

Clause as Message: Theme, Topic, and Information Flow in
Mark 2:1–12 and Jude

James D. Dvorak and Ryder Dale Walton
Oklahoma Christian University

Too often, study of the biblical text degenerates into rudimentary word studies, leaving aside larger syntactic and logical connections. This paper proposes that careful study should include considerations of genre, register, prime, subsequent, theme, rheme, topic, and comment. To demonstrate this, it applies a Systemic Functional approach to Mark 2:1–12 and the book of Jude.

Keywords: Exegesis, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Prime, Subsequent, Theme, Rheme, Topic, Comment, Process Chains, Semantic Shift, Cohesion, Coherence, Linearity, Genre, Register

1. *Introduction*

Exegesis is commonly defined as the process of “bringing out the meaning” of a biblical text. No matter which guide a student follows, the exegetical process inevitably includes studying the text in its original language, and rightly so.¹ In the past, even minimal linguistic studies of biblical text consisted of meticulous examinations of grammar, syntax, and lexical semantics. Present exegetes now enjoy much greater access to high quality digital resources, including high-resolution facsimiles of ancient manuscripts. Moreover, linguistic theory and modeling in biblical studies have taken major strides forward. Yet, unfortunately, it seems that careful linguistic study has devolved

1. Cf. Porter, “The Greek Language of the New Testament,” 99–130.

into little more than rudimentary word studies—and often these are quite meager because they consist simply of citations of the standard lexica.² Certainly, there is value in studying the individual parts of a text (i.e., words and phrases), but even in cases where high quality researches of these parts are achieved, exegetes must always bear in mind that a text's meaning is greater than the sum of its constituent parts.³

For this reason, we argue that more extensive linguistic analyses are required if exegetes are to arrive at a fuller, more principled understanding of “what a text is about.” For example, methodology deriving from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL),⁴ the underlying paradigm of the approach we model below, generally deploys interpretive models that seek the meaning(s) of a text along three basic functional-semantic categories. Halliday, the father of SFL, calls these ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions.⁵ Briefly, the *ideational metafunction* refers to meanings people make with language⁶ as a means of representing their experience of life as it unfolds, mapping “what’s going on, including who’s doing what to whom, where, when, why and how and the logical relation of one going-on to another.”⁷ The *interpersonal metafunction* refers to meanings made with language that enact social relationships and interactions among the participants of a given communicative context.⁸ Generally, these relationships are

2. For a caution against this kind of practice, see Yallop, “Words and Meaning,” 24–27.

3. Halliday makes this point in a discussion of coherence and cohesion in “Text Semantics and Clause Grammar,” 223.

4. Foundational resources include: Halliday, *Language as Social Semiotic*; Halliday, “Language in a Social Perspective”; Halliday, “Language and Social Man.”

5. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 33–36.

6. I.e., natural, human, adult, verbal language. Cf. Halliday and Matthiessen, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 20.

7. Martin and White, *The Language of Evaluation*, 7. Lemke (*Textual Politics*, 41) calls this “presentational” meaning.

8. James D. Dvorak, “Interpersonal Metafunction,” 16. Lemke (*Textual*

enacted by making assertions; asking questions; giving commands; evaluating what one thinks or feels about people, things, or events; and by indicating one's relative commitment to any given proposition or proposal.⁹ The *textual metafunction* refers to meanings made as people organize, structure, and intertwine ideational and interpersonal meanings into a cohesive and coherent flow of information that is connected and relevant to the context of situation.¹⁰ The features at work in this metafunction are what allow hearers and/or readers to distinguish between text and "non-text," that is, between sensical discourse and nonsensical "blather."¹¹ As Martin puts it, the job of the textual metafunction is "to package ideational and interpersonal meaning as waves of information, in one rhythm or another depending on context."¹²

In this article, we fix our gaze upon a set of interrelated features that operate within the textual metafunction, namely *prime* and *subsequent*; *theme* and *rheme*; and *topic* and *comment*. Following Porter and O'Donnell,¹³ we suggest that prime and subsequent function at the clause level and are specified by word group order; that theme and rheme function across any number of clauses and are delimited by spans of actor and process

Politics, 41) calls this "orientational" meaning.

9. Dvorak, "Interpersonal Metafunction," 16.

10. James D. Dvorak, "Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow," 17–37 (here, 17). Cf. Halliday, "Language Structure and Language Function," 175–76; Halliday, "Linguistic Function and Literary Style," 92; Lemke (*Textual Politics*, 41) calls this "organizational" meaning.

11. Cf. Halliday, "Text as Semantic Choice in Social Contexts," 44–45.

12. Martin, "Mourning," 323.

13. As mentioned, our model is anchored in Halladayan SFL, yet our perspective on theme, topic, and information flow has been shaped by Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 85–118 (as of the writing of this article, this book has not yet gone to press; all page numbers refer to a pre-publication copy that we obtained from the authors and use it with their permission). See also Porter, "Prominence: An Overview," 45–74; Dvorak, "Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow," 17–37.

chains; and that topic and comment functions at paragraph¹⁴ level and beyond and are marked by semantic shifts.¹⁵ We show how these features are crucial with regard to the flow of information in a text and, thus, its cohesion and coherence. We present a series of frameworks for analyzing each of these features, and we validate both the utility and usefulness of these models by putting them to work in analyses of both narrative and non-narrative texts, namely, Mark 2:1–12 and the letter of Jude, respectively.¹⁶

2. *Discourse Structure and Information Flow*

2.1 *Linearity*

Language users cannot communicate all at once the whole content of meaning they wish to share with others. As a result, as is often said, they must “organize their thoughts,” so that when they create text the meanings they wish to make unfold linearly in a manner that increases the probability of understanding on the part of a reader or hearer. This constraint is commonly characterized as a “problem” that is somehow inherent to the linguistic system.¹⁷ However, it is really not an issue with the linguistic system *per se*; it is, rather, simply a matter of the use of language reflecting how humans experience the goings on of life.

Humans experience life as a series of social processes that unfold in a culture as countless situations.¹⁸ As a result, when

14. We recognize that “paragraph” is notoriously challenging to define. In this article, we follow Porter, “Pericope Markers and the Paragraph,” 175–95.

15. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 85.

16. We use examples from our analyses of these two texts throughout. See the appendix for full analyses.

17. Cf. Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 125ff. Dvorak, “Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow,” 18–19; Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 86.

18. Martin and Rose, *Working with Discourse*, 1–2.

language users construe and reconstrue these social processes,¹⁹ they encode them into texts that unfold as sequences of words, word groups, clauses, clause complexes, and paragraphs.²⁰ A well-chosen starting point for each clause—“prime” as we refer to it below—is crucial, for a poorly chosen point of departure may result in misunderstanding on the part of the text reader or hearer, possibly resulting in more work for the communicator, requiring her or him to “travel hither, thither, and yon” in an effort to arrive at the intended meaning. In this way, the so-called “problem” of linearity constrains a text’s flow of information.

Yet, as Porter and O’Donnell point out, texts are more than “an ordered list of concepts realized in a string of words.”²¹ They also have a hierarchical structure consisting of “chunks” of text that are organized around thematically related material.²² The arrangement of these chunks is also not unconstrained, but is governed by two different but related levels of context: context of culture, which we call *genre*; and context of situation, which we call *register*.²³

2.2 Genre

Following Martin,²⁴ we use the term *genre* to refer to “a staged, goal-oriented social process,”²⁵ or, more technically, “a recurrent

19. I.e., creating meaning that is constrained by context while at the same time contributing to and reifying that context.

20. Martin and Rose, *Working with Discourse*, 2. The language of “unfolding” highlights the linear nature of language in use. Cf. Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 125–26; Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 86. Cf. Dvorak, “Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow,” 18.

21. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 86.

22. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 86–88.

23. Discourse structure is also constrained by *ideology* in that meaning potential is not evenly distributed across participants in a culture (Martin, *English Text*, 575).

24. Martin, *English Text*, 493–588 (esp. 546–73). Cf. Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*; Eggins and Martin, “Genres and Registers of Discourse,” 230–56.

25. Martin and Rose, *Working with Discourse*, 8.

configuration of meanings . . . that enact the social practices of a given culture.”²⁶ Our view is informed by Bakhtin’s theory of speech genres, which he defined as habitualized, relatively stable patterns of meaning that are made with relatively predictable types of interactive utterances.²⁷ From this point of view, genre includes not only literary genres but “everyday” genres, both spoken and written, such as service encounters, political debates, gossip, jokes, sermons, stories, and so on.²⁸

The established genres of a culture provide an economy of meaning-making by which members of that culture are able to accomplish the manifold social processes required of everyday life without having to define each social process anew each time it needs to be repeated.²⁹ This is why, as Bakhtin puts it,

We learn to cast our speech in generic forms, and, when hearing others’ speech, we guess its genre from the very first words; predict a certain length . . . and a certain compositional structure; we foresee the end; that is, from the very beginning we have a sense of the speech whole, which is only later differentiated during the speech process.³⁰

Bakhtin’s point, as Eggins and Martin rightly highlight, is that structures of discourses vary in typically familiar ways because the staging of the social processes they are intended to accomplish varies on the basis of typically familiar cultural norms.³¹

26. Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*, 6. Clearly, our definition differs from that of traditional literary studies where the term tends to refer to various types of literary productions that are differentiated on the basis of form and/or stylistic convention (cf. Tate, “Genre,” 149).

27. Cf. Bakhtin, “The Problem of Speech Genres,” 60–102, here 60. Cf. Dvorak, “Interpersonal Metafunction,” 35; Eggins and Martin, “Genres and Registers,” 236. For an excellent portrayal of Bakhtin and his thought, see Holquist, *Dialogism*.

28. Cf. Eggins, *Introduction*, 56.

29. Berger and Luckmann, *Social Construction of Reality*, 53.

30. Bakhtin, “Problem of Speech Genres,” 79.

31. Cf. Eggins and Martin, “Genres and Registers,” 236.

Consider, for example, Mark 2:1–12. This stretch of text is one of many *stories* that comprise the biographical history (*bios*) that Mark writes about Jesus.³² As such, this text feeds into the greater social goal of the gospel to articulate and to defend the significance of Jesus and, perhaps more importantly, to legitimate the value system he embodies.³³ The particular kind of story Mark employs here is *narrative*.³⁴ Narratives are stories that aim at resolving some sort of complication. Typically, they consist of an orientation, one or more complication, one or more evaluation, and one or more resolution.³⁵ The discourse structure of Mark 2:1–12 follows this pattern (see appendix): Orientation (vv. 1–2) ^ Complication1 (vv. 3–4a) ^ Evaluation1 (v. 4b) ^ Resolution1 (temporary) (v. 5) ^ Complication2 (vv. 6–7) ^ Evaluation2 (vv. 8–9) ^ Resolution2 (final) (vv. 10–12).³⁶

The text of Jude is a letter, so the structure of the text is, in part, constrained by the conventions of letter writing of his day: greeting (vv. 1–2); body (vv. 3–23); and closing (vv. 24–25).³⁷ Jude identifies the social purpose of his letter as an admonishment to struggle intensely for the faith (*παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ . . . πίστει* [v. 3]). Here are the basic stages Jude employs in an effort to accomplish his task: offer the encouragement proper (v. 3); introduce participants to be

32. Cf. deSilva, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 145–48; Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 69–70; Aune, *New Testament in Its Literary Environment*, 35: “The unconscious functions of Greco-Roman biography involve the historical *legitimation (or discrediting) of a social belief/value system personified in the subject of the biography*” (italics added).

33. Cf. deSilva, *Introduction*, 147.

34. Other story genres include recounts, anecdotes, exempla, and observations. Cf. Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*, 44ff.

35. Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*, 52. These are the basic components that comprise a narrative. Of course, the number of these components and their order may vary depending on situational variables.

36. The caret (^) in this sequence means “followed by.” On the basic structure of different kinds of stories, cf. Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*, 49–98 (on narratives specifically, see 67–74).

37. Cf. Gabriel, “Letters,” 193–94.

portrayed negatively (v. 4); give a series of intertextual references to negative exempla (vv. 5–16); give a series of directives, with additional negative evaluations of the antagonists as foils for the positive commands (vv. 17–23).

As these brief examples demonstrate, discourse structure is not merely the result of an author's stylistic flourishes, though, indeed, an author may as a matter of style intentionally manipulate or even flout structural norms. Discourse structure is, however, largely governed by the strictures of a given culture. Language use becomes habitualized and is used to accomplish certain social processes in certain ways that are deemed acceptable by those who are part of the culture.

2.3 Register

As mentioned above, the structure of a text is also constrained by the register or more specific context of situation in which the text was uttered. The theory of register, first developed by Halliday³⁸ and further developed by Martin (whom we follow here),³⁹ both models context of situation and explains its relationship to language.

First, register theory stratifies context and organizes it around three contextual variables or features called *field*, *tenor*, and *mode*. Briefly, *field* refers to the sequences of activities that are going on in a situation, as well as the people, things, places, qualities, and circumstances that are associated with those activities.⁴⁰ *Tenor* refers to the kind of social relations that are enacted and negotiated among the participants in a given

38. Cf. Halliday, *Social Semiotic*, 110–113.

39. Cf. Martin, *English Text*, 497–502; also Eggins and Martin, “Genres and Registers of Discourse,” 230–56.

40. Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*, 14; Dvorak, “Interpersonal Metafunction,” 27–28.

situation,⁴¹ particularly the social relations of status/power⁴² and solidarity/contact.⁴³ *Mode*

is concerned with symbolic reality—with texture. Since symbolic reality (i.e., text/process) has the function of constructing social reality, mode is oriented to both interpersonal and experiential meaning. It thus mediates the role played by language along two dimensions. Interpersonally, mode mediates the semiotic space between monologue and dialogue. . . . Experientially, mode mediates the semiotic space between action and reflection. . . . Putting this in general terms, mode mediates negotiation.⁴⁴

Second, register theory describes the relationship between field, tenor, and mode and discourse semantics. It is described as a relationship of *realization* (also referred to as *expression* or *coding*), in which, in Hjelmslevian terms, register is the *content plane* for which discourse semantics is the *expression plane*.⁴⁵ In this regard, field is realized as *ideational meaning*, text as the representation of experience. Here the goings-on, participants, and circumstances of field are encoded into language primarily as verbal groups, nominal groups, and adverbial or participial groups respectively. Tenor is realized as interpersonal meaning, text as interaction or exchange. The enactments and negotiations of the social relations in the situation are encoded into language primarily through the system of verbal attitude (i.e., assertive [indicative], projective [subjunctive], directive [imperative], expective [future]). Tenor is also realized through the system of appraisal (i.e., attitude [affect, judgment, appreciation] and engagement [heterogloss, monogloss]). Mode is realized as textual meaning, text as a series of organized messages.⁴⁶ Here

41. Martin, *English Text*, 523–26; Dvorak, “Interpersonal Metafunction,” 28.

42. I.e., the relative position of the participants in the culture’s social hierarchy.

43. I.e., the degree of institutional involvement between participants in the situation.

44. Martin, *English Text*, 509.

45. Martin, *English Text*, 501–502.

46. Cf. Halliday, “Functions of Language,” 24–26.

the elements of ideational meaning and interpersonal meaning are “packaged,” as it were, into clauses in which some portion of each clause has special “thematic” status and the remainder of the clause develops the theme and completes the message.⁴⁷

Looking again at Mark 2, generic constraints of narrative may call for the story to open with an orientation (vv. 1–2), but register constrains the content of the orientation. Ideationally, Mark construes a world (a reality, an experience) in this portion of the narrative in which the goings-on consist of the following processes:⁴⁸

- material processes: gathering together (συνήχθησαν [v. 2]), separating (χωρεῖν [v. 2])⁴⁹
- a mental process: hearing (ἤκουσθη [v. 1])
- an existential process: is (ἐστίν [v. 1])
- a verbal process: speaking (ἐλάλει [v. 2])

The following participants are portrayed:

- “he” (presumably Jesus) as the one who is “entering” Capernaum, who “is” in the house, and who “was speaking” the message
- an assumed agent (the crowd?) as the one by whom it “was heard” that he is in the house
- “many” (πολλοί) (also “them” [αὐτοῖς]) who had “gathered” and could no longer “separate,” and to whom “he” was speaking the message
- Capernaum (Καφαρναούμ)
- a house (οἶκῳ)
- the door of the house (θύραν)
- the message or word (λόγον)

Interpersonally, the story’s orientation is monoglossic, being dominated by assertive verbal attitude, which is grammaticalized by indicative verbal mood. This enacts a relationship between Mark and his presumed readers in which, as storyteller, Mark has higher status than the readers because he is the one who

47. Cf. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 37.

48. On process types, see Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 108ff. Cf. also Tan, “Transitivity,” n.p.

49. The participle εἰσελθὼν technically constitutes the circumstance for hearing (ἤκουσθη) and is, thus, not a main process. Circumstances, too, are part of ideational meaning.

apparently knows everything about the situation he describes. The readers, on the other hand, are situated as potential acknowledgers of what Mark asserts. Moreover, that Mark has opted to include this particular narrative in his gospel indicates an appraisal; from his perspective, the readers need to be told this story. Even just within the narrative's orientation phase (i.e., at the level of the narrative⁵⁰) appraisal is evident. For example, the two clauses *καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν* (v. 2) betoken a positive evaluation of Jesus' growing honor among the masses.⁵¹

In terms of the textual strand of meaning, the function in which we are most interested here, the text unfolds in a series of clauses, and each of these clauses has a “leaping off point” and typically, though not always, some further development of that point. The major concern here is with how the author chooses to order the components of the clause. Yet even this choice is constrained by the situation and the social purpose of both the text as a whole and the stretch of text constituting the clause. For example, as noted Mark 2:1–2 make up the orientation portion of the narrative Mark has chosen to tell. The first clause in the orientation is: *Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ δι’ ἡμερῶν ἡκούσθη*. Not surprisingly, Mark's point of departure in this clause is the adjunct⁵² “And entering again into Capernaum . . .”

50. Cf. “The Rhetorical Effects of Attitude” in Dvorak, “Interpersonal Metafunction,” 54.

51. That so many people were filling the house that there was not even space to get into or out of the house is a token of positive judgment with regard to social esteem (t, +judgment: esteem: normality). Further, the use of the term *πολλοί* (*many*) coupled with the statement that there was no room in front of the door (*μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν*) increases the force of the judgment (both graduation: force: quantification: mass and graduation: force: quantification: extent: distribution). Cf. Dvorak, “Interpersonal Metafunction,” 102; also, Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 150–51.

52. I.e., adverbial/circumstantial participial clause. *Adjunct* refers to a word group or groups that modify the predicator (verb) in a clause to provide circumstances associated with the process (cf. “OpenText.org Annotation Model,” n.p.).

This demonstrates the “enabling” or “relevance” role of the textual metafunction, namely to “package” ideational and interpersonal meanings into clauses in a way that is both relevant to and communicatively effective in light of its purpose. That is, here, it orients the readers to the context of the narrative. Thus, it is how text is being used in a given context (i.e., mode) that governs the textual meanings that are made (i.e., textual metafunction), which, in turn, govern the arrangements of the clause components in the realization of each clause (information flow).

2.4 Summary

We demonstrated thus far that both discourse structure and information flow are not merely the result of stylistic choices made by language users. Rather, structure and flow are largely governed by two different levels of context, namely genre and register. With regard to discourse structure, people deploy language in ways that are staged and oriented to various social goals. The ways in which these social goals may be accomplished with language are governed by the language user’s culture; the staging or structure of the discourse reflects these cultural constraints. Information flow is constrained to some extent by variations in genre and to a greater extent by register variables—and of these mostly by mode. The textual metafunction arranges ideational and interpersonal meanings in ways that, from the language user’s perspective, are relevant to and most effective in reaching the communicative goal of the clause in relation to the larger purpose of the text.

3. Prime and Subsequent Analysis

We argued above that the role of the textual metafunction was to organize ideational and interpersonal content into clauses in a way that is relevant and consistent with register and that creates a coherent message. Here, we provide a framework for modeling clauses as messages and a method for interpreting those messages.

The message of a clause consists of two parts, “the element which serves as the point of departure of the message” and “the remainder of the message.”⁵³ Although Halliday referred to these parts as *theme* and *rheme*, respectively, we follow Porter and O’Donnell and use the terms *prime* and *subsequent*, reserving *theme* and *rheme* for the discussion of thematic elements at the level of clause complex (sentence) and multi-clause complex level (see “Theme and Rheme Analysis” below).⁵⁴ In the model we present here, prime refers to “*who or what the clause is focused upon*, realized by the first [word] group element in the clause. The subsequent is defined as *the development of the prime*, and is realized in the remaining group elements in the clause.”⁵⁵ The prime functions to orient the reader to the message of the clause, and the subsequent provides the news about the prime that the writer wants the readers to know, to experience, or to remember.⁵⁶

Every clause has a prime element and most also have a subsequent, though it is possible for a clause to consist only of a prime.⁵⁷ The word group element (i.e., subject, predicator, complement, or adjunct)⁵⁸ comprising the prime may be as simple as a single word (conjunctions are excluded), or it may be a complex nominal or verbal group or even an embedded clause.⁵⁹ Subsequent consists of all other word group elements following the prime. For example, the initial clause in Mark 2:1–12 is analyzed for prime and subsequent as follows (see the appendix for a full prime and subsequent analysis of this unit):

53. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 37. Cf. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 90.

54. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 91.

55. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 91 (italics theirs).

56. Dvorak, “Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow,” 20.

57. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 92; Dvorak, “Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow,” 20.

58. Cf. O’Donnell, Porter, Reed, Picirilli, Smith, and Tan, “Clause Level Annotation Specification,” n. p.

59. Cf. Dvorak, “Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow,” 20.

<i>Prime</i>	<i>Subsequent</i>
^A [[^P εἰσελθῶν ^A πάλιν ^A εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ ^A δι' ἡμερῶν]]	^P ἤκούσθη

Mark's point of departure in this clause is an adjunct consisting of an embedded participial clause that realizes a temporal context for interpreting or understanding the subsequent, which consists of the predicator (main verb).

The following clause from Mark 2:3 raises a crucial point, namely that prime and subsequent analysis must be performed on the Greek text and not on a translation.

<i>Prime</i>	<i>Subsequent</i>
^P ἔρχονται	^A [[^P φέροντες ^A πρὸς αὐτὸν ^C παραλυτικὸν [[^P αἰρόμενον ^A ὑπὸ τεσσάρων]]]]

The prime of this clause is the predicator or verbal group. In Greek, finite verbs are monolectic, which means they grammaticalize person as part of their form through the use of personal endings.⁶⁰ Thus, it is not necessary for users of Greek to specify explicitly a subject in a clause. In fact, the default, unmarked option in biblical Greek is *not* to specify a subject.⁶¹ However, in many other languages like English, for example, the default, unmarked option *is* to specify a subject. This means if prime and subsequent analysis is performed on an English translation, it would label prime incorrectly. In this particular instance, based on the English gloss, “They come/are coming bringing to him a paralytic being carried by four,” the prime would be “they.” However, the actual prime is the process “come/are coming.” Thus, Mark chose to begin with the material

60. Cf. Porter, “Prominence,” 71. Porter and O’Donnell (*Discourse Analysis*, 93) note that this gives the writer of Greek the flexibility to “(1) not specify a specific subject . . . , (2) specify the subject, but not place it in primary position . . . , or (3) specify the subject and place it in primary position in the clause”

61. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 93 n. 148.

process and to further develop it with circumstantial information provided by an embedded participial clause.

It is often assumed that items in prime position are prominent simply because they occupy prime position in the clause, but this is not the *de facto* case. Determining prominence requires consideration of other factors including analyses of clause realization patterns across the corpus of text written by the same author (e.g., the Pauline epistles),⁶² as well as the entire New Testament corpus and other factors such as literary genre. Also to be accounted for are features of markedness, grounding, and salience.⁶³ Further research in this area is needed, but it may be, for example, that because predicators fill prime position the majority of times across the New Testament, saying that a predicator is prominent simply because it occupies prime position in the clause would be to say too much.⁶⁴ That said, the order of word groups within a clause is, indeed, a factor in determining prominence.⁶⁵

4. *Theme and Rheme Analysis*

Porter and O'Donnell reserve the terms *theme* and *rheme* for identifying and discussing the “thematic elements at the sentence and multi-sentence level.”⁶⁶ This means the focus of our textual analysis now shifts to the level above the clause. When exploring theme and rheme analysis, it is important to define the terms

62. Cf. Tan, “Prominence in the Pauline Epistles,” 95–110.

63. Cf. Westfall, “Analysis of Prominence in Hellenistic Greek,” 75–94.

64. Dvorak’s analysis of the entire New Testament revealed that across the entire New Testament predicators were prime 7227 times, adjuncts 5767 times, subjects 5354 times, and complements 2634 times. Cf. Dvorak, “Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow,” 25–26. Cf. also Porter (“Prominence,” 71) who discusses patterns of order of first and second clause components.

65. Cf. Porter, “Prominence,” 67–69.

66. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 98.

clearly, to delineate the steps in analysis, and to stress a number of the important advantages to such an analysis.

To begin, one must have an understanding of the term *process chain*. A process is any verbal action, implied or inscribed, within a clause; a process chain refers to a string of verbal processes that form a series across a stretch of text.⁶⁷ This chain of processes is ascribed to a particular actor(s), who is said to be the thematic actor. Of course, other participants and their actions may be interspersed in the same stretch of text, but these do not necessarily break the process chain associated with the thematic actor. An easy example in English is as follows:

Bobby went to the store. There he was greeted by a clerk, and then searched for a loaf of bread. When he found it, however, he decided that it was too expensive, so he put it back on the shelf. However, an older woman standing nearby decided she would take it. Bobby then left the store and travelled to the Shop-For-Less down the road, where he purchased the bread for a less expensive price.

All of the verbs in this anecdote form a process chain, and Bobby is the primary participant: Bobby went, searched, found, decided, put, left, travelled, and purchased. Notice as well that the additional processes performed by the clerk and the older woman do not break the chain as it follows Bobby, for their actions are clearly secondary information and reactionary throughout Bobby's story.

This story provides an excellent segue to the notion of theme. Theme in narrative is best seen through the transition and change of a participant as a primary actor in a process chain—what is usually called the thematic actor.⁶⁸ In other words, a theme is the transition from one thematic actor to another or a change in participant involvement that breaks a process chain. That being said, the thematic actor must be an explicit subject, meaning that the actor cannot merely be implied from a verb. This does not mean, however, that the thematic actor must be prime or even articulated. Indeed, the thematic actor can be anarthrous or

67. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 98.

68. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 98.

articulated, prime or subsequent. Provided the thematic actor is articulated, this actor can be said to be more emphatic. More emphatic still is when the thematic actor also occupies the prime position in the clause.⁶⁹ Such a theme is said to be marked and should be noted as a potential boundary marker for a shift in discourse topic, which will be discussed more thoroughly below.

Interestingly enough, the thematic actor can actually be passive, which suggests that more refined language is needed in future formulations of theme and rheme analyses. The following brief narrative concerning a shirt demonstrates the shortcomings of “actor” language:

Cindy’s shirt was stained by an ice cream cone. The shirt, then, had to be tossed into the washing machine, which soaked it for twenty minutes. The shirt then was brought out of the wash and was placed into the dryer for a sixty-minute tumble. Finally, the shirt was removed by Cindy and hung on the drying rack.

Clearly, the narrative is about the shirt: It is the theme of the tale even though it is not truly an actor in any instance. Perhaps the language of “primary participant” could be more helpful and less misleading.

Moving onto clausal considerations, the thematic participant must be in a primary clause, or on clause level α in the Open Text model.⁷⁰ Any participant found in a secondary clause has been rank-shifted down to level β and therefore plays a subordinate role to the circumstances of the primary clause. Obviously, then, a subordinated participant cannot serve as the primary participant.

Lastly, one must consider the concept of rheme—the additional information regarding the current thematic participant,⁷¹ which is also understood as the extensive circumstantial information involved in a process chain. Consider the story of a young elf:

69. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 98-99.

70. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 103.

71. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 98.

Sissy was out late one night at her friends' home. Realizing that she would not be able to return to the hovel before the werewolves came out for the night, she decided to employ her cunning. Acting quickly, she pulled leaves and twigs off of a few nearby oaks and began to construct a glider. She then climbed atop the tallest tree at her friends' den and sets sail for home, landing safely at her hovel just as she heard the first howl of the dark night. She was safe, safe indeed.

In the preceding story, all of the details concerning her activities, the building, gliding, landing, and so on, all serve as rhematic material to fill out the picture of the text. It is clear that this section of text is about Sissy since she is the primary participant. The rheme is what allows the reader to know that the story is truly about not only Sissy but also her quick wit and her return voyage home.

Briefly, it is worth noting that following the application of both prime and subsequent analysis and theme and rheme analysis, the two analyses may be cross examined for additional and enlightening findings. For example, should a prime in a clause also be a theme, then the theme is considered marked, meaning that the author chose to launch his clause with the theme change.⁷² This reflects the nature of language in that the speaker has to make a choice regarding how to start a clause. Since language is necessarily syntagmatic and paradigmatic—linear and oppositional—only one thing can be said at a time. Therefore, the first chosen words that come out of the mouth must be considered significant, especially in the language of Greek where word order is significantly more malleable than in English, although it is important to note that a linguistic choice is not always conscious.

To grasp how the idea of prime and theme work together here is a small reiteration of Sissy's story: "Sissy was out late one night at her friends' home. Realizing that she would not be able to return to the hovel before the werewolves came out for the night, she decided to employ her cunning." Notice how the first clause begins with "Sissy" as both the prime and the thematic

72. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 100-101.

participant. There is no question as to whom the story pertains. However, the prime in the following sentence is actually a participle, adjunct material, which sets the stage for the problem in the text. Thus, the kernel of truth from these first two sentences is that Sissy realizes she has a problem. Without the coupling of prime and theme, such a realization could very well be missed by a casual reader or interpreter, leading to a misunderstanding of character prominence.⁷³ The true beauty of these analyses, therefore, can be seen in the fact that they cause the analyst to slow down and appreciate the rhetoric within the text itself.

The importance of theme and rheme analysis cannot be understated, for it is key in determining exactly what the author is trying to communicate in a given pericope. The thematic actor in a given process chain is the governing character in a multi-sentence portion of the text. All of the information that is circumstantial to the theme is the rheme and should be treated as adding additional information to the theme. If one were to confuse this, then one would be in danger of putting words in the author's mouth and mirror reading into the text. Therefore, theme and rheme analysis is critical to providing the clearest possible picture of a text's message, the bits of the text that the author considers most important, which leads to the best possible applications for daily living.

There are only two thematic units in Mark 2:1–12 (cf. the appendix for a full theme-rheme analysis). The first thematic unit consists of verses 1–5. In this unit, the only explicit subject of a process chain that occurs in a primary clause is πολλοί (v. 2). Mark has not chosen the most heavily marked theme option, since πολλοί does not also occupy prime position in the clause. Although ὁ παραλυτικός occurs in the subject slot of clause 16 (v. 4), it occurs in a dependent clause; thus, it does not constitute a thematic shift. Ὁ Ἰησοῦς occurs in v. 5, but it is part of a secondary embedded participial clause that serves as an adjunct in the primary clause and is, therefore, not a thematic shift. The

73. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 104-105.

only remaining possibility is *αἱ ἁμαρτίαι* in clause 19 (v. 5); however, although it is subject in a primary clause, it belongs to a stretch of reported speech and is, thus, not a thematic shift. The next thematic unit begins at clause 20 (v. 6) with *τινες τῶν γραμματέων* (not marked) and extends all the way through to the end of the unit (v. 12). Again, a number of other subjects occur in the subsequent clauses, but as in the first unit, none of them qualifies as a thematic shift because either they occur as part of reported speech or secondary clauses (embedded or standalone).

There are only a couple thematic units in Jude. A few of these will be examined below to demonstrate what has been written above. The first of these examples comes from clause twelve:

παρεισέδυσαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

Here we have an example of an unmarked theme, for the theme is not prime in the clause. *Τινες ἄνθρωποι* is the primary participant of this clause. The rest of the material is rhematic in that it is giving additional information about these “certain people.” The most significant of the rhematic material here is the process associated with the subject on the primary clause level. This process is *παρεισέδυσαν*, essentially meaning that these people have snuck in among them. There are other processes, however, involved that are related back to the theme here, which form a process chain when taken together. Some of these predicators are participles, which associate various circumstantial bits with the theme provided. Other verbs found in clauses 29–32 are also on the primary level, which at least include: *μαίνουσιν*, *ἀθετοῦσιν*, and *βλασφημοῦσιν*. Each of these verbs is intensely negative in nature, which supports the assertion that the author genuinely does not approve of these individuals at all.

Now, one might assert that these verbs should be rhematic for other subjects since there are indeed other subjects that these verbs predicate. However, there is no explicit subject on the primary clause level that signals a change in theme after *τινες*

ἄνθρωποι until Μιχαήλ.⁷⁴ Since this is the case, it cannot be said that any of these intermediate participants is thematic. The secondary clauses, embedded or otherwise, cannot carry enough weight to be thematic since they are additional information used to support the primary material they follow.

The second example comes from clause 40: Οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν. In this example, the theme is marked, meaning that the primary participant is also in the prime position. Since the author chose to present this theme as marked, it likely has extra weight. In this instance, the marked theme is actually a reference back to the theme in clause twelve, which serves as the topic of the entire discourse. Thus, it is likely that the theme is marked as the author tries to reorient his audience toward himself as opposed to his adversaries.

The final example comes from clause 67: καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελείας χάριν. In this example, the subject is articulated and prime, which makes this an especially marked theme. When the subject comes at the beginning of the clause, the subject is the leaping off point of the clause, the first bit of information that flows out of the speaker. On top of all of this, the author took the time to articulate the theme, which is not necessarily required in Greek. All of these elements work together to draw attention to the subject in subtle yet important ways. It is possible that this theme is so marked, as the author wants to draw attention to the wicked speech that spills forth from the mouths of *τινες ἄνθρωποι*—speech to which the author clearly does not want his audience listening.

5. Topic and Comment Analysis

Topic and comment analysis functions at the highest level of discourse. This level includes the clause complex, paragraph, and

74. The demonstrative pronoun οὗτοι in clause 29 does not signal a theme change because it is a reference back to the current theme, *τινες ἄνθρωποι*. This would be similar to the use of a personal pronoun like “he.” He is a referent back to a governing term that has been established in most cases, as is οὗτοι.

the entirety of a discourse.⁷⁵ First, attention goes to topic. Another name commonly used for topic is global theme. This term is helpful because it helps one to visualize the scope of the topic of a unit of text. Global theme can be understood as the key participant over the course of multiple clause complexes—groups of clauses with clear syntactic relationships—of information.⁷⁶ Typically, the topic is the participant about which all of the primes and themes are speaking. A contemporary way to envision this idea is to consider a chapter in a book on spirituality or education. The author typically names the chapter after the topic of discourse found on its pages. Everything aside from the topic found within those pages should be understood as providing additional information about the particular topic, which leads to the discussion of comment.

Following the pattern of subsequent to prime and rheme to theme, comment is the supporting information relative to the present topic of discourse.⁷⁷ Thus, the comment is all of the circumstantial evidence related to the present topic of discourse. It is, indeed, as the name suggests: Comment is nothing more than what is being said about a particular topic. As an example, consider an essay about school uniforms. The student penning said essay is in favor of school uniforms as a way to create an even playing field between students of different socio-economic levels. Her thesis is as follows: If students all had to wear uniforms, then there would be fewer cliques based on fashion sense. In this example, the topic of the essay is school uniforms, and the thesis serves as the comment. The sub-points of the student's essay will be made up of themes and primes that relate back to the topic, as well as subsequents, rhemes, and comments that directly tie back to her thesis. When she is finished, she has a coherent and cohesive paper.

The realization of topics and comments comes through shifts in semantic boundaries, which are defined as the clear shift

75. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 106.

76. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 110.

77. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 106.

between one semantic environment—a clearly cohesive and coherent portion of a text—and another.⁷⁸ This means the place in which one topic ends and another begins. There are several signs that a semantic boundary may exist between points. These include, a lack of semantic cohesion, the end of a lexical chain, discourse markers, summarizing statements, genitive absolutes, temporal participles or infinitival word groups, changes of setting within the text, and other circumstantial indicators.⁷⁹ To provide examples of each of these is beyond the scope of the present discussion, but a simple example of a semantic boundary is to reimagine chapters in a book once more. Suppose the chapters were actually short stories featuring the aforementioned Bobby, Cindy, and Sissy within an episodic tome of fantastic and mundane tomes. The ending of Sissy's story came as she arrived at her hovel. There is a clear summarizing statement, and the stated goal of the short story had been met. The readership is now primed for the next story, and when a new thematic actor is introduced, Bobby, in a modern and less fantastic setting, it becomes clear that a new discourse topic has emerged.

Unfortunately, determining topics and comments can be a very subjective exercise in a text that does not have obvious or universally agreed upon divisions. This is primarily due to its high level of operation within the text, meaning that topic and comment function well above the domain of grammar and lexical bits. This means that there is more semiotic space for interpretation in choosing what the true topic and comment of a pericope is. Understanding this leads one to ask how such subjectivity might be reduced. The best answer at present is the combination of all three level of analyses: prime and subsequent, theme and rheme, and topic and comment. Indeed, constructing the topic from the bottom up provides the most lucid and objective end result. Provided that the primes seem to point to particular themes that themselves point to a topic that can be explicitly identified, then one can reduce the subjectivity by

78. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 106.

79. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 109.

employing the model described here. Further, if the subsequents and rhemes point to a clear comment, then the topic and comment have a solid foundation, which inhibits subjectivity as much as possible.

Searching for the topic and comment in a given text is, therefore, significant for exegetes, both lay and professional, because it aids in uncovering the inner workings of the text as a text. Too often interpretation has been founded on mirror reading coupled with individualism, which has devalued the communal aspects of the text and caused the Bible and Christian religion at large to be suspect by pragmatists who have shunned faith. This model is useful in so far as it allows the exegete to capture the idea of syntagmatic relationships across various levels of discourse and also the intention of an author in writing his letter. It aids the interpreter by allowing the reader some guidelines with which to make sense out of the holy stories, which can prevent an abuse of the text that could lead to an abuse of human life, psychologically, physically, and spiritually.

Mark 2:1 consists of a major semantic boundary marked by both spatial and temporal deictics (i.e., entering again into *Capernaum* after *some days*, it was heard that he is *in the house*). Mark 2:13 contains another major semantic shift by means of spatial deictic; the scene changes from being in the house to being beside the sea. Thus, the outer boundaries of the pericope are established. Within the pericope, the semantic boundaries align with the thematic actors and their associated process chains. Verses 1–5 are concerned primarily with the interaction of Jesus and the paralytic that is brought to him from the perspective of the “many” (πολλοί)—mainly with overcoming the difficulty of getting the paralytic to Jesus because the “many” were blocking the way to him. The unnamed four who brought the paralytic to Jesus battle the crowd and even the house (!) until they eventually are able to place the paralytic at Jesus’ feet. Somewhat anticlimactically, Jesus does not heal the paralytic but pronounces his sins forgiven. This is somewhat ironic, perhaps even shocking, given that in Mark 1 wherever Jesus speaks

publicly he also heals and casts out demons. He is speaking⁸⁰ in this pericope, too, but he does not immediately heal.

Things change at 2:6. Perspective narrows to some scribes who were there (presumably part of the many) and their judgment of Jesus for pronouncing forgiveness of sins of the paralytic. The semantic chains formed by language related to the crowd, the house, and the paralytic are broken, and a new chain—a new topic—begins with the “zooming in” on the scribes and the disagreement they have with Jesus “in their hearts” (*ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν*). The remainder of the pericope focuses on the interaction between Jesus and these scribes; the paralytic is reintroduced into the narrative only so Jesus can heal him and prove that he does, indeed, have the authority to forgive sins. Given that this healing is in response to the scribes’ charge (by means of a rhetorical question) that only God has this kind of authority, the comment of this portion of the pericope appears to be that Jesus is God’s divine agent.

One might summarize the two topics in Mark 2:1–12 as follows: (a) Jesus responds favorably to those who act diligently and tenaciously on behalf of those who cannot act for themselves (2:1–5); (b) Jesus demonstrates that he is, indeed, God’s agent to restore wholeness/holiness to the land (2:6–12).

For all intents and purposes, Jude has only one topic and one comment related to it. The topic itself is found in clause twelve. The exact locution unveiling the topic is *τινες ἄνθρωποι*, meaning something akin to “certain people.” Throughout the rest of the letter Jude expounds upon these certain people, ultimately negatively evaluating them. The final statement of topic and comment, a single sentence that grasps the entirety of the point of the letter, is as follows: “These certain people that snuck in are bad; therefore, do not be like them, and keep yourselves from them.”

80. However, Mark has changed the verb he uses. In this pericope, this is the first time in Mark that *λαλέω* is used to refer to Jesus’ action of teaching (*ἐλάλει . . . τὸν λόγον* [v. 2]). Prior to this he tended to use forms of *κηρύσσω*.

Though *τινες ἄνθρωποι* is not prime in its clause, it is clearly the thematic actor. These people have snuck into the assembly to which the author is writing. One might assert that *τινες ἄνθρωποι* cannot serve as the topic of the letter since the theme is not marked, but it is significant that the author begins the body of his letter with these individuals as the thematic actors. It is, after all, only logical that a letter so brief would get immediately to the point. To further support *τινες ἄνθρωποι* as the topic of the letter, there are clear referential pronouns guiding the readers and listeners back to said phrase. Three of the instances—clauses 40, 65, and 74—use *οὗτοι*, “these,” and a fourth demonstrates possession and personification: *τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν*, meaning “their mouth(s).” Significantly, these same instances are also prime in their clauses. Thus, the textual referents back to *τινες ἄνθρωποι* are marked themes, which soundly buttresses the suggestion that *τινες ἄνθρωποι* is the topic.

Further evidence supporting the chosen topic can be found by studying the other thematic actors that do not seem to be referring to *τινες ἄνθρωποι*. In truth, it can be argued that the vast majority of these thematic actors actually serve as illustrations, which are ideationally related back to the topic. For instance, *Μιχαήλ*, the archangel Michael, is the thematic actor of clause 33. He is used as an intertextual thematic formation to ascribe the qualities of the devil to *οὗτοι* in clause 40. Thus, the thematic actor here is nothing more than an allusion to support the author’s accusation toward *τινες ἄνθρωποι*, and the same can be said of *Ἐνώχ* in clause 57. These references, then, cannot serve as topic material since they actually function interpersonally to offer negative appraisal of the true topic, which happens to make them very substantial comment material.

Before moving onto the more in-depth discussion of the comment material, one more potential objection must be culled. One might assert that *ὑμεῖς*, which is found in clauses 69 and 77, should be understood as a second topic in the letter. However, this need not be the case if the topic is considered correctly. It is important to remember that a theme is not a topic just because it is a theme. Here, the author refers to his readers and listeners as marked themes, since *ὑμεῖς* is in the prime position. This is

significant, and it should be noted that he is likely emphasizing that he is talking directly to his audience rather than philosophizing. Still, the author's volitional statements are an attempt to position his readers, through the co-textual commands, the earlier ideational illustrations, and the ever-present negative appraisals, to react to *τινες ἄνθρωποι* in the appropriate manner. Thus, since *ὕμεῖς* is a reactionary primary participant, it should not be mistaken for the global theme of its unit of text. The reactors in this case are not to be considered the topics.

Moving on, in Jude the comment ought to be understood in a distinctly interpersonal way. The entirety of the author's message can be summarized as a negative appraisal of *τινες ἄνθρωποι*, as is most readily apparent through observing the author's extensive use of social name calling. The first such example is found in clause twelve—the same clause where the topic is explicitly referenced. In said clause, the author attributes *τινες ἄνθρωποι* with godlessness (*ἀσεβεῖς*). A second, and particularly interesting, example lies in verses 12–13. Here, those that snuck in are actually called stains (*σπιλάδες*) in a relational clause. These are just two such examples of what could be discussed *ad nauseum* in Jude. This should be sufficient to demonstrate that the author believes these individuals are bad, and *σπιλάδες* provides the perfect segue into discussing the rest of the comment.

The completion of the comment requires a response in this case. There is a definite topic in *τινες ἄνθρωποι*, and the gratuitous amounts of social name-calling and relational clauses with negative verbal processes substantiate the readers' interpretation that these individuals are bad. Recalling the author's use of *ὕμεῖς*, one can easily see that there is a distinct response that the author has in mind, as he turns his attention directly to his recipients and makes them thematic participants in the letter in clauses 69 and 77. Thus, it is apparent that his readership must be part of the comment. All that remains is identifying the verbal processes the readers are to carry out. Such a task must revisit the ideational relationships brought about by the author's use of intertextuality, Michael and Enoch being the

thematic examples above. In both of those allusions, the point is to paint *τινες ἄνθρωποι* in a negative light by associating them with an act that the readership's heteroglossic background—their own social language and habits that are continually formative and comprehensible—allows them to easily understand. When the author reinforces these images with references to Sodom and Gomorrah and Cain, it is clear that the audience is to avoid any imitation of the godless people (vv. 7, 11). Instead, they are to keep themselves away from them and their staining qualities (*μιαίνουσιν*). No one, indeed, wants to be spoiled through association with corrupting taint.

In summary, taking the sum of all of the substantiated parts, one arises at the topic/comment statement, which is as follows: “These certain people that snuck in are bad; therefore, do not be like them, and keep yourselves from them.” This sentence appropriately encapsulates the entirety of Jude in one shot. The mood here shifts from indicative to imperative; the topic of both is the certain people. They are interpersonally labeled as bad, and the audience knows they should not imitate or associate with them. Thus topic and comment analysis, when building upon the thematic analysis foundation that ought to undergird it, leads to a lucid and supportable statement concerning the overall message of the letter.

6. Conclusion

We have attempted to demonstrate in this paper that exegesis requires more in-depth analysis of a text in its original language than simply doing lexical analysis. Determining “what a text is about” requires the exegete to consider ideational, interpersonal, and textual meaning. Focusing on textual meaning alone can glean a much richer understanding of a given text. We have introduced a model of textual analysis that begins at clause level and identifies the message of each clause. We also modeled textual analysis that moves beyond the clause to identify themes at the level of clause complex (sentence and multi-sentence), as well as topic at the sub-unit, unit, and discourse level. It is our hope that other biblical scholars will put these models to work

and, by doing so, will help sharpen them resulting in a greater understanding of the biblical text.

Appendix 1: Mark

Prime and Subsequent Analysis (based on OpenText Annotation)

Clause Component Abbreviations: S = Subject; P = Predicator; C = Complement; A = Adjunct

<i>Cls#</i> [component in prime]	<i>Prime</i>	<i>Subsequent</i>
c2_1 [A]	εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν	ἤκούσθη
c2_3 [A]	ἐν οἴκῳ	ἐστίν
c2_4 [P]	συνήχθησαν	πολλοὶ
c2_5 [A]	μηκέτι	χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν
c2_6 [P]	ἐλάλει	αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον
c2_7 [P]	ἔρχονται	φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων
c2_10 [A]	μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον	ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν
c2_14 [A]	ἐξορύξαντες	χαλῶσι τὸν κράβαττον
c2_16 [A]	ὅπου	ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο
c2_17 [A]	ιδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν	λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ
c2_19 [add]	τέκνον	ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
c2_20 [P]	ἦσαν	τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν
c2_23 [A]	τί	οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ;

c2_24 [P]	βλασφημεῖ	
c2_25 [S]	τίς	δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας
c2_27 [A]	μὴ	εἶς ὁ θεός
c2_28 [A]	εὐθύς ἐπιγνούς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς	λέγει αὐτοῖς
c2_31 [A]	τί	ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;
c2_32 [S]	τί	ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτερον
c2_33 [P]	εἰπεῖν	τῷ παραλυτικῷ
c2_34 [P]	ἀφιένταί	σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
c2_35 [P]	εἰπεῖν	
c2_36 [P]	ἔγειρε	
c2_37 [P]	ἄρον	τὸν κράβαττόν σου
c2_38 [P]	περιπάτει	
c2_39 [P]	εἰδῆτε	
c2_40 [C]	ἐξουσίαν	ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
c2_42 [P]	λέγει	τῷ παραλυτικῷ
c2_43 [C]	Σοὶ	λέγω
c2_44 [P]	ἔγειρε	

c2_45 [P]	ἄρον	τὸν κράβαττόν σου
c2_46 [P]	ὑπαγε	εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου
c2_47 [P]	ἠγέρθη	
c2_48 [A]	εὐθύς	ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων
c2_50 [P]	ἐξίστασθαι	πάντας
c2_51 [P]	δοξάζειν	τὸν θεὸν λέγοντας
c2_53 [A]	οὕτως	οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν

Theme and Rheme Analysis

Thematic Unit ₁	Rheme ₁	
	εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν	ἠκούσθη
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Rheme ₁			Theme ₁
ἐν οἴκῳ	ἐστίν	συνήχθησαν	πολλοὶ
Prime _b	Subsequent _b	Prime _c	Subsequent _c

Rheme ₁		
μηκέτι	χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν	ἐλάλει
Prime _d	Subsequent _d	Prime _e

Rheme ₁		
αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον	ἔρχονται	φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν
Subsequent _e	Prime _f	Subsequent _f

Rheme ₁	
παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων	μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον
(Subsequent _f)	Prime _g

Rheme ₁		
ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν	ἐξορύξαντες	χαλῶσι τὸν κράβαττον
Subsequent _g	Prime _h	Subsequent _h

Rheme ₁		
ὅπου	ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο	ιδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν
Prime _i	Subsequent _i	Prime _j

Rheme ₁		
λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ	Τέκνον	ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
Subsequent _j	Prime _k	Subsequent _k

Thematic Unit ₂	Rheme ₂	Theme ₂
	ἦσαν	τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Rheme ₂			
Τί	οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ;	βλασφημεῖ	τίς
Prime _b	Subsequent _b	Prime _c	Prime _d

Rheme ₂		
δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας	(...) μὴ	εἰς ὁ θεός
Subsequent _d	Prime _e	Subsequent _e

Rheme ₂	
εὐθὺς ἐπιγινούς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς	
Prime _f	

Rheme₂

λέγει αὐτοῖς	τί	ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν
Subsequent _f	Prime _g	Subsequent _h

Rheme₂

τί	ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον	εἰπεῖν	τῷ παραλυτικῷ
Prime _h	Subsequent _h	Prime _i	Subsequent _i

Rheme₂

Ἀφίενται	σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι	εἰπεῖν	Ἔγειρε	ἄρον
Prime _j	Subsequent _j	Prime _k	Prime _l	Prime _m

Rheme₂

τὸν κράβαττόν σου	περιπάτει	εἰδῆτε
Subsequent _n	Prime _n	Prime _o

Rheme₂

ἐξουσίαν	ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
Prime _p	Subsequent _p

Rheme₂

λέγει	τῷ παραλυτικῷ	Σοὶ	λέγω
Prime _q	Subsequent _q	Prime _r	Subsequent _r

Rheme₂

ἔγειρε	ἄρον	τὸν κράβαττόν σου
Prime _s	Prime _t	Subsequent _t

Rheme₂

ὑπαγε	εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου	ἠγέρθη
Prime _u	Subsequent _u	Prime _v

Rheme ₂	
εὐθύς	ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων
Prime _w	Subsequent _w

Rheme ₂			
ἐξίστασθαι	πάντας	δοξάζειν	τὸν θεὸν λέγοντας
Prime _x	Subsequent _x	Prime _y	Subsequent _y

Rheme ₂	
Οὕτως	οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν
Prime _z	Subsequent _z

Topic (Global Theme) and Comment

Unit Boundaries: Temporal and Spatial Deictics

	<i>V. # (Cl. #)</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Text</i>
New Unit	v.1 (c2_2)	Spatial deictic	εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν
	v. 1 (c2_2)	Temporal deictic	εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν
	v.1 (c2_3)	Spatial deictic	ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν
New Unit	v. 13 (c2_54)	Spatial deictic	Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν
	v. 13 (c2_54)	Temporal deictic	Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν

Unit Boundaries: Person Reference Chains

There are three major person reference chains that interact with each other in this text: the paralytic, Jesus, and “some of the scribes.” Both the paralytic and scribes chains break after v. 12; this, in conjunction with the spatial and temporal deictic markers (above), signals the end of the unit.

Paralytic

1. παραλυτικὸν (v. 3)
2. person reference (v. 3 αἰρόμενον)

3. παραλυτικός (v. 4)
4. person reference (v. 4 κατέκειτο)
5. παραλυτικῶ (v. 5)
6. τέκνον (v. 5)
7. of you (v. 5 persPRO σου)
8. παραλυτικῶ (v. 9)
9. pronominal reference (v. 9 σου)
10. person reference (v. 9 ἔγειρε)
11. person reference (v. 9 ἄρον)
12. pronominal reference (v. 9 σου)
13. person reference (v. 9 περιπάτει)
14. παραλυτικῶ (v. 10)
15. pronominal reference (v. 11 σοί)
16. person reference (v. 11 ἔγειρε)
17. person reference (v. 11 ἄρον)
18. pronominal reference (v. 11 σου)
19. person reference (v. 11 ὕπαγε)
20. pronominal reference (v. 11 σου)
21. person reference (v. 12 ἠγέρθη)
22. person reference (v. 12 ἄρας)
23. person reference (v. 12 ἐξήλθεν)

Jesus (most recent previous full reference in 1:25)

1. “he” (v. 1 verbal person ἐστίν)
2. “he” (v. 2 verbal person ἐλάλει)
3. “him” (v. 3 intnPRO αὐτόν)
4. “to him” (v. 4 intnPRO αὐτῶ)
5. “he” (v. 4 person reference ἦν)
6. “seeing” (v. 5 person reference ἰδῶν)
7. Ἰησοῦς (v. 5)
8. person reference (v. 5 λέγει)
9. pronominal ref (v. 7 demPRO οὗτος)
10. person ref (v. 7 λαλεῖ)
11. person ref (v. 7 βλασφημεῖ)
12. person ref (v. 8 ἐπιγνούς)
13. Ἰησοῦς (v. 8)
14. “his” (v. 8 intnPRO αὐτοῦ)
15. person ref (v. 8 λέγει)
16. person reference (v. 10 ἔχει)

17. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
18. person reference (v. 10 λέγει)
19. person reference (v. 11 λέγω)

Some scribes

1. person reference (v. 6 ἦσαν)
2. pronominal reference (v. 6 indfPRO τινες)
3. τῶν γραμματέων (v. 6)
4. person ref (v. 6 καθήμενοι)
5. person ref (v. 6 διαλογίζομαι)
6. pronominal ref (v. 6 intnPRO αὐτῶν)
7. person reference (v. 8 διαλογίζονται)
8. pronominal reference (v. 8 rflxPRO ἑαυτοῖς)
9. pronominal reference (v. 8 αὐτοῖς)
10. person reference (v. 8 διαλογίζεσθε)
11. pronominal reference (v. 8 persPRO ὑμῶν)
12. person reference (v. 10 εἰδῆτε)

Generic Analysis

Orientation

1 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν. 2 καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν, καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον.

Complication₁

3 καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων. 4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον

Evaluation

ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλαῶσι τὸν κράβαττον ὅπου ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.

Resolution (temporary)

5 καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Τέκνον, ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.

Complication₂

6 ἦσαν δὲ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, 7 Τί οὕτως οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ · τίς δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός;

Evaluation

8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγινούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; 9 τί ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν, Ἐγειρε καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει;

Resolution (final)

10 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς —λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, 11 Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. 12 καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντας ὅτι Οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν.

*Appendix 2: Jude**Prime and Subsequent Analysis (based on OpenText Annotation)*

Clause Component Abbreviations: S = Subject; P = Predicator; C = Complement; A = Adjunct

<i>Cls#</i> [component in prime]	<i>Prime</i>	<i>Subsequent</i>
c1_1 [S]	Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου	τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς
c1_4 [S]	ἔλεος ... καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη	ὑμῖν ... ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη
c1_5 [add]	Ἀγαπητοί	πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει

c1_12 [P]	παρεισέδυσαν	γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάσαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι
c1_16 [C]	Ἵπομνησαι	ὕμᾱς βούλομαι
c1_18 [P]	εἰδόμενος	ὕμᾱς πάντα
c1_19 [S]	Ἰησοῦς	ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν
c1_22 [C]	ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον	εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν
c1_25 [S]	Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις	ὄν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι
c1_29 [A]	ὁμοίως	οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μαίνουσιν
c1_31 [C]	κυριότητα	ἀθετοῦσιν
c1_32 [C]	δόξας	βλασφημοῦσιν
c1_33 [S]	Ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος	
c1_34 [A]	τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος	διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος

c1_36 [A]	οὐκ	ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας
c1_38 [P]	εἶπεν	
c1_39 [P]	ἐπιτιμήσαι	σοι κύριος
c1_40 [S]	Οὗτοι	ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν
c1_42 [C]	ὅσα φυσικῶς	ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπίστανται
c1_44 [A]	ἐν τούτοις	φθειρόνται
c1_45 [S]	οὐαὶ	αὐτοῖς
c1_46 [A]	τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάϊν	ἐπορεύθησαν
c1_47 [A]	τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ	μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν
c1_48 [A]	τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κόρε	ἀπώλοντο
c1_49 [S]	Οὗτοί	εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως, ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, νεφέλαι ἄνδρῳ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δις ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται
c1_57 [P]	Προεφήτευσεν	καὶ τούτοις ἑβδομος ἀπὸ Ἰαδὰμ Ἐνώχ λέγων

c1_59 [P]	ἰδοὺ	
c1_60 [P]	ἦλθεν	κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς
c1_65 [S]	Οὗτοί	εἰσιν γογγυσταὶ μεμψίμοιροι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτῶν πορευόμενοι
c1_67 [S]	τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν	λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελείας χάριν
c1_69 [S]	ὕμεῖς	ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
c1_71 [P]	ἔλεγον	ὕμῃν
c1_72 [A]	ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τοῦ χρόνου	ἔσονται ἐμπαίχται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν
c1_74 [S]	Οὗτοί	ἴσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες

c1_77 [S]	ὕμεῖς	ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ τηρήσατε προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
c1_81 [C]	οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους	
c1_83 [C]	οὓς	σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες
c1_85 [C]	οὓς	λεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ μισούντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα
c1_88 [C]	Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὕμᾶς ἀπταίστους καὶ στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλιάσει, μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν	δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν

Theme and Rheme Analysis

	Theme ₁	Rheme ₁
Thematic Unit ₁	Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου	τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς·
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a
Rheme ₁		
	ἔλεος . . . καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη	. . . ὑμῖν . . . πληθυνθείη Ἀγαπητοί
	Prime _b	Subsequent _b Prime _c

Rheme ₁
πάσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει
Subsequent _c

Thematic Unit ₂	Rheme ₂	Theme ₂
	παρεισέδυσαν	τινες ἄνθρωποι
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

(Theme ₂)
οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι
(Subsequent _a)

Rheme ₂		
Ἵπομνησαι ... ὑμᾶς	βούλομαι	εἰδότας
Prime _b	Subsequent _b	Prime _c

Rheme ₂		
ὑμᾶς ἅπαξ [NA ²⁸] πάντα	Ἰησοῦς [NA ²⁸]	λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν
Subsequent _c	Prime _d	Subsequent _d

Rheme ₂		
ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλ' ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον	εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφου τετήρηκεν	Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις
Prime _e	Subsequent _e	Prime _f

Rheme ₂	
τὸν ὁμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι	οὗτοι
Subsequent _f	Prime _g

Rheme ₂		
ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μαίνουσιν	κυριότητα	ἀθετοῦσιν
Subsequent _g	Prime _h	Subsequent _h

Rheme ₂	
δόξας	βλασφημοῦσιν
Prime _i	Subsequent _i

Thematic Unit ₃	Theme ₃	Rheme ₃
	Ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος	τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Rheme ₃		
οὐκ	ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας	εἶπεν
Prime _b	Subsequent _b	Prime _c

Rheme ₃	
ἐπιτιμήσαι	σοι κύριος
Prime _d	Subsequent _d

Thematic Unit ₄	Theme ₄	Rheme ₄
	Οὗτοι	ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Rheme ₄		
ὅσα (...) φυσικῶς	ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπίστανται	ἐν τούτοις
Prime _b	Subsequent _b	Prime _c

Rheme ₄		
φθείρονται	οὐαὶ	αὐτοῖς
Subsequent _c	Prime _d	Subsequent _d

Rheme ₄		
τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάϊν	ἐπορεύθησαν	τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ
Prime _e	Subsequent _e	Prime _f

Rheme ₄		
μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν	τῇ ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κόρε	ἀπώλοντο
Subsequent _f	Prime _g	Subsequent _h

Rheme ₄	
Οὗτοί	εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως, ἐαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, νεφέλαι ἄνδρῳ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δις ἀποθανόντα
Prime _i	Subsequent _i

Rheme ₄	
ἐκριζωθέντα, κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἐαυτῶν αἰσχύναις, ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.	
(Subsequent _i)	

Thematic Unit ₅	Rheme ₅		Theme ₅
	Προεφήτευσεν	τούτοις	ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ λέγων
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a	

Rheme ₅		
ἰδοῦ	ἤλθεν	κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς
Prime _b	Prime _c	Subsequent _c

Thematic Unit ₆	Theme ₆	Rheme ₆
	Οὗτοί	εἰσιν γογγυσταὶ μεμψίμοιροι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτῶν πορευόμενοι
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Thematic Unit ₇	Theme ₇	Rheme ₇
	τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν	λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελείας χάριν
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Thematic Unit ₈	Theme ₈	Rheme ₈
	Ἵμεῖς	ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Rheme ₈		
ἔλεγον	ὑμῖν	ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου
Prime _b	Subsequent _b	Prime _c

Rheme ₈		
ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν		
Subsequent _c		

Thematic Unit,	Theme ₉	Rheme ₉
	Οὔτοί	εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες
	Prime _a	Subsequent _a

Thematic Unit ₁₀	Theme ₁₀	Rheme ₁₀
	Ἰμεῖς	ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ προσευχόμενοι
	Prime _a	Subsequent _b

Rheme ₁₀	
ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ τηρήσατε προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον	οὓς (...) [...] διακρινόμενους
(Subsequent _b)	Prime _c

Rheme ₁₀		
[ἐλεᾶτε]	οὓς	σφίζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες
Subsequent _c	Prime _d	Subsequent _d

Rheme ₁₀	
οὓς	ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα
Prime _e	Subsequent _e

Rheme ₁₀	
Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους καὶ στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει, μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν	δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία
Prime _f	

Rheme ₁₀
πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν
Subsequent _r

Topic (Global Theme) and Comment Analysis

Unit Boundaries: Letter Convention

Section	Marker
Letter Opening (vv. 1–2)	Begins with identification of sender and recipient; ends with wish for peace
Letter Body (vv. 3–23)	Begins with address formula (ἀγαπητοί); ends with dramatic shift in person (3rd person plural to 2nd person plural (ὕμεῖς δέ [v. 17, 2]) spike in directive attitude (imperative mood)
Letter Closing (vv. 24–25)	Begins with person shift (2nd plural to 3rd singular); consists of doxology

Generic Analysis

The basic merit of this analysis for the letter is that it allows us to chop off the more formal parts of the letter, meaning we can focus on the body, where the bulk of the meaning is made.

Greeting (1-2)

1 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς· 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

Body (3-23)

3 Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει. ... 22 Καὶ οὐς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, 23 οὐς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὐς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

Closing (24-25)

24 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταιστους καὶ στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλίασει, 25 μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ

κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

Unit Boundaries: Person Reference Chains

There are several participants that are referred in Jude. Below, we have included the primary participants of each person—first, second, and third. Additionally, we have included references to some of the more interesting allusions and prominent personalities. Below, participles and attributive nouns are only included if they serve as explicit metaphors for their particular referents—as in relative clauses or in the case of substantive participles glossed as relative clauses. All in all, the number of references to “certain people” and “you all” makes it readily apparent that these are the two most important participants in the letter. The “certain people” are clearly the most referred to, and after Jude has made all of his points concerning them, he admonishes his audience, “you all,” to respond in a way that honors their commitment to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Jude

1. Ἰούδας (v. 1)
2. person reference (v. 3 ἔσχον)
3. pronominal reference (v. 3 ἡμῶν)
4. pronominal reference (v. 4 ἡμῶν)
5. pronominal reference (v. 4 ἡμῶν)
6. person reference (v. 5 βούλομαι)
7. pronominal reference (v. 17 ἡμῶν)
8. pronominal reference (v. 21 ἡμῶν)
9. pronominal reference (v. 25 ἡμῶν)
10. pronominal reference (v. 25 ἡμῶν)

“Certain People”

1. person reference (v. 4 παρεισέδυσαν)
2. τινες ἄνθρωποι [ἄσεβεῖς] (v. 4)
3. οἱ προγεγραμμένοι (v. 4)
4. μετατιθέντες (v. 4)
5. pronominal reference (v. 8 demPro-οὔτοι)
6. person reference (v. 8 μαιίνουσιν)
7. person reference (v. 8 ἀθετοῦσιν)
8. person reference (v. 8 βλασφημοῦσιν)
9. pronominal reference (v. 10 demPro-οὔτοι)

10. person reference (v. 10 οἶδασιν)
11. person reference (v. 10 βλασφημοῦσιν)
12. person reference (v. 10 ἐπίστανται)
13. person reference (v.10 φθείρονται)
14. pronominal reference (v. 11 demPRO-αὐτοῖς)
15. person reference (v. 11 ἐπορεύθησαν)
16. person reference (v. 11 ἐξεχύθησαν)
17. person reference (v. 11 ἀπώλοντο)
18. pronominal reference (v. 12 demPro-οὗτοι)
19. person reference (v. 12 εἰσιν)
20. σπιδάδες (v. 12)
21. συνευωχούμενοι (v. 12)
22. pronominal reference (v. 12 rflx-PRO ἑαυτοῦς)
23. ποιμαίνοντες (v. 12)
24. νεφέλαι (v. 12)
25. δένδρα (v. 12)
26. κύματα (v. 13)
27. pronominal reference (v. 13 rflxPRO-ἑαυτῶν)
28. ἀστέρες (v. 13)
29. pronominal reference (v. 13 relPRO-οἷς)
30. pronominal reference (v. 14 demPRO-τούτοις)
31. ψυχὴν (v. 15)
32. pronominal reference (v. 15 intnPRO-αὐτῶν)
33. person reference (v. 15 ἠσέβησαν)
34. person reference (v. 15 ἐλάλησαν)
35. ἁμαρτωλοὶ (v. 15)
36. pronominal reference (v. 16 demPro-οὗτοι)
37. person reference (v. 16 εἰσιν)
38. γογγυσταί (v. 16)
39. μεμψίμοιροι (v. 16)
40. pronominal reference (v. 16 rflxPRO-ἑαυτῶν)
41. pronominal reference (v. 16 intnPRO-αὐτῶν)
42. ἐμπαῖκται (v. 18)
43. pronominal reference (v. 18 rflxPRO-ἑαυτῶν)
44. pronominal reference (v. 19 demPro-οὗτοι)
45. person reference (v. 19 εἰσιν)
46. ἀποδιορίζοντες (v. 19)

You/You All

1. pronominal reference (v. 2 ὑμῖν)
2. pronominal reference (v. 3 ὑμῖν)
3. pronominal reference (v. 3 ἡμῶν)
4. pronominal reference (v. 3 ὑμῖν)
5. pronominal reference (v. 4 ἡμῶν)
6. pronominal reference (v. 4 ἡμῶν)
7. pronominal reference (v. 5 ὑμᾶς)
8. pronominal reference (v. 5 ὑμᾶς)
9. pronominal reference (v. 12 ὑμῶν)
10. Ἰμεῖς (v. 17 persPRO)
11. person reference (v. 17 μνήσθητε)
12. pronominal reference (v. 17 ἡμῶν)
13. pronominal reference (v. 18 ὑμῖν)
14. Ἰμεῖς (v. 20 persPRO)
15. pronominal reference (v. 20 rflxPRO-ἐαυτοῦς)
16. pronominal reference (v. 20 ὑμῶν)
17. pronominal reference (v. 21 rflxPRO-ἐαυτοῦς)
18. person reference (v. 21 τηρήσατε)
19. pronominal reference (v. 21 ἡμῶν)
20. person reference (v. 22 ἐλεᾶτε)
21. person reference (v. 23 σώζετε)
22. person reference (v. 23 ἐλεᾶτε)
23. pronominal reference (v. 24 ὑμᾶς)
24. pronominal reference (v. 25 ἡμῶν)
25. pronominal reference (v. 25 ἡμῶν)

Jesus

1. Ἰησοῦ (v. 1)
2. Χριστοῦ (v. 1)
3. Ἰησοῦ (v. 1)
4. Χριστῷ (v. 1)
5. δεσπότην (v. 4)
6. κύριον (v. 4)
7. Ἰησοῦν (v. 4)
8. Χριστόν (v. 4)
9. κύριος (v. 5)
10. σώσας (v. 5)
11. person reference (v. 5 ἀπώλεσεν)

12. person reference (v. 6 τετήρηκεν)
13. κύριος (v. 9)
14. person reference (v. 9 ἐπιτιμήσαι)
15. κύριος (v. 14)
16. κυρίου (v. 17)
17. Ἰησοῦ (v. 17)
18. Χριστοῦ (v. 17)
19. κυρίου (v. 21)
20. Ἰησοῦ (v. 21)
21. Χριστοῦ (v. 21)
22. Ἰησοῦ (v. 25)
23. Χριστοῦ (v. 25)
24. κυρίου (v. 25)

Angels

1. ἀγγέλους (v. 6)
2. τηρήσαντας (v. 6)
3. pronominal reference (v. 6 ἐαυτῶν)
4. ἀπολιπόντας (v. 6)

Sodom and Gomorrah

1. Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα (v. 7)
2. ἐκπορνεύσασαι (v. 7)
3. ἀπελθοῦσαι (v. 7)
4. person reference (v. 7 πρόκεινται)

Michael

1. Μιχαήλ (v. 9)
2. person reference (v. 9 διελέγετο)
3. person reference (v. 9 ἐτόλμησεν)
4. person reference (v. 9 εἶπεν)

Enoch

1. person reference (v. 14 Προεφήτευσεν)
2. Ἐνώχ (v. 14)

Bibliography

- Aune, David E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity 8. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1987.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "The Problem of Speech Genres." In *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 60–102. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966. Reprint, NY: Anchor, 1967.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- deSilva, David A. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2004.
- Dvorak, James D. "The Interpersonal Metaphor in 1 Cor 1–4." Unpublished Ph.D. diss., McMaster Divinity College, 2012.
- _____. "Thematization, Topic, and Information Flow." *Journal of the Linguistics Institute for Ancient and Biblical Greek* 1 (2008): 17–37.
- Eggs, Suzanne. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Eggs, Suzanne, and J. R. Martin. "Genres and Registers of Discourse." In *Discourse as Structure and Process*, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, 230–56. London: Sage, 1997.
- Gabriel, Andrew K. "Letters." In *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 193–95. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Halliday, M. A. K. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Arnold, 1994.
- _____. "Language and Social Man." In *The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday, Vol. 10, Language and Society*, edited by Jonathan J. Webster, 65–130. London: Continuum, 2007.
- _____. *Language as Social Semiotic*. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978.
- _____. "Language in a Social Perspective." In *The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday, Vol. 10, Language and Society*, edited by Jonathan

- J. Webster, 43–64. Edited by Jonathan J. Webster. London: Continuum, 2007.
- _____. “Language Structure and Language Function.” In *The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday, Vol. 1, On Grammar*, edited by Jonathan J. Webster, 173–95. London: Continuum, 2002.
- _____. “Linguistic Function and Literary Style.” In *The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday, Vol. 2, Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*, edited by Jonathan J. Webster, 88–125. London: Continuum, 2002.
- _____. “Text as Semantic Choice in Social Contexts.” In *The Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday, Vol. 2, Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*, edited by Jonathan J. Webster, 23–81. London: Continuum, 2002.
- _____. “Text Semantics and Clause Grammar.” In *The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday, Vol. 1, On Grammar*, edited by Jonathan J. Webster, 219–60. London: Continuum, 2002.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and C. M. I. M. Matthiessen. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold, 2004.
- Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism*. 2nd. ed. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Lemke, J. *Textual Politics*. Abingdon: Taylor and Francis, 1995.
- Martin, J. R. *English Text: System and Structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1992.
- _____. “Mourning: How We Get Aligned.” *Discourse and Society* 15 (2004): 323.
- Martin, J. R., and David Rose. *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum: 2007.
- _____. *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*. London: Equinox, 2008.
- Martin, J. R., and Peter R.R. Martin. *The Language of Evaluation*. New York: Palgrave, 2005.
- O’Donnell, Matthew Brook. “OpenText.org Annotation Model.” No pages. Cited 13 March 2014. Online: <http://www.opentext.org/model/introduction.html>.
- O’Donnell, Matthew Brook, Stanley E. Porter, Jeffrey T. Reed, Robert Picirilli, Catherine J. Smith, and Randall K. Tan. “Clause Level Annotation Specification.” No pages. Cited 14 March 2014. Online: <http://www.opentext.org/model/guidelines/clause/0-2.html>

- Porter, Stanley E. "Linguistic Criticism." In *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 199–202. New York: Continuum, 2007.
- _____. "Pericope Markers and the Paragraph." In *The Impact of Unit Delimitation on Exegesis*, edited by Raymond de Hoop, Marjo C. A. Korpel, and S. E. Porter, 175–95. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "Prominence: An Overview." In *The Linguist as Pedagogue*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, 45–74. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- _____. "The Greek Language of the New Testament." In *A Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 99–130. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Matthew Brook O'Donnell. *Discourse Analysis*. Forthcoming.
- _____, eds. *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. New Testament Monographs 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Tan, Randall. "Prominence in the Pauline Epistles." In *The Linguist as Pedagogue*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, 95–110. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- _____. "Transitivity." No pages. Cited 12 March 2014. Online: <http://www.opentext.org/resources/articles/a6.html>.
- Tate, W. Randolph. "Genre." In *Interpreting the Bible: A Handbook of Terms and Methods*, 149. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Westfall, Cynthia Long. "A Method for the Analysis of Prominence in Hellenistic Greek." In *The Linguist as Pedagogue*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, 75–94. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- Yallop, Colin. "Words and Meaning." In *Lexicology*, edited by M.A.K. Halliday and Colin Yallop, 23–93. 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 2007.