GNT2: Module 1 - Discourse Grammar
3 - Point/Counterpoint Sets

Bibliography:
Dana, H.E. and Mantey, Julius R, [1968] *A Manual Grammar of the Greeek New Testament*, New York Macmillan
Denniston, John Dewar, *The Greek Particles* 2nd Edition Indianapolis, Hackett 1996
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 Arbour 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 Synatax of the New Testament*, Zondervan

Abbreviations:
DSA^{ubs4} = Discourse Segmentation Apparatus of UBS4 ^{1994}
UBS4^{1994} = Greek Text of the United Bible Societies, 4th Edition 1994
NA^{27} = Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland, 27th edition

1 - Introductory idea

Runge revises for us what it is that Behaghel's Law which states, that the default expectation is that adjacent clauses are assumed to have some kind of relation to one another. He gives us three pairs of clauses to consider:

A I liked the introduction. The conclusion was very poor.
B I liked the introduction, but the conclusion was very poor.
C Although I liked the introduction, the conclusion was very poor.

He comments that in A, there are just two clauses laid side by side with asyndeton. There are no markers which constrain the relation of the one to the other. In B, with the introduction of the "but" we have a typical relation we might call contrastive. In C, the use of "although" indicates that there is something coming and that it is probably going to be contrastive in nature. The "but" of B, states the contrast OK, and yet "although" of C indicates that there is a contrast is coming and it is signalled from the beginning.

When we are considering point/counterpoint sets, we mean clauses or clause elements that are related to one another through one of more grammatical means:

[a] the prospective use of μέν to indicate that some related point will follow
[b] the use of an interrogative or negated clause that is restricted by using εἰ μή or πλήν
[c] the use of ἀλλά to correct or replace something in the preceding context.

2 - The use of μέν – anticipation of a related sentence that follows

Runge quotes Denniston as giving three different senses for μέν: emphatic, adversative and preparatory. Runge thinks that this is not the semantic meaning of the particle. Rather, the particle is best understood as unmarked for contrast. Instead, it is anticipatory in nature, creating the expectation that another related point will follow.

db: *Notice that the issue here is that Denniston is giving what he calls the "senses" of the particle. This is an attempt to state meaning in the sense of the translated meaning. Whereas Runge - and the discourse analysis enterprise - is always asking another question, which is "what is the mind of the writer in using this particle and with what effect is it used?" This type of question marks the different interests of the enterprise we are attempting to understand.*

We are being presented with a new set of questions. And because that is the case the constant comparison with the traditional grammarians often leads to a disconnect. But it is only apparent. We can learn much from the approach we are studying which will eventually bring us to understand what it is that we are reading.

The most common usage associated with μέν is to correlate a clause with one that follows introduced by δέ and ἀλλά. [Remember that both μέν and δέ are post-positive particles; not occurring first in the clause].

Runge indicates that he holds to the use of μέν as the anticipation of a related sentence that follows. He intends to present to us some fairly obvious usage of μέν/δέ sets. Then, he will present to us some examples of which are non-typical, and which have led others to suggest that these are non-prospective.

db: *The most common usage of μέν/δέ sets is in narrative or the letters of the NT.*
Example 34: ***Matthew 3.1***
Both the contrast and the connection are present without the μέν, these qualities are inherent in the content. COntrast is not a semantic quality of the μέν, but it serves to highlight what is already there.

Example 35: ***Mark 14.3b***

Example 36: ***Luke 23.41*** *The particle καί links verse 41 to the previous context. The μέν creates the expectation that another related element will follow. The criminal's justification of the punishment is not the main point of the discussion,*

but is the foil for what follows.

Example 37: ***Hebrews 9.1-11*** *[especially verse 1 and then 11 and 12] - be good to read his full discussion of this passage.*

Now for some non-typical examples;

Example 38: ***Acts 2.41-42***

Example 39: ***2 Corinthians 11.4***

Example 40: ***Colossians 2.23***

3 - The use of negation followed by an excepted/restricted element

First an example which contains a negated clause followed by an exception.

db: *Example 41:* ***Matthew 12.24***

Here we see that the negated clause is not of itself stating something that is entirely true with out the inclusion of the exception that follows. It would have been easier to simply state, "This one casts out demons by Beelzebul, the ruler of demons." That states what the content is.

However, the use of the negative plus the exception/restriction shows that the leaders want to assert more than just comment upon the source of his power, they want to highlight this matter. This they do with rhetorical impact.

They first make a sweeping negative statement which is not actually true- because he has been casting out demons. Then they make the exception for impact.

Runge tells us that the process is analagous to having a table full of items, sweeping them all to the floor and then replacing the one item that you are interested in back on the table all by itself. He notes that you could have simply said "this is the one I am interested in". But to sweep them all away has great dramatic effect.

Conventional explanations are offered by the grammars, which note the use of οὐκ...εἰ μή as it is found in the Synoptics.

Runge offers the discourse analysis explanation of what is happening by first stating that there are two distinct functions of exceptive/restrictive clauses in the NT:

[1] Where the exceptive/restrictive clause precedes the main clause ie. it is in the protasis. Here it functions as a specific 'frame of reference' for the clause that follows. He gives as examples Matthew 24.22; Mark 8;14, 13.20; John 9.33, 15.22; 18.30 Romans 9.29; and 1 Corinthians 7.17.

[2] Where the exceptive/restrictive clause follows the main clause ie. it is in the apodosis and is preceded by either a negated main clause or an interrogative clause, the exceptive clause then receives emphasis with respect the main clause. This is so because of the counterpoint/point relation with the negated clause; or by supplying the answer to the rhetorical question posed by the interrogative pronoun in the main clause. Egs would include Luke 5.21, Romans 11.15; 1 Corinthians 2.11, 2 Corinthians 2.2; Ephesians 4.9; Hebrews 3.18; 1 John 2.22,25] The few exceptions to this last point are Acts 26.32, 1 Coritnthians 14.5 and 15.2.

We note that English can make use of the same device. So this rhetorical exceptive/restrictive technique can go before an English audience pretty much as you read it in Greek.

db: *We have been looking at the examples [1] where* ***the entire clause is negated and then excepted.***

Here is another Example 42: ***Mark 6.4-5*** *- Notice here that the statements are essentially incomplete until you read the apodoses, then they are accurate.*

Example 43: ***1 Corinthians 7.5*** *- Here Paul is quite able to make a statement "You may deprive each other by agreement for a time" but he does so in a negative way by providing for a narrow loophole in the general statement that sexual relations in married lives are generally an obligation.*

Example 44: ***2 Timothy 2.5*** *- The content is that 'the crowned one must compete lawfully'. This makes the point in a powerfully rhetorical way.*

Example 45: ***Romans 7.7*** *- Similar to Example 37, the point/counterpoint set is embedded in another. Here, the higher level counterpoint is replaced by the complex point introduced by ἀλλά . The point is not that Paul did not know sin, he did. But here he is making known that the purpose and value of law is making sin known to the*

sinner.

*Now we turn to some examples [2] where **only one element of the clause is negated through the use of a negative pronoun.***

*Example 46: **Mark 2.29** - Uses the rhetorical device of making clear that prayer is the one way this demon may be driven out.*

*Example 47: **Matthew 24.36** - where the negative pronoun excludes everyone, and then the exception is made of the Father.*

*Example 48: **Mark 2.7and 1 John 2.22; 5.5** - here the interrogative pronoun "Who" creates a list of potential person who can forgive sins - the implication is that no one can do this; but there is an exception.*

4 - The use ἀλλά of to correct or replace

ἀλλά is usually referred to as an adversative co-ordinating conjunction; it is similar with πλήν which is normally seen as the stronger of the two.

The discourse analysis perception is that ἀλλά is a global marker of contrast, and that it introduces a correction of the expectation created by the first conjunct; an incorrect expectation is cancelled and a proper expectation is put in its place.

Although there are other contrastive and adversative particles, ἀλλά has the unique constraint that it corrects some aspect of what precedes. Runge goes on to make the clear distinction between εἰ μή and ἀλλα: he says that,

"the key is the relation of what follows the particle to what precedes. In the case of εἰ μή, the excepted element that replaces what precedes was a potential member of the negated set. In the case of the ἀλλά, the correcting member was not a member of the original set; it is a new element."

***db:** Examples of ἀλλα where **it is used to create a correlation with a preceding clause or proposition.** In each case the clause element introduced by ἀλλά either replaces or corrects some aspect of what precedes.*

*Example 49: **Matthew 4.4** and Example 50: **Matthew 10.19-20***

*We are taken to a complex section in Example 57: **Philippians 3.7-9***

[1] 4b-6 describe Paul's reason for potentially boasting. These serve as a counterpoint for the ἀλλά introduced at verse 7.

[2] verse 8 contains another ἀλλά, which has the same constraint, it corrects what has preceded. Since there are back-to-back ἀλλά, the οὖν instructs the reader to view verse 8 as an inferential development of verse 7.

Verse 8 has three links;

[a] one backward pointing inferential one, οὖν

[b] one backward pointing thematic addition γέ καί

[c] one forward pointing counterpoint relation μέν