

Bibliography:

Dana, H.E. and Mantey, Julius R, [1968] *A Manual Grammar of the Greeek New Testament*, New York Macmillan
 Dooley, Robert A., and Levinsohn, Stephen H. [2001], *Analyzing Discourse: A manual in Basic Concepts*, SIL Dallas
 Longacre, Robert E., [1985], *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentiential Form*, Karoma Ann Arbor Michigan
 Runge, Steven E., [2010], *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, Hendrickson Publishers
 Wallace, Daniel B., [1999] *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics; An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Zondervan

Abbreviations:

DSA^{ubs4} = Discourse Segmentation Apparatus of UBS4¹⁹⁹⁴
 UBS4¹⁹⁹⁴ = Greek Text of the United Bible Societies, 4th Edition 1994
 NA²⁷ = Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland, 27th edition

db: *It is helpful to recognise that translation is often a very limited tool. For there are often subtleties in the language being translated which it is not possible to register in the target language. We can often see wonderful implications in the way the translated language expresses things, and yet find that a translation is not enough to convey them.*

To be not limited to simply making a translation, but to be able to expound further on the text and give a thorough exegesis of what is written is a very helpful way to make known to your audience - or readers by footnote - what it is that can be seen in the subtleties of the original language.

This is what informs our teaching, our preaching, and our exposition - whether written or oral - so as to make it very rich. This is very much the case in moving from Greek to modern English. See Runge [2010] p.19

Part 1 - Foundations -

1 - Introduction

Runge begins by making clear that discourse grammar concerns itself with the functions of a language. It is concerned with discovering - and so describing - what linguistic structures are used for; what functions do they perform and what are the conditions for their use.

We should not give up in trying to describe the systems of language, even if they seem messy. It may simply be that we do not have adequate descriptive tools to state what they are and what they are doing. So we must be prepared for new descriptive ways to emerge.

Runge points out that the typical grammatical descriptions eg. 'historical present' point up for us how the Greek differs from the English usage, but that they don't show us something about Greek as Greek. They often do not tell us why a Greek writer -as a writer of Greek - would use that form of construction. It is also true that when we have some sense of why a Greek writer would write that way, grammatically speaking, then we have some understanding of his choice to actually do so.

So, discourse grammar complements the formal approaches to grammar; it does not replace them. So we don't ignore, in trying to analyse the constructions, what is really a proper syntax that accounts for the construction. Discourse grammar uses a unified approach to text, perhaps more so than many grammars.

Runge presupposes three matters:

- [a] Choice implies meaning
- [b] Semantic [or inherent] meaning should be differentiated from the pragmatic effect.
- [c] Default patterns of usage should be distinguished from marked patterns [ones that are not default]

db: *Learning basic grammar involves us in an attitude to text where we see ourselves as people learning the 'code' of the new language. We are unscrambling it so that we can comprehend its patterns - some regular, some less so - and this is what opens its meaning to us as a coded message. What I think we should notice here is that as we move from this early move of 'breaking of a code' is that we then take a step to understand what is being said. And to some extent we can do that, for a de-coded message starts to reveal its meaning.*

And when we come to consider that meaning, we are starting to draw on our knowledge of how language is written by a writer, before it is read by a reader. And that requires us to have a knowledge of how Greek is written. What are it's ways of stating a nuance and style and ways of breaking up the narrative of a story.

Early basic grammars, not so much the modern American ones, had many exercises in writing Greek as they had in reading it. And it is true that we learn to write well, by reading people who do that. So that whether we are a reader or a writer is not a fixed static thing - we are always doing both; and both actions inform our reading of others thoughts and, at the same time, inform our own writing of how we shall say best what we want to say.

Runge is worth studying, and studying early, because he is teaching us to observe how the different writers of the NT actually present what they want ot state. And it is not so much a revelation of each personal style, although that will

GNT2: Module 1 - Discourse Grammar



1 - Connecting propositions together

be evident as well, after a lot of text has been handled. It is rather that he is teaching us to see what are the basic elements of style in Greek NT writers. This is the use of this study in moving from de-coding to understanding what the code reveals. It is an ideal bridge into reading the text because it leads us to consider - by teaching us how to recognise - the markers that reveal the writer's intentions. As readers we are well served.

db: At the early, basic code-breaking stage of our learning of a language, our focus is upon the word and the sentence. This is particularly true of the exercises we have been doing in Mounce. It is only occasionally that we focus upon the paragraph. Indeed, the weakness of the focus on the disconnected examples we have had to consider is costly to us, even if necessary to be taught by focussing on one thing at a time.

Moving to an intermediate stage requires us to, amongst other things, focus on the paragraph as the basic sense unit. But this also draws to go further to focus on a series of paragraphs as we see the form of a narrative develop. This leads us into considering the way of the story teller, if it is narrative, or an argument of the writer of letters.

[1] Choice implies Meaning

We make choices when we communicate. We prioritize and order events, we lay out ways that represent what we want to say. As speakers of language we choose best what fits the context that we are in.

The same is true for the writers of the New Testament. If they have chosen to use a participle and not an indicative or another finite verb form, then this means that there is some meaning in the choice. Defining the meaning from looking at the choices the writer makes is different from determining an appropriate translation. It requires us to understand what the difference is in using the participial form that would have not been accomplished by using another form.

If we wish to tell a story then we have some tasks before we get under way:

- [a] we need to introduce the characters in the story
- [b] we need to set the story in a location, a time and tell of the situation

[c] there may be some background information we shall need to include to account for our readers ignorance of a matter.

Once the story begins then these things need to be attended to:

- [a] who is doing what to whom
- [b] when time and place changes we need to indicate that
- [c] decide what information is needed to present and how to bundle it together
- [d] as the climax approaches how shall we single that

[2] Semantic Meaning versus Pragmatic Effect

Runge uses examples to show that the simple semantic meaning - what the words say, and usually mean - can be quite changed when they are used in a particular context. He uses egs. of "your kids" as a way of distancing; the use of a statement of being in the progressive form; and the way a joke often turns around the simplest recitation of facts, albeit in the wrong setting.

He gives an example of the use of the "historic present" in the NT. The semantic meaning of the progressive, on going continuous action is clear. But Mark and John often use this form to signal past action in the narrative. Runge shows that it is odd, it stands out, because the expected pattern of usage is broken. It is the breaking of an established pattern of usage for a practical effect.

What is the effect of this? Runge says that it is forward-pointing, it draws attention to the speech or the event that follows. So, while the present tense does not have the inherent semantic meaning of 'highlighting', the historic present can be used in that way by breaking up the expected pattern of usage.

So, using a grammatical construction like this in a wrong, or unexpected way, can have the practical effect on the narrative or discourse that follows it.

[3] Default versus Marked Framework

Obviously, if we are to notice and highlight "markers" that are used, there must be basic set, or default position. It is the usage of the language which normally pertains, when no extra distinctions or nuances are being expressed. This default setting, as it were, sets the background against which the contrast of the 'markers' are noticed, so as to stand out. As we saw above the normal use of the present tense makes for a use by the writer of the historic present to be shown up.

Selecting those small words that act as conjunctions are as connectives in some way, Runge gives an example of how the traditional grammarian, in this case Wallace, might list their meanings. He has drawn his information from Wallace [1999] p.761.

Runge, concentrating on *καί* and *δέ*, indicates how many times they are listed together. This gives us a direction to consider for the semantic meaning of each, but does not give us much help in differentiating the distinctive functions of *καί* and *δέ*.

[4] Prominence and Contrast

[i] Prominence

Every story has prominent persons or features which the writer wants us to see. He directs his attention to these by the use of the 'markers'. We may say that, like a photographer, an author frames his subject, pays attention to the foreground and the background. He has a point of view from where he sits to take the picture. All these are conscious choices about the presentation of the picture he sets before us.

[ii] Contrast

The NT writers use different markers to communicate prominence and to bring something into contrast with something else.

Runge quotes Longacre [1985]p. 83, "Discourse without prominence would be like pointing to a piece of black cardboard and insisting that it was a picture of black camels crossing black sands at midnight".

Because humans are used to established patterns, breaking the pattern can make things stand out. This is used by writers, musicians, and, really everyone. His point is that we constantly make choice about what we communicate and therefore, how.

2 - Connecting Propositions

Runge distinguishes between a 'connective' and a 'conjunction' for the purposes of this next move.

This is because a language commonly connects ideas or [prose together by the use of other forms than simply conjunctions. Runge wants to call these functionalities simply "connectives". They include such things as adverbs and other grammatical forms.

In moving between Greek and English we need to understand that English usually joins its clauses without any explicit indicator being used at all- this is called asyndeton. Whereas Greek uses a wide range of joiners such as *καί*, *δέ*, *ἀλλά*, *γάρ*, *οὖν*, *δή*, and others. These connectives indicate how the writer wants us to understand how one clause relates to the other. Indeed, if each connective relates the connected elements in a unique way, it can even be complicated further when more than one, or a string of them, are used. eg Phil 3.8 [*ἀλλά μενοῦνγε καί...*].

Runge introduces us to Behaghel's Law via a quotation from Dooley & Levinsohn [2001] p.15.

"items that belong together mentally are grouped together syntactically".

The implication of this is that it helps us to understand a writer's default expectation when seeing adjacent elements. They share a conceptual relationship of *some kind*. [emphasis his].

[1] Asyndeton

This expression is used when clauses are linked without the use of a connective. In English, this is the default way of writing. It is the option we choose when we do not have a specific relation to indicate between adjacent clauses. That may be because there is none to specify or, asyndeton may be a writer's choice when he does not wish to specify any relationship between clauses.

In Koine Greek, asyndeton is the default means of connecting clauses in the:

[a] Epistles

[b] in speeches that are reported within narrative.

It is also used in the narrative of John's Gospel ie, it is the most basic - the unmarked option - not necessarily the most common.

db: Throughout his book, Runge has many examples taken from the LEB the Lexham English Bible. We shall work over these in our seminars. The number assigned to each example is his number in the book. I have kept these to facilitate reference to his work. Here we look at his:

Example 3 from **John 1.1-8**

Example 4 from **Matthew 6.24-26**.

The LEB is a product of Logos Software and is published along with the Society for Biblical Literature [SBL]. If you want to have a look at it consult this address <http://sblgnt.com/download/revint/01-Front%20Matter.pdf>. Selections from the NT are available as a pdf.

If the use of asyndeton means that the writer chose not to make a connection explicit for us, then we may say that the relation can be gleaned from the context.

GNT2: Module 1 - Discourse Grammar

1 - Connecting propositions together



Runge quotes Levinsohn to the effect that since it is the fact that connectives imply an explicit relationship, then their absence was a choice to not strengthen, associate, develop or infer anything between the clauses.

[2] καί

Runge indicates that a serious mismatch occurs when we come to render καί into English. Mostly, in our former instruction, we have been asked to think of two primary ideas

[a] connective, in the sense of “and” or

[b] adversative, in the sense of “but”.

Runge thinks of καί as a co-ordinating conjunction that links items of equal status. It does not mark a distinction of semantic continuity or discontinuity, it simply connects two items so that they are closely related to each other. This relationship between two items of equal status where καί is used implies something a little tighter than asyndeton. What is represented here by καί is the writer's choice to put them together.

db: In looking at the

Example 5: James 1.21-24 we see in this selection examples of καί being used as a co-ordinating conjunction, joining together individual words, phrases, clauses or paragraphs.

Example 6: 1 Thessalonians 2.18 the two clauses are contrastive in content, but they are simply linked here together. Here we learn that the discourse analysis is not teaching us about the content of the adversative contrast, rather it is using καί as a way to put them together for us, the readers.

Presenting the ‘development’ of a discourse or narrative.

When a writer presents to us his thoughts in an organised manner, he may choose a way to do this according to simple sequence of his narrative where ‘this follows that’. Indeed, as the narrative flows on we can recognise a great difference between a simple running assembly of things that happen in a simple chronological order, as distinct from a way the narrative is broken up into chunk, according to the way the author wants us to think of them.

This “chunking” - breaking up a narrative or discourse into pieces - of a piece of writing indicates that writers have a lot of latitude as to how they will develop the discourse they are presenting to the reader. Writers do this chunking to help the reader process what they are reading. Indeed, the ‘development’ of the written piece is the writer imposing upon the reader a way to organise in their mind what they are reading.

These thematic breaks which make up the chunks of the narrative, can indicate natural discontinuities such as a change of time, place, participant, topic or kind of action.

[3] δέ as a development marker

Whereas καί has nothing to indicate concerning development, δέ breaks the discourse into chunks for easier processing by the reader. δε indicates that some development of is being signalled. The writer is stating that a new development is taking place in the story or argument and this from the point of view of the writer. καί instructs you, as a reader, to group or connect things together; δέ while it coordinates like καί, also instructs you to move on and see the development that follows.

db: In looking at the following examples we see how the difference between these two words καί and δέ can give us a fresh appreciation of what the writer intended when he wrote.

Example 9: Matthew 2.1-10 where we see the narrative concerning the visit of the Magi arranged into 6 developments. It is instructive to look at other EV's to see whether these have been expressed in the translation. It is also helpful to look at the DSA^{ubs4} and notice the way they have recorded the differences here in the various Versions.

Example 10: Matthew 14.22-27 //Mark 6.45-50 illustrates how Matthew segments the text in a way that marks for us what he considers to be developments in the narrative. We can also draw a number of inferences here:

[a] Since Mark does not indicate development in so many places, we can assume that his presentation is connected but not particularly broken up for the reader.

[b] This would imply that where he does express segmentation, then he has something really important to indicate by the use of it.

Example 11: **1 Corinthians 12.3b-7** marks a different usage between **καί** and **δέ** in the way the argument is presented to us by Paul. Notice also the variations in the translations of the **δέ** passages, how the translators have to choose quite a different way to express what they think is happening, driven by the development in the argument.

[4] τότε as a temporal development marker [narrative τότε]

We have already seen that **δέ**, when it is used expresses a development. The use of adverbs of time as development that expresses a sequence is also clear. **τότε** [then] is a good example.

Narrative must show sequence [‘contingent temporal succession’] and also who is doing the action [agent orientation]. Every reader expects these distinctions in what is read, and so has a default expectation that [a] one event will follow the other sequentially and [b] there is a consistent passing of time as these events unfold.

This is the case unless the author indicates otherwise. He may interrupt the sequence with a flashback such as “before these things happened” or he may indicate a passage of time “ten years later” to show that a much longer period has elapsed than the reader may assume.

Both **δέ** and **τότε** mark new developments. Based on the understanding of default versus marked, then we should think of **δέ** as the default marker of development and **τότε** as the sort of development that is temporal in nature.

db: We now consider some examples that make a distinction between the use of **τότε** as a paragraph marker and then its use before a speech which is a response to a speech.

[1] **τότε** as a simple paragraph marker

Example 12: **Matthew 18.2**

[2] **τότε** in the middle of a paragraph before a speech.

Example 14: **Matthew 17.10-13**

Up to this point we have looked at the two connectives [asyndeton and **καί**] and the two development markers [**δέ** and **τότε**]. Runge introduces in his book [p.42] a little chart that helps us to see in overview the functional differences that we have been considering.

	<i>Continuity</i>	<i>Development</i>	<i>Semantic Constraint</i>
<i>Asyndeton</i>			
καί	+		
δέ		+	
τότε		+	<i>Temporal</i>

[5] οὖν

There are two uses that traditional grammarians give to **οὖν**, they are:

[1] As an ‘inferential’ connective showing that what it is introducing [going forward in our reading] is the result of or an inference from what has gone before. So, like **καί** and **δέ**, **οὖν** is pointing backwards to something preceding it, and then introduces a new movement in the light of that antecedent. This is very much its use in the letters of the NT, where often an argument is put forward and is being developed. It is often rendered “therefore”.

[2] As a marker of continuation in narrative, where it is often rendered “so”, “now” or “then”.

[3] As a marker for the resumption of a discourse that has been interrupted. Where the narrative flow has been interrupted. This is different from **δέ**, which does permit a change of topic, but indicates a new line of development. Whereas **οὖν** constrains what follows as a further development of the topic that has been resumed.

οὖν has a certain close continuity with what precedes and yet also takes us forward to a new development. It is often found in what Runge calls “high-level boundaries in discourse” where the “next major topic is drawn from and builds upon what precedes” [p.43].

GNT2: Module 1 - Discourse Grammar

1 - Connecting propositions together



db: As an example of what he means as a high-level discourse boundary Runge takes us straight to the section in Romans where Paul is moving from those matters he has been asserting concerning our belief in the resurrected Jesus to the corollary of these matters.

Example 17: **Romans 4.23-5.1.**

As a "lower-level" example He uses:

Example 18: **Matthew 3.7-8**

[3] As a marker for the resumption of a discourse that has been interrupted Runge directs us to the

Example 19: **Matthew 27.14-17.** Here we see that, in the account of Jesus' trial, background information has been supplied by the use of imperfect and pluperfect indicative verbs [verses 15 and 16] - with their imperfective aspect, consistent with "offline" material - both introduced by the development marker **δέ**. This background material does not take the plot forward, it fills out the background before the movement of the narrative is taken forward at verse 17, introduced by **οὖν**.

We should note that there is a difference in the way that John uses **οὖν**. He uses it to mark a new development in much the same way as Mark and Matthew use **δέ**. So we might say that **οὖν** is used in the same way that it is in the letters.

[6] διὰ τοῦτο

While this expression **διὰ τοῦτο** is not a conjunction by its morphology, yet it does function as a connective. It functions in a way as to show how the following clause will be related to the one that preceded. The preposition **διὰ** usually tells us the reason as to why something happens, results or exists. So we often translate it as 'because of, for the sake of'.

So whenever there is a clause introduced by **διὰ τοῦτο** then we are invited to see that "because of this" something which follows had a cause. It is similar to **οὖν**, in that it expresses development and also continuity, but **διὰ τοῦτο** has a narrower semantic constraint than **οὖν** does.

This comparison between **οὖν** and **διὰ τοῦτο**, with the narrower constraint being found in **διὰ τοῦτο** mirrors the relation between **δέ** and **τότε** where the **τότε** has a narrower temporal constraint.

διὰ τοῦτο is often found in the Gospels where it introduces an important proposition.

It does not always function as a connective. In the absence of a coordinating conjunction when it does function as a connective it marks both continuity and development, as well as a causal constraint.

db: We see the example of this use of **διὰ τοῦτο** in the parable of the rich fool.

Example 21: **Luke 12.22.** Here the **διὰ τοῦτο**, coming at the end of the parable, introduces the teaching of Jesus upon anxiety. It hinges together the two pericopes, yet taking us forward to a new element in the discourse. See also the // subject in Matthew 6.25.

Example 22: **Ephesians 5.15-17** makes for a wonderful eg. of the use of **οὖν** and **διὰ τοῦτο**.

Our table can now be expressed as:

	Continuity	Development	Semantic Constraint
Asyndeton			
καί	+		
δέ		+	
τότε		+	Temporal
οὖν	+	+	
διὰ τοῦτο	+	+	Causal

And with this table we complete the connectives

[6] γάρ

Both Wallace and Young think of this as a subordinating and co-ordinating conjunction. It is used, not as a development of the narrative or discourse, but provides background information that strengthens

καί
δέ
τότε
οὖν
διὰ τοῦτο
γάρ
μέν
ἀλλά
DSA^{ubs4}
UBS4¹⁹⁹⁴
NA²⁷

GNT2: Module 1 - Discourse Grammar

1 - Connecting propositions together

or supports what precedes.

Like **καί** , **οὖν** and **διὰ τοῦτο**, **γάρ** marks a close continuity with what precedes. But it is different from **οὖν** and **διὰ τοῦτο** in that it does not mark development in the discourse. It takes us sort of 'off-line' to introduce strengthening or supporting information that applies to what has preceded it.

It is not used a lot in narrative proper [only 10% of the NT]; whereas in the letters, and the in particular, Romans and Hebrews, 1 & 2 Corinthians and Galatians account for the other 90%.

db: Runge notes that where the expression **γάρ** is used in narrative, in 6 of the 33 narrative occurrences in Mark, **γάρ** introduces verbs of speaking, describing what people were saying in response to or to precipitate the preceding action.

Example 23: **Matthew 10.19-20.**

Example 24: **Galatians 5.13-14**

[7] **μέν**

This connective will be dealt with later as a forward pointing correlation usually used with **δέ**.

[8] **ἀλλά**

This connective will be dealt with later also under the point/counterpoint setting.

Our Table now is like this:

	<i>Continuity</i>	<i>Development</i>	<i>Correlation</i>	<i>Forward pointing</i>	<i>Semantic Constraint</i>
<i>Asyndeton</i>					
καί	+				
δέ		+			
τότε		+			<i>Temporal</i>
οὖν	+	+			
διὰ τοῦτο	+	+			<i>Causal</i>
γάρ	+				<i>Support</i>
μέν	+		+	+	<i>Expectation</i>
ἀλλά			+		<i>Correction</i>