπέβαλεν αὐτοῖς having-boarded, Having-sighted (Cyprus)
21.3 ἀναστὰς δὲ τὴν Κύπρον καὶ καταλύσας αὐτὴν εὐαίσθημαν
               Having-sighted () the Cyprus and having-left it on-the-left
               ἐπέλευσαν εἷς Συρίαν καὶ κατήηθαμεν εἷς Τύρουν we-sailed to Syria and went-down to Tyre ...
21.6 ἀποστασαμένα ἄλλης καὶ ἀνεβηκαν εἷς τὸ πλοῖον, We-bade-farewell to-each-other and boarded to the ship,
               ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ὑπέστρεψαν εἷς τὰ τῶν. They () returned to the own,
21.7 ἦμεις δὲ τῶν πλοίων ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ Τύρου κατηπνηθάμεσσαν εἷς Πτωλεμαίαν We () the voyage having-continued from Tyre arrived at Ptolemais
               καὶ ἐπεζευγάμεν τοὺς θελοῦσας έμεισαν ἡμέραν μίαν παρ' αὐτοῖς. and having-greeted the brothers remained day one with them.
21.8 τῇ δὲ ἐπαρχοῦ ἐξελθὼν ἢμοιοι εἷς Καισαρείαν ... The () next-day having-left we-came to Caesarea ...
21.15 ... ἐπεζευγάμενοι ἀνεβηκαν εἷς Ἡροδολυμίαν ... Having-got-ready we-were-going-up to Jerusalem.
21.16 συνελθοῦσαν δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπὸ Καισαρείας σὺν ἡμῖν, Went-along () also of-the disciples from Caesarea with us
               ἄγωντες παρ' ὧν ἐξεπέλευσαν Μιθαδᾶ ... bringing with whom we-may-lodge Mnason ...
21.17 Γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἡροδολυμία αὐτίκρας ἀπεδέχαντο ἡμᾶς οἱ ἀδελφοί. ... Having-arrived () us to Jerusalem joyfully greeted us the brothers ...

summary

The 21 Prenuclear Aorist Participles can be divided into certain distinct semantic fields:

1) Motivation for taking specific route (1)
    21.3 ἀναστὰς Having-sighted (Cyprus)
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2) Travelling (10)
   19.1 διέλθουτα having-crossed
   20.2 διέλθων Having-crossed
   20.5 προελθότας having-gone-ahead
   20.13 προελθότας having-gone-ahead
   20.14 ἀναλαβότας having-taken-on-board
   20.15 ἀποπλησσότας having-sailed
   21.1 εὐθύθηματας having-gone-straight
   21.3 καταλάτοτες having-left
   21.7 διεσάντας having-continued (the voyage)
   21.8 ἐκείσατας having-left

3) Actions before leaving (10)
   d) staying a while (2)
       18.23 πούσας having-spent time
       20.3 πούσας having-spent (three months)
   e) proper leave taking (5)
       20.1 μετατησόμενος having-summoned (the disciples)
       20.1 παρακάλεσας having-exhorted
       20.2 παρακαλέσας having-bade-farewell
       21.7 δαπανάμενοι having-greeted
   f) preparation (3)
       21.2 ἐξευτελείτες having-found (a ship)
       21.2 ἐπιβάτες having-boarded
       21.15 ἐπορευόμενοι having-got-ready

Acts 20:3 πούσας τε μῆνας τρεῖς “having-spent also months three” might be analyzed as postnuclear, and hence PURPOSE+RESULT, i.e. “he went to Greece and (as a result) spent three months there.” However, in that analysis the particle τε “also/and” would be problematic, since I argue that the only conjunctions linking Participle and main verb mark contraexpectation (e.g. Hebrews 12:17). A better solution is that it is prenuclear to the next main verb, and followed by a Genitive Absolute, i.e. “And when he had been there for three months, since a plot had been hatched against him by the Jews, as he was about to sail for Syria, he decided to return via Macedonia.” This would parallel Acts 18:23 lexically and semantically καὶ πούσας χρόνον τινὰ ἔμπλεθεν “And having spent some time [there] he left,” and parallel Acts 20:9 and 2 Corinthians 2:12 syntactically, with Prenuclear Nominative Participle followed by a Prenuclear Genitive Absolute.

Overall summary of the Acts travelogue

There are 55 prenuclear Aorist Participles in the travel section of Paul’s Missionary journeys and the Council of Jerusalem. They fall into the following distinct semantic fields:
1) Motivation for travel / for taking specific route (5/55)
2) Travelling (28/55)
3) Actions before leaving (21/55)
   a) abandoning (1)
   b) preaching (3)
   c) choosing companions (2)
   d) staying a while (3)
   e) proper leave taking (9)
   f) preparation (3)

4) Action before reporting success (1/55) (on arrival back at sending church)

There are only 3 postnuclear Aorist Participles in this selection, compared to 55 prenuclear Aorist Participles. None are of a verb of motion, but they relate to the main verb non-temporally:

**MANNER**
15.40 ἐξελθόντες παραδόθηκαν left ... having-been-commended

**REASON**
16.6 Διήλθοντες κυλίθετες They-crossed ... having-been-blocked
18.18 ἔξεπηλε ... κελαμενος he-sailed-off ... having-shorn (his head)

There is also one postnuclear Present Participle in this selection, (compared to 55 prenuclear Aorist Participles, and 3 postnuclear). This also is non-temporal and shows the REASON for the main verb:

**REASON**
16.10 ἐξῆθησαμεν ἐξελθοῦσαν κυλίθετες ... we-sought to-leave ... concluding ...

These data support my theory that preceding events from the script of the main verb’s scenario are grammaticalized as Prenuclear Aorist Participles, since such Participles related to main verbs in the selection of “missionary travel” belong to a limited set of semantic domains, which all fit the category of preceding script events.

From the above we can therefore reconstruct a tentative “missionary travel” scenario:

**Motivation for travel:**
- Being sent by the church

**Travel:**
- Preparation for travel
  - Choose companions
  - Find ship (for sea voyage)
- Modes of travel
  - On foot
  - By ship
- Motivation for specific time or route of travel:
  - Escaping danger
  - Divine guidance (Acts 16:6)
  - Vision (Acts 16:10)
  - (at sea) Sighting land
- Result: Arrive
- Purpose: Teach about Jesus

**Work on arrival:**
- Preach and teach
- Strengthen existing believers

**Time scale for work:**
- Stay for days, months, years
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Result of work:
  Success: believers
  Failure: rejection, expulsion

Actions before leaving:
  If teaching accepted,
    encourage believers
    bid farewell
  If teaching not accepted,
    shake dust from feet

Leave: Go elsewhere, and start script again:

End: Return to sending church
     Report back on success of the mission
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Further evidence for Genitive Absolutes as switch-reference markers

This appendix explains apparent exceptions to the hypothesis that Greek Genitive Absolutes are switch-reference markers, as argued in Chapter 5 “Case: Nominative or Genitive”.

If Genitive Absolutes are switch-reference markers, indicating that there will be a different subject for the following main verb, one would expect that the Genitive Absolute and the main verb would always have a different grammatical subject. Occasionally, however, the Genitive Absolute and the main verb have the same grammatical subject, e.g. Matt 1:18 and Acts 22:17, which Burton calls the worst examples of “irregularity” (1987:175). Such apparent inconsistencies can be explained by considering the underlying semantic role of the subject (Levinsohn, 1992:178), e.g.

Matt. 1:18
μετατεθειότης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ,
having-been-betrothed the mother-of-him Mary to-the Joseph,
πρὶν ἢ συνεκάθισαν αὐτοὺς
before the to-come-together them
εἰδὼν ἐν γαστρὶ Ἑλέους ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου,
she-was-found in belly having from spirit holy.

Here although Mary is grammatical subject of clause 1 and 3, she is not the agent in the underlying semantic roles, since she is not controlling either event. Moreover, each event has a different underlying agent:

event 1: betroth
agent Mary’s father
goal Mary
beneficiary Joseph

event 2: come together
agent Mary and Joseph

event 3: be found
agent Joseph
goal Mary

event 4: be pregnant
agent (atypical) Holy Spirit
patient Mary

Similarly, in Acts 22:17, although the grammatical subject of clauses 2 and 3 are identical, the underlying semantic roles are distinct, since in clause 3 Paul is not controlling the event:

Acts 22:17
Ἐγένετο δὲ μοι ὑποστρέφοντι εἰς ἡρώουσαλήμ
It-happened () to-me having-returned to Jerusalem
καὶ προσευχομένου μου ἐν τῷ ἱερό
and praying me in the temple
 γενέσθαι μὲ ἐν ἐκστάσει
to-become me in ecstasy.

event 1: return
agent I

event 2: pray
agent I
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event 3: be in ecstasy
  agent  God
  patient I

Healey and Healey’s 4/313 exceptions (1990:211-214) also include Acts 21:34, and 28:6, but exclude Mark 6:22 where ἐπεξερευνεῖν may be analysed “it pleased” rather than “she pleased”. These may perhaps be categorized in Greek as switch-reference because of the different underlying participant roles of the grammatical subjects:

Acts 21:34
  event 1: be able to know
    experiencer he
  event 2: command
    agent he

Acts 28:6
  event 1: expect
    experiencer they
  event 2: behold
    experiencer they
  event 3: change mind
    agent they
  event 4: say
    agent they

Mark 6:22
  event 1: enter
    agent Herodias’ daughter
  event 3: please
    stimulus Herodias’ daughter OR the dancing
    experiencer Herod

The restriction on conjoining items with the same surface form but different semantic roles has already been noted in Greek with regard to strings of participles, which are only conjoined when they fit in the same semantic slot.

Similarly, the “Genitive Absolute” switch-reference system is found in Greek where the subjects of consecutive clauses are partially, but not completely, identical.

Healey and Healey call this the part-whole case (1990:207):
  where the deep subject of one verb (first or second) semantically includes the deep subject of the other verb (as in the words for “Jesus and his disciples ... he ...”) ... Some languages treat these two deep subjects as same, whereas others, including New Testament Greek, treat them as different. Such part-whole instances observed are: Mt 17:9, 17:22. 26:21, 26:26; Mk 11:12, 14:18, 14:22; Acts 26:14, 27:18

Although Genitive Absolutes as a switch-reference device always have a different subject (in the sense of underlying semantic role) from the main verb, they need not have the same subject as one another, as Healey and Healey show (1990:198 text and note):
  There are also instances where conjunctions occur between two subordinate clauses of the same kind with different subjects, although this is less common...Lk 3:1, 3:15, 8:4; Acts 27:9. In Acts 25:23 and Jn 2:9, it is only the subject of the last clause which is different. Rom 2:15a and b follow rather than precede their main clause, and the first subject is different.

Of these 7 examples, John 2:9 is a “when” clause, and the others are genitive participial clauses. In Luke 3:15 and 8:14, although the surface subjects are different, they may well be co-referential. However, the other conjoined clauses have distinctly different subjects.
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This is no problem for genitive participial clauses, since they may or may not have the same subject as each other, the only restriction being that they have a different subject from the main verb. In contrast all nominative participial clauses, conjoined or otherwise, must have the same subject as the main verb, so they can never occur with different subjects.

The use of the Genitive Absolute within a switch-reference system also explains why the Participle sometimes stands alone without an explicit subject. Where the subject of a Genitive Absolute is not explicit, the implicit subject must be inferred from the scenario which is currently open in the discourse. Since the Genitive Absolute explicitly marks that the subject of the main verb will be switched, i.e. different from the current subject, it implies that the current subject is not switched. So the most likely candidate for implicit subject is the “topical agent” (my term), i.e. the agent currently most prominent in the discourse and hence already focal in the audience’s mind, usually the explicit subject of the previous main verb. This “topical agent” remains topical as the implicit subject of the Genitive Participial Clause, but then the “switch-reference” occurs and the subject of the main verb is different (Indicatives and grammatical subjects (also semantic agents) bolded, Participles underlined), e.g.

Matthew 17:11-14

The subject of the verb “come” in the Genitive Absolute construction is best understood as including all the topical agents from the previous text, i.e. Jesus and the disciples, not the disciples alone. This is not so much determined by grammar, since disciples are masculine plural and immediately precede the Participial Phrase, but more by the scenario of disciples, which includes their prototypically accompanying their teacher.

Similarly:

Acts 21:30-31

The indefinite “they” as subject of the verb “dragged” (marked only by 3rd person plural verb endings) takes precedence as topical agent over “doors”, the subject of the immediately preceding clause. This is probably due not only to the gender marking of the Participle “seeking” as masculine, but also to the fact that doors are inanimate and are the
subject of a passive verb, i.e. the semantic goal, not agent of the action. Scenario theory allows for prototypical “fillers” for its participant slots, and a prototypical agent is animate. Thus real life expectations, not grammar alone, affect disambiguation.

One might argue that the criterion for disambiguation above is purely grammatical: the grammatical subject of \( \zeta \tau \theta i oντων \), which is masculine plural, cannot possibly be co-referential with “doors” αλ θόρας, which are feminine plural. It should be noted however that the grammatical subject of \( \epsilon πλαθόμενοι \), which is also masculine plural, is co-referential with “the city” η πόλις (feminine singular) and/or “the people” τοο λαον (masculine singular), so the crucial determining factor is semantics not simply grammar.

Using zero marking for a Noun Phrase in the subject slot is of course quite normal with Indicatives which have the same subject as previous verbs, and though subject deletion with Genitive Absolutes is infrequent in the New Testament, it is quite common in the papyri (Argyle, 1957/8:285, note 1).
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Prenuclear and Postnuclear Participles - form and function

This appendix provides fuller explanation and further examples to illustrate the
form and function of Prenuclear and Postnuclear Participles, as described in Chapter 5
"Types of Participial Clause with examples". It also includes an analysis of so-called
Independent Participial Clauses.

1) Prenuclear Aorist Participle Nominative
= preceding EVENT with same subject as main verb

> preceding time setting (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)

Since a Discourse-old or predictable event is not, for the hearers, a new element on
the event line of the narrative, there must be some other reason for the author to mention it.
The most frequent reason is to provide a time setting for the subsequent action, e.g.
Acts 13:4b-5a
ἐκεῖθεν τῇ ἐπέτειλεν εἰς Ἰᾶππον,
thence and they-sailed-off to Cyprus
καὶ κατῆγγελλον ἐν Σαλαμίνι κατὰ καθηγελλον τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ ...
And having-come in Salamis announced the word of-the God...
NIV "and sailed from there to Cyprus. When they arrived at Salamis..” Note that Salamis is the first major
port in Cyprus approaching from the East, so arriving at Salamis is highly predictable.
Also Acts 27:36, 38

There are two interesting examples from the Epistles, with the main verb in a
different Tense/Aspect/Mood, showing that Prenuclear Aorist Participles mark the
temporal relationship relative to the time of the main verb, not absolute tense, i.e. the
temporal relationship relative to the time of speaking or writing:
1 Corinthians 2:1
Καὶ γαῖον ἐλθὼν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὁ δὲ θεὸς,
And-I having-come to you, brothers,
καὶ καθηγελλὼν ἤμιν τῇ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ θεοῦ.
announcing to-you the mystery of-the god.
NIV “When I came to you, brothers I did not come with eloquence ...”
This previous visit is alluded to in 1:14 "I did not baptise any of you except Crispus”
2 Corinthians 2:3b
τοια μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ σαλῶν ὅπερ δὲ ἦσεῖ με ἐχαρεῖν
so that not having-come grief I-might-have from whom it-was-right me-to-rejoice
NIV “so that when I come I should not be distressed...”
This intended visit is implied in 2:1.

The verb ἔρχομαι seems to be ambiguous, referring to either the actual motion of
travel, or the time during which a visitor is present. In these examples the Prenuclear
Aorist Participle appears to refer to the travel, but the main verbs, including ἔρχομαι, to
the time when present.
> preceding event, implicit reason (usually Participle is verb of perception)

Things which one perceives are likely to affect one's actions, hence prenuclear *usi* and *ds*.

**Aorist Participles of perception usuH* temporal setting, e.g.**

Matthew 2:10

πολύνεις δε των ἀντερα ἐξάρησαν χαμᾶν μεγάλην σφόδραν.

Having-seen () the star they rejoiced joy great exceedingly.

NIV “When they saw the star they were overjoyed.”

The star has already appeared in 2:9. It is clear that their seeing the star provides both a time setting and a motivation for their rejoicing. NIV makes the time setting explicit “when”, leaving the reason relationship implicit, as is common in English. Nevertheless, the reader understands a reason relationship from the prototypical relationships within the scenario.

Acts 14:14

Ακούσαντες δε οι ἀπόστολοι Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος

Having-heard () the apostles Barnabas and Paul

καλοί τοις αὐτῶν ἐκμάθησαν εἰς τὸν ἔχλου κράζουτες...

having-torn the clothes of-them they-rushed into the crowd shouting...

NIV “But when the apostles Barnabas and Paul heard of this, they tore their clothes and rushed out into the crowd, shouting...” It is clear that they would not have been upset had they not heard that the people were regarding them as gods. What they perceive clearly affects what they do.

Events of perception are also highly predictable since things which occur are likely to be perceived by those present, and things which are unusual or important are likely to be heard about by everyone. As noted above, there are 73 prenuclear Aorist Participles of *ākoúow* “hear” in the New Testament. I calculate that 48 (66%) occur after an explicit or implicit speech act in the co-text, and mark a change to a different subject from the speaker. The others, like the examples above involve overhearing or hearing rumours. In contrast there are only 2 postnuclear Aorist Participles of *ākoúow* “hear” (Acts 16:38, Col. 1:4) each stressing that what was heard was the direct REASON for the hearer’s action.

The use of such Participles in discourse, conditioned by their prototypical role in scenarios, explains some data noted by O’Donnell (1997:15) which cannot be explained in terms of a direct correlation between Aspect and Aktionsart. Using Fanning’s classification of Greek verbs by Aktionsart into States, Activities, Accomplishments and Climaxes (1990), O’Donnell charts how each category patterns with Aspectual choice. He lists 10 States together with their z-scores (deviation from the norm of New Testament usage):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄκοινος</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>-4.66</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γινώσκω</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δοκέω</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔλπιζω</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔχω</td>
<td>-21.19</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>-5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θέλω</td>
<td>-8.66</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεωρέω</td>
<td>-5.82</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑμνάω</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>-15.60</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προτείνω</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θρονέω</td>
<td>-4.35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A z-score of over +/− 3 (bolded above) is statistically significant, so there is a clear trend for States to be -Aorist +Present, i.e. to occur in Imperfective Aspect verb forms, which supports a correspondence between Aspect and Aktionsart. Verbs with no bolded numbers are statistically insignificant here, but two “States” show high numbers for
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+Aorist -Present, i.e. Perfective Aspect. These are both verbs of Perception, frequently found in the Prenuclear Aorist Participle slot, referring to events predictable from the previous scenario, and fitting the initial event slot of the script of the following main verb. Thus the Perfective Aspect is not conditioned by the Aktionsart of the event per se, but by the role of this particular event in a narrative account.

This analysis is supported by the Tense/Aspect charting for ἀκοῦω (O'Donnell, 1997, Appendix), where Participial use shows the highest deviation from the average:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AORIST</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>IMPERFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occ</td>
<td>expc</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> preceding event in sequential stages of a script

Other events in prenuclear Aorist Participle form (i.e. not Discourse-old or predictable, nor verbs of perception) simply encode that this Discourse-new information belongs to the Hearer-old scenario of the following main verb and is in linear sequence, e.g.

Mark 8:13
καὶ ἀφελεῖς αὐτοῖς πᾶλιν ἐμβάλετε ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.
And having-left them again having-embarked he-went-away to the other-side
NIV “Then he left them, got back into the boat and crossed to the other side.”

Note that the grammatical and syntactical choice depends on the way the author wishes to present the events not any fixed Aktionsart of the events themselves. Compare parallel passages:
Mark 14:63
ὁ δὲ ἄρχιερες διαρρήκτας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ λέγει,
The (ὁ) chief-priest having-torn the clothes of-him says ...
NIV “The high priest tore his clothes. “...” he said”
Matthew 26:65
τότε ὁ ἄρχιερες διέρρηκεν τὰ λιματα αὐτοῦ λέγων.
Then the chief-priest tore the clothes-of-him saying ...
NIV “Then the high priest tore his clothes and said”

In both these passages the Participle shows that the two events of tearing one’s clothes and convicting of blasphemy are related in the one scenario. Mark chooses to entitle this scenario as “say (someone has blasphemed)” and makes explicit a preceding action in the script, viz. tearing clothes. Matthew chooses to entitle this same scenario as “tear clothes” and makes explicit a specific cotemporaous concomitant action, viz. stating the blasphemy aloud.

Sometimes the action of the Participle is a logical prerequisite of the main verb, e.g.

Matthew 8:3a
καὶ ἔκτελες τὴν χεῖρα ἡθάντο αὐτοῦ....
And having-stretched the hand he-touched him ...
Matthew 5:2
καὶ ἀφελέσαι τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἔδιδασκεν αὐτοῦς λέγων ...
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And having-opened the mouth he-taught them saying ... 

In such situations, mention of another item from the main verb’s scenario may have a discourse function of highlighting the event, i.e. the significance of Jesus’s healing touch to an untouchable leper, and the significance of Jesus’s next words, the beatitudes.

Another verb which has statistically significant bias towards the Aorist Participle is ἀφίημι (data from O’Donnell, 1997, Appendix):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>29/29</td>
<td>20/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>12/9</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>26/14</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>20/7</td>
<td>0/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>6/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This can be explained by the use of ἀφίημι as part of a sequential script. Of the 19 Aorist Participles I have identified using GRAMCORD, one is part of a Noun Phrase (Mark 13:34). The others are all Prenuclear and have varying senses according to the following scenarios:

a) leave behind - physical departure scenario(x14/18)

b) reject - choice scenario(x3/18)

c) emit a sound - death scenario (x1/18)

a) physical departure + follow/depart/flee/go/take (x14)

+follow (x5)

Matt.4:20 οἱ δὲ εἶδος ἀφέντες τὰ δικτυα ἰκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.
Matt.4:22 οἱ δὲ εἶδος ἀφέντες τὸ πλοῖον καὶ τὴν πατέρα αὐτῶν ἰκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.
Mark 1:18 καὶ εἶδος ἀφέντες τὰ δικτυα ἰκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

+depart (x5)

Matt.22:22 καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἐξεῖλασαν καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτῶν ἀπήλθαν •
Matt.26:44 καὶ ἂνει αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσπήκατο ...
Mark 1:20 καὶ εἶδος ἐκλέθους αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν ἰκεθεδάον ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθών ἀπῆλθον ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ.
Mark 8:13 καὶ ἠκούσαντες πάλιν ἐμῆς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.
Mark 12:12 καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον .

+flee (x2)

Matt.26:56b Τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτῶν ἐφυγον •
Mark.14:50 Καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτῶν ἐφυγον πάντες .

+go (x1)

Matt.13:36 Τότε ἠκούσα τῶν ὀχλοῦ ἐλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ...

+take (x1)

Mark 4:36 καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὀχλὸν παραλαμβάνουσαν αὐτῶν ὡς ὦν ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ ...

b) choice (x3)

Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων .
Rom.1:27 διόμενος τε καὶ οἱ ἁρπαγμενοὶ ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρήσαν τῆς ἁθλητῆς ἑξεκαθήσαν ἐν τῇ ὕβερει αὐτῶν εἰς ἄλλους .
Heb.6:1 ἂν ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φεράμεθα ...

c) death (x1)

Mark 15:37 δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφένει μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν .
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Similarly, Prenuclear Participles Nominative of the verb ἔρχομαι have a clear bias towards Perfective Aspect, i.e. 72 Aorist, but only 6 Present (GRAMCord). The New Testament figures for Participles are Aorist 2225 (35%), Present 3437 (55%) (O’Donnell, 1997:13). This bias, I argue, is again due to the role of this event in the scenarios of narrative text. Of the 72 Prenuclear Aorist Participles 64 occur in the crude division of narrative, i.e. (Matthew 28, Mark 13, Luke 12, John 4, Acts 7, compared to Epistles 8). These belong in various scenarios, as initial events, preceding and prerequisite for the main verb:

a) perception (x25/72)
   i.e. find (x13), see (x3 +8 with see as Participle or subordinated verb), realize (x1), e.g.
   Matthew 12:44b
   καὶ ἠλθόν εὐφάνει σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον
   And having-come finds ...
   Matthew 9:23
   καὶ ἠλθόν ἀντίστοις εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἔρχοντος καὶ ἤδη τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὕπνον
   And having-come ...
   
   b) speech (x17/72)
   Mark 12:14
   καὶ ἠλθότες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ διδάσκαλε, ...
   And having-come they-say ...
   
   c) various (x30/72)
   including: no motion (x4), worship (x3), fall at feet (x1), heal (x2), touch for healing (x3), recline/eat (x2), have (x2), steal (x2) etc, e.g.
   Matthew 2:9b
   ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας εἱστάντων ἐπάνω ὅπως το ταξίδιον.
   until having-come they-stopped ...
   
   If Prenuclear Aorist Participles of ἔρχομαι mark preceding events of a script, why are there 6 Prenuclear Present Participles? These can be explained by Imperfective Aspect marking specific Aspectual categories:

   distributive and iterative
   Luke 13:14b
   ἦν ἡμέρα εἷς εἰς ἅλλο ἐργάζεσθαι.
   six days are on which it-is-right to-work
   on those therefore coming be-healed and not on-the day of-the sabbath.
   Luke 16:21b
   ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἔρχομενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἑκάτον αὐτῶν.
   But also the dogs coming were-licking the sores of-him

   iterative
   Luke 18:5b
   ἐκείνην αὐτήν, ὅπως μὴ εἰς τέλος ἔρχομεν ὑπαντήσῃ με.
   I-will-vindicate her, so-that not to end coming may-exhaust me.

   progressive (i.e. still in process)
   Luke 15:25b
   καὶ ωσ ἔρχομενος ἤγγισεν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, ἤκουσεν συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν,
   and when coming he-nearly the house, he-heard music and dances.
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2 Timothy 4:13
πον φαλόταν ὅν ἀπέλευσον ἐν Τροίς παρὰ Κάρπος ἔρχομενος φέρε ... the cloak which I-left in Troas with Carpos coming bring...
NIV “When you come, bring the cloak...”
Romans 15:29
οἶδα δὲ ὅτι ἔρχομενος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ ἔλεησομαι.
NIV “When I come to you, I will come in the full measure of the blessing of Christ”

As stated above, ἔρχομαι seems to be ambiguous, referring to either the actual motion of travel, or the time during which a visitor is present. In Romans 15:29 above the second sense seems to be used. Contrast Romans 15:32, 1 Corinthians 2:1 and 2 Corinthians 2:3, where the Prenuclear Aorist Participle appears to refer to the travel, but the main verbs, including ἔρχομαι, to the time when present.

omnitemporal event?

There is one passage, Hebrews 2:10, which does not seem to fit the “previous event” definition:

Hebrews 2:10
"Ἐστιν γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὅν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' ὅν τὰ πάντα,
It-was-fitting for to-him, because-of whom the all and through whom the all,
pολλοὶ πλοῦτος εἶσ' δόξαν ἀγάπην
many sons to glory having-led
τὸν ἄρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ παθημάτων τελειώσαι.
the author of-the salvation of-them through sufferings to-perfect.
(Nota that in this construction, where the agent of the verb in the Infinitive is normally grammaticalized as Accusative, then the prenuclear Aorist Participle is in the Accusative)

Ballantine (1884:791) translates “For it became him ... in bringing many sons to glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings”, and states “The aorist participle here indicates ... that the writer views the “bringing” and the “making perfect through sufferings” as numerically one act; Christ on the cross reconciled us to God.” His rule is that the author, when using the Aorist Participle with a main verb normally refers to “another action which, even by the shortest interval, preceded it”, but may also refer to “the same act; having asserted the effect or nature of the action he wishes to add its outward form, or the converse.” I am arguing, however, that Ballantine’s rule, whilst correct in as far as it goes, applies only to Postnuclear Aorist Participles. Indeed of the 12 references which Ballantine cites as examples of this usage, all but Hebrews 2:10 are Postnuclear.

Certainly, the Prenuclear Aorist Participle here does seem to refer to a preceding event but rather as some kind of “coincident action” (Ellingworth, 1993:160), which expresses “God’s fixed purpose” (Lane, 1991a:55). I therefore suggest that “having led” may be a rare use of a Prenuclear Aorist Participle where the “time” reference is “omnitemporal”, i.e. it functions as the equivalent of a gnomic Aorist, meaning “God has led, does lead, and will lead”. The Perfective Aspect shows this is conceptualized as a whole Event, not a Process, and prenuclear word order shows that this Event began (though did not finish) before the event of the main verb, (similar to the function of the
augment with the Aorist Indicative). If my thesis is correct, one might translate this Aorist Participle as a statement about God’s eternal nature (like the preceding two clauses): “For it became him, by whom are all things and through whom are all things, and who brings many sons to glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”

Alternatively, the Prenuclear Aorist Participle in Hebrews 2:10 might be analysed as “timeless” rather than “omnitemporal”, where “timeless” indicates that the event described “is seen to be outside of temporal considerations”, as is “particularly frequent in the kinds of statements which occur in theology and mathematical propositions” (Porter, 1994:33, referring to Lyons, 1977:680). This would then contrast with “omnitemporal”, which describes an event which “regularly recurs, especially in nature” (Porter, 1994:33).

Similarly, the Prenuclear Aorist Participle in John 13:1, whilst it may not be strictly omnitemporal, is certainly multitemporal, referring to an event which begins before the action of the main verb but does not stop before it, and (theologically at least, e.g. Romans 8:35-39) continues after it:

having-loved the own the in the world to end he-loved them.

Here again, as with with verbs of perception, although grammatically what is marked is that this is in the same scenario as the main verb, and syntactically what is marked is that it begins prior to it, the lexical item itself, here “love”, shows that there is also an implicit relationship of motivation between the Aorist Participle and the main verb.

2) Prenuclear Aorist Participle Genitive
= preceding EVENT with different subject to main verb

> preceding time setting (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)

Sometimes there are several events in the same time setting, conjoined by kal, e.g.

Acts 25:23

This whole string functions as single setting: “Therefore the next day when A and B had come... and had entered the audience hall... and Festus had given command, Paul was led in.” As regards predictability, 25:22 states “Tomorrow you shall hear him”

Predictable time settings are often related to the passing of time, especially the natural cycle of night and day. Normally, the noun is pericope-new, anarthrous (because salient), and typically comes before the participle, e.g.

Matt. 14:15

evening () having-occurred

approached him the disciples saying ...
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NIV "As evening approached" but I reckon "When evening came"

> preceding event, implicit reason
(usually implying subject 2's perception of subject 1's action)
Matt. 13:6
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ δὲ διευκαλυπτοῦ ἐκαμάτισθη
sun () having-risen it-was-scorched
NIV "But when the sun came up, the plants were scorched"
The sun rose before the scorching and also caused the scorching.

> preceding event, precondition to sequential stages of a script
Mark 6:21
Καὶ κεραίη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ καλὸς ὁμοίως τὸς γενέσιος αὐτοῦ δελτων ἐποκαίνειν ...
And having-occurred day suitable when Herod on-the birthday of-him feast made...
καὶ εἰσελθομεν tyre ἀπὸ τῆς Ηηρόδου καὶ ἐρχομένης
and having-entered the daughter of-herself the Herodias and having-danced
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῷ Ηηρόδῳ ...
she-pleased/it-pleased the Herod...
Here the first Genitive Absolute is not merely a sequential time setting but also a precondition for all the following events. Similarly the second Genitive Absolute "having entered" is a precondition for dancing.

3) Prenuclear Present Participle Nominative
= concurrent PROCESS with same subject as main verb

> concurrent time setting  (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)
Where there is a speech event, it is predictable that those present will hear what is said. Thus "hearing" occurs as a Participle, predicted from the previous speech, and providing a temporal and often an implicit causal setting for the following main verb:
Acts 7:54
Ἀκολούθησε δὲ ταῦτα ...
Hearing () theses[things]...
In Acts 7:2-53 Stephen is addressing the Jewish council.
The council's "hearing" is predictable since they are being addressed in the preceding speech. Compare also:
Acts 13:48
Ἀκολούθησα δὲ τα ἔννυ ...
Hearing () the nations ...
In Acts 13:46-47 Paul and Barnabas are addressing the Gentiles.
Where the Prenuclear Present Participle is other than "hearing", the relationship may be simply concurrent time, e.g.
Luke 8:4b
ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνεν, ὅ ἔχων δὲ ἀκουέν ἀκουέτω.
These[things] saying he-was-calling, The having ears to-hear let-him-hear.
In Luke 8:4b-8a Jesus is telling a parable.
In the above example, the use of a Present Participle, Imperfective Aspect, refers to a Discourse-old event which is in Process right up to the time of the main verb.
> concurrent time setting, implicit reason (usually Participle is verb of perception)

In contrast to the 73 Prenuclear Aorist Participles of δικούω in the New Testament, there are only 9 with the Present stem. This I believe reflects the real life situation that usually people respond after they have heard someone else finish what they have to say (Aorist, Perfective Aspect), but sometimes they respond whilst the other person is still speaking (Present, Imperfective Aspect).

In several cases it is clear from the context that the hearing was in process when the following event occurred, i.e. Progressiveness is indicated by Imperfective Aspect, e.g.

Mark 6:2


he-began to-teach in he synagogue, and many hearing were-being-amazed saying . . .

After Jesus “began” to teach, the people’s amazement is encoded using the Imperfect Indicative in Greek. This reinforces what we would expect from the Present Participle alone, that the hearing was in process when people were amazed. Clearly too, their amazement is due to what they were hearing, not simply happening at the same time. Compare Acts 7:54, 13:48 where the Present Participle “hearing” is followed by Imperfect main verbs.

As has been mentioned elsewhere, the reason relationship includes the concessive relationship, being reason + contraexpectation. The following are examples of verbs of perception in a concessive relationship, although the use of the same verb with slightly different meanings obscures the fact that the Present Participle refers to a perception in process, and the main verb refers to a deeper cognition of the meaning of what is perceived.

Matt. 13:13


because seeing not they-see and hearing not they-hear nor understand

Luke 8:10


so-that seeing not they-might-see and hearing not they-might-understand

The different version in Mark 4:12 (although the Participles are still cotemporaneous with the main verb) may reflect Hebrew use of the “infinitive absolute” as an intensifier (Moulton, 1976:15; Weingreen, 1959:79), since the Participle and following main verb have the same root used with the same meaning:


so-that seeing they-might-see and not they-might-perceive,

cal δικούωτες δικούων και μη συνόων...

and hearing they-might hear and not they-might-understand

The two other examples of Prenuclear Participle Present of δικούω also refer to concurrent time with the main verb, but Imperfective Aspect is used not for Progressiveness but iterativity and distributiveness, e.g.

Mark 3:8


And from Jerusalem and from the Idumea and beyond the Jordan and around Tyre and Sidon πλήθος πολύ δικούωτες δια ἐπειδὴ ἤδην πρὸς αὐτόν.

crowd great hearing whatsoever he-was-doing came to him.

Although each individual presumably first heard and then afterwards came, this crowd did not come as one single group, since it came from various directions. The picture is of individuals hearing and then coming, perhaps forming groups en route, and gathering into
a single big crowd where Jesus was. The various acts of hearing then took place over a long time as did the separate acts of coming. A real-life time line would be as follows with each person first hearing and then coming:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hear</th>
<th>come</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The author has chosen to represent the coming as a single undifferentiated Event, whilst marking the hearing as an ongoing Process during which the coming occurred.

Similarly in Acts 18:8 we see iterativity and distributiveness marked by

**Progressive Aspect:**

Kρίσπος ὁ διάκονος τοῦ λαοῦ ἀκούειν τῷ κυρίῳ σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ, Crispus () the synagogue-leader believed in-the lord with all the household of-him καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀκούειν καὶ ἀποκατατίθεν, and many of-the Corinthians hearing were-believing and were being baptized.

Here there is no reason to believe that the difference between Aorist and Imperfect in the main verbs shows Aktionsart, i.e. Crispus’s act of faith was punctiliar, but others took longer or their faith was not so sure. Nor does it seem to mean that Crispus believed there and then and others were in the process of believing when ... (Progressivity). Rather the use of the Imperfective Aspect (Process) seems to indicate that many different individuals were over a period of time hearing and subsequently believing and being baptized, but the activities largely overlapped in time so that individual acts of belief and then baptism occurred in the midst of a Process of people hearing the gospel. A real-life timeline would be as follows, with hearing taking longer than believing (coming to faith in Christ), and being baptized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crispus</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be baptized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here both the hearing (Participle) and believing (main verb) are Imperfective showing both as an ongoing Process, not for the individuals concerned, but for the inhabitants of Corinth as a whole.

> **concurrent situation, implicit reason (usually Participle is verb of being)**

Verbs which refer to ongoing states (usually verbs of being) often occur in this construction, where REASON is clearly implicit, e.g.

**Acts 2:30-31**

προφήτης οὖν ἦν πρὸς τῷ θανάτῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ

Prophet therefore being ... he-spoke about the resurrection of-the Christ Peter presents David’s prophethood as Hearer-old.

**John 9:25b**

blind being now I-see.

John 9:1 says he was blind.

Being blind, above, is CONCESSIVE with seeing, i.e. “Even though I was blind, yet now I can see.” This concessive is not marked lexically or grammatically, but is
derived from the scenario, which contains the prototypical statements “Ordinary people can see” “Blind people cannot see.” Why, however, is the Present Participle used, as the man is already healed? This may be due to “aspectual vagueness” of the verb “to be” (Porter, 1993:442-3) which has no Aorist Participle (cf. 9:24 “the man who was blind” (Imperfect) meaning presumably the man who had been blind). Or perhaps the man is using the Present Participle to emphasize that this Process of being blind existed right up to the present time (i.e. up to the last hour or so), a fact his interrogators did not believe (9:18). Or perhaps ἔφεσε is here nominal, and the man still thinks of himself socially as a blindman, and says “I AM a blindman (which you deny), but nevertheless I can now see”. Possibly, even, the Prenuclear Present Participle does not have the pragmatic meaning of concurrent time here, but only the semantic meaning of a Process (Imperfective Aspect), although I prefer the referential explanation, especially since his identity as a blindman is being questioned. Another example of referring to people as blind even after they have been healed is in Luke 10:24:

τωφλος ἀναθέλουσιν, χωλος περιπατοῦσιν, λεπρος καθαρίζουται καὶ κωφος ἀκοιουσιν...
blind see, lame walk, lepers are cleansed and deaf hear...

A Prenuclear Present Participle, referring to a known existing situation, may also be explicitly marked CONCESSIVE, e.g.

Hebrews 5:8
καὶ ὥς ὑλάς, ἐμαθεν ἄφι ὡς ἐμαθεν τὴν ἀπακοὴν
although being son, he-learned from what he-suffered the obedience

> concurrent event in non-sequential scenario

Matthew 16:1
Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαίοι
And having-approached the Pharisees and Sadducees
περιπατοῦσιν ἐπιράξειν αὐτῶν σημείον ἐκ τοῦ συμφαίνειν ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτῶς.
testing asked him sign from the heaven to-show to-them

It is clear that whereas their approaching preceded their request for a sign, their testing was being done concurrently (cf. Luke 11:16). In the Gospels πειράζω occurs 9 times as a Present Participle (excluding the substantive). Of these only the above 2 are Prenuclear, the rest are Postnuclear and mark purpose.

GRAMCORD data for Prenuclear Participles nominative of ἔρχομαι “come/go”, shows that 72 are Aorist, but only 6 Present. This reflects the fact that typically the arrival precedes the action of the main verb (Aorist). These Present Participles relate to a variety of scenarios. In some instances Imperfect Aspect represents simultaneous events, in others Iterative Aktionsart, e.g.

Simultaneous events (approach, bring, come scenarios):

Luke 15:25
δος ἔρχεμενος ἰδὼν τῇ ολικῇ...
as coming he-near the house
2 Timothy 4:13
τὴν φαίλωσιν ἐρχόμενος φέρε...
the cloak ... coming bring ...
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Romans 15:29
οἶδα δὲ ὅτι ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ ἔλεόσομαι.
I-know () that coming to you in fulness of-blessing of-Lord I-will-come.
NIV "I know that when I come to you, I will come ..."

Iterative Aktionsart:
Luke 18:5
ὑμα μὴ εἴσ τέλος ἐρχόμενῷ ὑπανάχθῃ με.
so-that not to end coming may-weary me.
The widow’s repeated coming is what wearies the judge. Perfective Aspect to indicate
Iterative Aktionsart is particularly appropriate here in the light of 18:1 “a parable to show
them that they should always pray and not give up”.

Distributive plus Iterative Aktionsart.
Here the Present Participle shows that the event is regarded as a Process, which
happens time and time again since many different individuals each perform it once:
Mark 3:8
πλήθος πολύ, ἀρχάγγελοι δόσα ποιεῖ, ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.
crowd great, hearing what he-does, came to him.
The crowd, though singular, refers to many individuals. cf. Acts 18:8
Luke 13:14
ἐξ ἡμέρας εἰσῆν ἐν αἷς δὲ ἐργάζεσθαι:
six days there-are on which ought to-be-healed.
主管部门 therefrom coming be-healed...
Luke 16:21
καὶ οἱ κώνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἐλκή αὐτῶ.
and the dogs coming were-licking the sores of-him.

Diagrammatically one can see the contemporaneous nature of the events one to the
other, even though individual actions are sequential:
crowd
hear........................................
come........................................
you........................................
come........................................
be healed.................................
dogs........................................
come........................................
lick........................................

4) Prenuclear Present Participle Genitive
= concurrent PROCESS with different subject to main verb

> concurrent time setting (where event is Discourse-old or predictable)
Mark 14:43
Καὶ εἶδος ἐπὶ αὐτόν λαλοῦσις παραγίνεται [6] Ἰουδᾶς
And immediately yet him speaking arrives [the] Judas
Jesus’s speaking is here Discourse-old (14:41). In the Gospels, by my count,
lαλέω occurs 10 times in a Prenuclear Genitive Absolute Present construction, (Matthew
9:18, 12:46, 17:5, 26:47, Mark 5:35, 14:43, Luke 8:49, 22:47, 22:60, John 8:30). All have the agent as a pronoun, rather than a noun. This emphasizes the predictability of the event. Since it has already been stated that someone spoke, old-information marking can be used for back-reference, i.e. the agent can be referred back to by a pronoun, and the event referred back to by a Participle.

Acts 13:2
κυριακήν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡσυχήν
worshipping (ο) they to-the Lord and fasting
εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον,
said the spirit the holy ...
NIV “While they were worshipping ...”

Often the event is predictable due to the natural passing of time, e.g.
Luke 4:40
Δύοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου
setting () the sun
ἐπιτεφθαον οὖσας ἁγίους ποικίλας ἢγαγον αὐτοῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς
all whoever had sick with-diseases various led them to him.
NIV “When the sun was setting...”

John 20:19
Οὐχὶ οὐν ἡμέρα ἐκείνη τῇ μνήμῃ σαββάτων ...
Being therefore evening on-the day that the first of-the-week...
ἔδεικνυε ὁ Ἰησοῦς
came the Jesus ...
NIV “On the evening of that first day of the week...”

It is clearly predictable that the evening will come, and that the sun will set.

> concurrent event, implicit reason
(usually implying 2’s perception of 1’s action)
καί δὲ συνανακρίνεται τε αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπιτεφθάεται τὰ ἤμισυ καὶ τοὺς ἑλέουσας τοὺς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν ἀέρα,
Shouting and them and tearing the clothes and dust throwing in the air
ἐκλέκοντας δὲ ἠλέαντος συναγαγοῦν αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν
ordered the commander to-bring-in him into the fort
NIV “As they were shouting and throwing off their cloaks and flinging dust into the air, the commander ordered Paul to be taken into the barracks.”
The three Genitive Absolutes are conjoined by καί, all together providing a setting during which, and due to which, the main verb occurred.

> concurrent event, precondition to sequential stages of a script
Acts 4:37
ὑπάρχοντος αὐτῷ ἄγρον
being to-him field
πωλήσας ἤμπρεκεν τῷ κρήμνῳ καὶ ἐβιβάζεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἁποστόλων.
having-sold he-brought the proceeds and placed at the feet of-the apostles.
Unless he had a field, he could not sell it and give away the proceeds. Note that, due to the semantic meaning of the verbs, the state of ownership (Present Participle) is brought to conclusion by the following event of “selling” (Aorist Participle), so the events are not strictly concurrent but are temporally contiguous in as much as the possession lasts right up to the event of selling. In contrast, an Aorist Participle would have implied a preceding action.

5) Postnuclear Aorist Participle Nominative
= EVENT with same subject as main verb, related non-temporally to main verb
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> MANNER

Sometimes the semantic relationship between items in a scenario is that of MANNER-ACTION. In these cases the MANNER used to perform the main verb can be shown by a Postnuclear Aorist Participle, e.g.

Luke 2:16
καὶ ήσυχαν ὁπεραιτητες
And they-came having-hastened [MANNER]
Hebrews 12:2
ἐναρχομεν αἰλοχύνης καταφρονήσας
he-endured cross shame having-despised [MANNER]

Other examples of Postnuclear Aorist Participles indicating MANNER include:
Luke 4:35 “[the demon] came out without injuring him”
Acts 7:36 “led them, performing miracles”
1 Cor. 12:24 “God put the body together, having given more honour ...”
Eph. 1:11 “were chosen, having been predestined” (possibly MEANS or REASON?)
Heb. 11:9 “he lived like a foreigner, dwelling in tents”
2 Pet. 2:15 “they erred, having followed the way of Balaam”

> MEANS

Sometimes the semantic relationship between items in a scenario is that of MEANS-RESULT. In these cases the MEANS used to achieve the main verb can be shown by a Postnuclear Aorist Participle, e.g.:

Matthew 27:66
οἱ δὲ πορεύετες
They () having gone [PRECEDING EVENT]
καὶ ἐφαρμόσατο τὸν τάφον
made-fast the tomb
σφακέσατες τὸν λίθον μετὰ τῆς κοιστωθῆς.
having-sealed the stone with the guard. [MEANS]
The clear distinction here between Prenuclear and Postnuclear Aorist Participles.
Acts 11:29, 30
όρισαν ἐκατός αὐτῶν εἰς διακολου ἐξῆντο πέμψαν ... καὶ ἔποιησαν
determined each of them to aid send ... which also they-did
ἂνοτέρειτες ... διὰ χειρὸς Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Σαῦλου.
having-sent ... by hand of-Barnabas and of-Saul [MEANS]

Other examples of Postnuclear Aorist Participles indicating MEANS include:
Luke 7:29 “justified God, by being baptized”
Acts 10:33 “done well by coming”
Acts 10:39 “killed by hanging on a tree”
Acts 13:27 “fulfilled (the scriptures) by condemning (Jesus)”
Acts 15:8 “showed he accepted them by giving the Holy Spirit”
Acts 15:9 “made no distinction by purifying their hearts”
Ephesians 1:4-5 “chose by foreordaining” (or “chose, inasmuch as he foreordained”)
Ephesians 1:8-9 “caused to abound by making known”
Ephesians 5:26 “might sanctify by purifying”
Philippians 2:7 “emptied himself by taking the form of a servant”
Colossians 2:11-12 “were circumcised by being buried with him in baptism”
1 Timothy 1:12 “counted me faithful, by appointing me” (or “inasmuch as he appointed me”).

Further examples include John 17:4, Acts 5:30, 7:24, 9:25, 10:39, 13:33, 15:8,
22:16, 2 Cor 11:8, Gal. 3:13, 19, Eph. 1:20, 2:16, Phil. 2:7, 8, Col. 1:20, 2:2, 13-14, Heb
2:18, 6:10, 7:27, 10:32-33, 3 John 6 (perhaps conditional), and Rev. 1:1.

Several examples are more debatable, e.g.
I analyse the Aorist Participle εἰπόω as the MEANS of reconciling, rather than as AMPLIFICATION / SPECIFIC, i.e. clarifying the specific content of the main verb. Certainly, Postnuclear Aorist Participles are frequently used for MEANS, and whereas εἰπόω rarely occurs in postnuclear position, the Present Participle λέγω is extremely common in postnuclear position with SPECIFIC meaning.

A second possible example is more theologically charged:

Acts 22:16

having-risen be-baptised and wash-away the sins of-you
having-called-on the name of-him

Here Wilkins (1996), dismissing “attendant circumstance” and “cause” as unlikely, states: “If used for means, the participial phrase is establishing that the cleansing of sin actually takes place by means of the confession, rather than by the ritual of baptism.” I have argued throughout that the specific semantic relationship intended is found in the author and audience’s mental scenario, not our own theological preconceptions. The best clue we have to the original scenario is in the preaching of John the Baptist, e.g. Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3 “baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins.” In this phrase we have repentance grammatically linked with baptism, and forgiveness as the purpose of the two, so whatever else we say about the Aorist Participle, we should not exegete it as necessarily applying solely to forgiveness, excluding baptism. It is clear that calling on the Lord’s name is a necessary precondition for both baptism and forgiveness.

Luke 1:9 is an unusual example which should probably be understood as MEANS:

it-fell-by-lot of-the to-burn-incense having-entered in the temple of-the lord
i.e. “he was chosen by lot to burn incense, by entering the temple of the Lord”

This rare postposing of an Aorist Participle of motion, probably marking MEANS rather than simply time sequence, has the advantage of stressing that Zechariah must enter the temple, in this context meaning the sanctuary rather than the whole temple complex. He is obviously inside the sanctuary in Luke 1:11 and this is the venue for his meeting with Gabriel.

Acts 17:31 is another example of MEANS, and also corroborates my theory that Participles, unless conjoined by κατ, do not fill the same scenario slot, i.e. do not have the same semantic relationship to the main verb:

1. εν ανδρὶ δικαιοσεν, in man whom he-designated
2. προσευχησεν πρὸς αὐτὸν guarantee having-offered to-all [CONCOMITANT ACT with 1]
3. ἐκ νεκρῶν. having-raised him from dead [MEANS for 2]
Line 2 appears to be a concomitant act with line 1 "whom he designated, giving proof", whereas line 3 is clearly the means for line 2 "giving proof by raising him from the dead".

> PURPOSE AND RESULT

O’Rourke (1967) gave evidence that Postnuclear Present Participles can be used to mark Purpose. I argue that in narrative with an Aorist main verb, this construction can mark both Purpose and (incipient) Result. The Postnuclear Present Participle shows that the Participle represents a Process (Imperfective Aspect) which was the purpose of the main verb and was actually begun on the completion of the main verb.

I argue that a parallel construction can be used with the Aorist Participle, meaning that the Participial event was both the purpose and (completed) result of the main verb. The Postnuclear Aorist Participle shows that the Participle represents an Event which was the purpose of the main verb and was actually accomplished on the completion of the main verb (Perfective Aspect). This is rare, the classic example being Acts 25:13b, as already noted:

\[\text{Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Βερίκη κατέσωσεν ἐπὶ Κασαρίαν ἄνθρωποι τοῦ Φιλίτου.}\]

\[\text{Agrippa the king and Bernice went to Caesarea having-greeted the Festus.}\]

NIV "King Agrippa and Bernice arrived at Caesarea to pay their respects to Festus."

Although the NIV makes PURPOSE explicit, the Greek I believe includes the information that this purpose was successful.

The purpose and result sections of a scenario contain the same prototypical items, since purposes are often fulfilled. In real life, however, some purposes are not fulfilled, and some results are not intended. Greek, I argue, uses a postnuclear participle to mark BOTH purpose and result, i.e. this was the purpose and this was the result. Alternatively it can be seen as successful purpose.

> REASON

Many Postnuclear Aorist Participles which encode the reason for doing the main verb are of verbs of perception. This is quite natural, since what one perceives usually affects what one does, e.g.

Acts 16:38

\[\text{ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ὧν καθὼς ἤκουσαν τὰ ἰδία ταῦτα.}\]

Reported () to-the magistrates the officials the words these.

\[\text{ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἔχοντες ἀπὸ τῷ Ῥωμαῖον εἶδον.}\]

They-feared () having-heard that Romans they-are [REASON]

NIV "and when they heard that Paul and Silas were Roman citizens, they were alarmed."

In the New Testament the Aorist Participle of \[\text{ἀκούω} \]

"hear" occurs 75 times in the nominative case in a verb clause slot. 73 of these occurrences are in prenuclear position, indicating one of a sequence of events belonging to the same script as the nuclear verb. Only 2 occurrences are in postnuclear position (Acts 16:38, and Col. 1:4 above). In both these instances the postnuclear position of the Aorist Participle indicates that "hearing" is not treated as simply a preceding event in the script, but rather has a non-temporal
semantic relationship to the main verb. Such Postnuclear Aorist Participles of verbs of perception are typically used to mark the REASON for doing the nuclear verb.

Both times the Postnuclear Aorist Participle of “hear” occurs in the New Testament, it is followed by a phrase making explicit the content of what was heard. Of the 48 occurrences of Prenuclear Aorist Participle of “hear” in the context of a speech act, 33 have no reference whatever to the content of what was heard, and only 4 make the content explicit, as follows:

Generic content:
- “those words” John 7:40, 19:13
- “the word” Matt. 15:12, 19:22, Luke 8:15
- “his parables” Matt. 21:45
- “them debating” Mark 12:28

Explicit content:
- “the resurrection of the dead” Acts 17:32
- “that it is the Lord” John 21:7
- “that he lives and was seen by her” Mark 16:11
- “that he spoke in the Hebrew language” Acts 22:2

Naturally, if a postnuclear Aorist Participle is emphasizing the REASON for an action, one would expect the content to be explicit. In contrast, if a prenuclear Aorist Participle is merely listing an expected event in a script, the content is likely to be predictable and not in focus. This explains why the content of the above prenuclear Aorist Participles is often omitted or referred to in extremely generic terms.

I am not saying that when postnuclear word order in Greek suggests REASON, the translation must be “because”, or that when a participle is prenuclear, one should not translate “because”. The decision of how to translate naturally depends on the target language. I am merely clarifying what the author is choosing to mark in the source language, i.e. a Prenuclear Aorist Participle marks a preceding event in the script of the main verb, whereas a Postnuclear Aorist Participle marks an event with a non-temporal semantic relationship to the main verb, indicating that the audience must choose the prototypical semantic relationship between these two concepts in this open scenario.

Support for postnuclear Participles of perception verbs meaning REASON is found in parallel passages in the Gospels. For example the reason for Peter’s outburst about building tabernacles at the Transfiguration is related once with γὰρ “for” and once with a Postnuclear Participle:

Mark 9:6
οὐ γὰρ ἔφη τι ἀποκριθη ἐκφοβοί γὰρ ἐγένετο.
Not for he-knew what he-answered scared for they-became.

Luke 9:33
εἶπεν δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ... μὴ ἐλέητι ὁ λέγει.
said the Peter to the Jesus ... not knowing what he-says.

Although εἶπεν is glossed “knowing”, it is a Perfect Participle in form, literally “having seen.”

Similarly we can see parallel structures in the same passage between Postnuclear Participles of verbs of cognition and explicit REASON clauses, for example in the Haustafel passage Col. 3:18-4:1 (Commands bolded, reasons underlined, indented and glossed):
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Let us use the above observations to help us exegete the Postnuclear Aorist Participle in Acts 23:27. Note that of 11 occurrences of the word 'Ῥωμαῖος “Roman” in the New Testament, eight are related to two incidents in Acts, Paul and Silas’s imprisonment in Ephesus (Acts 16:21, 37, 38), and Paul’s arrest in Jerusalem (Acts 22:25, 26, 27, 29, 23:27). Thus we can see that the concept of Roman-ness is highly focal in these two passages. In these verses the word Roman occurs twice in a Noun Phrase with a main verb in an independent clause (22:25, and 22:27). Otherwise it occurs in a dependent clause or with a participle, and always follows the main verb (or verb form it relates to). I argue that all such instances are related to REASON. Note especially the explicit conjunction γάρ “for” in 22:26:
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Acts 16.21
καὶ καταγγέλλοντι ἐθή ὡς ἐστιν ἡμῶν παραδεχόμεθα οὐδὲ ποιεῖν Ῥωμαίους οὕσιν, and they-announce customs which not is-lawful for-us to-accept nor to-do Romans being.
("since we are Roman citizens" in contrast to Jews, 16:20)

Acts 16.37
Δείχνατε ἡμῖν δικοστὶ ἀκατακρίτους, ἀνθρώπους Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας, having-beaten us publicly uncondemned, people Roman being
("despite our being Roman citizens" i.e. REASON but contra-expectation)

Acts 16.38
ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἀκολούθησιν ὅτι Ῥωμαίοι εἶσιν.
They-feared () having-heard that Romans they-are,
("because they heard that they were Roman citizens")

Acts 22:25
Εἰ ἰδέατων Ῥωμαίου καὶ ἀκατάκριτων ἐστιν ἡμῶν μαστίζειν;
Whether person Roman and uncondemned is-lawful for-you to-flog?

Acts 22:26
Τι μέλλεις ποιεῖν; ὅ γὰρ ἰδέατων οὗτος Ῥωμαίος ἐστίν.
What do-you-intend to-do? He for person this Roman is.

Acts 22:27
Λέγε μοι, σὺ Ῥωμαίος εἶ;
Tell me, you Roman are?

Acts 22:29
καὶ δ ἡμίλησε δὲ ἐφοβήθη.
And the commander () feared

Acts 23:25
καὶ ἦσαν ἡμῶν αὐτὸν ἢν δεδεκώσ.
having-discovered that Roman he-is and that him he-was having-bound.
("because he had discovered that he was a Roman citizen and that he had had him chained up.")

Acts 23:27
Τὸν ἀνθρώπον ... ἐξειλάμπη μακρὸν ὅτι Ῥωμαίος ἐστίν.
The man this ... I-rescued having-learned that Roman he-is.
("because I had learned that he was a Roman citizen")

Three examples listed above (16:38, 22:29, 23:27) have a postnuclear Aorist Participle of a verb of perception introducing the “Roman” clause. Since all three have a lexical item from the same semantic area of perception, used in the same grammatical and syntactical form, with the same content of what was perceived, one would expect that all three encode the same semantic relationship. Based on the eight examples listed above, I argue that “knowing someone is Roman” prototypically functions as a REASON in the scenario of the main verb.

This contradicts Porter’s analysis of Acts 23:27 as an Aorist Participle of subsequent action (1989:386). I agree with Porter that a postnuclear Aorist Participle may refer to subsequent action, but only where that subsequent action fits the PURPOSE+RESULT slot of the scenario. In the Acts 16:38 example, it has already been reported that Paul is a Roman (Acts 16:38a) so here the real life event encoded by the Postnuclear Aorist Participle cannot possibly have occurred after the main verb, and logically must precede it, even if only by a split second’s reaction time. Similarly in Acts 22:29 Paul has already stated he is Roman in the previous verse, so the Postnuclear Aorist Participle must refer to a realization which, at least momentarily, preceded the reaction of fear. Similarly, the readers of Acts know the real-life sequence of events from Acts 21:32-33 and 22:27, first the arrest, then the discovery of Paul’s Roman citizenship, so there is no
reason for them to assume that the same construction means anything different in Felix' letter.

However, there is another issue. What did Claudius Lysias intend Felix to understand from the Postnuclear Aorist Participle in Acts 23:27? Claudius Lysias does not have to relate the true sequence of events, since Felix only has the letter to go on, so might he be trying to put a better spin on things? According to my thesis, the pragmatic meaning of a Participle is determined by its prototypical role in the scenario of the main verb, and the Postnuclear Aorist Participle simply restricts the range of possible pragmatic meanings to non-temporal (because Postnuclear) and Perfective (because Aorist). Given that Felix had no wider context than the letter itself, he would have had to interpret this in terms of prototypical relationships in the general scenario of "rescuing" someone, in the light of certain known facts about participants, i.e. the rescuer is a Roman officer and the people from whom this someone was rescued were Jews intent on murder. The examples given above suggest that knowing about someone's Roman citizenship prototypically functions as a REASON for treating such a person well. So, without giving specific indications to the contrary, Claudius Lysias could only reasonably expect Felix to take a prototypical interpretation of the Postnuclear Aorist Participle, and understand it as indicating REASON.

Similarly, Postnuclear Aorist Participles of verbs of seeing are used to show

**REASON:**

*John 20:20*

δέχασαν οὖν αὐτῷ ἔδωκεν τὸν κόρον.  
Rejoiced therefore the disciples having-seen the Lord

Similarly, Postnuclear Aorist Participles of verbs of thought are regularly used for

**REASON,** since thought, like perception, affects ones actions, e.g.

*John 11:31*

ἔδωκεν τὴν Μαρίαν ὅτι ταχέως ἀνείπτη καὶ ἔξηλεν,  
having-seen the Mary that quickly she-rose and went-out [PRECEDING EVENT]

they-followed her

ἔδωκεν ὅτι ἤπατεν εἷς τὸ μνήμεια ὡς καλύτερον ἔκει,  
having-reckoned that she-goes to the tomb so she-may-weep there. [REASON]

NIV "They followed her, supposing ..."

2 Tim 1:4-5

اتفاقεται παθηματω,  
so of-joy I-may-be-filled

ὑπόμνησιν λαβὼν τῆς ἐν σοι ἀνυποκρίτως πίστεως,  
recollection having-taken of-the in you unfeigned faith [REASON]

i.e. "so I may be filled with joy, since I recall your genuine faith"

2 Pet. 1:9

ὡς γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, τυφλὸς ἐστὶν μωμάτων,  
in-whom for not is-present these[things] blind is being-short-sighted

λήψων λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πλάκων αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτίων.  
forgetfulness having-taken of-the cleansing of-the in-past of-him sins [REASON]

i.e. "is blind and cannot see clearly, because he has forgotten ..."
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Heb. 11:17-19
Πίστει προσευμνίσθηκεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ πειραζόμενος
By-faith offered Abraham the Isaac being-tested
καὶ τῶν μονογενὴς προσέβερεν, ...
even the only-begotten he-was-offering, ...
εἰς τὸν μόνον ζητών, έγερθεν δύνατον ὁ θεός,
having-reasoned that even from dead to-raise able the god [REASON]
i.e. “because he reasoned ...”

Hebrews 11:24-25
1 Πίστει Μωϋσῆς ... ἤρεμαστο λέγεσθαι ὑόδο θυγατρὸς Φαραώ,
By-faith Moses ... refused to-be-called son of-daughter of-Pharoah
2 μᾶλλον ἐλάμβανος συγκακουχεῖταί τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ...
rather having-chosen to-be-mistreated-with the people of-the god
3 μείζονα πλῆθος ἀποδέενος τῶν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν τῶν δυνατισμῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
greater riches having-deemed than-the of-Egypt treasures the reproach
of-the Christ [REASON]

Line 2 is the REASON for line 1, line 3 is the REASON for line 2. Had lines 2 and 3 both been reasons for line 1, they would have been conjoined by καὶ.

Finally there are a small number of instances where the Postnuclear Aorist Participle is not related to perception or thought, yet refers to cause or REASON. For example, I would categorize the Postnuclear Aorist Participle δούς in Romans 4:20 as REASON, partly because it is conjoined to the following Aorist Participle πληροφορηθείς in verse 21 indicating that both Participles are related to the main verb in the same way:

Romans 4:20-21
εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελμα τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ δεικήθη τῇ ἁπατίᾳ
To () the promise of-the god not he-hesitated in-the unbelief
ἀλλ' ἐνεπιμυταγής τῇ πίστει,
rather he-was-empowered in-the faith
δούς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ
having-given glory to-the god
καὶ πληροφορήθης δὲ καὶ ἐπηγγέλται δυνατός ἐστὶν καὶ ποιήσαι,
and having-been-connvinced that what has-been-promised able he-is also to-do.
NIV “Yet he did not waver through unbelief but was strengthened in his faith and gave glory to God, being fully persuaded that God had power to do what he had promised.”

The NIV seems to ignore the conjoining καὶ which I believe links both Participles as filling the same semantic “slot”. I suggest “Yet he did not waver through unbelief but was strengthened in his faith, because he gave glory to God and was fully persuaded that God had power to do what he had promised.”

The following Postnuclear Aorist Participles, outside the semantic domains of perception and thought, also indicate REASON:

Eph. 2:19-20
ἐστε ... ὀλίγοι τοῦ θεοῦ,
you-are ... family-members of-the god
ἐπικοσμούμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ θεμέλῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν
having-been-built on the foundation of-the apostles and prophets.
Col. 3:9-10
μὴ ψεοδεσθε εἰς ἄλληλους,
Don’t lie to one-another
ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν διώρωπον ... καὶ ἐνυπαίθεν τὸν νέον ...
having-taken-off the old man ... and having-put-on the new ...
NIV “Do not lie to each other since ...”

The Participles are conjoined by καὶ indicating that both are in the same slot, as reasons for not lying.
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2 Tim. 4:10
Δημᾶς γὰρ μὲ ἐγκατέλυσεν ἀνατίθησι τῶν ὑπὸν αἰῶνα
Demas for me forsook having-loved the now world
NIV “for Demas, having loved this world, has deserted me...”
Hebrews 11:24-25
Πετει Μωυσῆς ... ἠρρήσατο λέγεσθαι ὑλὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ,
By-faith Moses ... refused to-be-called son of-daughter of-Pharaoh
μεθανῦν ἔλαμενοι συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ...
更好的 having-chosen to-be-mistreated-with the people of-the god

In the light of the above examples, the controversial Acts 16:6 may be reasonably interpreted as REASON (rather than subsequent action, since Postnuclear Aorist Participles have a non-temporal semantic relationship):

Acts 16:6
Διήλθον δὲ τὴν Φυσίγα καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν
They-passed-through () the Phrygia and Galatian region
κωλθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγιου πνεύματος καλεῖν τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ: having-been-prevented by the holy spirit to-speak the word in the Asia.

> CONCESSIVE
A CONCESSIVE clause can be regarded as a REASON clause which is contraexpectation. Contraexpectation, although it may be grammaticalized by a Participle alone, indicating it is part of an existing scenario, is often lexically marked in some way, e.g.

Hebrews 12:17
μετανοάς γὰρ τότον οὐχ ἔφεξεν
of-repentence for place not he-found
καίπερ μετά διαφρών ἐκείνιος αὐτῆς,
although with tears having-sought it (blessing or repentance)

One would expect the scenario of repentance to include the REASON “he found a place for repentance, because he sought if with tears”. The contraexpectation then is marked explicitly here by καίπερ “although”.

Similarly:
1 Peter 1:6
ἐν δὲ ἀγαλλάδοθε, in which you-rejoice
διὰ γὰρ ἀρτί εἰ ἔδων [εἰκῶν] λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμαῖς a-little yet if necessary [is] having-grieved in many tests

Here the contraexpectation is lexicalized by ἀρτί “yet, even now” and by the riders “a little” and “if necessary”.

> CONDITION
A CONDITION can be regarded as a particular type of REASON or MEANS clause where the protasis expresses the potential reason or means as a condition rather than a fact, e.g.

Hebrews 2:3
πῶς ἠμεῖς ἐκφευγόμεθα τηλικαίτης ἀνελθόντες συντήρας how we will-escape, such having-neglected salvation?
NIV “how shall we escape if we ignore such a great salvation?”
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This is related to the REASON statement “We will not escape, because we have neglected such a salvation,” which in Greek could use exactly the same structure of Postnuclear Aorist Participle, i.e.

οὐκ ἐφελέται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθῆς;

Not we will-escape, such having-neglected salvation.

Similarly:

Luke 9:25

τί γὰρ ὄφελεται ἄνθρωπος what for is-profiled person

κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθῆς;

having-gained the world whole self but having-lost or damaged?
i.e. “What advantage is it if one gains the whole world but loses or forfeits one’s very self?”

This is related to the MEANS statement “A person benefits by gaining the whole world” which in Greek could be ὄφελεται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον.

> CONCOMITANT ACT

Items in this category are often termed “attendant circumstance” but that name downplays the essential semantic relationship between this and the main verb, hence my term CONCOMITANT ACT. There is no doubt that occasionally the time reference of a Postnuclear Aorist Participle is apparently the same as that of the main verb. In these cases the two verbal events are not merely cotemporaneous, but either refer to the same event from a different point of view, i.e. a restatement, or refer to a specific event prototypical related to the main event, but not in a fixed sequential order. This differs from a Prenuclear Present Participle which simply states that the Participial event occurred at the same time as the main verb’s event, i.e. cotemporaneous, without any necessary semantic relationship. For example:

Acts 12:25

Βαρναβᾶς δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος ἐπέστρεφαν ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ.
Barnabas () and Saul returned to Jerusalem [SCENARIO TITLE]

ἐπιτέλεσας τὴν διακονίαν,

having-completed the ministry, [REASON]

κυριαρχοῦσας ἡμῶν πάντως Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον,

having-taken-along John the unnamed Mark, [CONCOMITANT ACT]

This might be translated, “So Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, since they had completed their aid mission, and they took John Mark back with them.” Alternatively, this might be viewed as MANNER, i.e. “So Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, since they had completed their aid mission, with John Mark as their companion on the journey.” This however seems to limit Mark’s role to the journey per se, rather than the purpose for which he was taken along.

A specific type of CONCOMITANT ACT is where two events are COMPLEMENTARY to each other, e.g.

Acts 21:1

ὅτι δὲ ἐγένετο διαχώρισα ἡμῶς ἀπορριμμάτως ἀπ’ αὐτῶν
When () it-occurred to-set-sail us having-separated from them
i.e. “When we had set sail and torn ourselves away from them”

Here going away necessarily involves leaving those who remain.
Another type of CONCOMITANT ACT is where events regularly occur in FIXED COLLOCATIONS IN COMPLEX SCENARIOS. In Greek, lexical items related to complex event scenarios, such as “sending”, frequently co-occur in the same grammatical and syntactic patterns. The scenario for “sending” includes a command to go somewhere, the giving of instructions to the travellers, and the travellers going. There is, however, no one set sequence of events. In real life, although the giving of instructions must precede the actual going, and often occurs after the command to go, the order of commanding and instructing is flexible, e.g. “Go and give this to Peter!” or “Give this to Peter. Off you go!”.

Such complex scenarios contain prototypically co-occurring events, but these do not fit the normal pattern of a script since there is no prototypical sequence of these events. Consequently the Aorist Participles used to encode events from these scenarios are not prenuclear (as for encoding script events) but postnuclear. Examples of such complex scenarios are given below.

Sending scenario

Mark uses conjoined main verbs to show the elements in a “sending” scenario, viz. summoning, sending, giving authority, commanding, giving specific instructions.

Mark 6:7-10
καὶ προσκαλέσας τοὺς δώδεκα
And he-summons the twelve
καὶ ἔφη κατὰ αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο
and he-began them to-send two two
καὶ ἔθεσαν αὐτοῖς ἑξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἁγίων,
and he-gave to-them authority of the spirits the unclean
καὶ παρατάξειν αὐτοῖς ὧν μηδὲν αἱρωσαν ἐξ ὀϑόν ...
and he-commanded them that not they-should-take for road ...
καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,
and he-was-saying to-them ...

Such complex scenarios as “sending” seem often to have the “instruction” element grammaticalized as a postnuclear Aorist Participle:

Matthew 10:5
Τούτους τοὺς δώδεκα ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς παραγγέλας αὐτοῖς λέγων ... These the twelve sent the Jesus having-commanded them saying ...
NIV “These twelve Jesus sent out with the following instructions:”
Compare Acts 23:30, where the command is to people other than those sent.
Contrast where the temporal order is marked, e.g.
Mark 6:27
καὶ εἶδος ἀποστέλλας ὁ βασιλεὺς στεκόμενος ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.
And having-sent them to Bethlehem he-said ...
NIV “He sent them to Bethlehem and said,”

This usage of Postnuclear Aorist Participles for instructions within the complex scenario “send” is also found in LXX as noted by Wilkins (1996), who quotes 2 Macc. 14:12-13 ἐξαπέστειλεν δοὺς ἐντολὰς and 2 Macc. 5:24 ἐπεμψεν ... προστάξας.

When a written message is involved in the “sending” scenario, the “writing” also occurs as a postnuclear Aorist Participle:
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Acts 15: 22-23
Τότε ἔδραγε τό πέμψαν του τὸν καλοῦμενον Βαρσαββᾶν καὶ Σιλᾶν,... Then it seemed good to send Judas the being-called Barsabbas and Silas,...

NIV “decided to ... Judas (called Barsabbas) and Silas... With them they sent the following letter...”

Acts 23: 23-25
Καὶ προσκαλεσμένος δύο τῶν ἑκατονταρχῶν ἔστηκεν,... And having-summoned two [certain] of the centurions he-said,...

NIV “Then he called two of his centurions and ordered them ... He wrote a letter as follows...”

This is a “sending” scenario, although there is no lexical item for send or for order. The scenario is opened by the lexical items call, say and write, as well as the content of what is said. This analysis is confirmed by κατὰ τὸ διαταγμένον “according to instructions” in verse 32.

There are other examples which seem to belong to a category of CONCOMITANT ACT. Concomitant acts do not have any specific temporal relationship to the main verb (indeed they may precede, follow, or be concurrent), but they are “viewed by the speaker as happening on the same occasion” since the events are part of a complex scenario, where the clustering of events, rather than the order of events is significant, e.g.

**Imprisoning scenario**

Acts 12:4
δι’ αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακήν, whom also having-beaten he-placed in prison

**Punishment scenario**

John 18:22:
εἶπεν μᾶχημα τῷ Ἱησοῦ εἰπών, ὡς ἀποκρίνεται τῷ ἄρχοντι;
gave slap to the Jesus having-said, Thus you-answer the highpriest

This example is extremely important when contrasted with uses of the Postnuclear Present Participle in similar situations. Ignoring the substantive uses of the Participle (John 5:12 Aorist, 4:10 Present), the only other occurrences in John of Masculine Singular Nominative Participles from λέγω are in the Present λέγων which occurs 7 times, each
time after a verb of speech in the Indicative (i.e. κράζω “shout” 1:15, 7:28, 7:37; ἀποκρύσω “answer” 1:26, 12:23; μαρτυρεῖ “witness” 1:32; λαλέω “speak” 8:12).

It is significant that here the Postnuclear Aorist Participle of “say” occurs with a non-speech main verb, which is seemingly unrelated. However, it is clear that the reason for the slap is contained in the speech, i.e. “I am slapping you because you spoke disrespectfully to the high priest.” So again CONCOMITANT ACT is not a “happenstance” coincidental action, but prototypically part of the main verb’s scenario, since people often verbalise the reasons for their actions (cf. Acts 7:39-40).

Decision and Command scenarios

Other complex clusters, related to scenarios of making decisions and issuing commands, are also grammaticalized as main verbs plus Postnuclear Aorist Participles showing CONCOMITANT ACTS, e.g.

Acts 22:24

ἐκέλευσεν ὁ χλαρχός εἰσάχθεθαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, ordered the commander to-be-led him into the fort

ἐπάτω μάστιξιν ἀνετάζεσθαι αὐτὸν ...

having-said with-scruties to-be-examined him

Acts 23:30

ἐπεμψάντω πρὸς σέ I-sent [him] to you

παραγενόμενος καὶ τοῖς κατηγοροῖς λέγειν [τὰ] πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ σοῦ. having-commanded also the accusers to-say [the] to-him before you.

Acts 23:35

Διακόσμων σου, ἔφη, ὅταν καὶ οἱ κατηγοροί σου παραγένωμαι. I-will-hear you, he-said, when also the accusers of-you arrive

κελεύεις ἐν τῷ πρατερίῳ τοῦ Ἡρῴου φιλάσεσθαι αὐτὸν. having-ordered in the praetorium of-the Herod to-be-guarded him

Acts 24:22-23

Ἀφείλατο δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Φίλαξ, Postponed.(.) them the Felix

ἀκριβοστερον ἔδωκεν τὰ περὶ τῆς ἀδικίας better having-known the[matters] concerning the way [REASON]

ἐπάτω ὅταν ... διαγνώσομαι τὰ καθ’ ὑμᾶς having-said When ..., I-will-determine the as-to you

διαταχεύμενος τῷ ἐκατοντάρχῃ ... having-commanded to-the centurion

In all these instances Postnuclear Aorist Participles are used to express statements or commands which accompany, and are inherently related to, the main verb, of commanding, saying, sending or postponing.

It is interesting that all the above examples of CONCOMITANT ACTS have as the subject someone with authority and include explicit or implicit commands. This may not be coincidental but relates to the fact that such people are able to perform multiple actions virtually simultaneously by commanding that things be done, without the need to actually perform the deeds themselves. Other scenarios where the agent has authority to command or establish events according to his will will have the same Postnuclear Aorist Participle structure for CONCOMITANT ACT:
Acts 10:24
ο δὲ Κορήλιος ἦν προσδοκών αὐτοῦ
The () Cornelius was awaiting them
συνκαλεσάμενος τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους.
having-summoned-together the relatives of-him and the intimate friends.

Acts 17:31
ἐν ἁφρίῳ ὁ Ἀρίστος, πίστιν παρασώπω ἔπαιν ... in man whom he-designated, guarantee having-offered to-all

> CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE

I use this term, rather than concomitant act, when the subject of the Participle is not
the semantic agent of both Participle and main verb. In most cases this is because the
Participle is in Genitive Absolute construction with a different agent from the main verb.
Occasionally, it is because the subject of the Participial event is not semantically agent, but
goal or patient. By “concomitant” I mean that such circumstances are not random
“happenstance” but represent prototypical relationships between the two events, due to
frequent co-occurrence, or special cultural significance, e.g.

Mark 12:21
καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ... ἀνέθανεν μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα.
And the second ... died not having-left seed

The action of leaving or not leaving a child is hardly a deliberate act on the part of the
person dying, so this cannot really be classed as a concomitant act. Rather, as translations
and parallel passages indicate, this Participle grammaticalizes the undesired circumstance
of a semantic patient, hence the analysis as concomitant circumstance. The significance for
Jews of having children, as shown by the Levirate system, explains why having
descendants, and hence childlessness, can be prototypical elements in the “die” scenario.

In my theory, CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE, along with CONCOMITANT
ACT, is a natural category for Postnuclear Aorist Participles since prototypical elements of
a scenario are based on experiential co-occurrence, and the only elements excluded from
being represented this way are those whose relationship to the scenario title (i.e. main
verb) in temporal sequence. This category includes many instances which are difficult to
classify otherwise, but as I say elsewhere, we should not expect all the prototypical co­
occurrents of real-life events to be reducable to a few fixed semantic relationships.

> RESTATEMENT

Restatement is not a common function of Postnuclear Aorist Participles. However,
Acts 27:33b, as already noted, is a clear example:
δοσιν διατελεῖτε μηθέν προσλαβόμενοι.
foodless you-continued nothing having-taken.
NIV “have gone without food - you haven’t eaten anything”

A possible example is in Mark 15:30, comparing it with Matthew 27:40 where the
second main verb seems to restate the first:
Mark 15:30
σῶσον σεαυτὸν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.
Save yourself having-descended from the cross.
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Matthew 27:40
σῶσον σεαυτόν...[καὶ] κατάβης ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.
Save yourself...[and] descend from the cross.

However Mark 15:30 may be better understood as MEANS “Save yourself by descending”, and Matthew 27:40 as perhaps Generic Specific “Save yourself! Come down!”

Another possible example of restatement is found in Mark 9:22:

οὐχ οὖν σπανωμεῖν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς.
Help us having-had-compassion on us.

Here again, this might be better understood as REASON (“For pity’s sake help us”) or CONDITION (“Help us, if you have compassion on us”), rather than restatement. Having compassion is more a prerequisite for helping rather than an identical action.

> RESTRICTIVE SETTING

There are only a few examples of Postnuclear Aorist Participles which seem to belong to a category of RESTRICTIVE SETTING, in as much as they are NOT concerned with time sequence of events in the narrative, but rather with defining the particular setting within which events took place, or restricting the reference to a single specific occasion.

The setting or occasion referred to is always Hearer-old, either Discourse-old or in the world knowledge of the audience, e.g.

RESTRICTIVE LOCATIONAL SETTING

John 4:54
Τούτῳ δὲ πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς
This () again second sign did the Jesus
ἐξ οὗ ἔκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐλήμβαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας.
having-come from the Judea into the Galilee.

“Then this is the second sign Jesus did, when he had come from Judea into Galilee”.

Here the stress seems to be on the place where the sign took place, not the fact that Jesus travelled before doing the miracle. This is shown by mention of the place in John 2:11 (the first miracle “in Cana of Galilee”), and then in John 4:43, 45, 47 (“Galilee”), 4:44 (“own native place”), and 4:46 (“Cana of Galilee”).

RESTRICTIVE TEMPORAL SETTING

2 Peter 2:5
καὶ ἀρχαῖον κόσμῳ οὐκ ἐφείσατο
And ancient world not he-spared

Alla δὲ γῆσον Ναὸς δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφωλαζεν but eighth Noah of-righteousness herald he-kept-safe
καταλυσάμεν κόσμῳ ἀρετοῖν ἐπάθαν.
cataklusamēn κόσμῳ ἀρετοῖν ἐπάθαν.

NIV “if he did not spare the ungodly world, when he brought the flood on its ungodly people, but protected Noah, a preacher of righteousness and seven others”

A Prenuclear Aorist Participle would mark a preceding item of a script, i.e. “he sent a flood and did not spare the ancient world...”
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John 21:14
τούτῳ ήθε τρίτων ἐφανερώθη ἤ' σως τοῖς μαθηταῖς
This now third[time] was-manifested Jesus to-the-disciples
ἐγερθένσε ἐκ νεκρῶν.
having-been-raised from dead
NIV “This was now the third time Jesus appeared to his disciples after he was raised from the dead.”

If the Aorist Participle were prenuclear, i.e. τούτῳ ήθε τρίτων ἐγερθένσε ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐφανερώθη ἤ' σως τοῖς μαθηταῖς, it would mean “This was the third time that Jesus rose from the dead and appeared to the disciples” since it would link the two events into a single script sequence. Here the setting is an event that occurred ONCE, but in that context, the main verb occurred several times.

Compare Matthew 26:42 which indicates that the whole script, including the events of both Prenuclear Aorist Participle and main verb, occurred a second time:
pάλν ἐκ δεύτερου ἀπελθὼν προσήκατο λέγων ...
again from second[time] having-gone-away he-prayed saying ...
NIV “He went away a second time and prayed…”

This repeats the events recorded in 26:39:
καὶ προσδόθων μικρῶν ἐπισέεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν προσευχόμενος καὶ λέγων ...
and having-gone-ahead little he-fell on face of-him praying and saying ...
NIV “Going a little farther, he fell with his face to the ground and prayed…”

RESTRICTIVE CIRCUMSTANTIAL SETTING
Acts 19:2
Εἴ τε σάρκα ἄγιον ἐλάβετε προσεύχατε:
If spirit holy you-received having-believed?
“Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you came to faith?”

The context of Acts 19:1-7 shows that the issue in question is whether these disciples have received the Holy Spirit or not. This supports the analysis of the Postnuclear Aorist Participle as circumstantial, questioning whether, in the specific circumstance of becoming believers, they received the Holy Spirit. In contrast, the Prenuclear Aorist Participle in Ephesians 1:13 marks a preceding event in a script of the main verb:

καὶ τον καὶ μισεύσατε ἐσφαγάθητε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἀγίῳ, “in whom you also believed and were sealed with the promised Holy Spirit”.

Acts 10:29
διὸ καὶ ἀναστηρήσας ἤλθον μεταπεμφθέοι
Therefore also unquestioningly I-came having-been-summoned.
“That is why I came without hesitation when I was summoned”

Here there is a complex contraexpectation set up. ἤλθον μεταπεμφθέοι would naturally be REASON, “I came because I was summoned” The fact that Peter was a Jew summoned by Gentiles sets up the expectation ὅτι ἤλθον μεταπεμφθέοι “I did not come, even though I was summoned” (i.e. CONCESSIVE). To this is added a special reason for Peter to come, which seems to make the meaning RESTRICTIVE SETTING.

Use of Postnuclear Aorist Participles for RESTRICTIVE SETTING is not surprising if we accept that they can refer to ANY semantic relationship in a single scenario between this event and the event of the main verb, with the exception of simple linear sequence (shown by prenuclear position).
> **AMPLIFICATION / SPECIFIC**

Some Postnuclear Aorist Participles are hard to categorize, although the meaning is clear, since they have more than one prototypical semantic relationship to the main verb, e.g.

Matthew 27:4

\[\text{\'H\mu\sigma\rho\rho\omicron\nuo } \text{παραδεχομαι \sigma\iota\mu\alpha \alpha\theta\omicron\nu.}\]

1-sinned having-betrayed blood innocent.

Here “betraying innocent blood” is a SPECIFIC type of sinning, but could also be seen as the MEANS by which the sin was accomplished. Hence NIV translates “I have sinned ... for I have betrayed innocent blood,” and TEV “I have sinned by betraying an innocent man to death.”

> **PARATACTIC?**

I include this category simply to dispute its existence. Wilkins (1996) labels certain participles “paratactic” because they are frequently translated paratactically in English, and states “The criteria for this category are that the participle assumes the mood of its governing verb, and, if the participle is aorist, it precedes its governing verb in time.” Similarly, Wallace (1996:641) uses the criterion of mood fluctuation to categorize the Participles in Matthew 2:13-14 below as “Attendant Circumstance”. I believe, however, they have failed to notice a generalization that Participles, unless they are predictable from the previous scenario and act as a time setting, ALWAYS assume the mood of the governing verb, whether they are Prenuclear or Postnuclear, Present or Aorist.

For example, Wilkins gives Mark 15:30 as an example of a “paratactic” participle where the mood of the Participle is affected by the mood of the main verb, translating it paratactically as “Save yourself and come down from the cross”. However the mood of the Participle varies according to the mood of the main verb simply because the semantic relationship between the events remains constant, e.g.

Mark 15:30 (Imperative)

\[\text{σωσων \sigma\epsilon\alpha\omicron\omicron\nuo \text{καταβας \acute{a}π\ddot{o} το\acute{u} \sigma\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\nu.}\]

Save yourself having-descended from the cross. [MEANS]

“Save yourself by coming down from the cross!”

Both events are Imperative: Save yourself! Come down!

cf. (Indicative)

\[\text{\epsilon\sigma\omega\omicron\omicron\nuo \sigma\epsilon\alpha\omicron\omicron\nuo \text{καταβας \acute{a}π\ddot{o} το\acute{u} \sigma\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\nu.}\]

You saved yourself having-descended from the cross. [MEANS]

“You saved yourself by coming down from the cross.”

Both events are past time: You saved yourself. You came down.

Regardless of whether Participles are Prenuclear or Postnuclear, Aorist or Present, the mood of the Participle varies according to the mood of the main verb simply because the semantic relationship between them is unchanged, e.g.

Matthew 2:13 (Imperative)

\[\text{\acute{e}γ\epsilon\rho\omicron\nuo \pi\alpha\delta\omicron\nuo \tau\omicd\omicdot \pi\nu \text{μ\mu\tau\omicron\epsilon\alpha\omicron\omicdot\s\omicnuo \acute{a}\sigma\omicdot\nuo \text{κα\acute{l} φε\epsilon\omicdot\nu\epsilon...}\]

having-risen take the child and the mother of-him and flee ... [PRECEDING EVENT]

“Get up, take the child and his mother and flee!”

All events are Imperative: Rise! Take! Flee!
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cf. Matthew 2:14 (Indicative)
δ ὁ δὲ ἐνεργοῦσα παρέλαβεν τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ ... καὶ ἀνεχώρησεν ...
he () having-risen took the child and the mother of-him ... and went-off ... [PRECEDING EVENT]
“He got up, took the child and his mother and went off!”
All events are past time: He rose. He took. He fled.

Matthew 10:7 (Imperative)
πορεύεσθε καὶ κηρύσσετε ἡγιάσμα, ἵνα ἐρμηνεύει τὴν βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.
travelling () announce saying that is-drawn-near the kingdom of-the heavens
“As you travel announce saying that the the kingdom of Heaven is near.” [SPECIFIC]
Both events are Imperative: Announce! Say!

cf. Matthew 8:29 (Indicative)
καὶ ᾿οι ἔρχεται λέγουσιν τί ἡμᾶς καὶ σοὶ ...
and behold they-shouted saying what to-us and to-you
“and behold they shouted saying: ‘What have you to do with us ...’ ” [SPECIFIC]
Both events are past time: They shouted. They said.

All the examples Wilkins gives of “paratactic” Participles taking the mood of the main verb can be explained simply by the prototypical semantic relationship between
Participle and main verb remaining the same, whatever the mood or tense of the main verb,
e.g.
MANNER:
James 5:14 “pray, anointing ...” [after Imperative]
Luke 20:10 “sent him away with a beating” [after Aorist Indicative]
Acts 19:29 “they rushed ... with Gaius and Aristarchus held firmly in tow” [after Aorist Indicative]
MEANS:
Mark 1:31 “he raised her by (grasping) the hand” [after Aorist Indicative]
Mark 15:17 “put on him a crown of thorns, by means of plaiting it” [after Present Indicative]
(otherwise there would have been no crown available)
Acts 7:45 “brought in the ark, by means of receiving it from our ancestors” [after Aorist Indicative]
REASON:
Phil. 2:19 “I may be happy because I know” [after Subjunctive]
Luke 11:8 “he will not give it him because he got up due to friendship” [after Future Indicative]
PRECEDING EVENT:
Mark 1:7 “I am not worthy to stoop and unie the thong of his sandals” [before Infinitive]

> OTHER?

By listing pragmatic meanings above I am not trying to delimit the usage of Postnuclear Aorist Participles, but rather to show their wide range of meanings. They can refer to ANY non-sequential semantic relationship within a single scenario, where the Participial referent is viewed as an Event (Perfective Aspect) rather than a Process.

6) Postnuclear Aorist Participle Genitive

= EVENT with different subject from main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

> MEANS

...σκότος ἔγενετο ἐδωδὲ πάντα τὴν γῆν ... τοῦ ὅλου ἐκλωτότοις.
... darkness occurred on all the land ... the sun having-failed
NIV “darkness came over the whole land ... for the sun stopped shining
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Here the Postnuclear GA is clearly the cause for the darkness. It may be analyzed as MEANS or possibly REASON.

> **REASON**

Mark 4:35  
Kal λέγει τοῖς ἀκούσας ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ  
And he-says to-them on that the day  
δύσας γενομένης, Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.  
evening having-become, Let-us-cross to the other-side  
NIV “That day when evening came...”

Had this GA been prenuclear, it would have indicated that the link between this and the previous text was the passing of time, i.e. “when evening had come”. Here the Postnuclear GA does not refer simply to time setting, which is already given by “on that day”, but includes a REASON relationship “since it was evening”.

Mark 16:2  
kal πρῶτον τῇ μέρα τῶν σαββάτων ἐγείρθη εἰς τὸ μυθήματον  
And very early on-the first[day] of-the week they-come to the tomb  
having-risen the sun.  
NIV “Very early on the first day of the week, just after sunrise...”

Had this GA been prenuclear, it would have indicated that the link between this and the previous text was the passing of time. Here the temporal link is made by “early in the morning”. Note that this GA does not refer only to time setting, but includes a REASON relationship. They could not travel far on the Sabbath, so because the sun had risen on the Sunday morning, they set out for the tomb. Hence NIV’s “just after sunrise”. Perhaps better “once the sun had risen”.

> **CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE**

1 Peter 3:22  
ὁς ἐστιν ἐν δεινῇ τοῦ θεοῦ πορευόμενος εἰς σώματαν  
Who is at right [of-the] god having-gone into heaven [MEANS]  
ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἄγγελων καὶ ἔξωφτων καὶ δυνάμεων.  
having-submitted to-him angels authorities and powers  
NIV “with angels authorities and powers in submission to him.”

Had this been prenuclear, it would have meant “When the angels ... had submitted to him...” This is similar to the category of CONCOMITANT ACT, although here, the agents of the concomitant act are different from the agent of the main verb.

> **RESTRICTIVE SETTING**

Acts 1:8  
ἄλλα μὴ ἐσμένει ἁγίασμι ἐπελέthroat τοῦ ἁγίου πνεῦματος ἐφ' ἑμᾶς  
But you will receive power having-come-upon the holy spirit on you  
NIV “But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you”

If the Aorist Participle were prenuclear it would indicate a preceding event in the script, and mean “(first) the Holy Spirit will come on you and (after that) you will receive power.” Here, by being postnuclear, the Genitive Absolute marks a non-temporal relationship. In the context of Acts 1:5, where the coming of the Holy Spirit is given a time frame “not many days hence”, and of Acts 1:6-7, where the issue of timing is again raised,
the relationship appears to be a RESTRICTIVE SETTING. What is being emphasized here, however, is not a relative temporal relationship between the two events ("first the Holy Spirit will come and after that you will receive power"), but the fact that power will only be received in a particular setting, on a specific occasion. The setting is "restricted" because of the underlying relationship of MEANS between Participle and main verb, Power cannot be received until the Holy Spirit comes because the Holy Spirit’s coming is the MEANS by which that power is received.

Acts 24:10
Ἀπεκρίθη τε ὁ Παύλος νεώσαντος αὐτῷ τῷ ἡγεμόνι λέγειν ... Answered and the Paul having-motioned to-him the governor to-speak ...
NIV “When the governor motioned for him to speak, Paul replied”
I analyse this as restrictive setting because what is in focus is not the time of Paul’s speaking as such but rather the occasion. There is a strong REASON relationship between the governor, giving permission and Paul speaking, and this provides the “restrictive setting” in which Paul may begin his speech. Although NIV’s “when” makes the time explicit, as readers we understand that in this context the lexically marked temporal relationship implies that permission has now been given.

See also Acts 24:20, 28:25 and Hebrews 8:9, where the Postnuclear Aorist Participle Genitive also marks the specific occasion when the main verb took place.

7) Postnuclear Present Participle Nominative
= PROCESS with same subject as main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

> MANNER
Matthew 27:39-40
Οἶον παραπετροεύοντες ἐθαρσίμως αὐτῶν κηρύγγετε τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες ... The () passers-by were-insulting him shaking the heads of-them and saying ...
Matthew 9:27
Ἰκολοθημαν [αὐτῷ] δύο τυφλοὶ κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες ... Followed [him] two blindmen shouting and saying ...
Matthew 9:29
τότε ἰψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν Then touched the eyes of-them
λέγω. Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γεννήθητω ὑμῖν. saying, According-to the faith of-you may-it-happen to-you.
At first glance the verbs touch and say seem unrelated, but the content of the speech act shows that they both belong in the “heal” scenario. The content of the speech act also shows the purpose of Jesus’s touching.
Matthew 11:18
Ἄλων γεὶ ἱδώνησε μὴτε ἐσθίων μὴτε πίνων ... Came for John neither eating nor drinking...
Note that “came” here is the title of the scenario for John’s ministry, not simply the event of coming. Thus the Participles refer to the manner of his ministry, i.e. his lifestyle.
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> MEANS
Acts 27:38
ἐκούσι οὖ τὸ πλοῖον ἔκβαλλόμενα τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.
NIV "they lightened the ship by throwing the grain into the sea."

After an Aorist main verb, it is common to have a Postnuclear Aorist Participle showing MEANS. The Present Participle is used here keeping the same Imperfective Aspect as the Imperfect main verb. The author's choice of Imperfective Aspect for both Participle and main verb suggests that the internal Process of the events is in focus. Within the open scenario of throwing grain into the sea, this choice of Imperfective Aspect suggests that this was not a single action but a Process involving reiteration of an action by many people, i.e. "they started the long drawn-out process of lightening the boat by throwing the grain overboard".

Luke 10:25
Καὶ λέγων νομικὸς τις ἀνέστη ἐξεπείραζε οὗ τὸν λέγων
And behold lawyer certain stood testing him saying

Here “saying” is best understood as the MEANS of “testing”, and it is grammaticalized as a Process, matching the Process of testing. The absence of καὶ between the Participles “testing” and “saying” shows they do not both belong in the same scenario slot, i.e.

stood testing PURPOSE AND RESULT of stood
saying MEANS of testing

Contrast Matthew 19:3 where the Participles are conjoined by καὶ:
Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι πελάτας αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, ...
And approached him Pharisees testing him and saying...

Here both Participles are in the same scenario slot, i.e.

approached testing PURPOSE AND RESULT of approached
and saying PURPOSE AND RESULT of approached

> PURPOSE

The use of Postnuclear Present Participles to express purpose with a verb of motion was argued by O'Rourke (1967) on the analogy of similar uses with the rare Future Participle (i.e. Acts 8:27, 22:5, 24:11 and Mark 27:49 as typical Postnuclear Future Participles, with Acts 24:17 where the Participle is prenuclear, and Hebrews 13:17 where the meaning is less certain). He cited as examples Matthew 20:20, 22:16, Luke 2:45, 10:25, Acts 14:21£, 15:27, 17:13, 18:23, 19:18, 21:16, pointing out that “In all of them the participle follows the verb”, e.g.

Matt. 20:20
Τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μητὴρ ... προσκυνοῦσα καὶ ἀποκτάν τις ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.
Then approached to-him the mother ... doing obeissance and beseeching something from him
NIV "Then the mother ... came to Jesus ... and, kneeling down, asked a favour of him."

On the basis of this, O'Rourke argues that the Present Participle in Romans 15:25 has the meaning of purpose, since the service, giving over aid money, could not begin until he arrived:
Now () I travel to Jerusalem serving the saints.
NIV “Now, however, I am on my way to Jerusalem in the service of the saints there.”

I agree with O’Rourke’s analysis, but wish to point out how this structure differs from a straightforward purpose clause. Regular purpose clauses with εἰς plus Infinitive or ἵνα plus Subjunctive do not necessarily imply that the purpose was fulfilled (e.g. 1 Thess. 3:5 “I sent to find out about your faith” where the actual finding out is reported separately in 3:6, Mark 14:55 and Matthew 12:10 where the purpose is thwarted). However, in narrative, when the main verb is a verb of motion in the Aorist (Perfective aspect), the Postnuclear Present Participle construction means that the event encoded as a participle was not only the PURPOSE, but also the incipient RESULT (see below). Thus Luke 2:45 (above) means “they set out in order to seek him, and they actually began seeking him.” This is often expressed in English as a purpose clause, with its (expected) fulfilment left implicit, e.g. “they set out to look for him”.

In the Gospels πειράζω occurs 9 times as a Present Participle (excluding the substantive). 7 of these are postnuclear and these all mark purpose, or purpose and result. Two are off the narrative storyline, being used as explanations showing purpose:

John 6:6
τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγεν πειράζων αὐτῶν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἤκει τί ἐμελλεν ποιεῖν.
This () he-was-saying testing him. He for knew what he-intended to do.

John 8:6
τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον πειράζοντες αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἔχωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτὸν.
This () they-were-saying testing him, in-order-that they-might-have to-accuse him.

Another 3 occur in the narrative backbone after a verb of speech, and these also show purpose:

Matthew 22:35
καὶ ἐπίρωτσαν εἰς ἀυτῶν [scribes] πειράζων αὐτῶν
And asked one from them [scribe] testing him

Mark 8:11
... ἔδειξαν σωτῆτες αὐτῷ,...
... They-began to-debate with-him

Mark 10:3
καὶ προσεδοκοῦσαν Φαρισαίοι ἐπίρωτον αὐτῶν... πειράζοντες αὐτῶν.
And having-approached Pharisees asked him ... testing him.

The last 2 occur after a verb of motion, and these two show purpose and result (see below).

> PURPOSE AND RESULT

Postnuclear Present Participles after a verb of motion are used to indicate not merely Purpose but Purpose and Result, e.g.

Luke 10:25
Καὶ ἵσων νομικὸς τὸς δικαστή ἐκπειράζον αὐτῶν λέγων... And behold scribe certain stood-up testing him saying

Here I analyse “testing” as PURPOSE AND RESULT, with “saying” as SPECIFIC, indicating the exact nature of the testing. The next verse begins ὅ δὲ ἔπειν πρὸς αὐτῶν
“He said to him” showing that the testing, made explicit in the speech, is understood not as merely a PURPOSE, but as actually occurring, i.e. a result.

If it is true that Present Participle after Aorist Indicative verb of motion in narrative means not simply Purpose, but Purpose and incipient Result, then Matthew 20:20 for example means not simply that Zebedee’s wife came to Jesus in order to ask something, but that she actually began bowing and asking a favour before Jesus spoke to her, e.g.

Matthew 20:20-21

Τότε προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ ... Then approached him the mother ...

bowing and asking for something from him δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ἦτο ἡμέρας He () said to her, What do you want?

Both the grammar and content of Jesus’s response support this view. Firstly Jesus’s speech is introduced by the “change of speaker” device of “articular pronoun ... together with the developmental conjunction δὲ” about which Levinsohn (1992:127) states: “This combination reflects the tight-knit nature of the exchange; the participants in the conversation remain the same, with the previous addressee becoming the new speaker, and vice versa” (bolding mine). Secondly Jesus asks “What do you wish?” which seems to imply that she has already stated that she wants something (cf. Matthew 20:32 after 31, Mark 10:51 after 48, and Luke 18:41 after 39 “have mercy”). Note also the repetition of τί. First she says she has a favour to ask, then Jesus asks “What is it you want?”

Acts 21:26-27 is another example of a Postnuclear Present Participle of a speech verb indicating the Purpose and Result of a verb of motion. The following “when” clause shows that the “announcing” is assumed to have occurred:

τότε ὁ Παῦλος ... εἶπεν εἰς τὸ ἔρημον Then the Paul ... entered into the temple διαγγέλλων τῷ ἔκπληκτῳ τῶν ἡμέρας τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ ... announcing the completion-time of the days of the purification ... "Τίς δὲ εἰμιλλὼν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας συντελεῖσθαι ... When () were about the seven days to be completed...

NIV “Then he went into the temple to give notice of the date when the days of purification would end...”

The Present Participle of a speech verb marking purpose and result may also occur after a verb indicating absence of motion, showing the reason for staying put, e.g.

Acts 18:11

Παῦλος ἐδήλωσεν δὲ ἐναυτῶν καὶ μήμας ἐς διδάσκοντον ... He-sat () one-year and months six teaching...

The Present Participle of “say” marking purpose and result occurs after verbs of sending, being a stereotypical way to grammaticalize a complex scenario, e.g.

Matthew 22:16

καὶ ἀποστέλλωσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν Ἰρθισιῶν λέγοντες, Διδάσκαλε, And they-send to him the disciples of him with the Herodians saying, Teacher

NIV “They sent their disciples to him ... they said”

Note that here, the addressee of “saying” is Jesus, not the people sent.

The Present Participle of “say” marking purpose and result, or successful purpose, is especially common after verbs of going, e.g.
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Mark 1:40
Kal ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπτὸν παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν [καὶ γονυπητῶν] καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ
And comes to him leper beseeching him [and kneeling] and saying to-him
NIV “A man with leprosy came to him and begged him on his knees...”

This pattern of Present Indicative plus Present Participle of “say” is frequently used to introduce a new major participant into the story, as above. Note that “leper” is anarthrous, as expected for the introduction of Discourse-new participants.

Black (1999:121) points out that Present Tense occurs 79 times in the past time narrative sections of Matthew’s Gospel, of which 59 (75%) are forms of λέγω, one of φημί (14:8), and 6 are non-speech verbs which occur in the Present Tense with the Present Participle of λέγω (8% of occurrences). Of these 6 occurrences, one (22:16 above) occurs with ἀποστέλλω as part of the complex scenario with “send”. The others all introduce new participants to the story:

Matthew 2:13b
Ἀναχωρήσαντων δὲ αὐτῶν
Having-gone () them

Matthew 2:19-20a
Τελευτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἡρῴδου
Having-died () the Herod

Matthew 3:1-2
Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέρας ἐκείναις
In () the days those

Matthew 15:1
Τότε προσέρχονται αὐτῷ ὁ μαθηταὶ Ιωάννου λέγοντες
Then come-to him the disciples of John saying

As shown above, when the main verb is one of motion the Postnuclear Present Participle of λέγω “say” indicates PURPOSE AND RESULT. This reflects the prototypical relationship between movement and speech within such a scenario, i.e. the purpose of the speaker’s movement is to orientate himself appropriately for the act of speaking. This prototypicality is reflected in both grammar and lexicon, since main verbs in the semantic domain of movement frequently collocate with Postnuclear Present Participles in the semantic domain of speech, e.g. (Present Participles underlined)

Ref. Main verb X-ing and saying
Matthew 19:3 approached testing and saying
Matthew 8:5-6 approached beseeching and saying
Matthew 17:14-15 approached kneeling and saying
Matthew 8:3, 9:18 knelt savine
Luke 5:8 fell at knees
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Matthew 26:39  fell  praying  and  saving
Matthew 1:20  appeared  saving
Matthew 2:1, 19  appears  saving
Matthew 2:1-2  arrived  saving
Matthew 28:9  met  saving
Matthew 3:1  arrives  announcing  and  saving
Mark 1:15  came  announcing  and  saving
(Mark 1:15 textual variant)
Matthew 9:27  followed  yelling  and  saving
Luke 4:41  came out  screaming  and  saving

This use of Postnuclear Present Participles for purpose and result with verbs of going or sending is totally in line with what I argue from scenario theory, since the scenarios for sending and going include prototypical purposes and results.

This use of the Postnuclear Present Participle of λεγω for PURPOSE AND RESULT helps explain otherwise confusing data from O'Donnell, comparing the actual occurrences of specific verbs in each verbal form with the expected occurrences based on New Testament averages (1997 Appendix):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>λεγω</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occ</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>occ</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-11.39</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-4.69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If, as O'Donnell was investigating, Aspect correlates with Aktionsart, then why is there a strong bias to Perfective Aspect with Indicatives, but an even stronger bias to Imperfective Aspect with Participles? I argue that Aktionsart is ONE of the factors affecting Aspectual choice. More significant is the role of the event in the scenario structures of the narrative or discourse. Most of the Indicatives of λεγω are in narrative, where the unmarked form for recounting backbone events is Aorist, being Past Tense and Perfective Aspect. However the Present Participle is frequently used, as shown above, as part of a complex scenario with a verb of motion representing PURPOSE AND RESULT, where Imperfective Aspect perhaps marks the Durative nature of the intention. Also it is frequently used (see SPECIFIC below) with other verbs of speech such as besought, replied, begged, criticized, where the Imperfective Aspect of λεγω marks simultaneousness with the main verb. Such uses explain the extremely high frequency of the Present Participle.

The textual variation with καὶ in Matthew 3:1-2 results in two different analyses:

1. παραγινέσθαι ίδον τούτον δ' ἐπητύπωσεν
2. εἰρήνευσαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Τουβαλάς
3. λέγων

Here announcing (2) is the purpose and result of arriving (1), and saying (3) is the manner (or specific) of announcing.
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1. 
2. 

Here announcing and saying (2) both fill the purpose and result slot of arriving (1).

Note that after a verb of motion the Present Participle, being Imperfective Aspect, may mark the incipience of a Process with a long duration, e.g. Matthew 3:2 above “John came and started announcing”. Compare Acts 15:41 “He went through Syria and Cilicia strengthening the churches” (cf. Acts 18:23). In contrast, where the Aorist Participle is used (e.g. Acts 25:13) the action of the Participle is achieved on the completion of the act of motion.

> REASON

A postnuclear participle of a verb of perception may be used to express REASON. We have seen above that only 2/75 nominative occurrences of the Aorist Participle of ἀκούω “hear” occur in postnuclear position, Acts 16:38 and Col. 1:4, both expressing REASON. Similarly, of 26 Present Participles of ἀκούω “hear” in the nominative, 14 are part of the noun phrase, 10 are Prenuclear and only 2 are Postnuclear, both expressing REASON, i.e.

Acts 9:7

οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοῖ,
the () men the travelling-with him stood speechless
ἀκούοντες μὲν τῷ φωnex ιδέαν ἔθεσαν
hearing () the sound/voice nobody () seeing.

They were speechless BECAUSE they could hear the sound but could see nobody.

Philem. 1:4, 5

Ἐὐχαριστῶ ... ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν, ...
I-give-thanks ... hearing of-you the love and the faith ...

Paul thanks God BECAUSE he hears of Philemon’s love and faith (Similarly Louw, 1982:122, re Philemon 4-7 “Then the reason, analyzed above, follows: ‘because I hear’)

The Present Participle denotes a Process (Imperfective Aspect). It appears that the writer chose to refer to these events as Processes, because the first clearly refers to action cotemporaneous with the main verb, and the second suggests action which was repeated, i.e. iterative Aktionsart.

> CONCESSIVE

I have found no clear instances where a Postnuclear Present Participle has a concessive force with respect to the main verb. However there are some such Participles which have concessive sense in relationship to other Participles. These are marked by a concessive or contraexpectation particle, e.g.

Acts 9:7

οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοῖ,
the () men the travelling-with him stood speechless
ἀκούοντες μὲν τῷ φωnex ιδέαν ἔθεσαν
hearing () the sound/voice nobody () seeing.

NIV “... they heard the sound, but did not see anyone.”

The explicit contraexpectation is marked between the two participles.

Compare the following Present Participles, apparently modifying the implicit Noun Phrase “we”, where the last is marked concessive and refers to “I”. 
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Philippians 3:4
ήμερος γάρ ἐσμέν ἢ περιτομή,
We for are the circumcision
οἱ πνεύματα δέ σου ἀπεσταλμένοι εἰς Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
the [ones] by-spirit of God serving and boasting in Christ Jesus
καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποίηται,
and not in flesh having-trusted
καὶ τεκέν ἐγὼ ἐξουσίαν πεποίησαν καὶ ἐν σαρκί.
although I having confidence also in flesh.

Compare also Postnuclear Present Participle Accusative in apposition to “God” (Acts 17:27), and Postnuclear Perfect Participle Accusative in apposition to “their brothers” (Hebrews 7:5).

> AMPLIFICATION / SPECIFIC

There are several instances where a Postnuclear Present Participle is used to amplify the meaning of the main verb, by making one or more cotemporaneous actions explicit.

Often we find the verb ἀποστέλλω “send” followed by the Present Participle of λέγω “say” and the specific content of what was said by the sender to the sent, e.g.

Matthew 10:5
τοῖς τούτος ἐβασκά ἀπεστείλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς παραγγέλλας αὐτῶς λέγων ... These the twelve sent the Jesus having-commanded them saying ...
NIV “These twelve Jesus sent out with the following instructions:”

Matthew 21:1-2
τότε Ἰησοῦς ἀπεστείλεν δόθο μαθητὰς λέγων αὐτῶς ... Then Jesus sent two disciples saying to them,”
NIV “Jesus sent two disciples saying to them,”

Contrast where the temporal order is marked, e.g.

Matthew 2:8
καὶ πέμψας αὐτῶς εἰς Βηθλεὲμ ἐπένευ ... And having-sent them to Bethlehem he-said ...
NIV “He sent them to Bethlehem and said,”

Very frequently this SPECIFIC use involves a main verb denoting a particular type of speech act, or mental activity, followed by the Present Participle of λέγω "say" and the specific content of what was said, or thought. The Participle and content of the speech/thought clearly refer to a specific item from the prototypical scenario of the main verb, e.g. (Present Participles underlined)

Ref. Verb Ἐ-ing and saying
Matthew 3:14 forbad saying
Matthew 5:2 taught saying
Matthew 9:30 admonished saying
Matthew 13:3 spoke saying
Matthew 13:24 put forward (parable) saying
Matthew 14:30 yelled saying
Matthew 16:13 questioned saying
Matthew 17:9 instructed saying
Matthew 17:25 spoke first saying
Matthew 22:43 call saying
Matthew 26:42 prayed saying
Matthew 26:70 denied saying
Matthew 27:46 cried out saying
Mark 1:7 announced saying
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Mark 5:23 besought  **saving**
Mark 15:29 insulted  **nothing and saving**
Luke 1:63 wrote  **saving**
Luke 1:67 prophesied  **saving**
Luke 3:16 answered  **saving**
Luke 4:35 rebuked  **saving**
Luke 4:36 conversed  **saving**
Luke 5:12 begged  **saving**
Luke 5:30 grumbled  **saving**
Luke 8:38 dismissed  **saving**
John 1:32 witnessed  **saving**
Luke 5:21 to reason  **saving**
Luke 12:17 reasoned in himself  **saving**
Luke 5:26 filled with awe  **saving**
Luke 7:39 said in himself (thought)  **saving**

This generic-specific pattern is found with other verbs also, e.g.

1 Peter 5:12b
εγραφα παρακαλων και επιμαθυνον ταστιν ελαι αληθη χαριν τον θεου εις ην στητε.
I-wrote encouraging and witnessing this to-be true grace of-the god in which you-stand

> CONCOMITANT ACT

A Postnuclear Present Participle can be used for a simultaneous CONCOMITANT ACT, i.e. an act that is related to the main verb and performed simultaneously. (In contrast, a Postnuclear Aorist Participle for a CONCOMITANT ACT indicates that the actions are not simultaneous, but are performed on the same occasion and the order is not significant.)

Due to the practical difficulty of doing two things simultaneously, it is hardly surprizing that typically the main verb is a physical action, and the Participle a speech act, both expressing the same attitude, intention, or emotion, e.g.

Matthew 18:28
και κρατιασα αυτων ἐπειδηεν λέγειν, Ἀπόδος ει τι αφειλεις.
And having-seized him throttled saying, Repay if anything you-owe.

Mark 15:36b
ἐπέτιζεν αυτών λέγειν, "Αφετε ιδωμεν ει ἔρχεται Ἡλίας καθελευν αυτων.
gave-to-drink him saying, Leave, let-us-see if comes Elijah to-take-down him.

Luke 5:13
ἐπάθαν αυτον λέγον Θελω, καθρεφτητη
he-touched him saying, I-will, be-cleansed.
Touching is a prototypical means of healing

This usage differs from MANNER, since speaking is not strictly a manner of performing the action of throttling, giving drink, or touching.

Symbolic actions often occur as main verbs in this CONCOMITANT ACTION structure, e.g.

Matthew 26:65
τότε ὁ ἀρχιερευς διέφρησεν τα λαμπα αυτον λεγον, Ἐβλασφημησεν.
Then the high-priest tore the clothes of-him saying, He-blasphemed.
Here tearing robes indicates grief not accident, or madness. (Contrast Mark 14:63 where only linear order is marked by Prenuclear Aorist Participle and Aorist Indicative.)

Matthew 27:24
ἀπειρφα ης χειρας ἀπεναιν τος δχλω λεγον, Ἀθοδος ειμι ἀπο το τοιμας τουτον.
washed the hands before the crowd saying, Guiltless I-am from the blood of-this.
Here washing the hands symbolizes innocence, rather than effects cleansing.
With symbolic actions in this structure, the Postnuclear Present Participle in Greek indicates that the speech act belongs in the same scenario as the action, and has a non-temporal semantic relationship to the main verb (marked by Postnuclear position), as well as typically being simultaneous (hence Imperfective Aspect). However, the specific relationship between main verb and Participle depends on the cultural significance of the symbolic act. Since scenarios are culture-specific, the symbolic significance may need to be made explicit in translation, e.g. “Pilate washed his hands in front of the crowd, as a symbol of his innocence in the matter, and said...”

> RESTRICTIVE SETTING

The Postnuclear Present Participle may express a situation restricting the time, place or circumstance of the main verb, e.g.

John 3:4b

Πῶς δύονται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν κόσμον λῆμναν γέρων ὅπως;

How can person be-born old being?

i.e. “How can someone be born when they are old?” This seems to imply a remote possibility that if it were a baby there might be a chance of pushing it back into the womb (cf. 3:4c).

8) Postnuclear Present Participle Genitive

= PROCESS with different subject from main verb, related non-temporally to main verb

> CONCOMITANT CIRCUMSTANCE

This is sometimes known as attendant circumstance. However the circumstance expressed by a Postnuclear Present Participle in the Genitive Absolute must be prototypically related to the main verb, not simply a circumstance which happens to exist. Concomitant circumstance is NOT a reason for the action of the main verb, e.g.

Acts 27:2

Having-boarded () ship Andramyttian going to-sail to the along the Asia places

we set-sail being with us Aristarchus Macedonian of-Thessalonica.

The implicit reason for sailing is the destination of the boat, not the presence or absence of Aristarchus. The Present Participle, being Imperfective Aspect, presents Aristarchus’ presence as a Process not an Event, since he was with them all the time they were sailing, not simply at the time of their departure. In contrast, the far more frequent Prenuclear Genitive Absolute, being placed before the main verb, implies that the Participle’s event is either a time setting for the main verb, or has some significance as regards the behaviour of the main verb’s subject, i.e. implicit reason.

Compare the Postnuclear Perfect Participle in Genitive Absolute construction, which also implies neither time setting nor reason:

Acts 5:2

καὶ εὔνοοσίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, συνελθὼν καὶ τῆς γυνακὸς

and appropriated from the price, having-realized also the wife

NIV “With his wife’s full knowledge he kept back part of the money for himself.”
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Independent Participial Clauses

If prenuclear and postnuclear Participles are part of the main verb’s scenario, what of seemingly independent Participles used with imperatival meaning? Do they exist in the New Testament, and do they have their background in Hellenistic Greek or in Hebrew?

Barrett argues that so-called examples in Hellenistic writings are frequently either dependent on main verbs, or due to anacoluthon, or depend on an implicit Imperative verb (e.g. Polycarp Ep. ad Phil., 4-6). In summary he states (1947/8:166)

The construction in question can be produced at best in a few Greek papyrus letters, which are certainly exceptional; but in the Mishnah it is regular.

We have seen above that nominative Participles which are part of the scenario of a main verb in the Imperative are to be understood as imperatives. (This would exclude Participles which encode Discourse-old material and refer back to a previous main verb.) Is it possible that so-called “independent Participles” agree in mood with an implicit Imperative verb, in the same way that they agree in case, number and gender with a subject which is frequently left implicit? My hypothesis is that such Participles are explained by an implicit imperative “you be!”.

The most extended list of so-called independent Participles is in Romans 12:9-19. However, there is an implicit “let it be” in 12:9 ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος “(Let) love (be) unfeigned” which heads this list of Imperatives. Moreover, there is an implicit “let it be performed” or “let him perform it” in all the clauses from 12:6-12:8. Even in the list of Participles following there are some adjectives, which surely presuppose an implicit Imperative “you be!”. This I believe supports the hypothesis that such “Imperatival Participles” are either Postnuclear to an explicit main verb (in a SPECIFIC relationship), or presuppose an implicit Imperative of the verb to be, e.g. 12:10b-13 (Present Participles underlined, adjectives bold italic):

It can be seen above that not only does an adjective parallel a Participle in clauses 3 and 4 (both with “one another”), but clause 5 has an adjective with the negative μὴ (rather than οὐ) clearly indicating an implicit verb (cf. 1 Timothy 3:6, 8 and 11 where μὴ precedes accusative adjectives after the explicit “should be” in 3:2, and similarly Titus 1:7).

Compare the lists in Philippians 1:27b-28:

and 2:2-4:
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Reed says of these (1997:350):
the series of participles (2.2c, e, 3b, 4a), verbless clauses (2.2d, 3a, 4b) and subjunctive (2.2b) which are
all initiated with the particle ἵνα and all arise from the imperative πληρῶσατε in 2.2a, are also probably
best treated functionally as commands, albeit made in a circuitous manner. So also the participles in
1.27g, 28 after the imperative στήσετε similarly function as commands.
I analyse these as Postnuclear Participles. In both cases, there is some doubt as to whether
the Participles relate to the first or second main verb. If the first, they refer to the
MANNER of achieving the main verb, and take their Imperatival force from the mood of
the preceding main verb, since the main verb marks the tense/mood of the whole scenario.
If the second, they are probably best regarded as referring to SPECIFIC items from the
scenario of the generic main verb.
Appendix K
Texts showing the link between the article and information status

This appendix provides textual evidence that the Greek article is used for referring to Hearer-old information, as described in Chapter 6 “The article is used for all Hearer-old referents”.

A short text which shows the link between the article and Hearer-old status is Luke 8:26-39 (first mention bold, arthrous underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Noun phrase</th>
<th>Information status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>τὴν γῆν</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (Gerasenes 8:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν Γερασινῶν</td>
<td>2b KNOWN unused (whole world scenario)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν Γαλαταίων</td>
<td>3c GIVEN textual-displaced (Galilee 5:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27</td>
<td>τὴν γῆν</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (lake 8:22, get out 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αὐτῷ</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν πόλεως</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (region 8:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δαμάσκιν</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ἰμάττον</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἶκα</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν μηχανῶν</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (region 8:26, town 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:28</td>
<td>τῶν Ἰησοῦ</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (him 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:29</td>
<td>τὸ πνεύματι τῶν ἀκαθάρτων</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (demons 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦ αὐθόραπου</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἄλογον καὶ πέδαις</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τὰς δεσμὰς</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (chains etc. 8:29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦ δαμουλίου</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (demons 8:27, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν ἑρήμων</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (region 8:26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K - Texts showing the link between the article and information status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>δ 'Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (Jesus 8:28)</td>
<td>1 NEW (or 2b KNOWN inferrable (man 8:27) +salient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δινόμα</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 NEW (not simply the demons 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δεινών,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δαιμόνια πολλά</td>
<td></td>
<td>2b KNOWN unused (whole world scenario)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:31</td>
<td>τίνι δύσιν</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (region 8:26, lake 8:22)</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (demons 8:27, 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 8:27, 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τούς χορῶν</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (pigs 8:32)</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (mountain 8:23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἡ ἄγελα</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (herd 8:32)</td>
<td>3c GIVEN textual-displaced (lake 8:22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦ κρημνοῦ</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (herd 8:32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τίνι Λίμνην</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (herd 8:32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:34</td>
<td>ο λόμοιτες</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (8:32)</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (8:28-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>το γεγονός</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (town 8:27)</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (town 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τίνι πόλιν</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (region 8:26, town 8:34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοίς ἄγροις</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (8:28, 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>το γεγονός</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (8:34)</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (Jesus 8:28, 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τον Ἰησοῦν</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 8:27, 29, 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τον ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (demons 8:27, 30, 32)</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (Jesus 8:35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τα δαιμόνια</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (Jesus 8:28, 30, 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοις πόλεσ</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (Jesus 8:26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τον Ἰησοῦν</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (8:28, 30, 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:36</td>
<td>ο λόμοιτες</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (8:26, town 8:34)</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (8:28, 30, 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο δαιμονοθείς</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 8:27, 29, 32, 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:37</td>
<td>το πλῆθος</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (neighbourhood 8:37)</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (8:26, town 8:34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τίς περιχώρος</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (Gerasenes 8:26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν Γερασημῶν</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>φόβου μεγάλω</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πλῆθον</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:38</td>
<td>ο ἄγνη</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 8:27, 29, 32, 35, demonized 36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τα δαιμόνια</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (demons 8:27, 30, 32, 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:39</td>
<td>τον ὅλον σου</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (you 8:39)</td>
<td>2b KNOWN unused (whole world scenario)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο θέος</td>
<td>2b KNOWN unused (whole world scenario)</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (town 8:34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τίνι πόλιν</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (Jesus 8:28, 30, 35 x2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (Jesus 8:28, 30, 35 x2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the correlation between Discourse-new items (bolded), use of the article (underlined), and information status:

a) NEW information is bolded but not underlined, being Discourse-new, but anarthrous. Lack of the article marks NEW information as salient, since it is Hearer-new.

b) KNOWN information is bolded and underlined, being Discourse-new and arthrous. Use of the article means KNOWN information is not marked salient, since it is predictable from open scenarios.

c) GIVEN information is not bolded, but is underlined, being Discourse-old and arthrous. Use of the article means GIVEN information is not marked salient. (3a GIVEN situational
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is not strictly Discourse-old as it is not part of the discourse’s co-text. However it is part of the discourse’s real life context, and so treated as in the hearer’s consciousness).

Note also that the author has the choice of presenting information as NEW, KNOWN or GIVEN. Thus, assuming that πλοῖον in 8:37 refers to the same boat as in 8:22, which seems likely, the author could have chosen the articular form to mark 3c GIVEN textual-displaced. Presumably the author was not focussing on the identity of this particular boat, and thus chose to present it as NEW.

Note also that KNOWN and GIVEN information may be marked salient by the omission of the article. This will be discussed below.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Noun phrase</th>
<th>Information status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>Ἀνθρωπός</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δεῖπνον μέγα</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πολλοίς</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (him 14:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῇ ὁρᾷ</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (feast 14:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦ δείπνου</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (feast 14:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοῖς κεκλημένοις</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (many 14:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>ὁ πρῶτος</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (invitees 14:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ἀγρόν</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἀνάγκην</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>ἔτερος</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ζεύγη βασιῶν</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>ἔτερος</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Γνωάκα</td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>ὁ δοῦλος</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (slave 14:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῷ κυρίῳ</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 14:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 14:16, lord 14:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῷ δοῦλῳ</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (slave 14:17, 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν πλατειῶν καὶ ῥώμας</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (town 14:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῆς πόλεως</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (man, big feast 14:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν πτωχῶν καὶ ἀναπτέρους καὶ τυφλῶν καὶ νωλῶν</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (town 14:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>ὁ δοῦλος</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (slave 14:17, 21 x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Κύριε</td>
<td>3a GIVEN situational (lord 14:21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>tόπος</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.23 ο̣ κύριος</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (man 14:16, 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τον̣ δολίον</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (slave 14:17, 21 x2, 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τας̣ δομας̣ κα̣λ̣ φραγμό̣ς̣</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (town 14:21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο̣ ι̣κος̣</td>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable (man 14:16, 21, houseowner 14:21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.24 τω̣ν̣ δυσχα̣ων̣</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (invitees 14:17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τον̣ δείπνου</td>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current (feast 14:16, 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the vocative in 14:22 is salient, as are nearly all vocatives, referring to GIVEN entities which are highly focal for interpersonal reasons.

The above examples show the normal usage of the article, that is marking what the writer supposes to be Hearer-old information, i.e. information either in the text itself or recoverable from scenarios shared by the writer and his audience.
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This appendix provides textual evidence that anarthrous nouns are used in Greek to mark Hearer-old items as salient, as described in Chapter 6 “Lack of the article with Hearer-old items marks salience”.

The tendency for initial references (Discourse-new) to be anarthrous and subsequent references (Discourse-old) to be arthrous can be seen clearly in the sections from Acts which show Paul’s travels on his missionary journeys and name places. Exceptions to this rule will be discussed in terms of Hearer-old information status, and salience (prepositions and place names are underlined, names of regions and provinces are bolded, and the article is bolded):

FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY

13.4  Αὐτῷ μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγγελου πνεύματος
They () therefore having-been-sent-out by the holy spirit
κατάβαλον ἑστὶ Σελευκείαν, ἐκεῖθεν τε ἀπέπεμψαν ἑλς Κύπρον.
went-down to Seleucia, thence and sailed-off to Cyprus.
13.5  καὶ γενέμενον ἐν Σαλαμῖν κατήγγελον ...
And having-arrived in Salamis they announced ...
13.6  διελθόντες δὲ ἐκεῖν ἡν ῥήσον ἄνω Πάφου ἐφόρον ἄνδρα τινά ...  Having-crossed () all the island up-to Paphos they-found man certain ...
13.13 Ἀναρχέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου
Having-sailed () from the Paphos
οἱ περὶ Παῦλου ἤθεν εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας:
the around Paul went to Perga of-the Pamphylia
13.50 ... ἔξεβαλον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ὄρων αὐτῶν.
... they expelled them from the borders of-them.
13.51 ὄλας δὲ ἐκτιμάζοντο τῶν κοινών τῶν ποιῶν ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς ἠθέν ἐλς Ἰκώνιον. ...
They () having-shaken the dust of-the feet on them went to Iconium...
14.5  ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ὁ ρηθή τῶν ἐνθύσεων τοιαῦτα ὅτι Ἰουδαίων ...
When () occurred plot of-the nations also and Jews...
14.6  συνελθόντες κατέβαλγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Ἀχαΐας
Having-found-out they-fled to the towns of-the Lycania
14.8  καὶ τῶν ἄνω ἄθρων ἐν Ἀστράκας ...
And certain man impotent in Lystra ...
14.20 ... καὶ τῇ ἐπαύρων ἐξέβαλαν σὺν τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ εἰς Δέρβην. ...
... And the next-day he-left with the Barnabas to Derbe...
14.21  Ἐκαγγελισάμενοι τῇ πόλιν ἐκείνην καὶ συνετέλεσαν ἰκανοῖς
Having-evangelized also the town that and having discipled several ...
14.24  καὶ διελθόντες τῇ Πισίδιᾳ ἠθέν ἐν τῇ Παμφυλίᾳ
And having-crossed the Pisidia went to the Pamphylia
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14.25 καὶ ἀλαθεύσατε ἐν Πέργη τοῦ λόγου κατέβησαν εἰς Ἀττάλειαν
And having-told in Perga the word they-went-down to Attalia

14.26 καὶ κατέβησαν ἀπέλευσαν εἰς Ἀρτάκελειαν...
And-thence they sailed-off to Antioch ...

Summary

There are 24 references to places, 22 being proper nouns. If the place has been previously mentioned in the immediate discourse, that reference is in brackets.

Occurrences are sorted according to prepositions and case:

To, in, and accusative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Place Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>εἰς Σελέουςειαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>εἰς Κίπρων,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>ἐν Σαλαμῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>ἀχρὶ Πάφου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>εἰς Ἀρτάκελειαν τῆν Παισίλιαν..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>εἰς Ίκώνον, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>λύστραν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Δέρβην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>εἰς Βασσαλεῖαν (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>εἰς Δέρβην (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>τῆν πόλιν ἐκείνην (14.20) (evangelizing that town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>εἰς τῆν λύστραν (14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>εἰς Ίκώνον (13.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>εἰς Ἀρτάκελειαν (13.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>τῆν Παισίλιαν (13.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν Παμφυλίαν (13.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν Περγήν (13.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>εἰς Ἀρτάκελειαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>εἰς Ἀρτάκελειαν (13.1 ἐν Ἀρτάκελεια)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Place Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης (13.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are only two occurrences of ἀπὸ. Both are followed by a proper noun with the article, and both occur when the proper noun has already been introduced (without the article). Thus these places are regarded as Hearer-old and non-salient.

There are only three other occurrences of reference to a town with the article:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Place Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>τῆν πόλιν ἐκείνην (Δέρβην 14.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν λύστραν (14.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first occurrence (Acts 14:6) refers to unnamed towns, which are Discourse-new but presented as Hearer-old. These are the towns of Lycaonia, which are Hearer-old because everyone knows that regions have towns in them, i.e. the scenario for Lycaonia, by virtue of being known as a region, has slots in it for “towns”. Two specific towns falling into this category, Lystra and Derbe, are introduced immediately after this generic phrase as Discourse-new (no article). The other two occurrences, refer back to a Discourse-old proper noun, which has been recently mentioned.
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There are 4 occurrences of a proper noun, which is Discourse-old, but without an article. Two occurrences (Acts 14:8, 20) are used when the narrative action moves to towns which have already been mentioned (Acts 14:6). These towns then are “salient” as the place where current narrative occurs.

14.8 ἐν Λύστρα (14.6)
14.20 ἐς Δέρβην (14.6)

Two other occurrences (Acts 14:21) come in a list of three towns, all of which have already been mentioned, as below. Since all three towns have been previously visited and are all being revisited on the return journey, why should the first be arthrous, and the latter two not?

14.21 ἐς τὴν Λύστρα (14.8) (14.19 the town)
14.21 ἐς Ἱκώμιον (13.51, 14.19 Jews came from ...)
14.21 ἐς Ἀντιόχεια (13.14, 14.19 Jews came from ...)

The answer seems to be that Lystra, being the last town visited before the current town Derbe, is still as it were “in the wings” of the stage, being Discourse-recent and presumably in short term memory, so can be referred back to by the Hearer-old marker. In contrast Iconium and Antioch although Discourse-old are not Discourse-recent as places where Paul has been. To reintroduce them to the discourse, they are marked “salient” as if this were a first reference.

There are 5 proper nouns referring to regions or provinces, as opposed to towns or islands. All 5 occurrences of these take the article, regardless of whether they are direct object, after ἐς or part of the Noun Phrase.

13.13 ἐς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας
13.14 ἐς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίαν...
14.6 ἐς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαωνίας
14.24 τῆς Πισιδίαν
14.24 ἐς τὴν Παμφυλίαν

These data support the hypotheses that arthrous nouns refer to Hearer-old items and anarthrous nouns for Hearer-old items mark them as salient.

Regions or provinces are typically arthrous, whether or not they are Discourse-new or Discourse-old, since they are assumed to be Hearer-old, i.e. places the audience has heard of before, and are not being regarded as “salient” (e.g. Pamphylia, Acts 14:24).

In contrast towns and islands, although Hearer-old, are typically anarthrous when they are being approached or something happens in them, marking them as salient or significant in that section of text (e.g. Perga, Acts 13:13). However, when they are being left they typically have the article, since they are now Discourse-old and are no longer regarded as salient (e.g. Perga, Acts 13:14). When Discourse-old towns have gone out of narrative focus and are reintroduced, then the Discourse-new “salience” marking is used (e.g. Iconium, Acts 14:21)
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COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM

15.2 ... ἔταξαν ἀναβαλλεῖν Παύλου καὶ Βαρνάβαν ... εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ ...
... they-appointed to-go-up Paul and Barnabas ... to Jerusalem ...

15.3 Οἱ μὲν οὖν προσεξῆθεντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας
They () therefore having-been-sent by the church
dιήρξαν τὴν τῇ Φοινίκῃ καὶ Σαμαρίαν ἐκπερηγοῦμενοι ...
were-going-through the both Phoenicia and Samaria describing...

15.4 παραγενόμενοι δὲ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ παρεξήγησαν ... ἀνήγγειλαν ...
Having-arrived () to Jerusalem they-were-received ... they-reported ...

15.22 Τότε ἔδωκε ... πέμψας εἰς Ἰούστιοχείαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ, ...
Then seemed-good ... to-send to Antioch with the Paul and Barnabas ...

15.30 Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολύμενοι κατῆλθον εἰς Ἰούστιοχείαν ...
They () therefore having-been-dismissed went-down to Antioch ...

summary
towns
15.2 εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (13.13)
15.4 εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (15:2)
15.22 εἰς Ἰούστιοχείαν (14:26)
15.30 εἰς Ἰούστιοχείαν (15:22)

regions and provinces
15.3 τὴν τῇ Φοινίκῃ καὶ Σαμαρίαν (Phoenicia 11.19, Samaria 1.8, 8.1, 9.31)
Again in this section we have four occurrences of εἰς with town names. They are
Discourse-old, but pericope-new (3c GIVEN textual-displaced) in 15:2 and 15:22, and
Discourse-old and pericope-old (3b GIVEN textual-current) in 15:4 and 15:30. In all cases
these are anarthrous, being “salient” either as pericope-new items, or locations of
significant narrative events.

Again we have Discourse-old but pericope-new reference (3c GIVEN textual-
displaced) to regions, Phoenicia and Samaria, which are conjoined with a single article.
They are thus presented as a single geographical region, which is Hearer-old (part of long-
term memory, i.e. general world knowledge and long-term discourse memory). They are
not presented as “salient”.

SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY

15.39 ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμὸς
Occurred () sharp-contention
ὡσεὶ ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοῖς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων,
so-that to-be-separated them from one-another
τὸν τῇ Βαρνάβᾳ παραλαβὸν τῶν Μάρκον ἐκπελάσαν εἰς Κύπρον,
the and Barnabas having-taken the Mark to-sail-out to Cyprus.

15.40 Παῦλος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος Σίλαν ἐξήλθεν
Paul () having-chosen Silas left
παραδόθη τῇ χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν,
having-been-commended in the-grace of the lord by the brothers.
15.41 διήρξεν δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ τὴν Κιλίκιαν ἐπιστρέψαν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν,
Having-crossed () the Syria and (the) Cilicia strengthening the churches.
16.1 Καθήγησαν δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἀδημον καὶ εἰς Ἀντιοχινα...
He-came-down () also to Derbe and to Lystra,...

16.6 Διήρξαν δὲ τὴν Φοινίκιν καὶ Παλαιτίνην γύρων.
They-crossed () the Phrygia and Galatian country
καλυβεύουσα ὑπὸ τῶν ἄγνων πνεύματος καλύτερα τῶν λόγων ἐν τῇ Ἁσίᾳ
having-been-blocked by the holy spirit to-speak the word in the Asia.
16.7 ἐξῆλθαν δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυκηναν ἐπιερατοὺς εἰς τὴν Βασιλείαν πορευθήμενοι,
Having-come () near the Mysia they-were-trying in the Bithynia to-go
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καὶ οὖν ἔλαυεν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦς καὶ αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἐδόθη πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦς καὶ αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦς καὶ αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἐδόθη πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦς καὶ αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦς καὶ αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἐδόθη πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦς καὶ αὐτοῖς.

16.8 παρεκλήθησες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν κατέβησαν εἰς Τροᾶν. ...

16.9 καὶ δραμα διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε.

... καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε.

... καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε, καὶ νυκτὸς τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀφῆνε.

16.10 ὅτε δὲ τῷ δραμα εἶδεν, εὐθὺς ἐξετάσασαν ἐξελθέαν εἷς Μακεδονίαν. ...

When () the vision he-saw, straightway we-sought to-leave to Macedonia σαββάτους δι τοπο Παύλου τινής εύηθες καὶ παρακαλοῦν αὐτῶν καὶ λέγων, concluding that has-called us the god to-evangelize them. 16.11 Αποφθέγματα δὲ απὸ Τροᾶν εὐθυρομισθάμεν εἷς Σαμοθρακίτης. Having-sailed () from Troas we-went-straight to Samothrace, 16.12 καὶ ἐκεῖ οἱ Φίλιπποι. ... and-thence to Philippi 16.40 ἔξελθόντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς εἰσῆλθον πρὸς τὴν Αὐδαν having-gone-out () from the jail they-entered to the Lydia καὶ ἔδωκεν παρακαλέσαν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐξῆλθαν, and-having-seen they-exhorted the brothers and left. 17.1 Διαδιασαντες δὲ τὴν Ἀμφιπόλιν καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν Having-gone-through () the Amphipolis and the Apollonia 17.10 Οὐ δὲ ἀδελφοὶ ... ἐξεβίασαν τὸν τῇ Παλῶν καὶ τῶν Σιλῶν εἷς Βέροιαν. The () brothers ... sent-out the both Paul and the Silas to Berea σάββατας παρακαλοῦν εἷς τὴν συναγωγήν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπήσαν. ... 17.11 ἕως ἔκβαιναν εἰς Ἀμφιπόλιν καὶ εἰς Ἀπολλωνίαν. ... they-came to Thessalonika.

18.1 Μετὰ τοῦτο Χαρίσσης ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἤλθεν εἷς Κορινθίου. ... After those[things] having-left from the Athens he-went to Corinth... 18.18 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐπὶ προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἦκαν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. The () Paul more having-remained days several with-the brothers ἀποστάσιμοι ἐξέπληξεν εἷς τὴν Ἑβραίου. ... having-bid-farewell sailed-off to the Syria κεραμείον εὗρ Κεννυστίς τὴν κεφαλήν, having-shorn in Cenchrea the head ἐξελέγχειν εὗρ εὔχησαν, he-had for vow. 18.19 κατέξησαν δὲ εἷς Ἐφεσον. ...

They-came-down () to Ephesus... 18.21 ἀνα ἀποστάσιμοι καὶ εἰπών ... ἀνηγῆ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφέσου. But having-bade-farewell and saying ... he-sailed from the Ephesus 18.22 καὶ κατείπεν εἷς Κασαρείαν, And having-gone-down to Caesarea, ἀνάφασα καὶ ἀπασάμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, having-gone-up and having-greeted the church κατέβη εἷς Ἀρκάδειαν, he-went-down to Antioch... summary

The occurrences have been divided according to semantic domains towns and islands, versus regions and provinces, and grammar:
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Towns and Islands
To, in, and accusative
15.39 ἐν Κύτταρον,
16.1 ἐν Δέρβην
16.1 ἐν Λύστραν
16.8 ἐν Τρικάλα.
16.11 ἐν Σαμοθράκην,
16.11 ἐν Ἔκατον Πόλει
16.12 ἐν Φιλίπποις
17.1 τῇ 'Αμφίπολιν
17.1 τῇ 'Απολλωνίαν
17.1 ἐν Θεσσαλονίκην
17.10 ἐν Βέροιαν,
17.15 ἔνω 'Αθήναν
18.1 ἐν Κόρινθοι
18.18 ἐν Κέρκυραις
18.19 ἐν Εφέσου
18.22 ἐν Κασάριαν
18.22 ἐν 'Αντιόχειαν (15-35)

From
16.11 ἀπὸ Τρικάλα (16.8)
18.1 ἐκ τῶν 'Αθηνῶν (17.15)
18.21 ἀπὸ τῆς Εφέσου (18.19)

Regions and provinces
To, in, and accusative
15.41 τῇ Συρίαν καὶ τῇ Κυπρίαν
16.6 τῇ Φύλιαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν
16.6 ἐν τῇ 'Ασίᾳ.
16.7 κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν
16.7 ἐν τῇ Μυσίαν
16.8 τῇ Μυσίαν
16.9 ἐν Μακεδονίαν
16.10 ἐν Μακεδονίαν
18.18 ἐν τῇ Συρίαν
17.14 ἔνω ἐν τῇ θάλασσαν

There are 17 occurrences of town or island names in the accusative or after to or in. 15 of these are without the article, presenting them as "salient". They are all Discourse-new, certainly as far as this particular pericope, Paul's second missionary journey, is concerned. Why then are 2 Discourse-new towns, only appearing here in Acts, marked with the article as Hearer-old? i.e.
17.1 Διοδεύσαντες δὲ τῇ 'Αμφίπολιν καὶ τῇ 'Απολλωνίαν
Having-gone-through () the Amphipolis and the Apollonia

I believe they are marked Hearer-old because the author assumes that the audience will have heard of these towns (2a KNOWN unused). This is supported by their being used in a Prenuclear Aorist Participle construction, which, according to my theory, indicates that Luke expected his audience (Theophilus at least) to know that Amphipolis and Apollonia are on the way between Philippi and Thessalonica. I believe they are not marked as "salient" since nothing happens there, they are just "passed through".
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There are three town names after ἀπό or ἐκ “from”. All three are Discourse-old and as expected two of these take the article, marking Hearer-old. They are also, of course, non-salient, since they are being left.

18.1 ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν (17.15)
18.21 ἀπὸ τῆς Εφέσου (18.19)

Note however the irregularity of ἀπό with a Discourse-old town name and no article:

Even though they are leaving Troas, Troas is marked as salient. Perhaps Troas is marked salient as one would have expected Paul to evangelize there, but instead he leaves immediately. A more convincing explanation, however, is the strong focus on going to Macedonia so that even the town they sail from is marked salient. Perhaps also there is a kind of inclusio going on to emphasize the call to Macedonia. In any case, the lack of an article with Troas here seems to be statistically unusual, and hence marked as “salient”.

16.9 ἐς Μακεδονίαν
16.10 ἐς Μακεδονίαν
16.11 ἀπὸ Τροάδος

This salience marking corresponds with “the stress which the narrative lays on this movement into Greece” where, in 16:6-10, “Luke emphasizes as every stage the travellers receive supernatural guidance” (Barrett, 1998:765).

The references to the province of Macedonia above are also statistically marked. Out of 9 references to provinces listed above only these two references lack the article. The first reference could be regarded as Discourse-new, but we have seen above that provinces, even when Discourse-new, are regularly introduced by the Hearer-old marker, the article. Here then, we can say that the lack of an article is statistically marked. This seems to conform to the concept of the lack of an article marking salience, since at discourse level Macedonia seems to be salient, since there is a very specific divine call to Macedonia, by means of a vision (Acts 16:9), and Acts 16:6 and 7 each contain references to the Holy Spirit blocking their moves in other directions.

Another very intriguing factor comes into play here. Acts 16:10 is the first of the “we” passages. The sudden appearance of “we” late on in the book of Acts has led some scholars to believe that the “we” passages have been taken from some other travel narrative (e.g. Barrett, 1998:xxv-xxx, summarizing this debate). However, the establishment of the interpersonal “I/you” relationship in Acts 1:1, where “I” is the author of the book and “you” is Theophilus, makes it a reasonable interpretation (both for Theophilus and today’s exegete) that “we” refers to “I”, the author of the book of Acts, plus other unnamed individuals who are to be determined by the context (here the co-text suggests the “they” of Acts 16:8, i.e. Paul and his travelling companions). Whether the “we” passages were incorporated from some other source or were based on the personal notes or reminiscences of the author of Acts, the text as we have it suggests that the author of Acts joins the party at Troas for the mission to Macedonia (Alexander, 1963:106-7, 184
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Marshall, 1980:263-4, cf. more cautiously Barrett, 1998:776). If this is so, the highly marked anarthrous nouns in 16:9, 10, and 11, for Macedonia and Troas, not only have theological significance in the text as shown above, but have deep personal significance for the author himself. The author's own first-hand involvement in the story from now on may be another factor explaining the "salience" marking of certain place names.

The one reference to "the sea", Acts 17:14, is again Discourse-new but Hearer-old, part of the audience's world knowledge.

THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY

18.23 καὶ πούσας χρόνων τινα ἔξηλθεν,
And having-spent time certain he-left
διερχόμενος καθεξής τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν,
going-through in-order the Galatian region and Phrygia
ἐπιστρέφων πάντας τὸνς μαθητὰς. ... strengthening all the discipules.

19.1 Ἐγένετο ... Παῦλος διελήφθη τὰ διαφορετικὰ μὲν [κατέλεξεν ἐν "Ἔφεσον ...
It-happened.. Paul having-crossed the upper part to-come to Ephesus...
20.1 μετατευθημένος δὲ Παῦλος τὸνς μαθητὰς καὶ παρακαλέσας,
having-summoned the Paul the disciples and having-exhorted
ἀποστασίμενος ἔξηλθεν πορεύομαι ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας,
having-bade-farewell he-left to-travel to Macedonia.
20.2 διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκείνα καὶ παρακάλεσας αὐτοῖς ...
Having-crossed () the part that and having-encouraged them ...

20.3 πούσας τε μῆνας τρεῖς,
having-spent also months three,
γενομένης ἐπίβουσιν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μέλλουσιν ἀνάγχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς Συρίας,
having-occurred plot to-him by the Jews intending to-sail to the Syria,

20.5 αὐτῷ δὲ προεδρύσας ἐμένων ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρῳάδᾳ,
having-became minded of to-return via Macedonia ...
These () having-gone-ahead were-waiting for-us in Troas,

20.6 ἦμες δὲ ἐπελεύσασθαι ... ἀπὸ τῆς Φιλιπποῦ
We () sailed-off ... from Philippi,

20.13 ἦμες δὲ προεδρύσας ἐπὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἀναχθημένοι ἐπὶ τὴν 'Λασοῦν.
We () having-gone-ahead on the ship sailed to the Assos
ἐκέθεσαν μέλλουσιν ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον ... thence intending to-take-on-board the Paul

20.14 ὡς δὲ συνέβαλεν ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς 'Λασοῦν,
When () he-was-meeting us in the Assos,
ἀναλαμβάνετο αὐτὸν ἡμῶν εἰς Μιλητίαν,
having-taken-on-board him we-came to Mitylene,

20.15 κάκεθεν ἀποπληθώσαντες τῇ ἐπιούσῃ κατακτήσαμεν δικαίως Χίου.
And-thence having-sailed the next-day we-arrived off Chios,
τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ παρέβαλομεν εἰς Σάμου,
on-the () next-day we-crossed to Samos,
τῇ δὲ ἐξομήνυ ἡμῶν εἰς Μιλητίαν.
on-the () next-day we-came to Miletus,

20.38 ... προπετυμων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος.
... They-escorted () him to the ship.

21.1 ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἀποσπασθέντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν,
When () it-happened to-sail us having-been-torn-away from them,
ἐνεδυσώμεθας ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν Κάρα
having-gone-straight we-came to the Cos,
τῇ δὲ ἐξῆς εἰς τὴν 'Ρόδον κατέθεντο εἰς Πάταρα
on-the () next-day to the Rhodes and-thence to Patara.
Appendix L - Texts showing the link between article, information status and salience

21.2 καὶ εὑρόντες πλόον διασπέρων εἰς Φοινίκην
And having-found ship crossing to Phoenicia

21.3 ἀνασκόπησαν δὲ τὴν Κύπρον καὶ καταλείποντες αὐτὴν εὐθύμησαν
Having-sighted () the Cyprus and having-left it on-the-left

21.6 ἀπεσταλμέθη δὲ καὶ ἀνεβηκαν εἰς τὸ πλόον,
We-bade-farewell to-each-other and boarded to the ship,

21.7 Ημεῖς δὲ τὸν πλόον διασκόπησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Τύρου κατατήρησαμεν εἰς Πτολεμαίδα
We () the voyage having-continued from Tyre arrived at Ptolemais

21.10 καὶ ἀπεθάνασασιν τοὺς ἁγιασμοὺς ἐμείναμεν ἡμέραν μιᾶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς.
and having-greeted the brothers remained day one with them.

21.13 ... οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν οἱ Κασαραίνας ...
The () next-day having-left we-came to Caesarea ...

21.14 ... ἐπισκευάσασιν αὐτοῖς ἐνεπολίσαμεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα ...
... having-got-ready we-were-going-up to Jerusalem.

21.15 καὶ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπὸ Κασαραίνας σὺν ἡμῖν,
Went-along () also of-the disciples from Caesarea with us

21.17 Γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα ἐφέρεις ἀπεδέξασθι τὸ ἡμᾶς ὁ ἀδελφός ...
Having-arrived () us to Jerusalem joyfully greeted us the brothers ...

Summary
The Paul only section here (Acts 18:23-20:4) shows typical patterning as seen above, except for two occurrences of Macedonia as salient.

Towns
19.1 εἰς Ἐφέσον

Regions and provinces
18.23 τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν,
19.1 τὰ ἀνωτέρακα μέρη (of Galatia and Phrygia 18.23)
20.1 εἰς Μακεδονίαν.
20.2 τὰ μὲν ἑκέινα (20.1 Macedonia)
20.2 εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα
20.3 εἰς τὴν Συρίαν,
20.3 διὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδαν

Discourse-new towns lack the article (19.1) i.e. are “salient”, but Discourse-new regions and provinces take the article (18:23, 20:2, 20:3) being marked Hearer-old non-salient, except for Macedonia (20:1 and 20:3) which lacks the article and is thus salient. Also anaphoric reference with a common noun takes the article, being Discourse-old and Hearer-old (20.2). Similarly, a Discourse-new element “the upper part” of a Discourse-old scenario “Galatia and Phrygia” (2b KNOWN inferable) takes the article , i.e. is marked as Hearer-old, since everyone knows that provinces have various “parts”.

However, when we move into the “we” section of the journey (Acts 20:5-21:7) there seem to be certain irregularities:
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Towns and islands

To, in, accusative

20.5 ἐν Ἀχαΐᾳ (they waited for us)
20.6 ἐς τὴν Ἀχαΐᾳ (we met them) (20.5)
20.13 ἐπὶ τὴν Ἄγιον (we sailed)
20.14 ἐς τὴν Ἄσσων (Paul was meeting us) (20:13)
20.14 ἐς Μιλίληπτην (we came)
20.15 ἄντικρυσις Χίου (we arrived)
20.15 ἐς Σάμου (we crossed)
20.15 ἐς Μιλήτου (we came)
21.1 ἐς τὴν Κάτω (we came)
21.1 ἐς τὴν Ἄδη (we came)
21.1 ἐς Πάταρα (we came)
21.3 τῷ Κύπρῳ (we sighted)
21.3 ἐς Τύρου (we went down)
21.7 ἐς Πτολεμαία (we arrived)
21.8 ἐς Κασάρειαν (we came)
21.15 ἐς Ἱεροσόλυμα (we were going)
21.17 ἐς Ἱεροσόλυμα (we arrived)

From

20.6 ἀπὸ Φωκίππων (we sailed)
21.7 ἀπὸ Τύρου (we continued) (21.7)
21.16 ἀπὸ Κασάρειας (disciples from) (21.8)

Regions and provinces

To, in, accusative

21.2 ἐς Φωκίππα (ship which was crossing)
21.3 ἐς Σωρὰν (we sailed)

In the "we" section, there are 17 occurrences of proper nouns for towns or islands with to, in or accusative. As expected most, i.e. 11, are without the article, being marked salient since they are Discourse-new.

Of the six which have the article, two are anaphoric reference, and are marked Hearer-old, without salience:

20.6 ἐς τὴν Ἀχαΐᾳ (we met them) (20.5)
20.14 ἐς τὴν Ἄσσων (Paul was meeting us) (20:13)

Note that the relevance of these places is simply as a place for meeting, thus not salient in the development of the journey.

The reference to Assos in 20:13 is Discourse-new but has the article:

20.13 ἐπὶ τὴν Ἄσσων (we sailed)

Of course it can take the article because it is presumably a town people have heard of, and thus is Hearer-old. But since towns are normally salient in this account of a missionary journey (naturally enough), why is Assos not marked as salient? The answer seems to be that the purpose of going there is stated simply as "because we intended to pick up Paul there." In other words, like the two examples above, these places are non-focal meeting places, not salient places on the route.

Two other proper nouns with the article come in Acts 21:1. This seems extremely odd as the same verse has two names with an article, and one without.

21.1 ἐς τὴν Κάτω (we came)
21.1 ἐς τὴν Ρόδου (we came)
21.1 ἐς Πάταρα (we came)
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On the face of it, one might say the first two are islands, and the third a town, and the islands are here being treated as less salient, like regions. However we have seen above in the earlier journeys that islands are normally marked salient. A clue comes from the grammatical structure of the sentence (verb in bold)

21.1... εὕρημοι... ἔστιν... τῆς... ἔχοντας... τῆς... Κώνα.]

... having-gone-straight we-came to the Cos,

της... εχεσ... ες... Της... Κώνα... κατέλεεν... ες... Πάταρα... on-the () next-day to the Rhodes and-thence to Patara.

Here it can be seen that there is one verb covering the whole journey from Miletus (20:17) to Patara. Cos and Rhodes are simply predictable places on the route. They can be seen simply as stages in the script of the “travel from Miletus to Patara” scenario. If one remembers the start and finish, the middle bits can be filled in from the scenario. Thus Hearer-old non-salient marking makes sense. In contrast Patara, the end of that section of the journey, is marked salient (no article).

This leaves another unexplained use of the article:

21.3... της... Κύπρου... (we sighted)

Again we see that Cyprus here is not the destination of a journey but simply a place on route that was sighted. As such it is not marked salient, but simply Hearer-old (from general knowledge).

The remaining examples are where we expect an article, but find none, thus marking the noun as salient.

In this section there are 3 town names with “from”, but they are all marked salient (whereas above in the non “we” sections the pattern was non-salience marking):

20.6... ἀνά... Φιλίτη... (we sailed)

21.7... ἀνά... Τύρο... (we continued) (21.7)

21.16... ἀνά... Καισαρείας... (disciples from) (21.8)

The most reasonable explanation seems to be that these places, are significant places on the main route, and to Luke, who visited them personally, they are salient, whether arriving or leaving.

Similarly, in the “we” section of Paul’s third journey, there are two regions or provinces named, and both times they are marked salient, clearly breaking the pattern seen in accounts of the previous missionary journeys.

21.2... ες... Φουλισ... (ship which was crossing)

21.3... ες... Συφία... (we sailed)

To summarize, normally, in the travelogue sections of the missionary journeys, regions and provinces (whether Discourse-new or Discourse-old) are marked Hearer-old, having the article. Towns and islands (whether Discourse-new or Discourse-old) are normally marked as “salient”, having no article, except after “from”, when they are being left and are thus Discourse-old, and no longer salient, and thus take the article. But in the “we” section of the travelogue of Paul’s missionary journeys (and trip to Jerusalem) what
is elsewhere non-salient is marked salient. The following chart shows the number of occurrences of normally non-salient structures, in both Paul and “we” sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journey</th>
<th>from town/island</th>
<th>no article</th>
<th>region/province</th>
<th>article</th>
<th>no article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 “we”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (Macedonia)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Paul</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (Macedonia)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 “we”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers are small, but the asymmetry is remarkable. Apart from two occurrences of Macedonia in a non-we section (Acts 20:1, and 20:3), both of which are salient, these structures are always salient in the we passages, and always non-salient in the non-we passages.

Without calling this proof, it is certainly evidence in support of the “we” passages being genuine first-hand recollection, since it seems beyond the scope of conscious textual editing to insert “salience” marking on places where the author was supposed to have been present, and omit it where he was supposed not to be. The salience marking could, of course, have been copied without change, along with “we” references, from someone else’s “first-hand” source, although this begs the question as to why the author of Acts would write a third person narrative yet incorporate some source material, without any adaptation, using first person forms. However, if the “we” passages indicate “where I, the author of Acts, travelled with Paul” (perhaps even visited for the first time), it is hardly surprising that the author should quite subconsciously mark these places as salient, whether arriving or leaving, whether town or province.

Whether the salience Luke gives to Macedonia in Paul’s section is simply part of his theological emphasis on that being God’s choice of itinerary, or whether it comes from the particular interest Luke himself has in the place he himself worked, or a combination of these, I leave to the reader to determine. I simply point out that Luke has marked Macedonia, and the itinerary of the “we” passages as unusually “salient”.

**JOURNEY TO ROME**

Acts 27:1-28:16 is another “we” passage. The following clauses contain proper place names:

27.1 δὲ ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποτελεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐλεῖ τὴν Ἰταλίαν... When (it was decided) of the to-sail us to the Italy...

27.2 ... τούτῳ Ἀδραμύττῃ μέλλοντι πλεῖν ἐς τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἰσίαν τόπους ... ship Adramyttian about-to sail to the along the Asia places.

27.2 ... ὡς οὖν ἦμιν Ἀριστάρχου Μακεδών Θεσσαλονίκεως. ... being with us Aristarchus Macedonian of Thessalonica.

27.3 τῇ τε ἐτέρᾳ κατάληθημεν ἐλεί Σίδηνα ... on-the and next-day we-landed to Sidon
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27.4 κακεῖθεν ἀναχώρησε ὑπεπλεῦσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον ...
Thence having-sailed-off we-sailed-near the Cyprus ...

27.5 τὸ τε πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κυκλάδαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν διαπλεῦσαντες
The and sea the by the Cilicia and Pamphylia having-crossed
κατὰθάλασσαν εἰς Μύρα τὰς Λικάνες.
we-came-down to Myra of-the Lycia

27.6 ... πλόον Ἀλεξανδρίνον πλέον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν...
... ship Alexandrian sailing to the Italy

27.7 ... μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κύπρον.
... hardly coming by the Cnidos
... ὑπεπλέυσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην κατὰ Σαλαμώνην.
... we-sailed-under the Crete by Salamone

27.8 ... ἔδομεν εἰς τῶν τινά καλοὶκόμενον Καλλίδος Λιμένας.
... we-came to place certain being-called Fair Havens
ἡ ἵππος πόλις ἦν Λασαία.
... to-which near city was Lasaea.

27.12 ... εἰ πως δύναιστο καταντήσαντες εἰς Φοίνιξα παραξεμάσαι
... if somehow they-might having arrived at Phoenix to-winter
λιμένα τὴν Κρήτην ...
port of-the Crete

27.13 ... παραλάγατο τὴν Κρήτην.
... they-coasted-past the Crete

27.16 ὑπέλειφον δὲ τι υποθραμίστην καλοὶκόμενον Καβδα ...
isle () certain running-below being-called Cauda

27.17 ... φοβοῦμεν τε μὴ εἰς τὴν Χαλκήν ἐξέπεσαν ...
... fearing and lest to the Syrtis they-might-fall-off

27.21 ... μὴ ἀνάγεοντα ἀπὸ τὴν Κρήτην ...
... not to-set-sail from the Crete

27.27 ... διαφερομένων ἡμῶν εἰ τῇ Ἀδηλία ...
... being-carried-about us in the Adriatic

28.1 ... ἔπεσαν δὲ τί Μελίτη ἡ νῆσος καλεὶται...
... we-discovred that Malta the island is-called.

28.12 καὶ καταγείνομεν εἰς Συρακούσας...
and having-been-brought-to-land at Syracuse

28.13 ὅθεν περευδόμεν καταντήσαμεν εἰς Ρήγανον,
whence tacking we-arrived at Rhegium.
καὶ ... ἠδομεν εἰς Ποταμόν...
and ... we-came to Puteoli

28.14 ... καὶ κατεβαίνεις εἰς τὴν Ρώμην ἠδομεν.
... And in-this-way to the Rome we-came/went.

28.15 ... ἔδωκαν εἰς ἀνάπτυσαν ἡμῖν ἄξιον Ἀπόπλου Φάρου καὶ Τρίπλου Ταβέρνω.
... they-came for meeting us as-far-as Appian Forum and Three Taverns

28.16 Ἄρτε δὲ εἰσελθοῦμεν εἰς Ρώμην, ...
When () we-entered into Rome, ...

Summary

Towns and islands

to, in, Accusative and Nominative

27.2 Ἑλεοφυλαικέων.
27.3 εἰς Σάδωνα ...
27.5 εἰς Μύρα.
27.7 κατὰ Σαλαμώνη.
27.8 Καλλίδος Λιμένας.
27.8 Λασαία.
27.12 εἰς Φοίνικα.
27.16 Καβδα ...
27.17 εἰς τὴν Σώρτιν (afraid lest they fall into)
27.27 ἐν τῷ Ἀδρία ...
28.1 Μελίτη.
28.12 εἰς Συρακούσας...
28.13 εἰς Ρήγανον.
28.13 εἰς Ποταμόν.
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28.14 ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην
28.15 ἔχει Ἄπτιον Φόρου καὶ Τρώιν Ταβερνάν,...
28.16 ἐς Ῥώμην

After verbs with ἐντό, παρά, βυ etc

27.4 τὴν Κύπρων (ὑπεπλεόσαμεν we-sailed-near)
27.7 τὴν Κρήτην (ὑπεπλεόσαμεν we-sailed-near)
27.13 τὴν Κρήτην (παρελέγουσαν they-coasted-by)

from, βυ, Genitive

27.7 κατὰ τὴν Κύθων,
27.12 τῆς Κρήτης
27.21 ἀπὸ τῆς Κρήτης

Regions, provinces, countries

27.1 ἐς τὴν Ἰταλίαν.
27.2 κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν
27.5 κατὰ τὴν Κυκλάδα καὶ Παισφυλάν
27.5 ἐς Μύρα τῆς Λυκίας.
27.6 ἐς τὴν Ἰταλίαν

Here we see the normal pattern of town and island names being “salient” i.e. lacking the article, with words denoting direction towards or in, nominative and accusative cases.

There are two instances which are hard to categorize since they refer to a sandbank and a sea respectively, and there is not enough data to determine unmarked usage, i.e.

whether the article is statistically most common.

27.17 ἐς τὴν Σύρτην (afraid lest they fall into the Syrtis sandbanks)
27.27 ἐν τῇ Ἀδριατικῇ (in the Adriatic Sea)

Again we see that towns and islands which are non-focal to the story are marked with the article as Hearer-old. Grammatically they may have a preposition βυ, from etc, or be genitive in case, or they may be accusative governed by a verb with a prefix βυ or from etc. Semantically, the latter are clearly non focal to the story, being places bypassed, rather than destinations.

The oddest example in the town names concerns Rome, which occurs first with the article then without. Why should Rome, the destiny of this journey, be marked in 28:14 with the article, i.e. non-salient? Perhaps the answer lies in 28:16. The travellers have not yet reached Rome. Some translations suggest that 28:14 means “And so we went to Rome”, but perhaps the verse is a summary of the past journey (Marshall, 1980:419; Barrett, 1998:1230) meaning “And that is how (battered by storm, but escaping death) we (finally) came to Rome (which was where the Roman powers that be decided to send us)” (Acts 27:1). At this point Rome is not a place Luke or Paul have arrived at, nor is it they who have controlled the choice of Rome as destination. They actually reach Rome in 28:16, and begin their task of evangelism there. And at this point, Rome is marked as “salient”.

28.14 ... καὶ οὕτως ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ἔδοθαμεν.
28.16 "Ὄτε δὲ ἐσπάθαμεν ἐς Ῥώμην,...

When () we-entered into Rome, ...
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Again, we see a return to the old pattern of provinces marked with the article as Hearer-old, but without “salience” as we saw in the “we” passages of the Third Missionary Journey. I posit that this is because the provinces are not salient in terms of the purposes of the key participants, Paul and Luke. The action is being overtly controlled by the Roman powers that be and the weather, not by Paul’s missionary strategy.

Is it possible that marking of salience is related to author and main character intent, and thus in Acts determined in part by theological issues? If this is so, it should be apparent in the marking of Rome, arguably the deliberate climax of the book of Acts. (e.g. Marshall, 1980:421 “the missionary programme of Acts 1:8 is now brought to a decisive point: the gospel has come to the capital city, and it is proclaimed without hindrance to the Gentiles...”). There are only five occurrences of the word Ρώμη “Rome” in Acts:

18.2 διὰ τοῦ διαστασέαν Κλαύδιον χωρίζοντος πάντας τοῖς οὐδείσις ἀπὸ τῆς Ρώμης
due-to the to-order Claudius to-move all the Jews from the Rome
19.21 ... Μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεί δὲ με καὶ Ρώμην ἔδειν.
... After the to-become me there it-behoves me also Rome to-see.
23.11 ... ὁ κύριος ἐδείχνεν, ἐς γὰρ διεμαρτυρῶ τὰ περὶ ἑμῶν ἐς Ἰερουσαλήμ, ... the Lord said, ... As for you-witnessed the about me in Jerusalem
25.10 ἐν τῇ ἐν Θεοῦ ἐδύνατο εἰς ἔκκλησιν καὶ εἰς Ρώμην διηγῆσαι. ... thus you-it-behoves also in Rome to-witness.
28.14 ... καὶ οὕτως ἐς τὴν Ρώμην ἠδομένων.
... And in-this-way to the Rome we-came/went.
28.16 Ὅτε δὲ εἰσήλθομεν ἐς Ρώμην, ...
...When () we-entered into Rome, ...

The two occurrences with the article are marked Hearer-old non-salient. Both refer to Rome in the context of the action of Roman rulers, one an edict to leave Rome, the other the fulfilment of a command to go to Rome. The command to go to Rome has previously been hidden (probably for dramatic effect) under the terms “appealed to Caesar” (Acts 26:32) and “it was decided we should sail to Italy” εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν (Acts 27:1). This Roman judicial decision to send Paul to Rome was completed in Acts 28:14, where Rome takes the article.

The three salient usages, without the article, are Paul’s statement that “it behoves him” to go to Rome, God’s confirmation of this, and its fulfilment. God’s plan for Paul to evangelize in Rome is thus marked “salient” in all cases. Certainly, in Acts 28:16 “there is no reference to the Roman authorities” (though they are implied in “was permitted”) and it seems “Luke is allowing the legal proceedings against Paul to drop out of the narrative” so that the final focus of the book (28:31) can be on the fact that “even in Rome the proclamation of the word was established” (Barrett, 1998:1232, 1253).

This may seem too clever, to use the article to make a theological point. I am certainly not saying that Luke sat down and edited his writing thinking “Now where should I put the article”. Rather I suggest that natural Greek usage of the article for known definite items, i.e. Hearer-old, and its omission to mark salience, was one of the means
Luke had available to mark the thread of what was important amidst the sheer mass of place names in his narrative.

If this analysis of the use of the article is correct, it is possible to explain both the normal patterns and deviations from those patterns which we see in the Travelogues of Acts as part of Luke’s deliberate theological and personal angle on the events, even though, no doubt, the way this was grammaticalized was subconscious, i.e. automatic as opposed to mechanically applied. The alternative is to say that articular usage is random, or that the salience theory as proposed works but is incorrect. It should be easy to disprove if it is incorrect. There is obviously scope for further study of all place names from the “we” and “non-we” passages, not just those in the actual travel sections, to see whether the patterns of usage seen above still hold true.
Appendix M
Types of salience in Greek discourse

This appendix provides more detailed discussion, examples and statistical evidence of various types of salience which are marked in Greek by the use of anarthrous nouns, as summarized in Chapter 6 “Lack of the article with Hearer-old items marks salience”.

I list below some of the factors which seem to affect the author’s choice of “salience” marking in Greek, showing the various levels of discourse at which grammatically marked “salience” applies, and giving evidence from statistics, references, and co-occurrence with other features in support of the thesis that anarthrous nouns always mark salience, either salience due to being Hearer-new, or salience due to being Hearer-old and especially significant in the discourse.

a) salience because of semantic category, proper nouns

Proper nouns are frequently salient at EPISODE level, since they typically refer to the location and major participants of that episode. This salience is marked by anarthrousness of the name.

Data from GRAMCORD shows that names of major characters such as Jesus, Peter and Paul show no clear difference in arthrousness from nouns in general, but less common characters show a tendency towards anarthrousness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>NT nouns</th>
<th>+article</th>
<th>-article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>28956</td>
<td>14291 (49%)</td>
<td>14665 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>407 (44%)</td>
<td>510 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>92 (58%)</td>
<td>66 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>70 (45%)</td>
<td>86 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11 (14%)</td>
<td>69 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15 (21%)</td>
<td>58 (79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these charts from GRAMCORD, only the totals are strictly accurate. The arthrous figures are for Article Noun with no intervening element, whereas for common nouns there may be an adjective, adjectival phrase, or conjunction (such as σὲ) between article and noun, and for names a conjunction. The anarthrous figures are derived by subtracting the arthrous from the total. Thus the true figures for arthrous are probably slightly higher than stated here, and for anarthrous slightly lower.

With personal names, however, one would expect nominative case to be more “salient” (since it frequently refers to the agent of an action, or in passives the marked theme of the clause), and thus to occur more frequently without the article. This is borne out by GRAMCORD data, with the notable exception of Jesus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>NT nouns</th>
<th>+article</th>
<th>-article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>7455</td>
<td>3637 (49%)</td>
<td>3818 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>280 (61%)</td>
<td>182 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37 (47%)</td>
<td>42 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39 (39%)</td>
<td>61 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>42 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>18 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(GRAMCORD data are not totally accurate, as noted above).

Since, for the total of nouns in the corpus, the percentages of arthrous and anarthrous are identical, regardless of case, case per se is not a significant factor in articular use. However, with personal names there is a positive correlation between the nominative case and anarthrousness. With the exception of Jesus, names have a higher percentage of anarthrousness in the nominative case than in all cases combined:
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- article All cases
  NT nouns | Jesus | Paul | Peter | Moses | Abraham
  51% | 56% | 42% | 55% | 86% | 79%
- article Nominative
  51% | 39% | 53% | 61% | 98% | 100%

This conforms to the theory that named individuals in the nominative are prototypically salient, since they are typically the agent of significant actions. The tendency for the least frequent names to be most frequently anarthrous agrees with the theory that a new character being introduced into an EPISODE would typically be marked salient.

For example, in the New Testament Abraham in the nominative is always marked salient. Since Abraham is not physically present as a participant in any pericope of the New Testament, he cannot become Discourse-old in the way that Jesus or the disciples become. Abraham is only introduced into the text to illustrate some significant point the speaker or author wants to make, and as such he is frequently being reintroduced as salient.

Similarly Saul is anarthrous 12/15 times (e.g. Acts 7:58, 8:1, 8:3, introduction, opposition, persecution). Saul is only arthrous in 9:1 referring back to persecution in 8:3, 9:24 non-agent, 13:2 non-agent). Anarthrous people and places are typically salient at EPISODE level.

Why is Jesus an exception? Jesus is clearly the main participant of the Gospels, rarely moving off centre stage, and is a major participant in other books, though less frequently as a grammatical subject. Thus he rarely needs reintroducing as a participant, and presumably all his actions, as main participant, are significant. So anarthrousness of the main character may mark super-salience, with significance at higher levels of discourse such as THEME UNIT.

The name Jerusalem occurs 62 times in the New Testament, of which only 4 are arthrous (John 2:23, 5:2, 10:22, 11:18). In the first three, Jerusalem is not a new location setting, but simple anaphoric reference to the place where action already is. In 11:18 nothing happens in Jerusalem at all, but it is mentioned to locate Bethany. This conforms to my theory that anarthrous reference to Hearer-old entities marks salience, since Jerusalem is typically mentioned as the location of significant actions.

Names of towns are typically anarthrous. I suggest that this is due to their most common semantic role, the location of significant events. From GRAMCORD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Jerusalem</th>
<th>Capernaum</th>
<th>Nazareth</th>
<th>Bethlehem</th>
<th>Bethsaida</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all NT</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining figures for these 6 town names, out of 113 occurrences, 8 are arthrous (7%) and 105 anarthrous (93%).

Names of provinces, however, are typically arthrous. I suggest that this is because a whole province is seldom the location of significant events. From GRAMCORD:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>Macedonia</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Syria</th>
<th>Galatia</th>
<th>Cappadocia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all NT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining figures for these 5 province names, out of 54 occurrences, 34 are arthrous (63%) and 20 anarthrous (37%).

The above observations are in line with observations by Reed, based on Wallace (1982:211-18), on what is naturally thematic or “salient” (1995:83-84):

1. People are more interested in other human beings (or at least in animate entities); 2. people tend to place themselves at the centre of attention; 3. individuated - especially concrete, definite, singular, countable - entities are more apt to attract interest than their opposites; 4. the real, the certain, the positive, the immediate, the bounded, and the dynamic are more effective in moving a discourse forward (i.e. to constitute the thematic portion of a text) than their respective contrasting properties, which form the supportive background.

Thus certain semantic categories tend to be “salient” in a discourse (Reed, 1997:112):

Some research in both linguistics and psychology ... suggests that certain semantic categories tend to appear in background and thematic material. These are typically discussed in terms of figure (theme) and ground (background), or ‘more salient’ and ‘less salient’ terms.

According to Reed’s listing (1997:113) “localized” items are naturally more salient than “unlocalized”. This explains why towns, being more localized than provinces, are more naturally salient, and thus more frequently given anarthrous salience marking.

b) salience because of semantic category and participant role, naming

Naming a participant indicates their salience at EPISODE level, and is marked by anarthroussness of the name.

Proper names are a distinct semantic category. Grammatically, however, names are like common nouns in Greek and frequently take the article in narrative when referring to the agent of a verb. Nevertheless names, especially people’s names, because of their semantic category occur in specific situations.

For example, at the introduction of a Discourse-new participant the name may be introduced by a special formula, e.g.

Mark 5:22

εἰς τῶν ἄρχισυναγώγων, Ἀνρίμων, Ἰάιρως

one of the synagogue-leaders by-name Jairus

Such names are always semantically salient because they identify main participants in an EPISODE. In the New Testament corpus, names in this formula are always anarthrous. Analysing a GRAMCORD search for δομα showed 22 examples of this structure, all anarthrous (1 in Mark (5:22), the rest in Luke (6x, 1:5, 10:38, 16:20, 19:2, 23:50, 24:18) and Acts (15x, 5:34, 8:9, 9:10, 9:36, 10:1, 11:28, 12:13, 16:1, 16:14, 17:34, 20:9, 21:10, and with the name fronted 5:1, 18:24, 19:24).

The same formula can also be used with a non-subject, e.g.

Matthew 27:32

εὗρον Ἀνρίμων Κυρηναίον Ἀνρίμων Ἀμαν

they-found person Cyrenian by-name Simon
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Similarly, when a person is being given a new name, that name is semantically salient at CLAUSE level (being comment/rheme as opposed to propositional topic/theme). The new name is also significant at whole TEXT level, since it will be used in the rest of the text for participant reference. There are 8 such occurrences linking ὄνομα with a new name in the New Testament. All names are anarthrous, and one is fronted:

καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ιησοῦν
and you-will-call the name of-him Jesus
Mark 3:16 (cf. Mark 3:17)
καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ
and added name to-the Simon Peter.
Luke 1:63
Ἰωάννης ἔστιν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.
John is name of-him.

Often the name of a new participant is given in an equative formula, with or without the verb to be. The name is salient at EPISODE level, being used for participant reference and storing this episode uniquely in memory. This formula occurs 24 times in the New Testament corpus. The name is anarthrous 22 times, of which two are fronted (Matt. 10:2, 27:57, Mark 5:9 (fronted), 14:32, Luke 1:5, 1:13, 1:26, 1:27 (2x), 1:31, 2:25, 8:30, 8:41, 24:13, John 1:6, 3:1 (fronted), 18:10, 13:6 Rev. 9:11,17:5,19:16):

Matthew 27:57
ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλοῦτος ἀπὸ Αριμαθαίας, τὸ ὄνομα Ιωσήφ
Came person rich from Arimathea, the-name Joseph
Mark 5:9
Λέγειν ὄνομα μου.
Legion name to-me.
John 3:1
Ἡ ἐφ άνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος ὄνομα αὐτῶ
Was () person from the Pharisees, Nicodemus name to-him

Only three times in the New Testament is ὄνομα equated with an arthrous noun (only once if one accepts the variant readings of 6:8 and 8:11, found in Sinaiticus), all in Revelation:

Rev. 6:8
καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ Θάνατος
and the sitting on it name to-him [the] Death.
Rev. 8:11
καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρος λέγεται ὁ Ἀμφύδος
and the name of-the star is-called the wormwood.
Rev. 19:13
καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.
and has-been-called the name of-him the word of-the god.

Here ὄνομα does not refer to an ordinary human name of a new participant, but rather to an identification with a different common noun or title explaining the meaning or significance of the symbol. This new name is not used again for participant reference, but for logical cohesion. The second occurrence of “death” in Rev. 6:8 is not anaphoric or coreferential, but refers to the way Death behaves. Likewise in Rev. 8:11 the star
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Wormwood turns water into wormwood. Again in Rev 19:13 The Word of God is not used to name a new character but to identify who this known character is, by using one of his titles. (The word δόξα also occurs another 166 times in non-naming contexts.)


If we chart these figures for naming, using data from GRAMCORD, we see a marked correlation between personal names and anarthrousness, together with a significant percentage of fronting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>by name</th>
<th>new name</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>called</th>
<th>all salient names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>22 (88%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article+fronted</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we compare these figures with other GRAMCORD data for nouns and proper nouns (regardless of case or semantic role, i.e. including purely anaphoric uses), we see clearly that proper nouns in naming formulas, i.e. semantically salient, are more frequently anarthrous than either nouns, or proper nouns in general (figures from the charts in a above):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NT nouns</th>
<th>People (-Jesus)</th>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>all salient names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>28956</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arthrous</td>
<td>14291 (49%)</td>
<td>77 (51%)</td>
<td>34 (63%)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anarthrous</td>
<td>14665 (51%)</td>
<td>163 (49%)</td>
<td>20 (37%)</td>
<td>105 (93%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures suggest that the names of major characters frequently on stage in a narrative are typically around 50% (+/- 10%) arthrous, similar to the percentage for all nouns. In contrast names in structures where the specific name of an individual is new information, i.e. salient, are only 4% arthrous. Names of characters such as Moses and Abraham, who do not dominate the narrative stage in any book but appear fairly frequently, are between 10% and 25% arthrous. This is in line with my argument that arthrous indicates Hearer-old, and anarthrous indicates salient, since each introduction of a new character in a new pericope would typically be salient and therefore anarthrous.

It might be suggested that case skews the figures, since the salient names analysed are nearly all nominative. However, taking New Testament nouns as a whole, the percentage of anarthrous nouns in the nominative is identical to the percentage of all anarthrous nouns regardless of case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NT nouns</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>28956</td>
<td>7455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arthrous</td>
<td>14291 (49%)</td>
<td>3637 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anarthrous</td>
<td>14665 (51%)</td>
<td>3818 (51%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover naming formulas which use accusative case also mark the “new” name as anarthrous and salient, e.g.

Acts 14:12
ἐκδίχον τε τόν Βαρναβάν Δα, τόν δὲ Παῦλον Ἑρμῆν they-were-calling and the Barnabas Zeus, the () Paul Hermes.

Lists of names identifying members of a group, are also salient and anarthrous, whereas the qualifying phrases are typically arthrous, e.g.

Matthew 10:2-4
Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τα ἀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα.
Of-the () twelve apostles the names are these:
πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας δὲ ἀδελφὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ Ἰακώβου δὲ τοῦ Ἱωάννου καὶ Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀδελφὸς αὐτῶν.
Philipos καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος, Θωμᾶς καὶ Ματθαῖος ὁ τελῶνης.
Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαίος,
Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος καὶ Ἰακώβος ὁ Ἰσκαρίωτης ὁ καὶ παραθύτης αὐτῶν.

Mark 3:14-19
καὶ ἐποίησαν δώδεκα ... καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμων Πέτρων, καὶ Ἰακώβου τοῦ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῶς ἀνώματα μεταρρυθμεῖς ἐστίν Υἱὸν Βροντῆς.
καὶ Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φιλίππων καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον καὶ Ματθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰακώβου τοῦ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαίον καὶ Σίμωνα τοῦ Καναναίον καὶ Ἰακώβον Ἰσκαρίωθ, δε καὶ παρέθεκεν αὐτῶν.


Likewise in Romans 16:3-16 and 21-24, all the names of people to greet and people sending greetings are anarthrous, but the qualifying phrases are arthrous. These names are marked as salient, since the farewell greetings of a letter play an important role in maintaining interpersonal relationships.

A further example of the salience of a name in an explicit naming formula is the Mount of Olives, which occurs 9 times as τοῦ ὀροῦ τῶν ἑλαίων with “of the olives” arthrous (Matt. 21:1, 24:3, 26:30, Mark 11:1, 13:3, 14:26, Luke 19:37, 22:39, John 8:1). But both times the mountain is explicitly named (rather than just referred to) it is anarthrous, τοῦ ὀροῦ τοῦ καλούμενου Ἑλαίων, even though the name “of olives” is in the genitive not the nominative (Luke 19:29, 21:37).

Similarly, the titles of New Testament books are a kind of naming formula, and each title contains the proper name or title of Hearer-old known referents (unless Acts is “Acts of some apostles”). There are 4 patterns of New Testament book names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Grammatical form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Gospels</td>
<td>x 4</td>
<td>Preposition Noun</td>
<td>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Acts &amp; Revelation</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>Noun Noun-gen.</td>
<td>ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Romans-Hebrews</td>
<td>x 14</td>
<td>Preposition Noun</td>
<td>ΠΡΟΣ ΡΟΜΑΙΟΥΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) James-Jude</td>
<td>x 7</td>
<td>Noun-gen.</td>
<td>ΙΑΚΩΒΟΥ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 29 nouns in these titles. All apart from “acts”, “apostles”, and “revelation” are proper nouns referring to people. All nouns, except possibly “acts”, and maybe “apostles” have definite known referents. All 29 nouns are anarthrous, since the referent is salient.
c) salience because of semantic category and participant role, addressee

Addressees are salient not only at CLAUSE level, but also at EPISODE level, and in the case of letters at TEXT level. The vocative case marks this by being anarthrous.

Addressees are frequently implicit, e.g. Imperatives normally do not have the pronoun “you”. This indicates that the addressees are treated as Hearer-old and can be identified from the co-text or context. Yet where the addressee is made explicit, the noun is typically anarthrous. An addressee is typically addressed using the vocative case, but the nominative case is also found (Porter, 1994:86-86). Looking at GRAMCORD figures for all nouns comparing case and anarthrousness, we see the vocative as statistically marked, both in overall infrequency and in correlation with anarthrousness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>14291 (49%)</td>
<td>3637 (49%)</td>
<td>50 (8%)</td>
<td>4294 (49%)</td>
<td>4101 (53%)</td>
<td>2188 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>14665 (51%)</td>
<td>3818 (51%)</td>
<td>581 (92%)</td>
<td>4521 (51%)</td>
<td>3580 (47%)</td>
<td>2187 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These GRAMCORD figures include as vocatives all forms used in a vocative sense, including nominatives, e.g. Mark 15:34 (cf. Matthew 27:46), and ambiguous forms, such as plurals, which grammatically could be either nominative or vocative, e.g. Ephesians 5:22. However, in the New Testament corpus, nouns which are unambiguously vocative in case NEVER take the article.

The relative rarity of vocative as a case can be explained by its normal restriction to human beings, and in cases of apostrophe towns. But why the high level of anarthrousness for addressees? One might argue that the Greek article simply has no vocative case (Wallace, 1996:66) so anarthrous vocatives are grammatically impossible. But why should this be so, given that an addressee can be referred to with the article when the noun is in the nominative?

The lack of a vocative case for the article is semantically motivated. It is not an anomaly in the system, but a direct result of the system. Addressees are typically addressed anarthrously because they are always conceptually salient, since they belong in the open “here and now” scenario of the communication act, and have the information status category 3a GIVEN situational, i.e. Hearer-old and already in mental focus. Typically addressees are humans, who are directly spoken to, or to whom letters are addressed.

Moreover, when we examine the instances of article and noun which GRAMCORD categorizes as “vocative”, we see that they do not refer to prototypical addressees. Of the 50 instances, not one is a personal name. 21 address God, as father, god, lord, almighty, master, king. (Of 13 instances of God in a vocative sense, 2 are anarthrous vocatives, 11 are anarthrous nominatives.) 6 address people not present by apostrophe (Rom. 15:11, Rev. 12:12, 18:4, 18:20, 19:5), and 4 address a town by apostrophe (Rev. 18:10 (2x), 18:16, 18:19). 12 address subsections of a letter’s addressees, (wives, husbands, children, parents, slaves, masters - Eph. 5:22, 25, 6:1, 4, 5, 9, and Col. 3:18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 4:1). Only 7 arguably address people face to face, but of these, 2 address a corpse (Mark...
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5:41, Luke 8:54), 1 addresses the demon possessing a person (Mark 5:8), 1 addresses a potential subsection of the people present, though is a quotation which originally may have been an apostrophe (Acts 13:41), and 3 address Jesus face to face, but by a title. In none of these 3 is the vocative to gain attention or forge an emotional bond, positive or negative. Rather it explicitly makes a statement about who the person is. In John 19:3 “Hail, king of the Jews” the vocative is used in mockery of such a claim. In John 20:28 “My Lord and my God” Thomas is making a statement about who Jesus is, and similarly in Hebrews 1:8 “Thy throne, o God, is for ever and ever”. None of these arthrous nouns is unambiguously vocative in case, and none is used simply to address a person present.

Thus the natural salience of a vocative, caused by making explicit reference to a participant who is already implicitly focal, does not apply to any of the arthrous nouns used in a “vocative” sense, whether they are nominative or ambiguous in form. This suggests that the ambiguous forms above, mostly plurals, are best analysed as nominative case. These data support Louw’s observation (1966:80) that “The nominative, in contradistinction to the vocative, is less exclamative, less direct, more reserved and formal because it merely states the nominative idea”.

Reed describes vocatives as salient at different levels (1997:116):
The vocative case is often a signal of thematic material at the level of discourse and focal material at the level of clause.

Vocatives, then, are always salient, and refer anarthrously to Hearer-old entities, which are not only focal at CLAUSE level, but typically key participants at the level of EPISODE or TEXT. For example “brothers” in 2 Thessalonians 1:3, 2:1, 2:13, 2:15, 3:1, 3:6, 3:13 is coreferential with “the church of Thessalonians” (1:1) but is always anarthrous and salient, since the Thessalonian “brothers (and sisters)” are addressees of the whole TEXT.

Vocatives occur within a clause which is salient at the level of EPISODE, typically following the personal pronoun “you” or occurring with an Imperative or mitigated command. Compare the clauses marked with the vocative in 2 Thessalonians, with the NIV section divisions, my EPISODES (omitting the Opening and Final Greetings):
1:3-12 Thanksgiving and Prayer
1:3 We ought always to thank God for you, brothers
2:1-12 The man of Lawlessness
2:1 We beseech you brothers ... not to become unsettled or alarmed...
2:13-17 Stand firm
2:13 But we ought always to thank God for you, brothers
2:15 So then, brothers, stand firm
3:1-6 Request for prayer
3:1 Finally, brothers, pray for us
3:6-15 Warning against idleness
3:6 we command you, brothers, to keep away from ... idle
3:13 And as for you, brothers, never tire of doing what is right.

Reed also points out that the use of vocatives with petitions is a common epistolary device (bolding mine) (1997:267):
Of the four verbs of epistolary petitions - ἐπιθυμέω, ἐπιθέω, ἐπιτροπέω and παρακαλέω (all sharing a basic function of ‘to ask, request, beseech’) - the fourth type, when it is used in the context of petition, occurs 14 times in the first person singular in the Pauline letters (Rom. 12.1; 15.30; 16.17; 1 Cor. 1.10;
4.16; 16.15; 2 Cor. 2.8; 10.1; Phil. 4.2 [2x]; Philm. 9, 10; cf. Eph. 4.1; 1 Tim. 2.1) and 5 times in the first person plural (2 Cor. 6.1; 1 Thess. 4.1, 10; 5.14; 2 Thess. 3.12). These follow a basic structure: (i) person(s) addressed (e.g. ἤμαχος) ἀπακολούθω verb; (ii) vocative ἀπελπίζατο, and (iv) desired action.

The form ἀπελπίζατο could be analysed as nominative. However, a GRAMCORD search for the lexeme ἀπελπίζατο in the vocative (i.e. vocative use, not necessarily vocative case) produces 92 occurrences in the Epistles, all anarthrous, of which the two singular occurrences are clearly vocative, i.e. ἀπελπίζατο in Philemon 1:7 and 1:20. This suggests that the corresponding plural form, used in similar grammatical contexts and with the same semantic role of addressee, is also best analysed as vocative.

In Hebrews, the writer also uses vocatives to mark clauses as salient at the level of the whole TEXT. Hebrews contains four vocatives, three of which occur in sections labelled as hortative by NIV, and all of which are in sentences containing a command, either direct or mitigated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrews Section</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1-6 Jesus Greater than Moses</td>
<td>3:1-6 Jesus Greater than Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1 Therefore, holy brothers ... fix your thoughts on Jesus... (This is the first imperative in the Epistle, excluding quotations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:7-19 Warning against Unbelief</td>
<td>3:7-19 Warning against Unbelief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12 See to it, brothers, that none of you has a sinful, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God (This is the second imperative in the Epistle, excluding quotations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:19-39 A Call to Persevere</td>
<td>10:19-39 A Call to Persevere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:19 Therefore, brothers, ... let us draw near to God ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:22 Brothers, I urge you to bear with my word of exhortation ... (This is the final imperative, apart from the greetings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be clearly seen that 3:1 is thematic at TEXT level cf. 12:2, and the other instances are thematic at the level of both EPISODE and TEXT. The theme of Hebrews as revealed by the vocatives would be: “Fix your thoughts on Jesus, do not turn away from God, but draw near to God. Pay attention to this letter.” This seems to summarize the theme of Hebrews well.

Compare Lane’s analysis (1991a:lxxxiii). His Embedded Discourse 1 (1:1-4:13) “God Has spoken to us in his Son” ends with the section 1b (3:1-4:13) “Do not harden your hearts”. This section begins with the first vocative and command cluster “brothers, fix your thoughts on Jesus” and contains the second “brothers, do not turn away from God”. His Embedded Discourse 2 (4:14-10:18) “[The Son] as Our High Priest Has Offered a Complete Sacrifice for Sins and by This Obtained Salvation for Us” contains no vocatives, and the only imperatives are rhetorical, i.e. “consider” (7:4), or in quoted speech (8:5, 11). This, then, functions as support material for the previous and following commands. His Embedded Discourse 3 (10:19-13:21) “Therefore Let Us Draw Near to God ...” begins with the third vocative and (mitigated) command cluster “brothers, let us draw near to God”, and his Formalized Closing (13:22-25) begins with the final vocative and command cluster “brothers, bear with my word of exhortation”. Thus the vocatives occur at the boundaries of sections and summarize the themes of the sections they are in. (cf. Bruce,
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1965:lxiii-lxiv, whose sections I and II match Lane’s section 1, III-V match 2, VI and VII match 3, and VIII matches the closing.)

Vocatives and imperatives frequently collocate. Within the Epistles, a GRAMCORD search shows 159 vocatives, and 568 imperatives. 65 of these vocatives have one or more imperatives in the same sentence (a total of 89). So in the Epistles, treating collocation strictly at sentence level only, 34% of vocatives (65/159) collocate with imperatives (even though imperatives constitute only 7% of all verbs, i.e. 568/7901), and 16% of imperatives (89/568) collocate with vocatives (even though vocatives constitute less than 2% of all nouns, i.e. 159/10381).

Similarly in Philemon we see the use of vocatives to mark clauses as salient at the level of the whole TEXT. Philemon contains two vocatives only:

Philemon 1:7
χαράν γὰρ πολλὴν ἔχων καὶ παράκλησιν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου,
Joy for much I-had and consolation over the love of-you
ὅτι τὰ σπλάγχνα τῶν ἁγίων ἀναπέταμαι διὰ σοῦ, día σοῦ, ἀδελφὲ.
because the bowels of-the saints have-been-refreshed through you, brother.

Philemon 1:20
ναὶ, ἀδελφὲ, ἐγὼ σοῦ ὀναμίων ἐν κυρίῳ ἀναπεποίησάς μου τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐν Χριστῷ.
Yes, brother, I of-you may-have-help in Lord. Refresh of-me the bowels in Christ.

These two vocatives occurring with identical vocabulary “refresh the bowels”, one in a thanksgiving for Philemon’s past action, and the other in an appeal for his future action, emphasize Paul’s relationship with Philemon, and mark these clauses as salient at TEXT level, “as you have encouraged others in the past, so encourage me now.” In contrast, although other addressees are mentioned in verse 2, they are only referred to again by the use of the plural pronoun for “you” in the opening and closing blessings (vv. 3 and 25).

Similarly in 1 Corinthians 16, vocatives for main characters at paragraph level (16:12-16) are used to mark the clause they are in as salient at PARAGRAPH level, being the motivation for Paul’s teaching on divorce:

1 Corinthians 7:16
τί γὰρ οἶδας, γυναι, εἶ τῶν ἄνδρα σῶσεις;
What for do-you-know, woman, if the man you-will-save?
ἡ τί οἶδας, ἄνεφ, εἶ τήν γυναῖκα σῶσεις;
Or what do-you-know, man, if the woman you-will-save?

Further evidence of the salience of addressees at TEXT level, even when there is no vocative Noun Phrase, can be found in John’s Gospel, where, I believe, there are only two verses in the narrative (omitting direct speech) containing second person verbs, John 19:35 and 20:31. These state the book’s purpose (NIV) “He knows that he tells the truth, and he testifies so that you also may believe” and “But these things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name.” The purpose of writing is typically so significant that it often occurs in the opening paragraph of a book, and the first non-introduction paragraph of a letter (e.g. Luke 1:3-4 with vocative, 1 Timothy 1:3, 2 Timothy 1:6, 1 John 1:1-4 (highlighted 2:12-14), Jude 1:3 with vocative).
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I deal below with vocatives and proper nouns referring to addressees in the opening paragraph of letters or books which mark the theme of the whole TEXT. Such proper nouns are ALWAYS anarthrous in the New Testament.

d) salience because of semantic category and participant role, addresser

Addressers (i.e. the authors of letters, or speeches) are by definition human, and hence have natural saliency. I posit that addressers are salient not only at CLAUSE level, but in the case of letters at TEXT level.

The chart below shows that personal names of major characters in general show percentages of anarthrousness similar to all nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT nouns</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Peter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>28956</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>14291 (49%)</td>
<td>407 (44%)</td>
<td>92 (58%)</td>
<td>70 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>14665 (51%)</td>
<td>510 (56%)</td>
<td>66 (42%)</td>
<td>86 (55%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, if we look at the distribution of nominative uses of the name Paul we find that of 55 occurrences in Acts only 12 are anarthrous, whereas in the Epistles all 24 occurrences are anarthrous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Paul’s Epistles</th>
<th>other Epistles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominatives</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>43 (54%)</td>
<td>43 (78%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>36 (46%)</td>
<td>12 (22%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This corresponds with the theory that anarthrousness marks saliency, and that the addresser of an Epistle as agent is more salient than the mere agent of a narrative event.

Looking at the anarthrousness of Peter in the nominative we see (date from GRAMCORD):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>39 (39%)</td>
<td>53 (53%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>61 (61%)</td>
<td>47 (47%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(GRAMCORD data is not totally accurate, as noted above, hence total from GRAMCORD differs from the total as analysed).

In Matthew 3/15 nominatives of “Peter” are anarthrous: 10:2 the naming as narrative character, 16:16 Simon Peter (the double name) as addresser of the Confession at Caesarea Philippi speech, 16:18 Jesus naming Simon as Peter.

In Mark 1/9 is anarthrous: 13:3 where Peter, James, John and Andrew are specifically named and listed as asking Jesus about the destruction of Jerusalem. Here there is both the listing of names, and the role of addressers.

In Luke 2/13 are anarthrous: 5:8 the first and only occurrence of the double name Simon Peter, and 9:20 Peter’s Confession.

This gives us a remarkable fact that in the synoptic Gospels only 6/37 nominatives of Peter are anarthrous, and only 2/37 are not connected with naming or listing, viz. Matthew 16:16, and Luke 9:20 both of which have Peter as addressee of the Confession that Jesus is the Christ. It seems reasonable to argue that this confession is salient at TEXT level.
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In John 16/23 are anarthrous, 12 using the double name Simon Peter (none arearthrous), and 4 using Peter alone. Simon Peter occurs anarthrously once as a listing (21:2), once as introduction of a new participant (18:25), 5 times as addresser (6:68 acknowledging Jesus as Christ, 13:9 asking Jesus to wash him thoroughly, 13:24 asking John to ask Jesus re the traitor, 13:36 asking Jesus where he is going, 21:3 announcing he is going fishing), and 5 times as agent of other significant actions (18:10 cutting off ear, 18:15 following Jesus, 20:6 entering the tomb, 21:7 jumping into the sea, 21:11 pulling in the fish). Interestingly 4 of these occur in the one incident (21:2, 3, 7, 11) where Jesus appears to the disciples at the lake. (The significance of Simon Peter in nominative case always being marked salient deserves further research). Peter is anarthrous in 1:42 as a translation of the name Cephas, 13:8 where Peter objects to Jesus washing his feet, 18:26 where Peter had cut off someone’s ear, and 18:27 where Peter denies Jesus the third time. Apart from the use in naming, the other three uses underline Peter’s failure to understand and obey Jesus. Is John being deliberately ironic, here? Or is he reminding the audience “Do not worry. Jesus named Peter the Rock, and he will come right in the end”? Certainly this anarthrous usage seems motivated, i.e. marking salience at TEXT level.

In Acts, 22/37 nominative references to “Peter” are anarthrous, and of these 13 are used for the role of addresser. They can be grouped as follows: listing (1:13), naming (10:5, 18, 32), introducing character to narrative “stage” (3:1, 9:38, 39, 10:9, 11:2), addresser of significant speech (1:15 [16-22 new apostle], 2:38 [38-39 Pentecost call to repentance], 3:4, 6 [healing of lame man], 4:8 [8-12 defence to Sanhedrin], 5:8 [challenging of Sapphira], 5:29 [29-32 defence to Sanhedrin], 8:20 [20-23 condemnation of Simon Magus], 10:21 [greet gentiles], 10:34 [34-43 preaches to Cornelius], 10:46 [47 allows baptism of gentiles], 11:4 [5-17 recounts Cornelius episode to Jewish Christians], 15:7 [7-11 defends mission to gentiles].

In the Epistles 3/3 nominative references are anarthrous: Galatians 2:7 Peter’s ministry contrasted with Paul’s own, 1 Peter 1:1, and 2 Peter 1:1 Peter as addresser therefore salient at TEXT level.

This can be charted as follows (data from GRAMCORD):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>39 (39%)</td>
<td>53 (53%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>61 (61%)</td>
<td>47 (47%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-article Naming 7 2 1 1 1 3 -
-article Listing 2 - - (1) - 1 1 -
-article Addresser 23 1 1 1 5 13 2
-article Agent other 9 - - - 8 - 1
-article Introduction 6 - - - 1 5 -

Thus we see that 23/47 (49%) anarthrous nominatives of “Peter” are when Peter is the addresser either of a letter or significant speech act. Whereas John refers to Peter
anarthrously as agent of all actions, in Acts by far the commonest role expressed by anarthrous nominatives of “Peter” is addresser.

Similarly in John’s Gospel, 39/79 anarthrous occurrences of “Jesus”, in all cases, are in speech formulas, most commonly “Jesus answered and said.” This suggests that for John one of Jesus’s most significant roles is addresser.

I deal below with proper nouns referring to addressers in the opening paragraph of letters which mark the theme of the whole TEXT. Such proper nouns are ALWAYS anarthrous in the New Testament.

e) salience because of semantic category and participant role, proper nouns in letters

I noted above that names of people are frequently anarthrous, and posited this is due to their significance at EPISODE level. I will show in n) below that proper nouns for addressee and addresser in the opening of the Epistles are 100% anarthrous. I further observe that individuals and places named in the closures of letters are almost always anarthrous, and posit that this is because they are typically mentioned for interpersonal reasons, rather than for the role they might have in the plot as is typical of narrative.

I have pointed out above, under naming, that in Romans 16:3-16 and 21-24, at the letter closure, all the names of people to greet and people sending greetings are anarthrous, i.e. salient, since the farewell greetings of a letter play an important role in maintaining interpersonal relationships.

This is paralleled by the list of people and places mentioned in the letter closure in 2 Timothy 4:10-14 (13 names), and 4:19-21 (11 names) all anarthrous. These lists include not only greeters and greeted, but associates of Paul and their whereabouts. It is true that they are typically Discourse-new references, but as Hearer-old (which certainly applies to the list of Paul and Timothy’s colleagues) they could be referred to using the article. It seems than that named people and places in the Epistles are part of the interpersonal theme, and as such are salient at EPISODE and TEXT level.

1 Corinthians has a similar closing section, 16:5-21, discussing travel arrangements, various people, and greeters. Of 14 proper names, only 2 are arthrous, both names of provinces in a genitival phrase “first-fruit of Achaia” and “churches of Asia”. All personal names, as well as towns and provinces as travel destinations, are anarthrous.


f) salience because of semantic category and participant role, place names

I noted above that names of towns are frequently anarthrous, whereas names of provinces are less frequently so. This is due to their significance at EPISODE level.
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I suggest that town names are frequently anarthrous since they are the prototypical locations of significant events. From GRAMCORD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Jerusalem</th>
<th>Capernaum</th>
<th>Nazareth</th>
<th>Bethlehem</th>
<th>Bethsaida</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all NT</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining figures for these 6 town names, out of 113 occurrences, 8 are arthrous (7%) and 105 anarthrous (93%).

I suggest that names of provinces, however, are typically arthrous, because a whole province is seldom the location of significant events. From GRAMCORD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Macedonia</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Syria</th>
<th>Galatia</th>
<th>Cappadocia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all NT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>16 (89%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>34 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>14 (54%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>20 (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining figures for these 5 province names, out of 54 occurrences, 34 are arthrous (63%) and 20 anarthrous (37%).

Two provinces show an unusually high degree of anarthrous references, Galatia and Macedonia. The anarthrous references to Galatia are in 2 Timothy 4:10 as the destination of Crescens (salient as Discourse-new, and also in terms of interpersonal relationships), and 1 Peter 1:1 in the list of addressees (naturally salient). (It should be noted that every proper noun in the interpersonal closure of 2 Timothy 4:9-22, and every proper noun in the letter opening of 1 Peter 1:2 is anarthrous. This fits the theory that interpersonal relationships are especially significant in letters, and that anarthrousness marks salience.)

The name Macedonia seems remarkable here for its high percentage of anarthrous references. These can be explained as follows: 4/8 references in Acts are anarthrous (16:9, 10, 20:1, 3). In all these Macedonia is salient as a destination for missionary activity. In contrast 16:12 refers back to where they already are, 18:5 refers to a place already left, 19:21 to a place being travelled through, and 19:22 a place where others are sent ahead, which in some texts is also anarthrous). In the letters, 10/14 are anarthrous, as follows: Romans 15:26 Macedonia and Achaia, anarthrous nominatives, standing for the Christians of those places as agent, 1 Corinthians 16:5 two occurrences as the route for Paul’s visit to them, 2 Corinthians 1:16 two occurrences as the route for Paul’s visit to them, 2:13 and 7:5 where Paul visited, 11:9 origin of visitors to Paul (8:1 is arthrous, reference to the churches of Macedonia), Philippians 4:15 place Paul visited and province of addressees, 1 Timothy 1:3 place Paul left for. Contrast 3 arthrous references in 1 Thessalonians 1:7, 8, 4:10, which refer to the location of believers affected by the Thessalonians witness, not a place on Paul’s itinerary. Thus, Macedonia seems to be frequently anarthrous in the letters since it is frequently salient as a place on Paul’s missionary itinerary. This again underlines the salience of interpersonal factors in letters.
g) salience because of participant role, agent in the nominative

An agent in the nominative is salient at CLAUSE level, since the grammatical subject (nominative case) and semantically salient agent role coincide.

Reed, who bases his discourse analysis on the systemic-functional theories of Halliday (1994), points out the relationship between grammatical slot, participant role and theme (1997:85):

in unmarked clauses the subject, theme and agent are the same.

He also links grammatical subject with “prominence” which I call salience (1997:116):

The grammatical relations between nouns are also indicators of prominence ... The nominative case generally signals a thematic element in the clause.

An example of this might be in the genealogy in Matthew 1:1-16. Throughout the genealogy (1:2-15) the first mention of all individuals is with the article (here bold), and the second mention without (here underlined), e.g.

Matthew 2:2

'Αβραάμ ἐγέννησεν τόν Ἰσαάκ, Ἰσαάκ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τόν Ἰακώβ,

Abram begat the Isaac, Isaac () begat the Jacob,

Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τόν Ἰωάννα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ ...

Jacob () begat the Judah and the brothers of-him ...

This usage directly contradicts the simple “rule” above that first mention lacks the article and subsequent mention takes the article. However the presence of the article on first mention can be explained by these characters being “Hearer-old” from the “whole world” scenario of Jewish Christians. How do we then explain why the second references lack the article? In this genealogy the first references are to people as goals of γεννάω “beget” in the accusative, or partners of “beget” in the genitive (Rahab and Ruth 1:5, the (wife) of Uriah 1:6), the second reference to people is as the agent of “beget” in the nominative, which is more salient as the clause-level theme.

Compare Acts 7:8b:

καὶ ὁτις ἐγέννησεν τόν Ἰσαάκ καὶ περετέμεν αὐτόν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ.

And thus he-begat the Isaac and circumcised him on-the day the eighth

καὶ Ἰσαάκ τόν Ἰακώβ,
and Isaac the Jacob

καὶ Ἰακώβ τοὺς δίδεκα πατριάρχας.
and Jacob the twelve patriarchs.

Note that in such genealogies there is a change of grammatical subject in every clause, each person occurring first as goal, then agent. Salience marking helps the audience keep track of this subject switching. This pattern can be explained since agents are naturally more salient than other participants, and typically are grammatically nominative case subjects, syntactically clause-initial, and semantically clause-level theme.

Further evidence for agents being marked salient comes from the list of names in Hebrews 11:4-32. It can readily be seen that each new character who acted “by faith” is in the nominative and anarthrous. However these are normally Discourse-new as well as agents. Occasionally though, there is anarthrous reference in the nominative to a Discourse-old name, e.g. Abraham in 11:17 (cf. 11:8), and Moses in 11:24 (cf. 11:23).
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Here their role as agent is being regarded as salient, and this is also indicated by repetition of the clause initial “by faith”.

There are also several Discourse-new participants who are introduced using the Hearer-old non-salient marking of the article. These are however patients in the accusative, not agents in the nominative, e.g. 11:17 Isaac, 11:20 Jacob and Esau. When they are referred to as Discourse-old agents, they are anarthrous and marked salient, e.g. 11:20 Isaac, 11:21 Jacob.

Looking again at the distribution of nominative uses of the name Paul we find that of 55 occurrences in Acts only 12 are anarthrous, whereas in the Epistles all 24 occurrences are anarthrous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Paul’s Epistles</th>
<th>other Epistles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominatives</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arthrous</td>
<td>43 (54%)</td>
<td>43 (78%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anarthrous</td>
<td>36 (46%)</td>
<td>12 (22%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This split corresponds with the theory that anarthrousness marks saliency, and that the addressee of an Epistle as agent (“I”) is more salient at the level of TEXT than the mere agent of a narrative event (“he”), since it is part of the interpersonal context of the whole letter. As Reed states (1997:181):

> The prescript - namely superscription (sender, ‘implied author’) and adscription (recipient, ‘implied reader’) - was obligatory for the epistolary genre. … The prescript and salutation (and other opening elements such as the thanksgiving) set the social and interpersonal context for the entire discourse.

However, even in the Acts narrative the distribution of anarthrous nominatives suggests a link with salience. 11 of the 12 anarthrous occurrences of “Paul” are in the first 20 mentions (13:9-19:13). During this early part of Acts, Barnabas occurs 24 times (4:36-15:39), and Silas 13 times (15:22-18:5). Thus it is reasonable to assume that Paul is frequently anarthrous to highlight him as agent, rather than other major characters.

In contrast, only 1 of the 12 anarthrous occurrences of “Paul” occurs in the last 35 mentions (19:21-28:15). This exception is Acts 23:18 where Paul is spoken of in direct speech embedded in the narrative. During this last part of Acts, Paul is indisputably the main character. Thus it is reasonable to assume that as indisputable main character there is no need to mark him salient.

This corresponds to Levinsohn’s conclusions that reintroductions of salient participants other than the main character are anarthrous (i.e. marked salient), whereas reintroductions of the main character are arthrous “apparently assumed to be in the wings … rather than truly being introduced” (1992:100).

The anarthrous nominative references to Paul in Acts are as follows: 13:9 the first naming as Παῦλος Ἐβέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος “Saul, the (one) also (called) Paul”, 13:16 addresser of major speech (13:16-41), 14:11 reference to Paul as agent of a miracle, 14:14 naming Barnabas and Paul after the generic referent “the apostles”, 15:35 summary of Paul and Barnabas’s time in Antioch, 15:36, 38, 40 Paul contrasted with Barnabas at the time of
the split (Barnabas is dismissed from Acts in 15:39 by arthrous reference in the accusative case in a Postnuclear Aorist Participial clause, whereas Paul is marked as a continuing main character by an anarthrous nominative in a main clause), 16:18 reference to Paul as agent of a miracle, 16:25 and 16:28 (textual variant) Paul as agent of righteous actions, prayer and saving someone, in the same Philippian episode, 17:22 (textual variant) Paul as addressee of major speech (17:22-31), 19:4 Paul as addressee of small but important speech linking John’s baptism to faith in Jesus, 19:13 and 23:18 Paul referred to in direct speech.

It is reasonable then to posit that the above instances are salient at a TEXT level, due to the particular importance of the actions Paul was performing in the narrative, i.e. teaching (13:16, 17:22, 19:4), performing miracles (14:11, 16:18), planning missionary activity (15:35, 36, 38, 40), and performing righteous acts leading to conversion (16:25, 28). Other uses are in naming (13:9, 14:14), and in embedded direct speech (19:13, 23:18).

Again this corresponds to Levinsohn’s conclusions (1992:99) that “anarthrous references to particular, known participants either mark the participant as locally salient or highlight the speech which he utters.”

It would be reasonable to suppose that, in narrative, proper nouns occurring sentence initial, and with the developmental particle δέ as second word, would be salient, since they refer to people as agents of action which develops the plot. Charting all such examples in Acts we find:

Sentence initial Proper nouns in Acts with δέ as second word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proper Noun</th>
<th>Anarthrous Articular</th>
<th>Articular Genitive</th>
<th>Anarthrous Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saul/Paul</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph/Barnabas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B and S/ P and B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrippa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crispus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Jews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I have not included the following instances in this analysis, since they are either part of direct speech, or arguably not proper nouns:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that most examples (39/43) are in the nominative, and all but one “the Jews” refer to an individual person. The non-nominatives occur in so-called “Genitive Absolute” constructions.

Of the nominative references, over half (22/39) are anarthrous, but this is not significant, since on average half of all nominatives are anarthrous. What is significant is which people occur anarthrously in this construction, and in what circumstances. Almost half the references charted (18/43) are for Paul and/or Barnabas, who are unarguably major characters in Acts. Of these (10/18) are anarthrous. Similarly almost half the total anarthrous nominatives (10/22) refer to Paul and/or Barnabas, and 5 of these are for Paul alone. Saul is introduced anarthrously in 8:1 at the end of Stephen’s stoning, and occurs anarthrously in 8:3 at the end of the short section on persecution. Both these seem to foreshadow Saul as a future major participant. Saul reappears in 9:1 but only occurs again in this anarthrous construction in 9:22 where he successfully preaches Jesus as Christ. From here on Saul is regularly centre stage, 9:1-30, 11:25-26, 11:30, 12:25-28:21.

Barnabas is introduced anarthrously as Joseph in 4:36 as someone who gives generously to the church. He reoccurs anarthrously in 9:27 where he introduces Saul to the church, which foreshadows his future importance in the discourse. In 12.25 Barnabas and Saul are anarthrous, returning from Jerusalem to Antioch, and from then on they are both indisputably centre stage till 15:35 where they appear anarthrously as Paul and Barnabas. The next section 15:36-41 “Disagreement between Paul and Barnabas” has the largest concentration of this anarthrous construction, 15:37 Barnabas, 15:38 Paul, and 15:40 Paul. From this point to the end, Paul becomes the main character of Acts, and the only other anarthrous nominatives are Crispus and Agrippa, whose actions affect Paul’s ministry so significantly.

These data are in line with the theory that anarthrous reference to known referents marks salience. Barnabas and Saul’s future significance is foreshadowed by anarthrous reference, even when they are Discourse-old and not prominent above the level of PARAGRAPH. When Paul and Barnabas are “struggling for centre stage” (as far as the narrative plot is concerned), they are each anarthrous, but the anarthrous construction ceases for Paul once he is indisputable main character.

Almost a quarter of the references charted (9/43) are for Peter and/or John, who are similarly major characters in parts of Acts. One third of these (3/9) are anarthrous. 3/22 of all anarthrous nominatives charted refer to Peter or Peter and John. These are 2:38 when Discourse-old Peter makes a direct appeal for the crowds to repent, 3.1 when Peter and
John take centre stage and heal the lame man (3:1-4:23 or 31), and 8:20 where Peter again challenges someone to repent, here Simon in the middle of the Philip section. All these referents are Discourse-old, and do not simply occur at the point of reintroducing the character. This is in line with the theory that anarthrous reference to known referents marks salience. 2:38 and 8:20 also support Levinsohn's conclusion (1992:99) that “anarthrous references to particular, known participants” can “highlight the speech which he utters” since in both cases Peter’s call to repentance had significant results.

The next section contains others who are mentioned anarthrously: Agrippa (x3), Philip (x2), Stephen, Herod, John, Crispus (x1), and Gallio (x1 genitive).

Surprisingly (to me) Agrippa is marked salient 3 times: 25:22 when he asks to hear Paul, 26:1 when he grants Paul permission to speak, and 26:35 where he announces Paul’s innocence, yet confirms that he should go to Rome. Agrippa’s final statement is salient at discourse level for Acts since it both vindicates the gospel, and provides the means for Paul to travel to Rome, thus fulfilling God’s promise (23:11). Agrippa’s request to hear Paul, and invitation for Paul to speak, are necessary prerequisites for this statement, and by being marked salient, highlight the concluding event even more. The salience of Agrippa may also explain the “unusual” postnuclear Aorist Participle in 25:13 κατήνυτησαν εἷς Καλοδρείαν ἀποσαήμενοι τοῦ Φήσθου where the unmarked construction would be Aorist Participle for “go down”, main verb for “greet”. However, whatever Agrippa’s motivation, Luke’s focus is NOT on his greeting Festus, but on his arriving at Caesarea where Paul is, hence the travel to Caesarea scenario is encoded as the main verb.

Philip is the major character for Acts 8:5-40, and the two anarthrous references charted are in the first and last verses of this passage, with an anarthrous reference to Peter in the middle 8:20. Philip is already Discourse-old (6:5) and the anarthrous reference in 8:40 emphasizing his going to Caesarea foreshadows his reappearance on stage in Acts 21:8-9.

Stephen is clearly a major character throughout Acts 6:8-8:1, and is re-introduced in 6:8 anarthrously when he takes centre stage, although he is Discourse-old (6:5).

Herod is clearly the major character for the section 12:19b-23 “Herod’s Death” (NIV), so he is re-introduced anarthrously in 12:19b even though he has been on stage from 12:1.

John is marked salient when he leaves the mission (13:13). John is Discourse-old (12:25, 13:5) but of course he is to return as focal in the section 15:36-41 “Disagreement between Paul and Barnabas” (NIV) where the greatest concentration of initial anarthrous nominatives with δὲ occurs (Barnabas x 1, Paul x 2).

Crispus is marked salient in 18:8, but only occurs here in Acts, and only reoccurs in 1 Corinthians 1:14, as one of the few Corinthians Paul baptized. Perhaps Crispus’s conversion is being marked here as especially significant. Up till now, Jewish leaders had not been responsive to Paul’s mission, indeed they had blocked his ministry (13:8, 13:50,
Appendix M - Types of salience in Greek discourse

14:2, 5, 14:19, 17:5, 17:13, 18:6), so a prominent Jewish leader and his household becoming believers was clearly some kind of break through, and was indeed followed by many Corinthian converts, resulting in Paul staying a year there. Crispus is also Discourse-new and may well be Hearer-new.

Gallio’s significant refusal to connive with the Jewish antagonists in Corinth (18:14-17) may explain why he is introduced anarthrously in 18:12. Gallio is Discourse-new but may be Hearer-old.

Thus all characters encoded by anarthrous nominatives above are salient at the level of PARAGRAPH, EPISODE or even whole TEXT.

There are still a number of names which occur once each on this chart, as articular nouns: Simon, Cornelius, the Jews, Alexander and Festus. Simon is on stage 8:9-25, but he is upstaged by Philip whom he follows, and Peter, whose mercy he implores. Cornelius is indeed a significant character, on stage 10:1-48, but he seems to be a minor character compared to Peter, who is on stage 9:32-11:18, and whose action in baptizing gentiles into the Christian faith is focal at a higher discourse level than Cornelius’s action, being focal in 11:1-18, and again 15:7-11. The Jews in 13:50 are significant in verses 50-51, but thereafter have no part in the discourse. Alexander (19:33) is clearly a minor character only focal in 2 verses, whose action has no effect. Festus would appear to be a major character, being on stage from 25:1-26:32, but as a “new boy” (25:1), he clearly feels the need to defer his judgment to Agrippa (25:26), and it is the trial before Agrippa which is given most coverage, and Agrippa who has the last word on the case (26:32). So the 3 anarthrous references charted for Agrippa seen to reflect his prominence above Festus. None of these characters are significant at levels of discourse above the episode.

These data from Acts again seem to confirm the thesis that anarthrous reference to Hearer-old entities marks salience, often at the higher levels of discourse.

h) salience because of participant role, agent but not in the nominative

An agent is typically salient at CLAUSE level in a narrative, since the agent causes the narrative events. Where the agent is also the main character of several EPISODES one would expect to see anarthrousness marking salience.

In the New Testament there are 30 occurrences of “Paul” in the Accusative, all in Acts. Of these only three are anarthrous. In each of these, Paul is in fact an agent, albeit marked accusative for other reasons, i.e. as a member of the nominative Noun Phrase, or as agent in an Accusative and Infinitive construction:

Acts 13:13
... οι περὶ Παῦλου ἔλθον εἰς Πέργαμον ...
... those around/with Paul went to Perga ...

Acts 15:2
... ἔταξαν διαβαίνειν Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν ...
... they-assigned to-go-up Paul and Barnabas ...

213
Acts 19:1
'Eye veT086 $ TlaOXov ... \[icaTkXGeXv el? 'Erieaov
It-happened () ... Paul ... to-go to Ephesus

In the New Testament there are 225 occurrences of “Jesus” in the Genitive, of which 185 (82%) are anarthrous. This genitive case frequently refers to Jesus as the agent of an action represented by another noun, e.g. Acts 10:36 εἰρήνην διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ “peace through Jesus Christ”, i.e. Jesus gives peace. This figure is extraordinarily high, being over 30% different from the average for all nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28956</td>
<td>7455</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>8815</td>
<td>7681</td>
<td>4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>14291 (49%)</td>
<td>3637 (49%)</td>
<td>50 (8%)</td>
<td>4294 (49%)</td>
<td>4101 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>14665 (51%)</td>
<td>3818 (51%)</td>
<td>581 (92%)</td>
<td>4521 (51%)</td>
<td>3580 (47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slight discrepancies exist between raw GRAMCORD data in this chart, and analysed data used for figures in the text.

If we look at the figures for the Gospels and non-Gospels separately, we see that both show a marked divergence from the 50% average:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29 (71%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>172 (94%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acts 7:45, included in raw GRAMCORD data, refers to Joshua.

I have already stated that anarthrous references to Jesus are statistically low in the Gospels since Jesus is the main character and thus his actions are always salient. This is supported by the low percentage of anarthrous Genitives in the Gospels. However, if we look at the references in the New Testament non-Gospel writings, the situation is dramatically reversed, and with 183 occurrences, this seems unlikely to be a statistical blip.

There are two reasons for this seeming anomaly. Firstly, there are a large number of references in the Epistles where Jesus is part of a fuller noun phrase including a descriptive noun such as “his son”, “the Lord”, “the saviour”, “Christ”. In these cases, Jesus might be regarded as primarily naming the individual, who is being referred to by the descriptive term. Secondly, and I believe more significantly, in Acts and the Epistles Jesus is not physically present as a character in the narrative, nor is Jesus addresser or addressee of the written communication, yet faith in Jesus is being presented as vital for people’s lives. In such cases, it is reasonable to suggest that Jesus is being given salience marking more frequently than in the Gospels, since he needs to be continually reintroduced onto the mental “stage”.

In the Gospels, the name Jesus typically occurs alone in the genitive and is arthrous. Elsewhere in the New Testament where the name Jesus occurs alone in the genitive it is frequently anarthrous, e.g. in Acts 10/30 times, 4/10 anarthrous, in Epistles 8/142 times, 3/8 anarthrous, Revelation 7/11 times, all anarthrous.
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It should be noted these arthrous references seem to refer to Jesus as a historical human figure, i.e. Acts 1:14 Jesus’s mother, 4:18, 5:40, not to teach in the name of Jesus, 9:27 Paul’s preaching in the name of Jesus, 18:25 facts about Jesus, 28:23 convince people about Jesus. Similarly 2 Corinthians 4:10 (x2), 4:11, Galatians 6:17, and 1 Thessalonians 4:14 are all references to Jesus in physical human form, either during his life on earth, or at the Second Coming.

The anarthrous references to Jesus above refer primarily to Jesus’s power and work, i.e. Acts 16:7 the Spirit of Jesus, 25:19 and 26:9 Jesus focal as topic of a charge, Philemon 2:10, Hebrews 10:19 referring to his name and his (sacrificial) blood, and Revelation 1:9, 12:17, 17:6, 19:10 (x2), 20:4 referring to Jesus’s witness, and 14:12 to his faith.

Where Jesus in the genitive is part of a larger descriptive noun phrase, there is only one arthrous occurrence of Jesus in the whole New Testament, “the Jesus Christ”, Matthew 1:18. This reference proves that Jesus Christ CAN take the article, yet of 45 occurrences of “Jesus Christ” alone in the genitive, only 1 has the article. Similarly, of 25 occurrences of “Christ Jesus” alone in the genitive, only 2, Galatians 5:24 and Ephesians 3:1 take the article.

I suggest that the low occurrence of the article with Jesus, Jesus Christ, and Christ Jesus is due to the fact that Jesus in the Epistles is marked as salient, since he is thematic at the level of TEXT. This is reinforced by a seemingly anomalous lack of the article in the phrase “Lord Jesus (Christ)” where one would expect its use since Lord refers to a known definite individual. The New Testament has this phrase 31 times, and 11 are anarthrous, all in the Epistles.

Seven out of these 11 anarthrous forms occur in the opening prayer formula, where the genitive marks the agent of the desired action, e.g.

1 Corinthians 1:3
χάρις ἡμᾶς καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Grace to-you and peace from God father of-us and Lord Jesus Christ

This identical formula is used in 2 Corinthians 1:2, Galatians 1:3, Ephesians 1:2, Philippians 1:2, 2 Thessalonians 1:2 and Philemon 1:3.

One occurrence comes from the identification of the addressee of the letter:
James 1:1
Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἑοδοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος ...
James of-God and of-Lord Jesus Christ slave ...

One occurrence comes in the closing prayers:
Ephesians 6:23
Εἰρήνη τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ αὐτᾶς μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Peace to-the brothers and love with faith from God father and Lord Jesus Christ

Two occurrences occur within the body of the text: 2 Thessalonians 1:12
“according to the grace of our God and (the) Lord Jesus Christ” in a summary statement of the opening thanksgiving section 3-12, and Colossians 3:17 “in the name of (the) Lord
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Jesus” in a summary statement of the teaching in 3:1-17 as well as an introduction to 3:18-4:1.

Of the 8 occurrences which are arthrous, 4 occur in the final prayer of blessing, i.e. 1 Corinthians 16:23, 2 Corinthians 13:13, Philippians 4:23, Philemon 1:25 “the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ ...” and 4 occur in the body if the text, 1 Corinthians 6:11, 2 Corinthians 11:31, 1 Thessalonians 4:2, and 2 Thessalonians 1:7.

This seems to suggest that anarthrous usage marks salient, and that in the opening prayer of blessing of a letter, which establishes the interpersonal relationships of the whole TEXT, the agent is especially salient, even though marked by genitive case. In contrast, it appears the final blessing shows less marked salience, being primarily a repetition of the blessing invoked in the opening.

i) salience because of participant role, being the predicate noun, or subject complement

A “predicate noun” or “subject complement” is used to predicate information about the subject, e.g. “king” in “Croesus was king”. The concepts of subject and predicate are also related to given/new and topic/comment distinctions, the subject being “given” or “topic”, the predicate being “new” or “comment” (Chalker and Weiner, 1994:307). Predicate nouns are naturally salient, since they are the new comment, rather than the given propositional topic.

Levinsohn relates this to articular use in Greek (1992:97):
Frequently, the propositional topic is information that the author considers to be “known” to the reader and the subject is most frequently the topic. The observed tendency for the subject to be arthrous in Greek naturally follows.

Similarly, the comment usually contains “new” information “not in the sense that it cannot have been previously mentioned, although it is often the case that it has not been, but in the sense that the speaker presents it as not being recoverable from the preceding discourse” (Halliday, 1967:204). As a result, the constituents of the comment show a tendency to be anarthrous.

Examples of comments being anarthrous, even when the referent is definite, come from Hebrews. The topic of these statements is God’s son, introduced in 1:2 (topic is underlined, comment bolded):

Hebrews 1:2
εὐ γὰρ ὠν ἐδηκένε κληρονόμον πάντων,
in son, whom he-appointed heir of-all
Hebrews 1:3
δέ ὡς ἀπαντάσεσ τῆς διάνεις καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ
who being radiance of-the glory and representation of-the reality of-him

Surely, given the whole focus of Hebrews on the uniqueness of Jesus, we are to understand that Jesus is not simply an heir, a radiance and a representation, but the heir, the radiance, and the representation. Anarthrousness here, I posit, is to mark the comment as salient, by presenting it as if it were NEW (even though, presumably, the recipients of Hebrews knew these facts).

Similarly in 1 Timothy (topic is underlined, comment bolded):
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1 Timothy 3:15b
ἐν οἰκῷ θεοῦ ... ἐντὸς ἑκκλησίας θεοῦ, στῦλος καὶ ἐπιτραπέζια τῆς ἀληθείας.
in house of-God ... which is assembly of-God living, pillar and bulwark of-the faith

Again, in context the comment must be definite, i.e. “the assembly of the living God, the pillar and the bulwark of the faith”. Hence, I argue anarthrousness here marks salience.

This may account for so-called “anomalies” such as “class” words occurring without an article where they function as predicate nouns in the comment slot, e.g.

Galatians 5:19-21a
φανερὰ δὲ ἐστὶν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς, διὰ τὰς ἑπεταίρες, ἀκαθαρσία ... Manifest() are the works of-the flesh, which are fornication, uncleanness...

Galatians 5:22-23a
ὅ δὲ καρδίας τοῦ πνευματός ἐστὶν ἀγάπη χαρὰ ἐξήρησι, μακροθυμία χρηστότης ...
The () fruit of-the spirit is love joy peace, long-suffering, kindness...

(As has been shown above, nouns in lists tend to be anarthrous, possibly due to highlighting the implicit contrasts between items filling the same semantic role, but more probably due to the thematic significance of such listed items at EPISODE level.)

Comments may be anarthrous, even when the sentence is not equative, e.g.

James 1:3-4
τὸ δοκίμων ἦλθον τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν.
the testing of-you of-the faith produces steadfastness.

James 1:15
εἶτα ἡ ἠμαρτία ἡ συλλαβοθειά τίκτη ἡμαρτίαν,
Then the lust having-conceived bears sin,

Romans 5:3b-5a
ἐξειδίκευέτες τὴν ἡμετερίαν ὑπομονήν καταργοῦν, ἥ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκίμων,
knowing that the affliction steadfastness produces, the () steadfastness character

These examples show a chaining of ideas in a predictable sequence, where the same noun is anarthrous as comment, and arthrous as topic. (This of course parallels the basic Discourse-new, Discourse-old pattern. Indeed Moule (1953, 1990:117) commented on the use of the article in Romans 5:3-5 for “renewed mention”.)

However, even a Discourse-old or Hearer-old element may be anarthrous, i.e. salient, when it occur as a predicate noun, since it is NEW in Halliday’s sense of not predictable. It may have been previously mentioned in the text, but “the speaker presents it as not being recoverable from the preceding discourse” (Halliday, 1967:204), e.g.

Revelation 1:20
οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγγελων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν.
The seven stars angels/messengers of-the seven churches are

and the lamps the seven seven churches are.

Here the “angels” in the first line are Discourse-new but probably Hearer-old. Certainly in 2:1, use of the article with the singular noun “the angel” seems to presuppose the hearers already knew each church had one. The anarthrous occurrence of “seven churches” in line
two must clearly refer to Hearer-old churches, since they first occurred in 1:4 with the article and have just been mentioned in the previous clause. The following list of churches makes it clear that these are “the seven churches” i.e. the seven churches of Asia.

Revelation 20:2

δεῦτα Διάβολος καὶ δὰσπανᾶς
Who is Devil and (i.e.) the Satan

Here the Devil is clearly meant to refer to a single identifiable Hearer-old entity, and is also Discourse-old (see 2:10, 12:9, 12:12).

Luke 2:11

δεῦτα Ἰησοῦς κόριος
who is Christ lord

Here Christ must refer to the Hearer-old Messiah who is to come, but is marked salient, because of semantic role.

Matthew 16:18

αὐ σεῦ Πέτρος
you are Peter

Here Peter is marked salient, because of semantic role. The next occurrence (16:22) is with the article.

A similar pattern can be seen with the verb καλέω where the named is arthrous and the name, being salient, anarthrous:

Matthew 1:21 (cf. 1:23, 1:25)

καὶ καλέσεις τὸ δώμα αὐτοῦ Ἡσών;
and you-will-call the name of-him Jesus.

Matthew 10:25

εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Ἔελζεβολ ἐπεκαλέσαν
If the householder Beelzebul they-called

One may argue that names in Greek are frequently anarthrous. This is true, but why? Grammatically they are the same as common nouns, being able to take the article (although not occurring in the plural). I argue that they frequently lack the article as they are frequently salient at clause or discourse level.

j) salience because of participant role, manner/means versus sphere

We have seen in Romans 12:7-8 that abstract nouns in the semantic role of sphere take the article, and in the role of manner, i.e. adverbial usage, are anarthrous. We have also seen that prototypical slot fillers may be referred to as Hearer-old, i.e. take the article. Sphere slots have a restricted range of possible fillers. Indeed, in the above passage the abstract nouns for sphere are all derived from the same root as the preceding noun or verb. Adverbial slots, however, not only have a wider range of possibilities, but where adverbial concepts are explicit, they are prototypically salient, since the manner of performing the verb is frequently new information, and determines whether the action of the verb will bring success or failure, e.g.
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2 Corinthians 9:6
Τούτο δὲ, ὁ σπέρνων φειδομένως φειδομένως καὶ θερίζει,
This [, the one] sowing sparingly sparingly also will reap
καὶ ὁ σπέρνων ἐπ’ εὐλογίας ἐπ’ εὐλογίας καὶ θερίζει.
and the one] sowing on blessings on blessings also will reap

NIV “whoever sows generously will also reap generously”

Here it is the manner of the action, expressed in the first clause by an adverb, and in the second by an abstract noun, which determines the result, and hence the abstract noun in the phrase indicating manner is anarthrous, i.e. marked salient. This suggests that nouns in adverbial slots are salient at SENTENCE, PARAGRAPH, or even EPISODE level, since they affect predictability of outcomes. For example, “generously” above occurs in the first sentence of the NIV’s section entitled “Sowing Generously” (2 Corinthians 9:6-15) which suggests salience at EPISODE level.

James 1:5, 6
αὐτὴ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ ... θεοῦ ... καὶ δοθῆται αὐτῇ.
Let him ask from the ... God ... and it will be given to him.

Here again, the verb is simply repeated, but the manner, expressed by an adverbial noun phrase with anarthrous abstract noun, is the key to success of the verb, since James himself warns in 1:7 “That man [who wavers] should not think he will receive anything from the Lord.” Here “faith” is salient at PARAGRAPH level, throughout James 1:2-8.

There are many examples of abstract nouns in adverbial phrases being anarthrous. Salience can be argued I believe, as the adverb is frequently the only new information, the verb being predictable, e.g. in the instructions to slaves, who are forced to obey and serve:

Ephesians 6:5, 7
Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακοῦέτε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις
The slaves, obey the according-to flesh masters
μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόπου ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ἴμων ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ ... with fear and trembling in singleness of the heart of you as to the Christ
μετ’ εὐνοίας δουλεύουσες ... with goodwill serving ...

Colossians 3:22, 23
Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακοῦετε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις,
The slaves, obey in everything the according-to flesh masters
μη ἐν δολαιμοδουλίᾳ ὡς ἄθρωπομάρσκοι, not in eye-service as men-pleasers,
ἀλλὰ ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας φοβοῖμεν οἱ κύριοι,
but in singleness of heart fearing the Lord
δὲ ἄνω ποιήτε, ἐκ φυσικῆς εὐράσεως ... What ever you do, from soul do ...

Sometimes the verb is not in the clause, but assumed from a previous clause, e.g.
1 Peter 3:15, 16
κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐγνάσατε ...
Lord () the Christ reverence ...

Similarly, in the following examples, the adverbial noun phrases are semantically important, and the grammatical verb is virtually empty of semantic content:
1 Timothy 3:4b
τέκνα ἠκούσατε ἐν ὑποταγῇ, μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος, children having in submission, with all gravity
i.e. control your children and make them behave well.
I Timothy 4:12b

but pattern become for-the faithful

in word, in behaviour, in love, in faith, in purity.

i.e. speak, behave, love, believe, be pure, so well that you are a good example.

Danove also shows the significance of adverbial phrases of manner in Greek in predicting likely plot development, and argues, using Fillmore’s Construction Grammar, that they are especially significant because they are not required by the case frame (1993b:112):

The generalized Valence Description of the predicator, to listen to, requires two complements, an experiencer and a “to” prepositional phrase (or, in Greek, an experiencer and a patient in the genitive case). In the sentence, “He listened to him gladly ([Mark] 6:20),” the adverb ἰδέως, offers particular information necessary for the meaning of this specific statement, though in general no adverb need be present for the verb to produce a meaningful sentence:

Danove argues (ibid.) that the Adverbial Phrase of manner, “gladly”, identifies Herod as “inconsistent” and is part of the “Passion Narrative frame” which “relates to a particular character who first defends the hero and later is responsible for the hero’s death.” (This same Passion Narrative frame is later cued by the same phrase, “And (the) great crowd listened to [Jesus] gladly (12:37c)” thus linking the crowd’s treatment of Jesus with Herod’s inconsistent treatment of John.)

Evidence for the salience of certain semantic roles is also found in Pam Bendor-Samuel’s thesis on the analysis of semantic roles in Greek prepositional phrases (1996:151-173). She examines the semantic roles of certain abstract nouns with the preposition ἐν, commenting not only on their frequency and role, but also whether they are arthrous.

Bendor-Samuel identifies 19 occurrences of ἐν (τοῖς) ἐγγάπτη “in love”. She analyses 9 as sphere, 6 arthrous (John 15:9, 15:10 (x2), 1 John 4:16, 4:18b (x2)), and three anarthrous (Eph. 3:17, 1 Tim. 4:12, Jude 21). According to my analysis, the anarthrous occurrences for sphere are being marked as salient, since in Eph. 3:17 and Jude 21 the phrase is also fronted for focus (cf. Reed (1997:118) “syntactic elements may be moved for the sake of markedness (e.g. comparison, contrast, focus)”), and the occurrence in 1 Tim. 4:12 is one of five elements in a list, which listing indicates thematic significance at EPISODE level. In contrast all the 10 occurrences which she analyses as manner are anarthrous (1 Cor. 4:21, 16:14, 2 Cor. 6:6, Eph. 1:4, 4:2, 4:15, 4:16, 5:2, Col. 2:2, 1 Th. 5:13).
Similarly Bendor-Samuel identifies 13 occurrences of \(\varepsilon\nu\) \(\tau\eta\) \(\delta\varepsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\) "in power". She analyses 4 as sphere, and all are anarthrous (1 Cor. 2:5, 4:20, 15:43, 2 Cor. 6:7). These anarthrous occurrences for sphere are marked as salient, the first three being in explicit contrast with other elements "not in wisdom," "not in word," "in weakness", and the last being the final one of eight abstract nouns in a list (from v. 6 "in purity" on), which listing indicates thematic significance at EPISODE level. She analyses the other 9 occurrences as manner or means, commenting "due to the semantics of the word ... the line between the two is fine". The 4 means are all anarthrous (Romans 15:13, 15:19, 2 Th. 1:11, 1 Pe. 1:5). Romans 15:13 again seems to show a contrast between sphere "in the hope" and means/manner "in power". Of the 5 manner, 3 are anarthrous (Mark 9:1, Rom. 1:4, Col. 1:29) and two arthrous (Luke 4:14, Rev. 1:16). In both these arthrous uses the noun is part of a genitive construction and does not refer simply to manner: "in the power of the Spirit" is not about the manner of Jesus’s return to Galilee, but about the Spirit’s indwelling presence at that time, and "in the power of it [the sun]" is a reference to time "as the sun shines when at its brightest". These arthrous uses are not simply adverbial, meaning "powerfully", and indeed might be reasonably analysed as sphere.

Bendor-Samuel identifies 15 occurrences of \(\varepsilon\nu\) \(\tau\eta\) \(\pi\lambda\sigma\tau\epsilon\) "in faith". She analyses 12 as sphere, 4 are arthrous (1 Cor. 16:13, 2 Cor. 13:5, Ti. 1:13, 2 Pe. 1:5), and 8 are anarthrous (1 Tim. 1:2, 1:4, 2:7, 2:15, 3:13, 4:12, Ti 3:15, Jas. 2:5). All these anarthrous occurrences for sphere are salient. The six occurrences in 1 Timothy are themselves an indication that "the faith", i.e. the true apostolic Christian faith, is thematic to the letter. In 1:2 it occurs in the opening paragraph as an indication of the letters theme (see below), 2:7 also seems to be salient due to theme as does 3:13 (cf. 3:9), 1:4 is in implicit contrast with "tales and genealogies", 2:15 and 4:12 occur in lists, indicating comparison or contrast. The occurrence in Titus 3:15 comes in the letter closure, and is salient in terms of the interpersonal theme of the letter, (cf. “according to faith” in 1:1). The anarthrous occurrence in James 2:5 is salient due to contrast "rich in faith" contrasting with "poor in world". The 3 analysed manner/means are all anarthrous (Gal. 2:20, 2 Tim. 1:13, Jas 1:6).

In summary then, accepting Bendor-Samuel’s categorization of semantic roles, abstract nouns with \(\varepsilon\nu\) are typically anarthrous as manner/means, and arthrous as sphere, unless the sphere is salient:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic role</th>
<th>manner/means</th>
<th>sphere</th>
<th>sphere +salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical form</td>
<td>arthrous</td>
<td>anarthrous</td>
<td>anarthrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in love</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in power</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in faith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Arguably sphere, see discussion above.

If the alternative analysis for "in the power" in Luke 4:14 and Rev. 1:16 be accepted, the pattern is even more marked:
Bendor-Samuel also lists uses of “in (the) spirit/Spirit”. This naturally is more problematical due to the polysemy of the Greek word. However she lists 43 occurrences, 7 arthrous (6 as Holy Spirit, Rom. 1:9 as human spirit), and 36 anarthrous (13 of which are followed by “holy”, and most of which she analyses as referring to the Holy Spirit, mainly in the role of agent, e.g. Matt. 22:43, Rom. 9:1, Eph. 2:22, 5:18, all anarthrous). Thus the vast majority of references to the Holy Spirit in agent role are anarthrous, i.e. by my analysis “salient”. It is not surprising that the Holy Spirit is frequently marked grammatically as a salient agent, given the significance of the Holy Spirit’s role in the life of the believer (e.g. John 16:5-16).

Similarly Bendor-Samuel notes that “in the Lord” occurs 48 times, of which only 1 is arthrous (Eph. 1:15), “in Christ (Jesus)” occurs 82 times of which only 6 are arthrous (1 Cor. 15:22, 2 Cor. 2:14, Eph. 1:10, 1:12, 1:20, 2:6. She says re “in Christ” “Sphere ... is the major role of the phrase.” If, as I argue, a noun in the sphere role is anarthrous when it is marked salient, then the high percentage of anarthrous occurrences of Lord and Christ grammaticalizes the significance of the believer’s relationship to Christ (e.g. John 15:1-17).

**k) salience because of discourse role, named main participant in a TEXT**

We have seen above that agents referred to by proper nouns, whether in the nominative or not, are frequently anarthrous, especially where their role seems to be highlighted, either in contrast to that of others, or in contrast to other actions they perform.

We have seen that for “Jesus” there is a marked imbalance in the genitive case between a low number of anarthrous occurrences in the Gospels, where Jesus is the main narrative character, and a high number of anarthrous occurrences in Acts and Epistles, where Jesus is thematic, but not “on stage”.

We have also seen that in general the percentages of arthrousness for Jesus are not significantly different from those for all nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>14291 (49%)</td>
<td>3637 (49%)</td>
<td>50 (8%)</td>
<td>4294 (49%)</td>
<td>4101 (53%)</td>
<td>2188 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>14665 (51%)</td>
<td>3818 (51%)</td>
<td>381 (92%)</td>
<td>4521 (51%)</td>
<td>3580 (47%)</td>
<td>2187 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>917</th>
<th>407 (44%)</th>
<th>280 (61%)</th>
<th>0 (0%)</th>
<th>59 (46%)</th>
<th>37 (16%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>407 (44%)</td>
<td>280 (61%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>59 (46%)</td>
<td>37 (16%)</td>
<td>30 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>510 (56%)</td>
<td>182 (39%)</td>
<td>10 (0%)</td>
<td>68 (54%)</td>
<td>188 (84%)</td>
<td>63 (68%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However book by book analysis shows that Jesus is in fact normally arthrous in the Gospels, yet normally anarthrous in Acts, and almost always anarthrous in the Epistles:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+article</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>436 (77%)</td>
<td>18 (26%)</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-article</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>127 (23%)</td>
<td>51 (74%)</td>
<td>262 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Jesus is the main narrative character in the Gospels, and thus always on stage and focal, anarthrous uses in the Gospels mark salience at TEXT level, and cluster around especially significant events. In contrast, in Acts and the Epistles, Jesus as a narrative character is no longer on stage, yet is still thematic at TEXT level, hence occurrences of Jesus are typically anarthrous, i.e. marked salient.

For example, Matthew has 19/150 anarthrous uses, clustered as follows:

- Jesus's birth: 1:1 Title, 1:16 climax of genealogy, 1:21 name prophecy, 1:26 name given,
- Jesus attracts opposition: 14:1 Herod heard fame of Jesus,
- Transfiguration: 17:8 Jesus left alone,
- Jesus enters Jerusalem: 20:30 heard that “Jesus is coming”, 21:1 Jesus sent 2 disciples to get donkey, 21:11 crowds said this is the prophet Jesus, 21:12 Jesus entered into the temple,
- Peter deserts Jesus: 26:51 one of those with Jesus, 26:69 26:71 accusation of being with Jesus, 26:75 remembered word of Jesus (3 in a row),
- Crucifixion: 27:17, 27:22 Jesus (direct speech), 27:37 heading on cross,
- Resurrection: 28:5 you seek Jesus (direct speech), 28:9 Behold Jesus met them.

Note that there are NO salient references to Jesus in Matthew from 1:26 until 14:1, where all Jesus does is “the norm” of teaching and healing.

Mark has only 8/82 anarthrous references to Jesus. They also occur at focal points of the text as a whole:

- Title: 1:1 Title
- Jesus introduced to narrative: 1:9 Jesus comes on the scene
- Jesus addressed by those in need: 1:24, 5:7 Jesus addressed in direct speech, vocative, by demonized (Jesus’s mission, to destroy the works of Satan), 10:47 (x2) direct speech, blind man heard it is Jesus, and Vocative, have mercy
- Resurrection: 16:6 Direct speech, you seek Jesus of Nazareth
- Ascension: 16:19 Lord (Jesus) went to heaven

Luke has 21/87 anarthrous references to Jesus, also clustered in significant sections:

- Childhood: 1:31, 2:21, name announced and naming, 2:27 taken into temple, 2:43 Jesus stayed in Jerusalem, 2:52 summary of childhood
- Beginning his ministry: 3:21 Baptism, 3:23 ministry, 4:1 Temptation
  (These first 8 references to Jesus are all anarthrous.)
- Ministry: 4:34 Vocative, demon possessed man “come to destroy us?”, 5:8 Peter at Jesus’s knees “depart from me”, 8:28 Vocative, demon possessed man “come to destroy us?”, 17:13 Vocative, lepers asking for mercy, 18:37 Direct speech, blind man hears Jesus is passing, 18:38 Vocative, blind man asks for mercy
- Transfiguration: 9:36 Jesus alone
- Betrayal and crucifixion: 22:48 Jesus said “judas do you betray me with a kiss?”, 22:52 Jesus said “Do you come against me as a robber?”, 23:43 Vocative, Jesus remember me when come in your kingdom
- Resurrection: (Last three references in the book) 24:3 Did not find the body of the Lord Jesus, 24:15 Jesus drew near (Emmaus), 24:19 Direct speech “concerning Jesus of Nazareth”

Note that the first 8 references to Jesus in Luke, covering his birth and the beginning of his ministry, and the last three references, referring to the resurrection, are all anarthrous.

In John 79/244 are anarthrous, a much higher proportion than in the other Gospels. Of these 39 are speech formulas, most commonly “Jesus answered and said”, which suggests that for John one of the most significant things Jesus does is speak. This parallels
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the commonly observed fact that John's miracles do not stand alone, but are "signs" demonstrating the truth of Jesus's teaching. John's salient sections are as follows:

a) Prologue: 1:17 first mention "grace and truth through Jesus"
b) Calling of Philip and Nathaniel: 1:45 direct speech "we have found the prophet, Jesus of Nazareth", 1:48, 1:50 answered Jesus and said to him, Nathaniel
c) Jesus in Jerusalem: 2:19 answered Jesus and said to them, Jews seeking a sign, 2:24 Jesus did not entrust himself to them
d) Jesus and Nicodemus: 3:3, 3:5, 3:10 answered Jesus (and said to him) Nicodemus
e) Jesus and the Samaritan woman: 4:1, 4:2 Jesus baptizing, not baptizing (comparisons), 4:10, 4:13 answered Jesus and said to her, woman at well
f) Jesus heals official's son: 4:44 Jesus himself testified that a prophet not welcome in own country, 4:47 (direct speech) man heard that Jesus had come to Galilee
g) Jesus heals lame man in Jerusalem: 5:1 Jesus went to Jerusalem, 5:15 (direct speech) lame man, Jesus made me whole
h) Jesus feeds 5000: 6:3 Jesus goes into mountains, feeding of 5000, 6:15 Jesus perceives they want to make him king and leaves, 6:24 (direct speech) Jesus is not there, 6:42 (direct speech) Is this not Jesus?, 6:43 answered Jesus and said to them
i) Jesus in Jerusalem, day one: 7:14 Jesus went up into the temple, 7:21 answered Jesus and said to them, 7:39 because Jesus was not yet glorified
j) Jesus in Jerusalem, day two: 8:1 Jesus went to Mount of Olives, 8:14 answered Jesus and said to them, 8:19, 49, 54, answered Jesus, 8:58 said to them Jesus, 8:59 Jesus hid and left.
k) Jesus heals man born blind: 9:3 answered Jesus, 9:11 (direct speech) the one called Jesus, 9:35 Jesus heard that they threw him out
l) Lazarus: 11:9 answered Jesus, 11:20 Martha heard that Jesus is coming, 11:32 she came where Jesus was, 11:33 Jesus therefore... groaned, 11:38 Jesus therefore again groaning inwardly comes to the tomb, 11:46 said to them what Jesus did, 11:51 prophesied that Jesus was about to die, 12:1 whom Jesus had raised from the dead
m) Triumphal entry: 12:16 when Jesus was glorified, 12:30 answered Jesus and said, 12:36 these things spoke Jesus, 12:44 Jesus cried out and said
n) Last supper: 13:7 answered Jesus and said to him, Peter, 13:8 answered Jesus to him, Peter, 13:31 says Jesus, now is the son of man glorified, 13:36 answered Jesus, Peter, 13:38 answers Jesus, to Peter re denial, 14:23 answered Jesus and said to him, Judas not Iscariot
o) Prayer for disciples: (next 9 are all in a row) 16:31 answered them Jesus, do you now believe, 17:1 these things spoke Jesus, 17:3 (direct speech) whom he sent Jesus Christ
p) Betrayal: 18:1 these things having said Jesus went out, 18:2 because Jesus often gathered there, 18:4 Jesus therefore knowing ..., 18:5 (direct speech) Jesus of Nazareth, 18:7 (direct speech) Jesus of Nazareth, 18:8 answered Jesus, I told you that I am he
q) Trial by high priest: 18:20 answered him Jesus, high priest, 18:23 answered him Jesus, high priest's officer
r) Trial by Pilate: 18:34 answered Jesus, Pilate, 18:36 answered Jesus, Pilate, 19:11 answered Jesus, Pilate
s) Crucifixion: 19:19 board "Jesus the Nazarene the king of the Jews", 19:26 Jesus therefore seeing his mother says ...
t) Resurrection, Mary: 20:14 knew not that it is Jesus, 20:15 says to her Jesus, woman, 20:16 says to her Jesus, Mary, 20:17 says to her Jesus, do not touch
u) Resurrection, apostles: 20:24 Thomas .. when Jesus came, 20:31 believe that Jesus is the Christ
v) Resurrection, Galilee: 21:4 stood Jesus on the shore, 21:4 did not know it is Jesus, 21:13 comes Jesus and takes the bread, 21:14 appeared Jesus to the disciples

John's anarthrous nouns for Jesus are distributed fairly evenly throughout the text, but notable are 8 related to the raising of Lazarus, 9 (all sequential) related to Jesus's prayer for the disciples and Peter's fleeing and denial, and 10 related to the resurrection appearances, especially the cluster in the appearance to Mary where all four clauses are also highlighted by the Present verb form.
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I) salience because of being a paragraph-level theme.

In Luke’s genealogy, 3:23-38, only two names occur without the article (first mention is bolded, subsequent mention underlined), e.g.

Luke 3:23-24a
Kal autòs ἐγένετο ἄρχομενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα,
And himself was Jesus beginning about years thirty,
δὸς ὑλός, ὡς ἐνομιζότοι, Ἰωάννης τοῦ Ἰς τοῦ Μαθαθατ τοῦ Ἰετά ... 
being son, as was-reckoned, of-Joseph of-the Eli, of-the Matthat, of-the Levi

Here Jesus and Joseph (3:23) are marked as salient since they have no article, even though both are Discourse-old (3:21, 1:27). Although Jesus could be seen as salient due to participant role (being in the nominative case), Joseph is in the genitive. It is better then to see this as discourse salience at the PARAGRAPH level, marking Jesus and Joseph as the most salient in the whole genealogy. This might lend strength to Luke’s genealogy being through Joseph’s lineage, rather than Mary’s as some suggest.

In contrast everyone else in Luke’s list of names is marked simply as “Hearer-old” by the article. With Luke’s presumably gentile audience it seems unlikely that he would regard these names as really Hearer-old, but perhaps the very nature and purpose of a genealogy, to preserve known names, standardizes the use of articles here.

Similarly in Revelation 7:4-8, both common and proper nouns in “the sons of Israel” and every mention of “the tribe of so-and-so” are all anarthrous, even though the referents are surely “Hearer-old”. This could be explained as thematic at the paragraph level.

m) salience because of being a higher Discourse-level theme

In Matthew’s genealogy, 1:1-16, the first occurrence of most names is with the article, marking these people as Hearer-old. However, there are four names which first occur without the article, even though they would be clearly “Hearer-old” for the probable target audience of primarily “Jewish-Christian readers” (Hagner, 1993:lix; France, 1985:17-18). These anarthrous names are Jesus Christ, David, Abraham (1:1), and Mary (1:16), all first occurring in the genitive case (first mention is bolded, subsequent mention underlined):

Matthew 1:1
Βιβλος γενέσεως Ιησου Χριστου υπο Ναυδ ιοθ Αβραάμ,
Book of-origin of-Jesus Christ son of-David son of-Abraham

Matthew 1:16
Ἰακώβ ἐγένετο τοῦ Ἰωάννη τοῦ Ἰακώβ τοῦ Μαρλας,
Jacob () begat the Joseph the husband of-Mary,
εἶναι Περιτοι τοῦ Ἰουδαίων Μεσσιαν,
from whom was-born Jesus the being-called Christ.

These anarthrous names are all salient at levels of discourse above the paragraph, since the issue addressed here is that Jesus, the son of Mary, is son (i.e. descendant) of Abraham and of David, thus fulfilling Messianic promises (e.g. Isaiah 7:14 quoted in Matthew 1:22-23, Genesis 22:18, 2 Samuel 7:16 referred to in Matthew 21:9).
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Jesus as son of Mary seems thematic from Matthew 1:16-25, linking the genealogy (1:1-17) to the birth (1:18-25) including messianic prophecy (1:23).

Jesus as the Messiah, descendant of Abraham and of King David, seems to be thematic for the whole TEXT. This is not surprising since Matthew 1:1, a verbless sentence, functions as the title of at least the book’s opening section, the genealogy (Hendriksen, 1974:107-8). It therefore sets the theme for the whole book, Jesus is the promised Christ.

The second mention of Jesus (1:16) is also without the article, even though he too is the semantic goal of the same verb γεννάω “beget”. However, Jesus is topicalized, i.e. made clause-level theme, by making him the grammatical subject of a verb in the passive.

Similarly in 1:17, in the summary of the genealogy, Abraham and David are again marked as salient:

Πάσαι σῶν αἱ γενεαὶ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἐως Δαυὶδ γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες,
καὶ ἀπὸ Δαυὶδ ἐως τῆς μετουκέσσας Βαβυλώνος γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς μετουκέσσας Βαβυλώνος ἐως τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες

In Romans 1:17, the Discourse-old noun “faith” occurs anarthrously three times.

Louw, analyzing the structure of Romans by identifying and linking colons, states (1982:149):

The line of argument in Romans 1:8-17 can now be summarized as
(A) giving thanks for their faith
(B) wanting to visit them to share their mutual faith
(C) This (=B) entails the gospel which is based on faith.

Faith is the link between sections (A), (B), and (C).

He further states (1982:149):

Their faith is the motivation for εὐχαριστεῖν, and πίστις is the item continued in the discourse and in fact in section C it builds up to a climax.

This climax is marked grammatically by anarthrousness. The arthrous noun ἡ πίστις occurs in section (A) 1:8, and again διὰ τῆς ἐν διάληκτος πίστεως in section (B) 1:12, but at the climax, 1:17, we have ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γεγραπται, 'Ο δὲ δικαίως ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. Faith is thus marked salient as the theme of this THEME UNIT, and indeed is thematic in the whole TEXT (e.g. “He is able to make you stand firm in your faith” 16:25). Indeed πίστις and δικαίωσιν can be regarded as “the two key terms in the thematic statement of [Romans] 1:17” (Dunn, 1988:163).

Consequently, “righteousness” also has thematic salience in Romans. Louw states (1987:127) “the topic explaining that people are put right with God through faith ... is the central theme of the letter”. By my count, δικαίωσιν occurs 34 times in Romans of which only 12 are arthrous (3:25, 26, 4:11 (once, maybe twice), 5:17, 6:18, 19, 20, 10:3 (twice), 10:5, 6). Anarthrous salience marking is especially clear in the first four occurrences of δικαίωσιν, all anarthrous references to the righteousness of God (1:17, 3:5, 3:21, and 3:22), and in the section on Abraham’s righteousness, 4:1-35, where 6, maybe 7, of the eight references are anarthrous (4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11b (?), 13, and 22, but not 11a). This supports the thesis that righteousness is indeed a major theme of Romans, and that anarthrous
reference to a “known specific” is a way to mark “salience” i.e. to say “pay special attention”.

The following chart below shows all the nouns which occur 20 times or more in Romans, ordered in terms of the percentage of anarthrous occurrences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns in Romans</th>
<th>Total 1700</th>
<th>arthrous 700</th>
<th>anarthrous 1000</th>
<th>% anarthrous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ιησοῦς</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰδίωμα</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δικαιοσύνη</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πνεῦμα</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔθνος</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόμος</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίστις</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύριος</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάρκις</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θάνατος</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σάρκις</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεός</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All nouns in NT 28956 14291 14665 51%

This raw data from GRAMCORD does not include as arthrous instances where the article is separated from the noun.

Of these 14 high-frequency nouns 11 show higher percentages of anarthrousness than the New Testament average of 51%. This combination of high frequency occurrence and high percentage salience marking is appropriate for TEXT level themes. Of all the abstract nouns listed, “righteousness” shows the highest percentage of anarthrous salience marking.

Where the article is used with “righteousness” it does not mean that the concept of righteousness is not thematic, simply that it has not been marked as such. The choice between anarthrous and arthrous is the choice between marking saliency, and not marking saliency. Anarthrous = marked SALIENT, and arthrous = unmarked for saliency.

(Arthrous does NOT = marked NOT SALIENT.)

n) salience in the text initial paragraph marking theme at the level of TEXT

We have seen above that the opening sentence of Matthew’s Gospel 1:1 consists only of 8 anarthrous nouns, including “Jesus Christ son of-Abraham, son of-David”.

Marked salience in the opening paragraph of a book, or letter, indicates a theme at the level of TEXT. So the text-level theme of Matthew is Jesus as the Messianic king promised in the Old Testament. This interpretation is supported by Matthew’s frequent use of Old Testament quotations related to Jesus as Messiah. Son of David occurs 10 times in Matthew and its Messianic significance is shown implicitly in Matthew 21:9 and explicitly in Matthew 22:42 where the Son of David and the Christ are linked. Also there is an interesting Messianic inclusio at text level between Matthew 1:1 and Matthew 28:18b:

Ἐδόθη μείῳ πάσῃ ἐξουσίᾳ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Was-given to-me all authority in heaven and on [the] earth.
This “giving of authority” is connected with the other Messianic title “Son of Man”, as in Daniel 7:14, cf. Matt. 16:28; 24:30; 26:64 (Hagner, 1995:886; Davies and Allison, 1997:683; France, 1985:413).

Mark’s Gospel also begins with a verbless sentence or title, either to the whole book or to 1:2-13 (Cranfield, 1977:34-7) with an anarthrous reference to Jesus Christ. Whoever wrote “Son of God” (ibid. 38) also made it anarthrous.

Mark 1:1
διδάσκον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Τύχου Χριστοῦ [οὗ τ θεοῦ].
Beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ [son of god]

Clearly Jesus and God are Hearer-old so lack of an article marks salience, and the position of this sentence as text first, indicates that this is thematic salience at whole TEXT level (cf. Cranfield, 1977:38).

Luke’s Gospel begins in a different manner, with the first paragraph combining “ideational” and “interpersonal” functions, i.e. not simply communicating certain ideas or concepts such as the book’s theme, but stressing the relationship between author and reader. Hence in Luke 1:1-4 we find first and second person pronouns as well as a vocative. Luke 1:3-4 reads:

ἐδοξάσε κυρίοι προσδοκουμενήτι διαθέθεν πάσιν ἀριθμὸς
it-seemed to-me-too having-investigated from-source all accurately
καθέτευς σοι γαρδόναι, κρατίστη Θεόδεσθε.
order-wise to-you to-write, most-excellent Theophilus,
λέγω ἵνα ἐπιγνώσης περὶ διὰ καταγγέλθησα λόγου τὴν ἀριθμόνιν.
so-that you-may-know concerning which you-were-instructed the reliability.

As mentioned above, vocatives often indicate what is thematic at the level of the whole discourse (Reed, 1997:116). Here the vocative occurring between infinitive and purpose clause marks Luke’s purpose as thematic “so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught”. Since this is in the first paragraph, I argue it marks the TEXT level theme, i.e. the theme of the whole book.

Why is there a link between vocatives and TEXT level theme? The referent of a vocative is ALWAYS salient, since it is always GIVEN information, i.e. Hearer-old and focal in consciousness. In face to face direct speech the addressee always belongs to the category 3a GIVEN situational. In letters and introductions to books, the addressee of a vocative is typically 3b GIVEN textual-current (e.g. Theophilus above, coreferential with σοι “you” which precedes it in the same clause) or 3c GIVEN textual-displaced, being co-referential with the addressee(s) of the letter (e.g. Galatians 3:1 “O foolish Galatians” after 2:17-21 referring only to “I”, the writer, Paul). The participant referred to by the vocative is typically part of the interpersonal relationship throughout the whole TEXT.

So vocatives, like pronouns and Imperatives, always refer to participants who are GIVEN, and thus focal. Since GIVEN focal participants are frequently left implicit in Greek (e.g. verb forms with no pronoun or noun phrase as explicit subject), making them
explicit gives some extra meaning, typically marking out the clause they belong in as significant at higher levels of discourse. In narrative, referring to the subject by a full noun phrase, rather than by a pronoun or zero anaphora, typically signifies the start of a new and significant paragraph or episode. Similarly, in interpersonal discourse, such as letters and introductions to books, a vocative noun phrase signifies that the clause in which it is embedded is significant at higher levels of discourse.

John’s Gospel begins thus (Discourse-new bolded, Discourse-old underlined):

'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος,
In beginning was the Word,
καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν,
and the Word was with the God,
καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.
and God was the Word.

The first occurrences of “the word” in line 1, and “God” in line 2, have the article as they are “Hearer-old”, albeit Discourse-new (2a KNOWN unused, from the “whole world” scenario of Christians and Jews). The next two occurrences of “the Word” in lines 2 and 3 have the article, as “the Word” is Hearer-old and now Discourse-old (3b GIVEN textual-current). However, the second occurrence of “God” (now Discourse-old) is anarthrous, and thus marked salient.

Here salience patterns with marked word order, i.e. the comment (rheme) “god” is fronted so that it occurs before the topic (theme) “the Word”. The Word is marked as clause level theme by being subject of the first three clauses, and as section level theme (1:1-14) by arthrous repetition in 1:14, and by being reduced to a pronoun (1:3-4, 12), and zero anaphora (1:10-11). This theme of the Word is also linked with life and (spiritual) light (1:4-5, 7-9) and with testimony and belief (1:7-11). The collocation of anarthrous salience marking and fronting is to be expected, since fronting is also a device for marking what is salient or prominent at TEXT level, e.g. Reed (1997:118):

The more to the left an item occurs, the more prominent topically it tends to be in the discourse.

I argue that what is marked salient in the first paragraph of a book is thematic at book level. Representing salience (marked by anarthrous anaphora) as bolding, and Discourse-level theme (marked by fronting) as underlining, gives a visual impression of the theme of John’s Gospel “The word was god”. The author’s stated purpose in writing reinforces this book level theme and also links it to testimony, belief and life, (John 20:31) “these [things] are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name.”

The beginning of Acts (1:1-11) is similar to that of Luke, having a mixture of ideational and relational content. The section is marked by inclusio, with 1:11 “you have seen him go into heaven” matching 1:2 “was taken up”. Much of it is recap, since Acts 1:12 “Then they returned to Jerusalem” takes us only as far temporally in the narrative as
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Luke 24:52. The presence of the anarthrous vocative "O Theophilus" in 1:1 emphasizes the relational aspect of this book, and marks that the sentence it is in is a discourse theme (see Reed above), viz. "In my former book I wrote about all that Jesus began to do and to teach until the day he was taken up into heaven". So, by implication, the theme of this second book is what "Jesus continued to do and to teach after he was taken up into heaven."

This section also contains salient anarthrous reference to the Holy Spirit in 1:2 and 1:5, and arthrous anaphoric reference to the Holy Spirit in 1:8. This section also links instructions to the disciples with the Holy Spirit, 1:2 and 1:8. This indicates that Jesus's continued "doing and teaching" is through the disciples by the power of the Holy Spirit.

The coming of the Holy Spirit on the disciples in Acts 2:1-4 and Peter's explanation linking this explicitly with Jesus (2:33) confirms this analysis. As Martín-Asensio points out re Acts 2:22-36 (1997:10) "Luke has referred to Jesus 10 times over 14 verses of text, but in only one single instance as an agent who performs an action extending beyond Himself", i.e. Jesus pouring out the promised Holy Spirit.

The Epistles generally show a different patterning. Reed, comparing the Epistles with other Hellenistic letters, states (bolding mine) (1997:181): The prescript - namely superscription (sender, 'implied author') and adscription (recipient, 'implied reader') - was obligatory for the epistolary genre. To it was typically added a salutation ... The prescript and salutation (and other opening elements such as the thanksgiving) set the social and interpersonal context for the entire discourse. They often take the form of 'A (nominative) to B (dative), greetings...'

If the initial paragraph of a letter sets the interpersonal context for the entire discourse, one might expect to see salience marking. Although in general names of people take the article in Greek if Hearer-old, in the opening of every Epistle, every personal name both of sender and recipient is anarthrous, i.e. marked salient, e.g. Philemon 1-2: Πάθως δέ συμμόνος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ο ἀδελφός Φιλίμον τῷ ἁγαπητῷ καὶ συνεργῷ ἡμῶν καὶ Ἀσπία τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ Ἀρχίππῳ τῷ συστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ κατ' ὅπλον σου ἑσκλησία,

However, where the sender is not named, but referred to by a common noun, that noun is arthrous, e.g. "the elder" (1 John 1:1 and 2 John 1:1), "the brothers with me" (Galatians 1:2).

Similarly, where recipients are not named, but referred to by a common noun or nominal phrase, they are often arthrous, e.g. "those having obtained faith" (2 Peter 1:1), "those having been loved" (Jude 1:1), "the church" in Corinth (1 Cor. 1:2), "the saints" in Philippi (Phil 1:1). However, recipients may also be anarthrous, e.g. "to chosen ones in..." (1 Peter 1:1) and "to chosen lady" (2 John 1:1), but arthrously "and the children of her".

As regards place names, where the recipients of a letter are believers in a named town, the town name is always anarthrous, e.g. Romans 1:7: πᾶσιν τοῖς συν ἐν Ρώμῃ ἁγαπητοῖς δοκεῖ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις to-all the[ones] being in Rome beloved of-god, called saints
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(Also 1 Cor 1:2, 2 Cor 1:1, Eph 1:1 (where present), Phil. 1:1, 1 Thess. 1:1, and 2 Thess. 1:1.)

However, as noted above, provinces are frequently arthrous, being less "localized" than towns and therefore less "salient" (Reed, 1997:112-113). Thus where the recipients are believers in a given province, the province name may be arthrous, e.g. Galatians 1:2, and Revelation 1:4 (a somewhat unusual "letter style" opening after the book style opening in 1:1-3). However, in the opening of a letter even province names are sometimes anarthrous, i.e. all five province names in 1 Peter 1:1.

Thus, in the opening paragraph of the Epistles, when proper nouns are used for addressers, addressees, or town of addressees, they are ALWAYS anarthrous. This 100% salience marking of proper nouns to establish the interpersonal context of letters compares with an average 50% for the article with New Testament nouns.

Hebrews begins without a typical letter opening. The letter's theme is marked by the anarthrous use of "son" in Hebrews 1:2:

εὐς ἐκχάστην τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἣμαν ἐν υἱῷ...

in last of-the days these he-spoke to-us in son...

Given the context of a letter to Jewish Christians, "son" here is clearly intended to have the "Hearer-old" reference to God's son, Jesus Christ, so in unmarked use the article would be expected. Lack of the article then is statistically unusual and hence salient.

The word "son" at first sight appears to be contrasted with "the prophets" in 1:1, but whereas the prophets are not a key theme in Hebrews (hence have the article marking Hearer-old and appear in a Participial clause), the son is marked salient as a key theme of the whole letter. The thematic salience of "the son" at the highest Discourse-level, the whole letter, is clearly justified from the wider context, e.g. "son" occurs 21 times in Hebrews, of which 12 (13 including 2:6 as exegeted by the writer of Hebrews) refer to Jesus. (Only the Gospels and 1 John have more occurrences). Also the Son is contrasted explicitly with angels (1:2-2:18), with Moses (3:1-4:13, especially 3:6), and with high priests (3:14-10:39, especially 7:28 and 10:29). Moreover, Jesus, to whom the son in 1:1 refers is also clearly thematic at TEXT level, e.g. 2:9, 3:1, 4:14, 6:20, 10:19, 13:20-21 etc.

1 John, although it is clearly a letter, with personal pronouns I, we, you, and vocatives, begins more like a book (cf. Luke or Acts) with ideational and interpersonal themes mixed. It opens with the topic or title "the word of the life" (1:1), which is further clarified in 1:3 by the anarthrous name "Jesus Christ". Clearly Jesus Christ refers to a Hearer-old entity, so lack of the article marks salience, and, in this opening paragraph, marks the ideational theme of the letter, "Jesus Christ, the word of life".

The interpersonal context of the letter is shown by the first person plural verb suffixes from 1:1-4, but more explicitly by personal pronouns "to you" and "to us" in 1:2
“we announce to you the eternal life which .. was manifested to us”, and again “you” “us” in 1:3 “so that you also may have fellowship (anarthrous) with us”. Thus the interpersonal theme is that of sharing “Jesus Christ, the word of life”, leading to mutual “fellowship”.

Jude shows the classic opening of a letter, with addresser, addressees and opening blessing. In this opening formula, Jesus occurs twice, in the description of both addresser and addressees, both anarthrous:

Jude has 6 references to Jesus, all anarthrous and all as Jesus Christ. 1:4 categorizes the false teachers as rejecting Jesus Christ, 1:17 refers to the true teachers, the apostles of Jesus Christ, 1:21 refers to our hope in Jesus Christ, and 1:25 includes Jesus Christ in the final prayer of praise to God. This would seem to reinforce the theory that the opening paragraph sets the theme for the TEXT, and marks it by anarthrous nouns.

Finally the opening of Revelation also shows salience marking. It also begins like a book, i.e. with an ideational theme rather than an interpersonal theme (which comes in 1:4):

Revelation of Jesus Christ...
The string of anarthrous nouns without a verb functions as a thematic title for the book, i.e. “This book contains the revelation of Jesus Christ...” (cf. Matthew 1:1 and Mark 1:1). One might argue that the revelation is not Hearer-old and could be translated “a revelation”, but the strict warning against adding to this revelation (22:18) argues against that. Clearly, however, Jesus Christ is intended to refer to a Hearer-old identifiable individual, and as such the unmarked form in Greek would be arthrous. Here then, I argue, the lack of articles shows salience, and occurring book initial in a verbless clause marks the book’s theme.

In Revelation the name Jesus occurs only 14 times, always anarthrously, Rev 1:1 (in the title, genitive), 1:2, 1:5, 1:9 (x2), 12:17, 14:12, 17:6, 19:10 (x2), 20:4, 22:16 (as addresser, nominative), 22:20 (as addressee, vocative), and 22:21 (as agent of closing blessing, genitive). This reinforces the theory that anarthrousness marks salience, and that Jesus is thematic at TEXT level.

o) salience marking co-occurring with fronting to mark discourse theme

We have seen above in John 1:1 the co-occurrence of the syntactical device of fronting with the grammatical device of anarthrousness:

and God was the Word. i.e. And the Word was God.

Reed describes the function of fronting the rheme as follows (1997:103) (bolding mine):

According to Halliday, THEME is that element which states what is being talked about in the clause. The RHHEME is that element which contributes what is being said about the theme. The theme appears first in a clause - it sets the stage for what follows. The remainder of the clause is the rheme. ... Marked thematisation (i.e. sentences which do not follow this pattern) indicates focal material.
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Where a propositional comment is both fronted and anarthrous, it is being marked as focal in the proposition and salient at higher discourse levels. At the beginning of a discourse, such as John 1:1, it indicates a theme at the level of TEXT:

Hebrews chapter 11 provides an interesting example of salience marking with πίστις "faith". This chapter contains 24 of the 31 occurrences of "faith" in Hebrews, and constitutes a distinct EPISODE in the discourse, to which NIV gives the heading "By Faith". Although the topic of faith has been introduced in 10:38, so is Discourse-old, 23 of the 24 occurrences in this section are anarthrous, e.g.

Hebrews 11:1
Εστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἤλεγχος οὐ βλέπομένων.
Is () faith being-hoped-for[things] reality, of-things proof not being-seen.

Hebrews 11:3
Πιστεύειν κατηγορία τοὺς σιλάνας δέματι θεοῦ,
by-faith we-understand the worlds to-have-been-created by-word of-god

From here on, throughout verses 3-33, the word for "faith" is clause initial and anarthrous.

The only anarthrous occurrence is at the end of the chapter, i.e.

Hebrews 11:39
Καὶ οὕτοι πάντες μαρτυρήθηντες διὰ τὴς πίστεως οὐκ ἐκμισάντω τὴν ἐπαγγέλλαν.
And these all having-been-approved through the faith not received the promise ...

Discourse analysis of New Testament Greek shows the use of fronting to mark theme, and Reed applies the principles of unmarked and marked word order to this very passage (1997:85):

in unmarked clauses the subject, theme and agent are the same. When they are distinct, the author is using more semantic resources (i.e. marking the discourse) to express interpersonal meanings. This distinction between subject, theme and agent is much easier to identify in Greek than, for example, in English, since Greek has more resources to distinguish the three functions: (i) nominative case or verbal suffix (or word order in infinitive clauses) for subject; (ii) word order (element at the beginning of the clause) for theme; and (iii) prepositional phrase (e.g. ὁμο + genitive) or, less frequently, oblique case for agent. The three for example are distinguished in Heb. 11.23 Πιστεύειν (theme) Μωυσῆς (subject) ... ἐξερήμη τρίμην ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ (agent) ‘By faith Moses ... was hidden for three months by his parents.'

If, as Reed claims, the fronting of "faith" marks it as theme, then this thematic fronting is also highlighted as salient by the lack of the article in all 22 occurrences from verses 1-38. Note that "faith" is marked salient in 1:1 even before the fronting, and its repeated use in "semantic chains" (see Reed, 1997) throughout the passage clarifies its status as thematic at the level of EPISODE.

In 11:39 the emphasis moves on from the topic of faith, to the topic of receiving the promise. Note that here "faith" is arthrous, i.e. no longer marked salient, and occurs in a Participial clause, rather than a main clause. Thus, both "faith" and "being approved" are treated simply as Discourse-old, not salient, in contrast with 11:2, with which this verse forms an inclusio, i.e.:

Hebrews 11:2
ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.
in this (i.e. faith, Discourse-old, focal) for were-approved the ancients.

Hebrews 11:39
Καὶ οὕτωι πάντες μαρτυρήθηντες διὰ τὴς πίστεως οὐκ ἐκμισάντω τὴν ἐπαγγέλλαν,
And these all having-been-approved through the faith not received the promise ...
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This the lack of the article to mark salience clearly parallels other grammatical and syntactic devices in this passage marking theme and focus.

In Luke 11:15-19, Beelzebul is both fronted and anarthrous, being marked salient as the theme of the whole EPISODE, 11:14-23, TEV’s “Jesus and Beelzebul”:

Luke 11:15, 18, 19
'Ev Beelzeboul tō ἄρχων τῶν δαιμόνων ἐκβάλλει τά δαιμόνια ...  
In Beelzebul the chief of the demons he casts out the demons

In Luke 11:20
εἴ δέ ἔγω ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τά δαιμόνια ...
if () I in Beelzebul I cast-out the demons, ...

Compare also the parallel passage Matthew 12:27, 28, where contrast, fronting and anarthrousnss co-occur.

In Ephesians also, fronting and anarthrous salience co-occur. A list of nouns which is a semantic comment (“You should not name ...”) is presented as if it were topic by passivization (“... should not be named”). The list, part of which is also fronted, consists of anarthrous abstract nouns for vices, followed by a second list of evil-doers in the next sentence:

Ephesians 5:3-5
τομφεα δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἡ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ἀνομαζέαθω ἐν ἑνὶ, καθὼς πρέπει ἄγιοι,
and uncleanliness and greed should not be named, as it is fitting for the saints.

In 1 Corinthians 11:3-10, there is also correlation between fronting and anarthroussness. In these verses the noun “head” occurs 9 times, 11:3 (x3), 4 (x2), 5 (x2), 7, 10. Of these only three are anarthrous and only two are fronted to clause initial. All occur in the setting of this topic:

1 Corinthians 11:3-4
θέλω δὲ ἵματεν εἰδέναι ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρός ἢ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστιν,
I wish () you to know that of every man the head the Christ is,

head () of woman the man,

head () of the Christ the God.

This topic is clearly thematic at EPISODE level, occurring in TEV’s section 5:1-20 “Living in the Light.”

In 1 Corinthians 11:3-10, there is also correlation between fronting and anarthrousness. In these verses the noun “head” occurs 9 times, 11:3 (x3), 4 (x2), 5 (x2), 7, 10. Of these only three are anarthrous and only two are fronted to clause initial. All occur in the setting of this topic:

Fronting in clause two may be to present the new and controversial issue of man as head of woman, rather than the accepted one of Christ as head of every man. Perhaps Paul marks the relationship between Christ and God as salient in order to reestablish his authority as an apostle of Christ to lay down the law on this matter of church practice (cf. 1:1). But whatever the significance of fronting here, there is a correlation between fronting and anarthrousness.
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Note that the third anarthrous usage introduces a new sense of κεφαλή as “physical head” as opposed to “authority/source”. Perhaps this is why it is also marked salient, since both senses are focal in this passage.

p) salience because of contrast, marking a discourse theme

Where there is an explicit contrast, the contrasted elements are typically anarthrous, even when they are Discourse-old. The contrasted elements are thematic at the level of PARAGRAPH or EPISODE (anarthrous is bolded, Discourse-old is underlined), e.g.

Luke 7:37, 38, 46
καὶ ἵππος γυνὴ ἤτοι ἤν ἐν τῷ πόλει ἁμαρτωλός, ... κομίσασα ἀλάβαστρον μέρου ... And behold woman certain was in the town sinful ... having brought alabaster-jar of perfume ... καὶ κατεφίλη τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ, ... and was-kissing the feet of-him and was-anointing with-the perfume...

ἐλαίῳ τῷ κεφαλῆς μου οὐκ ἠλείψας.
With-off the head of-me not you-anointed, αὐτὴ δὲ μόνον ἠλείψεν τοὺς πόδας μου.
she but with perfume anointed the feet of me

In the last line “perfume”, though Discourse-old, lacks the article and thus is marked salient, being contrasted with oil.

The contrast between the action of the woman and the Pharisee is thematic in the whole EPISODE of Luke 7:36-50, TEV’s section “Jesus at the Home of Simon the Pharisee”, especially from 40-47 where Jesus tells a parable and draws parallels to it.

Luke 16, 9, 11, 13
ἐκ τοῦ μαμονᾶ τῆς ἁδίκους ... ἐν τῷ ἁδίκῳ μαμονᾷ ...
from the mammon of the unrighteousness ... in the unrighteous mammon

οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δοξεῖν καὶ καὶ μαμονᾷ.
not you-are-able god to-serve and mammon.

Mammon occurs three times in Luke, the first time Discourse-new but Hearer-old (2a KNOWN unused) with the article, next Discourse-old (3b GIVEN textual - current) with the article, then Discourse-old again, but this time anarthrous and salient being contrasted with God (also marked salient). The contrast between God and mammon is thematic to this EPISODE, Luke 16:1-13, TEV’s “The Shrewd Manager”. (cf. Matthew 6:24)

John 4:23
προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δοξεῖν they-will-worship the father in spirit and truth

Here spiritual and true worship is contrasted with ritual “holy-place” centred worship, 4:21. This is thematic to the PARAGRAPH 4:19-24 and also to the EPISODE, TEV’s section 4:1-42 “Jesus and the Samaritan Woman” inasmuch as Jesus overthrows the taboos of ritualistic and ethnically restricted religion and talks of universal truth, 4:14, 22-24, 42 etc.

1 Timothy 3:16b
Ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἑδραμαζόθη ἐν πνεύματι, Who was-manifested in flesh, was-justified in spirit/Spirit ὃς ἀγγέλους, ἔκπρεπε τινι σταθεῖν, was-seen by-angels, was-announced among nations ἐπεσταθή ἐν κόσμῳ, ἄνελθη ἐν δόξῃ, was-believed in world, was-taken-up in glory.
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The nouns used here are all typically arthrous, as they refer to abstract noun classes (flesh, spirit, glory), class groups (angels, nations), or unique referents (world, Spirit).

Anarthrousness here marks salience, presumably due to the contrasting pairs.

In Romans there is a series of contrasts between circumcision and uncircumcision, both Discourse-old (2:25-3:30). After the arthrous topic introduction, these elements are marked anarthrously (except for the one instance “in the uncircumcision” which is merely part of an appositional Noun Phrase qualifying the salient Noun Phrase “sign of circumcision”). Each section contains a salient circumcision/uncircumcision contrast:

Romans 4:9-12

In Galatians 3:1-6, where the vocative “O foolish Galatians” marks a high level theme, there are contrasts between works of the law and the flesh on the one hand, and obedience of faith and the Spirit on the other. This contrast has already been established in 2:16 “a man is not justified by observing the law but by faith in Jesus Christ” (all anarthrous nouns in Greek), and the theme of faith and justification is continued in 3:6 ff:

Galatians 3:1-6

Similarly, there is a series of contrasts in Hebrews 3:1-6, between Jesus and Moses. All references are anarthrous, although Jesus has been just mentioned in 2:9. Note that the proper nouns form an inclusio:

Not A but B

Note the use of the construction οὐ/οὔτε .. οὔτε .. ἄλλα to mark contrast, and its frequent co-occurrence with anarthrousness:
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Romans 14:17
οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις
Not for the kingdom of the god eating and drinking
ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
but righteousness and peace and joy in spirit holy
All these nouns are abstract nouns and as such normally arthrous. Eating has been thematic from 14:2, and βρῶσις “food” is mentioned in 14:15, so βρῶσις would normally be arthrous as 2b KNOWN inerrable.

1 Corinthians 11:8-9
οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀθηρὸς ἀλλὰ γνῶσις ἢ διάθεσις
Not for is man from woman but woman from man.
καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔκτισθη ἀθήρα ἀλλὰ τῆς γυνακείας, ἀλλὰ γνῶσις ἢ διά τὸν ἀνδρα.
And for not was-created man because-of woman, but woman because-of man.
Man and woman are contrasted throughout this EPISODE, TEV’s section 11:2-16, “Covering the Head in Worship”.

2 Corinthians 3:6
ὅς καὶ ἐκάνων ἡμῶν διακόνους καὶ καθήκης, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος,
who also made-competent us ministers of new covenant, not of letter but of spirit
τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτένευτο, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ.
The for letter kills, the () spirit gives-life.
Spirit is Discourse-old, 3:3, 3b GIVEN textual-current. γράμμα “letter” is Hearer-old 2b KNOWN inerrable, from the ἐπιστολή “letter” scenario 3:1 onwards. In this verse, first both are anarthrous, then both arthrous. They cannot have different reference. The difference is marked salience due to contrast. Both are thematic at the level of EPISODE, TEV’s section 3:1-18, “Servants of the New Covenant.”

Galatians 1:12
οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέκλασιν αὐτὸ ὅπερ ἔδιδαχθην
Not for I from person received it nor was-taught
ἀλλὰ δὲ ἀποκάλυφαν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
but by revelation of Jesus Christ.
Jesus Christ is Discourse-old, 1:1. Paul’s apostolic authority is thematic at EPISODE level, TEV’s section 1:1-24, “How Paul became an apostle”, and even at the level of TEXT, cf. 1:1, 6:17.

Galatians 5:6
ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὕτως οὕτως περιτομή τι λογχεῖ οὕτως ἀκροβυσσία
In for Christ Jesus neither circumcision anything avails nor uncircumcision
ἀλλὰ πίστις δὲ ἀγάπης ἐνεργοῦμενη
but faith through love working-within.
Circumcision is Discourse-old 5:2-3, also faith 1:23. The circumcision versus faith issue is not only thematic in this EPISODE, 5:1-15, TEV’s “Preserve your Freedom”, but is thematic at TEXT level, cf. 2:11-14, 3:1-15 etc.

Galatians 6:15
οὐτε γὰρ περιτομή τί ἐστὶν οὐτε ἀκροβυσσία ἀλλὰ καθήκου
Neither for circumcision anything is nor uncircumcision but new creation.
cf. 5:6 and comments there.

Ephesians 5:3-5
πορνεία δὲ καὶ διαβασία τάπα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζόμενον ἐν ἰμαῖ, καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις, καὶ ἀλοχρότης καὶ μορφόλογα ἢ εὐτρεπελα, δ οὕτως ἄνθικεν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία.
Abstract nouns in Greek are typically arthrous, since they refer to the whole scenario as a single class. In a list, abstract nouns are typically anarthrous, since they contrast individually, and also mark the generic category they belong to as salient. Here, the final noun “thanksgiving” is contrasted with the list of vices, and thus is also marked salient. Thanksgiving, contrasted with vices, is thematic in this EPISODE, 5:1-20, TEV’s “Living in the Light.”

Colossians 3:11
δοτον οὐκ ἐν Ἑλληνικὰ καὶ Τουβαδοις, περιτομῇ καὶ ἀκροβυσσίᾳ, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, .GetById Δύσας, ἔλευθερος, ἀλλὰ ὑπάρξει καὶ ἐν τάξιν χριστός.
Circumcision is Discourse-old in 2:11, Christ in 3:1.
This issue of the universality of the gospel is not only thematic at the EPISODE level, 3:5-17, TEV’s “The Old Life and the New”, but also at TEXT level, cf. 1:20, 1:23, 1:28, 4:3-6 etc.

1 Thessalonians 2:4b
οὕτως καλομένειν, οὕτως ἀνθρώπους ἀρέσκοντες ἀλλὰ θεῷ ....
Thus we-speak, not as to-men pleasing, but to-God
God is just mentioned arthrously in 2:4a
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1 Thessalonians 2:13b
εἴδασας οὖν δυνάτων ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἦστιν ἄλλως δύναται θεοῦ ....
You received not word of-people but as it-is truly word of-God

The word of God is just mentioned in 2:4a with God arthrous, God clearly refers to a known definite referent.
The issue of the Thessalonians' heartfelt acceptance of the gospel is not only thematic at EPISODE level,
TEV's section 21-16 "Paul's work in Thessalonica, but also at the higher level of TEXT, cf. 1:2-10 TEV's
"The Life and Faith of the Thessalonians", especially 1:6-7, also 4:1, 5:2 etc.

2 Timothy 1:7
οὐ γὰρ ἐδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δεινά
Not for gave to-us the God spirit of-cowardice

These again are all abstract nouns, contrasted here, and thematic at the level of EPISODE, 1:3-18, TEV's
"Thanksgiving and Encouragement", and TEXT, e.g. 2:1 “be strong,” 2:14 “give them a solemn warning,”
3:14 “continue in the truths you were taught,”

Hebrews 2:16
οὐ γὰρ διηνότος δινέλεον ἐπιλαμβάνεται ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται.
Not for of-courage of-angels he-helps but of-seed of-Abraham he-helps.

Both angels (1:4), and the seed of Abraham (1:11 brothers, 1:14 children) are Discourse-old. The contrast
between angels and humans is thematic in the EPISODE 2:5-18, NIV's "Jesus Made like his Brothers".

Compare also Matthew 10:34, 1 Corinthians 14:32, Hebrews 10:39, 1 Peter 4:2.

Note also Acts 10:41 with only the latter element “witnesses” marked salient:
οὐ παντὶ τοῖς ἀλλὰ μάρτυσιν τοῖς προκεχιρωτομημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡμῖν...
Not to-all the people but to-witnesses the pre-appointed by the god, us ... “Witnesses,” though Discourse-new, is treated as Hearer-old 2b KNOWN innerrable, and
“post-triggered”, i.e. linked to an open scenario which follows in the text, as shown by the
article with the Participial phrase “those preappointed by God“. One would normally
expect τοῖς μάρτυσιν τοῖς προκεχιρωτομημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Here, however,
“witnesses” is not only contrasted with “all the people” but is also thematic in the
PARAGRAPH 10:40-43, whereas “the people” is not.

A GRAMCORD search for Noun ἄλλα Noun in a clause produces 16 hits, but for
Article Noun ἄλλα Article Noun produces 4 hits.

Neither A nor B
Romans 8:38-39a
πέπεσαμι γὰρ διὰ ὅτι θάνατος ὅτε ζών ὅτε δινέλεον ὅτε ἀρχαί
I-am-convincing that neither death nor life nor angels nor rulers
ὅτε ἐκεῖνοτα ὅτε μελλοντα ὅτε δυνάμεις ὅτε ἡμίαμα ὅτε βάθος
nor present[things] nor future[things] nor powers nor height nor depth
ὅτε τις κτίσεις ἐτέρα ...
nor any creature other...

These abstract nouns would normally take the article (2a KNOWN unused)
1 Corinthians 11:11
πάντα ὅτε γυνὴ χωρὶς ἄνδρον ὅτε ἄνδρι χωρὶς γυναῖκος ἐν κυρίῳ.
Nevertheless neither woman without man nor man without woman in Lord.

Man and woman are contrasted throughout this EPISODE, TEV’s section of 11:2-16, “Covering the Head in
Worship”)

A GRAMCORD search for Noun ὅτε Noun in a clause produces 14 hits (in
21:4) but for Article Noun ὅτε Article Noun produces 0 hits.
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A or B

Romans 8:35

τις ἡμᾶς χωρίζει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Who will separate from the love of the Christ?

θλίψεις καὶ θεσπορίας ἢ διωγμὸς ἢ λύπης ἢ γυμνότης ἢ κλείσις ἢ μάχαιρα; Affliction or distress of persecution or famine or danger or sword?

Galatians 3:2:2 (Levinsohn, 1992:108)

ἐξ ἐρωτῶν νόμου τὸ πείραμα ἔδειξε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πόρτεως:

From works of law the spirit you received or from obedience of faith?

The works of the Law, and faith are Discourse-old, e.g. 2:16, and are contrasted and thematic in the PARAGRAPH 3:1-5, the EPISODE, TEV's section of 3:1-14 “Law or Faith”, and indeed the TEXT (1:6 “another gospel” 6:13-14 “the Law ... the cross”)

A GRAMCORD search for Noun ἢ Noun in a clause produces 69 hits, but for Article Noun ἢ Article Noun produces only 12 hits (Matthew 5:17, 10:14, 15:5, 23:17, 23:19, Mark 7:11, 7:12, John 3:19, Acts 28:17, Romans 4:13, 1 Corinthians 7:15, Revelation 17:13). Most of these are not actually contrastive, but the combination of specifics really refers to a generic category, e.g.

Matthew 5:17

Μὴ νομίστητε ὅτι θλίσσων καταλύσατι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας:

Not reckon that I came to destroy the law or the prophets, i.e. the scriptures.

Matthew 10:14

... ἐξερχομένων ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἢ τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἠκέλευση ...

... leaving from the house or the town that ..., i.e. leaving that place

Matthew 15:5

Ὁς δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῷ μητρὶ, Whoever should say to the father or to the mother,

John 3:19b appears to show contrast, but actually shows comparison:

καὶ ἡγάπησαν αὐτὸν μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς

And loved the people rather than the darkness than the light

Matthew 23:17b and 19b also appear to show contrast, but actually shows a comparison, which ultimately is an invalid one, as evidenced by 23:20:

τις γὰρ μείζων ἐστιν, ὁ χριστὸς ἢ ὁ ναός ὁ ἁγιάσας τὸν χριστὸν;

Which for greater is, the gold or the temple the having-purified the gold

τι γὰρ μείζων, τὸ δέρμα ἢ τὸ θυσίαστρον τὸ ἁγιάζον τὸ δέρμα;

Which for greater is, the offering or the altar the purifying the offering

ὅπως ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ θυσίαστρῳ ὁμοίως ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ δόθῃ ἡ ἁγιασμοῦ αὐτῶν;

The one therefore having sworn on the altar swears on it and on all the things on it.

then A now B

Galatians 3:3:5 (Levinsohn, 1992:108)

ἐναρξάμενοι, περιεβαλλόντος πόρτα ἐπιτελείον;

having begun by spirit now by flesh do you complete?

The Holy Spirit, and the flesh are Discourse-old, e.g. 3:2b, 1:16, and are contrasted and thematic in the PARAGRAPH 3:1-5, and indeed the TEXT (cf. 5:16 both anarthrous, being contrasted again in the EPISODE 5:16-26, TEV’s “The Spirit and Human Nature”)

A does B, but X does Y

Matthew 3:11 (also Mark 1:8, Luke 3:16)

ἐγὼ μὲν ἤλθας βάπτισα ἐν θάυμα ἐλαττώναυ,

I on the one-hand you baptize in water unto repentance

ὅτι ὅπως κολλήσω ἐν χρύσῳ ...

the on the other-hand after me coming ... αὐτῷ ἤλθας βαπτίσασθαι ἐν πνεύματι ἅγια καὶ πῦρ;

he you will baptize in spirit holy and fire

In the last line “holy spirit”, though Hearer-old to John’s Jewish audience (and Discourse-old to Matthew’s readership, 1:18), lacks the article, and thus is marked salient, being contrasted with water.
The contrast between John’s work and Jesus’s work is not only thematic at EPISODE level, TEV’s section 3:1-12 “The Preaching of John the Baptist” (especially 3:3, 3:11-12), but also at TEXT level, cf. 3:14-16, and 4:12-17 re their different roles and changeover in public ministry. Also 9:14-17 where John’s disciples ask why Jesus’s teaching differs, 14:1-2 where their roles are compared by Herod, 17:10-13 where Jesus compares their roles, and 21:23-32 where Jesus commends John’s baptism and teaching. (In Matthew 3:3 John and Lord are anarthrous, 3:16 the Holy Spirit is anarthrous, 4:12, 9:14 and 14:2 John is anarthrous, 17:10, 11, 12 Elijah is anarthrous, and 17:13 John is anarthrous, 20:25 and 32 John is anarthrous.)

Acts 23:8
Σανδουκαίοι μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν μὴ εἶλαι ἀνάστασιν μὴτε αὐγελον μὴτε πνείμα, Sadducees on-the-one-hand for say not-to-be resurrection nor angels nor spirits

Φαρισαῖοι δὲ ὁμολογοῦσιν τὰ ἀμφότερα.
Pharisees on-the-other-hand confess the both

Here the contrast between the beliefs of Sadducees and Pharisees is thematic at the level of EPISODE, since TEV’s section Acts 22:30-23:11 “Paul before the Council” concerns how Paul escaped conviction by capitalizing on the theological division within the Sanhedrin.

Some say X but A says Y

Another type of contrast which is common in the New Testament corpus is using unnamed speakers and their opinion as a foil, contrasting with the subsequent highlighted comment of an individual, e.g.

John 12:29-30
οὐδὲν δύχολος δὲ δεσπότης καὶ δοκώσας δὲ λέγειν βροντὴν γεγονέναι,
The therefore crowd the standing and having-heard was-saying thunder to-happen

ἄλλοι λέγουν, Ἀγγέλος ἀυτῷ λελακχεῖν.
Others were-saying Angel to-him has-spoken

Answered Jesus and said...

Here Jesus is anarthrous, even though he is Discourse-old (12:23) because he, and what he says, is contrasted with the crowd, and the others. This statement of Jesus is not only thematic at EPISODE level, TEV’s section 12:27-36 “Jesus Speaks about his Death”, but clearly thematic at TEXT level, cf. 3:14-17, 7:32-36, 8:14, 21-30, 18:1-19:37, especially 18:14.

This same pattern is used to highlight Peter’s confession of faith:

Matthew 16:14-16
οἱ δὲ οἶκοι, ὅι μὲν ἔχοντας τῶν παπποτήν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἡμᾶς,
They () said, Some () John the Baptist, others () Elijah,

ἔτεροι δὲ ἑρεμλεῖν ἢ ἐνα τῶν προφητῶν.
others () Jeremiah or one of-the prophets

Says to-them, You () whom me do-you-say to-be?

Having-replied () Simon Peter said, You are the Christ the son of-the God the living.

The parallel passages, Luke 9:19-20 and Mark 8:28-29, have the same pattern of the disciples’ first answer as a foil. Luke highlights Peter’s answer by fronting the
anarthrous noun “Peter”, whereas in Mark, “Peter” has the article, but his speech is highlighted by use of the Present verb form.

This “contrast salience” at EPISODE or TEXT level may explain the lack of the article at key points in Romans for the “known particular” concepts of “law” (the Law of Moses) and “faith” (faith in Jesus Christ). Louw, in his semantic analysis, comments on Romans 3:19-31 (1987, 55):

to a Jew the keeping of the Law was in itself the way to be put right with God. In cluster A νόμος and πίστις are contrasted. In cluster D the same contrast occurs. ... This can be diagrammed as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Greek Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>νόμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>πίστις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>πίστις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>νόμος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chiasm underlines the fact that faith, and not obeying the Law, is the basis for δικαιοσύνη.

Below, the relevant noun phrases (righteousness, Law, and faith) are underlined if arthrous, and bolded if anarthrous:

3.19 ἔθαμεν δὲ ὅτι δοσὰ τὸν νόμον λέγει τὰς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλέι, ἵνα πάντα στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόθεσις γένηται τὰς ὃ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ. 3.20 διότι ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου οὐ δικαιωθῆται πᾶσα σαρκὶ ἐνόπλων αὐτῶν, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνοις ἀμαρτίας.

3.21 Νοεῖ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. 3.22 δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστευούσας.

3.29 ἂν δὲ λόγον ἔθες μόνον: ὁχὲ καὶ ὅλῳ; καὶ καὶ ἔθνων, 3.30 εἰτέρ εἰς ὃ θεὸς δὲ δικαιώσει περιπτώμην ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκορμουσάν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. 3.31 νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; ἠ γένετο δὲ ἄλλα νόμον ἑστάνομεν

Use of the article here agrees with Louw’s analysis. Righteousness occurs twice, both anarthurously, and is salient as a major theme at Discourse-level, as shown by its thematic introduction in 1:17, and the occurrence of the root in verbal form in 3:20 and 3:30.

Here, where in Louw’s analysis Law and faith are contrasted by both semantics and chiasm, the “salient” anarthrous nouns read Law, Law, Law, faith ... faith, Law, Law.

( Including arthrous nouns would give the “fuzzier” picture of Law, Law, Law, Law, Law, Law, faith ... faith, Law, faith, Law.) Law occurs 8 times and is anarthrous 5 times, excepting twice in 3:19 where the contrast has not begun, and 3:21 where it refers to the Pentateuch rather than the Law of Moses. Faith occurs 4 times, twice anarthurously establishing the topic, and twice arthurously, once anaphoric to the previous phrase in the same clause, and once in the section where Law is focal. The nouns used to introduce the topic before a contrast, and at the point of topical switch from Law to faith and then faith to Law are always anarthrous.

This confirms observations by Levinsohn (1992:107) that if “any noun whose referent is known and particular ... is anarthrous, its referent is salient”. He gives various examples of contrastive salience with anarthrous nouns: Galatians 2:19 (“to law” / “to God”), 3:2-3 (“works of law” / “hearing with faith”, and “in (the) Spirit” / “in (the) flesh”).

If this argument is true, that anarthurousness is related not simply to the referential category of a noun but also to its salience, then it destroys the argument that articular νόμος represents Mosaic law, whereas anarthrous νόμος represents the principle of law.
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(Burton, 1921:132-133; Lenski, 1937). Indeed even Nida and Louw seem to equate arthrousness with specificity, at least with regard to νόμος “law” (1992:69-70):

In Paul’s letters to the Romans and to the Galatians there are an unusual number of instances in which νόμος occurs without an article. In fact, the absence of the article is more frequent than its occurrence. It would appear that in certain contexts Paul was intent upon explaining the principle of law in contrast with grace as something with a wider scope of application than simply the Mosaic code.

They conclude:

Accordingly it is a dangerous procedure to insist that in every instance in which Paul used νόμος, he had in the back of his mind the regulations announced on Sinai or that all later developments associated with νόμος have to be interpreted as part of that Sinaitic revelation.

Whilst agreeing with Nida and Louw’s conclusion, that a single word may have different referents according to context, I reject their premise, and argue that anarthrousness is no reason to reject the referent of νόμος as Mosaic law. Whilst anarthrousness MAY introduce a new item or refer to an indefinite referent, where a potential referent is already focal, anarthrousness marks that GIVEN item as especially salient. Hence “law” in Romans 3:20 and in Galatians 2:19 and 3:2-3 is most naturally understood as Mosaic law (cf. Dunn, 1992:105; Longenecker, 1990:91, 102).

q) salience because of listing specifics, marking a discourse theme

It has been seen above that lists of proper names are typically anarthrous and thus marked salient. Similarly lists of specifics from a single generic category are typically anarthrous. (Although the specific abstract nouns listed are typically Discourse-new, as titles of classes they are Hearer-old and are frequently referred to with the article when occurring individually.) Lists of specifics occur when the generic category is thematic at the level of PARAGRAPH, EPISODE or higher, hence the anarthrous salience marking.

The list of sinners in 1 Corinthians, comes in TEV’s section (6:1-11) “Lawsuits against Fellow-Christians”, in the second PARAGRAPH (6:7-11) where the theme is the contrast between Christians’ old lifestyle and new.

1 Corinthians 6:9-10 (the only occurrence of οὕτε more than twice)

Here άθικος “unrighteous” is the generic term.

Similarly the list in Romans of things which cannot separate us from God’s love is thematic at PARAGRAPH level, coming at the climax of TEV’s section (8:31-39) “God’s Love in Christ Jesus”.

The significance of anarthrous lists at EPISODE level can be seen in the list of vices in TEV’s section Matthew 15:10-20 “The Things That Make a Person Unclean”:

Matthew 15:19 cf. Mark 7:21-22

The significance of anarthrous lists at EPISODE level can be seen in the list of vices in TEV’s section Matthew 15:10-20 “The Things That Make a Person Unclean”:
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Compare 2 Corinthians 12:20 where an anarthrous list of interpersonal vices is thematic at EPISODE level, TEV’s section (12:11-21) “Paul’s Concern for the Corinthians”.

Similarly, in 1 Thessalonians 1:5, the list of how the gospel came to them is thematic at EPISODE level, TEV’s section (1:2-10) “The Life and Faith of the Thessalonians”.

1 Thessalonians 1:5
οτί τό εναγγέλιον ήμων ούκ εγένηθη εἰς ήμιας εν λόγω μόνον
ἀλλα καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι άγίῳ καὶ [ἐν] πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, ...

The Holy Spirit is clearly intended as a known particular referent, so anarthrousness must be marking something other than indefiniteness.

The role of these anarthrous lists at EPISODE level is especially clear where lists occur in pairs, e.g. the lists of vices and virtues in Colossians 3:5-17, TEV’s section “The Old life and the New”:

Colossians 3:5 (list of vices)
Νεκρόσασθε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
pορνεῖαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν,
καὶ την πλεονεξίαν, ἢτις ἑστὶν εἰδωλολατρία.

Covetousness seems to be singled out as non-salient by the article, but is then identified as equal to idolatry, marked salient.

Colossians 3:12 (list of virtues)
Εὐαγγελισθεὶς οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἄγιος καὶ ἡγαμέμνον,
σπλάγχνα οὐκετισμοῦ χρηστότητα ταπεινοφοροῦσαν πραΰτητα μακροθυμίαν,

Compare also Galatians 5:19-21, listing the works of the flesh, and 5:22-23, listing the fruit of the spirit, all anarthrous abstract nouns, which occur in the TEV section Galatians 5:16-26 “The Spirit and Human Nature”.

The listing of evildoers in 1 Timothy are salient not only at EPISODE level, TEV’s 1:3-11 “Warnings against false teaching”, but also at TEXT level, cf. 6:3-5.

1 Timothy 1:9-10
οτὶ δικαίως νόμος οὐ κέκτηται, ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις, ἀδεσθεῖ καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ,
καὶ ὑποθελοις, πατρολοίς καὶ μητρολοίς, ἀνθρωφοίς πόρνοις ἀρσενοκοίταις ἀνθραποθυστοῖς
φιλότεθεν ἑπόροις, ...

It is clear that this warning refers to the whole class of such people, not simply some of them. Note also the list of anarthrous abstract nouns of vices in 1 Timothy 6:4b-5a, contrasted with the individual arthrous abstract nouns in 5b.

Similarly the listing of virtues in 1 Timothy are salient both at EPISODE level, TEV’s “Personal Instructions” (6:11-21), and also at TEXT level, cf. 4:12.

1 Timothy 6:11b
dιότι δὲ δικαιοσύνην εἰσέβεβαιν πίστιν, ἀγάπην ὑπομονὴν πραΰτητιν.

Moule (1953:114) also notes lists of anarthrous abstract nouns in Romans 14:17 (two lists, each list in the grammatical role of comment, and the lists being contrasted οὐ γὰρ ... ἀλλὰ ...) and Hebrews 12:18-24 (two lists, each list in the grammatical role of goal, and the lists being contrasted οὐ γὰρ ... ἀλλὰ ...). Both of these lists, I argue, are marked salient. Romans 14:17 (not food and drink, but righteousness, peace and joy) is
thematic in the PARAGRAPH 14:13-18, the EPISODE 14:13-23 TEV’s “Do not make your brother fall,” and the THEME UNIT, arguably 14:1-15:13 (14:2 “vegetables,” 15:13 “joy and peace”). Hebrews 12:18-24 (not the old covenant, but the new, climaxing in 12:24 καὶ διαθήκης νέας μεσότη Γένους καὶ αἵματι ἁντίσμον “and the mediator of the new covenant, Jesus, and the blood of sprinkling”) is thematic not only in the EPISODE 12:12-28, TEV’s “Instructions and Warnings” but also in the whole TEXT of Hebrews (1:1-2 “In the past .. through the prophets... in these last days ... though his son”, 13:21 “The God of peace who raised from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep by the blood of the eternal covenant, our Lord Jesus…”).

Moule also quotes Romans 12:10-13, as a series of nouns with the article, but this is not a straightforward list, but a series of parallel clauses, in many of which the role of the abstract noun is sphere (usually predictable and non-salient).

A GRAMCORD search for three consecutive occurrences of [NOUN Nominative] in a sentence produces 48 hits, but for three consecutive occurrences of [ARTICLE Nominative] [NOUN Nominative] produces 0 hits.

Conclusion

Thus anarthrous salience marking of nouns is only a crude tool. By itself it simply alerts the audience to PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION. The special significance of the noun so marked can only be understood in the light of the scenarios to which that noun belongs, including those scenarios related to the conceptual world, and those scenarios related to the expected development of events and plots in narratives, and to interpersonal relationships and the development of themes and arguments in the Epistles.
Appendix N
Greek evidence for the order of the search path

This appendix gives examples from New Testament Greek as evidence for the order of the “search path” which the audience must use to identify items from existing scenarios, as described in Chapter 6 “Search path for identifying items from existing scenarios”.

Basic grammatical factors affecting the search path

Since the article signifies Hearer-old and τις signifies Hearer-new, the grammatical structure of the Greek noun phrase limits the possible information status categories of the referent, but without altering the basic order of the search path. The search path for different types of Greek noun phrase is shown below:

If article + noun:
Understand referent to be Hearer-old.
Search existing scenarios in the following order until a relevant entity is found:
1) 3b GIVEN textual - current:
   short term memory, title of last opened scenario
2) 2b KNOWN inferrable:
   long term memory, in currently open scenario
3) 3a GIVEN situational:
   current perceptual experience
4) 3c GIVEN textual - displaced:
   short term memory, recently opened scenario
5) 2a KNOWN unused:
   long term memory, currently closed scenario

If τις + noun:
Understand referent to be 1 NEW,
   open new specific scenario,
   connect it to existing generic scenario.

If noun alone:
Understand referent to be Hearer-old salient, or Hearer-new.
Search existing scenarios in order as above, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.
a) If the item is found under GIVEN or KNOWN categories,
   mark it +SALIENT in memory.
b) Otherwise,
Understand referent to be 1 NEW,
open new specific scenario,
connect it to existing generic scenario.

The proposed “search path” above shows a hierarchy, from first place to look, to last place to look. This order posits that priority is given to the last opened and thus currently open scenario, then to the current perceptual scenario, then any recently opened scenarios, finally as yet unopened scenarios. This search path follows a logical pattern in terms of scenario theory, but is a jumble when viewed simply in terms of GIVEN and KNOWN.

The last category to be searched, 2a KNOWN unused, the “whole world” scenario, includes every scenario in the hearer’s long term memory. Obviously a random search through every scenario in the brain would take a long time and be fairly inaccurate, as it would find and choose the first randomly found occurrence. I suggest therefore that even this “whole world” search is not random but starts at a particular point.

As stated above, the first categories to be searched are KNOWN inferrable and GIVEN categories, whose scenarios are open in the co-text and context. Chafe says that GIVEN information “must be in the forefront of the mind” (1970:211), and thus more readily accessible and more likely to be relevant. A speaker naturally assumes that his audience will first search for information in open scenarios, which are “in the forefront of the mind”. Similarly, a speaker also assumes that certain subcategories of KNOWN unused information are “on the back-burner” of the hearer’s mind, and not simply somewhere in long-term memory.

The original New Testament target audience had at least the following “back-burner” scenarios, i.e. those with a high degree of natural relevance, which were to be searched first, even though they may not have been currently open. In terms of religion and history, the writer’s and audience’s own ethnic and religious background was also a major factor.Bracketed items apply especially to speeches spoken to non-Jews and texts written for a non-Jewish audience. The category “Christian religion” refers to those elements of religious belief and practice which were common to both Jews and gentiles who believed in Jesus, and applies to all texts written explicitly for a Christian audience, especially the Epistles. All these categories refer to the scenarios of the original authors and audiences, not to our own scenarios:

- Christian religion
- (Gentile religion)
- (Gentile literature)
- (Gentile history)
- Jewish religion
- Jewish scripture
- Jewish history

These scenario clusters would be searched before more generic categories, such as:

Natural world
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Man-made world
Metaphysical world

For many first-century Jews, such as the participants in the Gospel narratives, the most pressing "back-burner" issues would concern fulfilment of prophecies, especially the coming of the Messiah (e.g. Matthew 2:4-6, Mark 1:7, Luke 2:25-26, 38, 3:15, John 1:19-20). For them, any event spoken by a religious person, or in a religious context, and any event recorded in a religious book, would immediately make "Jewish religion" the first unopened scenario to be searched.

The original target audience then would prioritize their searches, even of KNOWN unused scenarios, to those scenarios which were related to the topic of conversation, the cultural identities and status of the participants, and their likely preoccupations, bearing in mind religious aspirations and events, and politically or personally significant current events.

Other grammatical factors affecting the search path

Certain other grammatical forms in the Noun Phrase, apart from the article and τῶν, restrict the categories to be searched.

Zero anaphora, personal pronouns, and deictic pronouns ("this" "that") cannot be used to refer to categories 1 NEW, 2a KNOWN unused, 2b KNOWN inferrable, or 3c GIVEN textual - displaced. They only refer to items currently in focus, that is identifiable items in currently open scenarios, i.e.

3b GIVEN textual - current:
short term memory, title of last opened scenario

3a GIVEN situational:
current perceptual experience

e.g.

3b GIVEN textual - current:

Zero anaphora
Matthew 4:2 ἐδεικνύεται he hungered = Jesus hungered, cf. Jesus 4:1

Pronoun
John 1:3 αὐτῷ his = the word's, 1:1a (The last scenario opened is God, but the "word" scenario is topical, being grammatical subject in 1:1-2)

Demonstrative pronoun
Matthew 1:20 ταῦτα those [things] = Mary pregnant etc. Co-text = 1:18-19

3a GIVEN situational:

Zero anaphora
John 19:35 πιστεύοντες you might believe, you = you who read or hear this

Pronoun
Romans 1:9 οὗτός of me = of Paul, the author of the letter, (cf. 1:1, where Paul is named as author)

Demonstrative pronoun
Matthew 16:26 τοῦτο this = this bread Jesus is giving (Co-text for us, but situational for the disciples)
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Deictic adjectives ("this" "that") with a noun cannot be used to refer to categories 1 NEW, or 2a KNOWN unused. They can only be used for scenarios, or items from scenarios, which are already open, or have been recently opened, i.e. for the above categories 3b and 3a, plus:

2b KNOWN inferrable:
long term memory, in currently open scenario

3c GIVEN textual - displaced:
short term memory, title of last opened scenario
e.g.

3b GIVEN textual - current:
Matthew 24:22 αἰ  ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνα "those days", refers to τότε "then" 24:16

3a GIVEN situational:
Matthew 12:34 ἐν τῷ ἡμερίῳ τῶν αὐτῶν "in this age", currently happening
Matthew 12:41 μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης "with this generation", currently present

2b KNOWN inferrable:
Matthew 8:13b οὗτος ἐκεῖνος "in that hour", refers to the time of Jesus's statement, 8:13a.
Obviously, all events have a time at which they occur.
Luke 9:5b ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης "from that city", refers to the city where those people live who do not accept the disciples, 9:5a.

3c GIVEN textual - displaced:
Although this appears to be 2a KNOWN unused, the reference seems to depend on a textual knowledge of the OT, especially LXX Zechariah 2:11, 3:10 etc. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ which talk of the time of the future Messianic Kingdom.

(These restrictions on the use of deictic adjectives refer specifically to New Testament Greek usage. Modern English can use "this" to introduce a NEW entity in the genre of joke telling, and narrative, in some social registers, e.g. “There was this bloke ...” Similarly, “this” can be used with entities from category 2a KNOWN unused, if the item is normally regarded as having only one possible referent, but in certain contexts can be a common noun, and these are being contrasted, e.g. “This earth of ours, is one of millions of planets.”)

Direct Speech embedded in narrative is unique. Addressees of the ORIGINAL SPEECH ACT identify the referents from the CONTEXT of the original speech act, the original speaker's and hearer’s real life situation, e.g.

3a GIVEN situational: e.g.
Zero anaphora
John 1:32 Τεθέαμαι. I have beheld = I, John the Baptist.
(Addressees can identify speaker)
NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current: I, John the apostle

Pronoun
John 1:32 αὐτὸν him = Jesus.
(John has pointed Jesus out, see 1:29)
NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current: John, 1:32 in speech margin

Demonstrative
Matthew 4:3 αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς these stones = stones in the desert.
(Satan is pointing them out)
NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current: stones not mentioned previously
However, addressees of the WRITTEN DOCUMENT identify the referents in Direct Speech from the CO-TEXT OUTSIDE the Direct Speech, i.e. the text itself, excluding the speech bubble, e.g.

3b GIVEN textual - current:
Zero anaphora
John 1:32 Τεθέαμαι. I have beheld = I, John the Baptist.
Co-text = John witnessed, 1:32
NOT 3a GIVEN situational: I, John the apostle

Pronoun
John 1:32 αὐτόν him = Jesus. Co-text = sees Jesus and says, 1:29
(The last scenario opened is God, but the “word” scenario is topical, being grammatically subject in verses 1 and 2)

2b KNOWN inferrable:
Demonstrative adjective with noun
Matthew 4:3 οἱ λίθοι αὐτῶν these stones = stones in the desert.
Co-text = desert, 4:1

Zero anaphora, pronoun, or demonstrative without a noun, cannot refer to a new item from an open scenario, since they are either anaphoric or deictic.

Evidence for the order of the search path

Apart from the experimental evidence from English text that computer programs using this basic search path allow “artificial intelligence” (Schank and Abelson, 1977:184), and the theoretical consideration that the proposed search path makes good sense in terms of scenario theory, there is also evidence within the New Testament texts of how the writer uses Hearer-old articular marking, expecting his audience to correctly identify the referent, and where that referent is found in terms of information status taxonomy.

In the proposed search path below, specific nouns and their referents are listed under the relevant category together with the categories they are NOT found in. The search path predicts that the correct referent is to be found in the highest category possible. The search path is presumed by the speaker, and used by the audience to correctly identify the referents of the speaker’s nouns. Consequently, the search path and the listing below is arranged according to the textual form, article + noun, ἃς + noun, and noun alone, rather than simply the semantic categories of information status.

Article + noun:
1) 3b GIVEN textual - current:
   short term memory, title of last opened scenario
   Luke 7:44 τῇ Σιμώνῳ. Simon = Simon the Pharisee, 7:43
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual-displaced, Simon Peter or Simon Zelotes, 6:14, 15
   John 4:6 τῷ πηγαῖς the well = the well of Jacob at Sychar, 4:6
   NOT 2a KNOWN unused, generic as in James 3:11
   Luke 7:15 ἦν νεκρός the dead[man] = the widow’s son, 7:12, even though now alive
   NOT 2a KNOWN unused, generic as in Matthew 8:22
   Acts 14:9 ὁ πόλεως the city = Lystra, 14:8
   NOT 3a GIVEN situational, where Luke was writing, or the audience reading
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual-displaced, Iconium, 14:1
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2) 2b KNOWN inferrable:

long term memory, in currently open scenario
Matthew 12:34 τὸ στόμα the mouth = the mouth of a person, scenario = speak, 12:34
NOT 3c GIVEN textual-displaced, Jesus’s mouth, 5:2
Acts 12:7 τὰς χεῖρας the hands = Peter’s hands, scenario = Peter chained, 12:6
NOT 3c GIVEN textual-displaced, Herod’s hands, 12:1
2 Corinthians 7:8 οὗτος the letter = Paul’s previous letter, scenario = Titus’s return with news of their reaction, 7:6
NOT 3a GIVEN situational, Paul’s letter currently being read (as in Colossians 4:16)
NOT 3c GIVEN textual-displaced, the Corinthian Christians, 3:2
Colossians 2:4b τὸ πνεῦμα the spirit = human spirit
scenario = human being, 2:4a, opened by I (1st person verb ending), the flesh
NOT 3c GIVEN textual-displaced, Holy Spirit 1:8
NOT 2a KNOWN unused, Holy Spirit

3) 3a GIVEN situational:

current perceptual experience
Acts 7:4b τῇ γῇ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ this land = the land where Stephen was speaking
NOT 3b GIVEN textual - displaced, 7:4a the land of the Chaldeans (The word “thence” 7:4b changes to a new locational scenario)
Colossians 4:16 οὗτος the letter = Paul’s letter currently being read
NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, no previous mention
NOT 2b KNOWN inferrable, no open scenario in co-text (as in 2 Corinthians 7:8)
Revelation 22:7 οὗτος the letter = Paul’s letter currently being read
NOT 3b GIVEN textual - displaced, the Lamb’s book of life 21:27

4) 3c GIVEN textual - displaced:

short term memory, recently opened scenario
Revelation 14:3 τὸν ζῷον οἱ τέσσαρες ζώον the four beasts, co-text 7:11
NOT 2b KNOWN unused, as in Jude 1:10, irrational beasts (plural generic)
Acts 15:37 τῶν Ἰωάννη τῶν καλομενον Μάρκον John also called Mark, co-text 12:25
NOT 2b KNOWN unused (as in Acts 12:12 anarthrous introduction as 1 NEW)

5) 2a KNOWN unused:

long term memory, currently closed scenario
James 3:11 οἱ ποιητὲς a well, wells in general, singular generic (scenario title)
Revelation 1:5 τῶν νεκρῶν the dead = all dead people, plural generic
(all possible referents of the “dead people” scenario)
NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, as in Luke 7:15, the dead man
Revelation 1:5 γῆς the earth, (singular specific, unique reference)
NOT 3a GIVEN situational, as in Acts 7:4b, this land
Revelation 7:1 τῶν τεσσαρεσ τῶν άνεμων the four winds (plural specific)
NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, as in Revelation 14:3, the four beasts
Mark 1:2 τὸν Ἰσαάκ Isaiah (singular specific, defined by the prophet.
No previous mention of Isaiah in this book.)

If τις + noun:

1 NEW:

not yet in memory, make new scenario
Luke 1:5 λεγοντες τις a certain priest
Acts 21:16 λέγει προσφέρειν τινα a certain (person called) Mnason
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If noun alone:
1) 3b GIVEN textual - current:
   short term memory, title of last opened scenario
   marked SALIENT
Mark 1:29 Ἰωάννης John = John son of Zebedee, Mark 1:19
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, John the Baptist, 1:14
   NOT 1 NEW
Luke 4:26 Ἡλίας Elijah, 4:25
   NOT 1 NEW
Acts 7:8b Ἰάκωβ James/Jacob = Jacob, 7:8a
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, James, 1:13
   NOT 1 NEW
Acts 14:21 Ἀντίοχη Antioch = Pisidian Antioch, 14:19
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, Syrian Antioch, 13:1
   NOT 1 NEW
Hebrews 11:3 Πίστις faith, 11:1
   NOT 1 NEW

2) 2b KNOWN inferrable:
   long term memory, in currently open scenario
   marked SALIENT
Acts 7:45 Ἰησοῦς Jesus/Joshua = Joshua, scenario = forefathers, 7:45, desert, Moses, 7:44
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, Jesus, 6:14 in accusation against Stephen
   NOT 1 NEW
Acts 7:55 Ἰησοῦς Jesus/Joshua = Jesus, scenario = ascension, heaven 7:55, cf. 1:10
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, 7:45 Joshua
   NOT 1 NEW
Acts 14:25 Ἀντίοχη Antioch = Syrian Antioch, scenario = Pisidia to Attalia, 14:24-25
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, Pisidian Antioch, 14:21
   NOT 1 NEW

3) 3a GIVEN situational:
   current perceptual experience
   marked SALIENT
Matthew 1:1 Βιβλίον The book = this book being read or heard (similarly, if = account)
   (This title is like a presentational sentence, with no equative verb and no topic,
   but only the comment, i.e. “(This is) the book...” Perhaps, strictly speaking the implicit Topic
   “this (book)” is what is GIVEN situational)
   NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, no previous text
   NOT 1 NEW
Mark 1:1 Αρχῇ The beginning = these words being read or heard
   NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, no previous text
   NOT 1 NEW
1 Peter 5:13 Βαβylon/Rome (metaphorically) = Rome,
   the town where Peter was writing from
   NOT 2a KNOWN unused, i.e. not historical Babylon, as in Matthew 1:11
   NOT 1 NEW

4) 3c GIVEN textual - displaced:
   short term memory, recently opened scenario
   marked SALIENT
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Acts 15:40 Σιλάς Silas, 15:32 (15:34)
   NOT 2a KNOWN unused (Probably hearers knew several people called Silas)
   NOT 1 NEW
Romans 9:30 πίστευος faith, 5:1 (5:2)
   NOT 1 NEW

5) 2a KNOWN unused:
   long term memory, currently closed scenario
   marked SALIENT
Luke 1:17 Ἐλληβζ Elijah
   NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, no previous text
   NOT 1 NEW (audience is expected to know about Elijah’s spirit and power)
1 Corinthians 2:4 πνεῦματος spirit = Holy Spirit
   NOT 1 NEW (audience is expected to know about the Holy Spirit)
Hebrews 3:2 Μωυσῆς Moses
   NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, no previous text
   NOT 1 NEW (audience is expected to know about Moses’ faithfulness)

6) 1 NEW:
   not yet in memory, make new scenario
   marked SALIENT as always for NEW items
John 4:6 τὰ ὕδατα a well = the well of Jacob at Sychar, presented as Hearer-new
   NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, no previous mention
Mark 1:19 Ἰάκωβος James = the son of Zebedee
   (presented as Hearer-new by no article, and reference to lineage)
   NOT 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, 1:4 John the Baptist
Mark 7:32 κωφὸς a deaf man
   (presented as Hearer-new by no article)
   NOT 3b GIVEN textual - current, no previous mention
   NOT 2b KNOWN inferrable, no appropriate open scenario
   NOT 2a KNOWN unused, no single identifiable referent
Matthew 20:30 δύο two blindmen
   (presented as Hearer-new by no article)
   NOT 3b GIVEN textual - removed, NOT the same as in 9:27 δύο (3b, would normally need the article. Salience marking only possible for characters focal in more than a single far-removed pericope)
   NOT 2b KNOWN inferrable, no appropriate open scenario
   NOT 2a KNOWN unused, no single identifiable referent

The search path, scenarios and misunderstanding

We must bear in mind that, despite the grammatical clues, it is not strictly grammar but “relevance” that guides the search path. If the audience fail to recognize the speaker’s intended scenarios, and hence fail to grasp what the speaker regards as relevant, they will search in the wrong search path and/or misidentify referents.

A “wild card” in this sequencing is the position of the current perceptual scenario (3a GIVEN situational), which on the one hand is current and open (inasmuch as one is hearing, seeing, smelling etc) and on the other hand is not normally in focus unless the speech act is referring to it. Note that this category may also include mental perception, i.e. thoughts, worries and preoccupations, not simply perception by the five senses. It is clear from personal experience that a speaker, especially to a known audience, may refer to
some preoccupation of theirs “out of the blue” and expect the audience to identify the
referents correctly (e.g. “Oh, by the way, he’s had the operation”).

Misunderstanding occurs whenever the audience chooses the wrong referent. They
may look in the right category yet still choose the wrong referent within it. This is
especially true for the mental perceptions in category 3a GIVEN situational, where the
speaker’s thoughts and audience’s thoughts are not in harmony, e.g. Jesus’ statement to
“beware of leaven”. This occurs in all the synoptics, in slightly different form, but with
leaven always arthrous:

Matthew 16:6
‘Οράτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.
Watch-out and beware from the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees

Mark 8:15
‘Οράτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρῴδου.
Watch-out, look-out from the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod

Luke 12:1
Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης, ἣς ἐστὶν ἐπόκρισις, τῶν Φαρισαίων.
Beware to yourselves from the leaven, which is hypocrisy, of the Pharisees.

Luke 12:1 is not a parallel passage. It refers only to the Pharisees, the metaphor is
explained, as “hypocrisy”, and Jesus said this to his disciples immediately after criticizing
the Pharisees publicly at a meal (Luke 12:37-54). There is no hint of misunderstanding.

However, in the Matthew and Mark occurrences, the disciples misunderstand Jesus
completely. Why? In New Testament Greek ζύμη “leaven” belongs in two scenarios,
either literally in the bread-making scenario, or metaphorically in the evil scenario. In the
parable of the leaven (Matthew 13:33, Luke 13:21), the scenario is one of making bread
and the emphasis is only on the effect of leaven spreading, without any negative
associations. However, the common saying “A little leaven leavens the whole lump”, is
clearly used in a moral context and with a negative sense, e.g. “not with the leaven of
malice and evil” (1 Corinthians 5:6-7), “Who ... kept you from obeying the truth?”
(Galatians 5:7-9). Thus, in a negative moral context, leaven is a metaphor of evil which
affects others. The Passover cleaning of the house of leaven, alluded to in the 1
Corinthians passage, reinforces this negative sense. In Luke 12:1 “leaven” is included in
this negative moral scenario both by the immediate context of Jesus criticizing the
Pharisees, and by the co-text “which is hypocrisy”.

So, in Matthew and Mark, the disciples misunderstand Jesus. Although they
searched for the referent of “leaven” in the right category 3a GIVEN situational, they
searched in the wrong scenario. The real life situation of the disciples at the time is
preserved for us Gospel-readers in the co-text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeding of 4000</td>
<td>15:29-39</td>
<td>8:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharisees ask for a sign</td>
<td>16:1-4</td>
<td>8:11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadducees ask for a sign</td>
<td>16:1-4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples forget bread</td>
<td>16:5-12</td>
<td>8:14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeast statement</td>
<td>16:5-12</td>
<td>8:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus there are two distinct elements in the GIVEN situation, the Pharisees asking
for a sign, and the disciples forgetting bread. Jesus was thinking about the former “evil
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mindset”, but the disciples’ minds were focussed on the latter “bread”. So they failed to recognize the two clues Jesus had given them as to which scenario to search for “yeast” in - it involved the Pharisees, and it was a negative context “Beware!”. Thus Jesus had given enough information as normally required for the disciples to understand. They were to search for something negative in a scenario involving Pharisees which was relevant for Jesus to discus with them. Jesus has already pointed out the evil of the Pharisees, “a wicked and adulterous generation looks for a miraculous sign” (Matthew 16:4, cf. Mark 8:12).

How then does Jesus clear up their misunderstanding? Does he tell them the referent of “leaven”? The texts show a similar pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions relevance of bread</th>
<th>Matthew 16:8</th>
<th>Mark 8:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t you understand yet?</td>
<td>Matthew 16:9</td>
<td>Mark 8:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminds re feeding 5000</td>
<td>Matthew 16:9</td>
<td>Mark 8:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminds re feeding 4000</td>
<td>Matthew 16:10</td>
<td>Mark 8:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t you understand yet?</td>
<td>Mark 8:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not talking about bread</td>
<td>Matthew 16:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeats “Beware the leaven ...”</td>
<td>Matthew 16:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples realize what he means</td>
<td>Matthew 16:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jesus does not tell them what the referent of leaven is at all. In Mark he simply questions the relevance of their concern about bread in the light of the miraculous feedings. Once he has dismissed the relevance of the “bread” scenario, he judges that the disciples will then search the next relevant scenario, this time including both Pharisees and negative attitudes. In Matthew, Jesus clarifies that he was NOT talking about bread, but rather than say what he WAS talking about, simply repeats the original warning. Again, by removing the “bread” scenario as the one to search first, he enables the disciples to search again, and this time they search a relevant scenario, the evil and hypocritical teaching of the Pharisees.

Diagrammatically the potential search paths were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information status</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a GIVEN situational:</td>
<td>bread:</td>
<td>leaven = yeast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a GIVEN situational:</td>
<td>Pharisees:</td>
<td>evil/negative:</td>
<td>leaven = evil teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By simply denying the relevance of the first scenario in the search path, Jesus directed the disciples to the second, where they found the intended referent.

Many misunderstandings are due to metaphorical usage, where the audience selects a non-metaphorical usage out of the context or co-text, rather than the speaker’s intended metaphorical use, e.g. the leaven example above. However, the reason for the original audience choosing a literal rather than a metaphorical meaning is that FIRST they were looking in the wrong scenario. Had they searched the correct scenario they would only have found the metaphorical meaning, and there would have been no misunderstanding.

(For today’s audiences, however, readers and hearers of a translation, the situation is more complex, since we neither share the same scenarios as the original speaker and audience, nor have the same metaphors. If “leaven” is never used metaphorically, even if the audience first search in the correct scenario “Pharisees” for an item with the correct
attributes “evil/negative” they will find no suitable referent, so will then have to search the less suitable “bread” scenario. In this way they will identify a referent never intended by the original speaker. Jesus will then appear to be a very poor communicator, who deliberately tries to confuse his audience by using a misleading word, and not even clarifying what he means when it causes confusion to his disciples.)

Sometimes, although there is no indication that the original hearer misunderstood, we as today’s audience are exegetically uncertain which particular search path or scenario was cued in the text. For example in John 3:5, where Jesus talks to Nicodemus, πνεύματος presumably refers to the Holy Spirit, not the human spirit, as shown later by the contrast with flesh in 3:6. Thus NIV translates “Spirit”. However both referents have the same information status, i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information status</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>reference</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable</td>
<td>God’s rule</td>
<td>3:3, 3:5</td>
<td>the Holy Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>3:3, 3:5 πνεύματος</td>
<td>the human spirit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In John 4:23 when Jesus is talking to the Samaritan woman, similar scenarios are open in the text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information status</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>reference</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>4:23 Father</td>
<td>the Holy Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b KNOWN inferrable</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>4:23 worshippers</td>
<td>the human spirit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, however, NIV translates πνεύμα as “spirit”. We cannot clearly determine what Jesus intended since a referent from either of the open scenarios makes sense semantically, and we do not know whether the particular idiom used here could refer to “Spirit,” or “spirit,” or both.

The audience may choose a referent from the wrong category. For example there may be a conflict between co-text (3b GIVEN textual-current) and context (3a GIVEN situational) in determining meaning, i.e. the speaker and audience may put a different priority on these, and so the audience chooses from the wrong category, e.g. “my flesh”

John 6:51

ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζων ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς.

I am the bread the living the from the heaven descended

ἐὰν τις φάγῃ ὡς τοῦ ἄρτου ζωής ἐις τοῦ άνω,

if anyone eat from this this the bread he-will-live to the age/eternity

καὶ ὁ ἄρτος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ζωής ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ζωής.

and the bread () which I will-give the flesh of-me is for the of-the world life.

To this the Jews respond “How can this man give us his flesh to eat?” If, as is commonly supposed, they are not questioning Jesus’s ability to die a sacrificial death, but his ability to feed them on his own human flesh, then they are searching the wrong category of information. The choice of search paths for a referent for “flesh”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information status</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current: belief:</td>
<td>sacrifice:</td>
<td>flesh = sacrificial death</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a GIVEN situational: human:</td>
<td>body:</td>
<td>flesh = physical meat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Jews seem to have taken the situation as their search path, a human being, whose flesh is physical. According to the search path suggested above, the category 3b GIVEN textual - current should have priority. In the immediately preceding text Jesus has
opened a scenario of religious belief using food and drink imagery, i.e. John 6:35 coming to Jesus and trusting in Jesus lead to no more hunger or thirst, i.e. are like eating and drinking, 6:47-8 “He that believes on me has eternal life. I am the bread of life.” In the context of belief and food metaphors, Jesus’s meaning should have been apparent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal</th>
<th>Metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>come to Jesus</td>
<td>(eat food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(be spiritually satisfied)</td>
<td>not hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust in Jesus</td>
<td>(drink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(be spiritually satisfied)</td>
<td>not thirst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus, one who gives life</td>
<td>bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes to Jesus</td>
<td>eats this bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will sacrifice myself</td>
<td>I will give this bread</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presumably, the Jews were so averse to coming to Jesus and believing in him (e.g. 6:41-42), that they do not even evaluate his words within the context of discipleship and faith, but only from the human angle of the person visibly before them (cf. 6:42).

Similarly Nicodemus misunderstands Jesus by taking the situation rather than context as the search path, and then understanding ἄνωθεν accordingly. Here the referent is not a nominal “thing” but an adverbial “relation”:

John 3:3b

ἔδωκεν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δώκαται. Ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

if not anyone be-born again/from-above, not can see the kingdom of-the God

There are two possible search paths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information status</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3b GIVEN textual-current: God’s rule:</td>
<td>access:</td>
<td>ἄνωθεν = from above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a GIVEN situational: human:</td>
<td>birth:</td>
<td>ἄνωθεν = again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nicodemus has himself established a context of God’s rule in 3:2 “a teacher come from God” “God with him”, but when Jesus speaks, he looks for the referent of “be born” and then ἄνωθεν in the situational human scenario, as evidenced by 3:4 “being old” “his mother’s womb”. Jesus, reasonably enough, expected him to search for referents in the contextual “God’s rule” scenario. Indeed Nicodemus equates ἄνωθεν with δεύτερον (3:4), whereas Jesus equates ἄνωθεν with ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος (3:7, 8).

For us, as a new audience, overhearing, as it were, the original communication to the original target audience, we have exegetical problems because we are not in the original context. For example, not knowing the original perceptual context of some New Testament speech events, we do not know whether the referent is to be found there or not. For example, in Luke 12:24 κατανοήσατε τῶν κόρακας “Consider the ravens,” are these to be found in the information status category 3a GIVEN situational (i.e. the specific ravens you can see around you), or in 2a KNOWN unused (i.e. all members belonging to the class scenario “raven”). In some languages, the translation would be different depending on the referent.

Similarly, in John 4:35 “open your eyes, and look at the fields. They are ripe for harvest.” Could they see fields ready for harvesting, which Jesus used as an analogy for people ready to believe? Or was Jesus asking them to look at the crowd of Samaritans approaching (4:30), and using metaphorical language? In either case the referent is to be
found in 3a GIVEN situational, but which referent depends on the situational context. The fact that the co-text mentions people, not fields, suggests the Samaritans are the original referent (at least the Gospel writer took it that way).

Sometimes the text indicates the information status category where the referent is to be found, but we cannot identify the referent. For example in 2 Thessalonians 2:5-7 there is the referent τὸ κατέχων and ὁ κατέχων “the restrainer” (neuter and masculine respectively) along with the information that “when I was with you I used to tell you these things” and “you know what is holding him back.” Paul makes it clear that this referent is 3c GIVEN textual - displaced, i.e. part of the text (in this case oral) that Paul communicated to the Thessalonians when he was there. Unfortunately, all we have of this text as today’s audience is the summary in Acts 17:3 “This Jesus I am proclaiming to you is the Christ”. So we know the original search path, but not the original referent, although it was clear to the original audience.
Appendix O
Parkari texts and glosses

This appendix gives in full the seven Parkari texts referred to in Chapters 10-14. These texts, all transcribed from tape, are written in IPA with a morpheme by morpheme gloss and a fairly literal translation, and with lines numbered for easy reference. Parkari grammatical morphemes are also listed, together with their glosses and explanations.

The Parkari texts are listed as follows:

They belong to the following genres:

Narrative factual:
Malo’s wedding

Narrative fictional:
Michael, Mongoose, Sparrow, The lame man and the blind man

Procedural:
My Farmwork, Breadpan

Glosses

For ease of reference, Parkari suffixes showing Person are glossed -P, and those showing Gender are glossed -G. The different Person and Gender morphemes are listed below, together with the meaning of other morpheme glosses used:

Gender suffixes -G
Hyphen alone indicates a zero morpheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-i̧</td>
<td>-i̧</td>
<td>-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>-i̧</td>
<td>-i̧</td>
<td>-i̧</td>
<td>-d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Type 1 Nominative forms (bolded) are the only -G suffixes to occur with verbs. All forms occur on nouns. There are two classes of noun, Type 1 which always has a Gender suffix, and Type 2 which does not. Each type contains both masculine and feminine nouns.

Person suffixes -P

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 2nd person | -e | -o |
| 3rd person | -e | -e |
| Future      | SINGULAR | PLURAL |
| 1st person  | -i-i | -i-o |
| 2nd person  | -i-o | -i-o |
| 3rd person  | -i-e | -i-e |

Other verbal suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-irr</td>
<td>irregular form</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nonf / -nonfinal</td>
<td>nonfinal form</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nonfinite</td>
<td>nonfinite form</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pf</td>
<td>Perfective Aspect</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-imf</td>
<td>Imperfective Aspect</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pres</td>
<td>Present or Current</td>
<td>-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-past</td>
<td>Relative Past or Anterior</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fut</td>
<td>Future Tense</td>
<td>-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-inf</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other noun suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-loc</td>
<td>locative case</td>
<td>-e / -e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-erg</td>
<td>ergative case</td>
<td>-e / -e / -i / -ie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These texts are transcribed in full below, using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), together with a word for word gloss, and a free translation. In the transcription and gloss, morphemes are separated by a hyphen.

Text 1 “My farmwork” Procedural text - habitual

1. fi-ta haor r-o vel-o uf-t-en
I morning of-G early-G get.up-nonf
Having got up early in the morning

za-in ban-i mën de-v-o i-jàkar
go-fut.P land-G on give-inf-G tour
I will go to take a walk round the land.

Text 2 “Michael” Narrative text - story

Text 3 “Breadpan” Procedural text - future

Text 4 “Malo’s wedding” Narrative text - account

Text 5 “Mongoose” Narrative text - story

Text 6 “Sparrow” Narrative text - story

Text 7 “The lame man and the blind man” Narrative text - story

Text 1 “My farmwork”

1. fi-ta haor r-o vel-o uf-t-en
I morning of-G early-G get.up-nonf
Having got up early in the morning

za-in ban-i mën de-v-o i-jàkar
go-fut.P land-G on give-inf-G tour
I will go to take a walk round the land.

2. i-jàkar d-en pas wa-le pas-o ow-d-fi qh-ac-e.
tour give-nonf then again back-G come-P-pres house-loc
After taking a walk round I come back home again.

house-loc come-nonf again ox-G drive-nonf go-fut.P tie-inf-G ox-team-G
After coming home, I will drive the oxen and go to yoke the ox-team.
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4 dʒor-o za-e-h, 
ox-team-G go-P-pres
The ox-team goes.

5 bɔn-ai kʰem-e pɔr-ai on paf wale za-e wacʰ-ɔ-ŋ-kʰomodh. 
land-G plough-nonfinite result-G and then again go-nonfinite cut-P-pres sugarcane 
After ploughing the land then I go and cut the sugarcane.

6 kʰomodh wacʰ-en wale u-a ne tukɔ-rे pɔr-e kar-e 
sugarcane cut-nonfinal again that-G to section-G result-G do-nonfinite 
After cutting the sugarcane then having chopped it into sections

7 paf wale bɔn-i məƞ wale kʰomodh u-a ɔr-ɔ pɔr-e kacʰ-e 
then again land-G on again sugarcane that-G trench-G result-G extract-nonfinite 
then again, back on the land, having made trenches

8 ɔr-ɔ moø wale kʰomodh vεɾ-ɔ-h. 
trench-G in again sugarcane plant-P-pres 
I plant sugarcane in the trenches.

9 kʰomodh vεɾ-e pɔr-e 
sugarcane plant-nonfinite result-G 
After planting the sugarcane

10 on paf u-a ne wale u-a ɔr-ɔ wale pur-ɔŋ. 
and then that-G to again that-G trench-G again fill in-P-pres 
then I fill it in, fill the trenches in.

11 pur-e pɔr-e on paf u-a m wale soɕ-ɔ-h pɔnį. 
fill in-nonfinite result-nonfinite and then that-G in again leave-P-pres water 
After filling them in then I let the water into it.

12 pɔnį soɕ-εn bʰor-a-en wale vɔtaɾ ne bʰdʰ kɔr-ɔ-h. 
water leave-nonfinal fill-pass-nonfinal again channel to closed do-P-pres 
After letting in the water, after it has filled, then I close the channel.

13 bʰdʰ kɔr-en pase wale a bɔn-i məƞ ʃakɔr dj-ɔ-ŋ. 
closed do-nonfinal then again er? land-G on tour give-P-pres 
After closing it then I er take another walk round the land.

14 wale pɔnį mɔtʰ mɔdʰ-a hə wale vɔtaɾ ne bódʰ-iɛ. 
again water upper mouth-G from again channel to tie-P.1p.Guj 
Then I close off the channel from the upper mouth.

15 vɔtaɾ ne bódʰ-en pase wale ou-en 
channel tie-nonfinal then again come-nonfinal 
After closing the channel I come back

16 bɔn-i mə ɡʰumr-o dj-ɔ-ŋ-h. 
land-G in tour-G give-P-pres 
and take a tour round the land.

17 wale bɔn-ø fo-e bɔn-ø r-ai kæʔ-ø kar-ɔ-h. 
again field-wall-G be-P field-wall-G of-G trimming-G do-P-pres 
Then if there are field-walls I trim the walls.
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18 6an-6 r-ai kata-i kar-e par-ai  
field-wall-G of-G trimming-G do-nonfinite result-G  
an sid\textsuperscript{a}-a 6an-o rak\textsuperscript{b}-fi  
and straight-G field-wall-G keep-P-pres  
After trimming the walls I keep the walls straight.

19 d\textsuperscript{a}e d\textsuperscript{a}or-o no-e, d\textsuperscript{a}or-a m\textsuperscript{e} t\textsuperscript{a}sid\textsuperscript{b}-en sid\textsuperscript{b}-o kor-6-fi.  
if mound-G be-P mound-G in dig.away-nonfinal straight-G do-P-pres  
If there is a mound, then I dig away the mound and level it up.

20 6an 6or-o namb\textsuperscript{a}ard\textsuperscript{a}ar d\textsuperscript{a}r\textsuperscript{e}-i kar-6-fi t\textsuperscript{a}auk-ai.  
and field-G in turn trimming-G do-P-pres good-G  
And I do fields in turn, trimming them well.

21 h\textsuperscript{a}rik-a 6ar-a kar-6-fi bad\textsuperscript{a}u-e  
level-G field-G do-P-pres all-G-incl.  
I make all the fields level,

22 d\textsuperscript{d}ji-a m\textsuperscript{e} ponj sahi sahi moe v-e pa\textsuperscript{a}r-i-o  
which-G in water correct correct in move-P fall-pf-G  
in which the water may come really evenly

23 bad\textsuperscript{a}-a m hek d\textsuperscript{d}eu-o 6ar-a m\textsuperscript{e} ponj pa\textsuperscript{a}r-e au-e.  
all-G in one like-G field-G in water fall-nonfinite come-P  
and the water may lie in the field just the same amount all over.

24 so eu-a namun-a t\textsuperscript{a}i kom apr-a k\textsuperscript{b}hajal t\textsuperscript{a}i  
so thus-G manner-G by work own-G thought by  
So in this way according to my own plan

25 su\textsuperscript{b}-a namun-a h\textsuperscript{a}l kor-6-fi.  
good-G manner-G from do-P-pres  
I do my work in a good manner.

Text 2 - “Michael”

1 hek sokr-o fi\textsuperscript{a}t-o.  
one child-G was-G  
Once there was a boy.

2 u-o r-o nom fi\textsuperscript{a}t-o moekal.  
that-G of-G name was-G Michael  
His name was Michael.

3 e sokr-o tarik tarik iskul moe b\textsuperscript{a}n\textsuperscript{a}-u-a zo-t-o.  
this child-G daily daily school in study-inf-G go-impf-G  
This boy used to go every day to study in school.

4 pa\textsuperscript{a}n rel g\textsuperscript{d}af\textsuperscript{c}-i m\textsuperscript{e} sa\textsuperscript{a}c-en iskul zo-t-o.  
but rail cart-G in climb-nonf school go-impf-G  
But he used to go to school on the train.

5 pa\textsuperscript{a}n home\textsuperscript{f} u\textsuperscript{a}gar b\textsuperscript{h}ar\textsuperscript{e} zo-t-o.  
but always without fare-loc go-impf-G  
But he always used to travel without paying his fare.
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6 an zaeo bafo tiket zo-v-a au-t-o
and when inspector ticket see-inf-G come-impf-G
And when the inspector used to come to check the tickets,

7 to e sokr-o kokus mē ya to siṭ fielb nafi-e za-t-o.
then this child-G toilet in or indeed seat under hide-nonf go-impf-G
then this boy used to hide in the toilet or under the seat.

8 fek di bafo i-a ne xul-e lidb-o.
one day inspector this-G to grasp-nonf took-G
One day the inspector caught hold of him.

9 zaeo i-a r-a gūz-a zo-i-a,
when this-G of-G pocket-G see-pf-G
When he checked his pockets

10 to i-a r-a gūz-a mē sanakbtī karqbt zor-i-o.
then this-G of-G pocket-G in identity card find-pf-G
he found his Identity Card in his pocket.

11 an karqbt māh lakbt-al hat-o maoel ujvaqi.
and card on write-ed was-G Michael Christian
and on the card was written "Michael Christian".

12 taeo bafo maoel ne kidb-o
then inspector Michael to said-G
Then the inspector said to Michael

13 "tu ujvaqi thb-en galat kom kar-e-ni.
you(s) Christian become-nonf wrong work do-P-pres
"You have become a Christian, but do what's wrong.

14 ujvaqi mānqbt to heq-a kom nōthi kar-t-a.
Christian people indeed like this-G work not do-impf-G
Christian people don’t behave like this.

15 to kam heq-a galat kom kar-e-ni r-i-o.
so(result) why like this-G wrong work do-P-pres stay-pf-G
So why are you doing wrong like this?*

16 taeo i-a sokr-a ne gūqni-qi jaram au-qi,
then this-G child-G to much-G shame come-G
Then this boy became very ashamed,

17 an ladub-br mār-i-o.
and embarrassment-loc die-pf-G
and became very embarrassed.

18 pase maoel fek lubuk-o ujvaqi thb-e gfi-o.
then Michael one good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G
Then Michael became a good Christian.

19 am-o badthb ne kāp-e ke
us-G all-G to must-P that
We should all
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20 amar-a bhuc(-a kom sac[-en t’auk-a kom kar-δ, our-G bad-G work leave-nonf good-G work do-P give up our bad deeds and do good deeds,

21 zam hae sokr-o t’auk-o urja$[i t’$e q-l-o, just as this(near) child-G good-G Christian become-nonf went-pf-G just as this boy became a good Christian.

Text 3 - “Breadpan”

1 zaesø hae tau$-o sqo-o when this breadpan-G raise-P When you put this breadpan onto the fire,

2 taeo pase ðxeoø ne zo$ somu ne hof kar-ia. then then Jevon to or Shomu to call do-fut.imp then give Jevon or Shomu a call.

3 to øh e u tam-ø ne høtø devø kor$-en then selves indeed they you-G to below fire do-nonf Then they will make the fire below [the breadpan] for you

4 pa$h u-a moø qt-o do$ø-j-e u-a ne tau$-a ne. then that-G in flour-G wash-fut-P that-G to bread-pan-G to then in it flour ... they will wash the breadpan.

5 tau$-a ne do$ø-en sup$ par-o kor-e bread-pan-G to wash-nonf clean result-G do-nonf After washing the breadpan and making it clean,

6 øn passe u-a ne poøi er$-ø-pø-o. and then that-G to water spill-fut-P result-G they will then pour away the water from it.

7 poøi er$-en moø veøø$-ø je qt-o. water spill-nonf in move-fut-P flour-G After pouring out the water, they will swill flour around in it.

8 qt-o par-o veøø$ flour-G result-G move-nonf After swilling the flour around,

9 øn u-a moø zaesø heø høø a$q loø$-j-e, and that-G in when below from fire seem-fut-P inside it, when the fire touches it from below,

10 ðøø$ø tarøø tap$-j-e tau$-o, good-G way heat-fut-P bread-pan-G the breadpan will heat up really well,

11 to u-a moø u qt-o bøløø$ moø $al$-j-e. so that-G in that flour-G really inside burn-fut-P so inside it, that flour will really burn up inside.

12 $aløø$ø-pøø moø $al$-j-e aøæø, outer-G side-loc inside burn-fut-P flour-G On the outer edge the flour will burn up inside.
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13 uə[e moe ʰtʰor-k-e-k til-əi ʰhaŋ-ia,
again inside little-dim-loc-or so match-G strike-fut.imp
Then put a match inside for a little while

14 to ʰbaθ-ai u ə ne əzañ laq-en
so all-G that-G to flame strike-nonf
so that the flame will touch it completely,

15 ʰbaθ-en u ʰkʰatam ʰθ-e əz-f-e əq-ə.o.
burn-nonf that finished become-nonf go-fut-P flour-G
it will burn up, and the flour will be totally consumed.

16 ʰkʰatam ʰθ-e əz-f-e əq-ə.o,
finished become-nonf go-fut-nonf flour-G
The flour will be totally consumed,

17 pase u-ə r-ai ʰjeł-ai re-f-e moe,
then that-G of-G ash-G remain-fut-P inside
then its ash will remain inside.

18 u ʰjeł-ai r-ai ʰkʰarpi-ə tʰli ʰhekəl par-əi ʰkaθ-ə.en
that ash-G topic-G scraper-G from aside result-G extract-nonf
Shift that ash with a potscraper

19 pʰəθol-e par-əi en pase ʰhek ʰsədk-o ʰgʰəθ-ia roq-ə r-o əo
throw-nonf result-G and then one scone-G make-fut.imp bread-G of-G
throw it away, then make a scone out of bread.

20 non-o non-o ʰsədk-o par-o ʰgʰəθ-ə
small-G small-G scone-G result-G make-nonf
After making a really small scone

21 u-ə ne uθə moe ʰnəθ-ia.
that-G to middle in put in-fut.imp
put it in the middle.

22 ʰhek par u-ə ɾ-o ʰqθ-ə ʰθ-e əz-e
one surface that-G of-G hard-G become-nonf go-P
One of its surfaces will become hard,

23 ʰən biz-o re-f-e ʰnaθəm.
and other-G remain-fut-P soft
and the other will remain soft.

24 biz-o ʰpəθ-e ʰutʰlaθ-e par-əo
other-G side-loc turn-nonf result-G
Turn it over onto the other side

25 ʰən pase ʰjakθəm u-ə ne ʰuə[e moe ʰgʰəməθ-e par-əo
and then immediately that-G to again inside turn around-nonf result-G
and then immediately move it around inside

26 ʰo ʰbaθəl ʰtaθ-ə moe ʰgʰəməθ-e par-əo
and everywhere bread-pan-G inside turn around-nonf result-G
and move it around everywhere inside the bread-pan,
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27 an badh-o u-a r-o tʰ-e-hi ro.
and all-G that-G of-G become-P-pres dross
and all of it becomes dross.

28 moṣ re-t-ai ro s-e
inside remain-rep-G dross be-P
The stuff that remains inside is dross.

29 u badh-o nikar-en kʰatam tʰ-e za-ʃ-e.
that all-G exit-nonf finished become-nonf go-fut-P
That will all come out and be finished with.

30 nikar-e za-ʃ-e par-o
exit-nonf go-fut-P result-G
It will come right out.

31 u-a ne roʃ-i ne sōt-e za-ʃ-e par-o hoe
that-G to bread-G to stick-nonf go-fut-P result-G completely
It will completely stick to it, to the bread.

32 pose u-a ne u jaki bʰuk-a moṣ r-e an bōt-e
then that-G to that all lump-G in remain-P and burn-P
Then all of it remains in a lump and burns up

33 an moṣ kʰiff-r-o the-ʃ-e.
and inside rubbish-G become-fut-P
and will become rubbish inside.

34 u vale kʰarp-i-a tʰi sapʰ kər-en
that again scraper-G with clean do-nonf
Clean it out with a scraper,

35 vale lugʰ-r-o r-o sapʰ-o par-o həŋ-e,
again cloth-G of-G duster-G result-G strike-nonf
and give it a wipe with a duster made of cloth,

36 pahi u-a ne kʰer-e par-o
then that-G to shake-nonf result-G
then shake it out,

37 an pose biz-i roʃ-i ghar-en kʰadʰ-o horu moṣ nokʰ-ia.
and then other-G bread-G make-nonf ate-G for in put in-fut.imp
and then make another chapatti for eating, and put it inside.

38 to u tam-ʃ ne kʰadʰ-o horu bʰuuk-i roʃ-i tʰe-ʃ-e.
then that you-G to ate-G for good-G bread-G become-fut-P
Then that chapatti will be good for you to eat.

Text 4 - “Malo’s wedding”

1 rifṣat g-i-o par-o tə tʰar-a malak mə
Richard went-pf-G result-G you(s) your(s)-G country in
Richard went, you went back to your home country

2 an pose ame kər-i-o viva mal-a r-o
and then we do-pf-G wedding Malo-G of-G
and then we held Malo’s wedding.
Appendix O - Parkari texts and glosses

3. uviu kar-i-o te paifh-a am-o kän kë noë.
   wedding do-pf-G then money-G us-G with anything not
   When we held the wedding we had no money at all.

4. pös rupi-a-e g'ar më noë.
   five rupee-G-even house in not
   There was not even five rupees in the house.

5. pase ko-e ul hë paie,set kar-ai,
   then some-even thither from borrowing do- G
   Then we borrowed some from over there,

6. ko-e ul ud'har-a lidh-a,
   some-incl thither loan-G took-G
   we got some loans from somewhere else,

7. ko-e ul ud'har-a lin-a,
   some-incl thither loan-G took-G
   we got some loans from somewhere else again.

8. zam tom kac-en (be ho) be hazar b'el-a kor-i-a.
   as so do-nonf (two hundred) two thousand together-G do-pf-G
   And in this way and that we got (two hundred) two thousand collected.

9. be hazar rupi-a tha-i-a.
   two thousand rupee-G make-pf-G
   We got together two thousand rupees.

10. pase lin-a sok'ha-a, trang mëng sok'h-a lin-a.
    then took-G rice-grain-G three maund rice-grain-G took-G
    Then we got rice. We got three maunds (120kg) of rice.

11. ko-e wok'h orvon-o lin-o.
    some-incl spices-G took-G
    We got some spices.

12. pad-o to na lidh-o, adh mëng pat(g)-a lidh-a.
    buffalo-G contraexp not took-G half maund potato-G took- G
    However we didn't get a buffalo, we got half a maund of potatoes.

13. pase kar-i-o uviu
    then do-pf-G wedding
    Then we held the wedding

14. at'h di vono-e ud'h-o.
    eight day feeding-loc went-G
    The feeding of the groom (at different houses) went on for eight days.

15. pase at-ë di-ë më
    then so many-G day-G in
    Then for this many days

16. biz-a mën'ë ko-e na au-e fek-i-a.
    other-G person some-incl not come-nonf can-pf-G
    nobody else was able to come.
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17 pañ apō diō mē
then eight-G day-G in
So for eight days

18 dēke amãr-ã oziz haf-ã hāt-ã, u a-i-a
whoever our-G relative true-G was-G that come-pf-G
whoever was a true relative of ours, they came.

19 pañe au-en b'at rōd-i-ã, uivā kã-i-o
then come-nonf rice cook-pf-G wedding do-pf-G
Then when they had come we cooked the rice and * held the wedding.

20 hōz r-o nimitar suñ-i-o, ṭak-ë r-i-a.
evening of-G wedding-money get loose-pf-G stay-night-nonf staypf-G
In the evening the wedding money was raised, they stayed the night.

21 tjan-ã acf-i-o
tent-G be.pitched-pf-G
The tent was pitched

22 ñ-i-a rītō diñ-mē raf-ë bāã-r-e bēt-i-e r-e.
and this-G Richard of-G house in only-G woman-G sat-G dwell-G
and in Richard’s house here only the women stayed.

23 ñañ-ã mē admi bēt-i-a r-i-a.
tent-G in man sat-G dwell-pf-G
The men stayed in the tent.

24 mīre fīk th-e cf-i-o uivā.
fairly fine become-nonf went-pf-G wedding
The wedding went fairly well.

25 pañe hāvar r-ai vel-ai apē vaf-ã cførson au-ai.
then morning of-G early-G eight-loc o’clock-loc Datsun come-G
Then early in the morning at eight o’clock the Datsun came.

26 pañ ame din-o lañ-a ne zoar.
then we gave-G bridegroom-G to showing
Then we gave the bridegroom the ritual showing.

27 zoar par-ô d-en cførson mē sar-ë gî-i-a.
showing result-G give-nonf Datsun in climb-nonf went-pf-G
After giving the ritual showing, we climbed into the Datsun.

28 pañe d'ol gî-i-o vifār-e.
then drum went-pf-G be.forgotten-nonf
Then the drum went and got forgotten.

29 pañe cførson l-en am r-ã am gî-i-a gîrﬁ-ã m sidb-ã.
then Datsun take-nonf so of-G so went-pf-G church-G in direct-G
Then having taken the Datsun we went anyway straight to the church.

30 pañe gîrﬁ-ã m zu-en utb-ë ame sidb-ã lañ-a.
then church-G in go- nonf there-loc we direct-G bridegroom-G
Then having gone to the church, there we straightway the grooms...
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31 ut\textsuperscript{e} maţl-i hū fiek loč-o a-i-o.
there-loc Matli-G from one bridegroom come-pf-G
one bridegroom came there from Matli.

32 mar-a dikr-a r-ai zon mol-a r-ai g\textsuperscript{f}-ai.
my-G son-G of-G wedding party Malo-G of-G went-G
My son Malo's wedding party went.

33 ut\textsuperscript{e} za-en a-ge t\textsuperscript{f}or-i var hca\textsuperscript{f}-e.
there-loc go-nonf we little-G time sat-G
Having got there we sat for a little while.

34 an pase uiva kar-i-o, niko par-i-o.
and then wedding do-pf-G marriage read-pf-G
and then we held the wedding, read the marriage.

35 pad\textsuperscript{h}ri a-i-o, b\textsuperscript{h}a\textsuperscript{f}ir d\textsuperscript{in} f\textadot\textsuperscript{d}a\textsuperscript{f}oBa\textsuperscript{f}a\textsuperscript{f}.
vicar come-pf-G Bashir Din Hyderabad from
The vicar came, Bashir Din from Hyderabad.

36 rauat pad\textsuperscript{h}ri a-i-o
Rawat vicar come-pf-G
Padri Rawat came.

37 an pase ut\textsuperscript{h}-e niko par-o kar-en
and then there-loc marriage result-G do- nonf
And then after they had read the marriage there

38 uiva par-o kar-en par-o,
wedding result-G do- nonf result-G
after the wedding had been held,

39 an pase a-ge zon ao-ai r-ai g\textsuperscript{h}ar-e par\textsuperscript{h}-a\textsuperscript{f}a\textsuperscript{f}.
and then we wedding.party come-G result-G house-loc wed-caus-nonf
and then we the wedding party came home after marrying them.

40 an loč-a be-e t\textsuperscript{h}-i-o r-a ut\textsuperscript{h}-e,
and bridegroom-G two-incl become-pf-G of-G there-loc
And both bridegrooms were there.

41 o sokr-o t\textsuperscript{h}-i-o r-o
that child-G become-pf-G result-G
That boy was,

42 an mar-o dikr-o t\textsuperscript{h}-i-o r-i-o.
and my-G son-G become-pf-G result-pf-G
and my son was.

Text 5 - "Mongoose"

1 aziz-o, uat kutjh am s-e ke
friend-G matter somewhat thus be-P that
Friends, it's like this.

2 fiek gom mē fiek g\textsuperscript{h}or fāt-o.
one town in one house was-G
In a certain town there was a house.
Appendix O - Parkari texts and glosses

3 an u-a gør-vol-a r-o nom premo fiat-o.
and that-G house-holder-G of-G name Premo-G was-G And that house-holder's name was Premo.

4 prem-a r-o sokr-o fiék kondʒi fiat-o.
Prem-G of-G child-G one Konji was-G Premo's son was one Konji.

5 fiék di u g-i-o apc-a mal sar-i-a haru
one day he went-pf-G own-G livestock graze-pf-G for One day he went in order to graze his livestock

6 an u-e fiék noji-o z'h-al-i-o
and that-erg one mongoose-G grasp-pf-G and he caught a mongoose

7 an u noji-a r-o boj-i-o l-en
and that mongoose-G of-G child-dim-G take-nonf and he took the baby mongoose

8 apc-e g'h-ar-e o-i-o.
own-loc house-loc come-pf-G and came home.

9 zeø u g'h-ar-e o-i-o, to u-a r-i mā kidh'-o ke
when that house-loc come-pf-G then that-G of-G mother said- G that When he came home his mother said

10 boj'-a, i-a noji-a r-a boj-i-a ne
child-G this-G mongoose-G of-G child-dim-G to Child, this baby mongoose

11 tā yapas soq'-e ao (apc-a) apc-i mā kan
you(s) back leave-nonf come (own-G) own-G mother to you take back to its own mother.

12 sokr-e foq'-l lidh'-o
child-erg tantrum took-G The boy had a tantrum

13 an u-a noji-a r-a boj-i-a ne apc-a g'h-ar moē rak'-en
and that-G mongoose-G of-G child-dim-G to own-G house in keep-nonf and kept that baby mongoose in his own home

14 u-a r-ai palaq poj kar-ai.
that-G of-G tending nourishing do-G and looked after it.

15 noji-o aste aste mot-o t'e-t-o g'i-o
mongoose-G slowly slowly big-G become-impf-G went-pf-G The mongoose kept gradually growing bigger

16 an u-a g'h-ar mē re-u-a laqj-i-o.
and that-G house in dwell-inf-G begin-pf-G and began to live in that house.
17 and whoever house of members was
And all the members of the family,

18 that from that friendship became friendly with them all.

19 And several days later

20 his baby brother was born,

21 who was in the same house.

22 And that boy’s mother

23 went outside to fetch water.

24 And the mongoose was in the house alone.

25 After a little while

26 a cobra came into the house,

27 and in order to bite that little child

28 it came there and raised its hood.

29 The snake’s intention was that

30 that it would strike him
31 nank-a 6āl ne mar-e nokh-o.
little-G child to kill-nonf put in-P
and kill the little child.

32 paŋ noļi-o ne g3and4 pər-ai on kəbər pər-ai
but mongoose-G to scent fall-G and knowledge fall-G
But the mongoose scented it and found out

33 ke mar-o g3ar mē hap s-e.
that my-G house in snake be-P
that a snake was in the house.

34 u a-i-o an jokd3om mē
that come-pf-G and moment in
It came and immediately

35 u-a hap hū makəbl-o kər u-a laq i-o
that-G snake from contest-G do-inf-G begin-pf-G
began to struggle with the snake.

36 ak3arkər noļi-e hap ne mar-e nokh-3-i-o.
finally mongoose-erg snake to kill-nonf put in-pf-G
Finally the mongoose killed the snake.

37 hap ne mar-en ut3-e pəqəl-ən
snake to kill-nonf there-loc throw-nonf
After killing the snake it threw it away there

38 noļi-o za-en məqər-a man bəq-3-o.
mongoose-G go-nonf doorway-G on sat-G
and the mongoose went and sat in the doorway.

39 u-a r-a məd3-a man g3ən-3-o loi fət-o
that-G of-G mouth-G on much-G blood was-G
There was alot of blood on its face

40 kəmke u-e hap ne mar-i-o t-o.
because that-erg snake to kill-pf-G past-G
because it had killed the snake.

41 təq-i-k dər keŋ u-a sokr-a r-ai mə au-ai.
little-G or.so time after that-G child-G of-G mother come-G
A little while later, the boy’s mother came.

42 an mənık-a mən au-en zo-i-o
and doorway-G on come-nonf see-pf-G
And she came to the doorway and saw ....

43 ke noļi-o ut3-e bəq-3-o s-e
that mongoose-G there-loc sat-ed be-P
that the mongoose was sat there,

44 an u-a r-a məd3-a man g3ən-o loi fət-o.
and that-G of-G mouth-G on much-G blood was-G
and that there was lots of blood on its face.
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45 mai dhil me i khjal kar-i-o ke i-e noji-e
lady heart in this thought do-pf-G that this-erg mongoose-erg
The lady thought in her heart that this mongoose

46 Jaeed mar-a nank-a bal ne mar-e nokh-i-o.
perhaps my-G little-G child to kill-nonf put-in-pf-G
has perhaps killed my little child.

47 u-a r-o marh-a man mat hat-o
that-G of-G head-G on waterpot was-G
On her head was a waterpot,

48 an u-e zor hoo u mat u-a noji-a manh pʰagol-i-o
and that-erg force from that waterpot that-G mongoose-G on throw-pf-G
and she threw that pot hard onto the mongoose.

49 an noji-a ne mar-e nokh-i-o.
and mongoose-G to kill-nonf put in-pf-G
and killed the mongoose.

50 mar-en pase jaeed gʰar mē g-fai
kill-nonf then when house in went-G
After she had killed it, when she went inside the house

51 jaeed za-en zo-e tō
then go-nonf see-P then
then once inside she looks and

52 pʰh-a r-a pah-a m hap mar-a pari-o,
swing-bed-G of-G side-G in snake die-ed fall-pf-G
there is a snake lying dead at the side of the cot.

53 an bāf-i-o uth-e rō-m-e-hi r-i-o.
and child-G there-loc play-P-pres staypf-G
and the child is there playing.

54 mai pehi-en viʃtar kar-i-o ke
lady enter-nonf thought do-pf-G that
When the lady had entered she thought that

55 bʰale bʰaʃoon, mē ki kār-e nokh-i-o.
oh.my! God, Lerg this what do-nonf put.in-pf-G
Oh God! What have I gone and done?

56 mē fiek bedhofi begunahe ne mar-e nokh-i-o.
Lerg one innocent sinless to kill-nonf result-pf-G
I have killed an innocent sinless creature.

57 u-e mar-ai kāt-ai na, u-e mū haru kom kar-i-o.
that-erg my-G how.much-G not, that-erg me for work do-pf-G
He did so much for me, didn’t he, he did so much for me.

58 par xh-e u-a ne mar-e nokh-i-o.
but Lerg that-G to kill-nonf result-pf-G
But I killed him.
59 ak\textsuperscript{b}ar mai g\textsuperscript{b}ar h\textsuperscript{a}l bar-\textsuperscript{a}i nik\textsuperscript{a}r-\textsuperscript{a}i.
finally lady house from outside-G exit-G
Finally the lady went outside.

60 no\textsuperscript{i}-\textsuperscript{o} ne l-en vi\textsuperscript{[i]}\textsuperscript{a}r kar-\textsuperscript{u}-\textsuperscript{a} l\textsuperscript{a}f-\textsuperscript{a}i.
mongoose-G to take-nonf thought do-inf-G begin-G
She took the mongoose and began to think.

61 u-e apr-\textsuperscript{a} m\textsuperscript{e} sof\textsuperscript{[i]}-\textsuperscript{i}-\textsuperscript{o} ke
that-erg own-G mind in think-pf-G that
She thought in her mind

62 m\textsuperscript{e} kam n\textsuperscript{a} sab\textsuperscript{b}ar kar-\textsuperscript{i}-\textsuperscript{o}?
I.erg why not patience do-pf-G
Why was I not patient?

63 kam n\textsuperscript{a} m\textsuperscript{e} perf\textsuperscript{i} zu-en g\textsuperscript{b}ar m\textsuperscript{e} zo-i-o?
why not Lerg first go-nonf house in see-pf-G
Why did I not first look inside the house?

64 ki, ki, ker-\textsuperscript{o} kom s-e?
what what what.sort-G work be-P
What, what, what sort of deed is this?

65 paq pass u-e apr-\textsuperscript{a} d\textsuperscript{[i]}\textsuperscript{e}l m\textsuperscript{e} k\textsuperscript{[i]}ju\textsuperscript{l} kar-i-o ke
but then that-erg own-G heart in thought do-pf-G that
But then she thought in her heart

66 e\textsuperscript{[i]}-\textsuperscript{o} kom n\textsuperscript{a} kar-\textsuperscript{u}-\textsuperscript{o} k\textsuperscript{b}ap-e.
this.sort-G work not do-inf-G must-P
One should not act like this.

67 f\textsuperscript{a}me\textsuperscript{[i]}\textsuperscript{a} sab\textsuperscript{b}ar kar-o-o
always patience do-pf-G
One should always be patient.

68 take sab\textsuperscript{b}ar r-o p\textsuperscript{[i]}\textsuperscript{e}l f\textsuperscript{a}me\textsuperscript{[i]}\textsuperscript{a} m\textsuperscript{e}l-b-o s-e.
so.that patience of-G fruit always sweet-G be-P
since the fruit of patience is always sweet.

69 perf\textsuperscript{i} sof\textsuperscript{[i]}-\textsuperscript{o} vi\textsuperscript{[i]}\textsuperscript{a}r-u-o,
first think-inf-G ponder-inf-G
First one should think carefully,

70 u-a ker \textsuperscript{f}iz-o kom kar-\textsuperscript{u}-\textsuperscript{o}.
that-G after other-G work do-inf-G
and after that one should take other action.

71 f\textsuperscript{o}e s-e az r-\textsuperscript{a}i v\textsuperscript{a}rta.
this(near) be-P today of-G story
This is today's story.
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Text 6 - "Sparrow"

1 fiek sakl-o fiat-o.  
   one sparrow-G was-G  
   Once there was a sparrow.

2 u la-i-o sok^h-o, u-a ne zaç-i-o.  
   he fetch-pf-G rice grain-G he-G to find-pf-G  
   He fetched a grain of rice, he found it.

3 pañ fáñ^h-o mën beñ^h-o.  
   then that log-G on sat-G  
   Then he sat on a log.

4 tô fáñ^h-o ne k-e-fi sok^h-o de  
   so log-G to say-P-pres rice grain-G give  
   So he says to the log, "Give me the rice grain."

5 u-a m ter hat-oi, na,  
   he-G in crack was-G no  
   There was a crack in it, wasn’t there,

6 fáñ^h-o moñ.  
   log-G in  
   in the log.

7 sok^h-o de  
   rice grain-G give  
   "Give me the grain of rice."

8 to k-e-fi sok^h-o nañ efj-d.  
   so say-P-pres rice grain-G not give-P  
   So he says, "I will not give you the grain of rice.

9 b^aq-e za.  
   flee-nonf go  
   Go away!

10 tû ne kun k-e-fi eh beñ?  
   you(s) to who say-P-pres here sit  
   Who says you can sit here?"

11 to q-j-i-o uaq^h-a kan.  
   so went-pf-G carpenter-G at  
   So he went to the carpenter.

12 k-e-fi, uaq^h-a, õ sok^h-o mû ne l-e de.  
   say-P-pres carpenter-G P rice grain-G me to take-nonf give  
   He says, "Carpenter, get me that grain of rice!

13 fáñ^h-o de-t-o nañ.  
   log-G give-impf-G not-pres  
   The log won’t give it me."

14 tô k-e-fi, b^aq-e za.  
   so say-P-pres flee-nonf go  
   So he says, "Go away!"
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15 mar-o keɾ-o doh kar-i-o, to, k-e-fi, ful tʰutʰ-o kon sokʰ-o ljô.
my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G that say-P-pres I log-G at rice grain-G take-P
What wrong has he done me, that I should take the grain of rice from the log.”

16 to k-e-fi, bʰatuʃa, bʰatuʃa,
so say-P-pres king king
So he says, “King, king,
tu u-a ne, vaqʰ-a ne, həzm-o, k-e-fi
you(s) he-G to, carpenter-G to, understand-caus say-P-pres
you explain to the carpenter
mi ne sokʰ-o l-e də tʰutʰ-o kane.
me to rice grain-G take-nonfinite give log-G at
to get me the grain of rice from the log!”

17 to k-e-fi, mar-o keɾ-o doh kar-i-o,
so say-P-pres my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G
So he says, “What wrong has he done,
to, k-e-fi, ful vaqʰ-a ne kô?
that say-P-pres I carpenter-G to say-P
that I should say so to the carpenter?”

18 k-e-fi.
say-P-pres
he says.

19 to k-e-fi, ron-iô, ron-iô, tame bʰatuʃa hû riña-e za-o.
so say-P-pres queen-G queen-G you king from sulk-nonf go-G
So he says, “Queens, queens, you get angry with the king!”

20 to k-e-fi, amar-o keɾ-o doh kar-i-o,
so say-P-pres our-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G
So they say, “What wrong has he done us,
to ome riña-ô bʰatuʃa hû.
so we sulk-P king from
that we should get angry with the king?”

21 ñfr-ô, ñfr-ô, tame, k-e-fi, ron-iô r-a luqʰ-r-ô kʰat-r-o par-a.
rat-G rat-G you say-P-pres queen-G of-G cloth-G cut-G result-G
“Rats, rats, you gnaw up the queens’ clothes!”

22 k-e-fi.
say-P-pres
he says.

23 to k-e-fi, amar-o keɾ-o doh kar-i-o,
so(new S) say-P-pres our-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G
to ome luqʰ-r-ô kʰat-r-o par-a?
so(result) we cloth-G cut-P result-G.
So they say, “What wrong have they done us, that we should gnaw up the queens’ clothes?

24 k-e-fi.
say-P-pres
they say.
25  tō k-e-h, min-q-ai, min-q-ai, tō Ṿdr-ō ne kha-e za.  
so(new S) say-P-pres cat-G cat-G you(s) rat-P to eat-nonf go  
So he says, “Cat, cat, you eat the rats!”

26  tō k-e-h, mar-o keq-o dhō kō-i-o,  
so(new S) say-P-pres my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G  
So she says, “What wrong have they done me,  
tō Ṿme Ṿdr-ō ne kō-ō-ō?  
that(result) we rat-P to eat-P  
that I should eat the rats?”

27  k-e-h, nā kō-ō-ō.  
say-P-pres not eat-P  
she says, “I won’t eat them!”

28  tō k-e-h, kutr-o, kutr-o, tō min-q-i ne mar par-ai.  
so(new S) say-P-pres dog-G dog-G you(s) cat-G to kill result-G  
So he says, “Dog, dog, you kill the cat!”

29  tō k-e-h, min-q-i k-e-h, kutr-o k-e-h,  
so(new S) say-P-pres cat-G say-P-pres dog-G say-P-pres  
So (the cat says) the dog says,  
min-q-i ne nā mar-ō.  
cat-G to not kill-P  
“I will not kill the cat!

30  mar-o keq-o dhō kō-i-o, Ṿt mar-ō?  
my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G I kill-P  
What wrong has she done me, that I should kill her?”

31  dōk-ā, dōk-ā, tō kutr-ā ne mar.  
stick-G stick-G you(s) dog-G to beat  
“Stick, stick, you beat the dog!”

32  tō k-e-h, mar-o keq-o dhō kō-i-o,  
so(new S) say-P-pres my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G  
So he says, “What wrong has he done me  
tō Ṿt kutr-ā ne mar-ō?  
that(result) I dog-G to beat-P  
that I should beat the dog?

33  nā mar-ō.  
not beat-P  
I will not beat him!”

34  k-e-h.  
say-P-pres  
he says.

35  detu, detu, tō dōk-ā ne bōl par-ō.  
fire fire you(s) stick-G to burn(tr) result-G  
“Fire, fire, you burn up the stick!”
36 k-e-fi. 
say-P-pres 
he says.

37 tå k-e-fi, mar-o ker-o doh kar-i-o, 
s(so(new S) say-P-pres my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G 
So he says, “What wrong has he done me,

te fu dêk-a ne boi-ê par-o? 
that(result) I stick-G to burn(tr)-P result-G 
that I should burn up the stick?”

38 k-e-fi. 
say-P-pres 
he says.

39 ponji, ponji, tê, k-e-fi, detua ne ozam par-o. 
water water you(s) say-P-pres fire to douse result-G 
“Water, water, you put out the fire!”

40 tå k-e-fi, mar-o ker-o doh kar-i-o, 
s(so(new S) say-P-pres my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G 
So he says, “What wrong has he done me

dê ge fu ozam-ê par-o detua? 
that(result) I douse-P result-G fire 
that I should put out the fire?”

41 tå k-e-fi, hatêi, hatêi, ponji seôz-o dárja p-e za. 
s(so(new S) say-P-pres elephant elephant water all-G river drink-nonf go 
So he says, “Elephant, elephant, drink up the whole riverful of water!”

42 tå k-e-fi, mar-o ker-o doh kar-i-o, 
s(so(new S) say-P-pres my-G what sort-G wrong do-pf-G 
So he says, “What wrong has he done me

dê ge fu pi-ê ponji? 
that(result) I drink-P water 
that I should drink the water?”

43 k-e-fi. 
say-P-pres 
he says.

44 naâe sakl-o utê ubê-en 
now(circ) sparrow-G there-P stand-nonf 
Now the sparrow stood there,

uâle giê-i o masr-ê ne ter-ua. 
again went-pf-G mosquito-P to fetch-inf(obl) 
them went off to bring the mosquitoes.

45 masr-ê ne k-e-fi, 
mosquito-P to say-P-pres 
He says to the mosquitoes,
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fial-o fiek-a maʃ fiaθi ubh-o, k-e-fi.
come.along-G one-G place elephant stand-G say-P-pres
“Come along, there’s an elephant standing over there.

come.along-nonf he-G of-G ear-G in enter-nonf say-P-pres
Come along, go inside his ears

loi pi-i-a u-a r-ɔ, fial-en, k-e-fi.
血 drink-fut.imp he-G of-G come.along-nonf say-P-pres
and drink his blood, when you’ve come,” he says.

47 fiaθi zo-i-o, to zoŋ-e-fi masar ov-e-fi r-i-a,
elephant see-pf-G so(result) know-P-pres mosquitoes caus-P-pres stay-pf-G
The elephant looked up, so he knows the mosquitoes are coming,

pase k-e-fi, o mar-o maθ,
then say-P-pres G my-G mother,
then he says, “Oh my goodness,

mʊ ne me karaθ-ia, k-e-fi, tome, k-e-fi.
me to don’t bite-fut.imp say-P-pres you say-P-pres
don’t you bite me,” he says.

48 fʊ, k-e-fi, daŋja ne p-e zo-ɔ hoc, k-e-fi.
I say-P-pres river to drink-nonf go-P completely say-P-pres
“I,” he says, “will drink the river right up,” he says.

49 tʊ k-e-fi, daŋja k-e-fi, mʊ ne me p-e
so(new S) say-P-pres river say-P-pres me to don’t drink-nonfinite
So the river says, “Don’t drink me

an fʊ dɛtua ne ozam-ɔ par-o.
and I fire to douse-P result-G
and I will put out the fire.”

50 tʊ k-e-fi, dɛtua k-e-fi, mʊ ne me ozam-ia.
so(new S) say-P-pres fire say-P-pres me to don’t douse-fut.imp
So the fire says, “Don’t put me out!

51 fʊ d'ok-o ne boŋ-ɔ par-o.
I stick-G to bum(tr)-P result-G
I will burn up the stick.”

52 d'ok-o k-e-fi, mʊ ne me boŋ-ia.
stick-G say-P-pres me to don’t bum(tr)-fut.imp
The stick says, “Don’t burn me!

53 fʊ kurt-o ne mar-ɔ zo-en, k-e-fi.
I dog-G to beat-P go-nonf say-P-pres
I will go and beat the dog,” he says.

54 kurt-o k-e-fi, mʊ ne me mar-ia,
dog-G say-P-pres me to don’t beat-fut.imp
The dog says, “Don’t beat me!”
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55  k-e-fi.
say-P-pres
he says.

56  fu to minq-i ne mar-ø par-o, k-e-fi.
I contra-exp cat-G to kill-P result-G say-P-pres
“I will kill the cat,” he says.

57  minq-øi k-e-fi, mõ ne me mar-io.
cat-G say-P-pres me to don’t kill-fut.imp
The cat says, “Don’t kill me!”

58  mar-ø odr-ø aøje k ordained s-e.
my-G rat-G normally diet be-P
Rats are my normal diet.

59  odr-ø ne mar-en fu k ordained-iñ, k-e-fi.
rat-G to kill-nonf I eat-fut.P say-P-pres
I will kill the rats and eat them,” he says.

60  to odr-ø k-e-fi, mõ ne me mar-io,
so(new S) rat-G say-P-pres me to don’t kill-fut.imp
So the rats say, “Don’t kill me!”

61  k-e-fi.
say-P-pres
they say.

62  fu, k-e-fi, røñ-ø ñ-a lug ñart-iñ por-a hoe, k-e-fi.
I say-P-pres queen-G of-G cloth-G cut-fut.P result-G completely say-P-pres
“I,” they say, “will gnaw the queens’ clothes right up.”

63  to røñ-e k-e-fi, ñmar-ø a lug ñart-øa me k ordained-ia
so(new S) queen-G say-P-pres our-G cloth-G don’t cut-fut.imp
So the queens say, “Don’t gnaw up our clothes,

an ome bøutjø fu riñ-a e ge, k-e-fi.
and we king from sulk-nonf went-G say-P-pres
and we will be angry with the king,” they say.

64  to bøutjø k-e-fi, ñm-ø fu riñ-a ia me, an fu, k-e-fi,
so(new S) king say-P-pres us-G from be angry-fut.imp don’t, and I say-P-pres
So the king says, “Don’t be angry with us, and I

vad-ø ne be-k za-en mosar mel-ø, k-e-fi, ap za-en.
carpenter-G to two-or so go-nonf shoe slap place-P say-P-pres self go-nonf
will go to the carpenter myself,” he says, “and give him a couple of whacks
on the head with my shoe.

65  tøat-ø a fu sokø-e l-e de-ñ-e u-a ne.
log-G from rice grain-G take-nonf give-fut-fut.P he-G to
He will get the grain of rice from the log and give it to him.”

66  tø vadø-ø g-i-o koar-ø l-en, sokø-ø par-o,
so(new S) carpenter-G went-pf-G axe-G take-nonf rice grain-G result-G
So the carpenter went having taken his axe, (the grain of rice)
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u-a ne, tidget-o ne, poar-o uaqb-e
he-G to log-G to result-G cut-nonfinite
chopped up the log.

on sokb-o u-a ne sakl-a ne didb-o poar-o.
and rice grain-G he-G to sparrow-G to gave-G result-G
and gave the grain of rice to the sparrow.

67 uarta kbotom $b$-oi-f.
story finish become-G pres
And that's the end of the story.

Text 7 - "The lame man and the blind man"

1 fiek-a gjom mfe fiek macb-o hat-o en fiek hat-o odb-o.
one-G town in one lame-G was-G and one was-G blind-G
In a certain town there lived a lame man and a blind man.

2 macb-o odb-a ne kke-fi "ape sor-ai kor-w-a hal-f-d-5."
lame-G blind-G to say-P-pres we.inc theft-G do-inf-G go.along- fut-P
The lame man says to the blind man "Let's go and steal something."

3 to "ti ne keb-e huz-a-e-fi ki?" kke-fi.
so "you(s) to where-loc know-pass-P-pres question say-P-pres
So the blind man says "Do you know where something is then?"

4 to kke-fi "foe"
so say-P-pres yes
So the lame man says "Yes".

5 "am nai hal-d-0 ape sor-ai kor-u-a" kke-fi.
thus not go along-P we.inc theft-G do-inf-G say-P-pres
The blind man says "We won't go stealing just like that.

6 "d meloq-oi bol-e-fi rai, utfe za-en" kke-fi
that bird-type-G sing-P-pres say-P-pres
"Go over there where that bird is singing

7 "g5bho$bc$-e mel-e av" kke-fi
potsherd-G place-nonfinite come say-P-pres
and put a broken pot-rim there.

8 to kke-fi "odb-a"
so say-P-pres blind-G
So he says "Blind man",

matb-o ri-o ke-fi ri-o, kke-fi "odb-a,
lame-G topic-G say-P-pres stay-pf-G say-P-pres blind-G
it's the lame man talking, he says "Blind man,"
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9 tō k-e-h ᵀᵛᵉᵉ ᵖᵃʳ--muted, tseō k-e-h
so say-P-pres Now we.inc night fall-G then say-P-pres
So he says "Now, when night falls,
sor-ai kar-um-a hul-f-ō k-e-h
theft-G do-inf-G go.along-fut-P say-P-pres
then we will go stealing."

10 rat pār-ai an sor-ai kar-um-a udē-a, tō pass
night fall-G and theft-G do-inf-G went-G so then
sor-ai kar-e pār-ai an bār-ar-ai pār-ai bōdō-en,
theft-G do-nonfinite result-G and bundle-G result-G tie-nonfinal
fiawe bōdō-e upar-ai bār-ar-ai,
now(circ) blind-erg lift-G bundle-G and
an madō-o padō-en za-e bārg-i-o u-a ne.
lame-G lead.by.hand-nonfinal go-P-pres go-nonfinite flee-pf-G he-G to
Night fell and they set off to steal. So then when they had stolen and tied up the
bundle, then the blind man picked up the bundle and the lame man escaped
leading him by the hand.

11 tō za-t-ō m za-t-ō m za-t-ō m
so new S go-impf-G in go-impf-G in go-impf-G in
u-ō ne ta di uif-i-o pār-o, haour tā-i-o pār-o,
he-G to so day rise-pf-G result-G, morning become-pf-G result-G,
ğom hō nikar-t-ō nikar-t-ō m.
town from exit-impf-G exit-impf-G in
As they were going on and on and on, the sun rose, morning came
as they were leaving the town.

12 tō k-e-h “ōdō-a, ᵀʰᵃᵛᵉ ᵅᵃⁿ ᴸᵃʳ-i-o pār-o.”
so(new S) say-P-pres blind-G now(circ) morning become-pf-G result-G
So he says "Blind man, it is morning.

13 madō-o k-e-h r-i-o, k-e-h “ōdō-a,
lame-G say-P-pres stay-pf-G say-P-pres blind-G
fiawe haour tā-i-o pār-o,ape kel za-f-ō?” k-e-h.
now morning become-pf-G result-G we.inc whither go-fut-P say-P-pres
The lame man is talking, he says "Blind man, now it is morning. Where shall we go?"

14 tō k-e-h “kel-e-e tū ne von dekō-i-a m ou-e-h” k-e-h
so(new S) say-P-pres where-loc you(s) to tree see-pf-G in come-P-pres say-P-pres
“zōr[īh]-a” k-e-h.
tree-G say-P-pres
So he says "Can you see any trees anywhere?"

15 tō k-e-h “na” k-e-h.
so(new S) say-P-pres no say-P-pres
So the lame man says "No.

16 “āek dō-an pār-ai-fi” k-e-h “dōk-ō r-ai.”
one pile fall-G-pres say-P-pres stem-G of-G
There is a pile of stalks lying there.

17 fiaz-r i-o dōk-ō r-ai dō-an pār-ai-fi” k-e-h.
millet-G of-G stem-G of-G pile fall-G-pres say-P-pres
u-ō m ape pefi-e hul-f-ō pār-ľ’a” k-e-h.
that-G in we.inc enter-nonfinite go along-P result-G say-P-pres
There is a pile of millet stalks lying there" he says, "Let us go and hide in that" he says.
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18 ð³-b-o k-e-fi "ñôl-o tô" k-e-f-i.
blind-G say-P-pres go along-G so say-P-pres
The blind man says "Let's go then."

19 ð³-b-o an mað³-b-o za-e par-a an ð³-an mê be³-a.
blind-G and lame-G go-nonfinite result-G and pile in sat-G
The blind man and the lame man went and sat in the pile.

20 tô mað³-b-o k-e-fi r-i-o ð³-b-o ne ð³-b-a
so lame-G say-P-pres stay-pf-G blind-G to blind-G
So the lame man is saying to the blind man "Blind man."

21 tô k-e-fi "{(gaç-i r-o) gûj-oi l-en ñu-e-fi r-i-o
so say-P-pres (cart-G of-G) cart-G take-nonfinal come-P-pres stay-pf-G
d³-anj dok-ô r-o" k-e-fi.
owner stem-G of-G say-P-pres
So he says "The owner of the stalks is coming with his cart."

22 ð³-b-o k-e-fi r-i-o, k-e-f-i, mað³-b-a ne k-e-f-i
blind-G say-P-pres stay-pf-G, say-P-pres, lame-G to say-P-pres
"g³ôq³-ar³-ô fôr-ô ai melaq-ô ai to nîkar-ô ai t-ô ai no?" k-e-f-i.
potsherd-G through-G bird-type-G indeed exit-G past-G no say-P-pres
The bird did go through the pot-rim, didn't it?

23 tô k-e-f-i "ñõe".
so(new S) say-P-pres yes
So the lame man says yes.

24 "ñîk s-e" k-e-f-i.
fine be-P say-P-pres
"Fine" he says. (blind man)

25 te∫i ñõm mê lôq-ôi par-ôi b³-añe,
then(Sindhi) town in stick-G result-G fire
   te ñôq-ô i-r o d³-anj g³-i-o par-o ozøm-u-a b³-añe ne.
so cart-G of-G owner went-pf-G result-G douse-inf-G fire to
Then the owner of the cart went to put out the fire.

26 ð³ k-e-f-i r-i-o ð³-b-a ne "ð³-b-a" k-e-f-i
that say-P-pres stay-pf-G blind-G to blind-G say-P-pres
"g³ôq³-ar³-ô et³-e ub³-añ-e.
cart-G here-loc stand-G-pres
He (lame man) says to the blind man "Blind man, there is a cart stood here."

27 ñe inc go along-P this(near)-G cart-G in climb-nonfinal flee-nonfinite go along-P
Let's go, let's climb into this cart and escape."

28 ð³-b-o an mað³-b-o gûj-ôi ñôk-ôl-en b³ôq³-e g³-i-a.
blind-G and lame-G cart-G drive-nonfinal flee-nonfinite went-pf-G
The blind man and the lame man drove away in the cart.

29 d³-anj pos-o a-i-o te³ô k-e-f-i
owner back-G come-pf-G then say-P-pres
"g³ôq³-ar³-ô kel g³-ôi, ub³-añ-e t-ô i?"
cart-G here-loc whither went-G stand-G past-G this
The owner came back and said "Where has the cart gone that was standing here?"
The owner of the cart went to report it at the police station.

He says "My cart was standing and some people have driven it off".

So two policemen mounted horses, and when they had mounted they took two rifles and set off following the cart tracks.

The lame man saw the two policemen and said to the blind man "Blind man, there are two police coming."

The blind man says "The bird did go through the pot-rim, didn't it?"

"Yes" he says (lame man).

"Let them come" he says. (blind man)

So they came round on either side so that one was on that side and one on this side.

So the one policeman when he shot the rifle hit the other, and the other when he fired the rifle, hit the first one.

Both the policemen died.
40 tö mac⁶-o bet⁶-o bet⁶-o k-e-fı r-i-o, k-e-fi
so(new S) lame-G sat-G sat-G say-P-pres stay-pf-G say-P-pres
"едь-о, спой бе мар-е г’и-о’ к е-фи.
blind-G police two die-nonfinite went-pf-G say-P-pres
So the lame man sitting there says "Blind man, the two policemen are dead."

41 tö k-e-fi "gʰor-ð mãň šar-en av-t-a t-ə,
so(new S) say-P-pres horse-G on climb-nonfinal come-impf-G past-G
mar-e g’i-o.
die-nonfinite went-pf-G
So he (blind man) says "They were coming on horses, and they died.

42 guf-oš ope saq-ð par-əi
cart-G we.inc leave-P result-G
and horse-G on climb-nonfinal come-impf-G past-G
Let us abandon the cart, take the two horses and escape."

horse-G take-nonfinal when flee-pf-G then flee-nonfinal far-loc go along-G
When they took the horses and escaped, they fled a long way away and sat down.

44 fek vaŋ ḥat-o.
one tree was-G
There was a tree.

45 sō-ə ḥat-o.
shade-G was-G
There was shade.

46 ut⁶-e za-en bet⁶-ə, tö taq-k-o alfa-e tap-i-o t-o.
there-loc go-nonfinal sat-G since sunshine-G lots-incl. heat-pf-G past-G
They went there and sat down, since the sunshine had made them very hot.

47 gʰor-ə ɓaur-ð r-e sōi-e bōd⁶-i-o t par-ə.
horse-G acacia-G of-loc shade-loc tie-pf-G past result-G
They had tied the horses in the shade of acacia trees.

48 bōd⁶-en pañ hap fek vaŋ nkaɾ-ə-i-o au-e-fı
tie-nonfinal then that snake one ??? exit-pf-G come-P-pres
When they had tied them, a snake suddenly?? came out.

49 maɾ⁶-o r-i-o, u-ə r-əi ęd⁶-ə r-əi dʒəf par-əi t-əi,
lame-G topic-pf-G that-G of-G blind-G of-G cudgel fail-G past-G
u l-e par-əi an hap ne mar-ı-o.
that take-nonfinite result-G and snake to beat-pf-G
The lame man picked up the blind man's cudgel which was lying there and struck the snake.

50 mar-e par-o hap ne an ęd⁶-ə kan la-i-o.
kill-nonfinite result-G snake to and blind-G to fetch-pf-G
When he had killed the snake he brought it to the blind man.

51 ęd⁶-ə ne k-e-fı “fə b’un mar-e o-i-o.
blind-G to say-P-pres I eel kill-nonfinite come-pf-G
He says to the blind man 'I have killed and brought an eel.
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52  apn-o jākʰ rōdʰ-f-ô" k-e-ô.
our.inc-G curry cook-fut-P say-P-pres
We will cook ourselves some curry."

53  u-e uafʰ-e pār-o u-a hap ne,
that-erg cut-nonfinite result-G that-G to snake to
an u-e jākʰ pār-o rōdʰ-en,
and that-erg curry result-G cook-nonfinal
u sqn-en u-a ne sul-a māh, g-i-o pār-o poni bʰar-a-u-a.
that raise-nonfinal that-G to fireplace-G on, went-pf-G result-G water fill-inf-G
He cut up the snake and having cooked the curry, having put it on the fire, he went off to get water.

54  u-a ne k-e g-i-o, am k-e-ô
that-G to say-nonfinite went-pf-G thus say-P-pres
"tī ugʰet-en zo-e me."
you(s) open-nonfinal see-nonfinite don't
He said before he went "Don't open it and look."

55  tādʰ qar-t-o zo-e-ô, an zo-t-o zo-e-ô,
then crawl-impf-G go-pf-pres and see-impf-G go-pf-pres
te u poni bʰar-en vol-j-i-o
\[ ... \]
and this also see-P-pres stay-pf-G
Then he crawls off and keeps looking, so when he comes back after getting water, the other one (blind man) is looking.

56  kʰol-e pār-o
open-nonfinite result-G
an u-a ne dʰeqt-i n an bʰeqa ne kʰol-en zo-e-ô r-i-o.
and that-G to pan-G to and pot-G to open-nonfinal see-P-pres stay-pf-G
He had opened it, and having opened the pan and the pot he was looking in it.

57  te dxe u-a r-ai varq dḵʰ-i-ô m g-i-o, u-a r-a hap r-ai,
so when that-G of-G steam eye-irr.-G in went-G that-G of-G snake of-G
tō hāz-e dḵʰ-i-ô u-a r-e tʰ-e g-e.
then whole-G eye-irr.-G that-G of-G become-nonfinite went-G
So when the steam from the snake went into his eyes, then his eyes were healed.

58  tō am hatʰ eqq-o d-en beqʰ-o dḵʰ-i-ô ne.
that(result) thus hand sideways-G give-nonfinal sat-G eye-irr.-G to
So he sat with his hand over his eyes.

59  tō māqʰ-o k-e-ô r-i-o dḏʰ-a ne
so(new S) lame-G say-pf-pres stay-pf-G blind-G to
"tē" k-e-ô "zo-i-o" k-e-ô "jākʰ ne ugʰeq-enção?"
you say-P-pres see-pf-G say-P-pres curry to open-nonfinal
So the lame man says to the blind man "Did you open the curry and look inside?"

60  tō k-e-ô "mī jākʰ naq zo-i-o" k-e-ô.
so(new S) say-P-pres I curry is not see-pf-G say-P-pres
So he (blind man) says "I didn’t look at the curry."

61  māqʰ-o r-i-o dxe wqʰ-i-o,
lame-G topic-pf-G when get.up-pf-G
te dḏʰ-a ne dqg-d be-k mel-e,
then blind-G to cudgel-G two-or.so place-G
then that-G to when anger stick-G past-G

So the lame man when he got up, gave the blind man a few blows with his cudgel, then when he (blind man) got angry he kicked him on the legs.

They both were healed.

They both were healed, then the snake curry they threw away, then the one took half the treasure and the other took half.

One took one horse, the other took the other.

"We are two brothers" he says.

That's the end of the story.
This appendix provides examples from various Indo-Iranian languages of the different types of doublet used to lexicalize scenarios, as described in Chapter 13 “Lexical doublets and scenarios”.

The use of doublets to identify single scenarios is found in several Indo-Aryan and Iranian languages. These doublets are most frequently nouns, but verb, adjective and adverb doublets are also found.

The following forms of doublets are found in Parkari:
1) doublet of two independent words
   a) with alliteration
   b) with rhyme
   c) with neither rhyme nor alliteration
2) doublet of one independent word and one nonsense word
   a) with alliteration
   b) with rhyme and word specific reduplicating consonant
   c) with rhyme and language specific reduplicating consonant
3) doublet of one nonsense word and one independent word
   a) with rhyme, dropping the second word’s initial consonant

Examples in Parkari and other Indo-Iranian languages follow:

Parkari:

The Ethnologue (2000) defines Parkari (Koli, Parkari) as “Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Indo-Aryan, Central zone, Gujarati”. Parkari has the following types of doublet:
1) doublet of two independent words
   a) with alliteration
   Nouns
   /mol mlµst/ “livestock treasure” = material wealth of any sort
   /maja mlµst/ “illusion treasure” = material wealth of this illusory world
   /dhsn dhotot/ “livestock wealth” = material wealth of any sort
   /mods mazo/ “enjoyment pleasure” = pleasure, self-indulgence
   /nom mjµn/ “name mark” = memory or trace
   /lut ma/ “looting beating” = robbery, pillage, beating and murder
   /neq nqk/ “eye nose” = facial features
   /neq neqk /n’uukal/ “at eyes at nose good” = fair of face (of female)
   /palaixpoj/ “tending nourishing” = looking after

   Verbs
   /palaix posef/ “tends nourishes” = looks after and cherishes
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Adjectives
/hožo hořo/ “complete easy” = fit and well
/touko /lik/ “good fine” = excellent

b) with rhyme
Nouns
/moŋ fon/ “honour splendour” = pomp and show, splendour and majesty
/piř p²skir/ “saint mendicant” = any specially religious person

C) with neither alliteration nor rhyme
Nouns
/dsk² tokli²/ “grief trouble” = all kinds of adversity
/jeoa sukrai/ “service devotion” = all kinds of devoted service
/rut dii/ “night day” = perpetually, without ceasing
/tif ni₂/ “high-caste-ness low-caste-ness” = caste discrimination

Adverbs
/az kal/ “today yesterday” = nowadays

As noted above, some Parkari doublets of this type do not clearly signify anything more than the sum of the two items mentioned. Nevertheless, I categorise them as part of this same phenomenon, since the couplet still refers to a single scenario, and there are restrictions on the form, i.e. the words occur in a set order without a copula. This occurs where the two elements named are the only two elements within that scenario. Sometimes there is a single word for this in English, e.g.
Nouns
/haŋ d²enori/ “arrow bow” = bow and arrow
/mat bap/ “mother father” = parents
/b²ai ben/ “brother sister” = siblings
/potra doetra/ “son’s children daughter’s children” = grandchildren
/bal bual/ “child children” = wife and children (/bual/ “child” is a common euphemism for wife)
/ţat b²aŋf “hand foot” = hands and feet (limbs)

Verbs
/k²uŋf pief “eats drinks” = eats and drinks
/sojfe vijfaref “thinks ponders” = thinks carefully

Adjectives/Adverbs
/tišo niso/ “high low” = up and down
/kalo d²al/ “black white” = black and white (e.g. television) though technically this includes greyscale

Adverbs
/ţil ţal/ “here there” = hither and thither

2) doublet of one independent word and one nonsense word
a) with alliteration
Nouns
/luqho lato/ “cloth ?” = clothing
/b³opo b³arco/ “shaman ?” = exorcist, shaman, magician etc.
/paiʃo pādiʒor/ “paisa ?” = money (including coins and notes)
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b) with rhyme and word specific reduplicating consonant
Nouns
/bʰɪmɑrəɪ bɪmɑrəɪ/ "illness ?" = illness, disease, or similar catastrophe.
/zɑt pɑt/ “caste ?” = the caste system, racial discrimination

c) with rhyme and language specific reduplicating consonant
Different languages in Pakistan use different consonants for reduplication when making rhyming doublets. Parkari uses implosive b “b”, e.g.
Nouns
/tʃɔftʃ oʃtʃ/ “tea ?” = tea scenario, tea or drink in a social setting
/bʰɔt bɑt/ “cooked rice ?” = cooked rice and other food served at weddings
/rɔʃi rɔʃi/ “chapatti ?” = chapatties and such like, food
/mɔl bɔl/ “livestock ?” = livestock and other domestic animals

Verbs
/upɔrə bupɔrə mɔ/ “in lifting ?” = in lifting or other physical activity

3) doublet of one nonsense word and one independent word
a) with rhyme, dropping the second word’s initial consonant
Here it is the second element of the doublet which is meaningful. The first element always begins with a vowel.
Postpositions/Adverbs
/oʃe pɑʃe/ “? beside” = “beside” scenario, round about, nearby
Here it is the second element of the doublet which is meaningful.
Perhaps also:
Nouns
/tʃpɔlʃ pʃpɔʃ/ “? peepul tree(?))” = name of a children’s game involving climbing a tree.
Here the meaning of both elements is uncertain. The normal word for a peepul tree is /ʃpɔl/.

Urdu:
The Ethnologue (1999) defines Urdu as “Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Indo-Aryan, Central zone, Western.” Urdu has the following types of doublet:
1) doublet of two independent words
a) with alliteration
Nouns
/jɒn o jɔukɔt/ “splendour and power” (from Persian) = pomp and show
/dɔn dɔulɔt/ “wealth riches” = riches, wealth, fortune
/pɔʃk bɔkɛɾu/ “feather bird” = winged creatures (plural)
/sɔuda sɔlf/ “wares provisions” = goods, provisions
The word sɔlf means “the provisions bought” according to Sarhandi’s dictionary (1998).
However, Qureshi (1982) lists sɔlf as an “adjunct for sauda” without giving any separate meaning, which would mean analysis as a nonsense doublet, type 2a:
/sɔuda sɔlf/ “wares ??” = goods, provisions
Certainly the second component is rare, except in this doublet.

b) with rhyme
Nouns
/tʃɔʃ kɔʃt/ “throne fate” = wealth and fortune (as a blessing)
/tɔn mɔn dɔn/ “body, soul and wealth” = all one’s resources
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Conjunctions as Nouns
/agar magar/ “if but” = hesitation, excuses, ifs and buts

Adjectives
/ad^ib o yarib/ “strange and poor” (from Persian) = strange, marvellous

c) with neither rhyme nor alliteration

Words of Indo Aryan origin are conjoined without a copula:

Nouns
/mā bāp/ “mother father” = parents (i.e. mother and father as a unit)
/khōna pīna/ “food drink” = food and drink, including snacks etc.
/kīrē mākōre/ “worms wood-ants” = insects of any kind

Words of Persian origin are conjoined with the Persian copula “o”, often becoming one Urdu word.

Nouns
/dād o yām/ “pain and grief” = physical and mental pain and distress
/amādorāft/ “coming and going” = communication, transportation

2) doublet of one independent word and one nonsense word

a) with alliteration

Nouns
/īōri ījākāri/ “theft ?” = theft, including the reconnoitring beforehand
    The element ījākāri may be derived from ījākār [īgonā] “to walk around”

b) with rhyme and word specific reduplicating consonant

Nouns
/zat jāt/ “caste ?” = caste system
/goj jāft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible
/bimari jīmāti/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, or similar catastrophe.
/gap jāp/ “gossip ?” = chit chat, idle talk, false report
    And perhaps with pseudo rhyme:
/bct ījūt/ “matter ?” = chat, conversation, negotiation

Adjectives
/ulāt pūlāt/ “reverse ?” = topsy-turvy, in a mess
    The element pūlāt has the same consonants as the word pūlā “reverse”, which may explain “p” as the reduplicating consonant here, but note that the vowels in the doublet are those of the first word.

c) with rhyme and language specific reduplicating consonant

Nouns
/kūae vąe/ “tea ?” = tea scenario, tea or drink in a social setting
/kōna vōna/ “meal ?” = meal scenario, meal or snack in a social setting
/mez vez/ “table ?” = table scenario, furniture

3) doublet of one nonsense word and one independent word

a) with rhyme, dropping the second word’s initial consonant

Here it is the second element of the doublet which is meaningful. The first element always begins with a vowel.
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Postpositions/Adverbs
/as pas/ "? beside" = "beside" scenario, round about, nearby
/ird gird/ "? about" = "about" scenario, round about, surrounding

Saraiki:

The Ethnologue (2000) defines Saraiki as “Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Indo-Aryan, Northwestern zone, Lahnda.” Saraiki has the following types of doublet:

1) doublet of two independent words
   a) with alliteration
      Nouns
      /dhan daulat/ “wealth riches” = riches, wealth, fortune
      /dulo doro/ “push stumble” = pushing and shoving
      /Jan Jaukat/ “splendour and power” = pomp and show
      Saraiki, unlike Urdu, drops the Persian style copula here.

   b) with rhyme
      Nouns
      /ton mon don/ “body, soul and wealth” = all one’s resources
      /text bxxt/ “throne fate” = wealth and fortune (as a blessing)

      Adjectives
      /odqib o yorib/ “strange and poor” (from Persian) = strange, marvellous

   c) with neither rhyme nor alliteration
      Words of Indo Aryan origin are conjoined without a copula:
      Nouns
      /ma piu/ “mother father” = parents (i.e. mother and father as a unit)
      /tukur parti/ “food drink” = food and drink, including snacks etc.
      /kite makaure/ “worms wood-ants” = insects of any kind
      /dso sota/ “stick club” = any weapon to attack with
      Words of Persian origin may be conjoined with the Persian copula “o”, and may become one Saraiki word.
      /amadoraft/ “coming and going” = communication, transportation

2) doublet of one independent word and one nonsense word
   a) with alliteration
      Nouns
      /ifori ifakari/ “theft ?” = theft, including the reconnoitring beforehand

   b) with rhyme and word specific reduplicating consonant
      Nouns
      /zat pat/ “caste ?” = caste system
      /goft moft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible
      And perhaps with pseudo rhyme:
      /goln mufor?h/ “matter ?” = chat, conversation, negotiation

      Conjunction forming noun doublet
      /aqor magar/ “if ?” = hesitation, excuses, ifs and buts
      In Saraiki, unlike Urdu, magar does not exist as an independent word.
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c) with rhyme and language specific reduplicating consonant

Nouns
/tʃaʃ tʃaʃ/ “tea ?” = tea scenario, tea or drink in a social setting
/kʰaŋ xaŋ/ “meal ?” = meal scenario, meal or snack in a social setting
/mez jez/ “table ?” = table scenario, furniture
/krtab jtab/ “book ?” = anything to read
/tufaf jufaf/ “presents ?” = presents and gifts etc.

In Urdu the following doublets have word specific reduplicative consonant, but in Saraiki they have the language specific reduplicative consonant. Did they originate as doublets in Saraiki?
/gʃap jʃap/ “gossip ?” = chit chat, idle talk, false report
/bimari jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, or similar catastrophe.

3) doublet of one nonsense word and one independent word

a) with rhyme, dropping the second word’s initial consonant

Possibly:
Adverbs/Postpositions
/as pas/ “? beside” = “beside” scenario, round about, nearby
/trd gird/ “? about” = “about” scenario, round about, surrounding

Perhaps also:
Nouns
/tʃkin mʃkin/ “? delete (?)” = name of a children’s game similar to hide and seek.
Here the meaning of both elements is uncertain.

Pashtu:
The Ethnologue (2000) defines Pashtu (Pashto) as “Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Iranian, Eastern, Southeastern.” Pashtu has the following types of doublet:

1) doublet of two independent words

a) with alliteration

Nouns
/tɔxt o tɔʃʃ/ “throne and crown” = royal authority and power
/dəɡ o dəɡbəd/ “cookingpot and cookingpot” = any kind of cooking vessel

Adjectives
/stɔrɛ stomora/ “tired weary” = very tired

b) with rhyme

Nouns
/tʃər o nor/ “thread and flower-stem” = extremely weak, thin and sickly
/yre o yre/ “mountains and doors” = variety of topics, no particular topic

There is NO single prototypical scenario where mountains and doors belong, hence the meaning “miscellaneous, anything at all”, i.e. the “anything and everything” scenario.

Adjectives
/xar pɔʃ/ “tan-colour ashamed” = very ashamed
/pɔʃ/ here replaces /pɔʃ/ = ashamed, to make the rhyme
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c) with neither rhyme nor alliteration
/mor o plar/ “mother and father” = parents
/dʒɔɾ roj/ “healthy healthy” = very healthy

2) doublet of one independent word and one nonsense word
a) with alliteration
/nave naze/ “new ?” = brand new

b) with rhyme and word specific reduplicating consonant
/paŋane gʌroveʒana/ “asking ?” = investigation
The form suggests the second element might have once been an independent word.

c) with rhyme and language specific reduplicating consonant
/dɛg meg/ “pot ?” = pot, etc.
/lips mips/ “lips ?” = anything like lipstick, face lotion, etc.
/lips/ is an English loan word used only by those Pashtu people who know English. Nevertheless it is fitted into the Pashtu pattern for lexicalising scenarios.

3) doublet of one nonsense word and one independent word
a) with rhyme, dropping the second word’s initial consonant
No example found.

Significance of doublet formation

It is the category 2c) which is most interesting, as it enables the speaker to make new doublets productively by simply substituting the language’s preferred reduplicative consonant as the initial consonant of the rhyming doublet. When a speaker uses his language’s reduplicating consonant to make a new doublet, he lexicalises a scenario.

Although this pattern of reduplication is common in Indo-Iranian languages, the actual phoneme used as the reduplicative substitute differs from language to language.

These reduplicative consonants are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkari</td>
<td>ɓ</td>
<td>/tʃɔtʃ ɓʊh / “tea ?” = tea scenario, drink and chat /roʃi ɓoʃi/ “chapatti ?” = chapatties and such like, food /mɔl ɓul/ “livestock ?” = livestock and other domestic animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachi</td>
<td>ɓ</td>
<td>/ʒoe bɑe / “tea ?” = tea scenario, drink and chat /paŋʃ ɓoŋʃ/ “water ?” = water scenario, a drink /pen bɛn/ “pen ?” = pen scenario, writing implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhatki</td>
<td>ɓ</td>
<td>/tʃa ɓa / “tea ?” = tea scenario, drink and chat /bɑt ɓat/ “cooked rice ?” = cooked rice scenario, cooked rice and all other food served at weddings /kukɔr bʊkɔr/ “chicken ?” = chicken scenario, chicken and all the trimmings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhi</td>
<td>ɓ</td>
<td>/ʃɑtʃtʃ bɑrʃtʃ / “tea ?” = tea, bribe, tip, etc. /mɑnɪ ɓoŋɪ / “chapatti ?” = chapatties and such like, food /kɔlam bɔlɛm/ “pen ?” = pen, pencil, ink, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkari</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/bimorai jimorai/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>/bimori jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bimari jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/goft moft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bonai bonai/ “servant girl ?” = servant girl scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/bimorai jimorai/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>/bimori jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bimari jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/goft moft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bonai bonai/ “servant girl ?” = servant girl scenario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since these Indo-Iranian languages use different phonemes as the normal reduplicative substitute in doublets, the various “irregular” forms of reduplicated doublets in Parkari and other languages (type 2b) may originally have been borrowed from a related language as an existing regular doublet. Compare:

- Parkari irregular form: /bimorai jimorai/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.
- Urdu irregular form: /bimori jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.
- Saraiki regular form: /bimari jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.
- Urdu irregular form: /goft moft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible
- Balochi regular form: /goft moft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible

The question also arises as to how a doublet is formed when the base word already begins with the language specific reduplicative consonant. Each of the languages investigated has not only a standard reduplicative consonant, but also a subsidiary reduplicative consonant or vowel, which is used in such cases, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkari</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/bimorai jimorai/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>/bimori jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bimari jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/goft moft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bonai bonai/ “servant girl ?” = servant girl scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/bimorai jimorai/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>/bimori jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bimari jimari/ “illness ?” = illness, disease, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/goft moft/ “meat ?” = meat scenario, anything edible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/bonai bonai/ “servant girl ?” = servant girl scenario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix P - Types of doublet used to lexicalize scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhatki</td>
<td>腚</td>
<td>腿腿/ “tea?” = tea scenario, drink and chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>READONLY</em></td>
<td>腳脚/ “cooked rice?” = cooked rice scenario, cooked rice and all other food served at weddings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhi</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>耳耳/ “tea?” = tea, bribe, tip, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>READONLY</em></td>
<td>耳耳/ “chapatti?” = chapatties and such like, food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>READONLY</em></td>
<td>腳脚/ “goat?” = goat, sheep, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>READONLY</em></td>
<td>腳脚/ “arm?” = arm, any organ of the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>耳耳/ “tea?” = tea scenario, drink and chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>READONLY</em></td>
<td>耳耳/ “water?” = water scenario, a drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “sermon?” = sermon, religious teaching etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “transit van?” = transit van or similar vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashtu</td>
<td>ㅁ</td>
<td>耳耳/ “tea?” = tea scenario, drink and chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “pot?” = pot scenario, pot etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “mother?” = mother scenario, mother or someone taking mother’s role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “snake?” = snake scenario, any kind of snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazaragi</td>
<td>ㅁ</td>
<td>耳耳/ “tea?” = tea scenario, drink and chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “meat?” = meat scenario, anything edible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “guest?” = guest scenario, any visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>耳耳/ “snake?” = snake scenario, any kind of snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochi</td>
<td>ㅁ</td>
<td>腹腹/ “tea?” = tea scenario, drink and chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “meat?” = meat scenario, anything edible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “guest?” = guest scenario, any visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “urine?” = urine scenario, urination and defecation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saraiki</td>
<td>bufio</td>
<td>腹腹/ “tea?” = tea scenario, drink and chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “table?” = table scenario, furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “wedding?” = wedding scenario, wedding and all arrangements and rituals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “doubt?” = doubt scenario, doubts and misgivings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjabi</td>
<td>bufio</td>
<td>腹腹/ “tea?” = tea scenario, drink and chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “bread?” = bread scenario, food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “shirt?” = shirt scenario, dress, costume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ReadString</td>
<td>腹腹/ “shyness?” = shyness scenario, embarrassment, hesitation, loss of face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>