The Convergence of Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Criticism in Luke 3-5

Timothy J Nicholls, MA, MAR

Supervised by: Dr Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, Dr Catrin Williams

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Wales Trinity Saint David

2019

ABSTRACT

Among many recent methods within New Testament studies, two approaches, rhetorical criticism and discourse analysis, offer distinct interpretive methods. Both approaches are predicated on a close analysis of the Greek text, each one claiming to make a significant, even essential, contribution to elucidating the writer's intended meaning. However, both approaches differ in orientation and may be perceived as offering differing interpretive outcomes, thereby encouraging the notion that they are theoretically and practically incongruent.

Such a posture is assisted by the notion that these two approaches are exclusively focused upon isolated elements in communicative meaning, with discourse analysis grounded in text-linguistics, and rhetorical criticism directed toward persuasive intent through shared literary conventions. Few attempts have been made to appropriate select components of both methods to combine them for practical exegesis. Therefore, this project seeks to address these deficiencies by considering the extent to which discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism may converge in identifying textual meaning of select narratives of the New Testament. To assess the feasibility of such congruence, this project explores mutual relationships in a portion of New Testament Greek texts—a continuous passage in Luke's Gospel.

Chapter I investigates general approaches within each method and presents shared communicative features that may display congruence. Chapter II expands upon the relevance of systemic functional linguistics as an approach within discourse analysis while Chapter III provides specific details related to rhetorical criticism, involving classical rhetoric as found in Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata*. Chapters IV and V offers practical exegesis of twelve consecutive scenes within Luke's Gospel to determine to what extent congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism may be possible. Finally, Chapter VI compares the results of this exegesis alongside three representative commentaries, elucidating potential and practical outcomes of this project for New Testament Gospel studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Among many recent interpretation methods for New Testament studies, the approaches of rhetorical criticism and discourse analysis offer the exegete distinct contributions toward discovery of textual meaning. Both approaches are predicated on a close analysis of the Greek text, each one claiming to make a significant, even essential, contribution to elucidating the writer's intended meaning. Although both approaches offer specific emphases and methodological criteria, they differ in orientation and may be perceived as offering divergent interpretive outcomes, thereby signifying the notion that they are theoretically and practically incongruent.

Such a posture is assisted by the notion that these two approaches are exclusively focused upon isolated elements in communicative meaning, with discourse analysis grounded in text-linguistics, and rhetorical criticism directed toward persuasive intent through shared literary conventions. Whereas rhetorical criticism is an ancient literary discipline concerned with a writing's purpose and its use of literary conventions to achieve it, discourse analysis has emerged only within the last 50 years as a linguistic discipline focused on the intricacies of a writer's language. Classical applications of these approaches may at first glance appear unsuited for independently negotiating New Testament texts. However, few attempts have been made to appropriate select components of both methods to combine them for practical exegesis. Some scattered attempts are available among New Testament letters, but few, if any, specifically devoted to New Testament narrations.[1] Therefore, this project addresses these deficiencies by considering the usefulness of both methods, specifically the extent to which discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism may converge in identifying textual meaning of select narratives of the New Testament. To assess the feasibility of such congruence, this

---

[1] George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (University of North Carolina Press, 1984). *Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane Watson (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991). Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser*, Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994). "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* ed. David P. Moessner (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press: 1999), 63-83. Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman Pub., 2001). Mikael C. Parsons, "Luke and the Progymnasmata: A Preliminary Investigation into the Preliminary Exercises" in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, eds. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 43-63. Ben Witherington III, *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament,* Eugene Oregon: Cascade Books, 2009. Vernon K. Robbins, *Sea Voyages and Beyond: Emerging Strategies in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Winona Lake, IN: Deo Publishing., Eisenbrauns, 2010).

project explores mutual relationships between rhetorical criticism and discourse analysis in a portion of New Testament Greek texts—a continuous passage in Luke's Gospel. This project does not purport to be an exhaustive methodological approach to the entire Gospel. Rather, it pursues only the potential interpretive benefits of possibly congruent elements of the two textual interpretation approaches.

The Greek text of the passage examined from Luke's Gospel for this project will be taken from the current edition of the Greek New Testament—the Nestle-Aland 28th edition.[2] Where relevant, the use of the Septuagint follows the Rahlfs-Hanhart edition and is referenced as LXX throughout this project.[3] The choice of an edited text for the Greek New Testament is essentially a practical one as it is the text commonly in use among biblical scholars and, in one edition or another, forms the basis of most commentaries on Luke's Gospel. However, eliciting principles of interpretation from an eclectic text compiled from a selection of manuscripts has an important drawback; namely, that editors making decisions about the best reading of a biblical text have applied neither rhetorical criticism nor discourse analysis criteria. Instead, they have worked with the more familiar criteria of traditional linguistics and broad considerations of stylistic and theological consistency.[4] Although variant readings among the many manuscripts of Luke's Gospel may be of potential significance for the current investigation, fully accounting for them is a major undertaking beyond the scope of an initial exploration of applying the criteria of rhetorical criticism and discourse analysis. Therefore, as a representative indication of the potential relevance of the two exegesis methods, preliminary attention will be drawn to one key manuscript that frequently differs with the N-A[28] edition, namely Codex Bezae.[5] The example will serve to illustrate differences that may arise in the results of an analysis of a text other than that of N-A[28].

---

[2] Nestle-Aland eds., *Novum Testamentus Graece*, 28th rev. ed. (Stuttgart Germany: German Bible Society, 2012).

[3] Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta,* 2nd rev. ed., edited by Robert Hanhart (Deutsche Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

[4] N-A[28], Introduction, p. 54*. A reading of the commentary on the Nestle-Aland edition by Bruce Metzger, a member of the committee for the 27th edition (1994), shows that features of rhetorical criticism and discourse analysis are rarely, if ever, taken into account. Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart Germany: United Bible Societies, 1994). The text of the 28th edition varies only slightly from that of the 27th edition and there is no reason to note any change in this respect.

[5] The edition of F. H. Scrivener, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, reproduced* (Pickwick Press, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1978, orig. 1864) will be referenced.

To investigate whether the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism in Luke's Gospel is feasible and offers practical benefits, this project will proceed in the following manner. Chapter I will investigate general approaches within each method, explicating the reasons that incongruence is commonly perceived, and presenting theoretically shared communicative features that may display congruence. Chapter II will expand upon the relevance of systemic functional linguistics as an approach within discourse analysis and, specifically, Halliday's discourse analysis of the practical exegesis of Luke's Gospel. Chapter III will provide specific details related to rhetorical criticism, involving classical rhetoric as found in ancient rhetorical handbooks, namely Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata*. Chapters IV and V will provide practical exegesis of twelve consecutive scenes within Luke's Gospel to determine to what extent specific congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism may be possible. Finally, Chapter VI will compare the results of such Lukan exegesis alongside three representative commentaries, elucidating potential and practical outcomes of this project, and also considering future prospects related to Gospel studies and the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism.

CHAPTER ONE:
PRESENTATION OF METHODOLOGY AND
THEORETICAL CONGRUENCE OF RHETORICAL CRITICISM
AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

1.1 Methodological Deficiency and Proposal for Congruence

A general deficiency in current interpretation methodologies for New Testament narrative studies is evident, particularly in Luke's Gospel, for several reasons. First, the profusion of interpretive approaches fosters methodological isolationism.[6] Utilizing an interpretive method in a responsible manner, particularly in academic praxis, entails that one is proficient in that method.[7] Few exegetes, however, have the time or resources to excel in more than one interpretive approach, thus limiting the textual interpretation to only one possibility. Second, attempting to incorporate two or more methods raises practical and theoretical concerns about the efficacy of outcomes generated by allegedly congruent methods.[8] Third, narratological approaches are generally adopted to interpret Luke's Gospel because the book is broadly conceived as a narrative text.[9] However, appropriating current narratological approaches in the book of Luke requires careful deliberation, particularly since the Gospel belongs to an ancient and distinctive socio-cultural context. These deficiencies clearly present challenges, both to offer a methodologically inclusive and congruent approach, and one that is historically relevant to Luke's Gospel.

---

[6] An inclusive posture to methodologies arose largely in response to traditional criticisms, and eloquently expressed in J. Muilenburg address: "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 88 (1969), 1-18. For a helpful survey of various criticisms, see: Stephen L. Menzie and Stephen R. Haynes, eds., *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999). Green, Joel, ed. *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: William B Eerdmans Pub., 1995). Stanley E., Porter ed. *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill Pub., 1997). A. K. M. Adam, *Handbook of Postmodern Biblical Interpretation*. Stanley E. Porter, ed. *Biblical Criticism and Interpretation* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

[7] Biblical studies with its fixation on methodology has received criticism. See Stephen Moore and Yvonne Sherwood, *The Invention of the Biblical Scholar: A Critical Manifesto* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 2011).

[8] Socio-rhetorical criticism provides a possible exception; however, it does not offer a detailed linguistic analysis. See Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 4. See also Robbins: *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology* (London: Routledge Press, 1996). David deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downer's Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press: 2000), 17-21. Vernon K. Robbins, et al., eds., *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003).

[9] Joel B. Green, *The New International Commentary on The New Testament: The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 1997).

This project adopts a unique way of approaching Luke's Gospel by engaging select components of two relatively unapplied and apparently disparate methods: discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism. Use of both methods together provide the exegete with the option of resisting the charge of methodological isolationism, while offering an opportunity to explore the potential benefits of two relatively unused interpretive methods for Luke's Gospel. While both methods are relatively unused, discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism inhabit distinct methodological domains and appear incongruent due to their respective emphases and tools.

Discourse analysis operates by means of an empirically based linguistic analysis that constitutes a predominantly text-internal focus, though not by any means neglecting the role played by the audience. Rhetorical criticism emphasizes text-external factors such as a given audience's response to a text, and largely operates without the use of formal linguistic features and criteria.[10] Discourse analysis incorporates modern linguistic theories, while classical rhetoric is grounded in ancient conventional use. The congruence of these two methods presents a formidable challenge to any potential practitioner based on these differences. Porter, an expert on linguistics, hermeneutics, and various methods of New Testament criticisms, warns of the difficulties awaiting those who seek to merge these two methods with reference to Paul's letters: "…any connection between ancient rhetoric and discourse analysis simply cannot be assumed but must be stringently argued for, since it enters into new territory not apparently traversed by discourse analysts (or rhetoricians)."[11] Porter continues: "Discourse analysis and ancient rhetoric are two separate paradigms, and forcing them together in an uncritical way is something that can be done only at great risk. The use of these two together must be clearly argued for, not assumed."[12]

Upon close investigation, however, there is a diachronic relationship between both methods.[13] There is affinity between both methods as they incorporate text-internal and text-

---

[10] Another way of stating this is to say that discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism appear on the surface to inhabit rather distinct interpretive domains: that of textual and extra-textual foci, between semantic and pragmatic considerations.

[11] Stanley E. Porter, "Ancient Rhetorical Analysis and Discourse Analysis of the Pauline Corpus," in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference,* eds., Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 258.

[12] Ibid, Porter, 273.

[13] In other words, following Wittgenstein's terminology, there is family resemblance between these two methods, despite the historical divide and their respective emphases. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, 4th ed., trans. G.E. Anscombe, P.M.S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte (Wiley-Blackwell Publishers: Hoboken, N.J., 2009).

external factors in order to better comprehend a given discourse. This correlation will become clearer by examining basic contours within discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, pertaining to §2.1 and §3.1 respectively. Within discourse analysis, systemic functional linguistics offers an approach that mediates text-internal and text-external features. At the same time, classical rhetorical criticism attends to text-internal factors, especially concerning the issue of rhetorical style, and as it negotiates text-internal and external features by means of ancient rhetorical handbooks called the progymnasmata.

1.2 Discourse Analysis

1.2.1. Introduction to Discourse Analysis

In simplest terms, discourse analysis is the study of "language in use."[14] As the study of language, discourse analysis is a branch of linguistic science.[15] However, what distinguishes discourse analysis from other linguistic branches is its focus on a broad network of discourse relationships, internal and external to a text. Text-internal analysis involves the study of total textual relationships, with attention to analysis above the sentence level.[16] The study of discourse above the sentence level remains the distinguishing hallmark of discourse analysis. Above sentence level analysis is possible because fundamental properties of a text include cohesion and coherence. Cohesion within a text means that grammatical and lexical relationships occur throughout the various levels of a discourse, extending from words, to clauses and sentences, and to broader levels of a given discourse. Coherence means that integral relationships occur among the various textual levels in a manner that promotes communicative intentions. Examining both the structure of a text and how it achieves various functions entails the use of well-defined linguistic criteria.[17]

Text-external analysis is another component of discourse analysis. Because meaningful communication occurs in a socio-literary context, a text is a negotiation of meaning between a

---

[14] Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.

[15] Contemporary linguistic theories are traced back to Fredinand de Saussure and they generally share these common principles: (1) linguistic analysis based on empirical investigation, (2) analysis that requires a systemic approach to linguistic structure, (3) linguistic analysis that prioritizes synchronic analysis over diachronic, and, (4) that the majority of linguists encourage a descriptive analysis over a prescriptive analysis. For a helpful overview, see Rodney J. Decker *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb*, 11.

[16] James Paul Gee and Michael Handford, "Introduction" in *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. James Paul Gee and Michael Handford (New York: Routledge Press, 2012), 1.

[17] Linda J. Graham, "The Product of Text and 'Other' Statements: Discourse Analysis and the Critical Use of Foucault" *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 43/6 (2011): 667.

6

speaker and audience as they interact within a given environment. A text represents the sharing of social expectations and discourse features, as the speaker of a text negotiates the semantic and pragmatic functions within a given social setting and for an audience's benefit.[18] The discourse analyst studies the social context and the literary conventions of a text, intending to uncover how these features impinge upon and facilitate discourse meaning. For example, one branch within discourse analysis, genre-analysis, focuses primarily upon text-external features, namely, socio-literary conventions.[19] Genre analysis is critical for identifying various functions within a given text. In other words, a text's function is associated with its text type, or genre, within a given social setting.[20] Accordingly, "genres are ways in which people 'get things done' through their use of spoken and written discourse."[21] Genre analyst scholars such as Martin and Rose emphasize the importance of genre as vital in understanding a text's function. For these scholars, the speaker's selection of a given genre involves several factors: i. genre selection is goal-oriented, so that the choice of genre is a choice toward a particular end, ii. a genre is a staged event, resulting in the development and deliberation to reach the discourse goal, and iii.

---

[18] This project employs systemic functional linguistics in general and specifically, the approach of Halliday. The traditional alternative is offered by Naom Chomsky, whose view of language distinguishes competence and performance. Halliday approaches language as an open and flexible system that provide for a variety of communicate intentions options. In contrast, within Chomsky's system, limited resources are available for analysis and those that occur are oriented toward rules-prescription. The difference is between language as system for Halliday, and language as a structure for Chomsky. Because systemic functional grammar tends toward the sociological, rather than the psychological of Chomsky, Halliday's work is preferred, especially since it provides measurable and available resources for analysing ancient texts such as Luke's Gospel. At the same time, Halliday's approach does not neglect linguistic structure, such as the concept of information structure. See: Nomi Erteschik-Shir, *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface: Oxford Surveys in Syntax and Morphology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1-5. See also: Ronald Ward Haugh, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics,* 6th ed., (Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell Pub, 2010), 2-6.

[19] Vijay K. Bhatia, *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View* (New York: Continuum Pub., 2006), 10. There is some ambiguity over the term "genre," related to the issue of "register." See Stanley E. Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 146-147. This project consideres genre to be a classification of shared conventions with a given contextual environment. See: Alexandra Georgakopoulou and Dionysis Goutsos, *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (England: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 33.

[20] Vijay K. Bhatia, *Worlds of Written Discourse,* 24. Brian Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis*, 86-94. Genre classification as belonging on a continuum. See: Emanuel A. Schegloff, "'Narrative Analysis' Thirty Years later: A Brief History of American Sociolinguistics 1949-1989," in *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*, ed. Christian Bratt Paulston and G. Richard Tucker (Malden Massachussets: Wiley-Blackwell Pub., 2003). Barbara Johnstone, "Discourse Analysis and Narrative," *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton (Malden Massachusetts: Blackwell Pub., 2001), 638.

[21] Brian Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis* (New York: Continuum Pub., 2006), 82, 84. See also: H. G. Widdowson, *Discourse Analysis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 38-40.

genre is participatory; it is a socially-shared enterprise.[22] Consequently, analysis of communication involves analysis of both text-internal and text-external features for discourse analysis.[23]

However, studying internal and external aspects of a text is an extensive task, revealing the breadth and diversity of approaches within the field of discourse analysis. Nevertheless, various emphases and methods may be discerned and assigned to three branches within discourse analysis.[24] These branches include i. text-linguistic analysis involving formal linguistic study, ii. empirical analysis with emphasis on sociological studies, and iii. critical analysis with emphasis upon identifying power structures in communication and their effect. These three branches represent various foci: text-internal and text-external issues, as well as semantics and pragmatics.[25] The discourse practitioner may choose to emphasize the sufficiency of a text as the structural and fundamental basis for meaning, representing the text-linguistic approach, or the practitioner may prioritize the impact and interaction of meaning within a sociological framework, representing the empirical analysis approach. Finally, the

---

[22] J.R. Martin and David Rose, *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture* (Oakville, Conn.: Equinox Pub, 2008), 6. Genre-analysts seek to explain, in various ways, how the narrative genre is assimilated by audience's frameworks. See: Barbara Johnstone "Discourse Analysis and Narrative" in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 639-640, 642.

[23] In the Greco-Roman context, prose and poetry constitute the two grand modes, with prose including rhetoric, historiography, philosophical discourse, and poetry including lyric, epic and drama. The consequence of acknowledging a genres static nature means an analysis of ancient genre categories carries certain expectations and strictures of a certain genre-set. At the same time, since a genre is dynamic, genre expectations cannot not exhaustively define the total pattern of meaning. One should not be surprised to encounter instances in Luke where a blurring of genres or rhetorical exercises may occur.

[24] There are many ways to adjudicate the various approaches within discourse analysis. See: Laura Alba-Juez Alba-Juez, *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice* (Newcastle, U.K: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 15.

[25] Hosney M. El-daly, "On the Philosophy of Language: Searching for Common Grounds for Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis," *IJAR*, 2/6 (Nov. 2010): 248-252, 257-258. See also: Gee, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis,* 13-14. One could also delimit discourse analysis, at its most basic level, into one of two approaches: formalism and functionalism. Formalism, beginning with Ferdinand de Saussure, and, later, Chomsky, placed special emphasis upon the signs of language, langue; as a formal system of the structure and linguistic signs. About the same time, a functional approach to linguistics was developing, known as the Prague school, with its emphasis on the functional nature of language, the *parole*. In broad strokes, these early proponents of linguistic analysis, between de Saussure and the Prague school, represent the variation within discourse analysis that remains to this day. The one with emphasis on the study of signs, language-competence and grammar as formalism, and, the other with emphasis on communicative function, or meaning; the signified as functionalism. This reflects the division of labor between semantics and pragmatics in discourse analysis. The divergence within discourse is thus commonly between (1) a more 'pure' approach to linguistic analysis known as *text-linguistics*, as the formalist approach which analyzes the sentence-clause structure primarily, as focus on the 'text', and (2) an approach which more readily facilitates the interaction between text and context, representing the functional approach, with focus on the 'context'. This project follows M.A.K. Halliday's mediating approach.

practitioner may choose to focus upon the means through which a discourse transmits and maintains its manipulative effects, emphasizing the critical analysis approach.

Despite the differences of focus among these branches, of import is that discourse analysis as the study of communication constitutes a semiotic system approach. Discourse analysis requires a consideration of both the semantic and pragmatic features and how various discourse functions are managed within a text and its external social environment.[26] As El-daly maintains: "… language is closely linked to its context and that isolating it artificially for study ignores its complex and intricate relation to society."[27] Among the three branches of discourse analysis outlined above, a text-linguistic approach has been selected for this project. A text-linguistic approach offers the Lukan exegete an empirically based, that is, a testable, concrete, and linguistically robust method, replete with the clearly defined criteria of rhetorical criticism and discourse analysis. As emphasized throughout this section, there is the need to incorporate text-external considerations as well. To negotiate both text-internal and text-external elements within the purview of discourse analysis, systemic functional linguistics will be utilized as the specific approach. Such an approach offers significant potential for the Lukan analyst by seeking to account for a text's socio-literary environment alongside a linguistically robust methodology.

1.2.2. Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics

Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) was developed by the linguisitics scholar Halliday and is the approach to linguistics that views language as a social semiotic system. Systemic functional linguistics is systemic in that communicative meaning is the interplay between language and the constructive selection of a system within that language. Languages are comprised of a system network of various discourse features and functions, representing a

---

[26] William C. Mann and Sandra A. Thompson, "Relational Discourse Structure: A Comparison of Approaches to Structuring Text by 'Contrast,'" in *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre* (Dallas, Texas: SIL, 1992), 19-45. See also: Vijay K. Bhatia, *Worlds of Written Discourse*, 3-22, Teun A. Van Dijk, *Discourse As Social Interaction: Discourse Studies A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (California: Sage Pub., 2000), 2. Teun A. Van Dijk, *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), Teun A. Van Dijk, *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002). M.A. K. Halliday, revised by Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 27-57. Regarding semantics and pragmatics, see: Yan Huang, *Pragmatics: Oxford Textbook in Linguistics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 2-10. Betty J. Birner, *Introduction to Pragmatics* (Malden Mass: Wiley Blackwell Pub, 2013). Alan Cruse, *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*, *3rd* ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). Ken Hyland and Brian Paltridge "Introduction" in *The Bloomsbury Companion to Discourse Analysis,* eds. Ken Hyland and Brian Paltridge (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011).

[27] Hosney M. El-daly, "On the Philosophy of Language," *International Journal of Academic Research*, 244. See also: Teun A. VanDijk, "Episodes as Units of Discourse Analysis," *Analyzing Discourse Text and Talk*, ed. Deborah Tannen (North Carolina: Georgetown University Press, 1981), 178.

speaker's conscious and unconscious choices within that system as they facilitate communicative intentions. Systemic functional linguistics is functional as communicative meaning reflects a purposeful engagement between speaker and audience, and these functions can be evaluated according to textual criteria.[28] This approach is linguistic as it is text-centered and analyses formal linguistic features within a given discourse. Taken as a whole, SFL offers a distinctive linguistic approach that focuses upon a given language as a system of functional choices that are evaluated by means of linguistic criteria and through a close analysis of text-internal features.

At the same time, and as Chapter II will explain in greater detail, SFL seeks to account for text-external features. Among various approaches in SFL, the Hallidean approach is particularly useful, approaching communication as a metafunctional system.[29] In Halliday's metafunction of language, three levels of discourse analysis are necessary: i. the ideational, a representation of the manner in which things are experienced, ii. the textual, the construction of the text as a semantic domain, and iii. the interpersonal, the clause as exchange.[30] Halliday's third level in particular, the interpersonal dimension, seeks to account for text-external factors and how such factors influence various communicative functions within a given discourse.

Nevertheless, the greatest benefit of SFL is its focus on text-internal features of a given discourse.[31] To this end, and for the Lukan exegete, SFL offers a substantial and vigorous text-internal method, one that is able to identify and incorporate various functions throughout

---

[28] Functional-Pragmatic approaches within discourse analysis abound with various schools of thought, such as: Prague, South African, Scandinavian, and others. Despite the varieties, Knud Lambrecht notes: "What unites linguistic research done under one or another of these headings is the idea that certain formal properties of sentences cannot be fully understood without looking at the linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts in which the sentences having these properties are embedded." Knud Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 2.

[29] For Halliday, language involves a semiotic system, what he also calls its architecture. A metafunctional analysis of language therefore incorporates textual output and the construal of experience as communicated among social relationships. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Gramma,* 30-31.

[30] Within Halliday's approach, particularly related to the interpersonal level, or the cultural context of a text, three factors are also important: field, the topics or intention which the language presents (oriented to the ideational metafunction), tenor, the relationship between language users (oriented to the interpersonal metafunction), and *mode*, the express means by which communication is presented (oriented to the textual metafunction). Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 31-42.

[31] Such a focus is evident in the space allocated between text-external and text-internal features in Halliday's work, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. In this book, the clause as exchange, featuring text-external considerations comprises 76 pages, while text-internal factors comprise approximately 500 pages.

discourse levels. To appreciate SFL's contribution to text-internal analysis, an examination of three critical principles that form the basis for linguistic inquiry within an SFL approach to language will both elucidate the benefits of SFL for Luke's Gospel, and signal potential areas for congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism.

Three key principles that govern an SFL approach to language include choice implies meaning, default-markedness, and prominence features.[32] All three of these principles are logically related.[33] The first principle, choice implies meaning, evaluates a given language as a system network of available discourse features and functions. When a particular feature has been selected, it represents that a meaningful choice has occurred. The selection of a particular feature represents a functional choice, given that other available features might have been selected within that system but were not.[34] Because cohesion and coherence are fundamental properties of a text, the analyst will examine meaningful choices that occur throughout various discourse levels. However, in order to incorporate all levels within functional analysis, a structural process is necessary. The process of managing various discourse levels for functionality occurs by means of a rank-scale, where a text is apportioned to analytic levels.[35] The following rank scale occurs in the Lukan exegesis of Chapters IV and V: i. textual boundary, ii. lower-level units at the clause level, iii. clause complexes, iv. highest level of analysis above the sentence, constituting the entire scene.[36]

---

[32] These principles align with Runge's analysis of discourse grammar. Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody: Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010), 5-15.

[33] The arrangement of these three principles follows the order provided in Runge's work: *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament,* 5-7, 10-16. The logic of *choice implies meaning* includes these basic premises: (1) within a given language system various discourse features are available, (2) discourse features frequently include a variety of sets and members within a given set, (3) the availability of varieties within a set and among its members entails that a choice exists for the selection of a given member within a set, (4) because choice exists among a variety of discourse options, meaningful analysis is possible, (5) meaningful analysis involves examination as to why a particular discourse feature was selected among others, (6) the examination of a particular selection among available options involves analysis of the functional use of language.

[34] A text is linguistic-semiotic regarding internal operations and relationships, and realized in Halliday's metafunction, and socio-semiotic concerning the instantiation of a particularized communication, a text as *interpersonal*, and oriented toward *mode*, so that it includes a context of situation which is projected onto a text. M.A. K. Halliday, revised by Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3rd ed., (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 22, revised by Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 27-57.

[35] M.A. K. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 22.

[36] Issues below the clause are not included in this project, such as word groups and phrases. A primary reason for this is that Hallidean grammar analyzes a text according to three components of metafunction: the textual, ideational and interpersonal. These three are essentially realized in clausal analysis, and not below the

The second principle is default-markedness. As noted above, within a language system there are numerous linguistic features that signal a variety of discourse functions. Where related discourse features occur within a language system, they operate along a default-to-marked continuum. Available discourse features operate within this continuum, and are the means for signaling discourse functions. The terms "set" and "members" provide an elucidation of this principle. A set occurs where there is more than one related discourse feature available within a given language system, and a member is a discourse feature belonging to a given set. For example, in the English language conjunctions provide a system set. Members of that set include conjunctions such as "and," "moreover," "in addition," and "also." Within a given set, there is a most basic option, depending on a given discourse occasion. The most basic option is called the default or unmarked member of that set.[37] For example, in casual conversation the conjunction "and" represents an unmarked or default member within a set of available conjunctions. A marked member, in contrast, indicates that the speaker has chosen to draw more attention to some quality or distinctiveness associated with certain information by means of various non-default discourse features. For example, in casual conversation, choosing the conjunction "moreover" might signal a marked member of that set, since it typically does not represent a basic or default member of the conjunctive set. In SFL, identifying and evaluating the various functions among the members of a given set is an important task that allows the Lukan exegete to discern pragmatic features within a text and at various textual levels. As will be discussed in Chapter II, the Greek New Testament provides a number of discourse features. These include process types, clause relationships, conjunctive use, constituent order, verbal aspect, participant referencing, and larger level textual patterns. Such discourse features in Luke will be examined throughout Chapters IV and V.

The third key principle in SFL is prominence features. By means of employing the principles of choice implies meaning and default-markedness, the analyst can thereby identify

---

clause. Halliday, 361. These concepts are explained in detail in Chapter II. Addressing issues beyond the various scenes contained in Luke 3:21-5:39 is beyond the scope of this project due to space limitations.

[37] Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 11. This project employs an asymmetrical model, wherein frequency of a linguistic feature is not the determinative location of a default or marked feature, as it is in a symmetrical model. An asymmetrical model considers each member of a set as contributing a distinct and unique functional status within its system. Simon C. Dik approach to markedness is also symmetrical: "A construction type is more marked to the extent that it is less expectable, and therefore commands more attention when it occurs. In general, the less frequent and rarer a linguistic item is, the higher is markedness value." Simon C. Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar: The Structure of the Clause*, 2nd ed., (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997), 41. Markedness is determined, however, on the basis of its environment; what is marked in one context may not be marked in another.

elements within a text that achieve a higher level of prominence relative to the weight that other textual elements carry.[38] Various discourse features possess differing levels of status within a cohesive text; consequently, various discourse features are accorded varying degrees of weight. The importance of textual prominence is reflected in Longacre's well-known statement:

> The very idea of discourse as a structured entity demands that some parts of discourse be more prominent than others. Otherwise, expression would be impossible. 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. [39]

This brief overview of SFL and its associated principles suggest that a certain degree of congruence may exist between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism. Because SFL is a text-internal analysis of discourse features, it is capable of identifying issues of functionality and aspects of prominence in Luke's Gospel. While discourse analysis advocates a commitment to text-external issues, there is a considerable deficiency in that it cannot provide a relevant socio-literary environment for an ancient text such as Luke's Gospel. In this respect, discourse analysis requires an additional resource, namely, one that can offer a relevant text-external environment for Luke's Gospel to be more effective in exploring the sense intended by an author. If rhetorical criticism provides such a framework and can incorporate the various marked and prominent discourse features as identified by SFL, then congruence is not only possible, but highly desirable.[40]

---

[38] The principles default-markedness and prominence features are corollaries to choice implies meaning. The logic behind the functional use of language includes: (1) the notion that not all elements of a discourse share equal status, (2) Inequality of functional status, entails that there are levels of functionality, (3) levels of functionality range from basic or default and extend to marked status, (4) marked status signals the highest level of prominence within a given discourse level. As will be seen in Chapter Two, marked discourse features may also possess unequal status. This is because a marked feature is the reason for the clause or discourse unit, and it is also called the salient feature. But there are also marked features that receive special prominence, called special salience. This occurs primarily with issues surrounding information structure and constituent order, outlined in Chapter Two.

[39] Roert E. Longacre, "Discourse Peak as Zone of Turbulence," in *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form,* ed. J. R. Wirth (Michigan: Karoma, 1985), 83.

[40] For both methods, there is keen awareness that within a given text resides a multiplicity of levels through which meaning is negotiated, which occurs as the author and audience dialogically encode and construct meaning within the semiotic system of signs and in cooperation with the mental processes and cognitive framework of the receptor in a given discourse. Consequently, the goal of discourse analysis and SFL in particular is to meaningfully interact with the social sciences. SFL does so through analysis of semantics, the analysis of meaning at the level of linguistic signs and their relationships, and pragmatics, the analysis of larger textual features through intentionality and extra-textual context. The study of semiotics involves the relationship between semantics (sign to the signified), syntax (relationship among signs), and pragmatics (signs in context to a particular audience). Consequently, analysis of textual meaning must take into account both semantics and pragmatics, as textual communication mediated through a particular social environment.

1.3. Rhetorical Criticism

1.3.1. Introduction to Classical Rhetoric

The origin of rhetorical criticism, as a specialized field in biblical studies, is commonly traced to Muilenberg and his presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1968.[41] At this lecture, Muilenberg expressed concerns over the inadequacies of the traditional criticisms, fixated as they were on lower-level textual concerns. To address this myopia, Muilenberg recommended an approach to biblical studies that emphasized textual cohesion and literary-rhetorical acuity, that is, a text should be evaluated as integrally coherent, creatively persuasive, and situated in a particular cultural environment. Because New Testament texts originated in a context that prized Greco-Roman rhetoric, attention turned to the study of the art of persuasion. As a method, rhetorical criticism focuses upon the form and functions associated with classical rhetoric, insofar as this field enriches New Testament exegesis.

However, the Greco-Roman environment is but a portion of the ancient context surrounding Luke's Gospel. There is a tendency when studying the cultural contexts of the Gospels to highlight the Greco-Roman socio-literary-cultural context as if it were the singular or dominant one. Although one could argue that the context of the Gospels is inescapably situated in the Jewish context, this project selects and isolates only the Greco-Roman context. Future analysis with a focus on Jewish contexts is not only warranted but would also provide potential benefits. In either case, an approach to the Gospels that takes seriously the persuasive nature of these documents in its various forms is necessary.

However, the Greco-Roman environment is but a portion of the ancient context surrounding Luke's Gospel. There is a tendency when studying the cultural contexts of the Gospels to highlight the Greco-Roman socio-literary-cultural context as if it were the singular or dominant one. Although one could argue that the context of the Gospels is inescapably situated in the Jewish context, this project selects and isolates only the Greco-Roman context. Future analysis with a focus on Jewish contexts is not only warranted but would also provide potential benefits. In either case, an approach to the Gospels that takes seriously the persuasive nature of these documents in its various forms is necessary.

At the same time, acknowledging that Luke's Gospel may be situated within a largely Jewish context in no way detracts from the notion that Greco-Roman rhetoric was pervasive

---

[41] James Muilenberg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 88.1 (1969), 1-18. doi:10.2307/3262829

throughout the Roman empire, presenting the Jewish nation with an unavoidable phenomenon insofar as one encountered various legal proceedings, public orations, or sought to meaningfully engage the prized Greco-Roman literary works.[42] In fact, even those Greco-Roman vicinities that tended to more actively promote conservative Jewish practices, regions like Judea and its surrounding environs, appear to have reflected, in varying degrees, openness to classical rhetorical training.[43] For more than a few Jews, including Philo and Josephus, actively supporting Jewish identity and values against the ever-impinging Roman values, led such Jews to actively service Greco-Roman rhetoric, with the aim of demonstrating Jewish superiority and its own nascent influences over the broader world.[44] Comparable sentiments are scattered throughout rabbinic sources, specifically the Talmud and Midrash. And although these texts were likely composed from the 2nd CE and following, these writings maintain those earlier Jewish affinities with Greco-Roman rhetoric.[45] In this light, rabbinic literature contains a

---

[42] Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942) 66-7. Richard Hidary, *Rabbis and Classical Rhetoric: Sophistic Education and Oratory in the Talmud and Midrash* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 2.

[43] Ibid., 6-7. Also see Andrew W. Pitts, "Hellenistic Schools in Jerusalem and Paul's Rhetorical Education" in *Paul's World,* ed. Stanley E. Porter (Boston: Brill, 2008), 33-49. Louise Feldman offers a helpful corrective to overextending similarities and parallelomania to Greco-Roman influence. Feldman helpfully surveys both the persistent and general Jewish resistance to substantial Greek thought, as well as a fair degree of assimilation among certain levels of the population to general Greek techniques and methodologies. *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993), 25-38.

[44] Ibid, 5. Richard Hidary, *Rabbis and Classical Rhetoric: Sophistic Education and Oratory in the Talmud and Midrash* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2018), 6-7; Erich S. Gruen, "Jewish perspective on Greek Culture and Ethnicity" in *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History.* eds. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Beate Ego, Tobias Nicklas (Boston Massachusetts: DeGruyter, 2016), 169-196; Ryan S. Schellenberg, *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education: Comparative Rhetoric And 2 Corinthians 10-13*, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 137-140; John Barclay, "Against Apion," in *A Companion To Josephus*, eds., Honora Howell Chapman, Zuleika Rodgers, (Malden Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 2016l) 83-84; Robert G. Hall "Josephus' Contra Apionem and Historical Inquiry in the Roman Rhetorical Schools" in *Josephus' Contra Apionem,* eds., Louise H. Felman, John R. Levinson (New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 229-248; Robert W. Smith, *The Art of Rhetoric in Alexandria: Its Theory and Practice in the Ancient World*, (: Hague, Prague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974), 52-59; Torrey Seland, "Philo and Classical Education" in *Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*. ed., Erkki Koskenniemi (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 2014), 102-128; Michael Martin "Philo's Use of Syncrisis: An Examination of Philonic Composition in the Light of the Progymnasmata", *PRSJ* 30.3 (Fall 2003): 271-297; Tamar Landau, *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric and the Herod Narratives* (Boston: Brill), 66-68, 187-202.

[45] Hayim Lapin, *Rabbis as Romans: The Rabbinical Movement in Palestine* (New York: Oxford University Press: 2012); Catherin Hezser, "The Torah Versus Homer: Jewish and Greco-Roman Education in Late Roman Palestine," in *Ancient Education and Early Christianity*, eds., Matthew Ryan Hauge and Andrew W. Pitts (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 201), 5-24.

variety of portions that reflect not only broader patterns of Greco-Roman rhetorical arrangement, but also classical rhetorical exercises, namely, the fable, chreia, and narration exercises.[46] All this to say, Jewish thought and practices in the first centuries CE reflected an important degree of knowledge and affinity with classical Greco-Roman rhetoric. Richard Hidary summarizes the issues in this manner:

> There must have been many Jews studying Greek language and rhetoric, whether formally or nor, whether they did so with the knowledge and blessing of the rabbis or not. More importantly, many aspects of Greek style and public oratory were simply so embedded in popular culture that they inevitably permeated rabbinic society deeply and often even imperceptibly.[47]

.

Leaving these preliminary comments aside, this section will survey classical Greco-Roman rhetoric by examining the following issues: the origin and development of rhetoric in the Greco-Roman context, Aristotle's approach to rhetoric and its various elements, and issues pertaining to rhetorical style. These issues are relevant in that they provide potential theoretical congruence between rhetoric criticism and discourse analysis, while offering benefit for Lukan exegesis.

Tracing the origin and development of Greco-Roman rhetorical practice is not a straightforward task. One reason is that the vicissitudes of time and circumstance have veiled any possibility of identifying the origins of rhetoric. Nevertheless, identifying foundational documents that reflect rhetorical ideals is possible. Foremost are the works attributed to Homer, namely, *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*.[48] With such texts, rhetoric was etched upon society's

---

[46] Henry Fischel, ed. *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1977); Haim Schwarzbaum, "Talmudic-Midrashic Affinities of Some Aesopic Fables", in *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature,* 443-472.; David Stern, *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991) ,4-56; Eli Yassif, *The Hebrew Folktale: History, Genre, Meaning*, trans. Jacqueline Teitelbaum (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 199) 120-132; Catherin Hezser, "Form Criticism Of Rabbinic Literature," in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, eds. Reimund Bieringer, Florentino Garcia Martinez, Didier Pollefeyt, Peter J. Tomson, (Bosotn Massachusetts: Brill Publishers, 2009), 102-110; Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 190- 239; Richard Hidary, "Classical Rhetorical Arrangement and Reasoning In The Talmud: The Case of Yerushalmi Berakhot 1:1" *AJS Review* 34.1 (April 2010): 33-64.

[47] Richard Hidary, *Rabbis and Classical Rhetoric: Sophistic Education and Oratory in the Talmud and Midrash* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2018), 15.

[48] See George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 1-19.

collective consciousness. Rhetorical practice subsequently grew, accelerating in the fifth century BCE because of Athenian politics.[49]

Alongside rhetorical practice, the theory of rhetoric developed and was increasingly refined. One who contributed to rhetorical theory was Aristotle the philosopher. His work on rhetoric in the 4th century BCE provided numerous insights and strategies. Among Aristotle's key contributions, while beguilingly simple, is his definition of rhetoric. According to Aristotle, rhetoric is the art of persuasion.[50] Aristotle's analysis of rhetoric conveys two fundamental assumptions: that rhetoric has a persuasive effect and that it should be rightly utilized.

While Plato agreed with Aristotle over the first notion, he vehemently disagreed with the second. In part, Plato's posture stemmed from the belief that rhetoric, as with other empirically oriented methods, was detached from correct or true knowledge, and so was helplessly inclined to perversity.[51] Rhetoric was persuasive to humanity and was therefore suspect and discounted. Against Plato, Aristotle valued rhetoric, seeing it as an ally in corporate and personal identity and advancement. Rhetoric was eminently practical, where rhetorical proficiency benefitted a well-ordered society. Despite their disagreements, Plato and Aristotle's contentions served to sharpen rhetorical theory. However, Aristotle's approach to rhetoric proved especially influential in the Greco-Roman milieu. For this reason, surveying a few components of Artistotle's work on rhetoric provides a useful dimension to discourse analysis.

The first component to note is that Aristotle's approach to rhetoric is comprehensive, considering not only the content of a persuasive speech, but the speaker and the audience. This

---

[49] The Greek political system encouraged a personal engagement with rhetoric. In Greek matters of law, the individuals themselves, not hired advocates presented or defended their own cases. Aristotle traces rhetoric's origin to Corax and Tisias (5th century BCE). See: Thomas Habinek, *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory: Blackwell Introductions to the Classical World* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Pub., 2005). Also: Richard A. Katula, "The Origins of Rhetoric: Literacy and Democracy in Ancient Greece," in *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*, *3rd ed*., eds. James J. Murphy and Richard A. Katula (Mahwah, N.J.: Hermagoras Press, 2003). See also: Edward Schiappa and Jim Hamm, *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*" ed. Ian Worthington (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2007).

[50] According to Aristotle: "Let rhetoric be the capacity to discover the possible means of persuasion concerning any given subject." For Quintilian rhetoric is "knowing how to speak well." One could trace back discussions of rhetoric to Plato in his dialogue *Gorgias*, which centralizes on the difficulty of rhetoric. In Plato's work, Gorgias defines *rhekorike* as "the worker of persuasion, and so, rhetoric as the art of one who speaks (*rhetor*: speaker, *ike*: art). See: Robert Wardy, *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato, and Their Successors* (New York: Routledge Press, 1996), 6-14.

[51] Plato's assertion is ironic, since Plato's works include narration and rhetoric. Plato's opposition to rhetoric was also shared by some comic poets, such as Aristophanes. Rhetoricians were aware of such opposition as reflected in their validations of rhetoric: Isocrates in *Nicocles* and *Antidosis*, Aristotle in his work, *Rhetoric*, and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratia*. Rachel Barney, "Gorgias' Defense: Plato and His Opponents on Rhetoric and the Good," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 48.1 (2010): 114-115.

triad reflects Aristotle's emphasis on proper ethos, a speaker's ability to garner attentiveness, pathos, engaging the audience's emotions, and logos, a systematic arrangement of cogent information.[52] Subsequent rhetoricians followed Aristotle's triad, and emphasized the importance of three rhetorical components: the rhetorical situation between the speaker and the occasion, invention as fitting content of the speech, and persuasive intent, a speech's intended effect upon an audience. With all three components rightly utilized, the result was effective persuasion.

Rhetoric's encompassing approach to persuasion facilitated its pervasive influence upon other fields and disciplines.[53] By the time of the New Testament texts, Greco-Roman rhetoric had established itself as an inescapable craft for authors writing in Greek and in a variety of subjects, stretching across diverse literary genres, including drama, poetry and historical narrative, in short, wherever persuasion in literature occurred.[54] Woodman commented: "Historiography was regarded by the ancients as not essentially different from poetry: each was a branch of rhetoric, and therefore historiography, like poetry, employs the concepts associated with, and relies upon the expectations generated by a rhetorical genre."[55] Rhetoric's influence extended to the Greco-Roman curricular trivium of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric.

---

[52] For Aristotle, logos provided a certain level of immunity from Plato's opposition, particularly that of pathos, that Plato understood as the principle and corrupting element of rhetoric. Michel Meyer, "Aristotle's Rhetoric," *Topoi* 31 (2012), 249-252. Various rhetoricians elevated certain modes. For example, the primacy of logos was a fundamental axis for the Greek tradition. For Romans, such as Cicero and Quintilian, ethos was elevated above both logos and pathos. David A. Bobbitt, "Cicero's Concept of Ethos and Some Implications for the Understanding of Roman Rhetoric," in *The Florida Communication Journal* XIX, 1 (1990), 5-12.

[53] See: Erik Gunderson, "Introduction," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric,* ed., Erik Gunderson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). George A. Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric," (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 32-33. For the power of rhetoric, see Plato's *Gorgias and Philebus,* but especially Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen.* Plato's reference to Gorgias is interesting, since one of his students was purportedly the famed rhetorician, Isocrates. Apparently, Gorgias believed that rhetoric was preeminent among all sciences and capable of wielding its influence since, in contrast to the other sciences, it was willingly received. For helpful introductions to Isocrates, see: Ekatarina Haskins, *Logos and Power in Isocrates and Aristotle* (South Carolina: Columbia University Press, University of South Carolina, 2004), and *Isocrates and Civic Education*, eds., Takis Poulakos and David J. Depew (Austin Texas: University of Texas Press, 2004). Also: Yun Lee Too, *A Commentary on Isocrates' Antidosis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). Lysias and Demosthenes are also rightly emphasized. Later rhetoricians, such as Cicero and Quintilian, proffered their own confidence in rhetoric's nature and benefits, as found in their rhetorical works.

[54] Simon Goldhill. "Rhetoric and the Second Sophistic," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, ed. Eric Gunderson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 41-61. doi:10.1017/CCOL978052186043. Indeed, one could go so far as to subsume various literary genres under the network of rhetoric.

[55] A.J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (New York: Routledge Publishing, 1988). Woodman goes on to note that while Thucydides appears to denigrate poetry, he regards Homer as his true predecessor and was not averse to utilizing poetic techniques in his own works.

From the above survey, the apparent conclusion is that rhetorical criticism emphasizes text-external features, where effective persuasion is achieved by focusing upon a given speaker and audience. However, effective persuasion also and necessarily is included in a given speech. As noted above, five elements constituted a persuasive speech: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Among these elements, rhetorical style and invention were especially attentive to text-internal issues. Examining these two elements also contributes to discourse analysis and benefits Lukan exegesis, given that style and invention may promote theoretical congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism.

1.3.2 Rhetorical Style

Rhetorical style, *elocutio* or φρασις, was a highly significant component in ancient rhetoric.[56] Style ensured that persuasive speech included not only what was said, but how it was said, which included semantic, linguistic, and aesthetic considerations in a given rhetorical speech.[57] Rowe writes of Greco-Roman style:

> Of classical rhetoric's five duties, the one concerning style (λεξισ/*elocutio*) has had an especially pervasive and lasting influence. At least three reasons account for this influence. First, classical rhetoric supplies a rich nomenclature encompassing most of the important stylistic phenomena found in any language… Secondly, the ancient precepts on style apply to any verbal expression and not simply to that which is used to persuade. These precepts inform poetry as well as prose, historical writings, philosophical essays, and letters as well as political and forensic speeches. Thirdly, classical rhetoric has established criteria for judging style that are sufficiently flexible to allow for changing tastes and requirements. In fact, the criteria, the so-called virtues (αρεται) of correctness, clarity, ornamentation, and propriety, form the basis of the entire classical theory.[58]

---

[56] New Testament studies have increasingly attended to issues of Greco-Roman style. See: Henry J. Cadbury *The Style and Literary Method of Luke: I, The Diction of Luke and Acts* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1919). Also, Cadbury "Four features of Lucan Style," in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, eds. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (London: SPK, 1968), 87-102, David Mealand, "Luke-Acts and the Verbs of Dionysius of Halicarnassus" *Journal of the Study of the New Testament,* 19.63 (1996), 63-86, Rick Strelan, "A Note on ασφαλεια (Luke 1.4)" *Journal of the Study of the New Testament,* 30.2 (2007): 163-171, Paul Elbert, "An Observation on Luke's Composition and Narrative Style of Questions" *The Catholic Bible Quarterly,* 66.1 (2004): 98-109. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43725140. Albert Wifstrand, "Epochs and Styles," in *Selected Writings on the New Testament, Greek Language and Greek Culture in the Post-classical Era*, eds. Lars Rydbeck and Stanley Porter, trans. Denis Searby (Tubingen: Mohr Siebck: 2005). Alex Damm, "Ornatus: An Application of Rhetoric to the Synoptic Problem," *Novum Testamentum,* 45.4 (2003), 338-364. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1561103. Adelbert Denaux "Style and Stylistics, with a Special Reference to Luke," *Filologia Neotestamentaria,* 19 (2006), 31-51.

[57] Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, III 1, 2, 5-6. http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.1.i.html.

[58] Galen O. Rowe "Style" *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period,* 121. Quintilian addresses these at length; see his *Institutes of Oration*, Chs. VII, VIII, IX, XI.

Among the four virtues of style, conciseness, clarity, ornamentation, and propriety; the virtue of ornamentation is particularly relevant. [59] Ornamentation addresses the aesthetic value of clauses and words with three considerations: i. compositional style, ii. period usage, and iii. the arrangement of words. Compositional style considers whether a speech should be in a loose, complex, or running style.[60] Period usage involves issues related to sentence length and complexity.[61] Finally, the arrangement of words in a speech involves word order, juncture, and rhythm. Of these three aspects, word order is especially relevant. For the ancient rhetoricians, words had certain predisposed, natural, and aesthetic placement respective within a clause or sentence.[62] As discussed in Chapter II, word order is of central concern for SFL and is highly significant for Lukan exegesis in Chapters IV and V.

Rhetorical style and the arrangement of words was a fundamental concern for rhetoricians and authors in general. Such a notion is strikingly evident in the work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Greek historian and rhetorician who lived into the first century CE. His

---

[59] The virtue of correctness is the proper use of the speaker's language/words in its particular setting. The virtue of clarity is related to the manner in which words express clearness of expression. The virtue of propriety is the careful selection of their coherence among all the related parts. Since the fourth virtue, ornamentation, is particularly relevant to this project, providing the theoretical congruence for discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, it will be examined in further detail below. Ibid., p.p. 121-167. Concerning clarity, Rowe states: "They understand the object of clarity to be the immediate apprehension of the speaker's remarks even by inattentive readers or listeners." 123.

[60] The running style is especially appropriate to the narrative exercise, since it involves a linear or chronological presentation, with more diminished subordinate clauses, compared to the complex style. Rowe "Style," 151. Luke's narratives display this well, keeping to the finite verb, the aorist, throughout much of his narratives, and aligning participial clauses where particularly appropriate, as will be seen in chapter four. Mark's Gospel appears the most recalcitrant (see Mark 5:1-6, 8:24-9), but, as will be argued in Chapter IV, such instances invoke the rhetorical exercise of *ecphrasis*.

[61] The three factors include: i, the overall length in a sentence, its complexity related to clauses therein, ii, its coherence in providing completion and clarity by its own independent unity, and iii, the issue of rhythm, as that which involves consideration of the relationship between the comma and the colon. "In selecting rhythm prose artists follow three rules. First, the end of a period must not sound, rhythmically, like the end of a poetic verse; however, it may sound like the beginning of a poetic verse. Secondly, there must be a variety of long and short syllables and not an excess of either kind in any clausula; and the rhythmical patterns or successive clausulae must vary. Thirdly, and finally, although there must not be an excess of either long of short sounds in any clausula, the long sounds will outnumber the shorter sounds in order to achieve a braking effect on the momentum of the period." Rowe "Style," 154.

[62] Rowe "Style," 150-153. Word order includes the consideration of increasing the length of words and clauses, as the sentence develops.

work, *On Literary Composition,* addresses issues of rhetorical style in general and the arrangement of words in particular.[63]

Dionysius underscores the importance of rhetorical style by appealing to Isocrates and Plato. According to Dionysius, the famed rhetorician Isocrates was so devoted to style and aesthetics that he spent over ten years composing his renowned work, *The Panegyric.* Regarding *The Republic*, Plato continually refined it even until his death.[64] More specifically, Dionysius addresses issues of word order.[65] In his analysis, Dionysius seeks to negotiate linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. In his work, *On Literary Composition*, he attempts to account for word order, lamenting that many poets and prose writers have neglected the arrangement of words and as a result, those works decreased their potential effectiveness.[66] To address this concern, Dionysius examines theoretical foundations for word order, seeking to identify a natural law or ordering principles to account for the proper arrangement of words.

Dionysius begins his analysis of word order by examining the propriety of placing the noun before the verb, following the Aristotelian distinction between substance and accidents, between essential properties and those that are transient. However, his proposal concludes with the assertion: "This principle is attractive, but I came to the conclusion that it was not sound. At

---

[63] He writes: "Although in logical order arrangement or words occupies the second place… yet it is upon arrangement, far more than selection, that persuasion, charm, and literary power depend…though it holds the second place in order, and has been the subject of far fewer discussions than the other, yet possesses so much solid strength, so much active energy, that it triumphantly outstrips all the other's achievements." Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Literary Composition,* ed. and trans. W. Rhys Roberts; (London: Macmilan and Co. Limited, 1910), 73. Especially noteworthy is his discussion of both content and style is *Literary Epistles: Letter to Pompeius.*

[64] Dionysius explains why the issue of style was so important: "…it is not surprising after all that a man who is held to deserve a greater reputation than any of his predecessors who were distinguished for eloquence was anxious, when composing eternal words and not submitting himself to the scrutiny of all-testing envy and time, not to admit either subject or word at random, and to attend carefully to both arrangement of ideas and beauty of words: particularly as the authors of that day were producing discourses which suggested not writing but carving and chasing… For it appears to me far more reasonable for a man who is composing public speeches, eternal memorials of his own powers, to attend even to the slightest details, then it is for the disciples of painters and workers in relief, who display their dexterity and industry of their hands at perishable medium to expend the finished resources of their art on veins and down and bloom and similar minutiae." Ibid*,* 265, 267. Also, Chapter XXV, "How Prose Can Resemble Verse."

[65] A particularly helpful treatment of this is Casper C. DeJonge, *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature* (Boston: Brill, 2008).

[66] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Literary Composition,* 75. Albeit: "They never thought that words, clauses, or periods should be combined at haphazard. They had rules and principles of their own; and it was by following these that they composed so well. What these principles were, I shall try to explain so far as I can; stating not all, but just the most essential, of those that I have been able to investigate." *On Literary Composition*, 105.

any rate, a reader might confront me with instances in the same poet where the arrangement is opposite of this, and yet the lines are no less beautiful and attractive."[67] Lacking a satisfactory principle, Dionysius eventually settled on aesthetics as the controlling principle for word order. Words must be meaningfully arranged according to their rhetorical effect that affects the hearer, producing a "deep feeling" of grace, charm, and harmony, which is the combination of words in a pleasing and concerted effect.[68] According to Dionysius, a persuasive speaker must master the aesthetic principle of word order by practice, continually testing various arrangements and identifying what is most suitable by experience.[69]

In summary, Greco-Roman rhetoric appears to address text-internal issues of communication. Discourse features, such as word order, play an important part in the persuasive process of rhetoric. At the same time, integrating a modern linguistic approach such as SFL appears to produce exegetical gains. Stylistic concerns in Greco-Roman rhetoric thereby provide a level of congruence with discourse analysis, a point that will be demonstrated in Chapter II. In that chapter, evidence will show that great deal of what exegetes attribute to style is understood by discourse analysts to be an aspect of Greek language that, while appearing to be subject to the whim of the writer, is governed by rules that operate outside the confines of the traditional sentence grammar. For example, as Chapter II will explain, even word order is not free as a matter of style in order to simply avoiding repetition or to enhance aesthetic appeal. Instead, its flexibility within constituent order serves to allow a writer to underline his/her point, drawing attention to a particular component of the narrative, and even indicating a section or paragraph break. The example of word order is but one instance; others include articular use, verbal tense, participial use, and so on.

There is another level of potential congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism involving the issue of rhetorical invention. For ancient rhetoricians, rhetorical invention entailed attention to a speech's content, which included a variety of literary exercises.

---

[67] Ibid, 99.

[68] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Literary Composition,* 111. "The problem can be approached in two ways: by way of grammar, or by way of logic and rhetoric. The ancient critics, in such casual observations as they have left us, confined themselves to the latter course. But during the last hundred years, scholars have devoted much energy to the task of determining the grammatical precedence between different parts of speech." J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, 3rd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 2002), 42.

[69] Ibid, 111.

For the Lukan exegete, understanding these ancient literary exercises is possible by means of rhetorical handbooks called the progymnasmata.

1.3.3 The Progymnasmata

The Greek word *progymnasmata* is a composite of two words; the prefix "pro," or "before," and *gymnasmata,* meaning "preliminary exercises." The progymnasmata consisted of preliminary rhetorical exercises that trained students to one day publically and persuasively address audiences.[70] In the classical school system, progymnasmatic education commonly occurred after primary and secondary education, which consisted of reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, and literature, and prior to the tertiary education of rhetoric proper and philosophy. As students appropriated the rhetorical exercises they steadily increased in rhetorical proficiency until they entered formal declamation education.[71] To equip these fledgling students, formal rhetorical handbooks became an important means of inculcating Greco-Roman rhetorical practices. Thus, reference to the progymnasmata refer to any number of ancient rhetorical handbooks designed to instruct intermediate students with an increased level of rhetorical instruction. The extant handbooks range from the first century CE with Aelius Theon to the ninth century CE with John of Sardis.[72]

The benefit of these handbooks was substantial. According to Aelius Theon, whose rhetorical handbook this project chiefly follows, "There is no secret about how these exercises

---

[70] Robert J. Penella, "The Progymnasmata in Imperial Greek Education" in *The Classical World*, Oct 1: 2011 77-90, 77-83. George A. Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical literature, 2005), xvi-xvii.

[71] The traditional view of Greco-Roman education is that students from approximately ages 7-14, and with financial means, received grammatical training which consisted of basic reading and training in works of literature, both prose and poets, as well as basic instruction in mathematics, geometry, and logic. Students aged 15-20 received formal rhetorical training. The initial stage of rhetorical training involved progymnasmatic instruction, with the end goal of declamation. Students in tertiary education also studied philosophy, medicine, and politics. Cristina Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Boston: Brill, 2013), 375. For a helpful overview of the educational process, see: Jeffrey Walker, *The Genuine Teachers of This Art: Rhetorical Education in Antiquity* (South Carolina: The University of South Carolina Press, 2011), 3-5. For a complete account see: H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956).

[72] The exact date of Theon's text is somewhat uncertain. George Kennedy states that scholarly consensus approximates Theon's work between the Augustan period and the second century CE. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. George Kennedy (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 1. Malcolm Heath identifies Theon's work belonging to the fifth century CE. Either way, material equivalence remains between Theon and first century rhetoric. Innovations primarily revolved around thematic arrangement and were geographically-based. Malcolm Heath and D.H. Berry identify Cicero's narration discussion (80 BCE) as reflecting Theon, in his *Pro Roscio* oration. See: D.H. Berry and Malcolm Heath "Oratory and Declamation," in *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period,* ed. Stanley E. Porter (Boston: Brill, 2001), 413.

are very useful for those acquiring the faculty of rhetoric."[73] Classical rhetorical scholars Hock and O'Neil concur with Theon. They write:

> …by the time students had reached the end of the progymnasmata sequence… they had honed their compositional skills to the point that they, to use Doxapatres' imagery again, had ascended the stair steps (ἀναβαθμοί) to the very threshold of the rhetorical art. Only now were students ready to learn rhetoric proper, to master the methods, rules, and models of the discipline that would turn them into orators and the best of them into sophists.[74]

The progymnasmata handbooks contained a variety of literary exercises, such as the chreia, fable, narrative, ecphrasis and six other literary types. These exercises are windows into ancient socio-literary conventions, providing the Lukan exegete with a considerable number of ancient literary forms and functions. Since Lukan exegesis involves careful consideration of the socio-cultural environment surrounding ancient texts, then artifacts that distill the values and practices of the ancient Greco-Roman world are highly relevant. Serving this function, the progymnasmata provides a critical component in text-external analysis. To the degree that both discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism incorporate text-external analysis, congruence between the methods is possible.

1.4. Summary of Theoretical Convergence

The detail provided in the preceding sections of Chapter One makes summarizing the theoretical congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism possible. The congruence begins with the recollection that discourse analysis, and SFL in particular, involves text-internal analysis, addressing a variety of discourse features and functions. SFL also acknowledges text-external factors, a given discourse as a socio-literary exchange in a particular cultural environment. Concurrently, rhetorical criticism involves text-internal analysis through issues of rhetorical style and the arrangement of words. Rhetorical criticism also attends to text-external issues, particularly in attending to ancient socio-literary conventions and specific rhetorical exercises. There is therefore substantial overlap between the interests, themes, and conceptual processes of these two methods.[75] Rhetorical criticism offers

---

[73] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 4.

[74] *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric Classroom Exercises*, trans. and ed. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 82-83.

[75] John R. Taylor, *Linguistic Categorization*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 134. Michael Stubbs, *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983, 1. Alexandra Georgakopoulou and Dionysis Goutsos, *Discourse Analysis*, 2-3. "The universe of discourse is divided into two parts: (a) the Text-external world, which comprises (i) Speech Participants, i.e., a speaker and one or several addressees, and (ii) a Speech Setting, i.e., the place, time and circumstances in which a

the modern linguist with ancient conventional literary exercises by which one might discern the form and function of various units within a discourse. At the same time, discourse analysis provides principles and methods by which to discern issues of prominence within an ancient literary exercise. Therefore, despite the historical divide between methods, congruence appears possible, and even necessary from the vantage of New Testament Gospel studies. George Guthrie's approach to congruency further verifies the benefits of this approach, as he notes that discourse analysis:

> …is a methodology that can incorporate and use valid "criticisms" of the New Testament. Rhetorical criticism, literary criticism, and sociological exegesis, for example, all have to do with discourse, and the insights they offer can be embraced within the framework of discourse analysis. Because it is a field of inquiry with tremendous breadth, it might serve to address the splintering of New Testament studies into a plethora of competing criticisms. Thus, discourse analysis may serve as a tool of integration.[76]

1.5 The Relevance of Luke's Gospel

Luke's Gospel has been chosen as the case study for this project for two reasons, a text-external reason regarding narration and a text-internal reason regarding the level of Greek used in Luke's Gospel. Luke's Gospel is largely a narrative text. While rhetorical criticism has engaged a variety of New Testament texts, the focus hitherto has been on hortatory, or didactic texts, such as those found in New Testament letters. While these issues will be examined further in Chapter III, noting here that macro and microstructural approaches to the New Testament have been dominated by a focus on letters is instrumental. Among those few rhetorical studies that have attended to narrative texts like the Gospels, fewer still have considered the relevance of the progymnasmata handbooks as a microstructural interpretive approach. There is more rhetorical analysis to be done, both in Gospel studies and the book that

---

speech event takes place; (b) the Text-Internal World, which comprises Linguistic Expressions (words, phrases, sentences) and their meanings." Knud Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form,* 36-37. See also: H. G. Widdowson, *Discourse Analysis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 13.

[76] George H. Guthrie, "Discourse Analysis," in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*, eds. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Pub., 2001), 267. In Biblical studies, discourse analysis began to be implemented in the 1960s. For an overview, see: Jeffrey Reed, "The Cohesiveness of Discourse," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, 28-29. David Alan Black, *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995). Jeffrey T. Reed identifies that various levels of discourse as (1) co-text (words, phrases, larger units of discourse), (2) context of situation (genre register), (3) context of culture (language, idiolect). "Discourse Analysis," *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, 194-195. Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation* (Downer's Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1989), 13-15, 31-32. Michael Stubbs, *Discourse Analysis*, 3. c. *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, eds., S. E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 20-21.

Luke wrote, which is amenable to rhetorical studies and promises a high yield if properly pursued.

Second, Luke's Gospel has been chosen because of Luke's level of sophistication with the Greek language. This is strikingly evident from the outset of Luke, the prooemium in 1:1-4. Luke's Gospel maintains a high level of mastery of the Greek language, exhibiting literary sophistication and rhetorical proficiency in both content and style. Regarding content, Luke's Gospel utilizes advanced rhetorical exercises, such as the ecphrasis and syncrisis, a point that will be supported throughout Chapters IV and V. Regarding style, Luke is sophisticated to such an extent that his writing permits comparative analysis with the famed works of Greco-Roman historians. Chapter III §1.3-1.4 will further explicate the degree to which Luke's Gospel reflects issues of rhetorical content and style, providing five reasons why rhetorical criticism is relevant to the book of Luke. A note of clarification for this project is the assumption that Luke, as the author of the Gospel, may have been either a Gentile or a Greek-speaking Jew. In either case, the influence of Greco-Roman literary education was of such an extent, as Chapter III §1.2 will argue, that one cannot decide the ethnicity of Luke simply because Greco-Roman rhetoric is employed.[77]

Summarily, Luke's Gospel has been chosen as the case study for the theroretical congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, instead of other narrative texts such as the Book of Acts, because the Gospel provides significantly fewer textual problems than those associated with the Book of Acts. The Book of Acts presents a much greater degree of manuscript discrepancies and divergences.[78] In this regard, Luke has been chosen from a practical standpoint, as it simply allows a case study of a text that is not encumbered by an unwieldy number of lower textual issues.

---

[77] While the dominant view has been that the composer of Luke's Gospel was a Gentile, there are strong arguments in favor of Luke being composed by a Jew. See: Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), xiii-xv. Rick Strelan, *Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel* (Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2008). Isaac W. Oliver, *Torah Praxis After 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

[78] Despite minor variations within the eclectic text, there is the larger issue of divergence between the so-called 'Western' Text and Codex Bezae. Keith J. Elliott, "An Eclectic Textual Study of the Book of Acts" in *The Book of Acts as Church History/ Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte*, et al. eds. Tobias Nicklas (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 9-30. Jenny Read Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text Of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*, (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 2-60. For general issues related to textual criticism: Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed. (Boston Massachusetts: Brill, 2013). For a helpful overview: Carl R. Holladay, *Acts: A Commentary* (Louisville KY: John Knox Press, 2016), 4-29.

1.6 Conclusion and Prospective

The intended reader of this project is one who is not necessarily familiar with either discourse analysis or rhetorical criticism, but one who has knowledge in the Greek of the New Testament. However, insofar as the reader has knowledge of either discourse analysis or rhetorical criticism, or both, the expectation is that this project will still prove useful, through the manner in which practical congruence is demonstrated. In either case, the intention of this project is to determine the specific application of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism in combination to Luke's Gospel. Specifically, the intent is to determine whether these two methods are practically congruent, subsequently enhancing an understanding of Luke's Gospel.

CHAPTER TWO:
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

2.1 General Overview and Primary Contributors

Chapter I presented three key principles of SFL: choice implies meaning, default-markedness, and prominence features. These foundational principles are operative throughout the present chapter as discourse features and functions are presented. Addressing specific discourse features is facilitated by attending to various discourse levels as well as appropriating the insights of Halliday[79] and Levinsohn. Drawing on the work of both discourse analysts is important for three reasons.

First, both analysts approach communication as a semiotic system, addressing a wide variety of discourse features and functions at various levels of analysis, extending from the clause to the higher boundary unit. A comprehensive accounting of discourse levels ensures no discourse system is neglected but rather that a range of communicative functions is exploited.[80] For Halliday, the analysis of a given discourse "should be grounded in an account of the grammar that is coherent, comprehensive and richly dimensioned."[81]

Second, both analysts address text-internal and text-external factors. These factors are especially evident in Halliday's approach to language as a metafunction, involving analysis of the following criteria: i. the ideational, a representation of the manner in which things are experienced, ii. the textual, the construction of the text as a semantic domain, and iii. the interpersonal, the clause as an exchange, the interaction between speaker and audience related to speech functions.[82] Halliday's semiotic network is significant since it provides potential congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism.[83]

---

[79] Halliday was influenced by many, such as Ferdinand Saussure, the Prague Linguistic School, J. R. Firth, (emphasizing language as a system), and Benjamin Whorf (language as an unconscious meaning-making system). A helpful introduction to Halliday's approach is: M. A. K. Halliday, "A Brief Sketch of Systemic Grammar." *On Language and Linguistics,* ed. Jonathan Webster (New York: Continuum, 2003), 180-184.

[80] M. A. K. Halliday and revised by Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed. (New York: Routledge, 2014), 23, 24.

[81] Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4-5.

[82] Within Halliday's approach, particularly related to the interpersonal level, or the cultural context of a text, three factors are also important: field, the topics or intention which the language presents (oriented to the ideational metafunction), *tenor*, the relationship between language users (oriented to the interpersonal metafunction), and *mode*, the express means by which communication is presented (oriented to the textual metafunction). Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 31-42.

[83] This idea is not presented to suggest that a clause does not represent the entire metafunction of language; consisting of textual message, the ideational, and the interpersonal, but rather, to suggest that identifying

Congruence is facilitated by Halliday's attention to the interpersonal metafunction. In this project, rhetorical criticism addresses the interpersonal clause as exchange, grounded in a particular socio-rhetorical context, as presented in Chapter III. Particularly important for the discourse analysis of this project is Halliday's analyses of two clausal components, the ideational, involving process type analysis as the manner in which narration happenings are depicted, and the textual, involving clause analysis, and associated clauses of elaboration, extension, and enhancement. In comparison, the clause as exchange, the interpersonal receives much less attention in this chapter, but will be of principal focus in Chapter III with rhetorical criticism.

Third, because Halliday addresses the English language system and not the Greek, looking elsewhere for discourse features pertaining to the Greek New Testament is necessary. To assist with specific Greek discourse features, the insights of Levinsohn are pertinent. Whereas Halliday's metafunction provides the generating framework for this project, Levinsohn's insights into Greek discourse features provide specific functional resources in Luke's Gospel. [84] In addition to Levinsohn, there are other New Testament scholars who have contributed to understanding various discourse features and functions, particularly in narrative texts. This being the case, Chapter Two discusses New Testament scholars who employ a functional linguistic approach in Luke's Gospel. Where such scholars are presented, their contributions provide a literature review and occur in §2.2-2.5.

Discourse features in this chapter are arranged according to a rank-scale. The rank-scale first identifies a textual boundary between various scenes, and then proceeds to clausal analysis, clause-complex analysis, and finally, the scene level of analysis. Regarding clausal

---

the interpersonal component of narrative texts cannot be identified solely at the clausal level, particularly with ancient texts. This project identifies issues related to *mode* with the clause as *exchange*, what Halliday refers to as the *rhetorical paragraph*. In other words, it is the entire scene that conveys a given communicative function and this is evaluated by an ancient text's relationship to a particular socio-cultural context, here provided by rhetorical criticism. Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 44-46.

[84] As a university-based Bible translation consultant, Levinsohn was one of a small number of scholars who, some 40 years ago, opened the way to apply discourse analysis to the Greek New Testament. For Levinsohn, discourse analysis was an important tool for understanding how authors made use of the flexibility of the Greek language to communicate meaning in a way that traditional, sentence-level grammar had not identified. He paid particular attention to the structure of narrative discourse and following his ground-breaking work in this area, his findings have been further developed and refined by other scholars in applying his research to the Gospels and to Acts. Levinsohn's insights have influenced a number of works, including: Stanley E. Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 89, 135. Martin C. Culy, Mikael C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek New Testament* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2010), 8, 10, 16, 55, 117-118. The works of Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Steven Runge frequently follow Levinsohn's insights. Their contributions will be noted through this chapter.

analysis, two Hallidean components are presented. The first addresses the text as message, the textual facet, as it pertains to information structure in a clause. The second is the clause as representation, the ideational facet, as it pertains to process type analysis. Clause complex analysis incorporates Halliday's notion of taxis, and paratactic/hypotactic relationships.[85] Scene level of analysis includes discourse features such as conjunctive use, participant referencing, verbal aspect, and discourse patterns.

Defining a few key terms provides a foundation for discussing rank scale. In this project, a higher-level cohesive boundary is called a scene. While the terms discourse boundary and unit may be used for such a boundary, these terms do not provide a suitable alternative since they are ambiguous and may refer to any textual level boundary, extending from lower-level to higher-level cohesiveness within a text. To make matters clear, when the word "unit" is used in this project, it refers to any given portion within a scene, marked by a level of discontinuity or development from its textual surroundings. The scenario of higher-level integral relationships occurring above a scene is called a sequence.[86] A sequence occurs when various scenes relate to one another linguistically and thematically.

2.2 Textual Boundaries: Identifying the Scene

Chapter 1 §2.1 shows that a fundamental axiom in discourse analysis is that a text exhibits both cohesion and coherence. Consequently, a text exhibits a grammatical and lexical relationship that hangs together in a cogent manner, promoting various communicative functions.[87] Because a text exhibits a series of coherent relationships, identifying precisely where discourse boundaries occur within a text is essential. Where discourse boundaries occur, there is a tighter integration of coherent text-internal relationships. A central task in Lukan exegesis is that of establishing various discourse boundaries. However, discourse boundaries in Luke's Gospel frequently do not correspond to previously determined chapters or even the

---

[85] A clause complex occurs when more than one clause is linked grammatically to another. Hallidean analysis centers upon clausal analysis, especially because the clause exhibits the metafunction of language. Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 10.

[86] What this project calls a scene, Halliday generally refers to as a rhetorical paragraph or rhetorical unit. *Sequence*, for Halliday, refers to the arrangement of clausal configurations, realized by lexico-grammatical considerations. Halliday, An Introduction to Functional Grammar, 43-44. For a helpful introduction to terms used in the systemic-functional theory of linguistics, see: Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen, Kazuhiro Teruya, and Marvin Lam, eds., *Key Terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics* (New York: Continuum, 2010).

[87] Halliday writes: "Perhaps the most noticeable dimension of language it is compositional structure, known as 'constituency': larger units of language consist of smaller ones." Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 5. "We refer to such a hierarchy of units, related by constituency, as a rank scale, and to each step in the hierarchy as one rank." 5.

traditional pericope or paragraph divisions.[88] Interpretive disagreements in Luke's Gospel occur because of textual boundary issues.

Levinsohn's analysis of New Testament Greek is useful in that he identifies a number of discourse features that assist in marking off textual boundaries. A discourse boundary for Levinsohn corresponds to what this project calls a scene, as noted above in §1. Levinsohn maintained that the most substantial and comprehensive boundary marker indicator is what he refers to as a point of departure.[89] Accordingly, in narrative texts, a point of departure occurs when textual groupings are identified and distinguished, in what he calls discontinuities of situation, reference or action. The function of a point of departure is to introduce a fresh starting point for communication, as well as to permit, consequently, successive clauses to anchor back to this particular trajectory.[90] Levinsohn thus writes: "In narrative, points of departure relate events to their context on the basis of time, of place, or of reference."[91] Further details regarding points of departures are provided at the clause level in §2.3.

Levinsohn also observes that in Luke's Gospel, ἐγένετο tends to indicate the start of a new scene.[92] At the same time, the use of ἐγένετο at the start of a scene indicates there is a thematic relationship to the previous scene. More specifically, Levinsohn notes that where ἐγένετο occurs, it designates that the previous scene provides general background information to the scene that follows.[93]

While a point of departure and ἐγένετο provides important support for establishing a textual boundary, Levinsohn's approach advocates a cumulative approach:

> Although the presence of a surface feature can be taken as supporting evidence for a paragraph or section boundary, it must be emphasized that the presence of such a feature is seldom a sufficient criterion on which to base a boundary. Rather, if one of

---

[88] This project utilizes the Greek text available at: www.GreekBible.org which uses: *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland 26th ed. (Stuttgart Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979). The latest edition is *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010). Differences between these two editions, where significant, will be noted in exegesis of Chapters IV and V.

[89] Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek,* 2nd ed. (Dallas Texas: SIL International, 2000), 271.

[90] Ibid., 8.

[91] Ibid., 7.

[92] Translations differ in the meaning of ἐγένετο, including "now" (KJV, NASB, ASV, RSV, RSVCE), "when" (NIV, NIVUK, CSB), "and it came about" (OJB), and "now it happened" (LEB).

[93] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 177-180.

the reasons for the presence of a certain feature is because of a boundary between units, almost invariably there will be other reasons why that feature might be present.[94]

Consequently, support for a scene's boundaries in the book of Luke includes multiple discourse features and additional considerations. Levinsohn asserted that support for a boundary includes summary statements, character introductions or changes, verbal markers, and boundary linguistic markers. A summary statement is a unifying device whereby information is summarized, indicating that preceding material has been organized around a coherent boundary.[95] Character introduction or change typically involves the presentation of a new participant or group of narrative participants, as non-identifiable referents, or as retrievable but inactive participants or activated but non-attendant participants in a given scene.[96]

Another possible resource for identifying a boundary is the use of verbal markers, which includes identifying verb-initial clauses as displaying continuity, so that non-verbal constituents may signal the presence of a new textual boundary. A verbal tense or mood might also contribute to the identification of a textual boundary.[97] In addition to these discourse features, textual boundaries may also be identified by distinct spatial settings,[98] the presence of a chiastic structure or inclusion.[99] The particular choice of a conjunction may also signal a textual boundary, with δέ and τότε and asyndeton frequently used at such junctures, and καί and τέ less so.[100] In Chapters IV and V, the first step of this project is to identify textual boundaries in the selected passage of Luke's Gospel, whereby each scene is analyzed according to its own integrally coherent logic.[101] With the boundaries each scene identified, analysis turns

---

[94] Ibid., 271.

[95] Ibid., 277.

[96] Ibid., 278-279.

[97] For Levinsohn, narrative verb-initial sentences signal continuity with the previous context. 15.

[98] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 276. Levinsohn observes that a new temporal setting is indicated by a sentence initial temporal marker, and where a sentence initial temporal marker is absent, the scene therefore does not orient to a new temporal setting as its primary basis for a point of departure. In such a circumstance, a temporal indicator is a secondary factor in identifying a point of departure.

[99] Ibid., 277.

[100] Ibid., 275, 280.

[101] However, there are a few caveats. First, while boundary markers may be identified through the various discourse features, there is not a shared functional equivalence among the four Gospels. One Gospel might tend to signal a textual boundary by a specific conjunctive use, while another might altogether ignore such a discourse

to the clause level, then the clause complex level and finally the scene level.

It is important to keep in mind that one must avoid modern literary assumptions as to Lukan scene boundaries, especially since, on occasion, the Lukan textual boundaries discerned by discourse analysis may leave the modern reader hanging 'in the air', as it were. In such cases, it is necessary to reconsider long-standing assumptions as to what constitutes Lukan boundaries. At the same time, it must be kept in mind that while discourse analysis offers a testable and empirical method for discerning scenic boundaries, it cannot on its own, explain 'why' a given Lukan scene opens and closes where it does. Acknowledging this deficit, however, only serves to strengthen the proposal of this project, namely, that rhetorical criticism is a vital exegetical counterpart to discourse analysis. For whereas discourse analysis provides an answer to '*what* is a given textual boundary', even as rhetorical criticism provides an answer as to '*why* a given textual boundary occurs'.[102]

2.3 The Clause as Textual and Ideational
2.3.1 The Clause as Textual/Message: Information Structure

In Halliday's metafunctional approach to language, the clausal level contains all three components, the clause as message, representation, and exchange. Chapter III focuses on the metafunction of exchange, representing text-external factors in rhetorical criticism. The notions behind clause as message and representation are presented here.

Regarding the clause as message, Halliday writes: "We may assume that in all languages the clause has the character of message: it has some form of organization whereby it fits in with, and contributes to, the flow of discourse."[103] Because a clause contains a number of syntactical possibilities, there is a system network at this level that facilitates the principle of choice implies meaning. In other words, choice implies meaning is operative at the clause level

---

feature. Second, identifying the boundaries of some Lukan scenes is not always easy, as Lukan scenes often appendage transitional material. Levinsohn concurs, noting that bridge material occurs within many portions of Luke's Gospel, without clearly discerned breaks. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 271-280. Yet, despite the presence of bridge material, Luke's Gospel reveals a carefully organized structure, from highest to lower levels, a point which Chapters IV and V of this project will illustrate, particularly at the scene level of analysis. For an excellent example of discerning patterns in Luke's Gospel at various levels, see: Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), xvii-xxi.

[102] It may be useful to consider the analogy of a door when dealing with what may be perceived as oddly placed textual boundaries in Luke's Gospel. The role of a door, as with clearly discernable textual features, is to open up a new scene, even as it serves to close the preceding scene. However, the door analogy does not entail that with the closing of one room, the subsequent scene or scenes bears no relationship or memory to what preceded.

[103] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 64.

because within a given linguistic system, the semantics, syntax, and grammar are "…competing with each other for the limited coding possibilities offered by the structure of the sentence."[104] Discourse analysts commonly refer to constituent order of a clause or sentence as information structure.[105]

Because a clause has a number of ordering possibilities, when a structural choice has been made, that decision represents a meaningful choice whereby a given function may be identified. Lambrecht writes: "Speakers do not create new structures to express new meanings. They make creative use of preexisting structures in accordance with their communicative intentions."[106] Yet to identify intentionality, the second principle of SFL is necessary, default-markedness. Within a clause's constituent order, there may be a default, or expected pattern, or there may be a disruption of that pattern. Differentiating default and marked order in a clause necessitates a greater understanding of information structure.

Beginning with the notion of theme aids in understanding information structure in a given clause. Theme is the subject that the clause discusses.[107] Lambrecht explains: "The *Theme* is the element which serves the point of departure of the message; it is that which locates and orients the clause within its context."[108] The theme is that element around which the

---

[104] Knud Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 12.

[105] Nomi Erteschik-Shir, *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1. See also: Margaret Berry, "What Is Theme? (another) Personal View," in *Meaning and Choice in Language Studies for Michael Halliday*, eds. Margaret Berry, Christopher Butler, Robin Fawcett, Guowen Huang in vol. LVII (Norwood N.J.: Ablex, 1996), 4. See also: Kay L. O'Halloran, ed. *Multimodal Discourse Analysis: Systemic-Functional Perspectives* (New York: Continuum International, 2004).

[106] Lambrecht, *Information Structure,* 26. Paul Kroeger helpfully emphasizes the creative possibilities within sentence structure alongside the notion that speakers unconsciously exploit meaning-making possibilities. The unconscious use of speech entails that SFL linguists must seek to identify the forms and functions by which an individual's speaker operates, but of which the speakers are rarely aware. Paul R. Kroeger*, Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-functional Approach* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1.

[107] Discourse analysts are careful to note that one must distinguish between the topic of a sentence (individual sentence) and the topic of a discourse (totality of the text). Topics reside primarily in the speaker and not in the sentences, and clauses taken together inform the theme against singular clauses. This distinction is manifested in assigning two values: to discourse theme and to clause theme. Berry, "What Is Theme? A(nother) Personal View," 18. Margaret Berry goes on to note that analysis of theme conveys a prioritizing meaning (that which is especially important), and notes various devices for prioritizing meaning, such as repetition, intonation, special particle use, unusual position, and fronting. Berry, 27-28. Halliday's work on theme identifies the theme as found at the beginning of the clause. There is ongoing debate as to what constituents in a given clause represent the theme. Several options for identifying the theme include: first in position, first ideationally, inclusive of the subject of the main clause, that which precedes the main verb, auxiliary verbs included, the lexical verb and all parts of the clause preceding it, decreasing clausal effect, and unusual position. 29-31.

[108] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 64.

clause is organized; the conceptual underpinning, or the nexus by which the clause operates.[109]

In English, the theme is typically represented as a nominal or nominal group, where the theme is a participant, also called the subject, typically located in what Halliday calls "declarative clauses."[110] In such instances, the theme tends to conflate with the subject of the clause.[111] A theme may include more than a single element in a clause.[112] In the English language, the theme tends to be pre-positioned, prior to a predicate grouping in a given clause. To clarify the concept of theme, consider this example:

Jesus went into the Capernaum synagogue.

Assuming this is the first clause in a narration, the theme would be Jesus, since the clause is talking about him. In other words, subsequent clausal elements anchor back to Jesus as the organizing element. Jesus as the theme is conflated with the subject of the clause, insofar as narrations typically represent declarative clauses. The theme is restricted to Jesus, even though it could include more than one element, such as a nominal grouping, as in this example:

Jesus, the villager from Nazareth, went into the Capernaum synagogue.

Because the message in a clause is facilitated by the flow of information with the theme as the informational package (the reason for the clause), identifying the theme is necessary. However, the theme of a clause may include more than one constituent and is not restricted to one positon in a clause. The theme is determined by the location and status of references as the discourse advances, in light of the hearer's mental representation at a given point in a discourse. The two concepts of the rheme and mental representations in a discourse further advance these notions. While the theme is the message and anchor for a clause, a clause serves to project something about the theme. In addition to the theme, subsequent clausal information addresses what the theme is about. This "aboutness" is equivalent to what is called the rheme.[113] Consider again this example:

---

[109] For Halliday, the notion of the clause as message is combined with the notion of the clause as representation. In the notion of representation, there are three elements, two of which are necessary: a participant, a process (an attendant circumstance as the third). For Halliday, the theme is represented by only one of these elements, what he calls the topical theme. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 79.

[110] See also: Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 43. Also: Simon C. Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar: The Structure of the Clause*, 2nd ed. (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997), 316.

[111] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 67.

[112] For example, "the man from Galilee [*theme*] walked on the beach."

[113] Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 150. Also: Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar,* 312.

Jesus, a villager of Nazareth, went into the Capernaum synagogue.
In this example the rheme is what remains after the theme, that is, "…went into the Capernaum synagogue*."* As evident in the given example, the rheme is often referred to as the comment, which is the topic of the theme. Because the rheme develops the theme in a clause, the rheme is what remains in a clause after the theme has been provided. In English, the rheme tends to occur after the theme, particularly in declarative clauses.[114]

The understanding of the relationship between rheme and theme in a clause leads to mental representations, since this concept allows the discourse analysts to better identify the theme and rheme in a clause and to employ the principle of default-markedness. Because the rheme provides comment on the theme, the rheme tends to be prior unknown information from the standpoint of the audience. As new and additional information, the rheme is not immediately retrievable in the context, and therefore provides the audience with an element of discourse information that has not yet been disclosed. It is known to the speaker but not to the audience to whom the discourse is directed. Halliday explains:

> The information unit is what its name implies: a unit of information. Information, in this technical sense, is the tension between what is already known or predictable and what is new or unpredictable… It is the interplay of new and not new that generates information in the linguistic sense. Hence the information unit is a structure made up of two functions, the New and the Given.[115]

From the standpoint of the audience the rheme is new information in a given clause, while the theme represents given/known information. Lambrecht explains:

> It is a fundamental property of information in natural language that whatever is assumed by a speaker to be new to a hearer is information which is added to an already existing stock of knowledge in the hearer's mind. The hearer's mind is not a blank sheet of paper on which new propositions are inscribed. Conveying information therefore

---

[114] To better understand the notions of theme and rheme, consider an example from Luke 2:52: "And Jesus grew in wisdom…" (Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν [ἐν τῇ] σοφίᾳ…). The theme in this case, is the nominal, and Jesus is the narrative participant. As noted above, the theme could also include a nominal group, such as in this clause: "And Jesus, from the tribe of Judah, grew in wisdom." Here, the nominal group is included in the theme, "from the tribe of Judah," but it could also be a prepositional phrase or adverb, depending on the status of information at a given discourse location. As stated above, the rheme follows the theme. In the example of Luke 2:52, the rheme is: "grew in wisdom," as the verbal group that follows the nominal. This example represents a simple theme-rheme structure, but there are other ways in which this scenario might occur. A clause may express the theme-rheme by means of a complex structure, wherein several themes occur, as often found among clause complexes. Additionally, sometimes the theme and rheme are integrally related, an equitive structure, as in: "The way Jesus developed was to grow in wisdom…" In this case, the theme has been nominalized.

[115]Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 89. Halliday notes two provisos to this general remark. First, since a discourse must be initialized, the new element is initially conveyed apart from the given. A given may not be actualized in an information unit; being absent in the grammatical structure, it may already be seminal in a given grammatical context.

requires constantly changing hypotheses on the part of the speaker about the state of knowledge of the hearer as speech progresses…there is normally no "new information" without already existing "old information."[116]

The packaging of this information, from given to new, entails that the speaker is involved in a communicative process of brokering the flow of information according to the audience's then-current mental representation of discourse content.[117] Consequently, the natural flow of information proceeds from given to new, the constituent order that represents the default pattern. However, should a speaker choose to disrupt the default pattern of constituent order, such an occurrence is called a marked order.[118]

Returning to the example above and including an additional clause elucidates the use of given to new information:

Jesus went into the Capernaum synagogue. In the synagogue was a demon-possessed man.

In the first clause, "went into the Capernaum synagogue" constitutes new information from the standpoint of the audience. However, in the second clause, what was new information has become given information, thereby making way for the second clause to also provide new information, namely, that a demon-possessed man was present. Subsequent clauses might also be organized according to the natural flow of information, from given to new. However, a speaker may choose to restructure the flow of information, taking what would be new information and placing it first in a clause. An example is follows:

Jesus went into the Capernaum synagogue. A demon-possessed man was there.

By taking what was already new information in the clause, "the presence of a demon-possessed man," and placing it first in the clause, the new information becomes marked information. According to Dik, a discourse feature is marked insofar as it is less expected in a

---

[116] Lambrecht, *Information Structure,* 43, 44.

[117] For Lambrecht, linguistic expressions operate within the informational value of states of affairs, according to the mental state of the hearer, and the contextual setting between the speaker and hearer. This view is similar to Halliday's notion of the clause as exchange. The task of the speaker, then, is to both understand the relevant mental states of the hearer at the time of a given speech, and to add or develop new propositions to the hearer's mental representation at the time of speech. One can thus discern the pattern between sentence structure and presupposed representations. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 45-46. Lambrecht avoids equating "information" and "referents," because information is a set of pragmatic relations, identified by sentence structure, rather than the substance of what the proposition denotes in the hearer's mind. Information for the linguist is thus not concerned with the truth values behind the propositions, but rather how sentence structure facilitates and maintains pragmatic relations.
[118] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 73. See also: T. Givon, *Functionalism and Grammar* (Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing, 1995), 25-29.

given discourse, drawing more attention to that constituent because of its unexpectedness.[119] As new information, the demon-possessed man was already the salient information in the clause, but by placing it first, it is especially salient, that is, this information is highlighted information for some reason.[120]

At this point, addressing constituent order in the Greek New Testament as it pertains to Luke's Gospel is necessary. For New Testament discourse analysts, information structure provides a ripe field for inquiry into functional use.[121] Levinsohn has devoted a significant portion of his work to constituent order.[122] Addressing narrative texts, Levinsohn states:

> the default position of the verb is at the beginning of the sentence, and that subjects preceding the verb prototypically will be interpreted as propositional topics functioning as points of departure. For both of these constituents, therefore, the clause-final position is the only one available for focus (unless some other feature is present…)… Where a constituent may be placed for focus either prior to the verb or at the end of the sentence, however, grammarians have always taken the position that the preverbal position gives more prominence to the constituent that it would receive at the end of the clause or sentence. I see no reason to dispute this."[123]

Levinsohn identifies three key issues related to constituent order in Greek New Testament narratives. First, constituent order in the Greek of the New Testament proceeds from given information to new information, as the unmarked structure in a clause.[124] Second, due to

---

[119] Simon C. Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar,* 41.

[120] Givon emphasizes that markedness is domain-specific, with the context surrounding the communication impinging on markedness values. As an example, consider this alternative clausal structure in Luke 2:52: "growing in wisdom, Jesus…" (instead of the actual order: "Jesus growing in wisdom"). In the alternative structure, the rheme occurs first in the clause: "growing in wisdom." This is the rheme since it is not immediately known by the audience or retrievable from the context. This explains why, in declarative clauses, when a subject is not the theme, it is *marked*, or what Halliday calls a 'marked theme.' T. Givon, *Functionalism and Grammar* (Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing, 1995), 25-29.

[121] Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010), 184. In order to determine these distinctions, it is vital to understand the means by which the speaker and audience interact with knowledge. Jenny Read-Heimerdinger observes that the expectations, and presuppositions shared between the speaker and hearer, provide clues in determining the audience that the author envisions at the time of writing. *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 34-35. See also: Runge, *Discourse Grammar,* 5-6.

[122] Some of Levinsohn's other works include: Robert A. Dooley and Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts* (Dallas Texas: SIL International, 2001). "Participant Reference in Koine Greek Narrative," in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis,* ed. David Alan Black, Katharine Barnwell and Stephen J. Levinsohn (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992), 31-44. *Textual Connections in Acts* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1987).

[123] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 38.

the nature of narrative texts as sequentially ordered, verb-initial sentences are the default pattern. Third, disrupting the default pattern of these first two issues signals a marked order.[125] An example of marked order would be positioning new non-verbal information first in a Lukan narrative clause. In such an instance, placing such a constituent pre-verbal signals that such a constituent has special salience.[126] As new information, the constituent was already salient, but by placing it first in a clause exhibits a particularly unique status, carrying greater functional weight than other constituents. Where marked order or special salience occurs, an analysis of its functional use is important. Because there are a variety of functional uses for marked order in Greek New Testament narratives, greater details are provided below.[127]

In the Greek of the New Testament, the functions of marked order are first determined on the basis of whether a clause contains a main verb or not. With regard to narrative texts, if a clause contains a main verb and a constituent is placed prior to that main verb, such an instance is called forefronting. An occurrence of any constituent is moved to a place earlier than its usual, default position within a clause is called frontshifting. This distinction is important to keep in mind since various functions relate to distinguishing these two types of marked clauses. The functions associated with forefronting and frontshifting are provided below as well as illustrated by considering the metaphor of a drama on stage.

---

[124] Markedness is a qualitative issue, not necessarily related to frequency of use. Runge, *Discourse Grammar,* 185-186.

[125] Wolfgang U. Dressler, "Marked and Unmarked Text Strategies within Semiotically Based NATURAL Textlinguistics," in *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, eds. Shin Ja J. Hwang and William R. Merrifield (Dallas Texas: SIL, 1992), 5. Levinsohn's analysis has been confirmed and developed by other New Testament scholars. In particular, see: Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts,* 63-64, 69.

[126] The words "focus," "emphasis," "salience" and "prominence" are rather difficult to define, especially because in common speech these words are interchangeable, but distinguishing their uses is important in a technical sense. This work follows that of Read-Heimerdinger who distinguishes salience from focus, by identifying salient information as that which is displaced to a marked position nearer to the front of the clause than its default position. She uses "focus" to refer to the highlighting of specifically new information, concentrating on some information, whereas salience refers to any information whether old or new. Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 38. Jeffrey T. Reed refers to prominent information as that which is more semantically and pragmatically significant. Jeffrey T. Reed, "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis" in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 76. The concept of focality is similar, and refers to what is prominent in any given topicalization. These two inform each other with the topic serving as guardrails by which prominence/focality can be conveyed.

[127] In the Greek New Testament, marked order serves two general functions: i. to signal a point of departure in a scene, marked by discontinuity of spatial-temporal factors, or, ii. to signal contrast with a previously established constituent or focus/prominence to the marked constituent. There are a number of additional and specific functions related to aspects of focus. As will be seen, additional functions are determined on the basis of whether marked order occurs in a main-verb clause or non-main-verb clause.

Forefronting, as placing a constituent before the main verb, signals one of two functions: i. a point of departure or ii. giving focus to the pre-verbal constituent, that is, taking what was contextually obscure and bringing it into focus. Comparing these two functions to a drama is useful. In the first instance, a forefronted point of departure is like the introduction of a curtain change on the stage. Introducing a curtain change signals a level of spatial-temporal discontinuity, whereby the audience anticipates a level of newness in the drama. A forefronted focus, however, is like taking an established object on stage and bringing it into focus with a spotlight. Prior to the spotlight, while the object was present on stage, it was indistinct in the sense of being not particularly important. By directing the spotlight upon it, the audience is directed to consider the object's current prominence in the drama. In the case of a forefronted constituent in focus, discourse analysis cannot explain why focus is being drawn to that constituent on its own. Analysis of focus requires an understanding of larger textual issues or text-external considerations.[128]

Frontshifting occurs when a constituent is placed earlier than its usual position within a subordinate clause, that is, before a non-main verb. The new position is relative to the internal structure of the clause to which the constituents belong, and not to the sentence as a whole. Therefore, the reason for frontshifting is never to signal a point of departure as may be the case in forefronting. Rather, within a subordinate clause, a constituent is being highlighted for several possible reasons, all of them comparable to underlining or italics in a written text: i. as a switch of focus, ii. for contrast with another constituent, iii. to introduce an important speech, iv. to signal that the constituent was unexpected, or v. for a reason demanding greater knowledge of context.

These functions can also be compared to a drama. A constituent that is highlighted as a switch of focus is like a spotlight that has been placed upon an object. A constituent in contrast is like a spotlight successively used alternately between two objects. A constituent that introduces an important speech is like a stage performer who increases volume at a critical moment. Introducing an unexpected constituent is like an object on stage that was not clearly visible, but that suddenly appears when in the spotlight. Finally, a constituent that is

---

[128] The backgrounded information, that is, constituents not in focus, does not mean these are inconsequential or irrelevant. Rather, these elements are necessary in order to provide context to a given narrative scene. Nevertheless, not all constituents carry equal semantic weight, and so textual prominence is of special interest to discourse analysts.

highlighted but demands greater context is like a spotlight flashing upon an object, but for reasons known only to the audience members, perhaps due to their knowledge of the play, its development, or background issues.

As this section draws to a close, a summary of several key issues related to the clause as message and constituent order are useful. First, identifying the message of a clause requires an understanding of both the theme and rheme of that clause. Second, the natural flow of information develops from given to new information, as the default pattern. In narratives such as the New Testament Gospels, the default is verb-initial constituent order. Third, a disruption of the default pattern signals that such a constituent is marked. By being marked, that constituent receives greater salience than it would have in its post-verbal position. Fourth, there are various possible functions for a marked constituent, determined foremost on the basis of whether a clause contains a main verb or non-main verb. Fifth, forefronted constituents that are in focus, and frontshifted constituents that are highlighted for some reason, are cases where discourse analysis alone cannot determine the reason that the constituent is highlighted in their respective ways. Where such instances occur, there is a particular need for both text-internal and text-external analyses. Consequently, there is a basis for potential congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism. Because rhetorical criticism provides a number of text-external resources, it may clarify the occurrence of focal constituents, or provide a general literary framework whereby such constituents may be evaluated.

Chapter III examines the potential resources that rhetorical criticism provides for Lukan exegesis. Before moving on, however, another component of clausal analysis is necessary, that of Halliday's notion of the clause as representation. As with clausal constituent order, understanding variability within the clausal system provides another occasion for examining various discourse features and their respective functions in Luke's Gospel.

2.3.2. The Clause as Ideational/Representation: Process Types

In addition to Halliday's textual level of clausal analysis, the message as information structure, there is the ideational level of clausal analysis, the representation of experience. Analysis of the clause as representation involves analysis of the process or flow of events by which various experience may be represented. In Hallidean grammar, representational experiences are conveyed by means of six process types. These six processes include the mental, behavioral, relational, existential, verbal, and material.[129] Since there are six process

---

[129] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 170-175. Halliday primarily analyzes English clauses, but these may be extended to other languages. When categorizing these process types, they exhibit a

types by which a speaker may choose to depict experience, the principle of choice implies meaning requires an understanding of the six process types and an evaluation of their usage within a functional system. To begin this evaluation, the initial step is identifying what is meant by process types, whereupon an analysis of each process type is provided along with their occurrence in Luke 7:11-17, a scene that includes all six process types.

Three fundamental components for representing experiences in a clause are important to note in understanding what a process in Hallidean analysis means: i. the process, ii. a participant, and iii. a circumstance. Regarding process, a clause contains a verb or verbal group that represents a process that is associated with temporal factors. Regarding participant(s), a clause contains a nominal or nominal group that represents participants or subjects associated with spatial aspects. Regarding circumstance, a clause may contain adverbial or prepositional elements that represent some attendant factor or circumstance associated with a given process. Halliday maintained that the process and participant are essential in the clause's representation of experience. These two components comprise what Halliday calls the "experiential centre" of a clause.[130] The process, the verbal group, provides the system network of the six process types. These six processes are discussed in turn here below.

The Mental Process

Mental processes, according to Halliday:

> …are concerned with our experience of the world of our consciousness. They are clauses of sensing: a "mental" clause construes a quantum of change in the flow of events taking place in our own consciousness. This process of sensing may be construed either as flowing from a person's consciousness or as impinging on it; but it is not construed as a material act.[131]

An example of the mental process would be statements such as: "I remember kicking the ball," or "I like kicking the ball." In such clauses the speaker or participant's mental process, that is, internal consciousness, is represented. As an internal representational process

---

network of continuity or permeation with various other process types, what Halliday calls a "continuous semiotic space." This space is shared more integrally depending on the particular process type. For example, the behavioral process type is situated near the material and mental process types. The verbal process is situated near the mental and relational process types, and so on. Of the six process types, three process types are fundamental to the clause as representation: the material, the mental, and the relational.

[130] Ibid., 175-176.

[131] Ibid., 197. "…the Senser…senses'—feels, thinks, wants or perceives…" 201. Halliday specifically identified four sub-types of sensing: perceptive (sensory), cognitive (mental conjecture), desiderative (desire), and emotive (pathos). "They differ with respect to phenomenality, directionality, gradeability, potentiality and ability to serve as metaphors of modality…" 210.

there is no external operation expressed. There is no external operation in the sense that the discourse world is unaffected by the mental process of internal states of consciousness, whether of the speaker or discourse participant. In Hallidean analysis, the speaker or participant of the mental process is referred to as the senser. Following the example above, a participant's consciousness involves a spatial element or object, and therefore is referred to as the phenomenon.

An example of the mental process occurs in Luke 7:13: "The Lord felt compassion for her," ὁ κύριος ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ᾽ αὐτῇ. In this instance, Jesus, ὁ κύριος, is the discourse participant referred to as the senser. His inward experience, as an emotional state of consciousness represents the phenomenon, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ᾽ αὐτῇ. In this clause the mental process is represented by the aorist passive indicative. The use of the passive voice in mental processes is common, since the senser typically undergoes an experience in relation to some external phenomenon that impinges upon the senser's internal experience.

Senser	Sense	Phenomenon
ὁ κύριος	ἐσπλαγχνίσθη	ἐπ᾽ αὐτῇ

The Behavioral Process

According to Halliday, the behavioral process clause represents:

…physiological or psychological behavior, like breathing, coughing, smiling, dreaming and staring… They are the least distinct of all the six process types because they have no clearly defined characteristics of their own; rather, they are partly like the material and partly like the mental.[132]

The participant who is "behaving," labeled the behaver by Halliday, is typically a conscious being, like the senser above, but in this case, the process aligns less with sensing and more with doing.[133] For instance: "he was waving his hands for the soccer ball," where "was waving" represents the behavioral process, and "for the soccer ball" represents the circumstance associated with the process. An example is found in the same narrative of Luke 7:13: "They were glorifying God," καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν. Halliday observes: "...while 'behavioral' clauses do not 'project' indirect speech or thought, they often appear in fictional

---

[132] Halliday lists various examples of behavior process type verbs. Those shading into the mental process include: look, watch, listen, think. Those near the verbal: talk, murmur, grumble. Those representing psychological or physiological states include: cry, laugh, smile, breathe, sneeze, sleep. Those near the material include: sing, dance, sit. Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 251.

[133] Ibid., 249-250.

narrative introducing direct speech, as a means of attaching a behavioral feature to the process of 'saying.'"[134] Halliday's comment reflects Luke 7:16: "and they began glorifying God, saying that…," καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες ὅτι.

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(crowds)	καὶ ἐδόξαζον	τὸν θεὸν

The Relational Process

The relational process type serves to characterize and to identify that of being and having. An example of a being relational clause is: "The soccer ball was in the midfield," where "was in the midfield" represents a relation of outer experiences, characterized by the ball's relationship to other entities or locations. In this example, being is represented by the relationship of the ball to the soccer field. Halliday writes "… in a 'relational' clause, a thing, act or fact construed as a participant is configured with another relational participant that has to come from the same domain of being."[135] Configuring two relational entities is conveyed by Halliday as Be-er (1) and Be-er (2), for example: "she [Be-er (1)] is a princess [Be-er (2)]." By construing experience by means of "being" the relational process promotes a vast network of relational sets. As Halliday observes:

> … something is said to "be" to something else. In other words, a relationship of being is set up between two separate entities… we cannot have a "relational" clause such as *she was* with only one participant; we have to have two: *she was in the room*.[136]

Because the relational process portrays experience as a set of relationships, there is an absence of dynamic motion, physiological dynamism or sensing of phenomenon. For example, "I am smiling on the throne" represents the behavioral process and "I feel cold on the throne" represents the mental process. [137] However, clauses such as "I am on the throne," or "I am the throne," represent a variety of relational processes, the first clause representing relations of being, and the second clause as a relation of having, where a membership set is involved, attribution and identity.

---

[134] Ibid., 252.

[135] Ibid., 213.

[136] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 213.

[137] Ibid., 211.

Because of its relational representation of experience, a weakened process is typically represented in this process type. The relational process does not typically represent reality through external energy, but by associational or representational verbs. Because of this feature, Halliday writes: "More than any other process type, the relationals have a rich potential for ambiguity."[138] To illustrate this concept, consider again the example: "she [Be-er (1)] is a princess [Be-er (2)]." Here the predicate nominative represents some type of association or representational relationship between a given female and the princess set, but by lacking spatial-temporal indicators the meaning of such a clause is not entirely clear. In such an instance, metaphorical transference tends to be employed.

Two examples of the relational process type occur in Luke 7:12, "and she was a widow," καὶ αὐτὴ ἦν χήρα, and "and a large crowd of the city was with her," καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὸς ἦν σὺν αὐτῇ. The second example demonstrates the potential ambiguity typically associated with the relational process. While spatial relationships may be conveyed in the crowds accompanying the widow, the clause may additionally convey a sense of shared sorrows as the crowd's empathetic solidarity with the widow's grief. [139]

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Possessive)	Attribute: Possessive
καὶ αὐτὴ	ἦν	χήρα

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὸς	ἦν	σὺν αὐτῇ

The Verbal Process

The verbal process type occurs when the participant is a sayer, and is typically conveyed in dialogue, referred to as reported speech in narratives. Halliday explains: "'Saying' has to be interpreted in a rather broad sense; it covers any kind of symbolic exchange of

---

[138] Ibid., 247. In the relational process type, two sub-types emerge: (1) attributive clauses and (2) identifying clauses. In the attributive mode, the conveyed entity is assigned some class or set assigned to it. The identifying mode establishes a relationship between two sets. Other modes include: the circumstantial and the possessive. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 214-248.

[139] The relational process construes experience in ways most similar to the mental and material process types. Understanding the blurriness between such processes explains why potential ambiguity also occurs in Luke 7:12, which exhibits blurriness between the material and relational: "Now as he approached the gate of the city," ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως. Ambiguity arises between Jesus and the city gate, whether the gate is strictly circumstantial or invokes broader concepts, allusions, or echoes with the Jewish Scriptures.

meaning."[140] The sayer is not necessarily a sentient entity, as is necessary for the mental

process type, but may include any entity that is involved in some sort of communication or

signal, such as a stoplight or a written report. As Halliday observes:

> … "verbal" process clauses do display distinctive patterns of their own. Besides being able to project…they accommodate three further participant functions in addition to the Sayer: (1) Receiver, (2) Verbiage, (3) Target… The Receiver is the one to whom the saying is directed… The Verbiage is the function that corresponds to what is said… The Target occurs only in a sub-type of "verbal" clause; this function construes the entity that is targeted by the process of saying; for example: *He also accused <u>Krishan Kant</u> of*…[141]

An example of the verbal process type is Luke 7:13, "and he said to her, do not weep,"

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Μὴ κλαῖε. In this example, Jesus is the Sayer, the widow is the Receiver of

the communication, and there is direct or reported speech as the Projection.

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming[142]	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	καὶ εἶπεν	αὐτῇ		Μὴ κλαῖε	

The Existential Process

The existential process type refers to a participant called the existent. It may refer to

entities other than a person, such as an object, event, action, concept, and so on. According to

Halliday, the existential process type conveys:

> … that something exists or happens…While "existential" clauses are not, overall, very common in discourse… they make an important, specialized contribution to various kinds of texts. For example, in narrative, they serve to introduce central participants in the Placement (Setting, Orientation) stage at the beginning of a story… After the Placement stage, existential clauses are also used to introduce phenomenon into the (predominantly) material stream of narration.[143]

This existential process type is found in Luke 7:11, where a Lukan discourse feature is found

that serves as a point of departure for this new scene, "And it came about," Ἐγένετο δὲ

ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς. In this case, the narration scene begins by asserting an occurrence, that is, place-

---

[140] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 253.

[141] Ibid., 255, 256.

[142] Halliday refers to naming as verbiage, which involves either the content of reported speech or the naming of the speech, such as, asked, questioned, ordered, said, and so on. *Halliday's Introduction*, 306.

[143] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 256-257.

setting the scene by means of the temporal marker and circumstance that provides the oriented setting.[144]

Existential Process	Existent	Circumstance
Ἐγένετο δὲ		ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς

The Material Process

The final process type, to which the greatest space is devoted below, is the material process type. The material process type, according to Halliday, "…are clauses of doing-&-happening: a 'material' clause construes a quantum of change in the flow of events as taking place through some input of energy."[145] To depict a change, a participant, actor, or agent inputs some action or deed, resulting in a new event. An example of a material clause is "the boy kicked the ball." In this clause the boy is the actor, whose material process "kicked" results in a change in the event involving the movement of the ball, as the goal. An example is Luke 7:15 "and he gave him back to his mother," καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ.

While the actor is significant to the material clause, in triggering a new event, analyzing the network of recipients of that clausal change is also important. In grammar, such analysis involves the concepts of intransitivity and transitivity.[146] When an actor affects a happening, or a change of event status, but does so without reference to anything outside the actor, it is considered an intransitive clause. However, when this happening extends to a goal, it is considered a transitive clause. The goal is understood by Halliday to refer to the "one to which the process is extended."[147] This construction, typically, is a noun phrase (NP1) followed by a transitive verb, (VP), and another NP2, often a direct object or receptor of the NP1 subject.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circum./Recipient
(Jesus)	ἔδωκεν	αὐτὸν	τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ

Halliday's notion of transitivity-intransitivity has been applied to select New Testament narratives. To this end, the work of Martin-Asensio and his analyses in the book of Acts have been particularly insightful. Martin-Asensio writes of transitivity:

---

[144] Ἐγένετο δὲ… serves other functions as explained in Ch. II §2.

[145] Ibid., 224.

[146] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 295.

[147] Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 225.

Without a consistent depiction of the participants, their roles and action, and, more specifically, the actions of those characters who in different ways advance or resolve the plot, a narrative will appear to lack a backbone and sense of direction. In fact, the question of "who does what to whom" may be considered absolutely essential to the interpretation of all narrative texts.[148]

The notion of transitivity is especially significant for SFL, since it attends to choice implies meaning, markedness, and prominence. Along these lines, Martin-Asensio writes:

> The need of writers to mark varying degrees of saliency in narrative seems to be a universal one. By investing the text with diverse viewpoints on the action, and highlighting key elements or episodes through lexico-grammatical means, the skilled narrator is able to impose an 'evaluative superstructure' upon the text, aimed at effecting the desired response(s) in the reader. The textual function of language, of which foregrounding strategies are a realization, enables the writer to organize his text into a coherent and cohesive whole, so that what he writes is appropriate to the context and fulfills its intended function.[149]

In his work, Martin-Asensio not only explores transitivity but also ergativity. In the transitive model, extension or impact is the primary issue, such as "someone did something to someone" and addresses the notion of "doing." For example, the transitive clause "He caught the fish" addresses the actor's activity, his "catching." However, with the addition of the ergative model, the chief issue is that of happening, as in "he caught the fish with his prized lure." Ergativity generally occurs when an agent's act is mediated by a process toward causality, and so particular attention is given to the role of a medium through which the process is realized.[150] In the ergative model, then, it is not the agent that is the sole focus of change, but the process and the medium that results in a change of events. In essence, causation is the ergative pattern of meaning.[151] By employing Halliday's notion of ergativity as causality,

---

[148] Gustavo Martin-Asensio, *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles: A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 10. Martin-Asensio traces this observation among various narrative structuralists (Propp, Greimas, Chapman) to its ultimate source in Aristotle's *Poetic*. 11-13, 20.

[149] Martin-Asensio, *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding,* 43.

[150] Ibid., 68-71.

[151] Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 284-285, 288. For Halliday, the key participant by which a process comes about is called the medium. In the material process with an intransitive clause the medium is the actor if there is a goal, but in a transitive clause the medium is the goal of the initiator of the process. The issue has to do with agency, where a process occurs by way no separate agency, or by external forces by which another entity becomes the agency. 288, 290. According to Halliday, medium is the fundamental intersection for various interactions of a given process. In this respect, Halliday identifies two other entities: (1) beneficiary, that for which the process has taken place, and (1) range explicates the range/domain of the process. 292-293.

Martin-Asensio identifies the primary participant in the book of Acts to be God, rather than Peter or Paul.

There are two benefits in the Hallidean functional approach relating process type analysis to Luke. First, because narrative scenes operate along a spatial-temporal flow of events, the material process type is the default process for substantial narrative progression. Whether the material process represents the transitive model of doing or ergative model of happening, both cases provide prototypical means for changes within the flow of events among participants interacting in a given narrative world of external stimuli. Consequently, a functional analysis of Lukan narratives scenes include a consideration of the means by which the flow of events occur. Should a non-material process type be selected, it is marked to the extent that it disrupts the default pattern and is integrally associated with other marked features that signal prominence.

Second, and related to the first point, knowing that there are six process types by which experience is represented entails that a given scene may provide a variety of process types and in variety of different arrangements. Concerning the number of available process types, exploring to what extent SFL offers rhetorical criticism an objective means to identify the appropriate rhetorical exercises in a given scene is another interesting study. The importance of this point will become evident in Chapter III when discussing various rhetorical exercises in the progymnasmata as well as in practical exegesis of Luke's Gospel.

There is also a functional benefit in evaluating the organization of process types in a given scene, but it is a cumulative investigation. Not only is identifying the arrangement and frequency of process types in a scene necessary, but also correlating these to marked discourse features within the scene itself and then comparing the findings to other Lukan scenes. For example, in Luke 7:11-17, a total of 21 processes occur in this scene. Not surprisingly, the material process is most frequent (8 times), followed by verbal process (5 times), and the relational process (4 times). Apart from comparing this scene to others in Luke's Gospel, a noteworthy observation is that for each occurrence of the verbal process, the material process immediately follows, excepting the final two verbal processes that close out the scene. This arrangement is provided below:

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Μὴ κλαῖ (verbal)--καὶ προσελθὼν ἥψατο τῆς σοροῦ (material)

καὶ εἶπεν, Νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθη (verbal)-- καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς (material)

 καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν (verbal)-- καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτο (material)

λέγοντες ὅτι Προφήτης μέγας ἠγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν (verbal)

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος (verbal)

As noted above, the material process depicts experience as happenings or doings where an actor provides some input of energy resulting in a change of events. The material process is the fundamental process type that facilitates narrative development. Still, in this scene, the verbal process immediately precedes the material processes, and at critical junctures where Jesus is involved. For example, in consequence of Jesus' words to the widow, he approaches the bier of the deceased son. Even more significant, in consequence of Jesus' words, the dead young man is raised. Seen as a whole, while it is the material process of the young son rising that results in the widow's comfort and praise from the crowds, it was Jesus' preceding words, Νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθη, that initiated those series of events.

Whatever else might be said about Luke's frequency and arrangement of process types in this scene, the above analysis suggests that Jesus' input of energy, his "doing" is located in the verbal and not the material process. This brief example suggests that process type analysis provides exegetical benefit, for in this scene the construal of the quantum change of events comes through the words of Jesus, rather than from his deeds. Of further value is the exploration of how the process types analysis relates to analysis based on rhetorical criteria, an investigation that will be carried out in Chapters IV and V.

2.4 Clause Complex Analysis

2.4.1. Clause Complexes in Hallidean Grammar

While clausal analysis involves constituent order and process types, clause complex analysis involves discerning relationships between clauses that are integrally related. Halliday defines a clause complex as "clauses linked to one another by means of some kind of logico-semantic relation to form clause complexes representing sequences of figures (or moves) that are presented as textually related messages."[152] Halliday's analysis of the clause complex involves two elements: i. taxis and ii. logico-semantic relations. These two components provide a clausal structural system by which functionality can be discerned and are presented below.

Taxis in Hallidean grammar refers to the degree or level of interdependency among clauses. Whether a clause is dependent or not forms the basis of two systems: parataxis and hypotaxis. Parataxis refers to two or more clauses that share equal status and therefore exhibits an increased level of independence. Hypotaxis refers to two or more clauses that relate to one

---

[152] Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 428.

another by dependency. The distinction between parataxis and hypotaxis is important. For according to Halliday, "The distinction between parataxis and hypotaxis has evolved in languages as a powerful grammatical strategy for guiding the rhetorical development of a text, making it possible for the grammar to assign different statuses to figures within a sequence."[153]

Providing examples of clausal relationships are helpful in elucidating Halliday's point. Returning to the example of the widow's son in Luke 7:11-17, there are three paratactic clauses in v. 15. Their relationships are represented by Hallidean symbols which are explained below:

καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς// καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν,// καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ.

     1   2   3

The numeric notations provided above belong to paratactic clausal relationships. All three clauses share equal status as paratactic clauses and hence are assigned numeric values in ascending order, such as is common in narrative texts with temporal progression. The two bars between the clauses demonstrate that they operate independently from one another though structured in sequence. The conjunctions in paratactic clauses are what Halliday refers to as "linkers" and in the example above involves the three-fold use of καί.

A hypotactic relationship occurs in Luke 7:14. This example is also represented with Hallidean symbols:

καὶ προσελθὼν /ἥψατο τῆς σοροῦ

          β   α

In this example, the head clause is represented by the Greek letter α, with dependency displayed in the other clauses by means of successive Greek letters (β, γ, δ...). As Halliday observes, the main, or dominant clause carries higher level status than the dependent clause, which in the example above provides a temporal relationship to the main clause. According to Halliday, the choice to augment a clause represents a meaningful choice, where:

> …the basic consideration has to do with how much textual, interpersonal, and experiential semiotic "weight" is to be assigned to the unit: the more weight it has, the more likely it is to be constructed as an interdependent clause in a clause complex rather than as a circumstantial phrase (or adverbial group) augmenting a clause.[154]

---

[153] Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 441.

[154] Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 434.

Weight is important and will be considered more fully at the close of this section. Examining two types of relationships in hypotactic clauses is useful, which involves logico-semantic relations, that is, how various clauses relate to one another. Logico-semantic relations involve two basic considerations: projection and expansion. Projection concerns a relationship wherein one clause projects, or represents that of another clause, providing data for the other clause. Since projection is prototypically located within reports or speeches, it is not particularly germane to this project, since this project typically focuses upon non-reported speech elements.

Expansion concerns a relationship within a clause complex wherein one clause expands upon that of another clause. Halliday allocates expansion clauses into three categories: extension, elaboration, and enhancement. An extension clause adds a level of meaning not contained within the head clause. An enhancement clause presents a substantial development from the head clause. Finally, an elaboration clause serves to restate, exemplify, or clarify the head clause. These three categories are discussed below and with examples from Luke 7:11-17.

With extension, one clause extends the meaning of another clause. It extends meaning by adding to the information of one clause, providing meaning that is new in relation to the other clause. Halliday symbolizes extension with +, because of the manner in which one clause is joined to another by simple addition, alternation, or variation.[155] Furthermore, the extension clause tends to lack any specific notion of causal or temporal relationships. The choice to present an extension clause complex suggests that while there is a relationship between the head and dependent clause, there is a level of ambiguity related to causal and temporal between these clauses. However, by the nature of their dependency, an extension clause possesses less semantic weight than the head clause. This is also true for clauses of enhancement and elaboration. An example of an extension clause is in Luke 7:14:

καὶ προσελθὼν /ἥψατο τῆς σοροῦ

+β   α

With an elaboration clause there is a restatement, clarification, or example of another clause. Such a clause is symbolized by means of =, and is clarified by Eggins: "Common to all these types of elaboration is that the secondary clause does not introduce a new element of meaning, but rather provides a further characterization of meaning that is already there,

---

[155] Ibid., 477-476. Halliday observes: "In extension, one clause extends the meaning of another by adding something new to it. What is added may just be an addition, or else a replacement, or an alternative." 471.

restating it, clarifying it, refining it, or adding a descriptive attribute of comment."[156] In the example below from Luke 7:16, the saying of the crowd represents an elaborating clause since there is no new element presented which is not already nascent in the primary clause.

καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν/ λέγοντες ὅτι…

$$\alpha \qquad\qquad =\beta$$

Finally, with clauses of enhancement, one clause enhances the meaning of another by providing qualification to the head clause, through relating issues of time, space, manner, cause, concession or condition. Halliday maintained that enhancement occurs when a clause presents a developmental relationship to another clause, symbolized by x.[157]

2.4.2. Clause Complexes in the Greek New Testament

Considering the Greek New Testament is necessary since Hallidean analysis of clause complexes focuses on the English language. Clause complexes in the Greek New Testament involve the use of participles, as the Greek language makes extensive use of them to complement, in certain ways, the main verb. In examining Greek participles, there are several relevant issues to consider: i. participles as aspectual, ii. pre-verbal and post-verbal functions, iii. the prominence of the main verb in relation to associated participles, iv. the relative ranking scale of participles in relation to pre- or post-verbal placement.

The first issue, participles and verbal aspect, may be briefly stated. In the Greek New Testament, the imperfective participle signals action that is continuous in time with the main verb, while the aorist participle typically precedes the main verb temporally, though it may also be concurrent.[158] Issues regarding tense and aspect will be addressed in more detail in §5.4.

Second, participle position relative to the main verb serves one of two functions. Levinsohn writes of pre-main-verb participles: "prenuclear participial clauses are always backgrounded with respect to their nuclear clause..."[159] He notes further: "the information they convey is of secondary importance vis-à-vis that of the nuclear clause."[160] Concerning

---

[156] Suzanne Eggins, *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Bloomsbury, 2004), 280. See also: Geoff Thompson, *Introducing Functional Grammar*, 3rd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2014), 185-201. Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 461-471.

[157] Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 476-487.

[158] Randall Buth, "Participles as A Pragmatic Choice" in *The Greek Verb Revisited,* 275.

[159] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 181.

[160] Ibid., 183.

postnuclear clauses, Levinsohn observes that post-nuclear participles serve to provide a circumstance attending the main clause, or an aspect of an event attendant to it.[161] Similarly, Runge notes that a participle that precedes the main verb is backgrounded to the action of the main verb, while a participle that follows the main clause elaborates the action of the main verb.[162] Such functional analysis is more specific than Halliday's categories of clausal expansion; elaboration, extension and enhancement. At the same time, both systems share formal similarities, where Halliday's extension and enhancement clauses (+, x) reflect Runge's notion of backgrounded clauses and where elaborating clauses are equivalent (=).

Third, participles are ranked less prominently than the main verb. Runge writes:

Participles that precede the main verb have the effect of backgrounding the action with respect to the main verb of the clause, while most participles that follow the main verb elaborate the main verbal action. Participles therefore are not an option for prominence marking, since they already mark something else. Using them in narrative would be understood to signal either backgrounding or elaboration.[163]

Functionally, backgrounded or elaborating participles possess secondary status in relation to the main verb. This does not mean participles are without functional value. For, as Runge also notes:

We might be tempted to think of the participial action as unimportant, but that is not the case. It is simply a matter of prioritization, with finite verbs being used for more central action or activity…Not every action is equally important, and participles provide the grammatical means of explicitly marking this. The Greek participle allows the writer to make one finite verb (e.g., indicative or imperative) central to the entire sentence by rendering the rest of the actions as participles. [164]

Fourth, while main verbs are most prominent, there is a ranking scale to participles relative to their pre- or post-verbal placement. Buth addresses the relative status of both pre- and post-main-verb participles when he establishes that pre-verbal particles are

---

[161] Ibid., 186.

[162] Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 249. Runge notes that the participle is not unimportant to a clause complex, but that it is an issue of prioritization. The finite verb is central to the clause, receiving primary focus, with surrounding participles elaborating the main verb or backgrounded to it. 244, 248.

[163] Runge, *Discourse Grammar,* 244. Randall Buth writes: "Practically, choosing to encode one event with a finite verb and another event with a participle adds a relative ranking scale to their prominence when communicating." 278. "Participles as A Pragmatic Choice" in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, eds., (Bellingham WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 275.

[164] Runge, *Discourse Grammar,* 244. Buth, "Participles as A Pragmatic Choice" in *The Greek Verb Revisited,* 281.

"…prototypically demoted and less prominent in relation to the main verb and typically served as settings and introductory material."[165] Buth also notes:

> The post-main-verb continuative participles certainly bring in information that may be treated as naturally salient just like other postverbal material. There is a natural information cline in human communication that moves from more-presupposed to more-salient. Post-main-verb participles are typically important and salient, as their post-verb position would suggest, yet they are ranked with lower prominence than the main head verbs because they are participles.[166]

Buth's comments are consistent with the notion expressed earlier, that elaborating participles serve to restate or clarify the main verb. By selecting an elaborating participial clause, the speaker has chosen to iterate the main verb, packing additional information that clarifies or restates the main verb, and thus semantically loading additional information regarding the main verb.[167] The resulting suggestion is that increased prominence is assigned to finite verbs that carry elaborating participles. Such a notion, however, is not a fixed value, but rather relative to clausal constructions throughout the scene, including both clause complexes and clause simplexes. For example, should a given scene contain a number of elaborating clause complexes, the weight associated with any one elaborating clause complex is reduced due to equivalency. Further still, should there be a single clause simplex in relation to a number of clauses complexes, by virtue of its unique status within the scene, the clause simplex would be marked as possessing greater semantic weight by virtue of its unique status within a scene. In such cases, functional weight is assigned to clausal constructions due to disruptive and irregular patterns provided in a given discourse network.

2.5 Scene Level Analysis

The third level of discourse analysis in this project is scene level analysis. The scene level of analysis is important in that it provides the total network of discourse features in higher level integration. In demonstrated below, scene level analysis includes the following discourse features: conjunctive use, participant referencing, verbal aspect, and discourse patterns. Since

---

[165] "Participles as A Pragmatic Choice" in *The Greek Verb Revisited*, 281.

[166] Ibid., 282.

[167] While Rutger J. Allan does not cite participial use as signaling a prominent element in a narration, he does argue for a change of pace, what he calls "a slowing down of the camera" as an important contributing factor. "Towards a Typology of the Narrative Modes" in *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, eds. Stephanie Bakker and Gerry Wakker (Boston: Brill, 2009), 186-198.

Hallidean grammar attends to the clause and clause complex primarily, his contributions are limited in this section; rather attention is given to Levinsohn's analyses of Greek.

2.5.1. Conjunctive Use

Since a narration is an ordering of spatial-temporal relations, it is typical for conjunctions to facilitate progression. This progression is true in the English language, but in ancient Greek conjunctions are even more critical because of the absence of punctuation, including the lack of differentiation between capital and lower case letters in ancient manuscripts. Thus, while conjunctions commonly serve as linkers between paratactic clauses, conjunctions provide more functions than simply establishing cohesion between clauses or even units within a scene. For instance, a coordinating conjunction may also function to distinguish various levels within a narration scene, signaling developmental units whereby a new step or development is introduced within a narration.

For Levinsohn, conjunctive analysis provides another opportunity to explore the functional system network in New Testament documents. Such a wide conjunctive system benefits an SFL approach, where choice implies meaning and default-markedness are key principles. In Greek, a range of conjunctions is available in the system network, such as καί, δέ, τότε, γάρ, οὖν, or asyndeton which is a particularly common feature in John's Gospel.[168] However, in Luke's Gospel, the conjunctions καί and δέ are the principal means to link clauses in a narration scene. Unfortunately, these two conjunctions are typically treated as equivalent.[169] Levinsohn's default-markedness may be observed between these two conjunctions in Luke's Gospel.[170] Levinsohn observes that καί is the default, or unmarked means of narrative progression, and signals by its occurrence that two clauses or sentences are

---

[168] Levinsohn identifies καί as the default conjunction in Matthew, Mark, Luke and Acts, whereas δέ signals development Asyndeton indicates that a conjunction is implied but not stated and is common in John's Gospel. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 69-70.

[169] Evidence for this idea is seen at many places of variant readings among the early manuscripts, where the N-A editors base their choices on statistics, using the criterion of frequency of use by a particular author to determine the most likely original conjunction. See B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edition. (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005), 9, 73, 162.

[170] See Levinsohn, *Textual Connections,* 83-96. See also: Jenny Reid-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), xx. Also, Reid-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts,* 202-252.

functionally equivalent.[171] However, when δέ occurs in a narrative, it is a marked discourse feature, signaling a new step or development in the scene.[172] In other words, the selection of δέ represents from the speaker's perspective, the choice to introduce a new unit in the narrative, for reasons that vary. As Read-Heimderdinger explains:

> If the information in a sentence is seen, (by the narrator, that is) as contributing to moving the story on, then δέ is used… δέ reflects something of the narrator's purpose as he tells the story. It indicates what he considered to be the elements that constitute the successive developments in his story.[173]

In this project, functional analysis of δέ is particularly important for discerning the arrangement and developmental steps in a scene.

2.5.2. Participant Referencing

The information structure and the flow of information presented in §2.3 relates to the discussion of participant referencing. Pertaining to the flow of information, the speaker must monitor the propositional information related to participants in a narration according to the audience's then-current mental representations. Lambrecht explains participant referencing by way of two important concepts:

> The first is IDENTIFIABILITY, which has to do with a speaker's assessment of whether a discourse representation of a particular referent is already stored in the hearer's mind or not… The second is ACTIVATION which has to do with the speaker's assessment of the status of the representation of an identifiable referent as already "activated," as merely "accessible," or as "inactive" in the mind of the hearer at the time of the speech act.[174]

---

[171] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features, 71.* Stephen J. Levinsohn, *Textual Connections in Acts* (Atlanta, GA: Scholar's Press, 1987), 83-85. Δέ is used for a temporal, participant/subject, event, or circumstantial change. See also: Read-Heimerdinger *The Bezan Text of Acts,* 202-205.

[172] Levinsohn notes that for δέ to be used, there must be both a distinctive factor involved and a new development in the narrative. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek,* 72. Also: Runge, *Discourse Grammar,* 31. See also: Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts,* 36.

[173] Ibid., 204-205.

[174] Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 76. Lambrecht compares introducing a new representation to a file which can both be opened and added to, according to the discourse needs of the speaker. He also rightly notes that the use of a pronominal in a given discourse entails that the discourse referent encoded by the pronominal is active in the hearer's mind at that particular moment of discourse. 77, 96.

Should there be an absence of a narration participant from one scene to another, that participant will need to be reactivated, an activation that occurs through several means.[175] Levinsohn explains the reasons for analyzing participant referencing:

> Greek, like all languages, has a variety of forms of reference to the participants in a story. They extend from an implicit reference conveyed only by the person of the verb, to a set of pronouns (articular and demonstrative, among others), to a full noun phrase…An understanding of these factors sheds light on the author's intentions as to the status of the participants in the story, on whether or not certain events or speeches are highlighted, and on the degree to which successive episodes are associated together.[176]

Based on research carried out jointly by Read-Heimerdinger and Levinsohn, the use of the article before proper names constitutes a particular discourse feature for referencing narration participants.[177] The researchers observe that when a narration participant is introduced for the first time in Luke's Gospel, the reference is typically anarthrous, that is, without the article. However, once the character has been indexed, or activated, the following references to that participant within the same narration are articular. Levinsohn's analysis suggests that the default manner of referencing a participant is articular, that is, once they are introduced into the narration the article is present. When a new narration scene is introduced, the case is usually that a major participant will be reactivated by means of an anarthrous reference, unless and importantly, that character is what Levinsohn calls the global VIP, meaning that such a character receives fixed and focused attention throughout a narrative. As expected, Jesus possesses the status of global VIP in Luke's Gospel.[178]

---

[175] This may be through a shift in the discourse, a strong anaphoric reference, or an explicit or implicit indication of the re-established entity. Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar*, 325.

[176] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 133, 134.

[177] Jennifer Read-Heimerdinger and Stephen H. Levinsohn, "The Use of the Definite Articles before Names of People in the Greek Text of Acts with Particular reference to Codex Bezae" in *Filología Neotestamentaria* 5 (1991), pp. 15-44.

[178] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 150-152. Levinsohn observes that Jesus is referred to anarthrously in the first three chapters of Luke, entailing that in this section Jesus is not the global VIP, but rather the local VIP. Jesus but must be reactivated in these chapters. After these chapters, however, Jesus is the global VIP, only reactivated, by anarthrous reference, after his death and burial. An important qualification to this occurs when a previously activated participant is given an anarthrous reference. The editors of the Greek New Testament did not take account of this factor in evaluating variant readings concerning articular use. Consequently, an analysis of conjunctive use should evaluate the patterns within a single manuscript, rather than based on eclectic comparisons and frequency of use.

In summary, when a character is reactivated, they are reactivated anarthrously. However, in a particular episode in which they have already been activated, reference to that narrative participant is articular. However, if they are a global VIP, the participant does not need to be reactivated and therefore remains articular. Exceptions to this principle occur when there is a switch of attention from one narrative participant to another, or to signal special attention to a particular participant's speech or action at a certain juncture in a scene.

2.5.3. Reported Speech Analysis

While reported speech is not the principal focus of this project, surveying a few relevant features as the occur in Luke's Gospel is useful. Following Levinsohn's analysis of the Greek New Testament, there are four items to note. First, direct speech is analysed as a separate unit of discourse within a narration, meaning that the discourse logic of a reported speech operates by principles that are relevant in reference to a speaker's mental-to-verbal state of affairs apart from the state of affairs as set out in the narrational-material world. Second, in Luke, while the aorist verb is the default form for narrative development, the historical present is commonly used to introduce reported speeches.[179] Third, Gospel narratives uses both direct and indirect speech. There is a functional choice with this system, for as Levinsohn notes, reported conversations as direct speech is ranked as more prominent in a narration rather than indirect speech which is backgrounded or ranked less in prominence. Fourth, in reported speeches of interaction between participants, one can observe steps of development and a culmination to the speech set.

Typically, such speeches begin with an initiating speech referencing the speaker, Halliday's sayer. This speech is then followed by an intermediate step, with the response of the receiver, who tends to be referenced by an articular pronoun. Following this, where a final speech does not occur, the sayer will be again referenced, rather than introducing some verb of speech. After this, ἀποκρίνομαι is used to signal that a sayer is seeking to gain control of the conversation, since no terminus has yet occurred. Finally, the use of ὅτι *recitiativum* represents a culmination of that speech set.[180] Even though such speech patterns only occur in a few Lukan scenes analyzed in this project, Levinsohn's comments will prove relevant where they do occur.

---

[179] Ibid., 215.

[180] Levinsohn, *Discourse Feature of New Testament Greek s,* 215-230.

2.5.4. Verbal Aspect

In the Greek language and within constraints of the semantic system, there are a number of choices regarding verbal forms.[181] However, identifying functions related to verbal tense-aspect is a complex issue as evidenced in recent debates and developments. The first part of this section will provide a brief overview of the verbal aspect debate, followed by a functional analysis of the aorist and imperfect verbs.

Porter's influential work on verbal aspect has been the fulcrum for much recent debate.[182] Porter's approach to verbal aspect is that it represents a Greek speaker's subjective choice correlating to a speaker's perspective of a given event. For Porter, this perspective is fundamentally an aspectual one, rather than temporal, with aspect grammaticalized within a given verbal tense.[183] Consequently, temporal indicators are not restricted to verbal tense but signaled by a variety of contextual factors, and verbal aspect is considered by reference to spatial metaphors rather than to temporal metaphors.[184]

Despite Porter's highly influential approach to verbal aspect, recent analyses into the topic have questioned Porter's approach, particularly his resistance to necessarily tie temporal factors to a given verbal form. Thomson offers a sharp contrast to Porter's approach, arguing instead that verbal aspect provides temporal relations, rather than being connected through

---

[181] Stanley Porter, "In Defense of Verbal Aspect", 33. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, eds. (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015). 33. Verbal aspect is a semantic notion whereby a speaker grammaticalizes verbal information by selecting a particular verb from among a given verbal system. For Porter, verbal aspect includes the notions of perfective, imperfective, or stative, the aorist, present/imperfect, and perfect/pluperfect forms respectively. Briefly stated, perfective views the situation as a summary complete event, imperfective appraises the situation as in progress, and stative depicts a state of affairs that exists. Rodney J. Decker, *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with reference to Verbal Aspect* (New York: Peter Lang Publishers, 2001), 27. Decker's own analysis is nuanced and contextually variable (involving lexis, aspect, grammar and other contextual features).

[182] Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson, eds. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research* (Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press), 1993.

[183] See: Constantine Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 24-26, 122-123. He argues that conceptually speaking, verbal aspect is more related to spatial considerations than that of temporality. In addition, infinitive and participial forms do not convey temporality.

[184] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of The Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 29. To indicate time involves analysis of "deixis," conveyed through a variety of linguistic factors: personal referents tied to temporality, sociality (titular), locational (spatial factors), speech (discourse by way of utterances tied to temporality), and, most particularly temporality (adverbials, temporal markers). See: Decker, *Temporal Deixis,* 55-59. Porter's approach to verbal aspect has been challenged from the beginning, particularly in the work of Buist Fanning: *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

spatial categories.[185] Thomson states: "…aspect is related to time, and in particular to temporal phases and boundaries…[clarification occurs] when one abandons visual and spatial metaphors and adopts a more literal time-referential definition."[186] Offering a mediating position, Fresch writes:

> …in a perfective past verb form, such as the aorist, perfective aspect will typically be the dominant component and the past-temporal reference will be secondary... Scholars such as McKay, Porter, Decker, and Cirafesi were right to push against some of the time-oriented approaches to the Greek verbal system. While I believe they went too far and erred in their timeless conception of the system, I appreciate and comment their focus on aspect as the most central component of the verb.[187]

Current debate continues over the extent verbal aspect is associated with spatial considerations represented by Porter's "viewpoint" perspective, or whether verbal aspect is fundamentally a temporal category. There are also mediating positions that continue to explore the means by which both spatial and temporal indicators operate within a functional analysis of the Greek verbal system.[188] As for this project, and in light of the ongoing nature of this debate, a mediating approach has been selected, one that seeks to identify the benefits of both approaches by incorporating temporal and spatial factors related to the aorist and imperfect verbal forms. Such an approach is accomplished by the notions of foregrounded and backgrounded narrative material.

A fundamental property of narrative texts is their portrayal of spatial-temporal factors. In other words, narrative texts represent experience by way of spatial-temporal sequencing; "happenings" that occur through temporal progression. By virtue of this narrative property, incorporating elements of time and space, the aorist tense is foregrounded material whereas the imperfect is backgrounded material. To consider these notions, this section will first address

---

[185] *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, Steven E. Runge and Christopher J, Fresch, eds., (Bellingham WA: Lexham Press: 2016), 16.

[186] Ibid., *69.*

[187] Christopher J. Fresch, "Typology, Polysemy, and Prototypes" in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis,* 410.

[188] Contrary in emphasis, others see mood and tense as central to the verbal system. See: Nicholas J. Ellia, "Aspect-Prominence, Morpho-Syntax, and a Cognitive-Linguistic Framework for the Greek Verb" *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, Stephen E. Runge and Christopher Fresch, eds. (Cambridge: Lexham Press, 2015)*, 159.* Increased attention is being placed on verbal categories. Thomson, for example, utilizes Vendler's taxonomy of four classes of verbs: states, activities, achievements and accomplishments. *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis, 49-73.*

temporality related to the aorist and imperfect. After this, spatial factors will be considered as they relate to foregrounded and backgrounded narrative material.

Regarding verbal aspect and temporality, Levinsohn correlates foregrounded/backgrounded material to verbal categories associated with the aorist and imperfect. He writes that clauses "with achievement and accomplishment verbs will strongly tend to occur in the temporal structure. In other words, such clauses will tend to present foreground information in the narrative."[189] Such a task, for Levinsohn, is facilitated by means of the aorist. In comparison, the tendency of the imperfect is to present verbal states or activities as temporally durative. Levinsohn asserts that the imperfective aspect tends to present offline material that fills in important narrative details, providing sidebar notes within a narrative or to background information to the mainline aorist verbs.[190] Levinsohn notes that imperfective/backgrounded verbs tend to be habitual actions, that is, uncompleted or ongoing behaviors, indicated by verbs such as traveling, praising, waving, departing, and saying. By contrast, perfective/foregrounded actions portray actions as completed and undifferentiated in process, indicated by verbs such as departed, came, spoke, healed, and touched.[191]

Levinsohn's observations shows some affinity to Hallidean grammar in that the imperfect commonly occurs with the behavioral and relational process types as temporally continuative verbal states and activities. Imperfects are used infrequently in material processes, where the aorist is the most frequent verbal form. Such associations, however, are not entirely exclusive.[192] Temporal factors explain why the aorist, as perfective, provides the basic structure, backbone or outline by which narrative progression occurs.[193] Decker explains this function of the aorist:

---

[189] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 174. Levinsohn observes that the imperfect correlates to backgrounded information because the imperfect tends to encode habitual and thus incomplete actions. In serving this function, the imperfect is secondary to the main storyline. 176. Levinsohn follows Callow's observations regarding thematic prominence, that is, what the unit is essentially speaking about. He also follows Grime's work on narrative as agent oriented and contingent upon temporal succession. Kathleen Callow, *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974). Joseph E. Grimes, *The Thread of Discourse* (New York: Mouton Publishers, 1975).

[190] Part of the difficulty associated with verbal functions is the use and referent of various terms. For example, Porter uses the terms 'foreground' and 'background' differently from Levinsohn. Porter, *Idioms*, 23.

[191] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 173-175.

[192] Maria Napoli, *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek,* (Italy: FrancoAngeli, 2006), 35-44.

[193] Decker notes that the imperfect tends to provide detail and description and from a remote perspective, compared to the main story line perfectives. Decker, *Temporal Deixis,* 107. See also: Rutger J. Allan, "Towards A

It is inherently logical… that one would use perfective aspect for such a description since it views the action as a complete event. In actual occurrence, the frequent use of a string of aorist forms in narrative to carry the storyline is quite evident…imperfective aspect for this purpose is not as common simply because the usual point of referring to past events is simply to note what happened, for this the perfective aspect is well suited.[194]

In addition to temporal elements associated with foregrounded/backgrounded material, the spatial dimension is also an important consideration. As with temporality, spatial considerations are tied to the nature of narrative texts as spatial-temporal representations. Narrative representations that provide for the unfolding events necessitate that events be portrayed as conceptually complete. For this task, the aorist provides the aspectual-perspectival function of representing events as spatially complete. Napoli writes:

…The right definition of perfective aspect has to be on the image of "complete" situation, rather than on the image of a "completed' situation"… perfective aspect seems to be preferentially linked to the past tense: this means that, from a cross-linguistic perspective, perfective morphemes tend to be restricted to the past, or they tend to refer mainly to past events. This is due to the fact that a past situation is most naturally conceived as bounded, having a terminal point.[195]

In comparison, the perspective provided by the imperfect is that of an event that is unbounded and durative, conjoining the spatial-temporal elements of backgrounded information.[196]

There is an additional function provided by the spatial perspective as it relates to the aorist and imperfect. Bakker explains: "the real difference between the two groups of verbs lies in the direct relevance of the action for the speaker in her present situation."[197] Bakker contends that the aorist and imperfect presents two modes of discourse, what he calls "two consciousnesses." The first is the immediate consciousness, the internal perspective, in which

---

Typology of the Narrative Modes" *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, eds. Stephanie Bakker and Gerry Wakker (Boston: Brill, 2009), 173-175.

[194] Decker, *Temporal Deixis,* 128-129.

[195] Napoli, *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek,* 28, 29.

[196] Aorist verbs constitute mainline events in a narration. C.M.J. Sicking and P. Stork, *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* (New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 102. Napoli, *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek. A Contrastive Analysis*, *27.* Imperfects, while imperfective use does not constitute mainline narration steps these may signal vividness within a narration. Alexander C. Loney, "Narrative Structure and Verbal Aspect Choice in Luke" *FN* 18, (2005): 3-31.

[197] Egbert Bakker "Verbal Aspect And Mimetic Description In Thucydides," in *Grammar As Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, ed. Egbert Bakker (New York: Brill, 1997), 17. Egbert Bakker "Storytelling in the Future: Truth, Time, and Tense in Homeric Epic" in *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 13.

information is gathered from external circumstances. The other is the displaced consciousness, the external perspective, in which elements of the past are remembered and verbalized.[198] According to Bakker, the external and displaced elements of a narration are provided by the aorist, and the immediate and internal elements are provided by the imperfect. [199]

The aforementioned spatial perspectives provided by the aorist and imperfect, and the difference between the speaker of a narrative and the audience are relative principles in understanding Bakker's approach. By selecting the aorist, the speaker has chosen to orchestrate a narration event as an intermediary and conceptualizes that event accordingly.[200] The speaker has transferred the narrative event into the speaker's then-present locus, but it is managed and delivered by the speaker in a highly controlled manner by means of the aorist.[201] For the speaker, the aorist provides immediacy to the event, insofar as the speaker recollects the events and organizes them in a manner that presents the narration's immediacy, as the "now" of the speaker to the audience.[202]

However, this is not the case for the audience; for them that event, by means of the aorist verb, is displaced and remote. By contrast, for the speaker, the imperfect provides a

---

[198] Bakker, "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," 17.

[199] Bakker, "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," 25. Bakker argues that the distinction between the imperfect and aorist best aligns with the narrator's conscious appropriation of the events, conceptualized according to relative distance from the events recorded. The aorist provides a mediation of the narrator to the events (aorist), from their given perspective, and the other a mimetic representation of nearness (imperfect). The imperfect represents an internal point of view and the aorist presents an external point of view. Bakker notes that while the imperfect presenting backgrounded narrative details (primarily to describe) is common, as well as for the aorist to foreground narrative details (primarily to narrate), this model does not always prove consistent, and is thus incomplete apart from reference to point of view. Rather than imparting knowledge referentially of events, narrating events is an instance of remembrance, according to what Bakker calls the "discourse of the observer," by which immediate and displaced narrations are observed. 16-17.

[200] Allan, "Towards A Typology of the Narrative Modes," 174.

[201] In addition to the aorist use signaling a higher level of control from the perspective of the speaker over the narrated event, the use of particles also signals a high level of control. Allan, "Towards A Typology of the Narrative Modes," 187-188. This means that clauses or sentences that include particles and the aorist aspect, or a cluster of such, tends to present highly controlled narrative perspective, minimizing an internal unfolding of events, and providing the speaker and audience to relate to the events from a "here and now" orientation. The less these controls occur, the more the audience perceives narrative elements from the vantage of narrative participants, and without recourse to spatial-temporal progression.

[202] Bakker "Storytelling in the Future: Truth, Time, and Tense in Homeric Epic," 15. See also: Egbert Bakker, "Pragmatics: *Speech and Text" Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2010), 165. The aorist provides the external to the text perspective, and in so doing, provides the speaker and audience with the "now" or recreation of the event. The imperfect provides the internal point of view, and thus distances the speaker and audience from the events, insofar as they are perceived without a speaker's immediate control over the events.

perspectival distance between her and the narrative event. [203] Because the speaker does not manage that event in a highly controlled manner, representing it as conceptually incomplete, the audience is given immediacy to that event. In other words, for the audience, the imperfect provides an internal perspective since the speaker chooses to abrogate control of the previously imposed order. Consequently, while the perfective aspect tends to provide the backbone for the narrative and is immediate from the perspective of the speaker, the use of the aorist thereby provides a remote perspective for the audience.[204] Related to the imperfect, while it provides backgrounded material and tends not to provide structure to the narrative development, it provides an internal perspective for the audience.

Scholars such as Loney and Bakker contend that due to the imperfect's internal perspective, the reader is drawn into a narration at its occurrence. Consequently, the imperfect may thereby provide a sense of vividness to certain elements within a narrative.[205] If this case, textual prominence may occur with the aorist, but also sometimes with the imperfective aspect.[206] Bakker supports the notion that the imperfect provides vividness in a narration by appealing to the Greek historian Thucydides. Bakker notes that in the case of Thucydides, the imperfect provides imminent access into narration events through the perceptions and experiences of narrative participants. For example, regarding the Athenian naval battle at Syracuse, Bakker explains that by use of the imperfect, "…we observe the past as it unfolds: we are invited to move to the past in our imagination, as we are adopting the perspective of the

---

[203] Bakker, "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," 26.

[204] The imperfect serves the narrative in three primary ways: setting the stage for the scene, providing offline details, or marking as prominent a forthcoming event through the historical present. Luke's Gospel contains 371 imperfect indicatives, with 340 of these not found in direct discourse (narrative proper). This analysis follows the work of Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 104-146. Also see: Stanley E. Porter. *Verbal Aspect* in *the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang), 1989, B.M. Fanning. *Verbal Aspect* in *New Testament Greek*, Rutger J. Allan, "Towards A Typology of the Narrative Modes," 173-179. Decker writes: "When the writer wishes to make a narrative transition… one of the linguistic means he has at his disposal is the use of the form that is semantically more heavily marked: the imperfective aspect of the present form. This draws attention to the statement and its discourse function, though without necessitating a statement of vividness." Decker, *Temporal Deixis.* 104.

[205] Loney, "Narrative Structure," 18.

[206] Reed, "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis," 84. Reed writes: "Background prominence is often signaled by clauses using the aorist tense (perfective aspect). Thematic prominence may be signaled by the present and imperfect tenses (imperfective aspect), as well as sometimes the future tense." 84. Reed distinguishes between thematic prominence and focal prominence. Reed also maintains that thematic prominence appears, to tend toward higher level units within a discourse, while focal prominence is usually found at the clausal level. 81-82. Interestingly, Reed identifies the perfective aspect as signaling focal prominence and the imperfective signaling thematic prominence.

soldiers who are watching the battle from the shore… the reader becomes a witness who observes the events of the war *in situ*."[207]

Verbal aspect is summarized first with the idea that the aorist provides foregrounded material providing the structure of a given narration, with a high control of the speaker over narrative events which are typically achievements and accomplishments. Consequently, aorist verbs "…are to be assigned focus function (or: are the 'nucleus') in the clause they are a part of, and… are the predicate of a self-contained statement."[208] On the other hand, the imperfect provides backgrounded material, in that it portrays states of activities and offline information, providing immediate access for the audience of material that ranges from descriptive to highly descriptive inducing vividness in a narration.[209] The function of the imperfect therefore tends to be cataphoric in narration.[210] In other words, the imperfect acts as a cataphoric pointer for a prominent action/event as provided by a foregrounded aorist.[211] This scenario is not always the case, however, since the imperfect may disrupt the default pattern and obtain a marked status that serves a particular function in a narration. Summarizing these findings, Runge explains:

> Because of the nature of narrative, events are assumed to be of a foreground nature unless they are marked in some way. Background information in narrative thus consists of the *nonevents*, together with those events that are *marked* as being of secondary importance (nonthematic)... Aorists (which portray events as a whole) are the default way of presenting foreground events (unless introduced with γάρ). Imperfects (which in their default usage portray an event as ongoing) usually present background information, but some events in the imperfect may be foreground.[212]

---

[207] Egbert Bakker, "Time, Tense, and Thucydides" *The Classical World* (100.2, 2007, https://www.jstor.org/stable/25433998), 117.

[208] Sicking and Stork, *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 103. For these authors, this principle applies to both the aorist and the aorist participle.

[209] "Towards A Typology of The Narrative Modes," 179-181.

[210] Sicking and Stork, *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 104. These authors particularly analyze Herodotus and Thucydides.

[211] Runge observes that the imperfective tends to present backgrounded information, though not always. "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative" *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis, 168.* See also Decker, *Temporal Deixis,* 108, 111.

[212] "Verb Forms and Grounding in Narrative" *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis, 168.*

2.5.5. Highlighting Devices

In addition to the scene level discourse features discussed, a brief noting of a few additional features pertaining to Luke's Gospel is useful. Levinsohn observes five relevant discourse features that serve to highlight or background material. First, relative clauses tend to be background material in a narration.[213] Second, certain structural markers tend to highlight particular material. Among these structural markers is the use of τότε, which signals a concluding speech, and τέ *solitarium*, which serves as a forward-pointing device to a specific development. Third, the use of ἰδού highlights a narrative participant, similar to the use of full noun phrases, such as genitive absolutes as these also tend to signal or highlight a newly introduced participant.[214] Fourth, "tail-head linkages" highlight an event by means of repetition, through adverbial or participial clause repletion.[215] Fifth, a clause may serve to slow the narrative temporal pace by introducing backgrounded material, signaling a prominent event or action in a narration.[216]

2.5.6. Scene Patterns and Arrangement

The final consideration at the scene level involves analysis of structural units. Such analysis has been advanced by Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps. These authors examine Lukan scenes by way of structural patterns that usually emerge as chiastic, which is as may be expected, since the Gospels are situated within a Jewish context.[217] While a chiasmus analysis

---

[213] Levinsohn writes: "The rhetorical effect of using a continuative relative clause in narrative is apparently to move the story forward quickly by combining background and foreground information in a single sentence. Since the clause prior to the relative pronoun commonly introduces participants, such sentences will tend to occur at the beginning of episodes, hence the appropriateness of moving as quickly as possible to the foreground events in the episode." Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 191, 192. However simply because the material is backgrounded does not entail its insignificance. Rather, such backgrounded material provides the basis for understanding the main clause, such as where it provides the temporal-circumstantial frame.

[214] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 197.

[215] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 197-200.

[216] Ibid., 213.

[217] The work of Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, like that of Levinsohn, largely guides the discourse analytic approach of this project. Not only is their research a development and refinement of Levinsohn, but more importantly, their work is a contribution to Lukan studies in three particular ways. First, it offers extended and detailed analysis on the text of actual manuscripts rather than the eclectic text. Second, their work is properly attuned to the Jewish orientation of the author of Luke, seen not only in its literary arrangement, but even more in the Jewish allusions and relevant inferences throughout both Luke and Acts. Third, it develops beyond the work of Levinsohn, and contributes, importantly, identifying structures that move beyond the sentence level and toward a narrative template of Luke's Gospel which may be utilized in a top-down fashion. This is true, of course, so long as one adheres to the variability of the patterns throughout Luke's Gospel. Their works include: Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian*

of Luke is fairly common in Lukan studies, the work of Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps is distinctive in that their analysis of structure is not derived, as is usual, from thematic or lexical observations.[218] Instead, Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps ground their structural analysis in discourse analysis. In particular, these scholars identify finite verbs as the fundamental building block of discourse, both in relation to units of discourse that surround the clause or clause complex, but also in relationship to other units of a given scene, such as points of departure, conjunctive use, and so on.[219] In this manner, their attention to the structural arrangement of finite verbs provides a significant means of identifying functional elements in a given narrative.[220] By examining finite verbs within Lukan scenes, these same scholars identify three primary structural patterns: i. concentric: ABCB'A', ii. developmental: ABCD…, and iii. symmetrical: ABCC'B'A'. These patterns are found to exist not just within scenes but also at higher levels of structure, as scenes grouped into larger units.[221] What is especially important to note is that identifying Lukan structures serves an important function. For example, in a Lukan scene that is symmetrical and concentric, the central element or elements exhibit "the point that the narrator wants to emphasize as fundamental for this part of the story."[222]

In addition to the structural analysis of Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps, Longacre has also performed structural analysis of Gospel narratives. However, Longacre's structural

---

Tradition, Vol. I. Acts1.1–5.42: Jerusalem (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004). Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus. See also:* Jenny Reid-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts.* The significance of the influence of Jewish literature on structural patterns of the New Testament writings is often overlooked though of course, the Greeks were not averse to chiasms. See: J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, 3rd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 2002), 74-77.

[218] The weakness of thematic structures is that they tend to be subjectively oriented, according to the various themes that the practitioner either identifies or imposes upon a scene. A notable contribution to the study of chiasmus, attended by Hebrew poetical parallelism in the Gospels, is that of Roland Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric* (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998). This earlier work laid important groundwork for his template. While his more recent work explores greater detail and interpretive issues in the Gospels: Roland Meynet, *A New Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* (Miami FL: Convivium Press, 2010). Meynet's analysis operates on the basis of patterns of themes, vocabulary and so on, which are detectable even in translation, and his approach does not take account of discourse analysis of the Greek text.

[219] Chiastic arrangement in Luke's Gospel is not only concentric or chiastic, but may exhibit other structures, namely progression. This triadic pattern is remarkably consistent in the Bezan textual tradition.

[220] For instance, Luke's Gospel may exhibit an A-B-A pattern, but it is more often much more detailed, and even progressive: A-B-C-D, or A-A' B-B', and so on.

[221] "From the highest level down to individual elements, the totality of Luke's work forms a hierarchy of finely balanced patterns. Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*, xviii.

[222] Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*, xviii.

approach involves utilizing the traditional plotline structure in order to incorporate discourse findings.[223] Longacre's plot structure aligns most closely with Freytag's schematic as his dramatic plotline structure.[224] As Longacre explains:

> Obviously, there is some sort of narrative template according to which stories are made. Since classical times (beginning with Aristotle's writing on drama) such a template has been recognized, although various writers have expressed it differently. The schema I have held to for some time now...has the following elements: (1) Stage, (2) Inciting Incident, (3) Mounting Tension, (4) Climax, (5) Denoument, (6) Closure.[225]

In Longacre's plotline structure, the most significant element is what Longacre calls the discourse peak.[226] In order to identify a narration's peak, Longacre considers the presence of several potential discourse features, [227] including compression or enlargement of narration details, verbal forms, rapidity of happenings, immediacy in reported speeches, major moments of interaction among participants, and chiasms and parallels.[228]

Longacre's approach is commendable in that he incorporates specific discourse features in order to account for his overarching plot structure.[229] That his approach considers important discourse features, such as attention to verbs of motion and participant references, has much to

---

[223] Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 2nd ed. (Dallas Texas: SIL, 1996), 33. He writes: "In a narrative we specifically recognize the primacy of plot as a coherent device."

[224] Gustav Freytag, *Technique of The Drama: An Exposition of Dramatic Composition and Art*, trans. Elias J. MacEwan, 3rd ed, (Chicago: Scott, Foreman and Company, 1900).

[225] Robert E. Longacre, "A Top-Down, Template-Driven Narrative Analysis, Illustrated by Application to Mark's Gospel" in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. (Sheffield Academic Press: England, 1999), 141. See also: Rutger J. Allan, "Towards A Typology of The Narrative Modes," 175.

[226] Longacre writes: "I use the term peak to refer to any episodelike unit set apart by special surface features and corresponding to the climax or denoument in the notional structure." *The Grammar of Discourse*, 37. Correspondingly, Longacre calls the special surface features that signal a peak as a "rhetorical underlining." 39.

[227] Longacre utilizes a traditional plot-oriented template similar to Aristotle's *Poetics.* Longacre, "A Top-Down, Template-Driven Narrative Analysis," 162.

[228] For Mark 5:1-20, Longacre identifies the plotline as: 5:1-5 (stage), 5:6-8 (inciting incident), 5:5-9 (climax), 5:11-14 (denoument), and 5:15-20 (closure). Longacre, "A Top-Down, Template-Driven Narrative Analysis," 144. For an example of the concept of peaking in exegesis: Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation*, 244-247. See also: Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 33-50.

[229] Longacre cites "vividness" as a factor in identifying a narrative peak. Unfortunately, he only briefly addresses verbal and nominal issues located near the peak. There is no reference to Greek usage in Longacre's account of verbal aspect. Fortunately, Longacre does account for participial use as a potential "change of pace" where the presence of an unusual accumulation of participles may signal a peak.

be commended.[230] However, charging Longacre's structural approach as somewhat anachronistic is difficult to avoid in that modern plotline structures do not precisely correspond to ancient narrative structures, even including the three-fold structure of Aristotle's *Poetics*. While Freytag's plotline shares certain similarities with Aristotle, Aristotle's three-fold structure is distinctive both in form, since the *Poetics* corresponds to the poetical genre not historiographical or biographical prose, and in features, with Aristotle's emphasis on pathos centering on the reversal, or *peripeteia*, as the most important element in Greek tragedy. [231] A structural approach that is relevant to the socio-cultural context of the Gospels is needed, one that is able to account for the literary framework of ancient narratives while also incorporating surface textual features. Chapter III offers one such structural approach. Chapter III will seek to demonstrate that ancient narratives, at least from a rhetorical perspective, do not exploit the value of temporality, or plotline analysis, for its own sake, but only in reference to the manner in which it contributes to a participant's "global action," to which all elements of a given narration necessarily orient. In doing so, this project charts a different and potentially significant path, one that attends to a far greater number of discourse features and that orients these around a more relevant ancient structure as fitting for Luke. Whether it is capable of incorporating discourse features in meaningful ways will be examined in Chapters IV and V of Lukan exegesis.

2.6 Summary of Discourse Features

The Greek language, such as has been examined in the documents of the New Testament, is a complex system, providing a considerable network of discourse features and sets through which various functions may be discerned. The benefit of an SFL approach to New Testament narratives is that it provides the analyst with an empirical, testable, and concrete linguistic means to employ the principles of choice implies meaning, default-markedness and

---

[230] For instance, Longacre notes that identifying a pericope may be temporal, locative, circumstantial, or participant-presentative. He also notes that quite often, motion verbs of a particular participant begin a new episode. Longacre, "A Top-Down, Template-Driven Narrative Analysis," 147.

[231] Part of the difficulty in using narrative criticism in the New Testament is that it often reflects an older structuralist model of narrative texts that is somewhat idiosyncratic for contemporary narratologists. Simply defining "narrative" provides a sense for divergent approaches in contemporary narratology. Reflecting this diversity, Stephen Moore's criticisms of NT narrative criticism is helpful: *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989). Another difficulty is New Testament narrative approaches that structure the Gospels around plot, following Aristotle's work, the *Poetics*, which addresses ancient Greek tragedy. From a discourse analytic perspective, ancient poetical works contain stylistic devices that are not reflected in the Gospels, such as the use of an elevated Attic style containing a large diction of unusual words and compound adjectives. See: Richard Ruitherford, "The Greek of Athenian Tragedy," in *Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Edited by Egbert J. Bakker (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 441-454.

prominence features. These principles operate on the critical assumption that not all narrative elements share equal prominence, following Longacre's famous dictum in §1.3. This project operates under this same assumption, utilizing SFL to identify elements of prominence that indicate various textual intentions.

Identifying issues of discourse prominence is not a solitary enterprise; it also involves incorporating relevant socio-cultural contexts. In particular, this means approaching Luke's Gospel as a narrative discourse that reflects and mediates shared literary values in an ancient Greco-Roman framework. Such a posture reflects Halliday's notion of the interpersonal element of the communicative metafunction, accounting for communication as a situational exchange between discourse participants. To account for communication as a socio-literary system of exchange within an ancient context, Chapter III will examine a Greco-Roman rhetorical handbook, the progymnasmata. This handbook provides the most relevant structural framework for interpreting Luke's Gospel, and one most capable of incorporating the various discourse features and functions with a given narration.

CHAPTER THREE:
GENERAL OVERVIEW OF TEXT EXTERNAL FACTORS IN LUKE'S GOSPEL

3.1 General Overview

Chapters I and II have shown that language is a semiotic system involving text-internal relationships within a particular socio-cultural context. Analysing a given discourse involves a consideration of both text-internal and text-external factors that is consistent with a discourse analytic approach to language, and in particular, Halliday's metafunction of language. His metafunctional approach attends to three aspects of communication: the ideational, a representation of the manner in which things are experienced, ii. the textual, the construction of the text as a semantic domain, and iii. the interpersonal, the clause as exchange. Chapter II has addressed Halliday's ideational and textual representations, considering language as a semiotic system and involving a wide variety of discourse features and functions and at various discourse levels. Such discourse features and functions have been examined in the Greek of the New Testament, and with particular reference to Luke's Gospel.

Chapter III addresses text-external factors in Luke's Gospel. Since discourse analysis takes into account the social environment of a text, a close examination of Halliday's third metafunction, the interpersonal aspect of communication as an exchange, is beneficial. Because communication involves an interpersonal exchange, discourse analysis may profit from rhetorical criticism, particularly if Luke's Gospel shares the socio-rhetorical environment of ancient rhetorical handbooks. To explore the potential relevance of rhetorical criticism and its congruence with discourse analysis, this chapter will specifically examine the rhetorical handbooks within their broader context. Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata* handbook and its relevance for Luke's Gospel and pertinent rhetorical exercises will also be integrated. Last, analysis will turn to specific Lukan studies that incorporate the progymnasmata handbooks in their exegesis.

3.2. The Progymnasmata within Greco-Roman Rhetoric and its Usefulness
3.2.1 The Progymnasmata in its Ancient Context

The name *progymnasmata* generally refers to ancient Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks that provided preliminary training in rhetorical exercises.[232] Such handbooks were

---

[232] The progymnasmata preceded the tertiary education of rhetoric proper and philosophy. Primary and secondary education consisted of reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, and literature. Theon's *Progymnasmata* assumed such education as foundational for his beginning rhetorical exercises. The traditional view of Greco-Roman education is that students from roughly ages 7-14, and with financial means, received grammatical training which consisted of basic reading and training in works of literature, both prose and poets, as well as possibly instruction on mathematics, geometry, and logic, among other things. After this, for students who still had the means, rhetorical training commenced, from roughly age 15-20, depending on circumstances. Those students who

significant insofar as they enabled fledgling students to understand and incorporate rhetorical exercises, thereby increasing their rhetorical proficiency and preparing them for formal declamation instruction.[233] Classical scholars Hock and O'Neil note the benefit of these ancient rhetorical handbooks:

> …by the time students had reached the end of the progymnasmata sequence… they had honed their compositional skills to the point that they, to use Doxapatres' imagery again, had ascended the stair steps (ἀναβαθμοί) to the very threshold of the rhetorical art. Only now were students ready to learn rhetoric proper, to master the methods, rules, and models of the discipline that would turn them into orators and the best of them into sophists.[234]

The significance of these progymnasmata handbooks is reflected in that many are extant, ranging quite possibly from the first century CE with Aelius Theon to the ninth century CE with John of Sardis.[235]

Progymnasmatic handbooks were oriented toward specific canons within Greco-Roman rhetoric. The canons included invention, a speech's content; arrangement, a speech's structure and sequence; style, words and clauses suitably chosen in a speech; memory, retaining the information in one's cognitive structure of the speech; and delivery, the speaker's particular

---

were able continued in tertiary education with subjects such as philosophy, medicine, and politics. Cristina Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Boston: Brill, 2013), 375. For a helpful overview of the educational process, see: Jeffrey Walker, *The Genuine Teachers of This Art: Rhetorical Education in Antiquity* (South Carolina: The University of South Carolina Press, 2011), 3-5. For a complete account see: H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956).

[233] Instruction in progymnasmatic exercises were designed to equip the student to eventually produce a declamation (*meletai*), a full rhetorical speech, which in turn provided the groundwork for subsequent actual oratorical speeches. The exercises encountered in the progymnasmata contained both elementary exercises used by grammarians, and more advanced exercises that led to a successful declamation. Robert J. Penella, "The Progymnasmata in Imperial Greek Education" in *The Classical World*, (2011), 77-90, 77-83. George A. Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), xvi-xvii.

[234] *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric Classroom Exercises*, trans. and ed. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 82-83. According to Aelius Theon, "There is no secret about how these exercises are very useful for those acquiring the faculty of rhetoric." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 4.

[235] The exact date of Theon's text is somewhat uncertain. Kennedy states that scholarly consensus approximates Theon's work between the Augustan period and the second century CE. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. George Kennedy (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 1. Malcolm Heath identifies Theon's work belonging to the fifth century CE. Either way, material equivalence remains between Theon and first century rhetoric. Innovations primarily revolved around thematic arrangement and were geographically based. Malcolm Heath and D.H. Berry identify Cicero's narration discussion (80 BCE) as reflecting Theon, in his *Pro Roscio* oration. See: D.H. Berry and Malcolm Heath "Oratory and Declamation," in *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period,* ed. Stanley E. Porter (Boston: Brill, 2001), 413.

manner of presenting the speech.[236] Among these, the canon of invention comprised the bulk of progymnasmatic material, addressing the content of a speech as it related to the virtues of various rhetorical exercises.[237] The progymnasmata handbook thus served a pivotal role for the fledgling student as the content of a speech provided fundamental elements in the rhetor's arsenal.[238] An effective speech required careful management of ethos, pathos, and logos, and was facilitated by appropriate rhetorical exercises as outlined in progymnasmatic handbooks.[239]

In addition to the rhetorical canon, circumstantial exigency required that the rhetor respond to a particular occasion and craft the speech accordingly. Greco-Roman rhetoric upheld a triadic and comprehensive species framework to aid the orator in this task, the forensic, epideictic, and deliberative.[240] Forensic speeches addressed the past, centering on the just or unjust.[241] Epideictic speeches addressed the present, centering upon the praiseworthy or

---

[236] Aristotle's *Rhetoric* discussed the first three primarily, though in the first century CE the five canons of rhetoric were maintained as in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Orality in presentation dictated the use of delivery and memory, and thus, was within the bounds of both poetry and rhetoric.

[237] For the rhetor, there were a considerable number of exercises that could be used to support a rhetor's central argument, called the *propositio*. This also involved consideration of what exercises were placed within the three principle portions of a speech, namely, the introduction, the narration, and the proof. For a helpful overview see: *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*, trans. George A. Kennedy, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), xiii.

[238] By focusing on rhetorical invention, this project avoids New Testament debates over rhetorical arrangement. See: Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer, "Oral Texts? A Reassessment of the Oral and Rhetorical Nature of Paul's Letters in Light of recent Studies," *JETS* 55.2 (2012): 323-341. Ben Witheringtom III, "'Almost Thou Persuadest Me…': The Importance of Greco-Roman Rhetoric for the Understanding of the Text and Context of the NT" *JETS*, 58.1 (2015): 63-88. Theon's briefly addresses rhetorical arrangement in his disucssino of an elaborated chreia. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 19-23.

[239] Progymnasmatic handbooks primarily addressed logos, that is, logical demonstrations, which included the two means of deductive and inductive proofs. Deductive proofs provided explicit premises in a logically linear fashion and contained a clear conclusion, as in the case of the *enthymeme*. Inductive proofs, called a paradigm, reached the conclusion from particular and general elements in an exercise, as in the case of a narration. While deductive proofs addressed certainty, the inductive approach was intended for probabilities. See Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory*, 5.14.1), David Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press), 154. Also: Manfred Kraus, "Theories and Practice of the Enthymeme," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*, ed. Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Ubelacker (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 95-110.

[240] The species to which a speech primarily belongs is not always clear in ancient rhetorical speeches because a certain level of fluidity between the species. Occasional debate arose as to the precise nature and number of species, and against the common tripartition, bipartition proposals existed, wherein the forensic and deliberative species converge, or a fourfold classification yielding additional proposals.

[241] More briefly, the forensic speeches are occasions to judge, celebrate, and advise. These components correspond to the three parts of the soul, namely, advising to the rational element, judgment to the emotional element, and celebration to the appetite. Ronald F. Hock, "Observing a teacher of Progymnasmata," in *Ancient Education and Early Christianity*. ed. Matthew Ryan Hauge and Andrew W. Pitts (New York: Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2016), 51-52.

blameworthy.[242] Deliberative speeches addressed a future course of action, either the expedient or inexpedient. Within the three species of rhetoric, certain exercises in the progymnasmata were especially suitable, though variation and creativity were encouraged in view of changing circumstances.[243]

Two items from the progymnasmata exercises are related to maintaining rhetorical balance in Luke's Gospel. First, frequent use of a particular rhetorical exercise in Luke's Gospel may shed light on functionality. The defense, praise, or advisement regarding Jesus is chiefly in view. For example, if Lukan exegesis presented in Chapters IV-V frequently includes the encomium exercise, often employed in epideictic rhetoric, then the plausibility is that Lukan narrations intend to praise Jesus, rather than defend him or provide advisement. Second, the extensive use of certain exercises in Luke's Gospel, such as the narration, does not decisively indicate the use of a particular species. Instead, the narration exercise commonly occurs in all three species. Permeation among the rhetorical species cannot be ruled out in Luke's Gospel since blurring among the rhetorical species did occur in ancient rhetorical speeches.[244] This project harmonizes these two considerations by principally approaching Lukan narrations through the epideictic lens, that is, praise for Jesus, while not excluding the potential for defense of Jesus and advising the audiences to follow Him may also occur in Luke's Gospel.

---

[242] Hayden W. Ausland, "Poetry, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Plato's Phaedrus," *Symbolae Osloenses*, 84 (2012) 2-18, 7-10.

[243] According to Theon's *Progymnasmata* handbook, various rhetorical exercises were especially appropriate within a given rhetorical speech. Forensic rhetoric tended toward the use of the confirmation, topos, narration and syncrisis exercises, epideictic speeches frequently included the encomium and invective, and deliberative speeches tended to include the fable, chreia, maxim and thesis and. See: Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches,* 376-377. Flexibility existed among the various rhetorical schools. At the same time, flexibility was permitted in view of changing circumstances surrounding a speech and the school in which a given rhetor was instructed. For instance, the Theodorean school, reflecting Aristotelian/Isocratic influence approached rhetoric as an art, and presented according to various exigencies. This school allowed for the narration exercise in any portion of a speech and left out items as need dictated. In comparison, the Appolodorean school was more rigid in orientation, upholding the traditional structure and rhetorical rules. J. E. Parker Middleton, "Anonymous Seguerianus," in *Classical Rhetoric's and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources.* ed. Michelle Ballif and Michael G. Moran (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2005), 24-28. Hock, "Observing a teacher of Progymnasmata," 51-52, 57.

[244] For example, Isocrates' famed speech, *Panegyricus* which contains both forensic and deliberative rhetoric. *Greek Orators III: Isocrates Panegyricus and to Nicocles,* trans. and ed., by S. Usher (England: Liverpool Press, 1990). See: Malcolm Heath, "John Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians," in *Biblical Interpretation,* 12.4 (2004): 369-400. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568515042418578. See also: Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography,* 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2004), 288-307. George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press: 1984), 23-25.

3.2.3. The Usefulness of Theon's Progymnasmata for Luke's Gospel

Among the extant handbooks, Theon's *Progymnasmata* has been selected as the chief resource for rhetorical analysis of Luke's Gospel for this project, providing a text-external and interpersonal metafunction.[245] There are three principal reasons for choosing Theon's *Progymnasmata*: i. Theon's inclusive appeal, ii. Theon's meticulous data, iii. Theon's inner-disciplinary approach.

First, Theon's *Progymnasmata* provides an inclusive approach, appealing to a broad readership. The *Progymnasmata* does not require a specific educational level or advanced rhetorical proficiency of Luke's Gospel for the intended audience.[246] Theon's handbook was an elementary rhetorical handbook for aspiring rhetorical students, situated between their secondary and tertiary education. Several of Theon's rhetorical exercises, such as the chreia, fable, and narration, were utilized by those students already in their primary and secondary education. For example, archaeological evidence confirms that the chreia exercise was presented early on in the educational experience, at the point when students were first learning to read and write.[247] Within the *Progymnasmata*, Theon adopts a progressive approach to the

---

[245] The general category of prose incorporates Theon's rhetorical handbook, constituting rhetorical prose and the branch of historiographical prose. Within the historiographical prose set significant differences among scholars exist as to whether Luke's Gospel constitutes biography (Burridge), scientific-technical treatises (Alexander), rhetorical historiography (Yamada), and romance literature (Pervo). See: Sean A. Adams "Luke's Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander *JGRChJ* (2006): 177-191. David E. Aune, "Luke 1:1-4: Historical or Scientific Prooimon?" in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J.M. Wedderburn*, eds., Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey and Bruce Longenecker (New York/London: T. & T. Clark, 2002), pp. 138-48. C.f. Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Greco-Roman Biography*. 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004). Richard Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress press, 1987). K. Yamada, "A Rhetorical History: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles" in *Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, eds., Stanley.E. Porter and T.H. Olbricht (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 230-250. Regarding the narration exercise relevant to Theon's handbook, it was distinguished according to type, namely, the dramatic as reflected in poetic literature, and the historical as reflected in historical prose literature. Hock, "Observing a Teacher of Progymnasmata," 59-60. Reflecting narration's division of labor, see: Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Greco-Roman Biography,* 67.

[246] This project advocates a minimalist approach to the level of rhetorical proficiency in Luke's Gospel. Duane A. Litfin, *Paul's Theology of Preaching: The Apostle's Challenge to the Art of Persuasion in Ancient Corinth,* rev. and enl. ed. (Grand Rapids: IVP Academic, 2015), 121. In comparison to Theon's handbook, larger and more technical rhetorical works were in existence, such as Aristotle's 4th century BCE *Rhetoric*, Cicero's 1st century CE works that include *De invention*e, *De oratore*, *Partitiones oratoriae, Brutus*, and *Orator* and Quintilian's 1st century CE work, *Institutio oratoria*.

[247] Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: Volume I. The Progymnasmata,* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986), 9-10. Also see: Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 1-55. Theon is unique among the *Progymnasmata* handbooks; all the other handbooks arrange the first

rhetorical exercises, "Easier things should be learned before more difficult ones, and it is easier to amplify what is clear than to demonstrate what is unclear."[248] To this end, Theon's handbook evades the subtleties of rhetorical theory and practice, and addresses readers with a somewhat limited awareness of rhetorical values and education.[249] While Theon's inclusiveness is ensured by his intended audience, it ultimately rests on the supposition that rhetoric, among all the disciplines, exercised a unique and vast jurisdiction over all other disciplines, prose, and poetic literature.[250] Reflecting this notion, Theon's discussion of the narration exercise copiously includes a wide variety of literature and authors, including Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, Diogenes the Cynic philosopher, Aesop.[251] Rhetoric's far-reaching influence over other literary fields is duly noted in Theon's handbook:

> Now I have included these remarks, not thinking that all are useful to all beginners, but in order that we may know that training in exercises is absolutely useful not only to those who are going to practice rhetoric but also if one wishes to undertake the function of poets or historians or any other writers. These things are, as it were, the foundation of every kind if discourse…[252]

An example of Theon's literary inclusiveness is found in his discussion of the narrative exercise, in which Theon uses the general word for narrative, *diegma*, as opposed to the more technical word in rhetoric, *diegesis*.[253]

Theon's *Progymnasmata* offers the Lukan exegete with a salutary text-external resource. In the face of ongoing debate and uncertainty regarding the educational level and

---

three exercises in this order: fable, narrative, chreia, while Theon lists the chreia first. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric,* v-vii.

[248] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 8.

[249] Benefits of using Theon's handbook for Luke's Gospel also include: (1) Theon's *Progymnasmata* is written in Greek, as are the Gospels, (2) Theon's discussion of the narrative exercise is amenable to both Latin and Greek rhetoricians. c. Malcom Heath, "John Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians," 369-370.

[250] Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 305. See also: Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*, 31. and Andrew Laird, "The Value of Ancient Literary Criticism," in *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism,* ed. Andrew Laird (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 3.

[251] Theon's discussion of the narration illustrates this point, with diverse examples; Homer and Hesiod (poetry), Thucydides, Herodotus, Philistus, and Theopompus (history), Demosthenes and Isocrates (political rhetoricians), and Menander's use of maxims (Greek dramatist). Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 38, 39.

[252] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,*12. Theon adds: "One who has expressed a *diegesis* (narration) and a *mythos* (fable) in a fine and varied way will also compose a history well and what is specifically called 'narrative' (*diegema*) in hypotheses- historical writing is nothing other than a combination of narrations" 4.

[253] Kennedy, *Invention and Method,* xiii, 31.

rhetorical proficiency of Luke's Gospel, Theon's handbook is uniquely capable of encompassing a wide swath of authors with their wide-ranging educational proficiencies and their diverse literary texts and intentions. Among the New Testament Gospels, Luke's Gospel appears to especially warrant Greco-Roman rhetorical analysis. As it stands, a substantial number of scholars are committed to the idea that Luke's Gospel represents a somewhat sophisticated literary work, not simply relative to the Synoptics, but also comparative to other similar texts in the Greco-Roman world. In fact, while scholars continue to discuss Luke's Gospel from a socio-literary standpoint, scholarly views about Luke's Gospel tend to range from viewing it as a respectable, middle-brow scientific treatise, to treating it as a highly polished and sophisticated work, both stylistically and conceptually.[254] In either case, utilizing a Greco-Roman preliminary rhetorical handbook fits well within literary capabilities of Luke's Gospel.

The second benefit of using Theon's *Progymnasmata* for rhetorical analysis of Luke's Gospel is that even though it is broadly inclusive, it is simultaneously extensive in its analyses. Theon's *Progymnasmata* is a pedagogical quintessence for the Lukan exegete, replete with lucid definitions, elaborations, examples and illustrations. While deceptively concise at several points, Theon's discussions are both nascent and profound. For example, Theon's discussion of the narrative exercise is, to use a psychological term, gestalt narratology, crystalizing nodal points throughout the Greco-Roman narrative traditions.[255] Theon's narration analyses thereby

---

[254] The term 'scientific writing' was ascribed to Luke's Gospel by Loveday Alexander who saw Luke's Gospel was addressed to middle class professionals, such as craftsmen and guild workers, "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing" *NovT* 28 (1986), 48-74. Vernon K. Robbins, who shares Lovedays' basic premise is nonetheless fully confident that progymnasmatic exercises, since they do not represent culturally elite and advanced rhetorical handbooks, are entirely within the range of Lukan studies. "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric" in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999), 63-68, Ben Witherington III views Luke (and Acts) as relatively sophisticated and following in the mold of earlier famed Greek prose-narrative writers, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1998), 4-49; *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament* (Eugene Oregon: Cascade Books, 2009), 33-39. See also: Daryl F. Schmidt, "Rhetorical Influences and Genres" in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel,* 27-60; Richard A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography, 2nd ed*. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 2004),188-189; David P. Moessner "Reading Luke's Gospel as Ancient Hellenistic Narrative" in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, eds., Craig C. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, Anthony C. Thiselton (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 125-134. On the other hand, however, Theon's handbook does not demand a particularly elevated literary style nor a specialized genre in its scope or audience. George A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta: GA: SBL, 2003), 3-15.

[255] Theon's definition of narrative reflects other rhetoricians, such as Cicero, *On Invention 1.19*, Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory 4.2.31*. Theon's narrative virtues also reflect Cicero, *On Invention* 1.19-21,

provide the Lukan exegete with an important interpretive lens, a clear example of ancient narrative criticism.[256]

Broadly speaking, Theon's handbook provides the Lukan exegete with explicit criteria in order to discern the form and function of various rhetorical exercises within Luke's Gospel. Consequently, the Lukan exegete is offered a discrete socio-literary framework alongside literary virtues attached to the various rhetorical exercises. For the exegete who seeks to avoid imposing anachronistic readings on Luke, Theon's handbook provides a wealth of material that addresses the socio-literary conventions in the Greco-Roman context. The *Progymnasmata* offers a rich text-external resource that appropriates Halliday's interpersonal metafunction, the message as a socio-literary exchange, and one that is situated in a Greco-Roman context that is potentially appropriate to Luke's Gospel. While one text-external resource of Theon's *Progymnasmata* used in this project appears capable of shedding light on the form and function of various scenes within Luke's Gospel, ancient rhetorical handbooks do not necessarily provide exhaustive knowledge of all that might be occurring within Luke's Gospel.[257]

The third reason for utilizing Theon's *Progymnasmata* in analyzing Luke's Gospel involves the issue of rhetorical style and genre. Theon's strident claim is that his rhetorical discussion of the narration exercise broaches historiographical or biographical writings. Such a claim is important insofar as scholarship typically situates Luke's Gospel among historiographical writings, rather than rhetorical ones. From a practical standpoint, these disciplines represent two separate islands without a capable bridge to cross them. In the midst

---

Rhetorica and Herennium 1.8-9, as well as Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory 4.2.31-59*, and even earlier, Aristotle, *Rhetoric 3.16.* Also see Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory 3.2.1-3*, Cicero *on Invention 1.4.*, and Aristotle *Rhetoric 11.*

[256] An ancient narrative critical reading minimizes the objection that Gospel narrative-critical are anachronistic and reductionist. See Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*, 51, 97, 104, 106-107, 115-117, 129-130, 174. For a candid admission of this liberty, see: David M. Gunn, "Narrative Criticism," in *An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application: To Each Its Own Meaning*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1999), 226. Also: Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books Inc., Pub., 1981), 178-179.

[257] Any framework utilized by a Lukan exegete is in some sense limiting, since the exegete only has access to extant texts and artifacts, and a limited knowledge of the author and audience to whom Luke's Gospel is directed. The environment behind Luke's Gospel has engendered much debate. See; Loveday Alexander, "Luke's preface in the Context of Greek Preface Writing, *Novum Testament,* 28.1 (1986), 48-73. doi:10.2307/1560667. Sean A. Adams, "Luke's Preface and Its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander" *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*, 3 (2006): 177-19. David L. Mealand "Luke-Acts and the Verbs of Dionysius of Halicarnassus" Journal of the Study of the New Testament, 19 (1997): 63-86.

of apparent disparity, testing whether Theon's jurisdictional claims hold true by means of objective linguistic support is essential.[258]

Willi's research concerning linguistic factors and ancient cross-disciplines has proven beneficial in that his analysis compares the three major prose text types, each containing a one-thousand-word count, i. philosophical dialogues with Plato and Aristophanes, ii. forensic rhetoric with Lysias and Andocides, and iii. historiography with Herodotus and Thucydides.[259] Willi's linguistic analysis involves sentence length, participial use, as well as other discourse features.

Willi's research reveals some differences among the text types, even as important similarities occur, particularly between historiography and forensic rhetoric. In Willi's analysis of those sample texts, historiography and rhetoric are similar in three ways: average sentence length, participle frequency, and nouns and proper names. Regarding sentence length, historiography contained 21.3 and 23.3 words respectively for the sentences of Herodotus and Thucydides.[260] Comparatively, forensic rhetoric contained an average of 19.6 and 20.4 words respectively for Lysias and Andocides. Regarding participles, forensic rhetoric contained 65 and 56 between their respective authors, and historiography contained 62 and 69 participles respectively.[261] Regarding nouns and proper names, forensic rhetoric comprises 131 and 147 respectively, and historiography contained 241 and 290 instances respectively. The differences between the rhetoric and forensic samples are rather minimal.

However, because Willi's examples do not include Luke's Gospel, his findings should be applied to a Lukan sample case. Luke 4:30-5:39 has been chosen for the sample case since it

---

[258] There does not appear to be any specific and universal textual features that signal clear-cut distinctions between the prose writings of historiography, rhetoric, and philosophical dialogues, although one might distinguish prose from poetry on the basis of a sustained iambic meter. See Andreas Willi, "Register Variation," in *Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 298.

[259] Willi, "Register Variation."

[260] A sentence was defined as a clause or clause complex, unified by a coherent topic or temporal action.

[261] Andreas Willi, "Register Variation," 306-308. The weakness of Willi's selection is that only forensic rhetoric is used. However, Willi notes that there are distinct registers between the three species of rhetoric, since the audiences differ, as might the arrangement of the speech. Including all five elements of speech in forensic rhetoric was common. Epideictic rhetoric tended toward a style of superlative language and the avoidance of hiatus, antitheses, and so on. Epideictic rhetoric was the most distinct of the three species, typically containing uncommon words and long clauses. Victor Beers, "Kunstprosa: Philosophy, History, Oratory "in *Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 465-467.

provides a 1,000-word count. Comparative analysis between the three sample cases is provided in Table 3.2.3 below.

Table 3.2.3
Comparative analysis between the three sample cases.

Nouns and proper names	Participles incl. periphrastics	Average sentence length
Willi: 131 and 147 (forensic)	Willi: 65 and 56 (forensic)	Willi: 19.6 and 20.4 (forensic)
Willi: 242 and 290 (historiography)	Willi: 62 and 69 (historiography)	Willi: 21.3 and 23.3 (historiography)
Luke's Gospel:136	Luke: 57 (67 for periphrastics)	Luke: 20.3

Comparing the samples in Table 3.2.3 above, the Lukan scenes reflect the forensic rhetoric samples in all three ways, average sentence length, participial use, and nouns.

3.3. Theon's *Progymnasmata* Exercises

Based on the Luke 4:30-5:39 as representative of Luke's Gospel, a significant level of congruence between Theon's rhetorical handbook and Lukan narrations is apparent. Consequently, Theon's handbook appears to provide a potential bridge with Luke's Gospel even though Lukan scenes likely correspond to historiographical writings. Theon's *Progymnasmata* offers a relevant text-external resource for Luke's Gospel. An analysis of Theon's chreia, fable, narrative, ecphrasis, encomion, and syncrisis rhetorical exercises provide a necessary foundation relevant to the Lukan scenes of this project. The first three exercises are the first and most elementary in Theon's list of 10 rhetorical exercises in his gradated scale of rhetorical proficiency, whereas the final three constitute the fifth, seventh and eighth exercises respectively. Because only a limited number of Theon's exercises occur in Luke 3:21-5:39, only those rhetorical exercises that do occur, and in relative frequency, are presented below.[262]

3.3.1 The Chreia

Theon's discussion of the chreia (χρεία) is presented first in his handbook, followed by the fable and narrative. This order is fitting, and in accordance with Theon's aforementioned principle that "Easier things should be learned before more difficult ones, and it is easier to amplify what is clear than to demonstrate what is unclear." [263] The chreia was useful for a

---

[262] Exercises not discussed in this project include the *topos*, a starting place or stock concept/imagery for arguments, the *prosopopoeia*, a speech-in-character, *thesis*, inquiry into a controversy, and *law*, a political decision. As evident, these four exercises prototypically involve some type of an argumentative, societal rhetoric. That is, they tend toward public refutation, challenge, or a representation of other individuals in polemical challenge. None of these occur within 3:21-5:39 as far as this project's analyses, though in the Ch. VI commentary analysis, the *topos* is sometimes considered by a few scholars.

[263] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 8.

variety of students across the Greco-Roman educational system.[264] For example, students learned to first read and write by using the chreia exercise, due to its brevity and ease of remembrance.[265] For older students, the chreia would be manipulated in form, aiding in their use of Greek declensions. For more advanced students, the chreia could be elaborated, which was especially beneficial for rhetoric. By arranging and elaborating a chreia the student was able to imitate sophisticated rhetorical speeches.[266] Notwithstanding the chreia's benefit in education, it appealed to a wide variety of audiences and literary genres.[267] Hock and O'Neil write:

> The popularity of the chreia… is shown not only by the variety of persons to whom chreia are attributed, but also by the number of people who knew chreiai and by the numbers of chreiai that are used by various authors. Thus Dio Chrysostom remarks that everybody could recite chreiai about Diogenes, and thousands of chreiai can be found in the writings of, say, Plutarch, Quintilian, Aulus Gellius, Lucian, Diogenes Laertius, Aelian, Philostratus, and Stobaeus… there can be no doubt that throughout the period under consideration the chreia was widely known and important literary form.[268]

Theon introduces the chreia exercise with this definition:

"A chreia is a brief saying or action making a point, attributed to some specific person… chreia is an action or a saying, the maxim (genome) is only a saying. The reminiscence is distinguished from chreia in two ways: the chreia is brief, the reminiscence is sometimes extended, and the chreia is attributed to a person, while the reminiscence is also remembered for its own sake."[269]

Theon identifies the chreia by its brevity and by attribution to a person.[270] Additionally, Theon observes that the chreia may present a saying or an action. In actual practice, Theon's

---

[264] Prominent rhetoricians such as Seneca attest to the chreia as a basic educational exercise for very young students. Seneca *EP 33.7*

[265] Hock and O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 3-4.

[266] Hock and O'Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric Classroom Exercises, 51-77.* While the chreia may be inflected in any number of ways, the nominative case is the typical one. Further, the chreia can be stated through a variety of forms: gnomic saying, logical demonstration, jest, syllogism, enthymeme, example, prayer, sign, tropes, wish, metalepsis, or a combination of these. On elaborating a chreia, 79-354.

[267] David E. Aune, "Oral Tradition in the Hellenistic World," in *Jesus and the Oral Tradition,* ed. Henry Wansborough (New York: T & T Clark Pub, 1991), 94.

[268] Hock and O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric,* 7.

[269] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 15.

[270] Theon maintained that a chreia's virtues include expedience, that is, useful instruction, conciseness, clarity in content and style, and if at all possible, plausibility. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 15, 22. The chief virtue of the chreia is expedience, that it comes "with a point," μετ᾽ εὐθστοχίας. By contrast, narration virtues include plausibility, clarity, and having a chief point. There are occasions in Lukan exegesis where ascertaining whether a

taxonomy of the chreia is threefold, the saying chreia, an action chreia, and a mixed chreia which contains both a saying and action. The saying (ἀπόφασις) chreia occurs where a chreia's point, or its authoritative intention or focus, resides in a given attributed statement, which typically occurs at the close of a chreia and is on an attributed action for the action (πρᾶξις) chreia. The mixed chreia makes its point by incorporating both an attributed saying and action.

Because these three categories of the chreia exercise are relevant to Luke's Gospel, they require additional explanation. Theon defined the saying chreia, also called the verbal chreia, as: "Verbal are those that have their authority without action….There are two species of verbal chreias, declarative chreia *(apophantikon)* and responsive chreia *(apokritikon)*".[271] The declarative saying chreia occurs when a person speaks by compulsion, whether internal or external compulsion, representing two categories of the declarative chreia, the declarative voluntarism and declarative circumstantial. Declarative voluntarism occurs when a saying arises by a person's own accord, internally constrained. Theon provides this example: "Isocrates the sophist used to say that those of his students with natural ability were children of gods." Declarative circumstantial occurs when an external circumstance prompts a person to speak,[272] as in this example: "Diogenes, the Cynic philosopher, seeing a rich young man who was educated, said 'He is dirt plated with silver.'"

The responsive chreia transpires when a person speaks in response to another person. There are four types of the responsive chreia; simple answer response, longer answer response, causation answer, and responsive statement answer. The simple answer response happens when a speaker provides a simple agreement or disagreement in response to a question. Theon's example is: "Pittacus the Mitylene, when asked if anyone escapes the gods' notice when doing wrong, said 'No, not even in contemplating it'."[273] The longer answer response occurs when a

---

scene constitutes a narration or a chreia is difficult. For example, a chreia is prototypically characterized by brevity/concision, a virtue not required for the narration exercise, but where some overlap may occur. If word count is an indicator of concision, some ancient narration examples also are concise. For example, Libanius' rhetorical handbook contains a number of concise narratives, and specifically the narration, *On Alpheus*, that contains a mere 26 words that is similar in word count to the mixed chreiai examples provided by Theon. See also: Gibson, *Libanius's Progymnasmata*, 10, 79.

[271] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 16.

[272] Luke 1:24-25 and 3:15-17 may well be examples of a circumstantial declarative chreia, each reflecting a discourse unit and one by which circumstances lead to a pronouncement, for both Elizabeth and John the Baptist.

[273] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,*16.

speaker responds to a question with a longer answer. Theon offers this sample: "Theano, the Pythagorean philosopher, having been asked by someone how soon after sexual intercourse with a husband may a wife go to the Themophoreion, replied 'From her own husband, immediately, from somebody else's, never.'"[274] The causation answer takes place when a speaker addresses a person's root cause in order to answer a question. Theon's example is: "Socrates, having been asked if the king of the Persians seemed to him to be happy, said, 'I cannot say, for I cannot know the state of his education'." [275] The responsive statement answer ensues in response to a statement, not a question or inquiry. Theon offers this sample, "Once, when Diogenes was eating his lunch in the market place and invited Plato to join him, Plato said, 'Diogenes, how pleasant your lack of pretension would be if it were not for your pretentiousness!' Diogenes was not asking Plato about anything nor was he inquiring of him, but he simply invites him to lunch which is neither.'"[276] In addition to these four responsive saying chreiai, Theon also presents the double chreia. The double chreia occurs when two individuals each provide a chreia, and the final statement is a response to the first statement.[277]

Theon's second category of chreia is the action chreia, where the focus resides in a given person's action. As with the saying chreia, the point of the action chreia is prototypically located as the close of the chreia. Theon writes:

Chreias are actional (πρακτικαί) when they reveal some meaning without speech, and some of these are active, some passive. Active ones describe some action; for example, "When Diogenes the Cynic philosopher saw a boy eating fancy food, he beat his pedagogue with his staff." Passive are those signifying something experienced; for example, "Didymon the flute player, taken in adultery, was hung by his name."[278]

The final type of chreia is the mixed chreia where both a saying and action contribute to the point of the chreia. As Theon explains:

Mixed chreias are those that partake of both the verbal and the actional but have the meaning in the action; for example, "Pythagoras the philosopher, having been asked

---

[274] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,*16.

[275] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 16. This is called an apocritic responsive chreia.

[276] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 17.

[277] Theon's example is this: "Alexander, the king of Macedon, stood over Diogenes when he was sleeping and said, 'a man who is a counselor should not sleep all night' (IlIiad 2.24), and Diogenes replied (with Illiad 2.25): 'A man to whom the people have been entrusted and who has many cares'. In this case, there would have been a chreia even without the addition of the answer." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,*17.

[278] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 17.

how long is the life of men, going up onto the roof, peeped out briefly, by this making clear that life was short." And further, "A Laconian, when someone asked him where the Lacedaimonians set the limits of their land, showed his spear."[279]

3.2.2 *The Fable*

The second exercise that occurs in Theon's handbook is the fable, which he defines in this manner: "A fable (mythos) is a fictitious story giving an image of truth."[280] Theon's definition explains why the fable is relatively easier to incorporate than the narrative exercise and so positioned prior to it. Compared to the narrative exercise, the fable addresses a vast assortment of potential corresponding circumstances and characters. It is therefore a ready and adaptable rhetorical exercise, and utilized in forensic, epideictic and deliberative speeches.[281] As Aristotle explains:

> "Fables are suitable for addresses to popular assemblies; and they have one advantage -- they are comparatively easy to invent, whereas it is hard to find parallels among actual past events. You will in fact frame them just as you frame illustrative parallels: all you require is the power of thinking out your analogy, a power developed by intellectual training."[282]

Despite the distinction between the fable and narrative, both exercises are inductive rhetorical arguments. In contrast to the enthymeme deductive argument that consists of a proposition and a supportive premise, inductive arguments operate by way of example.[283] As inductive argumentation, the persuasiveness of a fable is achieved by means of correspondence, or transferring shared symbolic values between the fable's world and that of the speaker.

Theon asserts that a fable's virtues, or crowning properties, are expedience, plausibility, and clarity.[284] Expedience in a fable entails providing useful instruction for the audience, for according to Theon, a fable's "…whole point is useful instruction."[285] Plausibility does not

---

[279] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 17.

[280] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 23.

[281] Hayden W. Ausland, "Poetry, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Plato's Phaedrus," *SO* 84 (2012) 2-18.

[282] Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* Book II. Ch. 20.

[283] George Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 7, 16-17.

[284] According to Theon regarding the fable, "The whole point is useful instruction… we have made clear the nature of the original statement in the account of the chreia, but in fables the style (not content) should be simpler and natural, and in so far as possible artless and clear (content)." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 23-27.

[285] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 24.

involve historical veracity, since a fable is a fictitious story, but rather entails that a seamless analogue occurs between the fable world and the speaker's world.[286] In other words, features within the fable's internal world must readily facilitate the transference of symbolic values between the two worlds. The fable's virtue of clarity involves using the natural, or usual, sense of words, facilitating a simple style so that expedience and plausibility are achieved.

3.3.3 The Narrative

Theon defines the narrative exercise in this manner: "Narrative (*diegema*) is language descriptive of things that have happened or as though they had happened."[287] While such a definition appears beguilingly simple, the virtues associated with the narrative reveals the depth of the rhetorical value of this exercise. [288] This section will examine the three virtues of the narrative exercise, credibility, clarity and conciseness while also discussing the relevance for

---

[286] "…the probability in fiction lies in its resembling the truth, by means of matching discourses and characters, as well as of the propriety in the arrangement of places, actions and other elements…" Hayden W. Ausland, "Poetry, Rhetoric, And Fiction in Plato's Phaedrus," *SO* 84 (2012) 2-18, 16. For Theon, a fable is refutable where it lacks plausibility, that is, entities within the fable that fail to obtain a cogent correspondence with truth. For example, if a rhetor were to compare domesticated fowl to political affairs in the Roman empire, the analogy of a duck to an honored emperor obstructs the credibility of a fable to represent and address the speaker's external world. Rather, the rhetor must find a more suitable representative in the fable world, perhaps a hawk, or owl, or some other bird known for its prowess, wisdom or majesty. The rhetor must thus avoid a mismatch, as much as possible, so that the audience can seamlessly identify issues of correspondence between the fable-world and the speaker's world. One might also challenge a fable's clarity, through the use of ambiguous words, or charge a fable with inexpedience to the extent that it lacks beneficial instruction. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 26-28.

[287] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 28. This definition follows that of Cicero *on Invention 1.19* and Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory 4.2.31*. Cicero categorizes narratives into three kinds (Cicero, *On Invention 2.19* the first two for civic purposes, to identify the cause or issue under consideration and to incriminate, compare or amplify). In his third category (for entertainment and the giving of instruction), he further distinguishes that of things (fable, history and argument) and persons (presumably encomium/panegyric, and biography). Quintilian follows suit: *Institutes of Oratory 2.4.2-4.* Theon's definition also captures the essence of contemporary definitions of a narration. Marina Grishakova and Siim Sorokin, "Notes on narrative, cognition, and cultural evolution" Sign Systems Studies 44/4 (2016): 542-561, 550.

[288] As a statement of facts, the narration informed the audience of a particular circumstance leading to a rhetor's main thesis. Compared to the chreia, which was designed to instruct, the narration exercise was primarily intended to inform. Penella, "The Progymnasmata in Imperial Greek Education," 77-90, 85. Regarding use of the narrative, the rhetor needed to inform the audience of what they were not aware, while providing new understanding of what the audience thought they knew. It was therefore a sophisticated process of taking facts that are either unknown by the audience or perceived dimly and managing those facts in a manner that maximizes rhetorical intention. Hence the word for narration, *diegesis*, literally means "a leading through." George A. Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical literature, 2005), 31-35. Compared to the fable, a well-composed narration required an increase in creative selection and orchestration. Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 65. Also: John D. O'Banion "Narration and Argumentation: Quintilian on Narratio as the Heart of Rhetorical Thinking" *Rhetorica*, Fall 1987, 5/4; 325-351, 335.

Lukan exegesis.[289] Correlated to this discussion is that according to Theon's handbook, the words narrative and narration differ; essentially, narration is to narrative what a poem is to poetry.[290] Accordingly, this project uses the word narration when referring to individual Lukan scenes, whereas the word narrative constitutes the whole of Luke's Gospel.

The first virtue of the narration exercise is credibility, *aretai*.[291] Theon maintained that credibility was of supreme importance, for "One should always keep to what is credible in the narration, for this is its most special feature."[292] A closer examination of the importance of credibility stems from Theon's definition wherein a narration presents "things that have happened," πραγμάτων γεγονότων. The word πραγμάτων covers a range of meanings such as acts, deeds, events, subjects, things, or matters under consideration. Theon maintained that a narration chiefly involves spatial representations, items or entities, whether actions, matters, or things. However, with the addition of the word, γεγονότων, a presentation of a new state of being, a narration exercise also involves temporal sequencing, though not entailing a strictly temporal progression.[293] Theon's definition of the narration as πραγμάτων γεγονότων is

---

[289] Theon writes: "Best of all, if it is possible, the narration should have all these virtues. If it is impossible for conciseness not somehow to be counter to clarity and credibility, one should aim at what is more pressing, for example, if the subject is of a difficult nature, one should go for clarity and credibility; if on the other hand, the subject is simple and not complicated, aim at conciseness and credibility. One should always keep to what is credible in the narration, for this is its most special feature." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 29.

[290] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 28-42. Theon considers the account of Thucydides concerning the Plataeans and Thebans as a single episode (diegema: .2-6) but also as a Histories' (comprehensive narration). This view might appear to preclude individual pericopes (*diegema* Luke 5:1-11) from the necessities of narrative virtues and their elements (what one might consider as Luke's Gospel in totality: *diegesis*), However, Theon himself cites a pericope (that of Thucydides relating the Plataeans and the Thebans conflict) in order to demonstrate that it contains, by itself, the requisite virtues and elements that render it persuasive, the highest virtue of narration (*diegesis*). Theon understood that both the comprehensive whole (the work in entirety: *diegesis*) and each of its constituent parts (a single episode: *diegema*) must conform to the requisite definition, virtues and elements. For the rhetorician Aphthonius, however, the terms narrative and narration differ depending upon length, the narrative narrates one event, but the narration involves many events and greater length. Ronald F. Hock, "Observing a Teacher of Progymnasmata," 59. Frequently, the term narration refers to a spatial-temporal unit within a rhetorical speech while the term narrative is broader, referring to a compilation of many narrations, such as a complete historiographical work, or, more specifically, the whole of Luke's Gospel.

[291] Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory 4.2.31-59.* Aristotle, *Rhetoric III.16.*

[292] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 29. Cicero, *On Invention*, *2.iv-viii*, ix-xi. Also Cicero's *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 2.3.18-19.

[293] Theon writes: "It is possible to begin in the middle and run back to the beginning, then to jump to the end… it is also possible to begin from the end and go to events in the middle and thus to come down to the beginning." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 34-35. Applied to Luke's Gospel, there may be scenes where two or three narrations occur within a single scene. In such cases, the exegete must consider how each narration contributes to the rhetorical effect of the scene, being careful not to discount any one narration, but rather identify a solitary purpose achieved by weaving several narrations together.

sufficiently broad, encompassing any discourse that represents spatial-temporal sequencing.[294]

This definition makes evident the reason that the virtue of credibility is of paramount importance in that it incorporates the relevant issues of space and time. To achieve credibility, Theon emphasized use of the six elements of a narration. These six elements, called *stoikheia,* include person, action, time, place, manner, and cause.[295] In negotiating these elements, the profundity of the narration exercise is revealed in Theon:

> …one should employ styles that are natural for the speakers and suitable for the subjects and the places and the occasions; in the case of the subjects, those that are probable and follow from each other. One should briefly add the causes of things to the narration and say what is incredible in a believable way, and simply put, it is suitable to aim at what is appropriate to the speaker and to the other elements of the narrative in content and its style.[296]

To substantiate the importance of these six elements, Theon cites Thucydides' account of the Thebans attack on a Plataean city, commending Thucydides for managing the narration elements in a coherent and satisfactory manner.[297] However, while incorporating the six narration elements was pivotal for achieving the virtue of credibility, the inclusion and management of these elements facilitated a speech's persuasiveness. Generally speaking, the selection of the narration elements was influenced by two important factors, i. the type of literature or species of rhetoric pertaining to a given narration, and ii. the audience to whom the narration is addressed.

---

[294] Mervin R. Dilts and George A. Kennedy, eds., *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire: Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara* (New York: Brill, 1997), 18-19.

[295] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 28. "The components of a narrative would be familiar to any journalist today: who, what, when, where, how, and why." *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric,* Craig A. Gibson trans. (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 9. Regarding the element of person and following Theon's order, listing the Greek first and Latin italicized: γένος/*genus* (origin, race, stock), φύσις/*natura* (nature), ἀγωγή/*educatio* (training), διάθεσις/*affectio* (disposition), ἡλικία (age), τύχη/*fortuna* (fortune), προαίρεσις/*propofitum* (morality, choosing). *Thenos Sophiston Progymnasmata*, ed., Camerarius Joachim, 1500-1574, 30

[296] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 33.

[297] As an example, Theon focuses one particular instance of Thucydides' episode, writing: "It is credible that the Plataeans, realizing that their city had been suddenly captured by the enemy, thought, because of the dark, that many more had come in…" Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 34. In other words, on account of nightfall impeding their sight, the reasonable action was for the Plataeans to initially yield to the enemies, not knowing their true size. By means of providing coherence to the elements, particularly time, action, and cause, Thucydides' narration scene achieves plausibility.

While every narration exercise consisted of "things that have happened," the degree to which the various spatial-temporal elements were exploited depended upon a given type of narration. In Greco-Roman rhetoric there were two kinds of narration, historical narratives and political oratory. Examining the Hermogenic corpus of rhetoric, Kennedy observes:

> He adds…that there are two kinds- one a simple statement of the facts, the other an examination of intentions and the arguments that are being set out- and reports that others have made a division into the kind of narrative found in historical writing and that found in political oratory.[298]

This distinction between historical and political oratory is likewise confirmed by the rhetorician Anonymous Seguerianus. In Seguerianus' discussion of a narration's genus, or *genera*, he notes that a narration is either addressed "to a judge or judges," or it was composed for general literature, narrations that were "for their own sake."[299] Apsines' rhetorical handbook also makes a similar distinction:

> …there are two kinds of narration, one an account of the bare fact, the other a scrutiny of intentions and of the arguments that are being set out….some narrations are historical, of which there are many specimens in prose writings, and some argumentative, as in speeches of political oratory.[300]

Consequently, the substance of a narration was determined by whether it was historical writing or political oratory. In fact, Kennedy and Dilts observe that such a distinction resulted in varying definitions of a narrative among the ancient rhetoricians:

> …Theodorus defines it as follows: "A narration is an exposition of a subject complete in itself by a bare statement of things that have already happened. Alexander says this definition is accurate but not the meaning of the term in political speech or rhetoric; for it is necessary to describe it more clearly in such uses."[301]

A pragmatic approach to judicial speeches, that is forensic rhetoric, meant that all or many of the narrative elements were required, since the orator needed to orchestrate the six

---

[298] Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus,* 51. While Theon considers a narration that lacks all six elements to be "deficient," he is not oblivious to rhetorical exigencies. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 36.

[299] Dilts and Kennedy, *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire,* 19. Cicero reflects this distinction as well, though his *genera* falls into three types: narrations used to win belief, to win a trial, and those as compositional exercises for grammar. 19.

[300] Ibid., 123. Apsines further categorizes narrations into seven types: pathetical, seeking emotional clarity; ethical, the character of a person related to their action; vehement; against persons, aggrieved, encomiastic, and intermediate. 123,135.

[301] Dilts and Kennedy, *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire,* 123.

elements in a manner suitable to the judge, and in doing so, win the trial or win belief. In historical writings or general literature, the six elements were not necessary only insofar as they suited the speaker's particular purpose.[302]

The second factor that influenced a narration's credibility was a given audience's pre-understanding which was of vital importance as well, because rhetoric was persuasive speech that appealed to a given audience's pre-understanding. To this end, rhetorician Anonymous Seguerianus emphasizes that a given narration must be regulated according to the audience's knowledge. In his survey of narration definitions by various rhetoricians, he cited the important difference between Apollodorus and Alexander's definitions of narration. Appollodorus defined narration as "an exposition of the circumstance," $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\H{\epsilon}\kappa\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, where the use of the word "circumstance" required all six elements in a narration: person, action, emotion, cause, resource, and time. [303]

In contrast, Alexander avoided mechanistically presenting all six elements with this definition: "A narration is an exposition and transmission to the hearer of the subject which we are sharing."[304] Alexander asserted that narration existed for the hearer's sake, requiring a careful selection of only those narration elements that will benefit the hearer while still serving the rhetor's purpose.[305] Alexander's approach reveals that the orator must be attuned to an audience's pragmatic concerns, even while judiciously employing the theoretical values of

---

[302] Dilts and Kennedy, *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire*. 19. Seguirianus described the following types: "some are descriptions of life, some are historical, some mythical, some concern the vicissitudes of fortune." Understanding the distinction between the two types of narrations reveals that while credibility was useful for the historian, it was essential for the rhetorician in the case of forensic oratory. For example, in a forensic speech in which a rhetor accused a man of murder, the cause and manner of the murderous action must be made clear. Hock, "Observing a Teacher of Progymnasmata," 65. In forensic rhetoric, a persuasive narration required the narrative elements of action and cause, but in the case of an epideictic speech, not every narration element was necessary. For example, as in a speech of praise to Julius Caesar. If a given audience was already aware that Julius Caesar's actions were motivated by his love for Rome, then causation might be assumed, without being stated. Ignoring the rhetorical occasion by repeating all six narrative elements not only risked the charge of superfluity it also inveighed against the audience, that they knew so little. John D. O'Banion "Narration and Argumentation: Quintilian on Narratio as the Heart of Rhetorical Thinking" *Rhetorica*, 1987, 5.4, 325-351, 347.

[303] Dilts and Kennedy, *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire*. 18-19.

[304] "…$\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\sigma\varsigma$ $o\H{\upsilon}$ $\kappa\sigma\iota\nu\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$…" Dilts and Kennedy, *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire*. 18-19.

[305] "More generally, the Greek prose writer needed to consider how to make such a composition intelligible and persuasive, adjusting his text to his audience and the mode in which they would take in his work." Victor Beers, "Kunstprosa: Philosophy, History, Oratory," in *Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 458.

rhetoric. In so doing, Alexander's approach helpfully navigates Theon's handbook as a theoretical guide within the broader world of rhetorical practice, declamation, and public speech.

The orator was incessantly negotiating two foci: a focus on circumstances for narration's sake and a focus on circumstances for the hearer's sake. In public oratory, a persuasive narration must attend to the world of the audience, and not strictly the world composed by the narration elements. In summary, the virtue of credibility for a given narration depended upon the type of rhetorical species and the rhetor's audience, making use of as many of the six elements as the occasion dictated.

A ranking scale does exist among the narration elements, as evidenced in Theon's definition of narration as "language descriptive of things that have happened," πραγμάτων γεγονότων. Since a narration is arranged by temporal sequencing, that is, things that have happened, there is a prioritization among the narration elements, with action, πρᾶξις, as the fundamental and central element in a narration for two reasons: the constraints of narrative logic, and the intentionality related to the rhetorical species.

Narrative logic requires acting upon entities in the narration world. In order for happenings to occur, action is necessary, since it provides the organizing principle for spatial-temporal relations.[306] Theon underscores the emphasis upon action in his introduction of the various narration elements: "…the action done by the person; and the place where the action was done; and the time at which it was done; and the manner of action; and…the cause of these things."[307] Theon's list postulates action as the pre-eminent or organizing principle for a given narration. However, Theon's priority to action is not unique, but rather reflected in Greco-Roman literature, ranging from historiography to rhetoric, and extending to poetry's domain.[308]

---

[306] The following probe makes this clear; in a given narration one can include a person, place and cause, following three of thein's six elements, but apart from some external phenomenon, some specified action, these elements are merely inert or existential, that is, "motion-less." No matter what narration elements are selected, action constitutes the central element around which all other narrative elements orchestrate or hold together.

[307] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 28.

[308] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 28-29. Aristotle's *Rhetoric III.16,* Cicero, *On Invention 19, Rhetorica ad Herennium 2.3.* Plutarch's biographical writings also reflects this schema. 225. *Plutarch Lives VII,* Loeb Classical Library, ed. Jeffrey Henderson (Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1919), 225. Action is not strictly associated with material activity but may also include reported speech. Paul Elbert "An Observation on Luke's Composition and Narrative Style of Questions*" CBQ* 66:1 (2004) 98-109. F. Gerald Downing, "Words As deeds And Deeds as Words," *Biblical Interpretation,* 3.2 (1995): 129-143. doi.org/10.1163/156851595X00258

Second, Theon's priority given to the element of action fulfils the primary purpose of rhetorical speech, that is, persuasion of defense, praise, or advisement. The action of a narrative participant instantiates the particular function of a rhetor's speech.[309] In other words, Theon's emphasis upon action as the fundamental framework for a narration provides the rhetor with a pivot for ethical assessments. Within a given narration, a participant's action mediates a particular virtue, even while auxiliary elements orchestrate around that action and in a way that the rhetor's intention is achieved.[310] Such a notion aligns with Theon's specific assessment of the element of action: "Those of the action are… advantageous or not advantageous, just or unjust, honorable or dishonorable."[311] Theon's comment on action corresponds to the three species of rhetoric, deliberative, forensic and epideictic action, guaranteeing that action is the narration conduit for persuasive intent. Seen in this light, the virtue of narrative credibility is maintained by selecting and arranging narration elements insofar as they contribute to a given action's persuasiveness.[312]

While the proposition that action is central to a narration's rhetorical appeal and that phenomenal process types are accorded greater semantic weight, a typical narration presents a variety of "happenings," making ranking certain actions an important task. Arguments presented below show there is a central organizing action, one that is capable of orchestrating the selected spatial-temporal elements and that directly relates to persuasive intent. The action that is accorded that greatest weight is called the global action. Examinig the remaining two virtues of a narration, clarity and conciseness, support the notion of a global action.[313]

Regarding clarity, Theon writes:

The narration becomes clear from two sources: from the subjects that are described and from the style of the description of the subjects. It becomes clear from the subjects whenever the things being said, unlike those in dialectic or geometry, do not depart

---

[309] Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 229.

[310] After action, Theon's element of person is undoubtedly next in importance but notably, Theon's rubric is not identical to Aristotle's *Poetics* (ref). In the *Poetics*, plot holds primary value and the character is secondary. Such a posture is due to Aristotle's insistence on plot as the apparatus whereby reversal and recognitions achieves catharsis, arousing pity or fear.

[311] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 28. Other descriptions of action include: (1) great/small, (2) dangerous/not dangerous, (3) possible/impossible, (4) easy/difficult, and (5) necessary/unnecessary.

[312] Aristotle's *Rhetoric 1.9*, 2.23, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.8-9, *Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum 3.16.* Also, Quintilian *Institutes of Oratory 3.7.1-19*, 3.8.4-12, 4.2.11-18, 5.10.30-52.

[313] Cicero, *On Invention 2.4.20-21*. Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory 4.2.31-32.* Also see Lucian of Samosota, *The Way to Write History*, 4-8, 19-20, 27, 42-62.

from common understanding, or whenever one does not narrate many things together but brings each to completion.[314]

Theon considers both the content and style of a narration in the case of clarity, that is, what is said and how it is said. Regarding content, Theon instructs that one should: "avoid inserting long digressions" and also to avoid that which "distracts the thought of the hearers and results in the need for a reminder of what has been said earlier."[315] Regarding style, Theon notes: "in aiming for clarity one should avoid poetic and coined words and tropes and archaisms and foreign words and homonyms." and follows up with explication of these lapses of style wherein clarity is concerned.[316]

In essence, both content and style should achieve a maximally lucid integration of narration elements. However, there must be a subject to which the narration principally aims. Clarity therefore operates within a singular rhetorical direction, instantiated by a global action.

The other narration virtue for Theon is conciseness:

The narration is concise from what is said and how it is said. Conciseness is language signifying the most important of the facts, not adding what is not necessary nor omitting what is necessary to the subject and style. Conciseness arises from the contents when we do not combine many things together, do not mix them in with other things, and when we leave out what seems to be assumed; when we do not begin too far back in time and do not lavish words on incidentals…[317]

Consistent with the virtue of clarity and global action, Theon writes: "…in speaking a narration one ought to look to the chief point of the whole subject that he has set out, bringing into the narration only things that complement this."[318] Theon maintains that conciseness is achieved by keeping to the main subject or issue at hand, what he calls the "chief point,"

---

[314] Theon goes on to add: "One should, moreover, avoid inserting long digressions in the middle of a narration…it distracts the thoughts of the hearers and results in the need for a reminder of what has been said earlier… Narration becomes unclear by omission of what ought necessarily to have been mentioned and by an allegorical account of disguised events." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 30.

[315] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 30.

[316] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 29-30. Galen O. Rowe "Style," *The Classical Handbook Of Rhetoric In The Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.- A.D. 400,* ed. Stanley Porter (Boston: Brill Academic Pub., 2001), 123, 124. George A. Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric," *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.- A.D. 400,* 16-17.

[317] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 32. This was also Lucian of Samosota's concern, *The Way to Write History.*

[318] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 32.

κεφαλαίου, whereby conciseness is constituted by "language signifying the most important of the facts," σημαίνων καιριώτατα του πραγμάτων.[319] Theon further elaborated that conciseness is achieved "when we leave out what seems to be assumed."[320] Here again, both content and style offer assistance. For example, word choice is an important stylistic consideration, since impropriety of word usage leads to confusion for the hearer.[321] In order to achieve the virtues of clarity and conciseness, the global action provides the matrix, or substrate, upon which a given narration rests.[322] Applying Theon's virtues of clarity and conciseness to Lukan exegesis is incumbent on identifying the global action of a narration scene, and that the coordinate and relevant narration elements are incorporated into a chief point as they contribute to the persuasive intent of a scene.

3.2.4 The Ecphrasis

According to Theon, the ecphrasis exercise involves the use of descriptive language, περιηγηματικός. Theon introduces the ecphrasis exercise in his handbook in this manner:

> Ecphrasis is descriptive language, bringing what is portrayed clearly before the sight. There is ecphrasis of persons and events and places and periods of time… The virtues of an ecphrasis are as follows: most of all, clarity and a vivid impression of all-but-seeing what is described.[323]

Using descriptive language reveals the twin virtues of the ecphrasis exercise: clarity, σαφήνεια, and specificity or vividness, ἐναργεία. By means of clear and vivid descriptive language, the intended audience approaches a level of near-to-seeing, σχεδόν ὁρᾶσθαι, regarding those selected discourse elements. Those selected elements may be culled from the endless varieties of human experience. The ecphrasis might involve a few short words, or in the case of Thucydides' verbose night battle, it may involve a sustained description of considerable length. Theon categorizes the endless variety of descriptive elements by this list: people, προσώπων, things, deeds or acts, πραγμάτων, places, τόπων, times, χρόνων, or other

---

[319] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 32.

[320] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 32.

[321] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 33.

[322] In Chapters IV and V, the chief point will be stated in a manner that capitalizes on the global action, and the extent to which other prominent elements interact for persuasive purposes and stated in a way that includes the potential for all three rhetorical species. In other words, forensic rhetoric would utilize the chief point in order to defend Jesus, the epideictic to praise him, and the deliberative to follow him.

[323] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 44.

circumstances and objects.[324] Combining two or more of these elements by means of vivid description is called a mixed ecphrasis.[325]

By drawing the audience into select elements in a discourse, the ecphrasis exercise produces an emotional response. To this end, the ecphrasis activated rhetorical pathos, and was utilized in both Greco-Roman rhetoric and in historical writings by such notables as Cicero, Quintilian, Thucydides, and Plutarch.[326] Because of the emotional force of the ecphrasis, it required measured control, a point Theon also reflects: "…if what it describes is colorful, the word choice should be colorful, but if it is rough or frightening [or a portrays a similar disposition], features of the style should not strike a discordant note with the nature of the subject."[327] The view that the ecphrasis was emotionally potent was common in the Greco-Roman context, stemming from a particular view of human constitution insofar as descriptive language produced strong impressions upon the listener's soul.

> Quintilian indicates that the speaker who could recall mental images well could create a vivid description that would penetrate the audience's emotions and have a powerfully persuasive effect. He notes that this kind of speech penetrates to the mind's eye (*oculis mentis*) and is able to dominate the listener (*plene dominator oratio*). Ps-Longinus also indicates that when this kind of rhetoric is combined with factual arguments, it not only persuades an audience but also enslaves (δουλουται) them.[328]

Because of the highly persuasive nature of the ecphrasis, Greco-Roman rhetoricians typically situated this exercise in a narration, whereby the rhetor could select from among the six narration elements in order to facilitate emotional persuasion where desired. Naturally, the emotionally descriptive element occurred at a strategic location in a narration, that is, at a

---

[324] The elements included in Theon's battle descriptions is extensive, including raising armies, sieges, countryside destruction, wounds, deaths, and enslavements. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 46. Various ancient rhetorical examples include artistic works, statues, plants, animals, festivals. *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, transl. Craig A. Gibson (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 427. Ruth Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Burlington VT: Ashgate Pub., 2009), 20.

[325] Theon offers an example of a mixed ecphrasis is a Thucydides' accounts of Philistus' night battle. In that case, the descriptive elements include both time, at night, and event, the battle. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 46. For Theon, the ecphrasis must avoid stating what was useless, or unprofitable, ἄχρηστα.

[326] Ruth Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion*, 61, 62; Quintilian, *Inst*., 6.2.29-32.
[327] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 47. Ruth Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion,* 24-25.

[328] David G. Horrell, Bradley Arnold, and Travis B. Williams, "Visuality, Vivid Description, and the Message of 1 Peter: The Significance of the Roaring Lion (1 Peter 5:8)," *Journal of Biblical Literature, 132*.3 (2013): 698, 710. doi:10.2307/23487894

particularly important juncture.[329] The ecphrasis was capable of achieving the zenith of a speaker's intention by means of vivid language forcefully impressed upon the soul and transfixed upon emotional persuasion,. To clarify, identification of various ecphrases "…invites us to consider whether these function in a particularly significant way in terms of highlighting a (or the) key message..."[330]

Two probes assist in identifying the presence of the ecphrasis exercise in Luke's Gospel. The first probe involves linguistic analysis, particularly the use of adjectives to describe a person, place, or action. This probe is confirmed by the examples that Theon provides. For instance, regarding an ecphrasis of person, Theon appeals to Homer's *The Odyssey* and a specific occurrence of adjectives: "'Round-shouldered, swarthy-skinned, wooly-haired'."[331] Regarding an event or action, Theon cites Thucydides' description of a battle siege: "They sawed a great beam and hollowed it out."[332] These examples demonstrate that an ecphrasis need not be lengthy, but rather requires the use of adjectives or participles as conduits for vivid description. The second probe involves concision, and is akin to the principle of Ockham's razor, that is, considering whether a perceived vivid participant or process might be presented in balder terms. The use of ecphrasis is a particular emotional conduit for persuasion, and therefore tends to occur at prominent elements in a narration in close proximity to the global action. The purpose for close proximity, the ecphrasis to the global action, is to provide the reader with a particularly vivid experience at the nexus of the global action, drawing the reader inward in order to accentuate it. The relevance of the ecphrasis for Luke's Gospel will be explored further in Chapters IV and V.

---

[329] Theon assumes the presence of the ecphrasis within the narration to the extent that refuting an ecphrasis mirrors the refutations that belong to the narrative exercise. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 47.

[330] Horrell, Arnold and Williams, "Visuality, Vivid Description, and the Message of 1 Peter," 698.

[331] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 44.

[332] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 46. "Round-shouldered, swarthy-skinned, wooly-haired": Γυρός ὤμοισι, μελανοχρονος, οὐλοκάρηνος. "They sawed a great beam and hollowed it all out": μεγάλω δίχα πρίσαντες ἐκοίλαναν ἅπασαν. The first line includes adjectives pertaining to the description of persons, and the second line is participial, related to verbal processes. The second line is similar to Luke 7:14, with an extension clause preceding the main clause. Theon's examples from Thucydides support the notion that descriptive participles may be extension or elaboration clauses. Theon's lengthier example from Ctesias follows this same pattern: "The Lydians, just before dawn, looking from afar toward the acropolis and seeing the standards of the Persians on long wooden posts, turned to flight since they thought the acropolis was full of Persians and had already been captured."

3.2.5 The Encomion

The encomion exercise involves "…revealing the greatness of virtuous actions and other good qualities belonging to a particular person." The encomion is epideictic rhetoric, or praise for an individual.[333] To accomplish praise, Theon identifies three classes, or argument types, by which one might furnish praise. These include: i. external goods, ii. goods of the body, iii. goods of the mind and actions. External goods include such items as addressing a person's good birth, tribe or city, ancestors, education, friendships, reputation, official position, children, and so on.[334] Goods of the body include an individual's physical constitution, such as their strength, vitality or health, comeliness, or acuteness of senses.[335] Goods of the mind and actions that follow address ethical virtues such as prudence, courage, justness, piety, generous, magnanimous, and so on.[336] Exemplary actions are those:

> done for others rather than ourselves; and done for the sake of the honorable, not the expedient nor the pleasant; and in which the toil is that of the doer but the benefit is common…Actions are praised on the basis of the occasion and whether someone else did them alone or was the first or when no one else acted, or did more than others or with few helpers or beyond what was characteristic of his age or contrary to expectation or with toils…[337]

Theon's comments regarding the expectations assigned to virtuous deeds are meaningfully conveyed by means of a carefully arranged structure, with external and bodily goods presented first, followed by particular actions and successes. In this structure, preliminary information about an individual's good birth or ancestry in Greco-Roman society served as a framework for evaluating a given individual's subsequent actions, particularly to the extent that such actions were consistent with, or contrary to, their good birth or ancestry. The meaningful pattern of the encomion provided a given audience with an ethical barometer by which to assess a person's activities. As Theon explains: "…we shall speak of good birth

---

[333] An encomion might also address an inanimate object. Theon lists honey, health, and virtues as possible topics. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 52.

[334] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 50.

[335] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 50.

[336] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 50.

[337] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 51.

and other external and bodily goods, not arranging the account simply and in any random order but in each case showing that the subject used the advantage prudently and as he ought…"[338]

3.2.6 The Syncrisis

The final relevant rhetorical exercise is the syncrisis. As with the ecphrasis, the syncrisis exercise tended to occur in the narration exercise.[339] In Theon's order of rhetorical exercises, the syncrisis is eighth among ten exercises, indicating that it belonged to a more advanced level of rhetorical proficiency. This exercise merged elements of the previous exercises, further developing the student's rhetorical proficiency.[340] According to Theon:

> Syncrisis (synkrisis) is language setting the better or the worse side by side. There are syncrisis both of persons and of things. An example involving persons is a comparison of Ajax to Odysseus, of things a comparison of wisdom and bravery. Since, however, we give preference to one of the persons by looking at their actions, and at anything else about them that is good, the method would be the same in both cases. First, let it be specified that syncrises are not comparisons of things having a great difference between them: for someone wondering whether Achilles or Thersites was braver would be laughable. Comparisons should be of likes and where we are in doubt which should be preferred because no evident superiority of one to the other.[341]

The central aim of the syncrisis, mediated by the comparison of two entities, was to assess a given virtue.[342] By comparing two entities, one was enabled to identify differences, establish superlatives, and throughout this process, achieve an understanding of the virtue under consideration.[343] In the examples of Theon regarding Odysseus and Achilles, virtues included

---

[338] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 53. Regarding actions and successes, the encomion exercise was arranged in a manner that exhibited various virtues in turn. For example, a virtue such as prudence would be exhibited, followed by deeds that exemplified that virtue. After this pattern, another virtue would be considered, such as temperance, followed by actions associated with that virtue. Theon notes that this pattern differs from a narrative exercise, which presumably follows a tighter chronological sequence, instead of the encomion that arranged deeds according to respective virtues, regardless of strict chronological sequencing. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 52.

[339] Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination,* 50.

[340] *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, transl. Craig A. Gibson (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 321. The syncrisis follows the encomium and invective, praise and attack, and may take several forms: double encomium, double invective, or a combination of both. Libanius disagrees with Theon in noting that two comparative entities need not differ considerably.

[341] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 52-3.

[342] Timothy E. Duff, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1999), 250-251. Exposing a given virtue was principally achieved by comparing two persons that exhibit the same virtue but in different circumstances. A level of continuity exists between actions of the two people, thereby exposing the essential properties of a given virtue. Comparative analysis leads to greater understanding of a given virtue.

[343] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 53.

bravery and wisdom. According to Theon, comparisons between persons might include birth, education, offspring, offices, physical appearances, and other internal and external goods.[344]

Congruent with the narration exercise, attention was given to a person's actions in Greco-Roman culture. Theon advises:

> …we shall compare their actions…giving preference to things done by choice rather than by necessity or chance, and things which few did more than what many did- for common and ordinary things are not very praiseworthy… a syncrisis claims to identify simply the superiority of successful deeds.[345]

Regarding issues of arrangement, a syncrisis may occur between two narration exercises, each person considered in turn, as reflective of Plutarch's biographies. Conversely, a comparison between two persons may occur within a single narration.[346]

The syncrisis exercise may be relevant to analysis of Luke's Gospel by inviting instructive comparisons between Jesus' numerous deeds and those of others. Such comparisons may occur within a single narration scene, between two scenes, or may be transfixed in a sequence of narrations and extend to the whole of Luke's Gospel. Lukan narrations might evoke comparisons not explicitly named but based upon an audience's recollected traditions. Lukan scholar Penner writes at length:

> …one observes in Lukan narratives precisely a pervasive culture of repetition and imitation of Hebrew, Greek, and Roman stories (whether I epic, novels, or history), as well as larger literary type scenes and stock categorizations prevalent across all genres in antiquity. It is not just that Luke has subtly imported his prior knowledge of these traditions into his own narrative, for Luke also writes and thinks in a context in which there was no history unless it repeats the patterns of the exemplars: if one cannot see Socrates, Hector, Aeneas, Moses, Abraham, Jesus, Alexander, Lycurgus, Numa, and Romulus, then this is not a story worth telling, a narration worth emulating, a moral vision worth promoting. In line with this, as Theon notes, it is also impossible to imitate unless one has already been infused by the thing to be imitated. Thus, we must think of a literary environment that is saturated with, obsessed by, and absorbed into this imitative spirit…[347]

---

[344] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 53. Theon appeals to the encomium exercise for an extensive range of possibilities, with general three categories: i. external goods, ii. goods of the boy, iii. goods of the mind. External goods involve issues such as birth, city, tribe, constitution, ancestors, education, friendship, reputation, office, wealth, children and death. Goods of the body include health, strength, beauty, acuteness of senses. Goods of the mind involve ethical virtues such as prudence, temperance, courage, justness, piety, generosity. 50.

[345] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 53.

[346] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 55.
[347] Todd Penner, "Reconfiguring the Rhetorical Study of Acts: Reflections on the Method in and Learning of a Progymnasmatic Poetics," *PRSt* 30 (2003): 425-439, 433.

From a practical standpoint, if Jewish assumptions provide the undercurrent for Luke's Gospel, Jesus' deeds will likely invoke comparisons to exemplars within the Jewish tradition.[348] After all, if Luke is Jewish, then there is every reason to expect that he would situate Jesus within the context of the Jewish Scriptures.[349] That is to say, it would be entirely in keeping with Luke's Gospel, where so many portions derive from the Jewish Scriptures, that narrations of Jesus would reflect the Jewish Scriptures.[350] This project employs what may be called 'intertextual minimalism' when including Jewish Scriptures within the purview of a Lukan scene. In other words, a minimalist intertextual analysis seeks to operate from explicit citations involving words or phrases, or readily identifiable allusions from the Jewish

---

[348] The notion that Luke's Gospel is situated in a Jewish environment and among Jewish texts will be explored in the practical exegesis of Ch. IV and V. It has also been maintained that Luke's Gospel reflects ancient Greek writings. See Donald MacDonald, *The Gospels and Homer: Imitations of Greek Epic in Mark and Luke-Acts*, vol. 1 (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015).

[349] William Kurz aptly states: "A consensus has emerged that Luke and Acts are thoroughly inspired by biblical motifs, vocabulary, writing styles, models, promises and prophecies and other devices. The two volumes are grounded in God's saving history from the creation and Adam in Genesis (e.g., in Luke 1-3) to the eschatological parousia of the son of Man (as in Luke 21). Already the preface to the Gospel makes a biblical allusion-granted, in nonbiblical Hellenistic idiom- to 'events that have bene fulfilled among us'." "Promise and Fulfillment in Hellenistic Jewish Narratives and in Luke and Acts" in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999), 149. Also: Joel B. Green, "Learning Theological Interpretation from Luke" in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, eds., Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, Anthony C. Thiselton, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 66-74.

[350] Identifying relevant texts in Luke that are derived from the Jewish Scriptures is a matter of ongoing discussion, related to both lower text critical issues and intertextuality concerns, namely, theoretical and practical issues regarding identifying the actual employment of Jewish texts in Luke's Gospel. While Richard Hays' works have been especially useful in delineating various forms of intertextual use between implicit and explicit references, recent work has called into question underlying assumptions regarding general schemas within intertextual studies. See: Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016). Moreover, a New Testament text may not simply anchor to a text in order to support a given proposition, but in order to evoke an underlying narrative beneath with within a referenced text. See: Sylvia Keesmaat, *Paul and his Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Further still, recent intertextual analysis suggests that while some New Testament texts contain the Jewish Scriptures as the substratum of legitimization, intertextuality also must incorporate a dialogical reflex. In other words, the use of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament does not simply involve interpretative control, but also encourages the shaping and reshaping of texts that occurs when a duality of voices interact. C. M. Blumhofer, "Luke's Alteration of Joel 3.1-5 in Acts 2.17-21" *New Test. Stud.* 62 (2016) 499-516; B. Fisk, *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of PseudoPhilo* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); Steve Moyise*, Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010); Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015); Kenneth D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005); Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), xxiii-xxv.

Scriptures, rather than from implicit echoes or suggestive themes or concepts that are more opaque and thereby subject to increased debate and uncertainty.[351]

3.3 Rhetorical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Critical Literature Review

A critical literature review examines the degree to which Greco-Roman rhetorical analysis has been applied to a variety of new Testament texts and the Gospels in particular. An evaluation of select New Testament scholars who employ rhetorical criticism determines the strengths and weaknesses of the scholars' specific approaches which provides the catalyst for determining the most viable approach in rhetorical analysis of Luke's Gospel. An evaluative summary addresses the shortcomings and strengths of previous proposals while offering a way forward in the practical implementation of rhetorical criticism in Luke's Gospel.

Kennedy was one of the first proponents in applying ancient rhetorical criticism to the Gospels. As an ancient classicist, his expertise was instrumental in both developing and refining rhetorical analysis of New Testament texts.[352] Other influential scholars who utilized rhetorical analyses include Betz, Mack, and Watson.[353] Since their work in the latter part of the

---

[351] Intertextuality of word/phrase correspondence is a first century CE Jewish exegetical technique referred to as *Gezerah Shevah*. Such a technique reflects the intertextual minimalism advocated in this project. Another method of Jewish exegesis, the *Heqesh,* regards similarity of topic/themes, but does not typically fall within the field of focus employed in this project, since it tends to involve a greater level of subjective appropriation at least in reference to contemporary debates over the plausibility of intertextual references, allusions and echoes. See David Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis Before 70 CE* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), 17-18. Also see Michael Fishbane, *The Exegetical Imagination: On Jewish Thought and Theology* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998), 12-13.

[352] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*, also: *Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian and Secular Tradition: from Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd ed., (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), not to mention many articles and compendiums. Kennedy's general approaches to Greco-Roman Rhetoric are also quite valuable: *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963), *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 BD- 300 AD* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972), *A New Introduction to Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), and *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[353] *Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane Watson (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991). Watson credits Kennedy for charting "new territory" and that the integration of rhetorical studies and biblical criticism is due "in significant measure to the creative efforts of George A. Kennedy" *Preface.* Also: Duane Watson, "The Rhetoric of James 3:1-12 And A Classical Pattern of Argumentation" *Novum Testamentum,* 35.1 (Leiden: Brill Publishers, 1993), 48-64. doi:10.2307. Duane Watson, "1 Corinthians 10:23-11:1 In the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Role of Rhetorical Questions," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 108.2 (1989), 301-318. doi:10.2307/3267299. Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994). Duane F. Watson, *The Rhetoric of the New Testament: A Bibliographical Survey* (U.K.: Blandford Forum, Deo Publishing: 2006).

twentieth century, numerous other rhetorical studies have proliferated, including the works of Porter,[354] Witherington,[355] Robbins,[356] and others. Throughout these decades, special attention has been on issues of rhetorical arrangement, or the structure of a text.

Notwithstanding, the issue of rhetorical invention, or the content of a text, has developed considerably in New Testament analyses. One such analysis involves appropriating specific rhetorical exercises, such as those found in the progymnasmata, and as provided throughout this chapter. Presently, a flurry of research in the progymnasmata studies is being conducted as it relates to the Gospels and Luke's Gospel in particular. Chambers expresses this sentiment:

> Luke's education most likely included training in the Progymnasmata… To be sure, Luke's narrative style in Acts and his message were also deeply influenced by the Old Testament history of God's people. Yet, Luke also seems to be aware of the kind of narrative conventions one would expect to see in the writings of someone who cut his teeth on the rhetorical manuals and the historians that were part of the standard curriculum of his day.[357]

In light of progymnasmatic influence, a variety of rhetorical exercises have been applied to Luke's Gospel including periphrasis for characterization,[358] prosopopoeia,[359]

---

[354] *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference,* eds. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), *Rhetorical criticism and the Bible*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric In The Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.- A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Boston: Brill Academic Pub., 2001).

[355] Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman Pub., 2001), 9-16. Also: Ben Witherington III, *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament,* Eugene Oregon: Cascade Books, 2009.

[356] Vernon K. Robbins, *Sea Voyages and Beyond: Emerging Strategies in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Winona Lake, IN: Deo Pub., Eisenbrauns, 2010). Robbins' contributions will be evaluated in section 3.3.3.

[357] Andy Chambers, *Exemplary Life: A Theology of Church Life in Acts* (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing, 2012), 27. Todd Penner, "Reconfiguring the Rhetorical Study of Acts," 425-439. In the final work, and against the criticism that New Testament narratives cannot be reproduced or examined in a rhetorical *narratio*, Penner counter by noting the example of Dionysius (rhetorician and historical composer), who adjudicates these fields along the same lines, so that "… the narratio is one and the same whether it is in speech or in an extended prose composition, only the length differs." 429.

[358] Timothy A. Brookins, "Luke's Use of Mark as παραφρασισ: Its Effects on Characterization in the 'Healing of Blind Bartimaeus' Pericope (Mark 10.46-52/ Luke 18.35-43)," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament,* 1 (2011): 70-89.

[359] Robert Simons, "The Magnificat: Cento, Psalm or Imitatio?" *Tyndale Bulletin,* 1 (2009): 25-46.

chreia,[360] fable,[361] topos,[362] enthymeme,[363] and ecphrasis.[364] Luke's Gospel has been frequently utilized in rhetorical studies as scholars tend to situate this Gospel within a Gentile and Greek environment, which is readily amenable to the pedagogy and strictures of Greco-Roman rhetoric.[365] Despite this widespread assumption, progymnasmatic handbooks would also be amenable to Hellenistic Judaism, and particularly those who had excellent command of Greek. Despite general optimism in utilizing rhetorical handbooks in the Gospels, debate continues over issues such as the degree of rhetorical sophistication in New Testament texts, oral versus written communication as it pertains to the relevance of rhetorical analysis, and what is perceived as subjective measures imposed on ancient texts by contemporary rhetorical critics.[366] With such optimism and caveats in mind, reviewing contributions of key scholars who have appropriated progymnasmatic handbooks in Luke's Gospel facilitates rhetorical analysis.

3.3.1 Mikael Parsons

Mikael Parsons' incorporation of the progymnasmata in Luke's Gospel has been beneficial and practically oriented.[367] He writes, "Theon's comments about narrative seem to

---

[360] Thomas D. Stegman, S.J., "Reading Luke 12:13-34 as an Elaboration of a Chreia: How Hermogenes of Tarsus Sheds Light on Luke's Gospel," *Novum Testamentum,* 4 (2007): 328-352. Yan Yang, "The Rich Ruler (Luke 18:18-30) and Chreia Rhetorical Practice in Roman Empire- Luke's Strategy to Exhort the Rich Ordo in Roman Society", *AsJT* 1 (2012): 3-28.

[361] Mary Ann Beavis, "Parable and Fable," *The Catholic Bible Quarterly,* 52.3 (1990): 473-498. https://www.academia.edu/10518804/Parable_and_Fable

[362] A.J. Malherbe, "The Christianization of a Topos (Luke 12:13-34)," *Novum Testamentum,* 38.2 (Leiden: Brill Publishers, 1996): 123-135.

[363] William S. Kurz S.J., "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts," *CBQ 4* (1980): 171-195.

[364] Peter Rice, "The Rhetoric of Luke's Passion: Luke's Use of Common-place to Amplify the Guilt of Jerusalem's Leaders in Jesus' Death," *Bibical Interpretation, 21.*3 (2013): 355-376.

[365] See: Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary convention and social context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (Nee York: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Also: Sean A. Adams, "Luke's Preface and Its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander, *Journal of Greco-Roman Chistianity and Judaism, 3* (2006): 177-191. Debate typically centers on the precise genre of Luke's Gospel. For clear arguments that Luke's Gospel is situated in a Jewish environment, see: Reid-Heimderdinger and Rius-Camps, *Luke's demonstration to Theophilus*, ix-xxxiii.

[366] Ben Witherington III "'Almost Thou Persuadest Me…': The Importance of Greco-Roman Rhetoric for the Understanding of the Text and Context of the NT" *JETS* 58/1 (2015): 63-88. Cf. Porter and Dyer "Oral Texts?," 323-341.

[367] Mikael C. Parsons, "Luke and The Progymnasmata: A Preliminary Investigation into The Preliminary Exercises" in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, eds. Todd Penner and Caroline

be the most intriguing in their potential for understanding Luke's rhetorical strategies."[368] Parsons addresses many aspects of Theon's narrative discussion, such as narrative virtues, the six elements of narration, and even inflection.[369] Most beneficial is his analysis of Theon's narrative virtues. For example, utilizing Theon's discussion of clarity, Parsons contends that Luke's Gospel is rhetorically adept, mediated by a prologue that provides an interpretive window by which to view the patterned structure of the Gospel.[370] Parsons compares the virtues of plausibility and conciseness between Luke's Gospel and Mark's Gospel and contends that Lukan narrations excel in rhetorical sophistication.[371] Parsons maintains that a paradigmatic example of Lukan superiority is displayed in the narrative of the great catch of fish in Luke 5:1-11.[372]

However, Parsons' progymnasmatic investigations into Luke's Gospel also reveal some weaknesses. First, while Parsons correctly attends to the six narration elements, he fails to distinguish two types of narrations in rhetoric, political oratory or historical writing. Consequently, Parsons' approach carries the risk of unnecessarily requiring that all Lukan narrations include all six elements. Second, Parsons fails to focus on the narration element of global action that is necessary for all Lukan scenes. Global action is the fundamental rhetorical conduit that surrounds the narration elements interface and must be addressed. Third, Parsons fails to account for the manner in which the narration elements relate to the narrative virtues credibility, clarity and conciseness, and how these in turn, relate to forensic, epideictic, and deliberative rhetoric.[373]

Vander Stichele (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 44. He writes similarly of *fable*: "If the chreia tradition is a well-furrowed field in biblical studies, the second topic of the *progymnasmata*, the fable, is relatively untouched." 49. Also see: Mikael Parsons and Michael Wade Martin, *Ancient Rhetoric and the New Testament: The Influence of Elementary Greek Composition* (Baylor University Press: Waco, TX, 2018).

[368] Mikael C. Parsons, "Luke and *The Progymnasmata*," 51.

[369] Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*, and "Luke and *The Progymnasmata*, 51-63.

[370] Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*, 44-47, 51-53.

[371] Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist,* 42-44, 53-55.

[372] Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*, 55-56.

[373] As discussed in §3.3, these three issues are not peripheral to progymnasmatic investigation into Luke's Gospel, but rather are fundamental to issues of rhetorical analysis.

3.3.2 Vernon K. Robbins

Vernon K. Robbins' progymnasmatic research involves an examination of several scenes throughout Luke and Acts.[374] Robbins' analysis is even more specific than Parsons in following the contours of Theon's narrative discussions in practical exegesis. A clear instance is Robbins' analysis of Acts 1:1-14. In the narration of Acts 1:12-14, Robbins clearly lays out the six narration elements:

> The characters in this narrative are eleven apostles, women- including the mother of Jesus- and the brothers of Jesus (1:13-14). The act is devotion to prayer, and the place is the upper room in Jerusalem where they had been staying. The time is immediately after Jesus' ascension into heaven, and the manner is 'with one accord'. The reason is not stated in the unit itself, but is evident from the information provided in 1:4-5.[375]

Robbins' explicit identification of the six narration elements is a rare occurrence among progymnasmatic studies, though perhaps due to pedantry where Robbins' analysis appears to reflect either literary formalism or trite pedagogical categorization.[376] Apart from a more comprehensive rhetorical framework, Robbins' outline of the six narration elements appears to serve little purpose. For example, Robbins' investigation into Acts 1:12-14 fails both to prioritize the global action of prayer and to take into account which of the surrounding narration elements contribute to the chief point of the scene. The consequence of assigning equal prominence to all narration elements is turning the book of Acts into a text that exists to slavishly serve the interests of political oratory; essentially, placing a fledgling student under a pedagogical overlord. In this respect, the weaknesses of Parsons' approach is also reflected in Robbins' approach.

---

[374] Vernon K. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* (London: Routledge Press, 1996), Burton Mack and Vernon K. Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, (New York: Wipf and Stock Pub., 2008), Vernon K. Robbins*, The Invention of Christian Discourse* (Winona Lake, IN: Deo Pub, Eisenbrauns, 2008), *Sea Voyages and Beyond: Emerging Strategies in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Winona Lake, IN: Deo Pub., Eisenbrauns, 2010). See also: "Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric and Rhetoric in Ancient Narrative" in *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1996, 368-384. "Pronouncement Stories and Jesus' Blessing of the Children: A Rhetorical Approach," *Semeia*, 2 (1983): 42-74.

[375] Vernon K. Robbins, "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* ed. David P. Moessner (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press: 1999), 82.

[376] Robbins states that 1:12-14 "…shows how the directives, rationale, program beyond Jerusalem, and commentary on Jesus' ascension produce a decisive response by Jesus' followers to the authoritative pronouncement in the preceding units. With one accord, Jesus' followers and family return to Jerusalem, to the upper room, and devote themselves to prayer, awaiting their baptism with the Holy Spirit." Robbins, "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric, 82-83.

3.3.3 David Moessner

David Moessner also incorporates progymnasmatic studies in Lukan exegesis.[377] His examination of rhetorical arrangement in Luke is instructive. As with Parsons, Moessner sees great value in the Lukan prologue for understanding the structure of the book. However, Moessner's work is unique in that he compares Luke's Gospel to the advisements of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, an ancient rhetorician. Moessner contends that Luke's prooemium displays significant clarity, which for Dionysius, is a crowning jewel in prose historical writing.

While Moessner's analysis begins by incorporating progymnasmatic virtues and elements, he quickly turns to Aristotle's *Poetics* as the mediating framework for rhetoric and Luke's Gospel. As a result, the fundamental framework becomes emplotment, a missing component in Theon's handbook since he structures time differently.[378] Moessner asserts that the use of Aristotle's dramatic structure serves to advance his distinctive trialetic approach to Luke's Gospel regarding a text's intention, its structure, and its impact.[379] Moessner does not woodenly employ Aristotle's *Poetics* structure but distances himself somewhat from the work, arguing that Aristotle's thinly conceived plot as causal-chronological is idiosyncratic. Consequently, rhetorical effect is achieved by means of a narrator's orchestration of order and harmony upon a given work. Moessner, incorporating Aristotle's framework, entails a focus on emplotment, specifically in the sense a well-structured work produces a cathartic effect on the audience.

---

[377] Vernon K. Robbins, "Dionysius's Narrative 'Arrangement' (oikonomia) as the Hermeneutical Key to Luke's Re-Vision of the 'Many'," in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman world: Essays in Honour of J. M. Wedderburn,* ed. A. Christophersen (Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 149-164. Vernon K. Robbins, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative, 2ⁿᵈ ed.* (New York: Continuum, 1998).

[378] David P. Moessner, "Reading Luke's Gospel as Ancient Hellenistic Narrative: Luke's Narrative Plan of Israel's Suffering Messiah as God's Saving 'Plan' for the World," in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, *vol. 6,* eds., Craig Bartholomew, Joel Green, and Anthony Thistleton (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Press, 2005), 125. David P. Moessner, "The Triadic Synergy of Hellenistic Poetics in the Narrative Epistemology of Dionysius Oo Halicarnassus and the Authorial Intent of the Evangelist Luke (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-8)," *Neot* 2 (2008): 289-303.

[379] Moessner maintained that intentionality is achieved by authorial purpose, genre, and a multiplicity of plots (action-sequences). Moessner thus identifies audience impact, not by chronological closure, but by rhetorical arrangement and cohesion. The author imposes the order, coherence and inner-connectedness in his work that produces impact. Consequently, Moessner posits that one can speak of emplotment as an intentional structuring of harmony upon a work, but distances from the notion of chronological causality and order. David P. Moessner, "Reading Luke's Gospel as Ancient Hellenistic Narrative," 127-128.

Moessner's approach is helpful as it provides an inclusive framework that focuses on arrangement and cathartic emplotment, while taking into account narrative action.[380] However, his trailetic framework does not specifically address individual Lukan narrations, and so fails to incorporate key principles in Theon's handbook. As with Parsons and Robbins, Moessner fails to register the global action fails as the exegetical substratum of rhetorical intention. In addition, Moessner's inattention to the virtues of a narration, and the means by which auxiliary elements provide the chief point of a scene reflects, the works of Parsons and Robbins. All such analyses fail to meaningfully incorporate critical components of Theon's rhetorical framework. As a result, narration virtues remain largely unexamined, which is most regrettable since narration clarity is achieved principally through the selection and management of various narrative elements. Credibility and conciseness are also disregarded insofar as exegetes fail to adhere to Theon's fundamental directive to centralize on the global action, $\pi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$, the primary structure through which a narrative realizes its primary intention.[381]

3.3.4 Summary

The critical reviews of the rhetorical approaches of the four scholars have served to demonstrate two important themes related to progymnasmatic research. First, beneficial progymnasmatic research has definitively begun in Lukan narrations. Second, much more work remains to be done to consistently and comprehensively incorporate the numerous insights of Theon's handbook for Lukan exegesis. This critical review has pinpointed key weaknesses of previous progymnasmatic approaches to Luke's Gospel. These weaknesses include: i. an inability to provide criteria to identify a Lukan narration from other rhetorical exercises, ii. the failure to identify and focus upon a narrations' global action, iii. the failure to incorporate surrounding prominent narration elements toward a narration's chief point. This project attempts to more coherently, consistently, and comprehensively address these shortcomings by incorporating the insights of Theon's *Progymnasmata* in Lukan exegesis.

Rhetorical analysis consists of a text-external resource, Theon's *Progymnasmata*. Rhetorical analysis tends to be more subjectively appropriated in Gospel studies. In this respect, rhetorical criticism depends upon a text-internal resource, one that is grounded in empirically based

---

[380] David P. Moessner, "Reading Luke's Gospel as Ancient Hellenistic Narrative," 126. While not advocating a strict causal-nexus plot of events, Moessner retains the service of complex plots, the dénouement, reversals and discoveries.

[381] Aristotle, *Rhetoric, III.16*. Plutarch, Lives: The Life of Aemelius, 1.1-7, *Life of Alexander*, I. Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

linguistic criteria. In this regard, this project is unique in analysing Luke's Gospel both from a text-internal methodology, discourse analysis, and a text-external resource, Theon's *Progymnasmata*. To this end, Chapter I has proposed that while both methods differ in orientation, they are theoretically congruent for Lukan exegesis. Chapters II and II demonstrate that amidst potential congruence, these methods offer distinctive practical outcomes, each offering beneficial insights for Lukan studies. With such findings in place, Chapters V and VI explore whether practical congruence, between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, is possible in 12 consecutive Lukan scenes.

CHAPTER FOUR
PRACTICAL CONGRUENCE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS
AND RHETORICAL CRITICISM IN LUKE 3:21-4:44

4.1 Introduction to Arrangement and Overview

While previous chapters have proposed theoretical congruence between discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, Chapters IV and V will determine whether practical congruence by means of a rank scale occurs in Luke through examining a sample of the continuous passage found in 3:21-5:39. Each scene will begin by establishing textual boundaries and then proceed to clausal analysis comprised of constituent order and process types. The subsequent evaluation is clause complex analysis, scene analysis, and a conclusion of rhetorical criticism. This analysis approach considers both text-internal and text-external factors in Luke's Gospel, reflecting Halliday's metafunction of language outlined in Chapter II. §1.1.

While this project chiefly attends to the boundaries of various Lukan scenes, textual boundaries also occur at a higher level, called a sequence. In this project, the term sequence refers to a group of scenes that exhibit linguistic and thematic cohesiveness. Similar to establishing a Lukan scene, a sequence is determined on the basis of specific discourse features. Specifically, for the passage in question, the linguistic determiner is the use of Ἐγένετο δέ, occurring at Luke 3:21, 5:1, and 6:1.[382] Consequently, sequence boundaries are reflected in this project's partitioning of Chapters IV and V: Chapter IV analyses the first Lukan sequence, consisting of eight scenes: 3:21-22, 23-38, 4:1-14a, 14b-29, 30-37, 38-39, 40-41, 42-44, and Chapter V examines the second sequence of four scenes: 5:1-11, 12-16, 17-26, 27-39.

The content and specific principles of previous chapters in this project will largely be presupposed, rather than explicitly stated or explained. To this end, a review of the relevant discourse features and functions within Chapter II §2-5, as well as the particular details of Theon's rhetorical exercises in Chapter III §2 are advisable. The Greek text used in this project is the current Nestle-Aland 28th edition and Ralfs-Hanhart edition is used for the Septuagint. While a full account of textual-critical issues is well beyond the scope of this project, there are a several textual differences that may prove relevant for exegesis. In such cases, attention will be given to one key manuscript that frequently differs with the N-A[28] edition, namely Codex

---

[382] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 177-180.

Bezae.[383] Finally, while the first scene will provide cross-references to information within the Chapter I-III, subsequent Lukan scenes will presuppose the information provided here and in the previous chapters in order to avoid cumbersome repetition.

4.2. Luke 3:21-22

4.2.1. Luke 3:21-22 Discourse Boundary

3:21 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν

Luke 3:21-22 constitutes a distinct scene in Luke's Gospel. [384] Such a notion is supported by the following factors:

1. Ἐγένετο δέ, occurring in 3:21, typically signals a higher-level discourse boundary in Luke's Gospel, in addition to signaling that preceding material is backgrounded to what follows.[385]

2. The end boundary for this scene is v. 22, evident by the pre-verbal constituent in v. 23, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν, which provides a point of departure for vv. 23-38.

3. Vv. 21-22 represents a distinct literary type or exercise in comparison to surrounding material. In particular, vv. 23-38 constitutes a genealogical record, whereas vv. 21-22 constitutes a rhetorical chreia.

4. Participant referencing identifies vv. 21-22 as a new scene.[386] Different on-stage participants are represented in 3:1-20, including John the Baptist, the crowds, and Herod the tetrarch. With vv. 21-22, Jesus, the heavenly voice, and Spirit are a new series of participants.

5. From its inception, Luke's Gospel has presented an alternating pattern between information related to John the Baptist and then information related to Jesus. The alternations consist of information related to their respective annunciations, births and opening ministries. Luke

---

[383] The Codex Bezae has been reproduced with the Greek and English version by Reid-Heimderdinger and Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*.

[384] The N-A text, in dividing sections, does not distinguish Luke 3:21-22 from the preceding material. Some commentators combine 3:21-38 into a single distinct unit. For example, see: David Garland, *Exegetical Commentary in the New Testament: Luke* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 165-174.

[385] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 177-180.

[386] Jesus is reactivated in this scene, as with previous scenes, by the anarthrous reference. He is similarly reactivated up to Luke 4, at which point Jesus becomes the global VIP. A local VIP participant, in contrast, is the primary participant restricted to a scene of cluster of consecutives scenes. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 155-158.

3:1-20 relates information about John's baptisms, whereas vv. 21-22 relates information about Jesus' baptism.[387]

4.2.2. Luke 3:21-22: Clause Level Constituent Order

Regarding constituent order, only marked clauses will be analysed since they disrupt the natural flow of information and serve various functions. In vv. 20-21 there are three instances of marked order. The first marked clause occurs in v. 21, καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος, in which case Jesus is frontshifted as the pre-verbal constituent.[388] Functionally, Jesus is highlighted in order to switch attention from John the Baptist in vv. 1-20 to Jesus in vv. 21-22. The second instance of marked order is another example of frontshifting, occurring in v. 21: καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι. In this case, placing the heavenly voice as the pre-verbal constituent signals that the heavenly voice is especially salient information. Because the heavenly voice has not occurred in previous scenes, the appearance of the voice is unexpected, catching the reader by surprise.[389] The third instance of marked order occurs in the reported speech of the heavenly voice at the close of v. 21, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

Recalling that default constituent order flows from core to peripheral information, the first constituent, Σὺ provides the core information, that is, the theme/topic for the clause. However, in the second clause, the same theme is retained as the pre-verbal, core information, ἐν σοὶ.[390] Functionally, by retaining Jesus as the theme of the second clause, Jesus is retained as the focal element in both clauses.

---

[387] Luke's alternating pattern of information related to John then Jesus reflects a rhetorical syncrisis, which consists of: "language setting the better or the worse side by side. There are syncrises both of persons and of things." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 52. Throughout Luke 1-3, Jesus is superior to John regarding bodily and external goods.

[388] As noted in Ch II §3.1 Frontshifting occurs in dependent clauses, those that do not start a new sentence. In such cases, a pre-verbal constituent may be highlighted for the following reasons: i. switch of attention, ii. contrast, iii. introducing an important speech, iv. important issue demanding context, v. unexpected information. Forefronting occurs when a pre-verbal constituent occurs at the beginning of a new sentence. Such instances signal: i. a point of departure, or ii. that the constituent is in focus. This marked clause is not a point of departure since the pre-verbal clause does not contain a main verb.

[389] While divine interventions occur previously in Luke (1:11, 26, 2:9), the heavenly intrusion in this scene is distinct, setting Jesus apart from John. For while John is validated by the Jewish Scriptures that anticipate his arrival in 3:4-6, the divine voice is unmediated/immediate at Jesus' baptism.

[390] This clause breaks the default pattern of information flow. Since Jesus was already the topic of focus in the reported speech, special salience is signaled in this clause by placing the verbal constituent last in the sentence. In the natural flow of information, from given to new, the second clause develops the rheme (underlined)

In considering constituent order, this scene places prominence on two participants. The first is Jesus, who is presented as the central participant in this scene, with the frontshifted switch from John the Baptist to Jesus in v. 21. The second is the unexpected appearance of the heavenly voice, arresting the reader's attention. Yet, the heavenly voice is not the sustained focus of this scene, rather, the voice immediately retains focus upon Jesus, thereby functioning to accentuate subsequent information about Jesus as the beloved son of divine pleasure, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

4.2.3. Luke 3:21-22: Clause Level Process Types

Clausal analysis also involves Hallidean analysis of the six process types by which various experiences are represented in a scene and as outlined in Chapter II §3.2. Luke 3:21-22 contains five of those processes, provided in Table 4.2.3.

Table 4.2.3
Five of the six process types of Hallidean analysis found in Luke 3:21-22.

Existent:	Existential Process:	Circumstance"	
	Ἐγένετο δὲ		

Actor:	Material Process:	Goal:	Circumstance:
(implied as τὸν Ἰωάννην as 'doer' in 3:20)	ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι	ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν	
(implied as τὸν Ἰωάννην as 'doer' in 3:20)	βαπτισθέντος	καὶ Ἰησοῦ	

Behaver:	Behavioral Process:	Circumstance/Behaviour, Phenomenon:
καὶ Ἰησοῦ	προσευχομένου	

Actor:	Material Process:	Goal:	Circumstance:
	ἀνεῳχθῆναι	τὸν οὐρανὸν	
τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον	καὶ καταβῆναι	ἐπ' αὐτόν	σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡςπεριστερὰν

Sayer	Verbal Process:	Receiver	Naming	Projection

---

in the first clause: Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. Reported speech does not conform to the default V-S-O word order; rather, it is bracketed apart from the narrative flow (below the narratival logic line) by the intrusion of a speaker or perspective. Consequently, the theme/rheme is re-established as it relates to the speaker's perspective in a given reported speech.

| καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ | γενέσθαι | (Jesus is implied) | | Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα |

Table 4.2.3 demonstrates that the first representation of happening in this scene is the existential process, exhibiting the existence of an entity or a temporal occurrence. Accordingly, the existential process is frequently used to introduce preliminary circumstances at the start of a scene.[391] The second, third, fifth, and sixth clauses represent experience by means of the material process type which depicts changes of events as coming about by some actor's input.[392] In this scene, the spatial-temporal happenings occur by means of two actors, John and the Holy Spirit.[393] However, consistent with the findings of constituent order, the lack of explicit reference to John as material actor additionally backgrounds his role in this scene.[394] Instead, the Holy Spirit is the organizing actor, and with an attendant circumstance, σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡς περιστερὰν. By depicting the Holy Spirit as the material actor in this scene as well as with an attendant circumstance, additional processing energy is required

---

[391] Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 307-308. In addition, Halliday observes "Frequently an 'existential' clause contains a distinct circumstantial element of time or place." 309. In Luke 3:21, ἐγένετο is typically regarded as event-anticipatory, "it came about," so that the existential process blurs with the material process regarding shared semantic space. As Halliday notes, even in English an existential clause may conflate theme and rheme and consist simply as a process without a participant. This usage is reflected in Luke 3:21a. The first clause in 3:21 is seen as temporal, indicating temporal relationship related to the main verb, ἐγένετο. Because of the adverbial use of the infinitival, the relationship is contemporaneous, and translated "while" or "when." See Wallace, pgs. 594-596. Culy, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek New Testament*, 117.

[392] "The Actor is the one that does the deed-- that is, the one that brings about the change." Halliday and Matthiessen, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 179.

[393] The descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus is an example of what Halliday calls a material process type of transformation (rather than a creative material type). As Halliday notes: "… 'transformative' means that the Actor ('intransitive') or Goal ('transitive') exists prior to the onset of the unfolding of the process... In many cases, the process is a true transformation where the participant being affected has changed in some fundamental way." Halliday and Matthiessen, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 186. Jesus' identity is enhanced both regarding his location and status, a notion supported by subsequent scenes where the Spirit leads Jesus (4:1) and empowers him in proclamation and miraculous deeds (4:18-19).

[394] Luke's depiction of John is unique among the Synoptics where they represent John as the explicit actor in a material process. In Luke, the consequence of presenting the material process by a non-finite verb (infinitival clause) and lacking an actor (no expressed doer), is that John the Baptist is backgrounded in this scene. See Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, 1996), 590. In the preceding scene, John the Baptist is rarely construed as the material actor (3:3, 7) in favor of the verbal process (3:3, 7-22). In contrast, Herod the tetrarch is presented in the two final verses, twice as the material actor (3:19-20).

respecting the Holy Spirit's descent upon Jesus, καταβῆναι.[395] There is increased semantic weight respective to the Spirit's activity, especially in comparison to other actors, namely, John the Baptist. As a result, while attention on constituent analysis has identified the unexpected appearance of the heavenly voice, the activity of the Holy Spirit also features prominently in this scene, particularly in relation to Jesus.[396] The final processes in this scene are marked as prominent comparative to previous information in this scene.[397]

However, while the Spirit's activity and the heavenly voice's attribution are prominent elements in this scene, they operate within a focused relationship on Jesus, in other words, Jesus is the core constituent around which the various participants relate, raising two issues regarding how Jesus is portrayed. First, while Jesus is portrayed by both the material and behavioral processes, his relationship to other participants is passive, particularly in his baptism, reception of the Spirit, and the divine attribution.[398] Jesus is not the actor, but the goal of the Spirit's activity and the receiver of verbal attributions, which means that Luke's audience will not learn about Jesus relative to his material or verbal input, but rather, that such information derives from the activities and attributions of others as they relate to Jesus. The Spirit's descent along with the heavenly voice's attribution constitutes the principal means of gleaning important information about Jesus.[399]

---

[395] The aorist active infinitive clause is connected to a nominative and prepositional phrase. Through the use of the dative phrase σωματικῷ εἴδει (dative of manner), the actor (the Holy Spirit), through the prepositional phrase, effects transformation by the Spirit's new location (descended from heaven to the spatial/physical location of Jesus). Culy, Parsons, and Stigall write: "The text appears ambiguous regarding whether the Holy Spirit descended in bodily form upon him as a dove descends (so Bock, 1:338), or descended in bodily form upon him as a dove (in the form of a dove, so Plummer, 99). The accusative case, however, seems to be used because the noun is part of an elliptical construction in which περιστεράν is the subject of the infinitive…" *Luke: A Handbook*, 119. These authors opt for identifying the dove as the movement (the subject of the infinitive) and not the form (nominal), since it is in the accusative case.

[396] Regarding καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι, the clause is not one of transformation, as it was with the previous clause and the Holy Spirit's decent, but rather a creative clause, representing a new outcome, one not previously existing (a transformative change relates to an already existing Actor or Goal). Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 254.

[397] For a discussion on relevant input on prominence, see: Deirdre Wilson and Dan Sperber, "Relevance Theory" in *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. Laurence R. Horn and Gregory L. Ward, BHL 16 (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 607-32.

[398] "Passivity" means that Jesus is the "one to which the process is extended." Halliday and Matthiessen, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 181.

[399] Halliday outlines two types of verbal processes, one activity, and the other semiosis. Activity relates to targeting and talking (to), while semiosis to verbal elements such as talking, saying, indicating, commanding, among others. Regarding the divine voice, the verbal process type may be an activity (targeted at Jesus and

Second, even though Jesus is portrayed as passive, or the goal and receiver of others, he is not backgrounded as were the crowds in this scene. Unlike the crowds, Jesus is additionally depicted by means of the behavioral process of prayer. Additionally, the genitive absolute, προσευχομένου, provides a switch of reference away from the baptism of the crowds and onto Jesus, resulting in Jesus as the center stage participant in this scene.[400]

The precise relationship between Jesus' praying and the heavenly activities is not entirely clear. Such ambiguity occurs because there is a blurring of lines between behavioral, mental, and material processes, since in various degrees these processes convey psychosomatic affairs.[401] Subsequent scenes may clarify the precise relationship between Jesus' praying and the heavenly activities. At a minimum, this scene's portrayal of Jesus as a "pray-er" sets him apart from the baptized crowds and situates him among pious Israel in accordance with Luke's previous scenes.[402]

4.2.4 Luke 3:21-22: Clause Complex Level

Hallidean analysis also involves examining the relationships between various clauses. As discussed in Chapter II §4, main clauses are symbolized by the Greek letter α, and subsequent letters refer to their hypotactic, or dependent, relationship to the main clause. The =

---

including the notion of praise) or it may represent semiosis, an imperating (for Jesus to assume his regal reign). Subsequent scenes may clarify what is essentially being expressed here.

[400] Genitive absolutes ascribed to Jesus serve to direct attention on him. Levinsohn notes that the genitive absolute provides: "…a natural way of highlighting the introduction to an existing scene of participants who perform significant actions that change the direction of the story, etc." *Discourse Features*, 183. Levinsohn also notes that in distinction from the noun phrase clause, the genitive absolute commonly has a different subject than the nuclear clause. Following the genitive absolutes, three infinitive clauses occur: the heaven's opening, ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν, the Spirit's descent, καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, and the heavenly voice, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθα. While these clauses are also associated with Ἐγένετο δέ, they are subsequent to the focus placed upon Jesus. Consequently, the reader's mental representation of discourse referents will assign the apocalyptic activity as having some relationship to Jesus as the previously established focal participant.

[401] Jesus' behavioral process of praying blurs the line between two process types: the material (doing), and the behavioral (behaving). As physiological and psychological behavior, the behavioral process constitutes the least distinct process among the six process types. Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 301. Luke will correlate prayer and divine activity with Jesus' teaching on prayer in 11:1-13 so that there is a causal relationship established between prayer and divine activity. In Luke 9:29, Jesus is construed by behavioral process of prayer and immediately after he is transfigured. The transfiguration correlates to 3:21-22, both using Ἐγένετο δέ and with a preceding topic of suffering (John imprisoned in 3:20 and Jesus' passion prediction in 9:21-27). Luke's theology of prayer assumes some type of causal relationship with external phenomenon.

[402] In Luke 2-3, those who pray liberally and spontaneously include Mary, Simeon, Anna, and the shepherds. The inclusion of shepherds is not surprising, especially since in Luke 2:11 the angels associate Jesus' birth with David's city, David himself being a shepherd. As will be seen, Luke 3:23-4:14a invites close comparisons between Jesus and King David.

symbol represents clauses of elaboration. Since this scene is brief, all clauses are represented below in Table 4.2.4

Table 4.2.4
Clause relationships in the Luke 3:21-22 scene.

Ἐγένετο δὲ

    α

    ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν (hypotactic extension)

        =β

καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος

        =γ

    καὶ προσευχομένου

        =δ

    ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν

        =ε

    καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν,

        =ζ

καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι,

        =η

    Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα (projection clause)

Halliday's tactic system involves analysing issues of dependency among various clauses, where an independent clause is called paratactic and dependent clauses are called hypotactic. Table 4.2.4 above displays a hypotactic relationship in this scene as various clauses, whether participial or infinitival, depend on the temporal/circumstantial main verb, ἐγένετο. The preceding baptismal activities of John therefore serves as the temporal frame for this scene, a point that will be discussed below in §2.5.

116

In Halliday's logico-semantic system, dependent clauses either involve a projection, a reported speech, or an expansion, in which case various dependent clauses relate to the main clause by elaboration (=), extension (+), or enhancement (x). While the majority of this scene provides expansion clauses, a singular clause of projection occurs at the close of this scene, with the heavenly voice.[403] All of the clauses function to elaborate upon or specify attendant circumstances respective of the circumstantial-temporal frame, ἐγένετο δέ.[404] In so doing, this scene constitutes a single clause complex despite numerous associated clauses. The result is what Halliday considers to be a "textually related message," and it is marked by compression and terseness.[405] Information throughout this scene is packaged as a unitary event, comprised by a single organizing theme around which a variety of clausal constituents operate. Consequently, this scene is characterized by informational solidarity, as various constituents inner-relate toward a unifying message. That message, as shown in clausal analysis, culminates at the close of the scene in v. 22, with the Spirit's descent and heavenly voice, being framed or organized around the solitary finite verbal clause, ἐγένετο δέ.[406]

4.2.5 Luke 3:21-22: Scene Level

Analysis at the scene level involves investigating discourse features and functions above the clause or clause complex level. This scene is brief, and all clauses are dependent on ἐγένετο δέ, which is aided by identifying three functions related to that discourse marker. First, as noted in §2.1, ἐγένετο δέ, serving as a higher-level boundary marker, signals that Luke 3:21-22 is a distinct scene.[407] Second, as noted in clause complex analysis, ἐγένετο

---

[403] "Most of the time it is not difficult to differentiate between projection and expansion: if the clause contains a verb of saying of thinking (or any of their synonyms) you are probably looking at a projecting relationship." Suzanne Eggins, *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics,* 2nd ed.*,* 271.

[404] Such a notion is confirmed by considering finite verb use. In addition, extension clauses tend to be indicated by non-equivocal construction, that is, the hypotactic grammatical relationships express similarity of meaning. Eggins, *An Introduction*, 283.

[405] *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 428. Combining clauses into a single clause complex exhibits a "tighter integration of meaning" as relative to other clause complexes or simplexes in a scene. 430.

[406] In this scene, the main event is not the temporal marker, but rather Jesus' reception of the Spirit and divine appellation. Even intuitively, "it came about" points beyond itself to what is consequent since an introductory temporal circumstance tends to set the stage for spatial-actional elements. In essence, ἐγένετο δέ does not draw attention to itself but rather points forward to Jesus' reception of the Holy Spirit and his subsequent ministry. See Reid-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps, *Luke's DemonstrationtTo Theophilus*, xvii- xix.

[407] See Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles* (London: United Bible Societies, 1973), 93. Levinsohn*, Discourse Features*, 177-180. Reid-Heimderdinger and Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration*, xvii-xix. Lukan examples include: 1:5, 1:8, 1:23, 1:41 2:1, 2:15, 3:21, 5:1,

provides a temporal-circumstantial marker and facilitates the organizing message of vv. 21-22, namely, that Jesus is uniquely set apart by means of his baptismal reception of the Holy Spirit and divine appellation.[408] Third, ἐγένετο functions to draws from previous circumstantial details while also anticipating subsequent information.[409] As Levinsohn explains:

> In this passage, the temporal setting of v. 21a relates back to the baptismal ministry of John… The coming of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus and the voice from heaven are then expressed in infinitival clauses as the subjects of the ʽεγένετο (vv. 21b-22b). The implication is that the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus is but the specific circumstance for the following foregrounded events, viz., his temptation by the devil and subsequent ministry.[410]

Therefore, ἐγένετο in v.21 draws from preceding and relevant information, namely, the message of John and the baptism of the crowds, while providing the circumstance by which one is to understand Jesus' temptations and the whole of the sequence, from 3:21-4:44.[411] As a result, as the sequence unfolds, Jesus' actions in light of the Holy Spirit's descent upon him and the divine appellation that he is the beloved son is continuous evaluation should be continuously evaluated.

Because this scene contains no marked conjunctions such as δέ, but rather καί which serves to cohesively link information, conjunctive use cannot be further analysed at the scene

---

5:12, 5:17, 6:1, and 6:16. Matthew and Mark also portrays Jesus' baptism as distinctive information within in a new scene. The discourse feature τότε is used in Matthew 3:13:
Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, whereas ἐγένετο is used in Mark 1:9:
Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. The use of Ἐγένετο δέ is the same in Bezan text in Luke and in N-A 28.

[408] As an infinitive of circumstance, ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν, the baptism provides a general setting for the main events which follow. The meaning is that in the general context of the people being baptized, as Jesus was baptized and while he was praying, the heavenly activities occurred.

[409] By providing the temporal setting in this manner, this scene relates back to previous information regarding John's baptizing ministry, but also points forward to Jesus' wilderness temptations and ministry which function as the foregrounded events as they relate to Jesus' activities. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*,178.

[410] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 178. In other words, ἐγένετο signals that Jesus' baptism correlates back to John the Baptist's ministry while at the same time proleptic in the sense that Jesus' reception of the Spirit provides the thematic anchor by which to understand or evaluate his genealogy and temptation.

[411] The connections may be either set in a *temporal-spatial* relationship, circumstantial elements in close relationship, or a *thematic* relationship, ideational-relational concepts as non-material representations involving similar referential status. Luke 3:21 may include both temporal and thematic relationships with the previous scene, Jesus' baptism occurred in shared time and space and his baptism was distinctly unique among all others.

level. Because there is only one main finite verb in this scene, ἐγένετο, no structural pattern can be discerned.

4.2.6. Luke 3:21-22: Rhetorical Analysis

While analysis of this scene has so far only involved text-internal features, Theon's *Progymnasmata* is the vehicle for text-external analysis. However, since this project explores the extent to which both methods are congruent, the starting point of text-external analysis is summarizing the marked discourse features in this scene. The marked discourse instances are arranged according to their rank scale and provided in Table 4.2.6 below. The exegete can then use those features to identify the relevant form and function of this scene as it pertains to Theon's rhetorical exercises. Identifying specific rhetorical exercises and influences broadens exegetical horizons, since text-external conventions serve to culturally frame marked discourse features and to enlarge interpretive patterns for meaning.

Table 4.2.6
Instances of marked discourse arranged by rank scale for Luke 3:21-22.

Constituent Order	Process Types	Clause Complex	Scene
καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος signals a switch of reference to Jesus as the primary participant in this scene καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι signals unexpected information, drawing extra attention to the heavenly voice's occurance and aacentuating the subsequent message directed to Jesus. ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα a retained focus on Jesus as the iterated theme of the second clause	Jesus is represented as the passive goal (material) of heavenly activity and reported speech (receiver), so that one learns of Jesus through others. Construal of the Holy Spirit has greater semantic weight	Single clause complex representing a single organizing message, resulting in a brief inner-related message	Ἐγένετο… signals a relation to John's baptisms (circumstantial-thematic), foregrounding the divine activity of the Spirit and heavenly voice in v.22 and prefacing subsequent scenes.

As indicated in Table 4.2.6 above, this scene is characterized by an inner-related message of solidarity and brevity.[412] While a variety of hypotactic clauses occur, marked discourse features signal special prominence with v. 22, the Spirit's descent on Jesus and the divine attribution given to him.[413] In light of these text-internal features, this scene corresponds

---

[412] In other words, a single clause complex lacks a sequence of figures, or moves between various clausal relationships wherein a textual message resides. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 428-429.

[413] The presence of a single finite verb as temporal-circumstantial finite verb, and the limiting of process types (4 out of 6), indicate *conciseness* in this scene, where conciseness is the central virtue of the chreia exercise.

with the chreia rhetorical exercise. A brief examination of the virtues of a chreia discussed in Chapter III. §2.1 include: i. conciseness, ii. clarity, ii. attributed to a person, and iv. expedience.[414] Regarding conciseness and clarity, as noted above, this scene is concise in its terse inner-related massage, and it obtains clarity of message by means of marked prominence in v. 22 related to the Spirit's decent and the divine voice. The virtue of "attributed to a person" is represented by the marked, unexpected arrival of the heavenly voice with included marked word order, and the Holy Spirit's descent. The action and reported speech are assigned to specific entities. Finally, the virtue of expedience is depicted in the teachable point of the scene that occurs at the markedly prominent discourse features in in v. 22, that is, the Spirit's activity and divine appellation as these relate to Jesus. Such prominent information occurring at the close of this scene comports with the structure of the chreia exercise, discussed in Chapter III §2.1.

Rhetorical criticism offers an additional benefit in addressing various functions related to the chreia. According to Theon, a chreia's function corresponds to the virtue of expedience, that is, the useful instruction prototypically located at the end of a chreia. Prominent information occurs in relation to Jesus' reception of the Spirit and divine attribution. Theon's three-fold classification of the chreia exercise is relevant in that there is a saying chreia, an actional chreia, and mixed chreia, which is both an action and saying. Because the Spirit and divine attribution constitute prominent information, this scene is a mixed chreia, a combination of both action, the Spirit's descent upon Jesus, and saying, the heavenly report of pleasure upon Jesus.[415]

As a mixed chreia, the action of the Spirit and the saying of the heavenly represent corresponding values.[416] Jesus' reception of the Holy Spirit correlates with divine pleasure

---

[414] Theon defines the chreia in this manner: "… a brief saying or action making a point, attributed to some specified person or corresponding to a person." George A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 15.

[415] "Mixed chreais partake of both the verbal and the actional but have the meaning in the action; for example, "Pythagoras the philosopher, having been asked about how long is the life of men, going up into the roof, peeped out briefly, by this making clear that life is short." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 17.

[416] Theon is unique in prioritizing action over saying in the mixed chreia. For example, consider Theon's example of a mixed chreia: "A Laconian, when someone asked him where the Lacedaimonians set the limits of their land, showed his spear." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 17. The progymnasmata of Nicolaus, however, includes a saying: "A Laconian, on being asked where the walls of the Sparta were, extended his spear and said: 'Here'." Hock and O'Neil, *The Chreia In Ancient Rhetoric*, Vol. 1, 28. Apart from discourse analysis, which identifies prominence both regarding the Spirit's decent and divine appellation, one might emphasize heavenly pleasure with Jesus to the exclusion of Jesus' sonship to the heavenly voice, or vice-versa. Chapter VI will address the practical consequences of disregarding discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism in Lukan exegesis.

attributed to Jesus, even as divine pleasure correlates to Jesus' reception of the Spirit. Both happenings constitute reflective truths. As a mixed chreia, in order to synthesize both happenings as a solitary, expedient point, an underlying meaning for both truths should be identified. In this instance, the expedient point appears to be, among other possibilities, that Jesus has been regally crowned. The reception of the Spirit constitutes his regal anointing, even as divine attribution of Jesus' sonship constitutes his regal coronation. Support for this possibility is twofold. First, the message of divine attribution corresponds to the Messianic coronation event in Psalm 2, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.While the eclectic text diminishes the reference, the Bezan text repeats it in greater detail, though in both cases, the Davidic reference is taken up/echoed.[417] Second, since earlier Lukan scenes have promoted Jesus as the Messiah, David's son, both terminologically and conceptually, his anointing for his regal ministry is necessary, enabling and validating Jesus, as foreshadowed to the extent that Jesus' regal ministry meaningfully corresponds to King David.[418]

However, identifying the potential regality motif behind Jesus' experience in Lk 3:21-22 does not diminish potentially nascent prophetic and priestly elements associated with Jesus' baptism, which may also occur within this scene. For example, the prophetic element seems relevant whereby Isaiah 42:1 is invoked alongside the Psalm 2 regal coronation.[419] As such, the

---

[417] The reported speech of the heavenly voice in the N-A[28] edition differs from that in the Bezan text, which corresponds to the LXX of Psalm 2:7 and its Messianic impulse. Psalm 2:7 (LXX) states: Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε and is reflected in the Bezan text. The Bezan text retains the Messianic nature of the divine voice as it relates to Jesus, particularly regarding the Messiah's rule the nations, and comports well with Zachariah's Messianic overtones in Luke 1:67-79. The N-A text subdues the Messianic connotations at Jesus' baptism, though it does not eclipse the Messianic undertones. The N-A 28 text in Luke 3:22 loosely reflects the Septuagint of Psalm 2:7: Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, though perhaps Genesis 22:2 is also in mind: Λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, ὃν ἠγάπησας, as well as Isaiah 42:1: προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου· ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν. In any case, Jesus' bestowal of the Holy Spirit as confirmation of his anointed status is clear in both Luke 24:36-49 and Acts 2:33-36. See Read-Heimderdinger and Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*, 337.

[418] Correspondence between Jesus and King David has previously been established in Luke's Gospel: 1:17, 32-33, 43, 68-76, 2:10-11, 26, 49, 3:15-17.

[419] The prophetic aspect, associated with the wording in Isaiah 42:1, appears to be particularly highlighted in Luke 4:14b-29 and subsequent scenes in this project. While both Jesus' regality and prophetic mission provide the undercurrent for these portions in Luke, it seems to be the case that Jesus' regality is principally in focus in Luke 3:23-39 and 4:1-14a. From that point onward, it appears that principal overt emphasis falls on Jesus' prophetic ministry, as subsequent scene analyses will seek to demonstrate.

mixed chreia may point both to Jesus' regal and prophetic anointing, or endowment.[420] In fact, evidence for the prophetic component is expressly provided subsequently in Luke 4:14b-29. Then too, it may also be the case that Jesus' priestly anointing is additionally in view, possibly being evidenced in Luke 5:12-39 to the extent that it addresses Jesus' priestly affinities and authority.[421] In effect, this project does not intend to restrict the activation of multiple Jewish texts or referents. Indeed, in the next Lukan scene regarding the genealogy, it may expressly allow for all three anointed functions related to Jesus' baptism: kingly, prophetic, and priestly could be in view. In short, Jesus' anointing by the Spirit may be referentially polysemous.[422] Along these lines, then, successive Lukan scenes may very well elaborate upon the fundamental trajectory provided with Jesus' Spirit-anointing and divine appellation. This thesis only suggests that at this point in Luke's Gospel, Jesus' Davidic messiahship is prominent, particularly when viewed from the light of both preceding Lukan data that emphasizes Jesus' regality and in view of Jesus' baptism to his subsequent genealogy.[423]

One additional benefit of rhetorical criticism of this passage is that it illuminates the use of Ἐγένετο δέ… in v. 21. As observed in discourse analysis, ἐγένετο points to foregrounded information, such as occurs in v. 22 with the Spirit's descent on Jesus and divine attribution. ἐγένετο also provides the general circumstance and thematic underpinning for subsequent

---

[420] To this end Walt Russell writes: "While the phrase "This is my beloved Son" might sound like Ps 2:7, the scene before us is prophetic in nature since heaven is opening and divine revelation is taking place. Such a context is primarily rooted in Old Testament prophecy, not kingship." Walt Russell, "The Anointing With The Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts" *TrinJ* (1986) 47-63, 49. On the contrary, Strauss argues, that Isaiah 42:1 in the LXX appears to differ importantly from Luke's intention. As such, while Isaiah 42:1 may be in view, Psalm 2:7 is especially relevant for Jesus' baptism. Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1995), 206-207.

[421] The priestly emphasis of Luke's genealogy was argued by Bishop Ambrose. *Ancient Christian Commentary On Scripture: Luke*, Arthur A. Just Jr (InterVarsity Press: Downers Grove, Ill.), 2003), 70. Also see: Hans Deiter Betz, "Jesus' Baptism and the Origins of the Christian Ritual", 386-387 in David Hellholm, Tor Vegge, Oyvind Norderval, Christer Hellholm, eds., *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, (DeGruyter: Boston, 20010).

[422] Several individuals within the Jewish Scriptures appear to relate to all three roles, namely, Adam, Abraham, Melchizedek, Moses, and David. Glenn R. Kreider, "Jesus The Messiah as Prophet Priest, And King" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 176 (Apr-June 2019), 174-187.

[423] "Whatever additional significance Luke may attribute to the baptismal anointing by the Spirit in Lk 3:21-22 (Lk 4:18), a royal-anointing is certainly in view." Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 208. Strauss supports the regal emphasis in four ways: (1) Acts 4:18 and 10:36-38 ties the baptism to regality, (2) 'Spirit and fire' references messianic concepts in Isaiah 11:4 and Ezra 13, (3) the Spirit's relation to the coming Davidic messiah in Jewish thought, (4) the allusion of Psalm 2:7 in Acts 4:25-26 and 13:33.

scenes. Consequently, evaluating Jesus' actions in ensuing scenes must draw from and incorporate the information gained in this scene, and among primary Lukan intentions, that Jesus is the divinely coronated Messiah. One additional benefit of rhetorical criticism of this passage is that it illuminates the use of Ἐγένετο δέ… in v. 21. As observed in discourse analysis, ἐγένετο points to foregrounded information, such as occurs in v. 22 with the Spirit's descent on Jesus and divine attribution. ἐγένετο also provides the general circumstance and thematic underpinning for subsequent scenes. Consequently, evaluating Jesus' actions in ensuing scenes must draw from and incorporate the information gained in this scene, that Jesus is the divinely coronate Messiah.

Another of Theon's rhetorical exercises, the encomion, was an exercise in of epideictic rhetoric that praised an individual in various ways and in a particular pattern, as discussed in Chapter III §3.5. The pattern of encomion begins by praising an individual according to bodily and external goods, such as an individual's reputation, accolades and ancestry. Goods of the mind and action follow. This order was significant insofar as an individual was praiseworthy to the extent that their subsequent actions met or exceeded prior expectations as established through bodily and external goods.[424]

Applying the general pattern of the encomion to this Lukan scene might explain why Jesus is largely passive not only in this scene but also the entire sequence from 3:21-4:44. According to the conventions of the encomion, Luke's Gospel appropriately begins by addressing accolades and reputations surrounding Jesus and his Messiahship, conveying bodily and external goods, and predominantly through the initiatives and announcements of various participants. Subsequently, with accolades regarding Jesus' Messiahship firmly established, the next sequence, 5:1-38, portrays Jesus no longer as largely passive but as the active material actor, initiating and performing deeds in accordance with those Messianic accolades. In this present sequence, the discourse marker ἐγένετο δέ anchors successive scenes back to Jesus' regal coronation, providing preliminary, foundational information for the evaluation of other scenes.[425] Finally, because encomiastic rhetoric is epideictic, that is, praise or blame of an individual, subsequent Lukan scenes explored in this project establish and confirm the

---

[424] George A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 51-52.

[425] That Jesus is the crowned king, the beloved son, is a fundamental theme both for Jesus' genealogy and his wilderness temptations. For example, his coronation reflects his regal ancestry (3:23-38), pertaining to bodily and external good, and the manner in which Jesus enacts his regal reign forms the basis of the devil's challenges.

praiseworthiness of Jesus. In contrast, subsequent scenes are not concerned with primarily defending Jesus, as in forensic rhetoric, or a call to follow him, as in deliberative rhetoric.[426]

4.3 Luke 3:23-38

4.3.1. Luke 3:23-38 Discourse Boundary

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦςἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα…

Luke 3:23-38 constitutes a distinct scene, supported by the following factors:

1. This scene fronts the pronominal αὐτός before the finite verb. The presentative nature of the new sentence with the verb εἰμι indicates that such fronting signals a point of departure, introducing a distinct and new unit of information.[427]

2. The content of Luke 3:23-38 is notably distinct from its surrounding scenes and sequences regarding lexical and grammatical features, which is particularly evident by use of successive genitive articles.

3. Luke 3:23-38 is thematically distinctive in addressing Jesus' physical/material progeny, whereas the previous scene identified his divine/relational sonship.

4. The literary form in this scene is distinctive in that this scene constitutes a genealogy.

5. Luke 4:1 introduces a new scene with pre-verbal fronting, the nominal phrase serving as a point of departure and focus, Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν…

4.3.2. Luke 3:23-38 Clause Level Constituent Order

The investigation of this scene features only v. 23, since the rest of this scene repeats the final constituent of this verse, that is, the genitive article but with differing names as the scene unfolds. Due to such repetition, there is no linguistic value in looking beyond the first verse of this scene. Verse. 23 provides the only instance of marked order, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος. Functionally, by establishing Jesus as the point of departure, he is the point of reference for subsequent information in this scene. The genealogy that follows is provided insofar as it relates to Jesus.[428] Focusing the genealogy on Jesus is

---

[426] Each Gospel must be approached separately. For example, Matthew's account of Jesus' baptism is not a mixed chreia, but rather a narration exercise that addresses causality, including why Jesus desired baptism. The causal element is vital for forensic rhetoric, possibly indicating that Matthew's Gospel seeks to defend Jesus.

[427] Since the preceding unit of 3:21-22 has been thematically tied to the sonship of Jesus, the fronting here is not for contrast. It could potentially function either for emphasis or to signal a point of departure with a distinct thematic anchoring. However, it cannot function for emphasis since it is placed at the beginning a new scene, and so it rather functions to anchor subsequent information. Jesus is the central element, and around him the genealogy calibrates.

[428] Following the natural flow of information, from given to new, information flows from Jesus as the primary participant, to additional information about him, concerning his reign or ministry, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα.

important to Luke's Gospel, for while the previous scene addressed Jesus' coronation, the present scene also addresses information pertaining to his reign; not the inception event at John's baptism, but rather that his coronation occurred at 30 years of age and was accompanied by a replete list of regal ancestors, which is supported below at the causal level.

4.3.3. Luke 3:23-38 Clause Level Process Types

Additional analysis at the clause level involves analysis of the manner in which happenings are represented. This scene contains only three processes displayed in Table 4.3.3.

Table 4.3.3
The three clause level processes represented in Luke 3:23-38.

Behaver	Behavioral Process	Circumstance
Καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς	ἦν ἀρχόμενος	ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα,

Relational (possessive attributive)	Relational Process	Circumstance
υἱός	ὢν	

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
	ὡς ἐνομίζετο	Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἠλὶ

Whereas vv. 24-38 represents happenings solely by the relational process, v. 23 distinctly provides two additional two processes by progeny, the behavioral and the mental. Functionally, the distinct presence of three process types in v. 23, as well as the syntax in vv. 24-38, containing only noun phrases and dependent on v. 23, serves to direct attention on Jesus.[429]

Further analysis of v. 23 reveals some ambiguity regarding the boundaries between process types. Blurring between process types sometimes occurs, particularly where one process type shares similar patterns of experience and grammar with another process type.[430] For example, the material process, that of happenings and doings, shares similar representational space with the behavioral process, since the behavioral process may also

---

[429] This may partially explain why Luke's genealogy presents a perennial exegetical challenge, not only in relation to whether this represents Mary or Joseph's progeny, but also in the name included and related patterns, at least, in comparison to Matthew's Gospel. See Reid-Heimderdinger, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*, 338.

[430] Process types may be envisioned as a circle exhibiting continuity and connectivity between the process types. In this respect Halliday writes: "The regions have core areas and these represent prototypical members of the process types; but the regions are continuous, shading into one another and these border areas represent the fact that the process types are fuzzy categories." Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 216. The basic distinctions between process types is the representation of happenings that occur internally or external, and processes that classify and address relationships (the material, mental, and relational processes). Between these process types, there are borderline processes (behavioral, verbal and existential).

represent outward manifestations of inward states.[431] In v. 23 the first clause reveals blurriness that sometimes occurs between the material and behavioral processes,

καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος, which arises due to the ambiguity over the meaning and referent of the participle, ἀρχόμενος.[432] However, if this clause is a material process, it is intransitive, since there is no goal provided, no participant, animate or inanimate, to whom Jesus' doing extends.

In the midst of ambiguity, the particular process type in view should incorporate the meaning of the word, ἀρχόμενος, as well as take account of whether a substantial figural value, and not strictly literal value, is assigned to the adverbial, ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα.[433] As such, ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα is integral for understanding the meaning of ἀρχόμενος.[434] Two fundamental meanings can be given to ἀρχόμενος: "beginning" and/or "ruling/reigning."[435] The word "began" is possible here, representing an inward state pertaining

---

[431] The basic distinctions between process types is the representation of happenings that occur internally or externally, and processes that classify and address relationships (the material, mental, and relational processes). Between these process types, there are borderline processes (behavioral, verbal and existential). Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 214-16.

[432] The notion of transitivity leads translations to commonly supply "his ministry" to the participle: Actor—verb "of doing"—Goal. However, material clauses may also be intransitive, for example "the leaves fell." Due to natural processes, this clause is one of doing ("what did x do?"; "what did the leaves do?"). There are probes, or questions, that assist in determining the classification of experiential material process clauses. One may ask: what did x do to y? (transitive with y as Goal) or, "what did x do?" (Intransitive with only x as Actor and process).

[433] For example, if "he began laughing" or some other sort of physiological or psychological behavior is supplied after the process verb, it would then be a behavioral process type. The same could be said for the clause "he began to speak" (verbal process type). The imperfect indicative verb ἦν is not entirely clear to which clause it should be linked: (1) began, (2) thirty years, or (3) Joseph. Cully, Parson and Stigall opt for the second option, citing LXX usage in introducing an individual's age, as well as its usage in the Gospels and Acts. Cully, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook*, 120. This project identifies the imperfect as periphrastic with the participle ἀρχόμενος, and 'thirty years' as a genitive of time (adverbial circumstance), as the simplest way to understand this construction.

[434] As shown in Chapter II §3.2, while the circumstance is not a core component of the clause (shared by process and participant), the circumstance is not unimportant. By presenting this clause as process, participant and circumstance, intentionality occurs through the negotiation of all three relationships. Geoff Thompson, *Introducing Functional Grammar, 93.*

[435] According to BDAG, ἄρχω signifies: (1) to rule or govern, and (2) to initiate or begin a process, action, or state of being. Frederick William Danker, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Christian Literature,* Third Edition, rev. and ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2000), 140. BDAG opts for the second option: "…prob. Jesus was about 30 years old when he began his work." 140. See also: Cully, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*,116. David Garland's commentary on Luke follows this option as well, writing: "Thirty years old marks a 'threshold age' in the ancient sources… The age signals to the reader that Jesus is now a mature, responsible man ready for his public career." David E. Garland, *Luke: Exegetical Commentary on The New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 170. Garland identifies both

to the behavioral process. It should be noted here that ἀρχόμενος typically conveys, within the Lukan panoply, the temporal meaning of 'began', or 'commenced'.[436] However, the second meaning, "reigned," is also plausible. If "reigned" is intended, the material process is the principal explanation of happening.[437] Consequently, as a material process, Jesus' reign is referential to external happenings; a direct input between Jesus and others within the "physical space" shared by various Lukan participants.

There are three reasons for possibly understanding ἀρχόμενος to signify *reign*. The first reason that ἀρχόμενος may signify 'reign' relates to linguistic factors. Regarding the periphrastic construction, research has demonstrated that, contrary to traditional understanding of the periphrastic which seems to arise through comparison with the English continuous tense, the focus is on the meaning of the verb and not the duration of the activity.[438] In fact, it makes little sense to focus on the temporal aspect of the verb here, for as the Lukan construction conveys, there is no antecedent information to that which Jesus 'began…'. Furthermore, there is no infinitive construction, which would be expected here to round out the information of: 'Jesus began to…'. Comparison may also be made with the infinitive construction that occurs throughout Luke, other Gospels, and Acts.[439] In this instance, in v. 23, the unusual construction

Joseph and David, who entered a specific service or reign at thirty years old, but he does not discuss the significance of comparison between David and Jesus specifically.

[436] Support for such a notion occurs in the preceding Lukan uses of this word, referring to temporality. Such portions include Luke 1:2, οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, the temporal meaning in 3:8, καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, and following Jesus' genealogy, in Ch. 4:21, the meaning undoubtedly also conveys the temporal meaning, ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι… Strauss makes an important distinction between Jesus' royal anointing at baptism and his royal enthronement with his resurrection and ascension. Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1995), 206.

[437] One possible reason why ἦν is without reference is reflected in Quintilian's *Institutio Oratia*, regarding tropes. A trope is an alteration of an original word-meaning to the transference of another, and may take many forms: metaphor, simile, synecdoche, metonymy, irony, hyperbole, inversion, etc. One possibility, of the stylistic choice of "began" (or rule) would be that of metonymy, wherein an abstract-concrete (vice-versa) transference operates. c. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratia* 8.6.23-28. It may also be a matter of semantic range, and hence, what Quintilian calls ἀντανάκλασις, one word carrying two different meanings at the same time. (*Int. Or.* 9.3.68-69).

[438] Stephen J. Levinsohn, "Functions of Copula-Participle Combinations ('Periphrastics')" in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, eds., (Bellingham, Washington: Lexham Press, 2015), 307-324.

[439] For example, Matthew 4:17, Mark 3:23, Luke 3:8, and Acts 1:1. Comparing the use of the word 'began' with both Matthew 4:17 and Acts 1:1, it should be noted that in both cases the verb is used as an auxiliary to the infinitive. As such, in both cases some reference to temporality does occur and the meaning of 'reign' is

lends support to the notion that the focus in not the temporal.

The second reason is because this scene immediately follows the coronation scene in vv. 21-22. In this previous scene, the reflective truth incorporated both the Spirit's descent and the divine attribution as indicating Jesus' regal coronation. With this in mind, whereas vv. 21-22 intended to praise Jesus relative to his royal coronation, the present scene praises Jesus' reign relative to his royal ancestry.[440] Because these scenes cohere within a larger Lukan sequence, it is plausible that the thematic coherence of 'regality' occurs within in this Lukan construction in v. 23.

The third reason that ἀρχόμενος may signify 'reign' is because of the attendant circumstance, ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα as it relates to intertextual factors. To the degree that Luke's Gospel presupposes an audience who is conversant in the Jewish Scriptures, the temporal circumstance, ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, possibly serves an analogical function. Jesus' commencing his reign at 30 years corresponds to one or more of his regal predecessors.[441] The closest temporal marker correspondence seems to be King David, whose rule also began when he was 30.[442] Such a possibility would be readily confirmed throughout Luke 1-2 replete with explicit associations between Jesus' regality and that of King David.[443] Further still, In 2

---

excluded. However, in Luke 3:23, the verb is used differently, as an imperfect periphrastic. As such the emphasis is not on duration but rather on the semantics of the verb. The plausibility remains then, that a non-temporal meaning, such as reign, occurs in Luke 3:23.

[440] Such a notion may illuminate why Luke's Gospel reaches back to Adam, the first "son of God" who was placed in the Garden of Eden as vice-regent, enacting God's rule. In some sense, Jesus' temptations recall the Adamic regency at Eden. At the same time, Mark L. Stauss observes that the genealogy serves a greater purpose: "…the main purpose is to confirm Jesus' identity: as a son of Adam his person and work have saving significance for the whole of humankind; as a son of Abraham his mission is part of God's salvation-historical work through the nation Israel (cf. Luke 1-2); and as son of David he is heir to the throne of David…" *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1995), 213.

[441] At several places it is apparent that Luke's Gospel is using the history of Israel as a paradigm to interpret the events of Jesus and thereby validate his ministry. Read-Heimerdinger traces Luke's usage of the comparative particles: ὡσεὶ and ὡς. She concludes that, as well as being an adverb indicating approximation, ὡσεὶ signals a comparison between two entities while ὡς signals a correspondence, a deeper level paradigm/type. See "Luke's Use of ὡς and ὡσεί: Comparison and Correspondence as a Means to Convey his Message", in *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi filologici di Greco biblioc in onore di padre Lino Cignelli,* OFM Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Analecta 68, ed. R. Pierri (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press), 251–74.

[442] 2 Samuel 5:3-5 in the LXX. Understanding relevant contextual signals throughout a text is essential to engage contextual meaning; also, how those inputs signal and guide intention, and that meaning is presupposed by shared pools of knowledge between author and audience. Daniel Wilson and Deirdre Sperber, "Relevance Theory" in *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, eds. L. Horn & G. Ward (NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006), 607–32.

[443] David is among the named participants in Jesus' genealogy (3:31).

Samuel 5:3-5 three successive actions are associated with King David; i. he was *anointed* in v. 3, ii. he was *thirty years old* when he became king in v. 4, iii. he reigned for *forty years* in v. 5. Such activities are likewise associated with Jesus in these first three Lukan scenes analyzed; i. Jesus is anointed by the Spirit in 3:21-22, ii. he begins to reign at thirty years old in 3:23-38, iii. for forty days he exhibits his regal reign over diabolic temptations in 4:1-14a.[444] As such, if this present scene of Jesus' genealogy anchors back to the immediately preceding scene regarding Jesus' regal coronation, then the likelihood remains that Luke's Gospel is threading a royal tapestry in this scene and beyond.[445] In summary then, related to the three points above, while 'beginning' is possible in Luke 3:23, the meaning of 'reign' is plausible.[446]

The second clause, ὢν υἱός… Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἠλὶ is a relational process. As a relational process, the fundamental depiction is that of two "be-ers" who stand in some attributive or identifying relationship. Specifically, this clause is a possessive attributive relational clause, meaning that the information provided is such that "x has y," wherein one entity, Jesus, is assigned a relationship to the possessor, who in this case is Joseph. Ambiguity regarding the precise nature of the relationship between Jesus and Joseph occurs here as in the first clause. Unlike the first clause, however, the relational process is inherently ambiguous. As Halliday observed, "More than other process types, the relational process has a rich potential for ambiguity, which is exploited in many registers from technocratic and political rhetoric to the discourse of poetry and folk sayings."[447] In this Lukan scene, Jesus stands in some relation to

---

[444] As discussed in Ch. III §2.6, this project employs intertextual minimalism, employing specific words or phrases that reflect the Jewish Scriptures. In other words, key Lukan words or phrases serve as 'hooks' that invoke reflection on the Jewish Scriptures. David Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis Before 70 CE* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), 17-18.

[445] The subsequent scene works much the same, for in order for Jesus to reign successfully, he must vanquish one's foes, the very thing Zachariah addresses in Luke 2:68-79. Consequently, Jesus first contest with the devil is not surprising. At the same time, Luke's genealogy may also convey Jesus' associations not only with his regal lineages but also includes his priestly and prophetic predecessors. Also see: I. Howard Marshall, New International Greek Testament Commentary: *Commentary On Luke*: (William B. Eerdmans Publishing: Grand Rapids, 1978), 161. Also: Darrell L. Bock, *Luke: Volume 1:1-9:50* (Baker Books: Grand Rapids, 1994), 353-360.

[446] The meaning of 'reign' is even more pronounced in the Bezan text, insofar as it uses both the conjunction δέ and the adverb ὡς identified as a marker signaling reference to a scriptural paradigm. See Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration:* 44-43, 337.

[447] Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 298. Halliday writes: "'Relational' clauses serve to characterize and to identify…Unlike 'material' clauses, but like 'mental ones', relational clauses prototypically construe change as unfolding 'inertly', without an input of energy- typically as a uniform flow without distinct phases of unfolding." 260.

Joseph but the relationship is inert, lacking clarity as to what both parties share, since sonship occurs along various semantic-conceptual lines.[448]

Further complicating such ambiguity, an additional mental process is used of the relationship between Jesus and Joseph, ὡς ἐνομίζετο.[449] According to Hallidean analysis, the mental process involves three components: a senser, a process, and a phenomenon. In v. 23, the senser presumably involves various participants within Luke's Gospel. There are three types of mental processes: i. cognition, which include beliefs, thinking, understanding, ii. affection as emotional perception, and iii. perception which constitutes a phenomenal awareness of physiological factors.[450] In this clause, the phenomenon type is cognition, since it contains the stated belief of narrative participants which can be stated in propositional form: Jesus was the son of Joseph. There are two types of phenomenon: i. act, as the perception process, or ii. fact as the clause or propositional content to which the senser assents. In this Lukan clause, the mental process of phenomenon is that of fact, the particular proposition held regarding Jesus' sonship to Joseph. Since this clause represents a fact of cognition, or the value of the proposition, Jesus'sonship to Joseph is open to revision, clarification, or negation, depending on information sequestered throughout Luke's Gospel. Ambiguity over Jesus' sonship is complicated not only by the relational process, but also the inclusion of the mental process, one that involves an imaging of Luke's "inner-physical world," according to an entity's internal awareness.[451]   However, the presence of two ambiguous processes may actually serve Luke's intention in v. 23. Ambiguity may distance Jesus from a straightforward material-biological relationship with Joseph, loosening familial connections between Jesus and his relatives. The relational processes may function to convey Jesus' ancestry in the context of politically

---

[448] Danker, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Christian Literature,* 1024-1027.

[449] The genealogy of Luke 3:24-38 demonstrates that while Joseph's lineage is important, Luke's Gospel capitalizes on the relational ambiguity between Jesus and Joseph, of relationships, specifically in 2:48-49: οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με.

[450] Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 245.

[451] Eggins writes of the mental process type: "Intuitively, mental processes form a viable semantic category: there are clear differences between doing something that goes on in the external world and something that goes on in the internal world of the mind: and there are many verbs that refer to these mental processes, of thinking, imagining, liking, wanting, seeing, etc." Suzanne Eggins, *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Bloomsbury, 2012), 225. In Luke's Gospel, there is no direct or necessary truth correspondence: between the world of mental imaging and the narrative world in Luke's Gospel. Mary's mental processes reflects such a notion (Luke 1:29, 2:19). Negatively, Zacharias does not rightly discern the ways of God (Luke 1:20, 77), his perception of reality does not match Luke's narrative world wherein God is working. Both Simeon and John the Baptist address the incoherence between the mental and material processes, that the Messiah's sword and fire will expose such inchoate ruminations (2:35, 3:16-17).

subversive in reference to Jesus and his reign.[452] If this finding is correct, the selection of a mixed chreia for Jesus' baptism is warranted, leaving the decision to Luke's readers to supply the equivocal truth related to Jesus' regal coronation.

4.3.4. Luke 3:23-38 Clause Complex Level

Halliday's clause complex involves issues of dependency, the tactic system, and relationships as logico-semantic relations and applies to the final two clauses in v. 23 that display a hypotactic, or dependency, relationship to the first clause. The third clause is embedded, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, and also dependent on the second clause. Independency is represented by the head clause α, with successive letters representing dependency. Regarding logic-semantic relations, dependent clauses of elaboration are symbolized by =. The arrangement of Halliday's clause complex for dependency, the tactic system, and logico-semantic relations is depicted in Table 4.3.4

Table 4.3.4
Halliday's clause complex involving issues of dependency, the tactic system, and logico-semantic relations in Luke 3:23-38.

---

[452] Luke 1:32-35, 68-71, 2:4,11, 26. Luke's Gospel possibly seeks to construct the programmatic theme that Jesus is the much-anticipated Savior, that is, the Davidic king and rightful ruler against Roman imperialism. Because such a notion is politically subversive, Luke's Gospel may employ ambiguity, but not for those who have "ears to hear" (Luke 8:8). For Luke's use of ambiguity and political exigency, see Bradley S. Billings, "'At the Age Of 12': The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52), The Emperor Augustus, and The Social Setting of the Third Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies,* 60.1 (2009): 70-89. doi:10.1092/jts/fln149. Further still, given Luke's theological trajectory, Jesus does not "enter into glory," or reign, until his ascension (Lk 24:46 or Acts 2:29-36). Therefore, his "reign" does not comprehensively occur until his resurrection/ascension (Lk 24 and Acts 1-2). Jesus' reign reflects King David who initially reigned over the house of Judah (2 Sam. 2) and then subsequently, over all of Israel (2 Sam. 5) See: Calvin C. Mercer, *Norman Perrin's Interpretation of The New Testament: From Exegetical Method to Hermeneutical Process*, (Mercer University Press, Macon Georgia, 1986), 53-55. Also: Philip Wheelwright, *Metaphor and Reality* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1962).

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα

α

ὢν υἱός [ὡς ἐνομίζετο embedded clause], Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἡλὶ

=β

Table 4.3.4 shows that the final two dependent clauses involve expansion, respective to the first clause. Expansion clauses "build on the meaning of the primary clauses, developing them in several ways."[453] The final two clauses expand on the issue of Jesus' reign/ministry at 30 years old. Expansion may occur in three ways, elaboration, extension, and enhancement, =, +, x, respectively. The second clause, ὢν υἱός… Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἡλὶ, elaborates on the first clause, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος, and is symbolized as =. Elaboration serves to restate a message, clarify it, or add an additional comment to the message. In v. 23, Jesus' reign is attended with the cognitive belief that he was Joseph's son.

Clause complex analysis signals various weights in respect to clausal relationships.[454] In the case of Jesus' genealogy, lesser weight is assigned to the elaborating clauses in v. 23b, as well as subsequent dependent clauses throughout this scene. In contrast, the main clause is assigned greatest weight, in virtue of being paratactic, as the main or head clause, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα. Accordingly, later information is subordinate as it stands in relation to Jesus' reign. In other words, less weight is given to hypotactic clauses even though they serve to clarify or add additional information of Jesus' reign, specifically through his lineage.[455] While subsequent clauses are downgraded, they do

---

[453] Eggins, *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics, Second Edition,* 271. In many cases, the clause complexes related to the primary clause allows the reader to "slow the pace" surrounding a process type and notice carefully that which occurs. That is, the meaning surrounding the people's baptism in clause (a) is that of the clauses which proceed it.

[454] Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 411. For Halliday, distinguishing parataxis and hypotaxis serves to identify a "…powerful grammatical strategy to guiding the rhetorical development of a text, making it possible for grammar to assign different statuses to figures within a sequence."

[455] The imperfect verbal constituent, ἦν, is the main clause of this verse. As an imperfect of the verb εἶναι, with a periphrastic, information is presented about Jesus, associated with present middle participle, ἀρχόμενος. Subsequently, the present active participle in the following clause, ὢν, is backgrounded to the verb, ἦν. As Chapter II §5.5 has demonstrated, participles that follow the main verb serve to elaborate the main verb. See Read-Heimderdinger, *Luke's Demonstration*, 337. Functionally, by the relationship to the main verb, Jesus' relational sonship is backgrounded to the main verb, in terms of relative significance. That is, subsequent clauses, including the embedded clause, are demoted, ranked less prominent to Jesus' reign. For the principle of demotion, see Randall Buth, "Participles as A Pragmatic Choice", *The Greek Verb Revisited*, 281.

function to clarify Jesus' reign by the inventory of royal characters such as David, Abraham, and Adam. These three individuals may serve a proleptic function in Luke's Gospel through examination of subsequent scenes.[456]

4.3.5. Luke 3:23-38 Scene Level

The main clause of this scene considers Jesus' reign, which is then elaborated by addressing his relationship to Joseph. In this manner, subsequent information is semantically downgraded, namely, the string of genitive of relationships that occur throughout vv. 24-38.[457] Because such an arrangement has been addressed in §3.4 above, no further analysis at the scene level is necessary, a point confirmed by the lack of conjunctions as well as the absence of a finite verbal structure.

4.3.6. Luke 3:23-38 Rhetorical Analysis

Table 4.3.6 below summarizes the findings of discourse analysis. Once these are provided, text-external, rhetorical factors can be incorporated into this scene.

Table 4.3.6
Findings of discourse analysis in Luke 3:23-38.

Constituent Order	Process Types	Clause Complex	Scene
Point of departure with scene anchored to information regarding Jesus' 'reign'	ἀρχόμενος is referentially ambiguous, but linked with the clausal circumstance, ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, 'reign' as a material process is likely (associated with King David) In v. 23 behavioral, relational, mental processes occur. There is ambiguity in the precise sonship Jesus has with Joseph.	v. 23 as single main clause, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα Jesus' reign at thirty years, as main clause, is accorded greatest weight/prominence. Lesser functional weight assigned to elaborations of Jesus' sonship and subsequent lineage	No verbal pattern or conjunctive use occurs in this scene since there is only one main clause.

Theon's rhetorical handbook does not address genealogy as a specific rhetorical exercise. However, his discussion of the encomion exercise is relevant for vv. 23-38. As noted in the previous scene, the encomion exercise was arranged in a manner that first addressed an individual's bodily goods and external goods. External goods included: "first, good birth, and that is twofold, either from the goodness of (a man's) city and tribe and constitution, or from

---

[456] Luke 2:55, 73 and 3:8 previously activated Abraham, and 1:32-33, 69, 2:11 activated David.

[457] Unlike Matthew's Gospel there are no patterns within the genealogy that assist the reader in corresponding Jesus to David. This is not necessary however, because associations between Jesus and David have been previously underscored in 3:21 and 3:23.

ancestors and other relatives."[458] The importance of this Lukan scene to the encomion is clear. The string of genitives in vv. 24-38, related to Jesus' reign, addresses Jesus' external goods, detailing his regal ancestry. In providing a genealogy, Luke's Gospel draws from information in the previous scene, showcasing that Jesus' genealogy is consistent with his regal coronation. By including David, Judah and the patriarchs Noah, Seth, and Adam in the genealogy, the encomion serves an additional proleptic purpose. Providing Jesus' regal ancestry, encourages an evaluation of how Jesus "used the advantage prudently and as he ought…"[459] Subsequent scenes, therefore, carry expectations respective of his genealogy, whether Jesus will act in ways that conform to or surpass those who previously reigned within his genealogical table. Since this Lukan sequence conveys an epideictic function, vv. 23-38 becomes another means of praising Jesus, not only in respect to validating his coronation, but also for evaluating Jesus' subsequent actions, insofar as they meet or exceed those of his regal predecessors.[460] If such is the case, the central and contentious issue in subsequent scenes will be whether Jesus' reigning activities meet or exceed his regal ancestors.

4.4 Luke 4:1-14a

4.4.1. Luke 4:1-14a Discourse Boundary

4.1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου…

Utilizing insights from discourse analysis, an objective case can be made for identifying Luke 4:1-14a as a scene. Support for these textual boundaries include:

1. Fronting, where the pre-verbal noun serves as a point of departure and also for focus, Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου This fronting of the noun by pre-verbal constituent order functions to distinguish the genealogy of Jesus, in the preceding scene, from the activity of Jesus in his wilderness temptations in this present scene.[461]

---

[458] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 50. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.9.33.

[459] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 51. With reference to subjects of encomium in general, Theon notes that one should address external and bodily goods and then after each, demonstrate how the person used these goods advantageously. Such structure is consistent with Luke's Gospel. After Jesus' good birth and dedication (2:1-40), the following scene displays how his noble or divine birth was used advantageously in his temple teachings at age twelve (2:41-52). In this scene, Jesus' ancestry relationships are rehearsed, from father to sons, (3:22-38), followed by his wilderness ordeal, displaying fidelity toward God as a true son (4:1-14a). In the scene following this, Jesus' 'official position' is addressed (4:14b-29), followed by specific activities related to his reign (4:30-44).

[460] Compared to David, the subsequent scene will demonstrate that Jesus' actions are "beyond what was characteristic of his age or contrary to expectations." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 51.

[461] The fronting of the noun in 4:1 differs from 3:23 in that it includes here both noun and adjectival phrase. In 4:1, Jesus is brought back into focus after the list of his ancestors, while the mention of the Holy Spirit

2. Use of δέ in Luke's Gospel is typically for introducing a new narrative scene, or that of signaling development within a scene. In v. 1, it functions to introduce a new scene, since there is no previously coherent information from which it follows.[462]

3. Verbal tense-aspect patterning. In v. 1, both the aorist, ὑπέστρεψεν and the imperfect, ἤγετο, occur. This is a common Lukan pattern for introducing a new scene.[463]

4. The Holy Spirit, as a participant in this scene, forms an inclusio, serving to indicate a self-contained scene. Such a reference occurs in in 4:1: Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ… and also in 4:14a: ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος.[464]

5. Thematic-rhetorical considerations. Thematically, Luke switches from a genealogy to a narration scene involving Jesus in the wilderness. In this scene, he will be called upon to act in accordance with his regal coronation and royal ancestry.[465] From a rhetorical standpoint, the previous two scenes involved a mixed chreia in vv. 21-22, and elements of the encomion exercise in vv. 23-38. Distinct from these exercises, it will be seen that the present scene constitutes a narration.

4.4.2. Luke 4:1-14a Clause Level

Only the marked clauses in this passage will be analyzed for constituent order for pragmatic effect. In this scene, there are three clauses with a marked word order in the storyline of events, and two instances of marked order in reported speech. The first marked order occurs in v. 1: Ἰςόϊῦὸ ἄὲ ðëἡῆςὸ ðíåὐìàôïò ἀãü͏ὃ ὑðέόôñåøåί…As noted in §4.1 above, the fronted noun phrase indicates a new scene. Forefronting Jesus in v.1 signals that subsequent information in this scene anchors to Jesus as the participant, and by fronting Jesus, he is in

---

is implicitly retrievable from 3:22, not being new information. The same case will be made for 4:14b, which introduces the next scene.

[462] The use of δέ in 4:1 contrasts with the use of καί in 3:22.

[463] Alexander C. Loney "Narrative Structure and Verbal Aspect Choice in Luke" *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 18 (2005): 3-31. Loney cites Luke's diegetic-mimetic patterning, and notes that it assists in identifying narrative units, as well as serving other factors, such as *energeia*.

[464] This may also be seen as a chiastic structure. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 277-278. In this scene, Jesus' journey is marked by the Spirit's leading (vv. 1a and 14a), orienting his regal responses to the devil (4:2-13).

[465] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 276-277.

focus.[466] The use of the anarthrous reference to Jesus serves as a solemn declaration. Now that preliminaries are out of the way, regarding Jesus' coronation and ancestry, his regally anointed activities can begin.[467]

In this first clause another marked constituent occurs, with the Spirit fronted for focus, Ἰςόϊὺò äὲ ðëῆῆςò ðíἀὑìáôïò ἀᾶῖõ ὑðέóôñåøåí. While there are relatively few instances of the Holy Spirit's activity upon individuals in the Jewish Scriptures, one notable exception relates to King David.[468] Specifically, in 2 Samuel 16 wherein Samuel anoints David and the Spirit of the Lord rests upon David.[469] Subsequently, David confronts Goliath.

The second marked clause occurs in v. 2, ἡìéñáò ôåóóåñάêïíôá ðåéñάæòìáῖïò… In this case, the temporal information is highlighted in order to draw attention to the time duration. By frontshifting information that is neither recoverable nor known from the immediate context, extra attention or focus is directed to the "forty days."[470] The two previous scenes explain the "forty days" which are in close association between Jesus' regal coronation and that of King David. The forty days may be marked in order to signal and maintain Jesus'

---

[466] Levinsohn notes that in Luke 4:1: "…the initial reference to Jesus reestablishes him as the center of attention, as the narrative resumes following the genealogy of 3:23-28." Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 76. This textual feature is also of service for the Progymnasmata, since it assists the audience in assigning the narrative elements of *person* and *action* to Jesus.

[467] Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 123-131, 151-157.

[468] In 2 Samuel 16:12-13, the LXX reads: καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Σαμουηλ Ἀνάστα καὶ χρῖσον τὸν Δαυιδ, ὅτι οὗτος ἀγαθός ἐστιν. καὶ ἔλαβεν Σαμουηλ τὸ κέρας τοῦ ἐλαίου καὶ ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐφήλατο πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπὶ Δαυιδ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ἐπάνω. καὶ ἀνέστη Σαμουηλ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς Αρμαθαιμ.

[469] I Sam 16:13 (LXX): καὶ ἐφήλατο πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπὶ Δαυιδ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ἐπάνω.

[470] Because salient information is unknown from the standpoint of the reader, it typically approximates to the end of the clause or sentence. Consequently, placing salient information first signals special emphasis. Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 34-35. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*, 5-6. The "forty days" precedes both the participial phrase as well as the main verb in v.3 (ἐπείνασεν). Culy, Parsons and Stigall link the forty-day temptation to the verb "led" of 4:1 (using 'for' at the beginning of 4:2 to link it to 4:1). They consider that "forty days" might be linked to the main verb in 4:2 (because 'led' was already modified by two prepositional phrases ("in Spirit" and "in wilderness")). They conclude, however: "The use of the imperfect 'ηγετο… makes it more likely that it modifies the main verb." This leads them to also conclude that the participle at the start of 4:2 is circumstantial, rather than a purpose clause. Culy, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, 123. Fortunately, little is lost in meaning even if one links the start of 4:2 to the main verb of 4:1. In fact, per Levinsohn, the final constituent in a given sentence is of marked order (for focus). See: Levinson, Discourse Features, 34.

correspondence with David, since Goliath taunted Israel for forty days, and David's reigned over Israel for forty years.[471]

The third marked clause occurs in v. 13, ὁ ἄεάᾶϊëϊὸ ἀδέόὁς ἀδʹ ἁὐῖ̂ϋ. In this case the forefronting creates a focus on the devil, as the author of the temptations. In fronting the devil for focus, attention turns from Jesus' declarations to the devil's departure. Consequently, it is the devil who exits the scene first, not Jesus. No tempter is left who will contest Jesus' regal sonship. [472]

Finally, marked order twice occurs within reported speech. Both speeches center on the devil's challenge to Jesus, in v. 3 and repeated again in v. 8, Ἀὶ ὄίὸὸ ἆῖ̂ ὂϊ̂ϋ ὲἆϊϋ… While both instances are subordinate clauses, placing ὄίὸὸ prior to the verb gives special salience to the element of Jesus' sonship which is not surprising, for as noted in the previous two scenes regarding Jesus' coronation and genealogy, his regal sonship has been the central issue so far. Consistent with this theme, special salience is also here given to Jesus' sonship, providing the fulcrum of the devil's temptations.[473]

4.4.3. Luke 4:1-14a Process Type Analysis Level

Along with marked order, clausal analysis involves the study of process types, in order to determine the manner in which various happenings are depicted provided in Table 4.4.3 below.

Table 4.4.3
Process types in Luke 4:1-14a.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου	ὑπέστρεψεν		ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου
ἐν τῷ πνεύματι	καὶ ἤγετο	Ἰησοῦ	ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ

---

[471] The Masoretic text of 1 Samuel 17:16 addresses Goliath's forty-day challenge and 1 Kings 2:11 addresses David's forty-year reign, καὶ αἱ ἡμέραι, ἃς ἐβασίλευσεν Δαυιδ ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραηλ, τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη (LXX).

[472] Since the context is retrievable in light of previous information, the fronted noun is not a point of departure. The position of ὁ διάβολος adjacent to the clause makes an overt link between the temptations and the devil as the author. In addition, the crowd's attempt to kill Jesus in Nazareth may imply the ongoing activity of the devil, both due to its close proximity to this scene and the comment in 4:13b.

[473] The concept of Jesus' regal sonship illuminates the devil's contentions: that Jesus should not deprive himself of bodily needs (vv. 3-4), requisite fanfare (vv. 5-8), and that God will always act favorable on his behalf and for his protection (vv. 9-12).

ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου	πειραζόμενος	Ἰησοῦ	ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα
(Ἰησοῦ)	καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν	οὐδὲν	ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις

Existent	Existential Process	Circumstance
(days of temptation-implied)	καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν	

Behaver:	Behavioral Process:	Circumstance/Behaviour, Phenomenon
αὐτῶν	ἐπείνασεν.	

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection
ὁ διάβολος …	Εἶπεν δὲ	αὐτῷ		Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰπὲ τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ ἵνα γένηται ἄρτος.
ὁ Ἰησοῦς	καὶ ἀπεκρίθη	πρὸς αὐτὸν		Γέγραπται ὅτι Οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

Actor:	Material Process:	Goal:	Circumstance/Recipient
(ὁ διάβολος)	Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν	αὐτὸν	
(ὁ διάβολος)	ἔδειξεν	πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου	αὐτῷ

Sayer	Verbal Process:	Receiver	Naming	Projection
ὁ διάβολος	καὶ εἶπεν	αὐτῷ		Σοὶ δώσω τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν: σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, ἔσται σοῦ πᾶσα.

Actor:	Material Process:	Goal:	Circumstance:
(ὁ διάβολος)	Ἤγαγεν δὲ	αὐτὸν	εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ
(ὁ διάβολος)	καὶ ἔστησεν	(αὐτὸν-implied from clause (n))	ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ

Sayer	Verbal Process:	Receiver	Naming	Projection
ὁ διάβολος	καὶ εἶπεν	αὐτῷ		Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε, καὶ ὅτι Ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσίν σε μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου.
ὁ Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν ὅτι	αὐτῷ	καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὅτι	Εἴρηται, Οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου

Actor:	Material Process:	Range:	Circumstance/Recipient
(ὁ διάβολος)	Καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν	πάντα πειρασμὸν	
ὁ διάβολος	ἀπέστη	ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	ἄχρι καιροῦ.
ὁ Ἰησοῦς	Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν		ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν

In view of the large number of process types, analysis will focus on issues related to the distribution and pattern of process types as well as distinct features. As seen in the Table 4.4.3 above, the material process occurs 11 times, the largest amount among the process types. In such a depiction, the devil is represented as the actor in seven clauses, exerting an external input of energy, and in each case, Jesus is the goal of the devil's activities.[474] In only three clauses is Jesus is portrayed as the material actor, and in one clause the Holy Spirit is the actor, καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, in which case Jesus is the goal. In the three clauses in which Jesus is the material actor, two of those clauses contain no goal. Instead these clauses are circumstances of location, ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ

---

[474] The material processes of the devil include tempting Jesus, bringing Jesus to a new locale, showing Jesus, taking and seating Jesus, and the devil finishing temptations and departing from Jesus.

πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, and ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. In the one clause in which Jesus is an actor with a goal, the goal is inanimate, and expressed by negation, καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις.[475]

By portraying Jesus in this manner, he is consistently the passive recipient throughout this scene; he exerts no input upon other participants, and instead is the goal of the other's activities. Consequently, whatever reign Jesus might be involved with from his coronation is not expressed by material means. Instead, Jesus is largely portrayed by means of the verbal process, manifesting a peculiar reign, at least in contrast to the devil's challenges, beseeching him to assume the role of material actor.

The second largest process type, occurring six times, is the verbal process. The devil initiates three rounds of verbal processes in which Jesus responds. As noted above, special salience on sonship occurs in two of the three reported speeches, Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ… In Jesus' responses to the devil, his three projections, the content of his reported speech, contain portions of Deuteronomy 6 and 8. These citations provide his rebuttal to the devil.[476] Such an observation is consistent with the manner in which Jesus was represented as the material actor, for in the case of Jesus' verbal processes, the content of his speech does not derive from himself, but from the Jewish Scriptures. The verbal process also portrays Jesus' reign in a distinct manner, for while his authoritative words conclude each sparring round with the devil, his authority is derivative, reflecting and promoting God's laws. He expresses his regality as a true son under God.

In addition to the material and verbal processes, the existential and behavioral processes also occur, but solely in v. 2. The existential process, καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν, addresses the circumstance antecedent to the devil's challenges providing a prelude to them.[477] The behavioral process, ἐπείνασεν, depicts Jesus' physiological activity as one who

---

[475] In other words, that *he ate nothing*, is non-contributive to a physical space construal, Jesus has not performed a deed, but rather has simply restrained from the performance of a deed.

[476] Jesus sees the whole of the Jewish Scriptures as fulfilled in him (Lk 24:44)

[477] "…they make an important, specialized contribution to various kinds of text. For example, in narrative, they serve to introduce central participants in the Placement (setting, Orientation) stage at the beginning of a story…Textually, the theme is just the feature of existence (there), allowing the addressee to prepare for something that is about to be introduced." Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 308.

experiences hunger, where the behavioral process represents partly a physiological state and partly a mental state. While the behavioral process commonly includes an associated circumstance, explicit behavior, or phenomenon, v. 2 contains none of these, resulting in a diminishing of prominence attached to this particular activity. Functionally, such representations are important to the scene in that they provide preliminary, circumstantial and behavioral information. Consequently, the scene turns to more prominent material and verbal processes in v. 3ff.

In order and amount, the arrangement of process types is as follows: material (4x), existential (1x), behavioral (1x), verbal (2x), material (2x), verbal (3x), material (2x), verbal (3x), material (3x). The first three processes, the material, existential, and behavioral, all occur within the short space of vv. 1-2. With the introduction of the verbal process in v. 3, the verbal-to-material processes alternates exclusively throughout the remainder of the scene.

Regarding the representation of temporal-spatial changes in this scene, the devil's material activities are instrumental, as he inputs energy on Jesus, resulting in various states of affairs. Likewise, the Holy Spirit initiates the happening, taking Jesus into the wilderness. In the midst of such activities, Jesus' reported speeches occur, which create a quantum of narration changes, for in his verbal responses to the devil, the result is an immediate change in external representations, occurring three times. The depiction of the verb-initiating pattern, Jesus' verbal authority and a resultant change of affairs, entails that significant authority is vested in Jesus' words.

In Hallidean analysis, changes may occur in two ways. First, a transformation process may occur whereby a change in state or status is achieved. The transformational change tends to occur with the material process. Second, change may occur by means of a creative process whereby a goal is actualized in some manner, and a new state of affairs obtained. Such a change is eminently suitable with the verbal process and confirms that Jesus' words effectively create changes as the scene develops. Jesus reign is marked by a commitment to the Torah, whereby Jesus shows himself to be a true son of God.[478]

---

[478]This scene centers upon Jesus' derivative authority: his regal sonship is a maintenance of God's directives and reign, encapsulated in the Torah. Jesus' dependence upon the Torah reflects another level of affinity between Jesus as 'son' to that of the heavenly voice in vv. 21-22, since both the son and heavenly voice share a commitment to sacred Jewish texts. Sonship is saturated with divine oracles as in Psalm 2:17: Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε (LXX), and God's words to Abraham: Λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, ὃν ἠγάπησας (Gen 22:2 LXX).

4.4.4. Luke 4:1-14a Clause Complex Level

Clause complex analysis involves an investigation into the variety of clause complexes, whether simplex or complex clauses, as well as the relationship of subordinate clauses to their head clause. In this scene, there are nine clause simplexes and six clause complexes. Since clause complexes appear less frequently than clause simplexes in this scene, and because clause complexes often carry additional semantic weight, it is useful to focus upon clause complexes.[479]

Of the six clause complexes in this scene, three clauses are extension clauses, providing additional information to the head clause.[480] Extension clauses are notated by the symbol +, and the head clause with α as shown in Table 4.4.4.

Table 4.4.4a
The three extension clauses represented in Luke 4:1-14a.

καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν/   ἐπείνασεν.
β+   α

⁵Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν/ ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου:
β+   α

 ¹³Καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν / ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ.
 β+   α

The first extension clause involves the temporal circumstance preceding Jesus' hunger. The second extension clause contains the devil taking Jesus to Jerusalem, preceding the devil standing Jesus upon the temple heights. The third extension clause relates the devil finishing the temptations, preceding his subsequent departure.[481] As discussed in §2.4.1-2.4.1, extension clauses tend to provide circumstantial information that precedes the main clause. Extension clauses are backgrounded to the main clause and tend to be less prominent than comparative clause complexes of elaboration.

---

[479] Regarding the arrangement of clause complexes and clause simplexes, with C=complex and S=Simplex, the pattern is: S-C-S-C-S-S-C-S-C-S-S-S-C-C-S The scene operates in an alternating pattern, first the simplex followed by the clause complex. This order is maintained for the majority of the scene, except in vs. 13-14a where the order is reversed with the complex preceding the simplex.

[480] As discussed in Ch. II §4.2, participles prior to the main verb are backgrounded to the main verb, while participles that follow the main verb elaborate the action of the main verb.

[481] The participle itself does not connote time, which can only be derived from the context. The participle establishes a logical relationship, not a temporal one. Time is aspectual and related to the main verb of a clause. In simplest terms, the present participle denotes continuous time with the main verb (commonly translated 'while…') while the aorist denotes completed time to the main verb (commonly translated "when" or "after…"). Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, 624-627

The remaining three clause complexes are elaborating clauses in which case a clause restates, or clarifies, a head clause. Elaborating clauses are designated with the symbol =, and occur in vv. 1, 8, and 12.

Table 4.4.4b
Elaborating clauses represented in Luke 4:1-14a.

καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ/ ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.
 α   β=

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς/ εἶπεν αὐτῷ…
 β=   α

¹καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς/ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι …
 β=   α

The first elaborating clause provides an attendant circumstance of the Spirit's leading, clarifying that it was associated with forty days of testing. As noted in clausal analysis, special attention or focus is on the forty days, ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα. The second and third elaborating clauses, ἀποκριθεὶς…εἶπεν, also provide attendant circumstances, with ἀποκριθεὶς serving as a redundant or correlative marker to the aorist indicative, εἶπεν. As Chapter II §4 has shown, elaborating clauses typically signal that increased semantic weight is assigned to such clause complexes because there is an increase in processing associated with the main clause itself. These three elaborating clauses are marked as highly prominent with increased weight associated with Jesus' authoritative words and the temporal marker surrounding his temptations.

4.4.5. Luke 4:1-14a Scene Level

Scene analysis considers a variety of discourse features at a higher level than the clause. Scene analysis of Luke 4:1-14a considers five discourse features: i. verbal aspect, ii. participant referencing, iii. conjunctive use, iv. speech introducers, and v. finite verbal pattern.

Regarding verbal aspect, in vv. 1-2, two verbal tenses are presented, the aorist and the imperfect. The imperfective aspect typically encodes habitual activities such as a participant's thoughts and behaviors, and perceptually non-complete activities.[482] The imperfect is typically

---

[482] The imperfect in narrations serves three functions: to set the stage for the scene, provide offline details, or mark as prominent a forthcoming event through the historical present. Loney, "Narrative Structure," 18. From a rhetorical perspective, the imperfect may be used to foster vivid detail in a scene. "… one or more imperfective verbs or participles, (are) used, in part, to give background information subsidiary to the motion, but, more importantly, to evoke an internal perspective by which the audience is drawn into the story. This sequence of verbal aspect regularly opens a new episode and a similar 'vivid' imperfective ends it." Loney, "Narrative Structure," 18.

used to provide introductory circumstantial elements or behavioral activities that set the stage for subsequent information conveyed by aorist verbs. Accordingly, the only imperfect in this scene occurs in v. 1, conveying the circumstance surrounding Jesus' wilderness experience, that he was led by the Holy Spirit, καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. From this point onward, aorist verbs will govern the flow of activities since the perfective aspect is the mainline narrative form, providing the outline or backbone of a given scene, typically associated with foregrounded material in a narration scene.[483] A central concern is the identification of a particular aorist verb associated with Jesus' global action. Taking cues from discourse analysis so far, it appears that the global action is associated with Jesus' verbal response(s) to the devil. In fact, an analysis of speech introducers below will serve to clarify issues related to Jesus' speech.

Participant referencing is another issue for consideration. Chapter II §5.2 shows that anarthrous referencing serves for a variety of functions: i. first mention, ii. a switch of focus, iii. for contrast, with back-and-forth between participants, iv. selection, v. fixed expression, vi. when referring to members of a group. The default manner of presenting a new participant is to reference them in the anarthrous. In v. 2, the devil is presented in the articular, πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.[484] The new participant reference is unexpected, given that the devil has not been previously activated in Luke's Gospel as a narrative participant. This reference suggests that the devil is a known entity for Luke's audience, whose presence and activity would be presumed in Jesus' narrative world. In effect, by referencing the devil in the articular in v. 2, this formidable foe is waiting in the wings in any given Lukan scene.[485]

Conjunctive use serves to signal clausal relationships and provide narrative progression. As Chapter II §5.1 discussed, καί signals an equitized relationship among clauses, sentences, or even paragraphs and this conjunction is the unmarked discourse feature in Lukan narratives.

---

[483] As discussed in section §2.5.4, Clauses that present accomplishment or achievement tend to present foreground information in the narrative." Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 173-4. Consequently, mainline narration events in the perfective, are what box cars are to a train's engine, they "carry the freight." Relating this to rhetorical criticism, among the variety of verbal aspects in a given narration, all things being equal, perfective verbs tends to possess greater prominence than imperfective verbs.

[484] The article is omitted at first mention only with proper names.

[485] The use of articular referencing for the devil suggests that Luke's audience is Jewish because diabolic, supernatural opposition to God is common in the Jewish Scriptures, Numbers 22:21-39, Zechariah 3:1-10, and the Talmud in Shabbat 89a:6, Megillah 11b:12, Bava Batra 16a.

However, δέ is a marked discourse feature. One function is that it signals that a new step or development in a narration has begun. Similar to verbal aspect, conjunctive use is a perceptual choice by a given speaker, monitoring the audience to identify new and distinct material.[486] In this scene, besides signaling a point of departure in v. 1, the conjunctive δέ is also used in v. 3 and v. 9. In v. 3, δέ occurs at the devil's first specific challenge, Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος… The function here is that it signals a new step in the narration, with background information provided in vv. 1-2, the main elements in the narrative begin in v. 3ff. In other words, while vv. 1-2 presented information regarding Jesus wilderness temptations by the devil, those verses did not address the temptations in any specific way.[487] Subsequently, information from v. 3 zeros in on the temptations themselves, developing from abstract information about Jesus' temptations in vv. 1-2 to specific examples in vv. 3ff. The second instance of marking a new developmental unit with δέ occurs in v. 9, Ἤγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ, and the final unit of this scene addresses Jesus in Jerusalem.

There are three possibilities for why the second temptation is marked by καί, and therefore is not a new developmental unit.[488] One possibility is that this scene essentially provides two central temptations, both related to the theme of Jesus' sonship, which is supported by the fact that Jesus' sonship is explicitly addressed in the first and third temptation, in v. 3, Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰπὲ τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ ἵνα γένηται ἄρτος and in v 9, Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω. As seen in clausal analysis, special salience occurs with Jesus' sonship in v. 3 and 9. If this is the case, then the first two temptations are

---

[486] As discussed in Ch. II §5.1

[487] Culy, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook,* 129. "Every temptation" is somewhat unclear, as it can refer to: (1) additional temptations besides these three, (2) a hyperbole, (3) these three as representative of every type of temptation that might be encountered, (4) or solely a reference to the three temptations. These authors favor option 1, since the text indicates Jesus was in the wilderness for an extended period of temptation, that is, forty days. David E. Garland, *Exegetical Commentary on New Testament: Luke* (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 2011), 180. This project contends that the temporal indicator is not for chronological, but rather thematic purposes, to reflect David's contest with Goliath, which began only after forty days.

[488] One way to approach the developmental units is a series of concentric circles. That is, vv. 1-2 provides the basic contours of the temptation accounts, wherein vv. 3-8 provides a more intensive investigation of the first two, and vv. 9-14a provides the most intensive analysis, provided in the third temptation and subsequent withdrawal from the wilderness. Another way, a narratological approach, may employ three narrative units: equilibrium to disequilibrium to new equilibrium. The equilibrium provides preliminary and summary information regarding Jesus' encounter with the devil (vv. 1-2), the disequilibrium involves two temptations, stones to bread and the kingdom offer (vv. 3-8), while the new equilibrium involves the third temptation and the devil's departure from Jesus (vv. 9-14a).

equitized, addressing material elements pertaining to Jesus as the regal son, namely, sustenance and territory. However, the third temptation is distinct in addressing an immaterial value, pertaining to the son's regal honor.

The second possibility is that the temptation scene corresponds to notable participants in the Jewish scriptures. Forty days may be marked in order to signal correspondence between Jesus and those who experienced a forty temporal index, namely Noah, Moses, wandering Israel, David, and Elijah.[489] However, because δέ also occurs with Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, geographical issues may also be at work. In that respect, only one individual in the Jewish Scriptures is associated with both forty days within the wilderness and entrance into Jerusalem, namely, King David. This option will be discussed in more detail below.

The third possibility is that the two developmental units correspond not to a single individual, such as David alone, but rather to the broader canvas of Israel's history, from wilderness wanderings to entrance into the Promised Land, and beyond.[490] Luke's developmental units, from wilderness experiences to the Jerusalem Temple, correspond to ancient Israel's journey in the wilderness and finally leads to Jerusalem, integrating a variety of individuals as they later suit the Gospel of Luke's purposes.[491] Jesus' journey therefore represents a tying together of Israel history, recursively encompassing a wide variety of participants and movements. Which possibility is most likely can only be satisfactorily determined as successive Lukan scenes unfold.

Another discourse feature involves analysis of verbal exchanges, or what is called "speech introducers." The default pattern is such that when there is a first establishment of a relationship or engagement in narrative discourse then πρὸς αὐτὸν is used. αὐτῷ tends to follow the initial verbal engagement. In v.4, Jesus' reported speech follows this default

---

[489] For example: Noah and the forty days of flooding, Moses and Israel in the wilderness for forty years, David reigned for forty years with his base in Jerusalem, Elijah wandered for forty days in the wilderness. Consequently, Luke may also intend to incorporate the whole of Israel's history, that he fulfills the law and the prophets (Lk 24:24).

[490] The motif of Israel's wilderness wanderings may be seen in: ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (4:1).

[491] The structure is arranged topographically, progressing from wilderness (vv. 1-2), to heights (vv. 3-8), and finally to Jerusalem and the Temple (vv. 9-14a). Such an approach is plausibility in that Jesus' journey loosely reflects Israel's journeys from Egypt and the wilderness, to Moses' view of the promised land atop the mountain and ending in Jerusalem and the Temple. As representative of Israel's history, Jesus thereby follows the history of both Moses and David in their wilderness wanderings. Such correspondence aligns with the citations from the Jewish Scriptures regarding both Moses in Deuteronomy and David (Psalm 91 traditionally ascribed to either Moses or David).

pattern.[492] However, in vv. 3, 8, and 12, the devil does not follow this dialogical pattern, even though v. 3 depicts the devil's first encounter with Jesus, suggesting that the devil is portrayed as one who is somewhat detached, or distanced from Jesus, seeking to avoid a deeper dialogical engagement with Jesus. At the same time, because Jesus's verbal engagements adhere to Luke's default pattern, Jesus is portrayed as one who is actively involved in engaging the devil's challenges. Jesus has something important to say, and he does not distance himself from the verbal challenges presented to him by the devil.

Another discourse feature related to reported speech occurs in v. 8. Levinsohn notes that when ἀποκριθεὶς occurs in dialogue, it indicates "that the new speaker is seeking to take control of the conversation or to make an authoritative pronouncement."[493] This discourse feature is found in Jesus' responses in vv. 8 and 12. Jesus' retort conveys a pragmatic function, signaling that Jesus' response to the devil's challenges represents an authoritative pronouncement.[494] Levinsohn further observes that when a reported speech contains both ἀποκριθεὶς and εἶπεν as a cluster of verbs within a given clause, it represents a seizure of control of a previous speech. The fact that this feature only occurs in the final two temptations suggests that there is an increasing escalation in dialogue.[495] Jesus' engaging, and authoritative words are repeatedly highlighted in this scene. That vv. 8 and 12 represents an escalating and authoritative pronouncement surrounding Jesus' regal sonship gives credence to the notion that the two developmental units function to promote a specific correspondence between Jesus and David. As with Davidic narratives, Jesus' activities comprise both wilderness and Jerusalem, and focus on the notion of regal sonship.

The final component at the scene level of analysis is the structure of finite verbs. Following the work of Read-Heimderdinger and Rius-Camps, expounded in Chapter II §5.6, The Gospel of Luke commonly employs concentric or symmetrical patterns, with the central finite verb(s) conveying the centre point that is fundamental to the story. However, in this story, a developmental pattern occurs, A-B-C-D, and so on, with repeating letters that correspond to

---

[492] Read-Heimerdinger, "Introducing Direct Speech in Acts," Unpublished SBL Conference paper. San Diego, Nov. 2014.

[493] Stephen J. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 231.

[494] Stephen J. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 233.

[495] This escalation is also reflected in David's challenge with Goliath, where the third and final round of reported speeches is climactic (I Sam 17:44-47), with David indicating Goliath's utter destruction.

the verbal exchanges between the devil and Jesus.[496] In essence, this pattern indicates that the scene develops by linear, though not necessarily temporal, progression.[497] A developmental theme emerges throughout this scene, with each of Jesus' rebuttals iterating the notion of his regal sonship, while diabolic tension escalates and results in the devil's retreat. The scene develops the notion of Jesus' regal sonship, for in the midst of the temptations, Jesus authoritatively displays his allegiance to the Torah, leading to the devil's defeat and departure.

4.4.6. Luke 4:1-14a Rhetorical Analysis

Table 4.4.6
Summary of discourse analysis insights.

Clause Level: Constituent Order	Clause Level: Process Types	Clause Complex Level	Scene Level
Special salience: In focus: πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου Extra attention drawn to temporal marker: ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα Special salience on sonship: Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ In focus: attention turns to devil's departure/defeat: ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	Jesus is portrayed as the goal throughout this scene. The scene is comprised largely of material and verbal processes, with Jesus' three verbal processes (Torah fidelity) leading to spatial-temporal changes	There are three elaborating clause complexes with greater semantic weight, v. 2: ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου and vv. 8, 12: ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν.	Conjunctive δέ provides three developmental units: preliminary information to wilderness to Jerusalem. Jesus' reported speeches, at close of second developmental (v. 8) unit and in third (v. 12) are authoritative pronouncements Finite verbal pattern is progressive, eventuating with devil's departure

Rhetorical analysis of the passage requires identifying the form of the scene. According to the virtues of Theon's exercises, this scene constitutes a narration becuase the chief virtue of a narration is plausibility, prototypically consisting of six narration elements, person, action, time, place, manner, and cause. [498] In this scene all six narration elements are included, with

---

[496] Such analysis is reflected in the work of Read-Heimderdinger and Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration*, Introduction, vviii.

[497] Luke's Gospel does not demand chronological sequencing. Theon's handbook encourages placing of various narratives even within a given narrative to achieve a speaker's intent. Kennedy, *Progymnasmat*a: *Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 35.

[498] Because of the conclusive nature of each of Jesus' reported speeches in this scene, one may argue that in its original form there were three chreiai. If this is the case, vv.1-2 is circumstantial to the first chreia (vv. 1-4), vv. 5-7 circumstantial to the second chreia (vv. 5-8), and v. 9 circumstantial to the third chreia (vv. 9-12). All three chreiai constitute a saying-response chreia, discussed in Chapter III §2.1. Clause complex analysis reveals this earlier pattern, where the simplex disrupts the typical pattern of this scene appearing beside the S-C pattern (clause *simplex* to clause *complex*). Both disruptions occur with the conjunction δέ. The first simplex occurs at v. 3:

cause and manner expressed in Jesus' reported speeches. That is, Jesus is willing to submit to God's Law, for this is advantageous to him, as befitting a regal son. The virtues of conciseness and clarity are additional considerations in a narration. The virtue of clarity is such that a narration should avoid distracting the audience with superfluous content or style. Instead, the narration should lead the audience by means of a lucid description of subjects. Concurrently, the virtue of conciseness entails that lucidity and plausibility lead toward a chief point, the reason or intention of the narration. The findings in Table 4.4.6 have shown there are a number of lucid and highlighted elements that guide the exegete toward this scene's chief intention.[499] The global action must be incumbently identified, alongside marked narration elements that contribute toward this scene's rhetorical function which is promoting Jesus' praiseworthiness.

Theon's six elements provide the framework for this scene. The person is Jesus, who is the participant around whom all other participants orchestrate, namely, the Holy Spirit and the devil. More specifically, marked discourse features are associated with Jesus' regal sonship, Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ. The global action of Jesus, concurrent with the three temptations involves a singular response of commitment to God's Torah, with Jesus submitting to God's directives for him as a regal son.[500] That Jesus' three-fold response to the devil is the global action is supported in several ways. Among these, Jesus' reported speeches trigger the creative transformations for this scene, being portrayed as authoritative pronouncements as to what constitutes regal sonship, καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ. The time is the highlighted forty days, ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα, and the place, signaled by the conjunctive δέ, is the narration's progression from the wilderness to the temple, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ… εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ. Finally, because Jesus' action is located in reported speech, it is not surprising that manner and causality are expressed in his words. Following table 4.4.6, the authoritative pronouncement of Jesus constitutes a manner of willingness, his willingness to engage the devil. Likewise, the

---

Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος… The second simplex occurs twice in v. 9: Ἤγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἔστησεν ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ.

[499] The primary way to identify the chief point is to examine marked discourse features in a narration, signaling those elements which possess more weight. Those elements are more prominent and instrumental in providing a scene's chief point.

[500] Jesus' action should not be conceived as a transitive clause ("x did y to z"), but rather as intransitive ('x did y'). It is not a transformation process as a change of state of actor, but rather as a creative process, whereby the actor brings about a goal. Thompson, *Introducing Functional Grammar*, 97.

cause of Jesus' responses, the source of his creative transformative responses, exposes his deep commitment to God's reign as expressed in the Torah, Γέγραπται... Εἴρηται.

Among the multitude of narration elements, only marked discourse features are considered especially prominent and to be incorporated into the rhetorical function of this scene. At the same time, rhetorical criticism offers another benefit. While Jesus is praised in this scene for his commitment to God's reigning law, demonstrating Jesus' office as constituting true regal sonship, another one of Theon's exercises is relevant here, the syncrisis. As Chapter III §3.6 discussed, the syncrisis was a common literary technique that elucidated a particular virtue by way of comparing deeds between individuals. More specifically, Theon observed that: "… a syncrisis claims to identify simply the superiority of successful deeds".[501] By comparing the deed shared between two individuals, the relevant virtue under consideration was discovered, and one of the comparative individuals was displayed as more praiseworthy.[502]

Applying the syncrisis to this Lukan scene involves two issues. First, identifying the individual being compared, and second, in what manner Jesus' deed is shown as more praiseworthy. The marked discourse features identified throughout the levels of analysis reveal that Jesus is compared to King David. Both individuals were anointed by God's Spirit, πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, associated with a temporal marker, ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα, faced a formidable foe who was consequently defeated, ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, both journeyed from the wilderness to Jerusalem, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ… εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ, and in both narrations, the issue of sonship featured prominently, Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ.[503] Finally, the issue

---

[501] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 53.

[502] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 53. Theon writes: "Syncrisis is language setting the better or the worse side by side. There are syncrises both of persons and of things. An example involving persons is a comparison of Ajax to Odysseus, of things a comparison of wisdom and bravery. Since, however, we give preference to one of the persons by looking at their actions, and at anything else about them that is good, the method would be the same in both cases. First, let it be specified that syncrises are not comparisons of things having a great difference between them: for someone wondering whether Achilles or Thersites was braver would be laughable. Comparisons should be of likes and where we are in doubt which should be preferred because no evident superiority of one to the other." *Progymnasmata,* 52-55. Duff, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*, 250-256. Duff notes that the principal intention of syncrisis is ethical. A syncrisis might be presented as two distinct narrative accounts, each character considered in turn, or combined together into one narrative account. *Progymnasmata,* 55

[503] In other words, Luke may give prominence to David in this scene, while also incorporating elements associated with Elijah, in order to lead into facets of Jesus' mission that go beyond his regal sonship. If this is the case, Luke is summing up the correspondence between Jesus and David, while at the same time opening interpretive horizons for comparing Jesus to famed Jewish prophets, namely Moses and Elijah. The LXX reads: καὶ ἔλαβεν Δαυιδ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου καὶ ἤνεγκεν αὐτὴν εἰς Ιερουσαλημ (1 Sam. 17:54).

of David's sonship is of fundamental concern for both Saul and Abner even as it forms the basis for the devil's temptations.[504]

With the correspondence between Jesus and David established, comparing the global action of each character, defeating Goliath and the devil respectively, is necessary. While both acted as regally anointed sons, the differences are instructive. In the case of Jesus, he vanquished by the words of Torah, but in the case of David, stone, sling and sword were all utilized. While David expresses a confidence in God, his material victory derives from a sling, stone, and sword. Jesus' regal reign, however, is markedly superior, for he alone commands and transforms events solely by his words of Torah fidelity. In this manner, Jesus is portrayed as the greater regal son.[505] Now that the syncrisis has been considered, one can return to the chief point of this narration: Jesus' verbally authoritative fidelity to the Torah demonstrates the he is a true regal son, for in maintaining God's reign in this manner, he surpasses even King David.

4.5 Luke 4:14b-29
4.5.1. Luke 4:14b-29 Discourse Boundary

4.14b καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ᾽ ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ

Utilizing insights from discourse analysis, Luke 4:14b-29 constitutes a new scene.[506] Support for such textual boundaries includes the following factors:

1. Fronting the noun, καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν, serves as a point of departure, anchoring this scene so that the following information correlates back to expanding reports about Jesus. In similar manner, the pre-verbal fronting in 4:30, serves as the point of departure for the

---

[504] I Samuel 17:55-58.

[505] Moses failed in striking the rock and so failed to enter the promised Land, as did many in ancient Israel in the wilderness wandering. David, who staved off temptations in his wilderness wanderings, succumbed increasingly and tragically to temptations in the royal city of Jerusalem, as expressed in 2 Samuel 11-12, 24. Elijah is certainly not without defect as evidenced in 1 Kings 19:9-21. At the same time, for a Jewish audience Jesus' ability to successfully reenact Israel's history demonstrates the legitimacy of Luke's claims about his Messiahship. He subsumes all of Israel's history, surpassing expectations.

[506] The NA-28 text and many commentaries do not separate these two scenes in the same location. The NA-28 clearly distinguishes vv.1-13 from v14ff, a point that will be developed in Ch. VI.

subsequent scene, αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.[507] In other words, Jesus' protection by God provides the orienting theme for vv. 30-37.[508]

2. Regarding verbal tense-aspect pattern, the aorist precedes the imperfect, ἐξῆλθεν in v.14a and ἐδίδασκεν in v.15. The aorist-imperfect pattern is typical Lukan when introducing a new scene.[509]

3. Regarding thematic distinctions, this scene orchestrates around the theme of news or report. Thematically, φήμη is the information anchor for vv.14b-29.

4. Concerning spatial-temporal distinctiveness, Jesus is no longer in the Judean wilderness or Jerusalem, but rather in his hometown of Nazareth, with a new cast of characters.

4.5.2. Luke 4:14b-29 Clause Level

Only those clauses in Luke 4:14b-29 which contain a disruption of the natural flow of information, with particular attention on highlighted constituents are examined. Analysis below begins with non-verbal marked clauses, and then proceeds to marked clauses within reported speech.

---

[507] In 4.14b, φήμη is neither explicit nor implicit in the text since the temptation is a private event. φήμη does not anchor back to the previous narrative unit. Because it is not a pre-verbal contrast (the contrast in 4.1-14a has been between Jesus and the devil.), it also does not belong to the 4.1-14a. This means that the only other reason for pre-verbal fronting is that it signals a new scene, anchoring successive information to φήμη. As an anchor for subsequent material, it prepares the reader with the supposition that καὶ φήμη will be thematically integral to this scene, supported both (1) by the length of Jesus' verbal processes (considerably longer then 4:1-14a), (2) his teaching activity (ἐδίδασκεν in v.15) and (3) the result of such, identified by crowd responses (δοξαζόμενος, ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες, ἐμαρτύρουν, ἐθαύμαζον).

[508] As discussed in Ch. II §2, this is one of those instances in which Lukan textual boundaries do not comport with modern sensibilities. However, since discourse analysis provides the exegete with testable and empirically-based linguistic criteria, Lukan exegesis may need to reconsider long-standing assumptions, specifically, that Jesus' rescue from the Nazareth crowds is not included within the boundaries of this present scene. The fore-fronting of a participant, alongside the conjunction δέ, indicates that v. 30 signals a new point of departure. The verb in its usual first position in v.31 does not allow that verse to be seen as a boundary marker, as shown in Ch. II. §2 and 3.1. The reason why such a boundary occurs at 4:29 and not 4:30, however, necessitates the additional resource of rhetorical criticism. Moreover, as Ch. III §3.3 has shown, Theon's narration exercise focuses on the global action of a given Lukan scene. As such, including the information about Jesus' release from the crowds in the present scene could thereby obscure or detract from the global action surrounding Jesus' Nazareth announcement. The result would be a reduction in the effectiveness of the narration related to its chief point and especially as it relates to the narration virtues of clarity and conciseness.

[509] As noted in Ch. II, §2.2.

As noted in §5.1 above, the first marked clause, καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν, signals a point of departure for this scene. The importance of this anchoring theme is particularly evident in vv. 18-19, where proclamation is underscored as central to Jesus' mission, εὐαγγελίσασθαι… κηρύξαι. The second marked clause, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν is for focus, redirecting attention from news about Jesus to his proclamation activity in the synagogue.[510] Similarly, another switch of focus occurs in v. 20, καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν. Here focus turns from Jesus' announcement of Isaianic fulfillment to the crowds' response to his announcement.[511] Because the crowds are in focus in v. 20, the next marked clause in v. 22 in highlighted, regarding the amazed response of the crowds, Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ.

Regarding reported speech, marked order for focus occurs in v. 24, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. In this instance, the default pattern of core to periphery constituent order is disrupted with, οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός.[512] Special salience is given to the notion of acceptability, Jesus the prophet will not be received well. In this manner, while previous Lukan scenes have identified Jesus' sonship by means of his regal office, this scene addresses his prophetic sonship. The crowd's marked response in v. 22 reflects this notion: Οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος.

A pattern emerges among the marked constituents. Beginning with vv. 15-19, focus is on Jesus' teaching authority, particularly related to his reading of Isaianic blessings. However, in v. 20 focus turns to the crowd's response to Jesus' announcement of fulfillment, καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν. In turn, Jesus relates that Isaianic blessing have been fulfilled in their hearing in v. 21. Focus then turns back to the crowd's amazed

---

[510] While the dissemination of news regarding Jesus is the topic of v.14b, in v. 15, it is the person of Jesus who redirects the topic, signaled by καὶ αὐτὸς and with special salience. Functionally, the reader is redirected, from general report of consequence, to the person and particular activity of Jesus, and as vv. 15-29 reveals, activities that provide a correspondence between Jesus and Israel's sacred texts and prophets.

[511] In addition, by fronting πάντων in this clause, Luke's Gospel focuses on the significance that Jesus' words have on the synagogue crowd, underscoring that the whole of them were affected. That such a clause is in focus presupposes v. 16, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν, namely, that a crowd has been present. The crowds were thus identifiable, but not activated until this clause. To use a camera analogy, this clause has taken the camera's field of view off Jesus and placed it on the crowds. This represents what is meant by the *contrast* for discourse analysts. But included with contrast, is the pragmatic effect of focus.

[512] Constituent order as was discussed in Ch. II, §5.1.

response in v. 22, Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ, leading the crowds to respond, Οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος. Finally, with Jesus' sonship contested by the crowds, Jesus reported speech is marked in v. 24, addressing his prophetic office as one rejected, οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.

By marking various constituents in vv. 20-22, Jesus' prophetic pronouncements are highlighted, particularly his claim of ushering in Isaianic blessings. Marking the crowds responses in vv. 20-22 to Jesus' claims highlights the effect his words have upon them, drawing Luke's audience into the forcefulness of Jesus' words.[513] Second, the back and forth pattern among marked clauses, from Jesus to the crowds, serves to highlight Jesus' prophetic sonship as the primary issue of contention, while also keeping the crowds in focus, accentuating their response and growing rejection of his claims. In this regard, the final marked elements in the reported speech in vv. 25-27 are worth noting. Jesus states:

v. 25: πολλαὶ χῆραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις…

v. 26: καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμφθη…

v. 27: καὶ πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου,

v. 27: καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθ…

As seen in vv. 25-27, the marked order accentuates issues of quantity, that is, the number of participants involved in affirmation and negation, the "many" to the "none." Runge calls such a pattern a point/counterpoint. He notes: "The effect of creating a set, removing all members of the set, and then adding one member back is to attract additional attention to the excepted items, attention that it would not otherwise have received."[514] Jesus' reported speech highlights affirmative propositions, there were many Israelites in need, πολλαὶ χῆραι ἦσαν … καὶ πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν, while the negative sets, the recipients of blessing, receive extra

---

[513] There is an alternating pattern surrounding the nature of Jesus in this sequence. While the heavenly voice conferred regal sonship on Jesus, the devil will challenge his regal sonship to God. In this scene, Jesus' sonship is associated with his prophetic office, and in the subsequent scene, the demons will challenge his prophetic office, particularly in v. 34.

[514] Runge, Discourse Grammar, 86. Runge goes on to note: "The pragmatic effect of using the negation + exception/restriction is to highlight the restricted element because of its significance to the discourse." 87. The series of affirmations to negations is one way in which Luke's Gospel conveys the concept of unexpectedness and surprise. This comes by way of particles or the nominative subject (of εἰμι) expressing polarity (ðïëëáì… ïûäåìò). Beyond discourse material in Luke, the theme of unexpectedness is presented in other Lukan text types, such as parable (Luke 14:16-24) and poetry (Luke 1:46-5). Litotes are also a Lukan device (15:13)

attention, καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμφθη… καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθ… In this case, it is the excepted set, consisting of a Sidonian widow and Namaan, who receive the extra attention.[515]

Because the excepted set is limited to Gentiles, there is an anticipation that Jesus' ministry will attend to those beyond the borders of Israel, or at least, those on the fringes of Judaism.[516] If such is the case, then Jesus' ministry will reverse normal expectations, consistent with the response of the Nazareth crowds who reject his claim to usher in Isaianic blessings. Luke's Gospel may serve to further indict the synagogue crowds, or more generally those within Luke's audience. For in their rejection of Jesus the prophet they may be reflecting Israel's spiritual plight associated with their pre-dated rejection of Elijah and Elisha's ministries. In any case, if Jesus's prophetic office is as he claims, then the crowd's rejection of Jesus entails a rejection of Israel's prophetic tradition.[517]

4.5.3. Luke 4:14b-29 Process Type Analysis Level

Table 4.5.3
Process types in Luke 4:14b-29.

Sayer	Verbal Process	Target	Naming	Projection
	ἐξῆλθεν	καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχ ώρου	καὶ φήμη	περὶ αὐτοῦ
καὶ αὐτὸς	ἐδίδασκεν	ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν		

Behaver	Behavioral Process	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
ὑπὸ πάντων	δοξαζόμενος	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(he-Jesus)	Καὶ ἦλθεν		εἰς Ναζαρά
(he-Jesus)	ἦν τεθραμμένος		οὗ
(he-Jesus)	καὶ εἰσῆλθεν		κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν
(he-Jesus)	καὶ ἀνέστη		ἀναγνῶναι

---

[515] In the scene that follows, while there are many synagogue attendants, only an excised man material receives benefit from Jesus.

[516] In other words, the case is not only that of highlighting the singular member from a negated set, but also involves the appositions that marks one set from the others; in this case the set of two gentiles and the set of corporate Israel.

[517] Luke 11:45-52 reflects the notion of prophetic rejection.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Recipient/Beneficiary	Circumstance
	καὶ ἐπεδόθη	βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἠσαΐου	αὐτῷ	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(he-Jesus)	καὶ ἀναπτύξας	τὸ βιβλίον	
(he-Jesus)	εὗρεν	τὸν τόπον	οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον…
(he-Jesus)	καὶ πτύξας	τὸ βιβλίον	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Recipient/Beneficiary	Circumstance
(he)	ἀποδοὺς	(τὸ βιβλίον)	τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(he-Jesus)	ἐκάθισεν		

Behaver	Behavioral Process	Behaviour, Phenomenon, Circumstance
καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ	ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες	αὐτῷ.

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(he-Jesus)	ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν	πρὸς αὐτοὺς		ὅτι Σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν	

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
Καὶ πάντες	ἐμαρτύρουν	αὐτῷ

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
(καὶ πάντες)	καὶ ἐθαύμαζον	ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(he-Jesus)	ἐκπορευομένοις		τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος		ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ
(καὶ πάντες)	καὶ ἔλεγον			Οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος	
(he-Jesus)	καὶ εἶπεν	πρὸς αὐτούς		Πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην…	
(he-Jesus)	εἶπεν δέ			Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν…	

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
πάντες ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ	καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν	θυμοῦ

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(καὶ πάντες)	ἀκούοντες	ταῦτα

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(πάντες)	ἀναστάντες		
(πάντες)	ἐξέβαλον	αὐτὸν	ἔξω τῆς πόλεως
(πάντες)	καὶ ἤγαγον	αὐτὸν	ἕως ὀφρύος τοῦ ὄρους
	ᾠκοδόμητο	ἡ πόλις… αὐτῶν	τοῦ ὄρους ἐφ' οὗ
(πάντες)	ὥστε κατακρημνίσαι	αὐτόν	ὥστε

Because process types represent a system selection for the depiction of happenings, the principle of choice implies meaning is relevant at this level of analysis. Accordingly, an investigation is warranted regarding the six process types; including frequency and overall pattern within a given scene. In this present scene, the order and frequency in which the process types occur is: verbal (2x), behavioral (1x), material (10x), behavioral (1x), verbal (1x), behavioral (1x), mental (1x), verbal (4x), mental (1x), behavioral (1x), material (5x).

Related to frequency, the material process occurs 15 times, the most of any process type, though not unexpected since narrations utilize material representation in order to sequence change amidst external representations. In keeping with the previous scene, the second most frequent process type is the verbal, occurring seven times. There are four behavioral processes and two mental processes. Among the six process types available, two are absent; the existential that predicates an existence or an occurrence, and the relational process, that expresses "be-ing" by relationship, or that displays class characteristics or identification.

The material process explains the way happenings occur. Change may occur in two ways, a transformation process, representing a change in state of an actor or participant, or change may occur through a creative process, as goal-obtainment. Both this scene and the previous one depicts change as goal-attainment, or Jesus' verbal process of proclamation resulting in his desired outcome, with subsequent response from the crowd. Consistent with the temptation scene, in this scene the verbal processes precede the material processes, that is, changes occur in the material state of affairs only after initiating verbal processes, which may lend support to the notion that Jesus' verbal process constitutes the global action.

Patterns also occur in the process types in this order: verbal-behavioral-material-behavioral-verbal-behavioral-mental-verbal-mental-behavioral-material. The material process

occurs near the beginning and end of this scene and is entirely absent in the middle. In contrast, the verbal process not only initiates the scene but is also prominent in the middle portions. The verbal process precedes all the other processes on three separate occasions, serving as initiator, that which activates the other representations. The behavioral process occurs on three separate occasions, representing psychosomatic activities on the part of the crowds, and subsequent to Jesus' verbal activities.

Finally, vv. 20-22 are distinctive insofar as this portion of the scene contains a distinctly compressed conglomeration of four process types, including the material (ἐκάθισεν), behavioral (ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες), verbal (ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν), behavioral (ἐμαρτύρουν), and mental (ἐθαύμαζον). Such a conglomeration has not occurred in previous scenes, and in virtue of such distinctiveness, vv. 20-22 is marked. Surveying the process construals in vv. 20-22 illuminates the wide variety of happenings: external input to physiological and psychological representation, then exchanges of meaning, next, physiological and psychological representations, and last, inner/mental experiences of consciousness.

4.5.4. Luke 4:14b-29 Clause Complex Level

Clause complexes tend to be more marked than simplexes in virtue of the additional processing energy required with the associated head clause. Elaborating clauses complexes are most marked. [518] In this scene, six of the seventeen finite main verbs include a clause complex, while the rest are clause simplexes. Of these six clause complexes, only three are elaborating.[519] Due to their increased prominence only these three elaborating clauses are analysed below.

The first elaborating clause occurs in v. 15, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων, following the main verb, ἐδίδασκεν. In this case, the elaborating clause provides an attendant circumstance, that is, Jesus' teaching was attended by praise. The next elaborating clause occurs in v. 22, τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. By following the main verb, ἐθαύμαζον elaborates the marvel of the synagogue crowd as it relates to hearing Jesus' announcement of Isaianic fulfilment. The final elaborating clause occurs in v. 28, ἀκούοντες

---

[518] Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*, 129.

[519] In addition, there are two embedded clauses in v. 16a and 29b. If one includes periphrastic participles and infinitives, then nine of the seventeen finite verbs include dependent clauses.

ταῦτα, and follows the main verb, ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ. All three clause complexes show Jesus' verbal announcements that arouse the crowds, and in escalating opposition, his words inciting them to praise, then wonderment, and finally, rage. As clause analysis has observed, Jesus' prophetic office associated with rejection is marked. Consistent with this notion, the elaborating clause complexes highlight Jesus as both an authoritative prophet who generates internal and external changes in the crowds, as well as one rejected, as the crowd's response develops negatively, eventuating with rage.[520]

4.5.5. Luke 4:14b-29 Scene Level

Scene level analysis involves examining conjunctive use, verbal aspect, and verbal patterns. Whereas the conjunction καί occurs 16 times in this scene, the conjunctive δέ occurs only once, in v. 21, ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι… The singular presence of δέ, as a marked discourse feature, merits attention. As shown in Chapter II §5.1, the conjunction δέ in Luke's Gospel signals either the introduction of a new scene, or a developmental unit within a given scene. In v. 21, a new developmental unit occurs as Jesus announces that Isaianic blessings have been inaugurated in his presence. While the crowds responded with praise at Jesus' words previously, the scene abruptly spirals downward with the use of δέ in v. 21 on the part of the crowds as amazement turns to questioning his sonship in v. 22 and eventuates with the crowd's rage in v. 28.

Functionally, δέ in v. 21 serves to distinguish two units in this scene, comprising two different responses from the crowds to two announcements by Jesus. In the first unit, Jesus reads Isaiah's blessings with the subsequent eyes of the crowds riveted upon him. However, in the second unit, Jesus relates that those blessings have arrived in their hearing and with his prophetic ministry, consequently, the crowds now wonder, question, and finally, rage. These two units portray the crowds in two very different ways, for while they are highly favorable to Jesus' initial reading of Isaianic fulfillment, they become highly antagonistic toward any 'son' who presumes to mediate those blessings.

Verbal aspect is another component of scene analysis. As noted in Chapter 2 §5.4, the aorist verb, as perfective aspect, serves to carry the storyline forward as the default pattern for narrative development. The distribution of aorist verbs throughout this scene confirms this point as thirteen of the seventeen verbs in this scene are aorist verbs. This scene is distinctive in

---

[520] Luke 5-6 follows the same trajectory as it relates to the Pharisees responses to Jesus: wonder and praise (5:21-22), then question and grumbling (5:30), and last, rage (6:11).

that four imperfects occur, compared to the previous scene where the imperfect only occurred once at the scene's commencement.

The first imperfect occurs in v. 15a, αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν. As noted in §5.1 above, the imperfect is typically used in Luke's Gospel when introducing a new scene. However, of the three remaining imperfects, all three occur within vv. 20-22. In v. 20 there is an imperfect periphrastic, καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ. And then twice the imperfect occurs in v. 22, Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος.

As Chapter 2 §5.4 has also shown, besides introducing circumstances at the start of a scene, the imperfect can function to draw an audience into a narration by providing an immediate perspective of certain elements, specifically behavioral processes. Verses 20-22 provides interior and perceptual information, drawing an immediate or close perspective on the crowds as they respond to Jesus' announcement of Isaianic fulfilment.

Finally, this Lukan scene is arranged concentrically (A, B, C, B', A'). In a concentric pattern of finite verbs, identifying the central finite verb is critical because the central element is "...the point that the narrator wants to emphasize as fundamental for this part of the story."[521] In the N-A text, by numeric count of finite verbs in this scene, the concentric center is in v. 20, καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ. As such, the crowd's response to Jesus' words provides the central element for the scene. Consistent with the case of both analyses, prominent elements are located within vv. 20-22.

As the findings of discourse analysis draw to a close, and because vv. 20-22 contains so many marked features, Table 4.5.5 presents all the marked features. For clarity, special salience in constituent order is bolded, the imperfects are italicized, the conjunctive δέ is underlined, and the concentric center is noted in brackets.

Table 4.5.5
All marked features in Luke 4:14b-29.

καὶ **πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ** ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ. [concentric center of the scene]

ἤρξατο <u>δὲ</u> λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι… (Isaianic blessings fulfilled today)

---

[521] Read-Heimderdinger and Rius Camps, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*, xviii.

Καὶ **πάντες** ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ

καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος

καὶ ἔλεγον

Οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος (marked reported speech)

As is evident in the table above, many marked features occur within vv. 20-22. This portion of the scene demonstrates happenings through a distinctive conglomeration of process types; the behavioral, verbal, behavioral, mental, and verbal. With these observations in place, and vv. 20-22 clearly marked as highly prominent, rhetorical criticism will incorporate these findings through text-external considerations.

4.5.6. Luke 4:14b-29 Rhetorical Analysis

Table 4.5.6
All marked discourse features in Luke 4:14b-29.

Clause Level: Constituent Order	Clause Level: Process Types	Clause Complex Level	Scene Level
Special salience: καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ (v. 20) Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ (v. 22) οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν (v. 24) Point-counterpoint series (vv. 25-27) regarding opposition	As with the previous scene, verbal material process occurs often, with the verbal process as transformative A conglomerate of four processes occurs in vv. 20-22 as inward and outward construal of happenings	There are two distinct clause complex locations. The first occurs in v. 20, immediately prior to the special salience. The second occurs in vss. 28-29, regarding the angered response of the crowds to Jesus' words.	Four imperfects, the first in v. 15a, and the other three in vss. 20-22 that provide near perspective. Conjunctive δέ occurs in vs. 21, immediately prior to his fulfilment announcement. The concentric center is v. 20.

This present scene constitutes a narration exercise according to Theon's classification. Primary support derives from the fact that a wide variety and pattern of process types occur, as well as a large number of marked discourse features. Since this scene constitutes a narration exercise, global action must be identified first, as well as how marked narration elements contribute to the rhetorical intention. However, in this scene another rhetorical exercise occurs, the ecphrasis. Because the ecphrasis is explored following further narration analysis because it is a subset of the narration exercise.

According to Theon, the ecphrasis is "…descriptive language, bringing what is portrayed clearly before the sight."[522] The ecphrasis occurs twice in this scene, within vv. 20-22. Such visual imagery is provided by a rich variety of internal and psychological-physiological process types, consisting of elaborating clause complexes as well as the imperfective use. Visual imagery becomes activated, drawing the audience to key elements within the scene, and from a rhetorical standpoint, such objects or events are forcibly impressed upon the soul.[523]

The first ecphrasis occurs in v. 20 and is proleptic to Jesus' fulfillment announcement in v. 21, drawing the reader into close proximity to the crowd's physiological staring at Jesus, καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ.[524] The second ecphrasis, in v. 22, immediately follows Jesus' announcement of fulfilling Isaianic blessings. In this case, vivid description turns to the crowd's gazing, in particular, at Jesus' mouth from which he uttered Isaianic fulfillment,

καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.[525]

According to Theon's classification of the ecphrasis, vv. 20-22 represents two ecphrases of event, that is, visual descriptions that surround Jesus' announcement in v. 21. As an event, focus is on temporal happenings that surround Jesus' proclamation,

---

[522] *Progymnasmata*, 45.

[523] Rhetorical exercises have included a mixed chreia in 3:21-22, a genealogical encomion in 3:23-38, and a narration that incorporates a syncrisis in 4:1-14a.

[524] For, while εἶδεν is common in Luke for sensory experience (Luke 5:2), it is replaced here by presenting the physical organs. This is followed by another imperfect with special salience, Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ, and immediately after, and once again, the physical organ presented, rather than, the common, εἶπεν: καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. In narratological terms, an ecphrasis serves to slows down narrative time, in order to focus upon certain narration elements.

[525] In the first instance, vivid attention is on the crowd's eyes, that they are firmly fixed on Jesus. In the second instance, vividness addresses Jesus' mouth, from which his gracious words of fulfillment flow. In both cases, the representation is a vivid sensory experience, an "all-but-seeing" consisting of oral and aural descriptions that zoom in, from the crowd's eyes then proceed to Jesus' lips, orchestrating to and from Jesus' verbal proclamation. By bracketing two ecphrasis around Jesus' fulfillment proclamation, Luke's Gospel slows down narrative time to heighten the visual experience, accentuating Jesus' momentous announcement event in v. 21, Σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶ.

Σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν.[526] By bracketing two ecphrases around Jesus' verbal event, one in v. 20 and one in v. 22, the visual experience draws the reader into such moments highlighting Jesus' solemn announcement in v. 21. From a rhetorical standpoint, the ecphrasis event has forcibly impressed itself upon the members of Luke's audience, compelling them to closely and carefully consider the weight of Jesus' announcement, that Isaiah's blessings are realized in himself.

Keeping in mind that the two event ecphrases occur within vv. 20-22 and that the majority of the marked discourse features occur there as well, as indicated in Table 4.5.6, the global action of this scene occurs with Jesus' proclamation in v. 21. The global action is a verbal action wherein Jesus conveys that as God's anointed, he actualizes the blessings envisioned by the prophet Isaiah.

Table 4.5.6 further assists the exegete by identifying what narration elements are prominent in this scene, including person, time, place, manner, and cause. Table 4.5.6 indicates that the narration element of person is a marked narration element, specifically, Jesus' person related to his sonship office in v. 22, Οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος. For the crowds, Jesus' sonship provides the necessary support for their less than positive response to his proclamation in v. 21.[527] Jesus' sonship therefore serves an important rhetorical purpose in this scene. Jesus' sonship is prominent in this scene is not surprising, since previously analysed scenes have also registered Jesus' sonship as prominent. In turn, Jesus' sonship relates to a validation of his office. However, while previous scenes addressed Jesus office as regal son, this scene turns to address Jesus' prophetic sonship with the marked constituent order in v. 24, οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν. Support for prominence given to Jesus' prophetic sonship was also displayed in the marked discoure features in vv. 24-27. In that portion, Jesus' prophetic ministry corresponds to Elijah and Elisha with a point-counterpoint speech, highlighting that his prophetic blessings, the many to the one, coincide with rejection from the people.

---

[526] Seen in this way, the direct speeches that follow this unit serve to elaborate this central element of v. 21, which the crowds subsequently challenge in v.22b. Levinsohn notes that v. 24 is a comment on vv. 22b-23 and that v. 21 is the culminating speech of the first unit which began in v. 18. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 267-269.

[527] While v. 20 may suggest a wondering gaze, the crowd's subsequent reported speech is dismissive, Οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος. The construal of processes, the mental to the verbal process of the crowd, signifies that the crowd was not admiring Jesus, since the verbal is a mental action represented by the additional verbal process as exchange.

Jesus' global action in v. 21 constitutes a verbal process whereby Jesus' words create transformational changes on the part of the crowds that hear him, ranging from amazement in v. 20, to questioning in v. 22, and ending with rage in vv. 28-29. Verbal creative change functions to align Jesus precisely within Israel's prophetic tradition. Like the prophets of old, Jesus' anointed ministry fundamentally consists of verbal authority, despite the opposition that such authority provokes. With all the marked features orchestrated around the global action, the chief point of this scene can be stated: Jesus' announcement of mediating Isaianic blessings demonstrates that he is a prophetic son whose ministry, like Elijah and Elisha, is both surprising and provoking in opposition.

Because previous scenes displayed Jesus' regal sonship by means of the syncrisis exercise, comparing Jesus to King David, the comparison of Jesus to Elijah and Elisha is fitting, supported by Luke's Gospel's sequence pattern.[528] In the first scene, Jesus was confirmed as the regal son of God, with Psalm 2 instrumental in his experience of baptismal anointing. Scripture provided the fundamental informational framework of Jesus' personhood, that he is God's regal son. Subsequently, Jesus was compared to King David, demonstrating that Jesus' global action, defeating the devil's challenges, exceeded King David's actions against Goliath. In this present scene, Scripture again provides the fundamental framework for understanding Jesus, but this time the issue is not his regal sonship, but rather his prophetic sonship. Naturally then, subsequent scenes will attend to Jesus' prophetic office, seeking to demonstrate that his prophetic sonship meets or exceeds the activities of Elijah and Elisha.

4.6 Luke 4:30-37

4.6.1. Luke 4:30-37 Discourse Boundary

4.30 αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.

Luke 4:30-37 constitutes a new scene. Support is provided by means of the following marked discourse features:

---

[528] If there is a syncrisis here there are two immediate possibilities. One is a comparison between Jesus and the Nazareth crowds, involving the action of Jesus, as he seeks to adhere to Israel's sacred texts in comparison to the synagogue crowd's response to the sacred texts, with initial favor (vv. 20-22), then animosity (vv. 28-29). This suggestion is consistent with the rhetoric of 4:1-14a, demonstrating Jesus' superior fidelity to God's words comparative to his predecessors. The same theme extends well beyond this scene (5:14, 31-31, 6:1-5, 7:22-28, 10:25-29, 11:29-54, Ch. 20). More explicit is the comparison between Jesus and the prophets, Elijah and Elisha. See: John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph VerHeyden, eds., *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014).

1. Pre-verbal noun fronting, αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν, provides a frame of reference for what follows, so that v. 30 marks a new contextual unit. v. 30 anchors this narrative unit cohesively, involving Jesus' outward mission of proclamation.[529]

2. Choice to use a participle referring to the escape downgrades the importance of the action.[530]

3. The inclusio in this scene begins at v. 30 ἐπορεύετο… and ends with v. 37 ἐξεπορεύετο.

4. Use of δέ which is used to signal either a new narrative scene, or to signal a developmental unit within a narrative unit.

5. Verbal tense-aspect, imperfect to aorist is a typical Lukan pattern for introducing a new scene- …ἐπορεύετο… καὶ κατῆλθεν… This pattern has been common in several of the Lukan scenes previously examined.

6. Concerning thematic distinctions, this unit departs from the proclamation theme of the previous scene, and instead features a particular activity within Jesus' proclamation of 4:18-19, that is, setting captives free.

7. Regarding spatial-temporal considerations, while Jesus remains the main participant, he nevertheless departs from Nazareth in v. 30 and relocates to a new place, Capernaum, and with this location, a new cast of participants are introduced.

4.6.2. Luke 4:30-37 Clause Level

As with previous scenes, not every clause will be examined, but only those that signal a disruption of information flow, particularly those clauses that receive extra attention by their marked constituent order and are thereby ranked as prominent among the narration elements. In this scene, marked clauses occur three times.

The first marked clause occurs at the start of this scene in v. 30, αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο. In this case, fronting the pre-verbal noun signals a point of departure for this scene. Jesus and his activity thereby provide the anchor or frame of reference for this new scene. The second marked clause occurs in v. 32, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. In this case, fronting the pre-verbal constituents,

---

[529] The alternative justification, fronting for focus, is not the case since Jesus' departure is not informational in the previous scene. Instead, Jesus' miraculous escape serves as the basis for what follows in vv. 30-37.

[530] Randall Buth, "Participles as Pragmatic Choice" in *The Greek Verb Revisited*, Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch eds., (Bellingham, Washington: Lexham Press), 281-282, 305. Stephen Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek* (Dallas Texas: SIL International, 2000), 172-173.

ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ, signals that extra attention is given to Jesus' authority as it pertains to his teaching. Authority is highlighted either because it assumes a given social-literary context that the author and audience share, or because the information is unexpected and so arrests the reader's attention. This second possibility cannot be the case; it is not unexpected information, particularly since Jesus' verbal authority has already been showcased in the previous scenes, both in Nazareth and in the wilderness. The authority of Jesus presumes certain social or literary contexts shared by the author and audience. As the previous scene has suggested, if Jesus is being compared to Elijah and Elisha, then the author and audience would anticipate that this scene displays his verbal authority as a prophet.

The third marked clause occurs in v. 33,

καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου. The immediate context suggests Jesus' teaching ministry occurs in the synagogue. The information about the synagogue is therefore not unexpected but rather highlighted, taking what was fuzzy in the scene, and bring it to the forefront. By highlighting the synagogue, extra attention is on the synagogue as the locus of Jesus' teaching authority. If Luke 4:14b-29 helps to determine the context, then highlighting the synagogue may serve two purposes. First, it may serve to prepare the reader for another synagogue confrontation, made possible since Luke's Gospel tends to portray the synagogue as the prototypical locus of receptivity or antagonism towards Jesus.[531] Second, highlighting the synagogue may serve to provide a contrast between what constitutes holiness and unholiness. In this case, the synagogue is associated with Jewish sacred activity, namely, assembling to meaningfully engage the Jewish Scriptures. However, this very location is where an unclean demon is housed. Consequently, the intention in Luke's Gospel might be to stress that holiness is not affixed to a particular location, but rather resides in the person or activity of Jesus. There is a pattern to these three marked clauses as they develop from general to specific. That is, vv. 30-32 frames the theme of verbal authority, and then vv. 33-37 provides the specific context whereby Jesus' authority is displayed.[532]

---

[531] This does not always appear to be the case, for in vv. 42-44, Jesus frequents the synagogues in order to proclaim the kingdom of God, but no resistance is represented. Later, in 5:17-26 the synagogue response is mixed. The Pharisees and scribes object to his claim to forgive the paralytic but the crowds are astonished at the healing and praise God accordingly. The next synagogue event takes place in 6:6-11 where Jesus heals a man's withered hand. As a result of the healing, the Pharisees and scribes are filled with rage, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας.

[532] Levinsohn identifies this use as a point of departure involving renewal, since it is most likely that Jesus' teaching occurred in the synagogue in vv. 31-32. He writes: "Verses 31ff. concern Jesus' *teaching*, emphasizing that his word was "with authority" (v. 32b). While vv. 33ff. finish with a similar emphasis (v. 36b), the response this time is to his command to a demon." *Discourse Features*, 19. In any case, v. 33 presents

Finally, the two significant clauses within the reported speeches of this scene are notable.[533] In the first instance in v. 34, the demon shouts aloud to Jesus, Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ. This exclamation is significant due to its close association with the Jewish Scriptures. Specifically, such an idiom occurs in the LXX in Joshua 22:24, Judges 11:12, 2 Samuel 16:10, 19:23, 1 Kings 17:18 and 2 Kings 3:13.[534] Among these texts, 1 Kings 17:18 is remarkably similar, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί.[535] The second clause, in this case an instance of marked order, occurs in v. 36, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει. Similar to v. 32, where Luke indirectly reports the crowd's amazement at Jesus' authority, v. 36 also highlights Jesus' authority, drawing extra attention to the potency of his words. In this manner, the marked order in both v. 32 and 36 forms an inclusio for this scene, centering on Jesus' verbal authority.

4.6.3. Luke 4:30-37 Process Type Analysis Level

Process type analysis identifies the description of happenings among the six types as presented below in two stages. First, there will be a survey of the various process types and patterns, and second, there will be a focus on those process types that are marked as it concerns process conglomerations. The process types are provided below in Table 4.6.3.

Table 4.6.3
Process types to identify happenings in Luke 4:30-37.

distinctive material, a discontinuity that does not pertain to location, but rather to a new event. The function of this renewal point of departure is to introduce a new participant, namely, the demoniac and the subsequent challenge, which elaborates on the marked theme of Jesus' authority, located in v. 32, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. Because vv. 33-37 zoom in on a specific event within the synagogue it is most likely that the global action will occur in that portion. This zoom in approach similar to 4:1-14a where vv. 1-2 frames the circumstantial elements of Jesus' temptations, and then zooms in on the specific diabolic challenges.

[533] These clauses are significant to the extent that the previous scene has activated a comparison between Jesus and Elijah and Elisha.

[534] Following the LXX, Josh. 22:24 reads: Τί ὑμῖν κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ Ισραηλ, addressing the altar that the tribes of Dad, Reuben, and Manasseh erected on the other side of the Jordan river, which was initially offensive to the other tribes. In Judges 11:12, the words are Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί… comprise Jephthah's response to the king of Ammon's aggression on the eastern side of the Jordan river. In 2 Sam. 16:10, the words, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑμῖν comprise David's words in flight from Jerusalem, when Shimei cursed David and Abishai requested to kill Shimei. In 2 Sam. 19:23 the words are again David's, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑμῖν, as his response to the second request from Abishai to kill Shimei. In 1 Kgs. 17:18, the widow whose son has died responds to Elijah's visit: Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί. Finally, in 2 Kgs. 3:13, Elisha responds to the king of Israel's desire for respite from the drought, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί.

[535] The demon's speech includes another significant clause: οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. Such an acknowledgement of Jesus' identity reflects the words of the devil in 4:1-14a: Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ. The difference is that 3:21-4:14a addresses Jesus as David's regal son. In 4:14b-37 the nature of Jesus corresponds to that of the prophetic son.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
αὐτὸς δὲ	διελθὼν		διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν
(Jesus)	ἐπορεύετο		
(Jesus)	Καὶ κατῆλθεν		εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	καὶ ἦν διδάσκων				αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(crowds)	καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο	ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ

Relational (Attributive)	Attributive Process	Attribute
ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ	ἦν	ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ

Existent	Existential Process	Circumstance
ἄνθρωπος	ἦν	καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ

Relational (Attributive)	Attributive Process	Attribute
(ἄνθρωπος)	ἔχων	πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(man)	ἀνέκραξεν		φωνῇ μεγάλῃ	Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.	
ὁ Ἰησοῦς	καὶ ἐπετίμησεν	αὐτῷ	λέγων	Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
τὸ δαιμόνιον	καὶ ῥίψαν	αὐτὸν	εἰς τὸ μέσον
(τὸ δαιμόνιον)	ἐξῆλθεν		ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
(τὸ δαιμόνιον)	μηδὲν βλάψαν	αὐτόν	

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
ἐπὶ πάντας	καὶ ἐγένετο	θάμβος

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(crowds)	καὶ συνελάλουν	πρὸς ἀλλήλους	λέγοντες	Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτοςὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ αὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν, καὶ ἐξέρχονται	

(crowds words)	καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο		ἦχος περὶ αὐτοῦ		εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου

In this scene, process types occur in the following order and frequency: material (3x), verbal (1x), behavioral (1x), relational (1x), existential (1x), relational (1x), relational (1x), verbal (2x), material (3x), mental (1x), verbal (2x). The portrayal of happenings in this scene is distinctive, as this is the first occasion in this project that all six process types have occurred in a single scene. In other words, Luke's Gospel has distinctly chosen to depict happenings across the entire spectrum of process types in this scene.[536] Such a comprehensive presentation of happenings might also suggest that the information provided in this scene is highly prominent relative to the surrounding scenes.

The material process occurs almost equal to the verbal process, six and seven times respectively. Whereas the material process begins this scene, the verbal process closes the scene. As indicated in clausal analysis, vv. 30-32 provides introductory information, and the verbal process, similar to the previous scenes, creates the quantum of change, where the behavioral and relational processes are ascribed to the crowds relative to their hearing Jesus' verbal authority. As expected, the existential and relational processes in v. 33, introducing the man with an unclean spirit, provides the circumstantial and frame-setting information for what follows. Following such circumstantial representations, the verbal process occurs, once for the demon and then for Jesus in vv. 34-35.

As was the case in previous scenes, Jesus' verbal rebuke in v. 35 is followed by a variety of additional processes. The material process is first, where the demon pushes the man down, καὶ ῥίψαν, departs from him, ἐξῆλθεν, and does not harm him, μηδὲν βλάψαν. The crowds also respond to the change that results from Jesus' rebuke. In v. 36, the crowds are depicted first by means of the mental process, καὶ ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας, and then by verbal reporting Jesus' authority, at which point the scene closes.

Such a pattern, where Jesus' verbal signifying is followed by changes in other participants and their representations, reflects the previous two scenes. In the temptation and Nazareth scene, Jesus creates change in the narration world by means of a creative process,

---

[536] Halliday writes: "each quantum of change is modeled as a figure- a figure of happening, doing, sensing, saying, being or having…such figures are sorted out in the grammar of the clause… a mode of reflection, of imposing linguistic order on our experience of endless variation and flow of events." Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 213.

resulting in the goal-obtainment of successfully resisting the devil's challenges and proclaiming fulfillment that results in diverse responses from the crowds. However, in this scene, Jesus' words induce a transformation change, in that a fundamental material change occurs for the demon-possessed man who undergoes an excision. At the same time, the crowds once again are depicted by means of the mental process. On this occasion, however, their fear at the exorcism leads to their reporting on Jesus' authority.

4.6.4. Luke 4:30-37 Clause Complex Level

Clause complex analysis examines the manner in which Luke's Gospel packages various clauses in relation to one another, and also serves to indicate prominent clause complexes marked by elaboration as discussed in Chapter II §4.

In this scene, there are three clause complexes and eight clause simplexes. Clause complexes tend to be more prominent in a given scene, relative to clause simplexes. Elaborating clauses are highly prominent as these convey information that is immediately associated with the head clause. Rather than increasing processing energy to the whole set of relationships as with extension clause complexes, an elaborating clause sustains its focus on information relative to the head clause. In this scene there are two extension clauses and one clause that contains both an extension and elaborating clause, occurring in v. 35b:

καὶ ῥῖψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον/ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ/ μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν.

$$+\beta \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \alpha \qquad\qquad\qquad =\gamma$$

The photograph analogy as discussed in Chapter II §2 is used to further analyse v. 35b. In the case of the main clause in v. 35b, ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, there are two photographs placed relative to the main clause concerning the demon's exorcism. First, the extension clause is provided, καὶ ῥῖψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον, which serves to convey preceding temporal-spatial information, that the man fell down prior to the excision of the demon. Such a clause is comparative to placing a smaller photograph to the side of a central and larger photograph, the head clause. Due to its position, the extension clause is backgrounded in relation to the head clause, and so is dependent and ancillary to the excision of the demon.[537] However, the elaborating clause, μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν, is directly associated and inherent to

---

[537] Clausal placement on its own cannot determine whether or not a given clause is elaborating or backgrounded to the main clause, and so other contextual factors are important. The demon is being exorcised co-terminously, or concurrently, as the man is not being harmed. Through clausal elaboration, comments on the physiological effects on the man, the scene slows down at this moment. Such is the case because increased and integrated processing energy is required in relating the elaborating clause to its head clause.

the head clause. Its position and status is comparable to an overlaid photograph in that it provides clarification and description about the excision itself. Choosing to represent the head clause excision by means of both an extension and elaborating clause serves dual purposes of increased processing energy that is required for this clause complex, relative to all others, and more specifically, high prominence of the demonic excision head, since it alone receives sustained focus with an elaborating clause.

4.6.5. Luke 4:30-37 Scene Level

Scene level involves a consideration of conjunctive use. As noted, the conjunctive δέ solely occurs at the start of this scene, serving as a point of departure, meaning that developmental units or progression occur by some other means. As observed in §6.2 above, the marked clause in v. 33 brings into focus the location of the synagogue that was previously opaque, even though its presence was assumed. The location of the synagogue is highlighted to draw attention to elements within the synagogue that will be highly relevant, namely Jesus' excision of the demon and those surrounding elements within vv. 33-37. Verses 30-32 set the stage for this scene, providing preliminary information about Jesus' teaching authority, an authority that is subsequently expressed most potently with the demoniac.

Verbal aspect is another consideration in scene level analysis. The aorist verb, as perfective, serves as the backbone to the narrative with the following verbs. Consequently, these aorists occur: κατῆλθεν, Jesus *came* in v. 31, ἀνέκραξε, the demon *cried* in v. 34, ἐπετίμησεν, Jesus *rebuked* in v. 35, ἐξῆλθεν, the demon came out in v. 35, ἐγένετο, as the fear that came upon the crowds in v. 36.[538] However, what is distinctive in this scene compared to preceding scenes is the number of imperfect verbs. The imperfect occurs six times whereas the aorist only occurs five times. Regarding distribution, the imperfects occurs at the start of this scene, within vv. 30-33, and also at the close of this scene in vv. 36-37. In this manner, the imperfects bracket the narration elements located within vv. 34-35.

Regarding verbal aspect, the aorist presents backbone events that are viewed as conceptually complete.[539] Transformational processes tend to occur with aorist verbs, since

---

[538] Constantine Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 124-125. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 202. Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129.

[539] As discussed in Ch. II §5.4 Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek,* 105-117. Campbell argues that Greek verb aspect principally conveys spatial, semantic spatial categories, rather than temporal values.

they are conceptually complete actions. This being the case, only two aorist verbs are assigned to Jesus in this scene. The first occurs in v. 30, καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ, and the second in v. 35, καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Whereas the first aorist is spatially circumstantial, and downgraded information, v. 35 signals a transformational process as the demon is excised. Functionally, then, the aorist verb in v. 35 comprises the central or global action of this scene.

While ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ constitutes the global action, it does not minimize the importance of the surrounding imperfects. As Chapter II §5.4. has also shown, the imperfect verb tends to provide a near/imminent perspective, from the standpoint of the audience. In this scene, imperfectives occur as a tightly-organized conglomerate, bracketed around vv. 33-35. Similar to a chiastic pattern with an immediate-to-remote-to-immediate arrangement, the imperfects actually serve to accentuate the central aorist assigned to Jesus v. 35, ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ.

The final component in scene analysis is the structure created by numerical count of the main verbs in order to determine the central verb in this scene. In the eclectic text, the central element is the demon's cry, καὶ ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ… The focused element of the scene occurs immediately prior to Jesus' expulsion of the demon, ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ. By focusing on the reported speech of the demon, that Jesus is the holy one of God, there is a close association between Jesus' office or nature and his global action of excising the demon.

4.6.6. Luke 4:30-37 Rhetorical Analysis

Table 4.6.6
Summary of marked discourse features in Luke 4:30-37.

Clause Level: Constituent Order	Clause Level: Process Types	Clause Complex Level	Scene Level
Special salience: ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ (v. 32) Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρην (v.34) οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 34) ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει (v. 36)	First scene with all process types represented A conglomerate of processes occurs in vss. 33-35	Two elaborating clauses. The first in v. 33, the second in v. 35b. V 35b distinct with both an elaborating and extension clause, surrounding the main clause as the demon's departure, ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	Only one aorist assigned to Jesus, καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς… bracketed by imperfects concentric center of scene in v. 33, καὶ ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ

According to Theon's *Progymnasmata*, the chief virtue of the narration exercise is plausibility. Plausibility is achieved by including a variety of narration elements; person, action, time, place, manner, and cause.[540] Because this scene contains all six narration elements, it is unquestionably a narration exercise. To specify, those elements include: the person of Jesus, the place of the synagogue, the time is after his departure from Nazareth and amidst preliminary teaching, the manner is Jesus being willing and evidenced in his verbal retort, and the *cause* is to expunge the demon, as that which is advantageous to Jesus and his mission. Among the six narration elements, the most important is the global action. While several actions are presented in this scene, marked discourse features displayed in Table 4.6.6 have identified the global action as occurring in v. 35, καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

However, rhetorical criticism adds awareness of another rhetorical exercise utilized in this scene, the ecphrasis.[541] The ecphrasis exercise occurs by means of descriptive language, producing a "vivid impression" whereby an entity or event is "clearly before the sight." The use of such descriptive language facilitates an emotional response in the audience, focused on a particularly compelling action or entity.[542] In tandem with rhetorical criticism, discourse analysis offers objective linguistic means to determine the presence of the ecphrasis. Several discourse features support the identification of an ecphrasis in v. 35, namely, the conglomerate of participles surrounding a singular clause complex, a variety of process types surrounding this event, and the imperfective use surrounding the singular aorist in v. 35. Verse 35 constitutes an ecphrasis of event, Jesus' rebuke of the demon. The use of the ecphrasis event thereby provides a vivid emotional conduit, accentuating Jesus' global action and rendering the audience emotionally engaged at the moment of Jesus' rebuke. Typical for Luke's Gospel, the ecphrasis tends to be signaled by three discourse features: imperfective use, a clause of elaboration, and a distinct conglomerate of process types.

To identify the chief point of this narration, the exegete must appropriate any marked discourse features as they relate to the six narration elements. As seen in Table 4.6.6, marked

---

[540] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, 28. One can identify these elements through process type analysis, whereby, for instance, the material process clause includes participant, action, and circumstance, the latter including temporal-spatial considerations and causal relationships and motivation).

[541] As shown in Luke 4:1-14a and 4:14b-29, imperfective use tends to signal the ecphrasis exercise. Even though the imperfect is backgrounded, it sometimes signals the global and perfective action.

[542] *Progymnasmata*, 47.

constituent order involves two aspects of Jesus' rebuke of the demon. First, that his actional rebuke was with authority, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει, and that such an action reveals something of Jesus' personhood, οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. The virtue of Jesus' global action is revealed, that it was authoritative, and indicates something about Jesus' personhood, namely, that he is the holy one of God.[543] By attending to marked discourse features the chief point is that Jesus' action of authoritatively excising a demon demonstrates he is the holy one of God.

At the same time, rhetorical criticism offers an additional benefit in elaborating upon the chief point. Jesus' action is praiseworthy respective of Luke's use of the syncrisis exercise, specifically as it occurs in v. 34, Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρην.[544] As a syncrisis, Jesus' is compared to Israel's famed predecessors, consistent with Luke's usage in previous scenes. In this scene, however, the idiom, Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, reflects several Jewish texts as previously noted. Among those texts, the comparison between Jesus and Elijah and Elisha is most plausible, specifically, the ministry of Elijah in 1 Kgs 17:18. There are three reasons for such a selection. First, in the immediately preceding text, Jesus actually compared his mission to Elijah. Second, Luke's literary arrangement conveys an alternating pattern; a presentation of Jesus' nature, reflected in Luke 3:21-22 and 4:14b-29 and pertaining to his regal and prophetic offices, followed by demonic challenges to his regal and prophetic offices, reflected in 4:1-14a and 4:30-37. Third, 1 Kgs 17:18 shares the greatest conceptual and lexical similarities with Luke 4:34. Conceptually, in 1 Kgs 17:18 a Zaraphath widow has lost of her son and responds to Elijah, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, ἄνθρωπε τοῦ θεοῦ; In Luke 4:34, the demon, who faces potential of loss of the man, also responds to Jesus, Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; …οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. By means of lexical similarities, both texts address holy messengers of God, and both involve a circumstance of death or destruction.

---

[543] Regarding the element of action, Theon presents several characteristics that may relate to a given action: easy or difficult, small or great, possible or impossible, honorable or dishonorable, dangerous or not. *Progymnasmata*, 28.

[544] The idiom may invoke another comparison to David, as found similarly in 2 Sam. 16:10 and 19:23. These two texts involve David's words in flight from Jerusalem, and in both cases, Abishai requests to kill the cursing Shimei for cursing David. In both cases, David retorts, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑμῖν. However, while there are certain conceptual similarities, such as an occasion of cursing and a flight from one's home, the most plausible comparative text seems to be between Jesus and Elijah in 1 Kgs. 17:18. Support derives from greater lexical and inner-textual similarities.

Further, the Lukan patterns analysed up to this point have first introduced Jesus' office, whether regal and prophetic, and then present demonic challenges to Jesus' offices. Due to all these factors, the address of Jesus' prophetic ministry by providing a renewed challenge from satanic forces is plausible. The present scene compares Jesus' activities with the prophet Elijah, while underscoring that Jesus' verbal authority over the demonic realm surpasses the venerable prophetic traditions of Elijah and Elisha.[545] Bringing all of these elements together, this scene's chief point is that Jesus' action of authoritatively excising a demon with his words demonstrates he is the holy one of God, exceeding even Israel's greatest prophets.

4.7 Luke 4:38-39

4.7.1. Luke 4:38-39 Discourse Boundary

Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος.

Luke 4:38-39 comprises a new scene. Support from discourse analysis includes:

1. Fronting the participial clause serves as a new point of reference for this scene. Fronting this cause, Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς, prior to the main verb, εἰσῆλθεν, signals a distinct spatial-temporal and thematic scene, as well as cohesively anchoring 4:38-39 to Jesus' departure from the synagogue and entrance into Simon's home.

2. Use of δέ in v.38 is typically used in Luke's Gospel for introducing a new narrative unit or for development within a narrative unit.

3. Verbal tense-aspect patterning, the aorist and imperfect, εἰσῆλθεν… ἦν συνεχομένη, is a typical Lukan pattern for introducing a new scene.

4. Regarding thematic distinction, whereas the previous scene involved Jesus' rebuke of a demon, ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ, this scene displays his rebuke of a fever, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ.

5. Concerning spatial-temporal considerations, while Jesus is the main participant, he and enters into Peter's home, thereby introducing a new setting and participants.

---

[545] This pattern reflects the encomium structure, noted in 4.1.3. in which a character's bodily and external goods precede goods of the mind which express ethical virtues through action. In the case of bodily and external goods, which include ancestry, city and tribe, reputation, and so on, Theon recommends: "in each case showing that the subject used the advantage prudently and as he ought…" *Progymnasmata*, 50-51. The function of the challenges, either by the devil in vv. 1-14a or the demon in vv. 30-37, is to showcase Jesus' actions as true regal and prophetic son, and that in such respects, he greater than both David and Elijah.

6. Luke 4:40 introduces the subsequent scene in view of frontshifting, conjunctive use, verbal aspect pattern, and thematic and spatial distinctiveness. These will be detailed in Chapter IV §8.1.

4.7.2. Luke 4:38-39 Clause Level

As with previous scenes, not every clause will be examined, but only those which disrupt the natural flow of information, specifically, those clauses that signal special salience.

In this scene, marked constituent order occurs in three clauses. The first marked clause occurs in v. 38, Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς. As noted in §4.7.1 above, this clause is fronted in relation to the main verb, presenting a temporal circumstance as the setting for this new scene. The second marked clause also occurs in v. 38, πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ. This clause signals a point of departure for renewal. There is no change of setting, but rather a new event is introduced. This new event is Peter's sick mother-in-law, which forms the basis for their subsequent request from Jesus, with his healing as the focus of the scene. The final marked clause occurs in v. 39, παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς. The clause is fronted to signal extra attention to the element of immediacy, that is, the speed by which Peter's mother arose and served. This clause alone represents marked order for special emphasis and will be discussed in more detail below.

4.7.3. Luke 4:38-39 Process Type Analysis

Process type analysis is another clausal consideration, one that attends to the various process types within the system of the presentation of happenings. The process types are provided below in Table 4.7.3.

Table 4.7.3
The process types for Luke 4:38-39.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Jesus)	Ἀναστὰς δὲ		ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς
(Jesus)	εἰσῆλθεν		εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος	ἦν συνεχομένη	πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(they)	ἠρώτησαν	αὐτὸν	περὶ αὐτῆς		

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
(Jesus)	καὶ ἐπιστὰς	ἐπάνω αὐτῆς

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	ἐπετίμησεν	τῷ πυρετῷ			

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(fever)	καὶ ἀφῆκεν		αὐτήν
(she: mother-in-law)	δὲ ἀναστᾶσα		παραχρῆμα
(she: mother-in-law)	διηκόνει	αὐτοῖς	

According to the table above, the order and frequency of the various process types is as follows: material process (2x), behavioral process (1x), verbal process (1x), relational process (1x), verbal process (1x), material process (3x). This scene contains four of the six process types for construing happenings, lacking the mental and existential processes.

Regarding the pattern of process types, the material process starts and concludes this scene, in v. 38a and 39b respectively, while the middle portion of this scene, v.38b, contains three process types: the behavioral, verbal and relational processes. Such a pattern is parallel to the preceding scene in that a conglomerate of process types occurs in the middle, flanked by the material processes. Accordingly, as with the previous scene, the verbal process of rebuke in this scene, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ initiates transformation for the participant, this time Peter's mother-in-law.[546] That the verbal process is the central and effectual process type aligns with marked constituent order regarding the speed by which Jesus' rebuke of the fever takes effect, παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.

4.7.4. Luke 4:38-39 Clause Complex Level

Regarding the distribution and arrangement of clause complexes, this scene contains three clause complexes and three clause simplexes. Due to the prominence associated with

---

[546] Jesus' verbal authority as the global action occurs in the three preceding scenes.

elaboration clauses, in comparison with extension clauses, only elaborating clauses are analysed and symbolized as =. In this scene, only one elaborating clause occurs, located in v. 39:

καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς / ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ

=β   α

While the majority of pre-verbal clauses analysed in Luke have been backgrounded to their head clause, Jesus' standing over the mother-in-law, is not strictly antecedent to the main clause, but rather coterminus or concurrent with the head clause, Jesus' rebuke of the fever.[547]

In the case of Jesus' rebuke of the fever, his standing over the infirmed woman serves to clarify the healing, providing a descriptive comment related to Jesus' words. Jesus' standing over the woman constitutes a clause of elaboration, signaling that additional semantic weight is associated with that head clause. Consistent with the findings of constituent order and process type analysis, among the various clauses in this scene, prominence is assigned to Jesus' rebuke, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ.

4.7.5. Luke 4:38-39 Scene Level

Scene level analysis of this scene begins with verbal aspect. Because the imperfective aspect tends to provide preliminary and circumstantial information, it appears in v. 38, where Peter's mother in law is presented as sick, ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ. The perfective aspect, specifically aorist verbs, serve to carry the storyline forward. Such a function is evident in this scene: Jesus *came* in v. 38, εἰσῆλθεν, they *asked* Jesus in v. 38, ἠρώτησαν, Jesus *rebuked* the fever in v. 39, ἐπετίμησεν, , and the fever *left* in v. 39, ἀφῆκεν.[548] As noted in previous scenes, due to the aorist verb being associated with achievement or accomplishments, the global action consists of an aorist verb. In this scene, two aorist verbs occur. The first aorist provides introductory and circumstantial information,

---

[547] Typically, the aorist participle typically presents antecedent and circumstantial elements. Wallace writes: "The aorist participle… usually denotes antecedent time to that of the controlling verb. But if the main verb is also aorist, this participle may indicate contemporaneous time." *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament,* 614. Wallace suggests as probe questions, when, why or how to identify temporal issues. In the case of Luke 4:39, it appears that how is the proper probing question. 624. Eggins, *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 280. Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 461.

[548] Constantine Campbell, *Advances in The Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 124-125. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 202. Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129.

εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος, and the second aorist constitutes Jesus rebuke of the fever, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ. Consistent with the analyses above, Jesus' rebuke of the fever features prominently in this scene.

Even though this scene is brief, three instances of the conjunctive use of δέ occur. As Chapter II §5.1 has shown, δέ is used within a narration to signal a new step or development. These three instances of δέ are provided below.

Ἀναστὰς **δὲ** ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος

πενθερὰ **δὲ** τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ…

παραχρῆμα **δὲ** ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς

The first unit of this scene consists of Jesus' arrival in Peter's home where the δέ functions to introduce a new scene. The second unit, signaled by δέ provides information related to Simon's sick mother-in-law. The third and final unit consists of Jesus' healing effects, the immediacy of her rising and subsequent service.[549] By means of the conjunctive δέ, this narration is sequenced into three informational units, beginning with circumstantial and preliminary information, then the request for Jesus and his rebuke of the fever, and last, the immediate result of that rebuke, where the woman rises and serves. Because of the brevity of this scene, that is, succinct information with limited process types, and the specific δέ sequencing around a focal issue, Jesus' healing of the sick woman is again accentuated.

Consideration of the structure and number of times finite verbs occur serves to identify the focal information or the global action of a given scene. In the eclectic text, the scene includes six finite verbs, resulting in a symmetrical pattern. Table 4.7.5 below displays the symmetrical pattern with the central elements bolded:

Table 4.7.5
The six finite verbs resulting in a symmetrical pattern in Luke 4:38-39.

Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς

εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος [a]

---

[549] In this scene the sequence of three conjunctions corresponds to Aristotle's *Poetics*, wherein the plotline consists of beginning, middle and end. Such an arrangement is not typical among the Lukan scenes, except that the subsequent scene also follows this structure (vv. 40-41). The temptation narration (vv. 1-14a) and synagogue reading (vv. 14b-29) corresponds to the structure of both vv. 38-39 and vv. 40-41 in their use of δέ.

πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ: [b]

καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς [c]

    καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς

ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ [c′]

καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν [b′]

    παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα

διηκόνει αὐτοῖς [a′]

The two focal verbs consist of two elements, the request on behalf of Simon's feverish mother-in-law and Jesus' rebuke of that fever. As confirmed by earlier analyses, Jesus' healing of the fever is a central element in this scene. However, because the request for Jesus to heal is also central, it serves a fundamental role in this scene. Because text-internal features are unable to determine the relevance of καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς, rhetorical criticism may be an option for successfully incorporating these discourse findings into a coherent and culturally located framework.

4.7.6. Luke 4:38-39 Rhetorical Analysis

Table 4.7.6
Summary of the marked discourse features in Luke 4:38-39.

Clause Level: Constituent Order	Clause Level: Process Types	Clause Complex Level	Scene Level
Special salience: παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς (v. 39)	A conglomerate of processes occurs in vss. 38b. The verbal process (v. 39a) initiates the material process (v. 39b), constituting the transformation	A single elaborating clause occurs in vs. 39a, καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετ	Imperfective use brackets the scene, aorist consists of Jesus' healing rebuke, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετ. Conjunctive δέ use: i. Jesus entering home, ii. Simon's mother-in-law fevered, iii. She arises and serves. Symmetric center of scene in v. 38b-39a, καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς… ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ

Analysing the rhetoric of this Lukan scene begins by identifying Theon's six narration elements, as follows: the person who performs the action is Jesus, the place where the action

occurs is Peter's home, the time is Jesus' entrance into Peter's home, alongside the threefold use of the conjunctive δέ, with each unit orbiting Jesus' healing rebuke as the global action, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ. The manner of Jesus' rebuking action is willing, and the cause of his action is the request from those in Peter's house on behalf of the fevered mother-in-law. As seen in Table 4.7.5, among these six narration elements, the global action and the cause of the global action are marked by a variety of discourse features.

Consistent with previous Lukan scenes, namely excising the demoniac, Isaianic proclamation in Nazareth and authoritative responses to the devil in the wilderness, the verbal process constitutes the global action. In this instance, Jesus' verbally authoritative rebuke, this time directed at a fever, constitutes the transformative change for Simon's mother-in-law. What is distinctive in this scene, however, is that prominence is also given to the cause of Jesus' action, one of Theon's six narration elements. In previous Lukan scenes, causality was backgrounded in favor of other elements, namely, the personhood of Jesus and issues of time and space, but in this scene, following insights from the scene level of analysis, causation is the second element that comprises the symmetrical center of this scene.

According to Theon, the cause of an action might include a variety of impulses, such as: "to acquire good things, or from friendship…or out of passions."[550] In v. 38b, καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς, the request on behalf of Simon's feverish mother-in-law constitutes the ground or cause that leads to Jesus' global action of rebuking the fever. Evidently, Luke's Gospel would wish to avoid portraying Jesus as one who acts from sterile or selfish motivations, requiring causality to feature prominently in this scene. Because of the importance of causality for this scene, the chief rhetorical point must incorporate the notion of Jesus acting on behalf of others, which in this scene, must incorporate Jesus' rebuke of the fever.

The majority of marked discourse features in this scene, reflected in Table 4.7.5, have served to signal the global action and the element of causality. However, in the case of constituent order, one additional highlighted element remains, παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς. This clause has special salience and requires further investigation of its function in this scene, particularly using rhetorical criticism. The clause frames a narration

<hr />

[550] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans., George A. Kennedy, 29.

around not only a praiseworthy action of Jesus, but also the impetus for making that action praiseworthy.

Theon attributes a given action to a variety of possible virtues: "great or small, dangerous or not dangerous, possible or impossible, easy or difficult, necessary or unnecessary, advantageous or not advantageous, just or unjust, honorable or dishonorable."[551] Special salience is assigned to the immediacy of Jesus' healing in virtue of its greatness. Evidently, healings at that time were not characterized by such speed of recovery, which drew attention to the temporal element of immediacy. Consequently, Jesus' healing is viewed as a great action. The chief point of this scene must also incorporate the rapidity of Jesus' healing, with marking the narration elements of cause and time.

Another benefit of using Theon's *Progymnasmata* is broadening the greatness of Jesus' deed by considering the potential presence of the syncrisis exercise in this narration. Based on previously analysed Lukan scenes which have compared Jesus with famed predecessors in Israel, specifically, King David and Elijah who show Jesus' global action as superior, another syncrisis is likely at work in this scene. The syncrisis exercise serves to further accentuate the greatness of Jesus' healing action, and that he is exceedingly praiseworthy. Two associated ideas enhance the use of syncrisis exercise. First, the immediacy of Jesus' healing is marked. Second, since Elijah was recently activated as the comparative participant, Elisha's serving as the comparative participant in this present scene is also likely, insofar as Jesus already compared himself to both of these prophets in his Nazareth address.

 In that respect, there are only two Elisha narrations that display conceptual similarities with Jesus' healing of Simon's mother-in-law. The first is Elisha's raising of the Shunnamite's dead boy; the second is his cleansing of leprous Naaman. The immediacy of Jesus' healing is also highlighted in the Lukan scene, παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς. The comparative analysis between Jesus and Elisha is not simply the healing deed, but also the speed by which the infirmed recovered in their respective cases.[552]

---

[551] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans., George A. Kennedy, 28.

[552] The preceding narration has explicitly invoked a comparison with Elijah. Subsequently, this present scene compares the ministry of Jesus with the prophet Elijah replete with widows and sons. Confirming this observation, the next narration in Luke 5:1-11 further considers the relevance of the third and final prophet evoked in Jesus' Nazareth proclamation. Successive scenes compare Jesus to each of these three prophets. Even if one compares this present scene to Elijah and his raising of the dead boy (1 Kgs 17:17-24), the result is the same as it is with Elisha- Jesus is markedly superior. In the case of Elijah, he first prays, then three times stretches himself on the child, and finally the boy is resurrected. None of this is required for Jesus.

Two features are evident in comparing Jesus' healing deed to Elisha's healing of the widow's son in 1 Kgs 17. First, Jesus' healing derives solely from his verbal authority, no other process type is represented that results in the healing. In the case of Elisha, however, the healing of the boy is accompanied by more than words, for Elisha both lays on the dead corpse and strolls the house prior to the son being resuscitated. Second, the speed of recovery is noteworthy. Whereas Jesus' healing is immediate for Simon's mother-in-law, the boy that Elisha heals experiences a protracted resuscitation. His body first warms, then he sneezes seven times, and finally, his mother takes him up as alive.[553] The story of Namaan in 2 Kgs 5 is similar in temporal immediacy. Leprous Namaan must dip himself seven times in the Jordan river before experiencing his cleansing.

Such comparisons demonstrate that Luke's Gospel contains highlighted immediacy, both in order to accentuate the greatness of Jesus' verbal authority over the feverish, but also to attribute superlative praise to Jesus as compared to Elisha. Jesus is the exceedingly great prophet whose words alone effect an immediate transformation for the infirmed. The chief rhetorical point for this scene emerges, that Jesus' action of verbally rebuking a fever, on account of others and with immediate results, demonstrates that his miraculous deeds are greater than even Elisha's.

4.8 Luke 4:40-41

4.8.1. Luke 4:40-41 Discourse Boundary

Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν

Utilizing insights from discourse analysis, Luke 4:40-41 constitutes a new scene. The following discourse support includes:

1. The fronting of this clause, δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου, a genitive circumstantial clause, and the following subject clause, ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις,

---

[553] 2 Kgs 4:33-37 reads as follow (LXX): καὶ ἀνέβη καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ καὶ διέκαμψεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, καὶ διεθερμάνθη ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ παιδαρίου. καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν καὶ ἀνέβη καὶ συνέκαμψεν ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον ἕως ἑπτάκις, καὶ ἤνοιξεν τὸ παιδάριον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξεβόησεν Ελισαιε πρὸς Γιεζι καὶ εἶπεν Κάλεσον τὴν Σωμανῖτιν ταύτην· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπεν Ελισαιε Λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς καὶ ἐξῆλθεν.

both occur prior to the main verb, ἤγαγον, and frame this scene by cohesively anchoring the remainder of 4:40-41 to this point of departure.[554]

2. Use of δέ, in v. 40 frequently functions in Luke's Gospel to introduce a new narrative scene, δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου.[555]

3. Verbal tense-aspect patterning occurs, the imperfect and aorist, at the start of this scene, εἶχον and ἤγαγον. This is a typical Lukan pattern for introducing a new scene.

4. Concerning thematic distinctions, while both previous scenes, vv. 30-37 and vv. 38-39, involved the rebuke of Jesus, ἐπετίμησεν, the healings were limited in scope, especially compared to this scene where a large amount of people benefit.

5. Regarding spatial-temporal considerations, while Jesus is the main participant, there is nevertheless a new temporal frame, δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου, for the sun has set, and consists of a new cast of characters with various infirmities, ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις.

4.8.2. Luke 4:40-41 Clause Level

As with previous scenes, only clauses exhibiting a disruption of the natural flow of information will be analysed, particularly, those that signal special salience. In this scene, the disruption of information flow occurs in three clauses. The first clause occurs at the beginning of this scene, in v. 40a, δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου. As noted in §8.1 above, pre-verbal constituents have been placed first to provide a point of departure, in which scene orients around a new temporal frame.

The second marked clause occurs in v. 40b and is highlighted, ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς. As highlighted information, the idea that every one of the infirmed were addressed by Jesus constitutes unexpected information. This information is unexpected insofar as previous Lukan scenes have addressed individualized healings, as in instances where Jesus heals only one participant in a given scene. In any case, that large crowds benefit from Jesus' healings functions prominently, as does the concurrent

---

[554] The genitive absolute not only functions to distinguish this clause from the main clause that follows, but also provides a switch of reference. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 182.

[555] Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 57. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 71-82, 275.

highlighted clause regarding the tangible, physical touch of Jesus, τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθείς.[556]

The third and final marked order occurs at the close of the scene in v. 41b, τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. Here, special focus is on the identity of Jesus as the Messiah, τὸν Χριστὸν, serving as the pre-verbal constituent.[557] The use of the article places emphasis on Jesus as "the*"* Messiah, which in the Jewish reference indicates that "the" Messiah had arrived in the ministry of Jesus. Previous scenes have underscored that Jesus is the incomparable Messiah through the syncrisis exercise that shows Jesus as greater than his regal and prophetic predecessors. The scope of Jesus' healings serves to signal that Jewish expectations were being met in Jesus, since the Messiah, evidently, had the ability to heal everyone. Jesus' universal healing capability therefore provides ample evidence of his Messiahship.[558]

4.8.3. Luke 4:40-41 Process Type Analysis

Clausal analysis also involves process type analysis, identifying various representations of happening as a scene unfolds, according to six modes of represented experiences. The process types are provided below in Table 4.8.3.

Table 4.8.3
Process types in Luke 4:40-41.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
τοῦ ἡλίου	δύνοντος δὲ		

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
ἅπαντες ὅσοι	εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας	νόσοις ποικίλαις

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
αὐτοὺς	ἤγαγον		πρὸς αὐτόν
τὰς χεῖρας (Jesus')	ἐπιτιθεὶς	ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν	
(Jesus)	ἐθεράπευεν	αὐτούς	
δαιμόνια	ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ		ἀπὸ πολλῶν

---

[556] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 46. The focus, however, only applies to the entire independent clause, being backgrounded to the main verb. The clause does not serve as a point of departures, since the crowds have already been introduced and the temporal circumstance is the same.

[557] Since this is a dependent clause, the emphasis applies to the embedded clause, and not the main clause. As embedded, the clause is not mainline to the finite verb, εἴα.

[558] Apparently, Luke's Gospel compares the scope of Jesus' healing ministry with his contemporaries, presumably since they were rather selective and limited in their healing ministries.

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(demons)	κρ[αυγ]άζοντα	αὐτὸν			
(demons)	καὶ λέγοντα		ὅτι	Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	
(Jesus)	καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν				

Actor	Material Process	Recipient	Circumstance: cause and matter [embedded]
(Jesus)	οὐκ εἴα… λαλεῖν	αὐτὰ	ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι

The following process types occur in order and frequency: material (1x), verbal (1x), behavioral (1x), material (4x), verbal (3x), material (1x). Since this scene depicts happenings through only three process types, it constitutes the fewest of process type demonstrations in the Lukan scene examined so far. As a result, the scene is marked by a certain brevity, a narrowing of information related to happenings.

This scene is also distinctive in that Jesus is portrayed in a minimal manner by a single verbal process, καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν. This present scene is similar to the first two scenes in this sequence, Jesus' baptism and genealogy, in that there is none or minimal verbiage, or reported speech attributed to Jesus. Unlike the majority of scenes in this sequence that center on Jesus' verbal authority, the material process constitutes the transformational process whereby in laying his hands on the infirmed, healings result,

ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.[559]

This scene is also distinctive in that four consecutive material processes comprise the middle portion of this scene, they came to him, he placed his hands on them, healed them, the demons came out:

ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν, ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς,

ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς,

ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν.

Jesus' inclusive healing touch constitutes the pivotal transformational process in this scene. In Jesus' touch, the sick and demonized are released.

---

[559] In this instance, Jesus is portrayed as the actor whose physical depiction, by means of his hands, extends to a goal, in this case the infirmed. At the same time, Jesus' verbal process appears contemporaneous with the exorcism, rather than preceding it. Such usage is also reflected in the synagogue expulsion in v. 35 and healing the mother-in-law in v. 39.

4.8.4. Luke 4:40-41 Clause Complex Level

Clause complex analysis involves an assessment of the relationships between clauses, including extension clauses that typically are backgrounded to the main action as well as elaborating clauses that are marked as functionally more prominent. As Chapter II §4 has shown, elaborating clauses signal greater semantic weight assigned to the head clause, particularly in virtue of the processing energy required to understand information directly associated with the head clause. In this scene there are no clause simplexes, only four clauses complexes. Only one instance constitutes an elaborating clause complex, with elaborations symbolized by =:

ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν/ κρ[αυγ]άζοντα / καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι…

          α   =β   =γ

With process type analysis, Jesus' healing touch tranforms the crowds, particularly the sick in v. 40. However, in v. 41 Jesus' healing touch extended also to those controlled by demons. These beneficiaries are assigned prominence by means of the elaborating clause complex, particularly in the verbal processes of the excised demons, κρ[αυγ]άζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι…[560] By means of elaboration, greater semantic weight is attached to the main verb, ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν, whereas the elaborating clauses clarify the constitution of the exorcisms by what they were accompanied. The demon's excision acknowledgment addresses the identity of Jesus, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, that he is the son of God. By associating Jesus' excisions of the demons by two elaborating verbal processes, attention is directed to Jesus' identity, his Messiahship.

4.8.5 Luke 4:40-41 Scene Level

Scene level analysis includes verbal aspect analysis, conjunctive use, and finite verbal patterns. Regarding verbal aspect, aorist verbs serve to carry a storyline forward in narrations. However, in this present scene the aorist occurs only once in v. 40, ἤγαγον, as the sick are brought to Jesus. The remainder of verbs are imperfective, εἶχον and ἐθεράπευεν in v. 40 and ἐξήρχετο and εἴα in v. 41. Compared to previous Lukan scenes where the imperfective was significantly less frequent than aorist verbs, this scene uses the imperfective far more

---

[560] In a previous scene, the demon confessed, οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, and in the devil's wilderness temptations, the devil addressed Jesus as, Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ. The sonship of Jesus thereby serves as the unifying thematic for this Lukan sequence of scenes.

frequently. The only other scenes where the aorist is reduced to this degree occurs with Jesus' baptism and his ancestry.

There are three occurrences the conjunctive use of δέ in this scene. As Chapter II §5.1 has shown, the choice to use δέ signals a new step or development in a scene. The three δέ conjunctions in this scene include:

Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις…

ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς

ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν…

By means of δέ, the scene is organized into three developmental units. First, the sick come to Jesus, second, Jesus touches and heals them, and third, the demons are expelled, acknowledging his sonship to God. The threefold organization of δέ corresponds to the preceding scene in vv. 38-39 by thematic structure: i. introducing the setting of a home, ii. the healing, and iii. a rising or transformation.

The finite verbs form a pattern and are counted in order to discern the structure and potential centre. [561] In such an arrangement, this scene contains two sets of parallel finite verbs in linear pattern, [a]- [a']- [b]- [b']: the infirmed are brought to Jesus (a), Jesus places his hands on them (a'), the demons are expelled (b), they recognize Jesus' Messiahship (b').[562] Such an arrangement reveals that this scene's focus occurs at the end, by means of developmental progression rather than in a central global action.

4.8.6. Luke 4:40-41 Rhetorical Analysis

A summary of marked discourse features that aid in undertaking rhetorical analysis of this scene is provided in Table 4.8.6. These elements serve to indicate the relevant form and functions associated with rhetorical criticism.

Table 4.8.6
Summary of marked discourse features for Luke 4:40-41.

Clause Level: Constituent Order	Clause Level: Process Types	Clause Complex Level	Scene Level
Special salience: τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν (v. 40)	Jesus' material process (touch) is the	A single elaborating clause complex occurs in v. 41 at the scene's close signaling	Imperfect used most frequently.

---

[561] *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*, 57.

[562] The only difference between the Bezan and eclectic texts is the first verb presented in both cases; the Bezan text has εφερον (imperfect) while the eclectic text has ηγαγον (aorist).

Special salience: τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι (v. 41)	transformation, unlike previous scenes where the verbal process is transformational	greatest semantic weight, ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν, κρ[αυγ]άζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	Scene represented by linear development-without central point, but development culminating at end of scene

According to Theon's taxonomy, this present scene corresponds to the chreia exercise because the virtues of a chreia include i. brevity, ii. an expedient point occurring at the close of the chreia, and iii. action or speech attributed to a specific participant. Discourse features identify this scene as a chreia, including the following six reasons: i. the scene is brief, containing only three of the six process types, ii. there is a predominance of imperfect verbs with only two perfective verbs, one with Jesus' healing, and one occurring at the close of the scene, ὅτι ἤδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, iii. clausal salience occurs at the close of the scene addresses Jesus' nature, τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, iv. the speech is attributed to demons, v. single elaborating clauses complex at the close of scene, vi. linear development of scene culminates with a focus at its closing.

Confirmation that Jesus is the Messiah is provided at the close of both scenes. Information is also provided regarding Jesus' Messianic activity of rebuking the demons. Likewise, while the majority of Lukan scenes analysed constitute the narration exercise, Jesus' baptism represents a chreia. Marked discourse features in v. 41 indicate that the expedient point of this scene therefore occurs where it would be expected for a chreia, at its closing. The final δέ conjunctive unit in v. 41 present two additional information items, first, the demons confessing that Jesus is the anointed one, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, and second, that Jesus acted to suppress them, οὐκ εἴα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ἤδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι thus representing a mixed chreia, where both a saying and action coalesce providing the expedient point of the chreia. As was the case with Jesus' baptism, two correlative truths are provided, but here the correspondence is between the saying of the demons and the action of Jesus, both displaying his Messiahship. The expedient point of this scene is that both demonic words and Jesus' action toward them confirm that he is God's anointed one. In the first scene of Jesus' baptism, the divine voice and Spirit demonstrate univocally that he is the anointed son, while in this scene, the demons and the actions of Jesus attest to the same.

From a rhetorical standpoint, the expedient point in v. 41 is the fundamental point of the chreia. The chreia exercise provides circumstantial information that sets the stage for

understanding the teachable point, providing the necessary context by which to comprehend a given saying and action. In this scen, the backgrounded circumstnace is particularly important because v. 40 includes special salience as it relates to Jesus' healing touch for many, ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς. As noted in §8.2 above, this clause is highlighted in order to accentuate that Jesus responded to every one of the infirmed, and large crowds benefitted from Jesus. Jesus' tangible, physical touch is highlighted information

Bringing together the expedient point in v. 41 with the marked circumstantial element in v. 40 guides the chreia's expedient point, that in the context of Jesus' healing touch upon all people, his Messianic nature is displayed in the demon's confession and Jesus' authoritative rebuke.[563] This scene merges the authoritative verbal authority of Jesus with a new component of his Messiahship related to the power of his physical touch. In any case, this present scene and Jesus' baptism are remarkably similar. In their form and function, both scenes address Jesus as the Messiah. The appellations given to Jesus are reflective, where the divine voice addresses Jesus in 3:22, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου, and the demons acquiesce in 4:41, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.[564]

4.9 Luke 4:42-44

4.9.1. Luke 4:42-44 Discourse Boundary

Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον τόπον

Analysing the insights of discourse analysis, a cumulative case can be made in identifying Luke 4:42-44 as a new scene. The reasons include the following:

1. Fronting the participial clause serves as a new point of reference for this scene. The

   fronting of this clause, Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, a genitive circumstantial clause, occurs

---

[563] Apparently, Jesus does not wish for demons to address his anointed nature, but rather receives this accolade only in relation to the heavenly voice and the sacred writings (3:21-22) and seen in his post-resurrection appearances (24:26-27).

[564] Both scenes are remarkably similar in form and function, indicating that 3:21-4:44 forms an *inclusio*, a sequence that is consistently organized around a validation of Jesus' Messianic nature. The similarities of this present scene to Jesus' baptism in 3:21-22. In 3:21-22 demonstrate that the Spirit rests on Jesus while the divine voice proclaims his identity. In this present scene, Jesus' rests his hands upon others, and the demons affirm his identity as the anointed son of God. As to Jesus laying his hands on the needy, there are two possibilities if there is a substantial comparison between Jesus and his famed predecessors. First, Moses laid his hands on Joshua and the elders in Deut. 34:9 and Num. 11:24-25. Second, Jewish priestly service required the laying on of hands (Ex. 29:10,15,19, Lev. 8:14,18,22, 16:21, Num. 8:10, 12). If the second option is in view, then this Lukan sequence provides a three-fold syncrisis, comparing Jesus to Jewish kings, prophets and priests.

prior to the main verb, ἐπορεύθη. It thereby serves to frame this scene, with subsequent information cohesively anchoring to this point of departure.[565]

2. Use of δέ, is used in Luke's Gospel typically to indicate development within a narrative unit, or as in this case, to introduce a new narrative unit.

3. The typical Lukan pattern for introducing a new scene occurs in v. 42 with the use of aorist and imperfect, ἐπορεύθη and ἐπεζήτουν.

4. Regarding thematic distinction, the previous two scenes focused on Jesus' healing ministry, while the present scene addresses Jesus' teaching ministry.

5. Concerning spatial-temporal issues, while Jesus remains the main participant in the present scene, there is a new temporal frame, Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, a new cast of characters, οἱ ὄχλοι, and a different location, εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

6. The close of this scene at 4:44 is indicated by several discourse features in 5:1, including Ἐγένετο δὲ, the frontshifting the crowds as a new point of departure, and spatial-thematic distinctions. These features will be discussed in Chapter V. §1.1.

4.9.2. Luke 4:42-44 Clause Level

As with previous scenes, not every clause will be examined, but only those that are marked, and specifically those that indicate special salience. In this scene, three clauses are marked. The first marked order occurs in v. 42, Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη. This information serves as a point of departure, providing a new temporal frame of reference for this scene, as noted in §9.1. The second marked order also occurs in v. 42 regarding the crowds search for Jesus, καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπεζήτουν αὐτόν. In this instance, fronting the crowds serves switch of focus, focus turns from Jesus to the crowds with their search for him. The third instance of marked order occurs in v. 44 with Jesus' reported speech, Καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με… The other cities, Καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν, is highlighted for focus, spotlighting Jesus' expansive outreach. Jesus' verbal authority is not limited to the two synagogues in Nazareth or Capernaum, in 4:14b-37, but to the many synagogues throughout Judea.

4.9.3. Luke 4:42-44 Process Types

Clausal analysis involves the study of how various happenings are depicted throughout a scene. The process types in this scene are provided in Table 4.9.3 below:

---

[565] Levinsohn, *Discourse Features,* 182.

Table 4.9.3
Process types represented in Luke 4:42-44.

Type: Circumstantial	Existential Process	Existent
	Γενομένης	δὲ ἡμέρας

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Jesus)	ἐξελθὼν		
(Jesus)	ἐπορεύθη		εἰς ἔρημον τόπον

Behaver	Behavioral Process	Phenomenon, Behavior
οἱ ὄχλοι	ἐπεζήτουν αὐτόν	αὐτόν

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(crowds)	καὶ ἦλθον	ἕως αὐτοῦ	

Behaver	Behavioral Process	Phenomenon, Behavior
(crowds)	καὶ κατεῖχον	αὐτὸν

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Jesus)	τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι		ἀπ' αὐτῶν

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν	πρὸς αὐτοὺς	ὅτι	καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην	
(Jesus)	καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων				εἰς τὰς συναγω γὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας

As seen in Table 4.9.3, the following arrangement and frequency of process types occurs: existential (1x), material (2x), behavioral (1x), material (1x), behavioral (1x), material (1x), verbal (2x). As indicated, the present scene depicts happenings through four of the six process, with mental and relational processes absent. The arrangement of process types is similar to Jesus' baptism in 3:21-22, where the scene begins with a behavioral process and closes with a verbal process, with alternating material processes in the middle of the scene.[566]

---

[566] Typically, in brief Lukan scenes, (vv. 38-39, and vv. 40-41), the material process tends to be bracketed around various process types. However, unlike the immediately preceding chreiai scenes, there is no substantive material process assigned to Jesus in the present scene, other than his entrance into the desert which serves as the circumstantial frame of reference for this scene.

Similar to Jesus' baptism as well, verbal processes provide for the substantial transformation for this scene, where words contribute to temporal-spatial changes.

4.9.4. Luke 4:42-44 Clause Complex Level

This present scene contains six clausal lines, one extension clause, symbolized by +, and five constitute clause simplexes, which includes embedded clauses and reported speech. The layout is provided in Table 4.9.5 below:

Table 4.9.5
Clausal layout in Luke 4:42-44.

Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας / ἐξελθὼν / ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον τόπον

    +β   +γ   α

καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπεζήτουν αὐτόν (clause simplex)

καὶ ἦλθον ἕως αὐτοῦ (clause simplex)

καὶ κατεῖχον αὐτὸν   / τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν (embedded clause)

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι… (reported speech)

καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας (clause simplex)

As seen in the table above, there are no elaborating clauses complexes, which signal prominence. Instead, this scene provides tersely structures clause simplexes. This scene is distinctive in that clause simplexes occur with the highest degree of frequency, a packaging of information that most closely reflects Jesus' baptism in 3:21-22.

4.9.5. Luke 4:42-44 Scene Level

Scene level analysis involves the study of verbal tenses, conjunctive use, and finite verbal patterns. Regarding verbal tenses, this scene is typical Lukan, with aorist and imperfect verbs introducing the scene, ἐπορεύθη… ἐπεζήτουν. Also common in Lukan scenes, imperfects bracket the aorist verb located in the middle of a scene which typically constitutes the global action. However, this scene repeats the aorist to imperfect pattern twice more, ἦλθον … κατεῖχον… εἶπεν… ἦν κηρύσσων. If the Lukan pattern occurs in this present scene as well, then the aorist verb in v. 43 constitutes the central verb, Jesus' response to the Capernaum crowds who seek him, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι…

The conjunction δέ occurs twice in this scene. As Chapter II §5.1 has shown, the conjunction δέ is typically used in Luke's Gospel to indicate a textual boundary or to signal a

new step or development in a scene. The first occurrence of δέ occurs in v. 42,

Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, indicating the start of the scene. The second occurrence of δέ is

occurs in v. 43, Jesus' response to the crowds to their searching,

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι Καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί. As a result,

two informational units occur. In the first unit, Jesus goes into the wilderness, the crowds find

him, and try to stop him from leaving them. In the second unit, Jesus responds to their search,

pronouncing and enacting an inclusive kingdom mission.[567]

In the eclectic text the finite verbal pattern is this: [a]- [b]- [c]- [d]- [e]-[f].[568] This

pattern indicates that the scene progresses through a linear arrangement to this scene. The scene

does not calibrate to the center point of the scene as is common in Lukan narrations, but rather

the main point culminates at the close of the scene, and so reflects the chreia exercise that

pertained to Jesus' baptism.

4.9.6. Luke 4:42-44 Rhetorical Analysis

In order to incorporate rhetorical analysis, it is helpful to summarize the distinct

discourse features in this scene. These are provided in Table 4.9.6.

Table 4.9.6
Summary of the discourse features in Luke 4:42-44.

Clause Level: Constituent Order	Clause Level: Process Types	Clause Complex Level	Scene Level
Highlighted for focus: ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί (v. 44)	Only four processes occur with verbal processes Process type pattern similar to 3:21-22 (mixed chreia) alternating material	Five clause simplexes (terse information), and one clause of extension (circumstantial), providing one of fewest number of clause complexes, comparable to 3:21-22.	Imperfects to aorist verbal pattern centers on Jesus' verbal response to the crowds, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι… Conjunctive δέ occurs twice, i. petitioning Jesus ii. Jesus's response and departure Scene represented by linear development, culminating at close of scene with ascending prominence

---

[567] True to his identity as God's faithful son (king, prophet and priest), Jesus stay on course with his mission, to preach the good news (4:14b-29).

[568] Read-Heimderdinger and Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus*, 57.

In view of the marked discourse features in Table 4.9.6, this scene constitutes a rhetorical chreia, corresponding to Theon's handbook respective of the virtues of a chreia: i. concise, ii. attributed to a person, and iii. expedient instruction.[569] Infrequency of process types and predominance of clause simplexes indicate conciseness, while the attributed speech of Jesus and his culminating action represents the expedient point. Such expedience is indicated by the various marked features that occur at the close of the scene, comprising both Jesus' words and activity in vv. 43-44.

This scene reflects Theon's mixed chreia, containing both an action and saying, Jesus' verbal response to the crowds and his activity of preaching in various synagogues. Because this scene constitutes a mixed chreia, the saying and action of Jesus are functionally equivalent. Jesus' verbal response of his mission to inclusively preach,

Καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ…

corresponds to, or essentially reflects his subsequent activity,

καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας. As Theon notes "Mixed chreias are those that partake of both the verbal and the actional but have the meaning in the action…"[570] Consequently, Jesus' reported speech in v. 43 explicates that his mission is to broadly proclaim the gospel, a mission that is manifested in his visitations among the Judean synagogues.

A general pattern emerges between the first and last chreia in this sequence. Whereas Jesus' baptism chreia in 3:21-22 explicated Jesus' anointed office to fulfill God's mission, the present chreia explicates Jesus' anointed mission by Jesus' voice and activity through the divine voice and Spirit activity. Since the Messiah has consistently lived up to the expectations set out by divine appellations, he is uniquely qualified to fulfill God's mission, and vv. 42-44 demonstrate this sequence by setting the stage for Jesus' initiating activities to follow.

This sequence has largely displayed Jesus' person and office by means of other participants, their attributions about Jesus, whether through the divine and activity, Jewish writings, or even, the devil and his minions, reflecting Theon's encomion exercise whereby a person is praised first for their external and bodily goods. Similarly, Luke's Gospel sustains a focus on Jesus' ancestry, reputation, and deeds performed for the sake of others.[571] This

---

[569] *Progymnasmata: Greek textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans., George A. Kennedy, 15.

[570] *Progymnasmata: Greek textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans., George A. Kennedy, 17.

[571] *Progymnasmata: Greek textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, tranl., George Kennedy, 50-2.

arrangement explains why Jesus is characteristically cast in passive terms, responding to the initiatives of others.[572] The initiative of other participants in Luke's Gospel provides the function of learning great deal about Jesus' nature and office through their interaction with him.[573]

Finally, while the crowds in this Lukan sequence do not adequately attest to Jesus' Messianic office, their response to the demonic excision pinpoints the central medium by which Jesus' Messianic office has been displayed, Τίς ὁ λόγος οὖτος. The congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism has confirmed the assertion that while various scenes present Jesus as a responder, accosted by various narration participants and their attributions of him, the verbal authority of Jesus is center stage. In fact, Jesus' verbal authority not only serves to confirm the scenes' attributions, but also demonstrate that Jesus surpasses both his regal and prophetic predecessors. With such a fundamental framework in place, the congruency of rhetorical criticism and discourse analysis may establish that subsequent sequences in Luke's Gospel no longer portray Jesus as a passive participant, responding to the prior initiative of others or their attributions. Instead, because his Messiahship has already been established, focus will likely be on his initiation and advancement of Jesus' regal and prophetic mission.

---

[572] The arrangement includes the devil's accosting, and in Nazareth, the synagogue attendant delivering Isaiah's texts to him and the crowd's subsequent scorn. It also includes exigencies arising within and outside of Peter's home, and finally, the Capernaum crowd interrupting his wilderness seclusion.

[573] Throughout such scenes, Luke's audience learns about and praises Jesus both through his transformative words, and as attested by mouths of others. Those mouths include: i. the divine voice, whereby one learns that Jesus is ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα, ii. the devil for whom Jesus is approached as υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, iii. the Jewish scriptures, for whom Jesus is anointed by the Πνεῦμα κυρίου, iv. For a demon, Jesus is ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, v. for other demons Jesus is, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ… τὸν Χριστὸν.

PRACTICAL CONGRUENCE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND RHETORICAL CRITICISM IN LUKE 5:1-39

5.1.1. Luke 5:1-11 Discourse Boundary

Luke 5:1-11 constitutes a distinct scene, with support derived from the following factors:

1. Ἐγένετο δέ occurs at the beginning of 5:1, typically signaling a higher-level discourse boundary in Luke's Gospel. In addition, this discourse feature signals preceding material is backgrounded to what follows while providing a thematic context for the current scene.[574] Such a function of Ἐγένετο δέ reflects this same function in Chapter IV §2.1 where John the Baptist's ministry in 3:1-20 provided the general background for Jesus' own baptism and anointing in 3:21-22.[575] The thematic relationship between 4:42-44 and this present scene will be considered below, throughout the various levels of discourse analysis.

2. Front-shifting occurs in v. 1, ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ, constituting highlighted information regarding the crowds. Such a switch of attention, from Jesus in the previous scene to the crowds in this present scene as they attend to Jesus, provides a thematic anchor to subsequent information. Jesus' authoritative teaching, fishing, and calling, by which various constituents respond, constitutes a prominent theme throughout this scene.

3. The discourse feature δέ typically functions in Luke to introduce a new narrative unit or to signal a developmental unit within a narration. Occurring at the start of v. 1 with Ἐγένετο, δέ serves to introduce a new scene and sequence.

---

[574] As discussed in Chapter II §2.

[575] While the manner in which 5:1-11 relates to 4:42-44 remains to be seen, there are two potential points of interest that may be observed here. First, the location of the wilderness serves as the location for backgrounded material in both sequences. John the Baptist's ministry in 3:1-20 occurs in the wilderness, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ in 3:2,4, preceding Ἐγένετο δέ in 3:21 with Jesus' baptism. Similarly, the wilderness forms the backdrop in 4:42-44, εἰς ἔρημον, followed by the Ἐγένετο δέ in 5:1. Second, John's notoriety leads to his departure. In John's case, Herod the tetrarch puts him in prison. 4:42-44 addresses Jesus' notoriety, leading his departure from the region around Capernaum. Third, stepping back to survey the larger landscape, throughout 3:21-4:44 there were two syncreses at work, Jesus and David, and Jesus and the prophets, namely Elijah and Elisha. Such syncrises began with Ἐγένετο δέ. The reader of Luke's Gospel might therefore expect another syncrisis, comparing Jesus to some party or individual within ancient Israel. This possibility will be explored briefly in this scene but explored in greater detail in 5:12-16.

4. Verbal tense-aspect patterning, the alternation of the aorist and imperfect in v. 1, Ἐγένετο… ἦν ἑστὼς, follows the typical Lukan pattern in signaling a new scene.[576]

5. Regarding thematic issues, while the present scene involves Jesus' proclamation activities, even as it did in 4:42-44 within the synagogues, specific attention turns instead to Jesus' verbal authority over crowds, fish, and disciples. Jesus' kingdom message within the synagogues, occurring in 4:22-44, is instantiated in specific ways in this present scene.

6. Concerning spatial-temporal elements, Jesus' previous proclamation among Judean synagogues develops to proclamation on the shore of Lake Galilee and with a new cast of participants, large crowds, fish, and Peter and his companions.

5.1.2. Luke 5:1-11 Clause Level

Since a considerable number of marked clauses occur in this scene, specific attention is given to those clauses that constitute prominent information. The first marked clause occurs in v. 1, ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ. As noted in §1.1 above, the front-shifted elements function as a point of departure for this scene, where the crowd's response to Jesus' teaching anchors subsequent information concerning a variety of other responses' to Jesus verbal authority. [577]

In the second marked clause in v.1, Jesus is forefronted, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἑστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ. Forefronting signals two functions, as a point of departure, or for focus.[578] In this instance, Jesus is forefronted for focus. As noted in the previous clause, attention begins in this scene with the crowds in focus. Subsequent to this, forefronting Jesus serves to establish him as the main participant in this scene which is consistent with the findings of Chapter II §5.2 where Jesus serves is the VIP in Luke's Gospel from Chapter 4.1ff.[579]

---

[576] As discussed in Chapter II §2.

[577] By means of this anchoring material, this scene grounds the theme of "response" to Jesus' verbal authority, correlating to the inclusio in v. 11, with the theme of response, ἀφέντες πάντα ἀκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

[578] As discussed in Chapter II §3.

[579] Consistent with both sequences, references to Jesus in a new scene are articular, rather than anarthrous, which occurs whenever a participant is reactivated in a new scene. Jesus needs no such reference, since he is the global VIP. See Chapter II §5.2.

The third instance of marked order occurs in v. 2,
οἱ δὲ ἁλιεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες. In forefronting the fishermen, specific attention is
directed toward that which Jesus saw.[580] Jesus' perception of the fishermen is thereby
highlighted for focus, particularly because these participants will subsequently respond in
significant ways to Jesus' verbal authority.

The fourth instance of marked order occurs in v. 6,
καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες συνέκλεισαν πλῆθος ἰχθύων πολύ, with the phrase
καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες, highlighting the notion of fulfillment. Highlighting the response of
the fishers is understandable given that Peter previously hesitated over Jesus' call for them to
let down the nets in the deep water. Jesus' verbal authority is accentuated in v. 6, and his
command creates the changes.

The fifth instance of marked order, in v. 8, is located within the reported speech of
Peter, in response to the great catch of fish,
Ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε. In this case, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός
is preverbal, highlighting Peter's sinfulness. Whatever the reason for highlighting such
information in this scene, Jesus is clearly the holy man who has taken possession of Peter.[581] As
in previous scenes where participants encounter Jesus' verbal authority, Jesus' claims on life
are intensely confrontational.[582]

The next instance of marked order occurs in v. 9, θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν. In
this case the constituent *fear*, θάμβος is preverbal and focuses on the emotional response of
Peter to the great catch of fish. To use the camera analogy, fronting θάμβος, takes what was
ambiguous in the scene, though retrievable from the preceding context, and brings the response
of fear into sharp focus. As noted in the previously marked clause, Peter has come to the

---

[580] To use the film analogy, the camera has moved from the general crowd's response to then zoom in on
Jesus, steadying the camera on him. From this perspective, the camera moves from what is general and ambiguous,
items within Jesus' purview, and zooms towards the boats as far as Jesus' direct visual perception is concerned,
and further still, zooming in on the fishermen and their activity.

[581] Peter's acknowledgment of his sinfulness is reflective of the demon's resistance to Jesus in 4:33-36,
with resultant fear, as well as in 4:41. Jesus' claim on others, confronting them in their circumstance, results in
Peter's response and is likewise consistent with Jesus' claim over Peter's future vocation.

[582] Peter's acknowledgement of sinfulness requires greater understanding of the socio-cultural context
which is unavailable to modern readers, though perhaps it is related to Peter's fishing practices and social values.
For example, Peter's may express fear due to potential illegalities related to his fishing enterprise, or more general
issues related to sinners.

realization that Jesus' authority extends not only over Peter's fishing vocation but also his future vocation and ministry.

The final instance of marked order occurs at v. 10 and is another instance of reported speech, this time Jesus' response to Peter, Μὴ φοβοῦ: ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν. The constituent of men, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους, is preverbal and is highlighted in order to focus on the notion that it is men, not fish that Peter will subsequently catch. By highlighting men as opposed to the fish that were just caught, Peter's mission is substantially redirected.

5.1.3. Luke 5:1-11 Process Types

Process type analysis involves close consideration of the six-processes system by which happenings are depicted. The process types in this scene are provided in Table 5.1.3 below.

Table 5.1.3
Process types in Luke 5:1-11.

Existential Process	Existent	Circumstance
Ἐγένετο δὲ		

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον	ἐπικεῖσθαι	αὐτῷ	

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(crowds)	καὶ ἀκούειν	τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
καὶ αὐτὸς	ἦν ἑστὼς	παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Jesus)	καὶ εἶδεν	δύο πλοῖα

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
(boats)	ἑστῶτα	παρὰ τὴν λίμνην
οἱ δὲ ἁλιεῖς	ἀποβάντες	ἀπ' αὐτῶν

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(fishers)	ἔπλυνον	τὰ δίκτυα	
(Jesus)	ἐμβὰς δὲ		εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Possessive)	Attribute: Possessive
Σίμωνος	ἦν	ὃ (boat)

200

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	ἠρώτησεν	αὐτὸν	ἐπαναγαγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ὀλίγον		

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Jesus)	καθίσας δὲ	ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου	

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Jesus)	ἐδίδασκεν	τοὺς ὄχλους
	ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο	λαλῶν

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	εἶπεν	πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα		Ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶχαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν	
Σίμων	εἶπεν,	(Jesus)	καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς	Ἐπιστάτα, δι' ὅληςνυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα	

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Simon)	καὶ ποιήσαντες	τοῦτο

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Simon)	συνέκλεισαν	πλῆθος ἰχθύων πολύ	
δὲ τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν	διερρήσσετο (intransitive)		

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(Simon, etc.)	καὶ κατένευσαν	τοῖς μετόχοις ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ	τοῦ ἐλθόντας συλλαβέσθαιαὐτοῖς		

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(companions)	καὶ ἦλθον		
(companions)	καὶ ἔπλησαν	ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα	
αὐτά	ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι		

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Peter)	προσέπεσεν	τοῖς γόνασιν	Ἰησοῦ

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
(Peter)	λέγων	(Jesus)		Ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε	

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
αὐτὸν	γὰρ περιέσχεν	θάμβος
καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ	(περιέσχεν)	ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων ὧν συνέλαβον
ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου	(περιέσχεν)	

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Possessive)	Attribute: Possessive
οἳ	ἦσαν	κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Naming	Projection	Target
ὁ Ἰησοῦς	καὶ εἶπεν	πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα		Μὴ φοβοῦ: ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(boat-companions)	καὶ καταγαγόντες	τὰ πλοῖα	ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
(boat-companions)	ἀφέντες	πάντα	
(boat-companions)	ἠκολούθησαν	αὐτῷ	

Analysis of process types in this scene reveals the following order and frequency: existential (1x), material (1x), behavioral (1x), relational (1x), behavioral (1x), relational (2x), material (2x), relational (1x), verbal (1x), material (1x), behavioral (2x), verbal (2x), behavioral (1x), material (2x), verbal (1x), material (3x), behavioral (1x), material (1x), verbal (1x), mental (3x), relational (1x), verbal (1x) material (3x). In common with previous scenes, the material process flanks the process types and verbal processes occur in the middle and end of the scene.

This scene provides the largest variety and diversity of process types in the Lukan passage. First, throughout this scene the frequency and variety of process types entails that a rich depiction of happenings is maintained throughout. Second, the considerable frequency of both the behavioral and relational processes is a distinctive feature in this scene. The frequency among process types bears this out: material (13x), behavioral (7x), verbal (5x), relational (4x), mental (4x), existential (1x). Functionally, this scene prioritizes the depiction of happenings by behavioral-physiological and spatial-relational domains of experience, system selections that

influence rhetorical intent. As a result, the portrayal of Jesus is manifested through his relational views as well as behavioral activities. Who or what Jesus interacts with, and what Jesus does throughout the scene are instrumental in the portrayal of Jesus.

5.1.4. Luke 5:1-11 Clause Complex Level

Clause complex analysis identifies how information is packaged among various clausal relationships. Seventeen clausal lines occur in this scene, representing the largest number of clauses examined in this project. Among these there are four clause simplexes and thirteen clause complexes. Because elaborating clause complexes carry the greatest semantic weight, these are presented below in Table 5.1.4. There are five elaborating clause complexes. Head clauses are marked by α, and consecutive dependent clauses, marked by β, γ, and so on. Dependent clauses are symbolized by their relationship to the head clause, either by extension, symbolized by +, or by elaboration symbolized by =.

Table 5.1.4
Clause analysis of Luke 5:1-11.

Ἐγένετο δὲ/ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ/ καὶ ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ…

      α   =β   =γ

καὶ εἶδεν δύο πλοῖα/ ἑστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην…

        α   =β

καὶ κατένευσαν τοῖς μετόχοις ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ/ τοῦ ἐλθόντας συλλαβέσθαι αὐτοῖς…

        α   =β

καὶ ἔπλησαν ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα/ ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά.

        α   =β

ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος / προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ/ λέγων…

+β   α   =γ

In the first clause-complex above, Ἐγένετο δὲ… there are two clauses elaborating the temporal marker ʽΕγένετο δέ. As noted in §1.1 above, this clause signals a new scene and anchors successive material around the temporal circumstances associated with the crowd's response to Jesus. The elaborating clauses, gathering around Jesus and hearing God's Word, form the basis for subsequent material in this scene.

Regarding the second clause complex above, the head clause, καὶ εἶδεν δύο πλοῖα, is elaborated, ἑστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην, specifying what Jesus saw. The relevance of such

information is successively revealed, as the boat is the location for Jesus' activities throughout this scene. First, Jesus uses the boat to teach the crowds, second, he uses it to catch fish, and finally, to draw Peter and his companions to himself.

The final three elaborating clause complexes occur in a short space in vv.7-9 and occur subsequent to Peter's catching a multitude of fish. In v. 7, this elaborating clause complex first occurs, καὶ κατένευσαν τοῖς μετόχοις ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ. In this case, the head clause is followed by a clause of elaboration, signaling what the call to the companions consisted of, τοῦ ἐλθόντας συλλαβέσθαι αὐτοῖς. That is, in response to the great catch, the signal to their companions consists of their coming and helping.

Inserted between the final three elaborating clause complexes, a solitary clause simplex occurs, καὶ ἦλθον. Here, Jesus' signal to Peter's companions to come and help is met with their response. The choice to present a clause simplex among a variety of clause complexes sometimes serves to signal its fundamental rolls in a narration.[583] Foregrounding the companions' arrival serves to integrate the experience of the fishermen with Peter's own experience of Jesus. Peter's catch of fish is their catch, Peter's confession is their confession, and his following Jesus, is theirs as well, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.[584]

Directly following the arrival of the fisherman, the next elaborating clause complex occurs. The head clause, καὶ ἔπλησαν ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα, precedes a clause of elaboration, ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά. This instance elaborates on the filling of the fish; the filling was of such a degree that the boats nearly sank from the load. In the next elaborating complex, the head clause, προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ, is situated between an extension clause, ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος…and an elaborating clause, λέγων. The

---

[583] As discussed in Chapter 2 §4.1. See also: Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 430.

[584] Vs. 9-10 supports this notion:
θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων ὧν συνέλαβον, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, οἳ ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. Matthew and Mark incorporate solidarity, but only by distinguishing the calling of Jesus, first to Simon and Andrew, then later, to James and John. Matthew and Mark both use Καὶ προβὰς to indicate a temporal-spatial development or thematic sequencing between their respective calls.

elaborating clause, λέγων, serves to specify the action associated with Peter's kneeling before Jesus, constituting his words of response to the great catch of fish.[585]

The distribution of both distinct clause simplexes and clause complexes suggests that fishing activities are accentuated at various locations throughout this scene. Jesus' activities relationally associated with fishing occurs throughout the scene's development, whether he is beside the shore teaching, in a boat proclaiming, or in that same boat catching fish and drawing fishermen to himself. The catch of fish activates a distinctive conglomerate of clause complexes as well as a solitary clause simplex. The great catch of fish activates prominent units of information that focus upon Peter's response as well as his companions.

5.1.5. Luke 5:1-11 Scene Level

Clause complex analysis suggested that this present scene progresses by clustering various units of information around Jesus' fishing activities. Support is derived from conjunctive analysis, particularly the use of δέ which occurs seven times. The first δέ is in v. 1, Ἐγένετο δὲ/ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ... As discussed in §1.1 above, while δέ introduces a point of departure for the scene, signaling that vv. 1-11 constitutes a new scene, δέ also serves to move the narration in successive stages. Regarding the second function, the second to fifth occurances of δέ occur in close proximity in vv. 2-4. The series commences with an imperfect, the fishermen washing the nets, and concludes with Jesus asking Peter to put his nets out into the deep:

οἱ δὲ ἁλιεῖς ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες ἔπλυνον τὰ δίκτυα

ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων ὃ ἦν Σίμωνος ὃ ἦν Σίμωνος ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν

καθίσας δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου ἐδίδασκεν…

ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα…

Two strings of the conjunction καί occur in this scene, in vv. 5-6, and in v. 7. Where a succession of the conjunction καί precedes a δέ, the final καί in the series signals a climactic moment in a narration.[586] In the present scene, two strings of καί occur. In the first καί series in vv. 5-6, the climactic moment occurs with the large catch of fish,

καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες συνέκλεισαν πλῆθος ἰχθύων πολύ. Subsequently, δέ v. 6

---

[585] V. 9 constitutes an embedded clause. The head clause, θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν, contains an elaborating embedded clause, καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ… τῶν ἰχθύων ὧν συνέλαβον.

[586] This has been previously discussed in in Ch. 2 §5.1.

begins the next stage, with the breaking of the nets, διερρήσσετο δὲ τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν. In the second καί series in v. 7, the climactic moment occurs where the boats fill their nets to breaking, καὶ ἔπλησαν ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά. Subsequently, δέ in v. 8 presents Peter's response to the catch of fish, ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ. The final stage of the narration occurs in v. 10, where the fear that previously seized Peter now seizes his fishing partners, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον. An overall view of the entire scene of conjunctions reveals that each informational unit signaled by δέ provides information related to fishing.[587] In each of these units, Jesus is the active participant, asserting some action or activity, initiating events to which others respond. The central fisherman may not be Peter, but rather Jesus, since in each informational unit he is associated with and initiating a fishing activity. Jesus is being presented as an incessant fisherman, drawing a host of entities to himself: crowds, fish, Peter, and, finally, Peter's fishing companions.[588]

Verbal aspect, as noted in Chapter II §5.4, is also integral in scene analysis. The aorist verb, as perfective, serves to carry the storyline forward. The distribution of the aorist verbs in this scene confirm such a function. However, there are three imperfects in this scene. The first two imperfects occur near the beginning of the scene. The first use is an imperfect periphrastic in v. 1, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἑστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ. The second imperfect occurs in v. 2, οἱ δὲ ἁλιεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες ἔπλυνον τὰ δίκτυα. The third imperfect, in v. 6b, occurs at the great catch of fish, διερρήσσετο δὲ τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν. After this moment, aorist verbs are used exclusively throughout the remainder of the scene.

As Chapter II§5.4 has shown, imperfect verbs tend to present backgrounded information, as is the case in vv. 1-2. However, imperfective use, particularly in the middle of a scene, also functions to signal prominent information by drawing the audience into select

---

[587] For example, in v. 1 Jesus is situated beside the lake, surrounded by crowds, and looking at two boats. In vv. 2-6a Jesus gets into the boat, teaches the people, and charges Peter to go into the deep for a catch of fish. In vv. 6b-7, Peter catches a great load of fish, the nets break, and the catch even swamps the other fishing boats who assist. In vv. 8-10, Peter responds with direct speech and fear at the catch of fish. Finally, in vv. 10-12, fear also overcome Peter's fishing companions as they leave their boats and follow Jesus.

[588] This comports well with the previous scene, in which Jesus' mission is to cast his nets large, preaching the gospel throughout Judea. As has been noted in §1.1 above, the use of Ἐγένετο δέ signals that this new scene is in some respect related thematically to 4:42-44. That Jesus is possibly being conveyed in this scene as a great fisherman, one who catches widely, collaborates with the general compass of the previous scene, as it conveys in a more general way Jesus' expansive gospel ministry.

narration elements. The imperfect verb in v. 6b occurs with the great catch of fish. As the pivotal moment of the narration, the great catch of fish is that which activates the subsequent and prominent actions of Jesus, Peter, and his companions.

Scene analysis also involves a consideration of finite verbal arrangement because the central finite verb or verbs pinpoints a central element in a scene. As discussed in Chapter II §5.6, numeric count of finite verbs identifies if a scene is organized in a concentric pattern with one central element or organized in a symmetrical pattern with two central elements. Following the N-A eclectic text, the present scene is arranged symmetrically, wherein two central elements are arranged in a similar pattern: a-b-c-c'-b'-a'. These two finite central verbs comprise the catch of fish, συνέκλεισαν πλῆθος ἰχθύων πολύ, and the nets that subsequently broke, διερρήσσετο δὲ τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν. The catch of fish triggers, or activates, a variety of distinct marked discourse features. The catch of fish serves a proleptic function, pointing forward to the prominent responses or results that the catch of fish produces in various participants.

5.1.6. Luke 5:1-11 Rhetorical Analysis

Before incorporating rhetorical criticism with the insights of discourse analysis, it is useful to summarize the marked discourse features that have been identified by discourse analysis. These are summarized in Table 5.1.6 below:

Table 5.1.6
Summary of marked discourse features for Luke 5:1-11.

Constituent Order	Process Types	Clause Complex	Scene
Marked clauses include: (1) highlighting Peter's compliance to Jesus' command to let down the nets, καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες. (2) highlighting Peter's fear after the great catch of fish, θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν. In reported speech: (1) Peter's response to the catch of fish, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε, (2) Jesus' response to Peter, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν	A considerable and distinctive number of process types, with relational and behavioral processes frequent, associated with fishing activities	Single clause complex, καὶ ἦλθον in v. 7 in the midst of three elaborating clause complexes in vv. 7-8. Prominence on Peter's response, as well as others to the catch. Such elaborating clauses culminate with Peter's response: ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ λέγων…	Informational units, by means of δέ revolve around Jesus' fishing activities The central symmetrical verbs include the catch of fish and the breaking of their nets

Rhetorical criticism according to Theon's handbook, approaches Lukan narrations with the two primary objectives of identifying the global action in a given narration and finding an appropriate virtue pertinent to that action. The global action is Jesus' great catch of fish, supported by the discourse analysis presented in Table 5.1.6. At the same time, prominence also rests on the consequences of Jesus' great catch of fish as it pertains to Peter and his fishing companions. As is typical in Lukan narrations, reported speech immediately prior or subsequent to the global action, reveals important information about Jesus' personhood, whether his office, nature, training, disposition, or so on. [589] In the case of Peter and his companions, Jesus' authority lays claims not only over fish but over their own lives as well.

Because the majority of marked discourse features occur in vv. 7-9a, these clauses constitute prominent information related to Jesus' praiseworthiness.[590] As evident in the table above, Peter's response to the catch of fish, constitutes three prominent elements in this scene. First is Peter's material response to Jesus' catch of fish, constituting the distinctive elaborating clause complex in this scene, ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ λέγων... Second is Peter's subsequent marked reported speech,

Ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε. Third, Peter's fear is marked, θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν.

By marking Peter's threefold response, the claim of Jesus upon Peter's mental, material, and verbal activities, Jesus authority is portrayed as extensive in scope, not simply over fish, but also over Peter. Like the fish, Peter is laid low in the boat at the overwhelming authority of Jesus, yet unlike the fish, Peter is depicted by a wide variety of happenings as one who is completely apprehended by Jesus.[591] A final marked feature occurs in v. 10, and reflects that Jesus' catch also consists of Peter. In v. 10, Jesus commissions Peter with these words, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν. The catch of men, not fish, represent Peter's future activities.

---

[589] The notion that reported speech often reveals the virtue of an action is consistent with previous Lukan scenes, such as 4:1-14a, 14b-29, 30-37, and 40-41.

[590] While there is a marked clause in v. 6 regarding Peter's acquiescing to Jesus' command to let down the nets for a catch, καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες, this clause serves to anticipate a great revelation of Jesus' authority and a far greater response that occurs in vv. 7-9.

[591] Jesus' authoritative claim over Peter and his companions fittingly closes out the scene in v. 11, ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

Theon's handbook thereby frames this narration, in identifying first the global action regarding Jesus' catch of fish, and second, what this action reveals about Jesus, as the authoritative fisherman. This observation comports well with this scene's frequent use of the conjunctive δέ, and the prevalence of the behavioral and relational processes. Within every developmental unit of this scene, Jesus is portrayed in a way that associates him with fishing activities. Consequently, while Jesus' global action centers on the great catch of fish, he has been involved in some type of fishing since the scene's inception, catching crowds, fish, and finally, recalcitrant sinners, to himself and through his words.[592] If this is the case, Jesus' global action of catching fish functions as a metonymy, encompassing a wide variety of narration participants. From a rhetorical perspective, the chief point of this scene is nearly complete, that Jesus' action of catching fish with his authoritative words demonstrates that he is the great fisherman, drawing both fish and sinners to himself.

An application of the syncrisis exercise reveals that Jesus has been compared to King David from Luke 3:21-14:14a, as well as to Israel's great prophets, Elijah and Elisha, in Luke 4:14b-44. The exercise focuses on whether Jesus' action in this present scene is also being compared with earlier paradigms, as in the previous comparison between Jesus and Elisha. The comparison is predicated on the thematic sequencing and a comparison between global actions. The sequence of Jesus' activities in Luke's Gospel corresponds generally to the thematic sequence within the Elisha narratives. In the Elisha narratives, the prophet resurrects the dead in 2 Kgs 4:18-37, provides an overabundance of food for the sons of prophets in vv. 38-44, and then heals a leper in 2 Kgs 5:1-14. Jesus raises individuals near death in Luke 4:31-44, provides an overabundance of food for those he commissions in 5:1-11, and in vv. 12-16, Jesus heals a leper. If Luke's Gospel thematically arranges such material around such Elisha narratives, then comparing Jesus to Elisha is entirely appropriate.[593]

---

[592] *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. George A. Kennedy, 39. The presence of several narratives within a single scene is not unremarkable. Theon notes: "It is possible to weave narration into narration whenever we try to narrate two or three narrations at the same time." This assertion comports well with the fact that Luke's Gospel is unique among the evangelists in presenting this scene, narrating not simply the singular call, but also involving Jesus' teaching ministry, the great catch of fish, and Peter's response. In fact, while both Jesus' call to the fisherman and a great catch of fish are narrated by the Matthew and Mark, these occur at diverse locations throughout their Gospel, rather than as a continuous narrative scene as here in Luke. One possibility for the intent is that by linking Jesus' teaching, with the great catch of fish and peter's response, Luke's Gospel provides a cumulative rhetorical effect that in Jesus' teaching, catching fish, and compelling followers, he is the great fisherman.

[593] John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden, eds., *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Compositionon of Luke* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2014). Thomas L. Brodie, *The Crucial bridge: The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press,

The global actions appear to be similar. Both Elisha and Jesus respond to those who are needy, whether in famine, or without a catch of fish throughout the night. Jesus' global action reflects that of Elisha; he is providing for the needy. However, upon closer examination, Jesus' global action once again exceeds that of Elisha. Jesus' great catch of fish is not for physical sustenance, to satisfy their material needs, but rather reaches deeper, laying claim over people presented both inwardly and outwardly. Elisha provides and those who benefit simply eat, closing out the narrations. In this Lukan scene, however, Jesus' provision forms the fulcrum for much more occurrences, as Peter and his companions leave all to follow him. Compared to Elisha's provision of food, Jesus' provisions looms large throughout this scene, drawing crowds, fish and disciples to himself, explaining why the majority of marked discourse features occur with Peter's response, whereas Jesus' authoritative draw also encompasses a wide cast of participants.[594] The chief point of this scene incorporating the syncrisis is that Jesus' action of catching fish with his authoritative words demonstrates that he is the great fisherman, drawing both fish and sinners to himself, surpassing both Elisha provisions and his ability to draw other to himself.

As noted in the chief point, Jesus' claim over sinners serves an important role in this scene. Jesus' relationship to sinners in drawing them to himself discloses the rationale for a new sequence in v. 1. The theme of sinfulness will continue to unfold throughout this sequence,

---

2000), 1-27. Thomas L. Brodie, *Proto-Luke: The Oldest Gospel account. A Christ-Centered Synthesis of Old Testament History Modelled Especially on the Elijah-Elisha Narrative: Introduction, Text, and Old Testament Model* (Limerick, Ireland: Dominican Biblical Institute, 2006).

[594] If this scene addresses Jesus' prophetic ministry, then it appears to present an ominous and complex theme, weaving in possible allusions to Isaiah six, and the summons for Israel to respond amidst rebellion. This observation would encourage a reading of Luke's Gospel that is polysemic, particularly Jesus' direct speech: Ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν, where deep waters and catching men carries the force of a prophetic indictment. Substantiating this observation is Jesus' subsequent words to Peter, Μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν, with echoes of Isaiah 6. If, in addition to comparisons with Elisha, Isaianic associations are nascent in this scene, then there is a portend of rejection and judgment for those within Israel who do not respond favorably to Jesus' proclamation. This may explain why 'fishing for men' is potentially ambiguous, yet also characteristically negative among the Old Testament prophets, as in Ezekiel 29:4-5, Habakkuk 1:14-17, and Amos 4:2. That Jesus' ministry conveys the portend of judgment or blessing is consonant with John the Baptist's remarks concerning Jesus' ministry in Luke 3:15-17, where one's response to Jesus is attended by various themes: the Holy Spirit and fire, chaff and grain, salvation and judgment. If Jesus' ministry raises such high stakes for those whom he ministered to, it also accentuates the rhetorical function of this scene for not only is Jesus is greater than the prophets of old, but negative response to him carries with it dire consequences. Jesus' ministry is praiseworthy to such an extent that it carries with it existential crisis for Luke's readership whereby response to Jesus results in confrontation and response, repentance toward blessing or rejection toward judgment.

as each scene addresses notions of uncleanness, sin and forgiveness, involving an unclean leper, a paralytic needing forgiveness, and a tax collector and his sinful entourage.[595]

5.2.1. Luke 5:12-16 Discourse Boundary

Utilizing insights from discourse analysis, Luke 5:12-16 constitutes a scene. Support derives from the following factors:

1. As discussed in Chapter II §1.2, the use of Ἐγένετο in 5:12 functions in Luke's Gospel as a transition marker. As a transition marker, successive scenes are seen against the background of previous ones and retain a thematic relationship. Prominent elements of the previous scene, particularly sinfulness or uncleanness, provide the general thematic circumstance for this present scene concerning Jesus cleansing a leper.

2. Regarding thematic considerations, as noted above, Jesus' relation to those unclean provides the undercurrent for this sequence. However, the precise nature of uncleanness is distinct from scene to scene. In the previous scene, it involved a sinful fisherman and his entourage, while this present scene involves an unclean leper.

3. Regarding spatial-temporal considerations, this present scene no longer takes place amidst seashore activities, but rather portrays Jesus in a city, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων, and with a new participant, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας.

5.2.2. Luke 5:12-16 Clause Level

In the present scene three marked clauses occur, in vv. 13, 14, and 16. The first instance of marked constituent order, καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, functions to highlight two aspects, first, the unexpected nature of Jesus' healing, καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν, and second, to draws attention to the fact the fact that the leprosy left the man, ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. In v. 14, the second instance of marked order occurs, καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ. In this case, the pre-verbal constituent serves to bring Jesus into focus, signaling a switch of attention from the leper's healing to Jesus' charge. To use the film analogy, the second marked clause takes the camera's focus off of the leprous man to

---

[595] If the theme of sin and uncleanness dominates this second sequence, then perhaps it is also the case the Luke's audience is introduced to an additional syncrisis in this sequence, particularly involving those in ancient Israel who ministered to sinners and those unclean, namely Israel's priests. A typical Jewish exegetical technique is for historians to use the Torah as a paradigm for then-contemporary circumstances. See: Andres Garcia Serrano, *The Presentation in the Temple: The Narrative Function of Luke 2:22-39 in Luke-Acts* (Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2012), 45-50, 71-72, 109-122.

instead focus on Jesus' command to the healed man. Such a switch of attention also occurs in v. 16, αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις where focus moves from the leper's response to Jesus' charge to then focus on Jesus' wilderness habitat. While vv. 14 and 16 signal a switch of attention, v. 13 is distinct in its function, highlighting the immediate nature of Jesus' healing, καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

5.2.3. *Luke 5:12-16 Process Types*

Process type analysis examines the construal system of happenings across the six process types. Table 5.2.3 below displays the process types in the present scene:

Table 5.2.3
Process types in Luke 5:12-16.

Existential Process	Existent	Circumstance
Clause Ἐγένετο δὲ	This discourse feature is associated with the three immediate clauses that follow, the relational, mental and behavioral processes. These processes serve as attendant temporal circumstances, providing a spatial-temporal frame of reference. That is, they provide background and introductory material that sets the stage for the scene's development.	

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
αὐτὸν	ἐν τῷ εἶναι	ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
(the leper)	ἰδὼν δὲ	τὸν Ἰησοῦν

Actor	Material Process	Goal (Client)
(the leper)	πεσὼν	ἐπὶ πρόσωπον

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
(leper)	ἐδεήθη	αὐτοῦ	λέγων	Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι	

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Jesus)	καὶ ἐκτείνας	τὴν χεῖρα

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Jesus)	ἥψατο	αὐτοῦ	

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
(Jesus)			λέγων	Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι	

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
ἡ λέπρα	καὶ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν	ἀπ' αὐτοῦ

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
καὶ αὐτὸς	παρήγγειλεν	αὐτῷ	μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν	ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς	
	διήρχετο δὲ		μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ		

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
ὄχλοι πολλοὶ	καὶ συνήρχοντο	ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶν[596]

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
αὐτὸς	δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν	ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Jesus)	καὶ προσευχόμενος	

A summary of the process types above indicates the following order and frequency: existential process (1x), relational process (1x), mental process (1x), material (1x), verbal process (1x), behavioral process (x1), material process (1x), verbal process (1x), relational process (1x), verbal processes (x2), behavioral process (1x), relational process (1x), behavioral process (1x). As seen above, the entire spectrum of the six depiction types occurs in this scene despite being considerably shorter than the previous one. In addition, the present scene retains the pattern of the majority of previous scenes wherein verbal processes largely occurs in the middle of the scene. Consistent with such a pattern, the global action would thereby occur near

---

[596] Note that this clause is not a separate process type because in this case, with the behavioral process, the representation is one of intent, with the behavioral process mediating between the mental process (intent and phenomenon) and the material (modal anticipation). The assembling of the crowds is accompanied by a circumstance of intent ("to be…").

the middle of the scene by means of Jesus' reported speech. As noted in the previous scene, the first sequence tends to provide a significant number of material processes. In the present sequence, however, the material process recedes, giving way to increased behavioral and relational processes. In fact, the present scene contains only two material processes, the leper falling down before Jesus, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, and Jesus reaching out to the leper, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ. In virtue of such minimal frequency, the material processes associated with the leper falling and Jesus touching may function as prominent elements in this scene.

5.2.4. Luke 5:12-16 Clause Complex

In the present scene, one paratactic clause occurs at the start of the scene, following by four clause simplexes and three elaborating clause complexes. In this scene, there are four clause simplexes, all are located in rapid succession, in the middle portion of this scene in vv. 13b-15. The first clause simplex is presented as a relational process type, as Jesus' response to the original request made by the leper, καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. The clause is presented relationally, and not as a material process, such as "his skin became whole," "the leprosy no longer consumed his flesh," or that it "deteriorated his skin." An increased usage of the relational process provides an increased capacity for nuances of meaning.[597] For example, the exegete may be encouraged, by this relational presentation, to consider whether this scene is simply about a leprous healing, or whether it may also signal that this healing constitutes a healing of holistic integration into a community, which is reflective of, but also surpassing, the service among Israel's priests. The second clause simplex, καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ, contains Jesus' words to the leper, including the specific Mosaic injunction concerning cleanness and associated with a leper's reintegration into a community, and by means of priestly confirmation. Leviticus 13:49, 14:2ff. In the third clause simplex, διήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ, the news about Jesus continues unabated, despite the healed man's disregard for Jesus' words. The final clause simplex contains two embedded clauses, καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶ This clause provides the result of the message of the man's healing, crowds flocking to Jesus to hear him and to be healed.

---

[597] As discussed in Ch II §3.2.

While clause simplexes provide one distinct means for processing information, elaborating clause complexes tend to signal greater prominence, by virtue of increased processing energy associated with the respective head clause. Table 5.2.4 displays these clauses, occurring in vv. 12, 13, and 16. Following Halliday's notation system, head clauses are marked by α, and consecutive dependent clauses, marked by β, γ, and so on. Dependent clauses are symbolized by their relationship to the head clause with extension clauses symbolized by +, and elaboration clauses symbolized by =.

Table 5.2.4
Clauses analysis for Luke 5:12-16.

ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν/ πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον / ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ/ λέγων…

    +β   +γ   α   =δ

καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα / ἥψατο αὐτοῦ/ λέγων…

    +β   α   =γ

αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις/ καὶ προσευχόμενος

                α   =β

In the first elaborating clause complex, two clauses of extension occur, ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν/ πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, preceding the head clause, ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ, and followed by an elaborating clause, λέγων... As noted in Chapter II §4, elaborating clauses clarify, specify, or describe the main verb in a given clause. The leper's prostration before Jesus is specified by his request that Jesus heal him if he so wills.

The next clause is arranged similarly, though the action is ascribed to Jesus rather than the leper. In this case, the extension clause, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, precedes the head clause, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ, and is followed by an elaborating clause of reported speech, λέγων… Jesus' words also reflect the elaborating clausal pattern between vv. 12-13, wherein Jesus consequently expresses that he so wills to heal the leper.[598]

---

[598] To assist in the importance of clause complexes that are assigned greater weight, likening clause complex to a few photographs stationed around a photograph centered on a given table is a useful comparison and discussed previously in Ch. II §4. The choice to place a photograph in the center of a table with a photograph or two placed around it is comparable to presenting a head clause, as the primary or central clause, and then positioning other dependent and auxiliary clauses around that head clause. Following this analogy, an extensions clause is comparable to placing a photo to the side of the central photograph, and an elaborating clause is comparable to a photo overlaid on the central photograph, but only to the extent that it elucidates the central photograph. In this case, the head clause is central to that table, extended and elaborated by attendant clauses. To extend this analogy, a variety of clause complexes in a scene represents several tables placed side-by-side. In that case, a clause complex that provides increased attendant and elaborating clauses is typically the most prominent

The final clause complex in v. 16 contains a head clause and a subsequent clause of elaboration that provides clarifying information regarding Jesus' stay in the wilderness, namely, that it involved prayer, αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις/ καὶ προσευχόμενος. Because the global action of Luke's Gospel centers on Jesus, and typically expressed by means of both extension and elaborating clause, comprising Jesus' words, the plausibility is that Jesus' touch and words of the leper constitutes the global action in this scene. For example, in vv.1-11, the same extension-elaborating clause complex occurred with Peter's response to Jesus' great catch of fish, in 4:30-37, the same pattern occurs as the demon is excised, and in 4:14b-29, Jesus' proclamation of Isaianic fulfillment is central to the scene.

5.2.5 Luke 5:12-16 Scene Analysis

Scene analysis involves analysis of conjunctions, verbal aspect, and finite verbal count. In the present scene, the conjunction δέ is used on three occasions First, in v. 12 as the leper sees Jesus, ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, second, in v. 15, as the leper fails to follow Jesus' charge, διήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ, and third, in v. 16 as Jesus withdraws into the wilderness, αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις. By means of the conjunction δέ, the scene is sequenced into three developmental units: i. Jesus' interaction, healing of the leper, and charge to silence in vv. 12-14, ii. the leper's publication, and multitudes crowding Jesus for healings in v. 15, and iii. Jesus' solitary praying in the wilderness in v. 16. The units are thereby arranged from healing and charge, to rejection of charge and healings, and finally, to Jesus' withdrawal in the wilderness.[599] These three units represent distinctions among participants and locations, as the scene moves from the city to the wilderness, and from two participants, to multitudes, and finally closing with Jesus all alone. The only shared process found in all three units is the behavioral process, Jesus reaching out his hand to the leper, the crowds flocking Jesus, and Jesus' solitary praying.

---

table, singled out from rest. In this scene, then, the posture of the leper before Jesus, and principally, Jesus' healing represents the most prominent elements within this scene.

[599] By using the conjunctions to arrange the scene in this way, the relational processes, possessing potential instances of ambiguity, may convey an implicit theme in this scene. To the extent that Jesus is following the injunctions and sequence of Lev. 13-14, there is an irony in this scene, namely, that whereas the leprous man is re-integrated into the community, Jesus' action results in his withdrawal from the community.

Regarding finite verbal use, aorist verbs not only provide backbone for a scene's development, but also constitute the verbal aspect for the global action. The global action of Jesus would be either his touch of the leper, ἥψατο, which results in the leprosy leaving the man, καὶ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν, or Jesus' charge for the man not to speak but to show himself to the priest, παρήγγειλεν. All three aorist verbs occur in succession in vv. 13-14.

Regarding imperfective use, three imperfects occur in succession in vv. 15-16, and immediately follow Jesus' charge for the man to show himself to the priest:

διήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ…

καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ…

αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν…

Besides providing preliminary and circumstantial information, imperfective use in Luke's Gospel signals close proximity to the global action, typically occurring immediately prior, or after, the global action.[600]

The third and final component to scene analysis is the arrangement of finite verbs by numeric count, in order to determine the central point of a narration. In the N-A eclectic text eight finite verbs occur, resulting in a symmetrical structure. Jesus' healing touch, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ, and Jesus' charge to the leper to show himself to the priest, παρήγγειλεν, provide the center points of the narration.

5.2.6. Luke 5:12-16 Rhetorical Analysis

Table 5.2.6
Summary of discourse analysis in Luke 5:12-16.

Constituent Order	Process Types	Clause Complex	Scene
Highlighted constituents: i. unexpected immediate nature of the healing, and ii. the leprosy leaving the man: καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. The remainder of marked clauses provide a switch of attention between the leper and Jesus	Material process is used only once in regard to Jesus, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ The behavioral and relational process types are more frequent than in previous scenes.	Distinctive clause complex containing both extension and elaborating clause, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων..	Conjunctive δέ signals three units: i. healing and charge to leper, ii. man's publication, iii. Jesus' wilderness withdrawal. Two aorist verbs ascribed to Jesus, i. touch of leper, ἥψατο ii. and his charge, παρήγγειλεν. Symmetrical pattern reveals two central verbs: ἥψατο, παρήγγειλεν.

---

[600] Discussed in Ch. II §5.4.

As discussed in Chapter III §2.2, Theon's handbook emphasizes the importance of the global action for a scene, where the other narration elements elaborate the epideictic function. In view of Table 5.2.6, Jesus' healing touch and accompanying words to the leper constitutes the global action, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων... There are three reasons for identifying the global action as Jesus' touch and words to the leper: i. Jesus' healing touch and subsequent words results in the sole highlighted clause, καὶ

εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ii. Jesus' touch and associated words constitutes the sole material process ascribed to Jesus, and iii. Jesus' touch and words to the leper represents a distinctive clause complex of extension and elaboration. At the same time, Jesus' charge to the leper is closely associated with the global action, providing prominent insight into the rhetorical function of Jesus' healing. Jesus' healing cannot be understood apart from reference to his charge for the man to show himself to the priest.

However, Jesus' material touch and elaborating words represents only the second time that the material process serves as the global action, the first occurring in 4:39-41, with Jesus' touch of the sick and demonized,

δὲ ἐνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.[601] However, because Luke 4:40-41 represents a mixed chreia, the present scene constitutes the first instance in a narrative exercise where the material process constitutes the global action.[602] At the same time,

---

[601] Jesus' actions have been portrayed primarily by way of the verbal process: rebuking the devil in the wilderness in 4:1-14a, Jesus' proclamation of Isaiah's fulfillment in the Nazareth synagogue in 4:14b-29, his rebuking a demon in a synagogue in 4:30-37, his rebuke of sickness in Peter's mother-in-law in 4:38-39, his kingdom proclamation throughout villages in 4;42-44, and his verbal authority over fishing enterprises in 5:1-11.

[602] The next instance of Jesus' physical touch is Luke 7:14:
καὶ προσελθὼν ἥψατο τῆς σοροῦ, οἱ δὲ βαστάζοντες ἔστησαν, καὶ εἶπεν, Νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθ
ητι. However, even in this scene it is still Jesus' verbal authority that raises the young man from the dead, and the distance between the material and verbal process is distinguished further by the δέ conjunction and distinct finite verbs, ἥψατο and εἶπεν. The next Lukan scene to merge the material and verbal processes is 8:54, αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν λέγων... Nonetheless, Jesus' verbal authority dominates the majority of Lukan scenes. Such an observation confirms the notion that Jesus' ministry reflects Jesus' primary mission as represented by his verbal authority. This is further supported by noting the programmatic scene whereby Jesus announcement his Isaianic fulfillment in Luke 4:18-19. In these two verses, the arrangement is chiastic: A-B-C-B'-A'. In this chiasm, verbal proclamation brackets the interior, with freedom/release as the B-B', and the central C as the recovery of sight to the blind. In other words, Jesus' mission is principally accomplished by the verbal process, that is, proclamation. Jesus' prophetic/verbal mission is consistent with Isaiah's own prophetic ministry and prophetic ministry in general. Elisha's cleaning of Namaan the leper in 2 Kings 5:10 is reflective of Jesus' verbal authority. In fact, Namaan's immediate objection to Elisha's verbal authority is that it did not carry with it some type of relational or material process seen in his complaint in 2 Kings 5:11. Perhaps the clearest example that the prophetic ministry of verbal authority carries with it material effectuality is seen in Jeremiah 1:9-10, where the words the Lord gives Jeremiah the power to destroy, plan, and build kingdom and nations. While it may be countered that Jesus' greatest action in Luke's Gospel is his death on the cross, it must be

the global action of Jesus' touch of the leper is not dissociated from his verbal authority, λέγων… The material and the verbal processes converge through what is elaborated in Jesus' words, λέγων, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. Consequently, Jesus' verbal authority is concurrent with his healing touch of the leper.

The operative assumption in this project is that since identifying the global action is a critical component to the narrative exercise in Theon's *Progymnasmata*, then the speaker is compelled, albeit unconsciously, to signal in various ways or levels, prominent discourse features so that the native audience can identify, though again, often subconsciously, a respective global action and its rhetorical function. Luke 5:12-16 is a fine case in point, with its demonstration of the various level of discourse analysis that has pinpointed Jesus' healing touch as the global action of this scene.

Following Theon's handbook, the global action achieves its rhetorical purpose through those prominent auxiliary elements, person, time, place, manner, and cause. Table 5.2.6 is instrumental in identifying the marked narration elements.[603] The first prominent narration element, and one that occurs in the same clause complex as the global action, is the element of manner, exhibited in Jesus' words to the leper, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. Such information demonstrates that Jesus' action toward the leper was done willingly and is significant insofar as a character's action is viewed as more noble if it is done by own choice and ability.[604] The action can only be opaquely assigned to the character. The time and place of the global action are not marked in the scene, but instead provide preliminary and backgrounded information.[605]

---

remembered that even on the cross, Jesus' verbal authority continues: extending forgiveness and welcoming a criminal into paradise. After the resurrection, Jesus commissions the disciples to a reflective ministry, whereby proclamation is central, as seen at the closing of Luke 24:44-53.

[603] As Ch. 1§3 has shown, a rhetorical speech envisioned by Theon is arranged purposefully, beginning with an exordium, followed by a narrative, a statement of facts that he led to the issue at point, with the narrative leading directly to the reason for the speech, the proposition. The proposition is then followed by arguments for and against the proposition and ends with a summary. In this arrangement the narrative must be presented with the triad virtues of plausibility, clarity and conciseness.

[604] The leper addresses Jesus by addressing the manner for his action, whether he is willing to perform the miracle, Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. Jesus 'subsequent response, affirms his willingness, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. Theon hints at why the narrative element of manner is important, particularly in his discussion of the syncrisis exercise: "we shall compare their actions… and giving preference to things done by choice rather than by necessity and chance." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 53.

[605] However, the final spatial element is thematically significant to this scene, as supported with the conjunctive δέ in v. 16. The developmental unit represented by v.16 is not only temporal but also spatial. Temporally, the leper's refusal to follow Jesus' charge is in some sense causally related to Jesus' departure from villages, particularly in light of the heightened requests for healing. After the lepers reporting, throngs seek Jesus

219

Another narrative element is the cause of the action. Causality is chiefly revealed through the mental and verbal processes, a person's words reveal their heart, a consonant theme in Luke's Gospel.[606] In the present scene, causality is not marked, less still is it explicitly represented.[607] The final narration element is the person who performed the action. Under the category of

in v. 15b, καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶν. Regarding spatial development, at the closing of the scene the leper is reintegrated into the Jewish community and his respective village. However, Jesus' habitat eventuates outside the village. With this spatial development, the narrative ends quite differently than it began. Whereas Jesus begins in a village, ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων, he ends in the wilderness, αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις. To the extent that this scene echoes the pattern and themes of uncleanness and the priestly ministry in Leviticus 13-15, the next chapter, Leviticus 16, turns to address the atoning scapegoat who was sent into the wilderness. In Leviticus 16:10, 22, and 23, the LXX reads, εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. *Septuaginta*, Rahlfs-Hanhart, Editio altera (Stuttgart Germany: Deutsche Bibelsegellschaft, 2006). The merit of an approach that also compares Jesus to a scapegoat is three-fold. First, it has been shown that Luke has been shown to be fond of the syncrisis exercise, comparing Jesus to various entities within the Jewish scriptures. Second, it coheres with Luke 4:1-14a where temporal development, by conjunctive use, also provided thematic significance. Third, it explains why the close of this scene places Jesus causally out in the wilderness, in 5:16, only to re-locate Jesus back in villages and teaching throughout Palestine in 5:17. It is somewhat odd to states his retreat in the wilderness because of the throngs of needy crowds, only to immediately place him back into the throng of crowds in the following scene. A plausibly alternative, then is to consider the wilderness motif as thematically significant. Luke 1:1-4 has already identified the narrative as thematically ordered, not necessarily temporally arranged, an arrangement that Theon and other ancient writers find perfectly acceptable.

[606] Luke 6:45 is confirmation, ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. The mental process is another common verbal process, revealing what causes a narrative participant to act. Theon states that the cause may arise "out of the passions: anger, love, hate, envy, pity, inebriation, and the things like these." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 29. Comparing Luke to Mark regarding the healing of the leper is instructive. In Mark 1:41 the action of Jesus healing the leper is assigned an emotive cause, καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ. Luke's Gospel provides no such detail. One reason for this might be that Mark's Gospel has not introduced the reader to why Jesus acts in the same programmatic way that Luke's Gospel does. Since causality is more opaque in Mark and not thematically iterated, it becomes more explicit and distinct within individual Markan scenes. In Hallidean terms, causality, as Theon presents it, is commonly represented by the mental process since it depicts the senser and the phenomenon as an inward experience for a given narrative participant. Halliday and Matthiesen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 245-258.

[607] The absence of causality is expected, given that the programmatic cause for Jesus' actions has been identified his programmatic proclamation of Isaianic fulfillment in Luke 4:18-19. In this manner, causality in subsequent Lukan scenes is unnecessary, for Luke's Gospel has already framed Jesus' actions around his commitment to fulfil God's mission, namely, to proclaim the good news with its associated benefits. Jesus thus acts on behalf of God's desires, as revealed through the Jewish Scriptures. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 29. Luke 4:18-19 is not the first time that the reader is able to identify what causes Jesus to act. It takes place much earlier on, when Jesus is but twelve years of age, in Luke 2:41-52. Responding to his mother's concern over Jesus not having returned home with them, Jesus responds, Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με; The second occurrence in Luke's Gospel is found in Jesus' three-fold response to the devil's temptations in Luke 4:1-14a. Consistent with the portrait of Jesus at age twelve, Jesus' acts in accordance with God's will, for God's advantage, to fulfill the mission for which he has been sent. Luke's audience is therefore provided with causality in an iterative manner. The first three scenes which contain Jesus' direct speech all focus upon what causes Jesus to act in various ways. In all three cases, his actions derive from his devotion to God. Such introductory and successive identification of Jesus' causality explains why not every Lukan scene reiterates the narrative element of causality. Causality has already been registered, or activated, for Luke's audience, and to a sufficient enough degree.

person, Theon includes several attributions, such as disposition, morality, and speech.[608] Jesus' global action, associated with his speech, focused on manner, his willingness to heal. However, Table 5.2.6 also indicates something of Jesus' personhood as contained within his charge to the leper regarding priestly service, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ. In that charge, Jesus activates priestly responsibilities, yet at the same time Jesus reflects those priests in declaring the leper clean while also performing a healing that no priest could provide. Jesus' words to the leper represent the third occasion in the Lukan scenes wherein Jesus appeals to either the Torah or the prophetic traditions. While the first two scriptural appeals provided insight into the personhood of Jesus as king and prophet, the third use appeal invokes his priestly nature or office.[609]

This final observation is significant because in Jesus' reference to the Jewish Scriptures in Luke 3:21-22 and Luke 4:14b-29 indicate the use of a rhetorical syncrisis, comparing Jesus to his Jewish predecessors.[610] In keeping with this pattern, Jesus' reference to Leviticus 13-14 in the present scene likely signals another syncrisis. Because the Levitical reference involves the priestly ministry, Jesus' ministry is being compared to Israel's priests. Theon's syncrisis exercise invokes qualitative comparisons, "the better or the worse", "giving preference to one of the persons," and instances of "evident superiority," or in the case of genus, "the most outstanding."[611] The manner in which the comparisons occur, according to Theon, is that "…we give preference to one of the persons by looking at their actions."[612]

---

[608] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 29.

[609] 5:14: καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς... In this manner, Jesus shows himself to be once again a faithful son of God. In Luke 4:34-12, Jesus appeals to Deuteronomic injunctions to demonstrate his regal sonship, and in 4:18-27, he appeals to the prophetic traditions of Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah to demonstrate his prophetic sonship. In his appeal to the Levitical codes, Jesus is displaying his priestly sonship.

[610] For example, Luke 3:21-22, where Jesus receives the Holy Spirit, echoes ancient Jewish anointing as service to God, but particularly addressing the Psalms and King David's ministry, a connection further confirmed in the subsequent genealogy in Luke 3:23-38, further correlating Jesus with David. This syncrisis has been demonstrated in Ch. 4§3.6. This is a valuable observation, particularly since the presence of such a syncrisis elucidates the devil's challenges in 4:1-14a, since the devil's challenges revolve around the concept of Jesus assuming his prerogative and regal glory. The next syncrisis occurs in Luke 4:14b-29. In that scene Jesus references the prophet Isaiah, and also evokes the ministries of Elijah and Elisha, for these Scripture anticipate and confirm Jesus' own ministry. The syncrisis thereby develops from Jesus' association with David and his kingly ministry, to that of Jesus' affinity with the prophetic ministry. Identifying Jesus' prophetic syncrisis elucidates why in the subsequent scene the demonic cry echoes 1 Kings 17:18, further evoking Elijah and the prophets with Jesus' own ministry. This has been discussed in Ch. 4 §6.6.

[611] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 52, 53, 55.

[612] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 52, 53.

The comparisons lead to a closer examination of the actions of both Jesus and Levitical priests in order to identify superiority. The actions of the priests in the Jewish Scriptures yields insights to their interaction with issues related to leprosy, where Leviticus chapter 13 is a fundamental text. In the Levitical instructions the iterated responsibility is for the priests to strictly 'look' upon the leprous condition of the individual in question, ὄψεται ὁ ἱερεὺς.[613] While looking constitutes the priestly charge, the next chapter in Leviticus 14 includes additional injunctions, primarily in order that the leper be pronounced clean and integrated back into the community. Reintegration only occurs after a considerable period of time, mediated by the sprinkling with water and by sacrifice. Consequently, the priest would physically touch the individual, respective to an anointing.

Comparing Levitical activities to Jesus' actions toward the leper reveals that there is no detailed process and no considerable time elapses prior to Jesus' pronouncement that the leper is cleansed. Whereas the priest is required to repeatedly "look" at the leper, Jesus' initial activity involves a physical touch and word of healing, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι.[614] Perhaps most revealing in the comparison is the marked temporal indicator as Jesus instantly heals the leper, καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Beyond such considerations, there are obvious dissimilarities, such as the priest is not able to actuate a leprous healing by his own inherent power, which is what Jesus accomplishes by his touch and words. Jesus' actions toward a leper greatly surpassing those of the Levitical priesthood is consistently demonstrated.

The chief point of this scene is that Jesus' action of willingly healing a leper with his touch and words, and with immediate results, demonstrates that he is far greater than the Levitical priests. The present scene advances preliminary information provided in the previous

---

[613] In the LXX, ὄψεται ὁ ἱερεὺς appears 23 times in Leviticus 13 in the LXX. At no point in Leviticus 13 does the priest touch the leper. Instead, the priest looks and declares, pronouncing the leper clean or unclean, καθαριεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεύς. Only after the leprosy is gone does the priest touch the leper, following the details instructions in Leviticus 14. The priest is to go outside the camp to assist the leper, sprinkling water over the leper and make sacrifices on the leper's behalf. Finally, the priest is instructed to touch the leper, anointing the leper with oil seven times, touching his right ear, right hand and his right foot. After the atonement sacrifice, the leper is clean.

[614] To support this notion, it is helpful to note that throughout Leviticus 13, the priest repeatedly interacts with the leper, but this is only depicted by means of the mental and verbal process, the priest looks and speaks. But in the case of Jesus, his touch and authorization are conjoined in a manner that is unique, simultaneous, and unparalleled in Levitical priestly ministry. Still, this does not mean that Jesus advocates an abandonment of Torah regulations of cleanness, rather, his charge for the man is that he follow the Mosaic injunctions. At that time, the priest would at best only replicate certain elements of Jesus' healing and over a period of time.

scene, regarding the theme of sin and uncleanness. Luke's Gospel carries the theme forward into the final two scenes in this sequence, and Jesus' priestly activities also relate to his forgiving a paralytic and dining with tax collectors.

5.3.1. Luke 5:17-26 Discourse Boundary

The following factors support the notion that vv.17-26 constitutes a scene:

1. The use of ἐγένετο functions as a transition marker in Luke's Gospel between scenes. Moreover, ἐγένετο functions to signal that preceding material is forms the background for what follows, while providing some thematic relationship to subsequent information. Verses 17-26 relates thematically to the previous scenes in this sequence, specifically regarding themes of sin, healing, or cleansing.[615]

2. Temporal markers typically introduce a new scene in Luke. A temporal marker occurs at the start of the scene in v. 17, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, as does the following scene, in v. 27, Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.

3. Regarding spatial distinctions, the present scene comprises a new setting and cast of characters. Whereas the previous scene includes a village, leper and many infirmed, the present scene occurs in a home, with a paralytic and great crowds.

5.3.2. Luke 5:17-26 Clause Level

Despite the considerable length of the present scene, there are only two marked clauses near the close of this scene. The first marked order occurs in v. 25, καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, highlighting that the healing of the paralytic was unexpected and instantaneous. The immediacy of the healing reflects another marked clause in the previous scene regarding the leper's healing, καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. The second marked order occurs in v. 26, καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας. In this case the marked order is for focus. To use the film analogy for this instance of marked order, the camera zooms in on the crowds and their amazement at Jesus' immediate healing of the paralytic.

---

[615] The issue of cleansing or healing is related to vv. 12-16, and the issue of sin comprises the Peter's confrontation with Jesus in vv. 1-11. Relating vv. 17-26 and vv. 12-16 to the theme of sin in vv. 1-11 suggests that the leprous healing also concerns the theme of sin. While not explicit, the leprous man constitutes the singular defection from Jesus charge. Hitherto, all the participants analysed in this project have responded in appropriate ways to Jesus' words and authority. Even Jesus' hometown visit represents a crowd who provide the self-fulfilling motif that Jesus provides in 4:24.

5.3.3. Luke 5:17-26 Process Types

Another system selection at the clausal level involves process type analysis, which examines the manner in which happenings are depicted across the six process types provided in Table 5.3.3.

Table 5.3.3
Process type analysis of Luke 5:17-26.

Existential Process	Existent	Circumstance
Καὶ ἐγένετο		ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
καὶ αὐτὸς	ἦν διδάσκων	
καὶ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι	ἦσαν καθήμενοι	

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
(Pharisees and scribes)	οἳ ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες	ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ

Existential Process	Existent	Circumstance
ἦν	καὶ δύναμις κυρίου	εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες	φέροντες	ἐπικλίνης ἄνθρωπον	

Existential Process	Existent	Circumstance
ἦν	ὃς παραλελυμένος	

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(men)	καὶ ἐζήτουν	αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ θεῖναι [αὐτὸν] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ[616]
(men)	καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες	ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν ὄχλον[617]

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(men)	ἀναβάντες	(paralytic)	ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα διὰ τῶν κεράμων
(men)	καθῆκαν	αὐτὸν	σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ

---

[616] Note that this is not a clause complex since in a behavioral process the representation is one of intent, mediating between the mental process (intent and phenomenon) and the material process (modal anticipation). In this case the clause is a circumstance of intent ("to be…"), represented by the pair of infinitives.

[617] As in the previous footnote, the representation is one of intent, with the circumstance of intent ("to be…"), represented by the aorist subjunctive.

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Jesus)	καὶ ἰδὼν	τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	εἶπεν,			Ἄνθρωπε, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου	
οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	καὶ ἤρξαντο		διαλογίζεσθαι λέγοντες	Τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται ἁμαρτίας ἀφεῖναι εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ θεός	

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
ὁ Ἰησοῦς	ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ	τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	εἶπεν	πρὸς αὐτούς	ἀποκριθεὶς	Τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν, Ἀφέωνταίσοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν, Ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτειἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας	
(Jesus)	εἶπεν	τῷ παραλελυμένῳ		Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιόν σου πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόνσου	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(paralytic)	καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς		ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν
(paralytic)	ἄρας	ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο	
(paralytic)	ἀπῆλθεν		εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(paralytic)	δοξάζων τὸν θεόν	τὸν θεόν

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
ἅπαντας	καὶ ἔλαβεν	ἔκστασις

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(crowds)	καὶ ἐδόξαζον	τὸν θεόν

Senser	Mental Process	Phenomenon
(crowds)	καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν	φόβου

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
(crowds)			λέγοντες ὅτι	Εἴδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον	

Process type analysis involves a consideration of the order and frequency of process types and marked or distinctive patterns that emerge. Regarding the order and frequency of process types, they occur in this manner: existential (1x), behavioral (2x), relational (1x), existential (1x), material (1x), existential (1x), behavioral (2x), material (2x), behavioral (1x), verbal (2x), mental (1x), verbal (2x), material (3x), behavioral (1x), mental (1x), behavioral (1x), mental (1x), verbal (1x).

As with the previous scene, all six process types occur. Similarly, while the verbal and material processes have been most frequent in the first sequence of this project, the second sequence has depicted happenings increasingly through the behavioral and relational processes. In the current scene, however, the behavioral process is most frequent: behavioral (7x), material (6x), verbal (5x), mental (3x), existential (2x) relational (1x). According to Halliday, the behavioral processes represent "physiological and psychological behavior… they are partly like the material and partly like the mental."[618] The possible intention behind such a high frequency of the behavioral process will be explored further with rhetorical analysis.

5.3.4. Luke 5:17-26 Clause Complex Level

Clause simplexes occur five times in this scene, located near the beginning, the middle, and close. Such an arrangement of clause simplexes is not uncommon in Lukan scenes. However, a single clause simplex, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ…, is situated in the middle of the scene between a conglomerate of clause complexes representing Jesus' words to the paralytic immediately prior to his healing.

Surrounding such a clause simplex, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ, two distinctive clause complexes occur, both containing extension and elaborating clauses. As discussed in previous scenes, the choice to represent a clause complex with extension and elaborating clauses signals prominent information within a scene. Following Hallidean notations, head clauses are marked by α, and consecutive dependent clauses, marked by β, γ, and so on, with extension

---

[618] Halliday and Matthiessen, 301.

symbolized by +, and elaboration symbolized by =. The first clause complex, immediately prior to Jesus' healing words to the paralytic, contains Jesus' answer to the grumbling religious authorities:

ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν/ ἀποκριθεὶς/ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς
                +β   =γ   α

The second clause complex occurs immediately after Jesus' healing words to the paralytic:

καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν/ ἄρας ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο/

            +β   +γ

ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ/ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν
       α   =δ

This second clause complex possesses the greatest semantic weight of any clause complex in the scene, containing two extension clauses and an elaborating clause, represented by =.[619] Because process type analysis has revealed that the behavioral process occurs most frequently in this scene, the behavioral process occurs as an elaborating clause in the most prominent clause complex, δοξάζων τὸν θεόν. Two of the six behavioral processes in this scene represent giving glory to God. Giving glory to God, as it is found twice at the close of this scene, alternates with the mental process, a pattern not hitherto seen. The behavioral processes in vv. 17-26 include teaching, seeking, not finding, seeing, and giving glory to God (2x). The process pattern involving glory to God is behavior (glory to God)-mental-behavior (glory to God)-mental.

The global action is ascribed to Jesus' verbal command to the paralytic, as seen in the distinctively placed clause simplex, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ. The surrounding and prominent clause complexes function to accentuate the global action, signaling important rhetorical elements that orchestrate around that global action.[620]

---

[619] The analogy of a photograph centered on a table explains this principle. In this analogy, the head clause represents a photograph placed in the center of a table. The choice to present both the photograph with another image to its side, and then overlaid with another photograph is to call attention to the pivotal placement of that head clause, particularly in relation to other head clauses in a scene that do not provide such an arrangement. Both clause complexes immediately before and after the clause simplex, the command of Jesus, signal a special juncture within the scene. As has been common in Luke's Gospel, it is the verbal process of Jesus that is central to the scene.

[620] That clause complexes alert the reader to the global action is not surprising, for Luke's Gospel frequently signals a global action by means of distinctive discourse features, particularly by the semantic weight assigned to various clausal lines and by virtue of their distinctive status within a given scene. The pragmatic effect of this arrangement matches that of the first two scenes of this sequence, in 5:1-11 and 12-16. As 4:30-37 has shown, the presence of a distinct clause complex, not only occurs prior to a global action, signaling its location, but also after

5.3.5. Luke 5:17-26 Scene Level

Scene analysis involves conjunction analysis, verbal aspect, and finite verbal count. Regarding conjunctive use, there is only one instance of the conjunction δέ, immediately following the complaint about Jesus extending forgiveness to the paralytic, ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν. While the conjunction δέ may function as a contrastive conjunction, presenting an opposing or contrary element to the scene is likely that δέ here signals a new developmental unit in this scene, one that comprises the paralytic's healing and subsequent results because Jesus' response to the religious leaders as oppositional is not clear. More likely, Luke's Gospel presents Jesus as assuming the ability to forgive sins and heal the paralytic, without reference to the charge of blasphemy.

There are two units in this scene marked by δέ. The first unit in vv. 17-21, includes the meeting between the paralytic and Jesus with Jesus' forgiveness extended to the paralytic and the subsequent complaint of the religious leaders. The second unit in vv. 22-26, includes Jesus' response to their complaint, his healing of the paralytic and the subsequent doxological response from the crowds. In both units, the pattern is the same: i. an initial encounter, ii. Jesus' verbal authority expressed, and iii. subsequent response from onlookers. In the first unit, the issue is Jesus' authority to forgive sins and in the second, the issue is Jesus' authority to perform a healing. The global action of Jesus in v. 24 ties the units together, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ… Consequently, these words of Jesus provide the hinge for both units, addressing that Jesus has authority to forgive sins and that he can enact an immediate healing for the infirmed. Accordingly, the healed man departs from the house, having received both healing and forgiveness.

Scene level analysis also involves a consideration of verbal aspect. Consistent with Lukan use, the aorist verb not only forms the backbone for the scene's progression, but also

---

the global action. In the case of 4:30-37, the distinctive clause complex demon contained information about the demon being cast out of the man, and this served to accentuate the global action of Jesus' verbal authority, particularly by showing the effect of his authority. Similarly, in vv. 17-26, the global action is identified in the clause simplex, but with a clause complex occurring both immediately prior to and after the global action. The reason for this is so that Jesus' action is not seen in isolation, but rather associated both with the issue of his claim to forgive sins, in the clause complex prior, and in the notion that his healing authority confirms his claim to forgive sins, in the clause complex that follows. In essence, by presenting various distinctive clauses in this manner, Jesus' global action is considerably more than simply a physical restoration for the paralytic, but also spiritual restoration. This much is evident in Jesus words in vv. 23, concerning whether it is easier to forgive sins or to cause the paralytic to walk. But it is the arrangement and semantic weight given to various discourse features that monitors the reader to identify the prominence accorded to both aspects contained within Jesus' global action.

constitutes the global action of Jesus. Reflecting earlier findings, the global action of this scene occurs as an aorist verb and is ascribed to Jesus, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ. In contrast, imperfective use in this scene provides circumstantial and backgrounded information.

In the N-A text, thirteen finite verbs occur, thereby resulting in a concentric pattern, where the central verb, the seventh, is the main point of the scene. The central verb occurs in v. 21, καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες… and consists of the scribes and Pharisees' complaint that Jesus' forgiveness of the paralytic's sins commits blasphemy. Consequently, the charge by the religious leaders is central to the point of the scene, the healing of the paralytic is not simply external restoration, the healing of limbs, but also inward restoration, the forgiveness of sins.

5.3.6 Luke 5:17-26 Rhetorical Analysis

The insights from discourse analysis are restated to see how they contribute to rhetorical criticism. A concise summary of the marked discourse features is in Table 5.3.6.

Table 5.3.6
Summary of the marked discourse features of Luke 5:17-26.

Constituent Order	Process Types	Clause Complex	Scene
Highlighted information includes the unexpected, immediate nature of the healing: καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀνασ τὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν. The second marked clause is for focus, καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας, zooming in on the crowd's amazement at Jesus' healing of the paralytic.	All six process types occur in this scene. The behavioral process is the most frequent, two of these pertaining to praise of God, δοξάζων τὸν θεόν	A single clause simplex, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμέν, occurs between two prominent elaborating clause complexes. The first clause complex constitutes Jesus' answer to the grumbling religious leaders, and the second addresses the paralytics immediate healing and praise-filled departure	Conjunctive δέ signals two patterned units: i. confrontation, ii. Jesus' authoritative words, iii. subsequent response. The hinge for both units is Jesus' verbal authority in healing the paralytic, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμέν. The global action consists of an aorist verb ascribed to Jesus, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμέν. The central verb of the scene consists of the grumbling complaint that Jesus has pronounced the paralytic's sins forgiven.

Theon's *Progymnasmata* provides the tool for rhetorical criticism of this passage. This scene constitutes a narration, demonstrated clearly in the use of all six process types. As a narration exercise, the global action is primary. As Table 5.2.6 has displayed, the global action

of this scene is Jesus' authoritative charge for the paralytic to arise, εἶπεν τῷ

παραλελυμέν… The epideictic function of this scene is ascertained by observing how the

remaining marked discourse features represent prominent narration elements. Constituent order

has revealed the healing of the paralytic is marked for its immediacy,

καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν.

 Invoking priestly service, Jesus' global action, demonstrates that he surpasses those

within the priestly ministry because there is no clear indication that a syncrisis between Jesus

and the priests has ended, and because the present scene highlights forgiveness of sins.

Forgiveness of sins is thematically prominent and has been identified by scene analysis,

wherein the central verb in the scene consists of the religious leaders' complaints over Jesus'

claim to forgive sins. By sequencing the scene into two developmental units that are hinged on

Jesus' words to the paralytic, Jesus' response toward the paralytic consists of a dual action, one

addressing forgiveness and the other of healing the paralytic. The cause of Jesus' healing the

paralytic appears to stem from his desire to forgive sins, since it is the chief issue that surfaces

in the first developmental unit. Jesus heals out of his desire to pronounce forgiveness of sins,

explaining why the central verb consists of the religious leaders' complaint about Jesus

extending forgiveness, even as the global action accentuates the immediacy of his healing and

its dual function.

 Finally, in view of the importance of the behavioral process to this scene, the response

of the healed paralytic and the crowds consists of the behavioral process of praise to God. In

this manner, Jesus' action is shown to be exceedingly praiseworthy, for his dual action of

forgiving and healing brings glory to God. Consequently, Jesus is portrayed as a true son of

God, whose service surpasses that of Levitical priests who minister to the unclean and sinful.

The chief point can therefore be summarized: Jesus' action of immediately healing a paralytic,

both enabling him to walk and departing with forgiveness, demonstrates that Jesus' ministry

surpasses Levitical priestly services and in a manner that glorifies God.

5.4.1. Luke 5:27-39 Discourse Boundary

 Utilizing insights from discourse analysis, it is evident that vv. 27-39 constitutes a

distinct scene. The support includes the following factors:

1. The fronting of the pre-verbal constituent, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν, indicates a point of

 departure for this scene. As a temporal marker, the subsequent material in this scene is

 organized around, and anchored to the temporal frame, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν.

2. The close of the scene, in v. 39, is indicated by the use of ἐγένετο δέ in 6:1. As noted in Chapter II§2, ἐγένετοt δέ is a common Lukan discourse feature when introducing a new scene, and more particularly, when introducing a new sequence. Ἐγένετο δέ was previously used in both 3:21 and 5:1, thereby indicating two Lukan sequences.[621]

3. Regarding thematic considerations, even though vv. 27-39 continues to address the themes of cleanness and sin in the present sequence, vv. 27-39 specifically addresses the notion of ritual purity. In this light, vv. 27-39 presents additional information regarding Jesus' association with sinner, insofar as it relates to issues of feasting and fasting.

4. Concerning spatial considerations, the present scene situates Jesus among Levi and his friends, and within Levi's home. In light of such a surrounding, additional participants are presented, such as Jesus' disciples and the Pharisees and scribes.

5. Regarding temporal issues, as noted above, the use of καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα indicates a new temporal frame that orients and anchors successive information throughout vv. 27-39.

5.4.2. Luke 5:27-39 Clause Level

There are two marked clauses in the present scene, one in v. 27 and one in v. 33. Regarding v. 27, as noted in §1 above, the temporal indicator, Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν is fronted, signaling that a new scene has begun. Regarding v. 34, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, the pre-verbal constituent signals a switch of attention from the Pharisees in v. 33, to Jesus in v. 34.[622] By this, Jesus' reply is underlined, emphasizing the contrastive attitudes between the Pharisees represented in v. 33, and Jesus in v. 34.[623]

5.4.3 Luke 5:27-39 Process Types

Table 5.4.3
Process Types in Luke 5:27-39.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
(Jesus)	ἐξῆλθεν		καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα

Senser	Mental Process		Phenomenon

---

[621] In addition, ἐγένετο introduces a new scene though one that is related thematically to the previous scene in vv. 1-39, specifically related to the notions of cleanness and sin.

[622] As discussed in Ch. II §3.1, marked clauses vary in the function. Fore-fronting, that is, constituent or constituents prior to a main verb, signals either as a point of departure or for focus. Focus can be either for a switch of attention or for contrast, or to bring what was fuzzy into focus. Front-shifting, placing a constituent before a non-main verb functions as a (1) switch of attention, (2) for contrast, (3) as an important speech introducer, (4) presents unexpected information, and (5) presents information that demands greater context to understand its relevance.

[623] The information could similarly be expressed in this manner: 'Jesus shut them up by answering…'

(Jesus)	καὶ ἐθεάσατο	τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευὶν

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Levi)	καθήμενον	ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
(Jesus)	καὶ εἶπεν	αὐτῷ,		Ἀκολούθει μοι.	

Carrier/Possessor	Relational Process (Circumstantial)	Attribute: Circumstantial Locative
(Levi)	καὶ καταλιπὼν	πάντα

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(Levi)	ἀναστὰς	

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance/Recipient
(Levi)	ἠκολούθει	αὐτῷ	
Λευὶς	καὶ ἐποίησεν	δοχὴν μεγάλην	αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ

Existential Process		Existent	Circumstance
καὶ ἦν		ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων	
οἳ ἦσαν		(toll collectors and sinners)	μετ᾽ αὐτῶν

Behaver	Behavioural	Behavior, Phenomenon, Circumstance
(toll collectors and sinner)	κατακείμενοι	

Sayer	Verbal Process	Receiver	Verbiage	Projection	Target
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν	καὶ ἐγόγγυζον	πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ	λέγοντες	Διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε	
ὁ Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν	πρὸς αὐτούς	καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς	Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλὰ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν	
Οἱ	δὲ εἶπαν	πρὸς αὐτόν		Οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννουνηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται, ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν	

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν	πρὸς αὐτούς		Μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὀνυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι; ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις	
(Jesus)	Ἔλεγεν δὲ	πρὸς αὐτοὺς	καὶ παραβολὴν ὅτι	Οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή γε, καὶ τὸ καινὸνσχίσει καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον. [καὶ] οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ, Ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν.	

Process types analysis involves a consideration of the order and frequency of process types, as well as distinctive patterns that may emerge. The order and frequency of process types include: material (1x), mental (1x), behavioral (1x), verbal (1x), relational (1x), behavioral (1x), material (2x), existential (2x), behavioral (1x), verbal (5x). In the present scene, the verbal process occurs most frequently, six times, followed by the material and behavioral, three times respectively. Such a high frequency of the verbal process indicates that reported speeches contribute significantly to the scene' intention.

Five of the six verbal processes occur at the close of the scene, and in immediate succession. Such allocation of verbal processes is unique among all the scenes analysed in this project. Accordingly, not only does the scene present information chiefly through verbal processes, but it does so with culminating repetition toward the close of the scene. The functional relevance of this observation will be addressed further at the rhetorical level.

5.4.4. Luke 5:27-39 Clause Complex

Analysis of clause complexes indicates that vv. 27-32 is distinctive in providing both clause simplexes and clause complexes. Throughout vv. 33-39, however, three successive clause simplexes occur as verbal processes predominate the closing portions of this scene. In this case, the clausal system within vv. 27-31 are primarily examined as clause complexes tend to include an increased prominence of information, at least relative to surrounding clause simplexes and extension clauses.

Table 5.4.4 provides an understanding of the scene's layout. The table includes all the clause simplexes and complexes within the scene and follows Halliday's system of notation with clause complexes, where head clauses are marked by α, and consecutive dependent clauses are marked β, γ, and so on. In addition, dependent clauses are symbolized by their relationship to the head clause, either by extension, symbolized by +, or by elaboration symbolized by =.

Table 5.4.4
Clauses found in Luke 5:27-39.

Vv. 27-32:

Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν (clause simplex)

καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευὶν/ καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον,

      α   =β

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ… (clause simplex)

καὶ καταλιπὼν πάντα/ ἀναστὰς/ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ.

      +β   +γ   α

Καὶ ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην Λευὶς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ (clause simplex)

καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων [οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν-embedded]/ κατακείμενοι.

              α   =β   =γ

καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ/ λέγοντες…

              α   =β

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς/ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς...

      =β   α

Vv. 33-37:

234

Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν… (clause simplex)

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς… (clause simplex)

Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι… (clause simplex)

Table 5.4.4 shows that there are five clause complexes, four of which constitute elaborating clause complexes. In the first elaborating clause complex, καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευὶν/ καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, one elaborating clause occurs. The elaboration, Levi sitting at the booth, clarifies or specifies what Jesus saw when he looked at Levi. This clause complex contains both a mental process, ἐθεάσατο, and a behavioral process, καθήμενον. Because the head clause is a mental process, that is, "goings on" which represent inner mental states, the information pertaining to this clause complex is downgraded in prominence because mental construal lacks a representation for any input upon narration participants or temporal-spatial states of affairs. There are no necessary actions or activities that facilitate spatial-temporal development, only the internal mental state of a participant.

The second clause complex, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων [οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν]/ κατακείμενοι includes an embedded clause, being bracketed, and one elaborating clause, κατακείμενοι.[624] The elaborating clause provides information on those who were in attendance with Levi and Jesus and their behavioral activity, sitting at the grand feast, which depicts happenings in a physiological and external manner. The depiction thereby provides the grounds for the subsequent complaint from the Pharisees regarding Jesus' activity that he, too, associates intimately with the feasting. The prominence of this clause complex is further underscored by all other clause complexes comprising verbal processes as well as the clause simplexes throughout vv. 33-38, consisting of subsequent questions and answers between the Pharisees and Jesus. The remainder of the scene is organized around this externally displayed clause complex.

The third elaborating clause complex provides both a verbal process, ἐγόγγυζον, and an elaborating clause, λέγοντες, that provides the direct speech associated with the Pharisees' grumbling against Jesus. The fourth elaborating clause complex is similarly organized around

---

[624] Halliday writes: "While 'existential' clauses are not, overall, very common in discourse… they make an important, specialized contribution to various kinds of texts. For example, they serve to introduce central participants…" Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 307.

the verbal process, καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς/ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς. This time, however, the head clause, εἶπεν, is elaborated upon by the direct speech of Jesus, ἀποκριθεὶς, addressing the grumbling complaint of the Pharisees. Jesus' response in v. 32 sets off the trajectory for the remaining scene which consists of a large string of verbal clause complexes.

5.4.5. Luke 5:27-39 Scene Analysis

Scene analysis involves conjunction analysis, verbal aspect, finite verbal structure, and participant referencing. Chapter II§5.1 has shown that within a given narration, the conjunction δέ signals a new developmental unit. In this scene, δέ occurs twice, in v. 33,

ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς… and in v. 36,

Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτούς… The scene is comprised of three developmental units, i. vv. 27-32 related to Jesus' call of Levi, the grumbling of the religious leaders at the feasting, and Jesus' response regarding doctoring the sick ii. vv. 33-35 with religious leaders' remarks concerning John the Baptist and fasting and Jesus' response, and iii. vv. 36-39, Jesus' parable about garments and wineskins. In each unit, Jesus' reported speech provides the closing information.

Another component of scene analysis is the arrangement of finite verbs in order to determine the center point of the scene. In the eclectic text, 11 finite verbs occur, resulting in a concentric structure. The central element, the sixth, consists of the gathering of crowds and their reclining to eat,

καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι.

Consistent with the findings in clausal analysis, this elaborating clause complex conveys prominent information. In verbal aspect, the scene develops by means of aorist verbs with two exceptions, both occurring in the first unit of the scene. The first imperfect verb is Levi's following Jesus' call, ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ. As an imperfect, providing non-remote perspective, the information here is circumstantial, leading to subsequent and more prominent information. The second imperfect occurs in v. 30,

καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν… Consistent with the first imperfective use, the information is backgrounded to Jesus' subsequent words spoken; in response to their grumbling in v. 31, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς…

The final component of scene analysis is participant referencing. This scene contains an abundance of pronominals, except where new participants are introduced, representing the

default Lukan pattern. However, in both v. 31 and v. 34 proper names occur and both are identical, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς. Jesus has already been established as the main participant from the scene's opening. Assigning to Jesus a proper name signals marked information, since referenced by either the pronominal is the expected pattern or the simple verbal form that constitutes the expected pattern. The default pattern is evident on the part of Pharisees and scribes in v. 33, Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν. Functionally, assigning a proper name to Jesus in vv. 31 and 34 signals that his ensuing reported speeches contain prominent information.[625]

5.4.6. Luke 5:12-16 Rhetorical Analysis

Table 5.4.6
Summary of marked discourse features in Luke 5:12-16.

Constituent Order	Process Types	Clause Complex	Scene
Marked order as a switch of attention in v. 34, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς. This clause underlines the contrastive attitudes toward feasting between the religious leaders and Jesus.	All six process types occur in this scene with the verbal process as most frequent (6x). Vv. 33-39 contain only the verbal processes in direct succession (5x).	Cluster of alternating clause complex to simplex in vv. 27-32, whereas clause simplexes only occur in vv. 33-39. The prominent elaborating clause complex in v. 29 consists of the large crowds gathered and reclining at the feast, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων [οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν]/ κατακείμενοι. After this information, only verbal processes occur for the remainder of the scene.	Central verbal element consists of the crowds feasting with Jesus, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺ τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλωνοἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι. Conjunctive δέ signals three developmental units: i. Jesus' call of Levi, his banquet, grumbling of religious leaders and Jesus' response, ii. question and answer over fasting, iii. Jesus' parable about clothes and wineskins. Participant referencing twice marked in vv. 31 and 34, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς as Jesus' responds to grumbling.

Theon's *Progymnasmata* provides an important means of assimilating the various marked elements displayed in Table 5.4.6 above. By means of the conjunctive δέ, there are three developmental units in this scene: i. vv. 27-32 with Jesus' call of Levi, his banquet, grumbling of religious leaders and Jesus' response, ii. vv. 33-35 as question and answer over fasting, iii. vv. 36-39 with Jesus' parable about clothes and wineskins. Comparing these units to Theon's handbook indicates that the scene may contain three rhetorical exercises, i. an elaborated chreia in vv. 27-32, ii. a simple chreia in vv. 33-35, and iii. a fable in vv. 36-39.

---

[625] Such referencing is noteworthy because articular reference has already been assigned to Jesus. He is the established global VIP. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 152-153.

The identification of these rhetorical exercises derives essentially from discourse features distinctive to each developmental unit. Identifying vv. 27-23 as an elaborated chreia explains the presence of wide variety of process types, as well as the alternation between clause complexes and simplexes and a culminating reported speech in that unit.[626] Identifying vv. 33-35 as a concise saying chreia is indicated by the marked participant referencing of Jesus and his culminating speech, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς. Last, vv. 36-39 explicitly signals the use of the fable exercise, Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς… Each of these exercises are examined briefly below.

The first unit in vv. 27-32 represents an elaborated chreia. An elaborated chreia is similar to a simple responsive or declarative chreia, but also includes a lengthier amplification of backgrounded or circumstantial elements. While expanding circumstantial elements obscures the narration exercise, an elaborated chreia is distinct in that the main point is located in concluding saying or action of the character.[627] Verses 27-29 provides circumstantial information regarding Jesus' feasting with sinners, providing the basis for the Pharisee's grumbling and Jesus' culminating claim that he is doctor to the needy, which sets the stage for Jesus' comments in vv. 31-33 and explains why marked information occurs in v. 29, since that clause complex is especially significant in understanding to Jesus' claim, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺ τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλωνοῖ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι. However, consistent with the chreia exercise, marked participant referencing and constituent order occurs with Jesus' culminating words in vv. 31-32, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς… As a switch of attention, from the religious leaders grumbling to Jesus' response, Jesus' contrastive attitude toward

---

[626] Elaborating on a simple chreia, according to Theon, serves to accentuate the circumstance leading to the central point: "We expand the chreia whenever we lengthen the questions and answers in it, and the action or suffering, if any." Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 21. By providing extended information regarding Jesus' association with Levi, the action of the chreia is underscored, involving Jesus' eating with Levi and his companions. This elaborated action serves as the springboard for the declarative chreia. This unit represents a declarative saying chreia because Jesus volunteers the statement, rather than being prompted by a question or statement (as with a responsive chreia). A responsive chreia follows in vv. 33-35. The difference between an elaborated chreia and a narration exercise is that while both exercises contain a principal action, the chreia elaborates the action with its closing information. In the case of vv. 27-32, the cause for Jesus' action is supplied by Jesus' final remark, that his action is both for the sake of a sinner's repentance (for the advantage of others), and also consonant with his mission, as one who ministers necessarily to those in need.

[627] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 16-23, Hock and O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 83-90.

sinners is underlined. He has come to call the sinners. In such a manner, vv. 31-32 functions as the 'point' of the elaborated chreia.[628]

The second rhetorical unit, in vv. 33-35, constitutes a saying chreia. As a saying chreia, the main point occurs in vv. 34-35 wherein Jesus identifies himself as the bridegroom of a wedding. As with the previous chreia, information pertaining to Jesus' culminating words, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, is marked. As a saying chreia, vv. 33-35 illustrates what Theon calls a responsive chreia, in which a speaker responds to some previous prompt.[629] The prompt occurs in v. 33, where the religious leaders express concern over Jesus and his disciples' lack of fasting. The responsive point of the chreia occurs in v. 34, as Jesus declares that a recalibration must occur; Jesus is the bridegroom and the wedding day has come. Fasting is inappropriate and must give way to feasting.[630] Stepping back, both of units, vv. 27-32 and vv. 33-35 contain a culminating expedient point that hinges on correspondence. Jesus is akin to both a doctor and a bridegroom. Consequently, the religious leaders are encouraged to reconsider their approach to sinners and seasons.[631]

With correspondence already in place, the third unit in the scene employs a fable, a selection that is entirely warranted, given that the fable provides the most suitable rhetorical exercise for analogical purposes.[632] Verses 36-39 constitutes a fable,

---

[628] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 15. According to Theon, the chief virtue of a chreia is in its "making a point," which is prototypically located at the close of a chreia. Interestingly, while both Matthew and Mark are similar in information and in the boundaries for the scene, Luke incorporates both the calling of Levi and the banquet into one rhetorical scene. Matthew and Mark signal discontinuity between Jesus' calling Levi and the feast. In Matthew, discontinuity is signaled by Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, while in Mark the signal is similar, Καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. These features suggest that while Matthew and Mark first present an actional chreia, followed by a responsive chreia, Luke has incorporated both of these units into one elaborated chreia, culminating with the expedient point in vv. 31-32.

[629] According to Theon, there are two kinds of verbal chreiai: i. a declarative chreia, in which a participant speaks by their own impulse, that is, unconstrained, and ii. a responsive, or apocritical chreia, in which some question or statement promoted a response. A responsive chreia contains four classes: (1) response to a question prompting a succinct response, (2) response to an inquiry, (3) giving a cause for the answer including advice, and (4) an apocritical chreia, which involve a response to a statement. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 16-17. In the case of vv. 33-35, this is an apocritical chreia in which Jesus responds to a statement regarding practices of fasting, between Jesus disciples and those of John the Baptist and the Pharisees.

[630] The opening question in v. 33 provides the circumstantial frame that conveys this unit's theme.

[631] Contrasts and comparisons are also implicit in this scene. Whereas the religious leaders are grumbling, Jesus is doctoring the sick, and while they seek to maintain status quo in fasting, Jesus is feasting at his wedding.

[632] For Theon, the virtue of *plausibility* in fables means that the comparison between two entities, one in the picture world and one in speaker's world, should not be opaque. For example, comparing Alexander the Great to a barnyard duck is deficient, lacing in plausibility. That is, there is no natural or seamless correspondence between Alexander the i.e., wise or courageous), and that of a duck (typically cowardly and fickle). In such an instance,

Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν. Theon defines a fable as a "fictitious story giving an image of truth." [633] A responsible engagement with vv. 36-39 entails considering the manner in which the image provided in the fable world correspond to the narrative world of truth in Luke's Gospel. Theon maintained that the useful instruction of a fable is achieved through such correlation, merging the image in the fable with Luke's narrative world of truth. Regarding fictitious images, vv. 36-39 includes, i. a new cloth taken applied to an old garment, ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ… ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν, ii. and new wine put into old wineskins, βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς.

A correlation between image and truth requires a survey of the landscape in this scene. While three rhetorical exercises occur in vv. 27-39, Luke's Gospel has effectively integrated all three into a single bounded scene. Such integration is the first of its kind in this project.[634] As a result, vv. 27-39 provides a unifying thematic message, best expressed by purity, especially as it relates to Jesus' association with sinful individuals amidst the religious leaders' perceptions that he is detached from traditional Jewish purity behaviors and associations, which leads to a clearer understanding of the fable's instruction in vv. 36-39.

The first unit in vv. 27-32, as an elaborated chreia, demonstrated that Jesus' feasting with sinners enacts his doctoring ministry. In the second unit, vv. 33-35, Jesus' feasting, rather than fasting, is commensurate with his arrival as the bridegroom. Jesus' mission of associating with sinners, as a doctor and bridegroom, represents the narrative truth for the parable, where the fictitious images include new cloth and the new wine. Jesus' approach to sinners represents the new cloth and new wine. At the same time, the religious leaders approach, displayed in their grumbling words, represent old cloth and old wineskins. With the coming of the doctor and bridegroom significant damage occurs wherever integration is desired. The new cannot be assimilated with an old approach to purity.

The fable thereby provides a fitting close to this Lukan sequence of Luke 5.1-39. The sequence began with Jesus calling sinful fishermen in vv. 1-11, followed by his cleansing of an unclean leper in vv. 12-16, then forgiving a paralytic in vv. 17-26, and finally, feasting with tax

---

another more suitable barnyard animal should be chosen, so that the audience can readily identify the correspondence (i.e., a stallion, bull, or goat). Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 26-27.

[633] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 23.

[634] Of all the other scenes examined in this project, only Luke 4:1-14a contains a possible but opaque rhetorical exercises (three chreiai), though these have been collated seamlessly into a singular narrative rhetorical exercise.

collectors and sinners in vv. 27-39. In all of these activities, Jesus' mission represents a radical approach to purity. As the regally anointed son and surpassing prophet, the new era has dawned with his coming, Σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ, necessitating the setting aside of old approaches to purity. There can be no seamless integration, since the inevitable consequence of merging the old and new is significant damage. In fact, damage does occur in the next sequence in Luke Chapter 6, particularly as it relates to Jesus' Sabbath activities.

Having completed twelve consecutive scenes from Luke 3.21-5:39 and the practical benefits of where discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism are congruent, Chapter VI will examine the exegetical findings of this project in comparison to three representative Lukan commentaries. Chapter VI closes with an evaluative summary to prospective matters, wherein the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism may yield future benefits for Lukan studies.

CHAPTER SIX:
REVIEW OF CONGRUENCE OF METHODS

This project has sought to explore the extent to which discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism are congruent exegetical methods. Chapters I-III have presented the theoretical compatibility, and Chapters IV-V have shown the practical congruence in select Lukan scenes. These methods depend upon one another; neither discourse analysis nor rhetorical criticism should be used in isolation. For instance, although the use of discourse analysis alone signals a variety of prominent elements in a given scene, it cannot meaningfully incorporate those marked elements within an appropriate socio-literary context. While discourse analysis is capable of signaling marked elements, it cannot fully address why or how those elements are marked in an ancient text such as Luke's Gospel. Concurrently, in a narration exercise, rhetorical criticism superintends Lukan exegesis in centering on the global action through auxiliary narration elements. Apart from discourse analysis, rhetorical criticism has little recourse to specifically, with empirically testable means and specific tools, to identify the global action and marked narration elements that serve an epideictic function. In summary, Lukan exegesis requires detailed consideration of both text-internal and text-external features of language to the extent that it seeks to appropriate the multi-dimensionality of communication.

Discourse analysis benefits Lukan exegesis in three important ways. First, it provides the Lukan exegete with an objective means for determining textual boundaries in the combination of choice of connectives and word order which work together to identify the places in the text where the author marked some kind of structural division. They serve, therefore, both to determine larger boundaries, a cluster of related scenes called a sequence in this project, and to identify smaller textual boundaries, those framing the individual scenes themselves. Such a function is vital, for without the benefit of linguistic indicators for determining a given textual boundary, the potential remains for one to inappropriately assimilate information from other bounded scenes in order to interpret a given scene's meaning. As a specific example, since Luke 3:21-22 constitutes a distinct scene, including additional information regarding John the Baptist from the previous vv.1-20 is appropriate when seeking to understand the rhetorical point of this scene. Comparative analysis of four representative commentaries in §2 below will examine the exegetical consequences of neglecting the resource of discourse analysis when identifying textual boundaries.

Second, discourse analysis provides tools to identify a structure within individual Lukan scenes. That is, by recognizing marked discourse features, the exegete is able to assign various elements as backgrounded or foregrounded information and thus see the way the writer organized the information. The modern-day reader is then able to understand and perceive a text in the way the writer intended. Rather than being guided by contemporary ideas about the significance of elements within a passage, or relying on presuppositions as to the relative importance of those elements based on traditional exegesis, the reader is able to discern more accurately what the author himself intended to be the key, central, or salient features of a scene. Hallidean analysis of process types directs the exegete to consider the way the various process types by which a scene is depicted and in particularly, paying close attention to the way in which the central point of a scene is conveyed by a particular process type, since it essentially contributes to the way in which a Lukan scene portrays Jesus. For example, the first Lukan sequence of this project has repeatedly focused on Jesus' verbal process as the means creative transformations rather than portraying through material or behavioral processes as might be expected. Accordingly, the Lukan exegete should accentuate the authority and message communicated throughout Jesus' reported speeches, since his words constitute the medium by which his personhood is most clearly revealed.

Third, discourse analysis enables the Lukan exegete to determine specifically what is most prominent in relation to foregrounded information, or what is the focal point of a given scene. Discourse analysis provides an objective linguistic method capable of determining various textual boundaries and the structuring of a scene according to a functional scale of prominence, a task that is invaluable to contemporary Lukan exegesis as a modern reader is significantly detached from the social environment of Luke's Gospel, separated by approximately 2,000 years.

However, discourse analysis of an ancient text can only cover so much exegetical ground, insofar as it primarily addresses text-internal features. As Chapters I-III have shown, text-external factors are also relevant for Lukan exegesis as socio-literary conventions can influence the formulation and reception of Luke's Gospel. Discourse analysts are aware of the significance of the external world, or the pragmatic aspects of a text, as is demonstrated by the merger of text-internal and text-external factors in Halliday's consideration of the metafunction of language: communication consisting of a text-internal message, or its theme and representation, and its text-external environment, or the communicative social exchange between a speaker and his or her audience.

In this project, Theon's *Progymnasmata* is one rhetorical tool that Luke, as the author of the Gospel, might have been familiar, and that provides input to text-external analysis by drawing on the literary context of the New Testament writings. Using Theon's handbook as an example of the rhetorical critical provides two distinct benefits for Lukan exegesis. First, Theon's handbook provides a relevant window into a variety of socio-literary conventions observed to occur in Luke's Gospel. As practical exegesis in Chapters IV and V has shown, there are a number of rhetorical exercises at work in the 12 Lukan scenes analyzed, particularly the chreia, fable, narration syncrisis, and ecphrasis. Thus, whereas discourse analysis addresses the text-internal linguistic structure of a given scene, rhetorical criticism makes available a choice of text-external forms according to ancient rhetorical conventions. In that sense, discourse analysis explains what is happening linguistically in a text and rhetorical criticism gives possible reasons why this should be so. For example, in this first scene analyzed in this project, Luke 3:21-22, discourse analysis revealed that marked discourse features occur in v. 22, namely, the Spirit's descent on Jesus and the reported speech of the heavenly voice. Theon's text-external resource enables the exegete to identify this scene as a mixed chreia, and consequently, directs the reader to consider that the Spirit's action and the divine speech are reflexive truths pertaining to Jesus' royal coronation.

As in the example of Jesus' baptism, the second benefit of this text-external approach is that it provides the Lukan exegete with an awareness of the ancient expectations associated with a particular rhetorical exercise in both the writer and audience, even if one or the other was not consciously aware of their influence in shaping narrative writing of the time. Form leads to function; various rhetorical exercises involve distinct audience expectations by means of a rhetorical framework that manages the text-internal discourse features in a particular social environment.

By employing both discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism in Luke's Gospel, this project incorporates the contribution of two methodological approaches to mutual benefit so that the value of each is enhanced. Discourse analysis provides the benefits of a rigorous linguistic approach as it pertains to text-internal features, and rhetorical criticism offers a copious resource relevant to an ancient text-external environment. The merger of these two exegetical approaches provides significant gains; the congruence of the objective and subjective, text-internal and text-external, notably, the identification of what is prominent in a scene and the identification of why such prominence occurs.

Considering the example of Jesus' baptism in Luke 3:21-22 further illustrates the exegetical rewards when both methods are congruently applied in Luke's Gospel. All three benefits for exegesis from discourse analysis are displayed in this scene. First, discourse analysis provides objective linguistic means for determining the textual boundaries of Luke 3.21-22. These discourse features include, i. the use of ἐγένετο δέ, ii. the pre-verbal constituent that begins the next scene, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν, and iii. participant referencing, καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος, the switch of reference to Jesus as the primary participant in the scene. Application of discourse analysis indicates that a higher level of textual boundary, a sequence, begins in v. 21 with ἐγένετο δέ that involves a cluster of eight inner-related scenes in Luke 3.21-4:44. Consequently, a tighter integration of meaning is perceived. Textual cohesiveness emerges among the messages contained in these eight scenes rather than a loose association of a random series of events. The second benefit of discourse analysis is to reveal the internal structure of the scene, again allowing a tight integration of meaning, exhibited a single clause complex that contains a number of marked discourse features, as the close in v. 22. Third, through the analysis of various discourse levels, v. 22 reveals the most prominent information, the focus point where Jesus' receives the Spirit and divine accolade.[635]

Even with the insights afforded by discourse analysis, significant questions remain unanswered: i. why this scene introduces a new sequence, ii. why this scene contains a single clause complex message, and iii. why two elements of prominent information occur at the scene's closing. Addressing these questions necessitates a text-external analysis, which is accommodated by the use of Theon's *Progymnasmata*. Theon's encomion exercise addresses the first question, the introduction of a new sequence. According to Theon's discussion, the message in vv. 21-22 provides fundamental information for the whole of the sequence, specifically, preliminary information by which the audience will evaluate Jesus' subsequent actions, whether he acts in accordance with or in excess of the expectations that are activated in vv. 21-22.

Concurrently, Theon's discussion of the encomion pattern indicates that the whole of this sequence addresses Jesus' external and bodily goods, issues such as good birth, reputation,

---

[635] In analyzing marked discourse features, three elements are marked as prominent: i. καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι signaled unexpected information, drawing extra attention to the heavenly voice's occurrence and accentuating the subsequent reported speech directed to Jesus, ii. Jesus was the message of first clause of the heavenly' voice's reported speech, the second clause, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα retained the focus on Jesus, iii. process type analysis identified that great prominence was given to the activity of the Holy Spirit's descent on Jesus.

official position, strength, and acuteness of senses. The second practical benefit of rhetorical criticism is that it addresses the reason for the structure of this scene as a tightly integrated clause complex message. An awareness of Theon's chreia exercise enables the exegete to appropriately situate and interpret this scene according to its own socio-literary convention and thus to recognize the text-external framework that the reader of the time could bring to the text in shaping and assigning its overarching purpose. Third, since a chreia's culminating message typically occurs at its closing, the dual focus on Jesus' reception of the Spirit and divine accolade indicates that this scene constitutes a mixed chreia. As a mixed chreia, the prominent action and saying in v. 22 are reflexive messages, each bearing equivalent functional weight. Bringing the insights of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism together, the author's purpose in Luke 3.21-22 is that Jesus is the coronate son of divine pleasure.

This brief sample demonstrates that integrating discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism provides an essential contribution to Lukan exegesis and that they operate in concert, each contributing vital aspects to the exegetical process. Discourse analysis provides the where and what of exegesis in occurrences of textual boundaries in this Lukan scene in v. 21 and v. 22, and identifies the elements of the scene that are prominent and focal, which in this case is Jesus' reception of the Spirit and divine accolade in v. 22. Rhetorical criticism subsequently provides the exegete with appropriate text-external, socio-literary conventions. This second step is vital since the use of a particular rhetorical exercise shapes the scene and provides the medium by which the audience manages, or appropriates, the various textual elements. Rhetorical criticism thus addresses why Jesus' baptism forms a new sequence, why the message of the scene occurs as a compressed clause complex, and why there is a dual focus in v. 22.

The intent throughout this project has been to explore both the theoretical congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism and especially, their practical relevance for Lukan exegesis. The analysis of the Lukan passages throughout this project suggests that the two approaches do work well together and are of value for exegesis. To further demonstrate the practical relevance of these congruent methods, the next section compares the findings of this project with four representative commentaries, briefly examining each Lukan scene in turn. Five considerations draw on the analysis of Chapters IV and V with each comparative analysis: i. where do textual boundaries occur? ii. what is the structure of a given scene? iii. what is prominent or the central focus in each scene? iv. why does the scene take this form? v. what is the overarching author's purpose for a given scene? Comparative analysis with the

commentaries will serve as a test to demonstrate whether this project provides substantial gains in practical Lukan exegesis, and whether its conclusions confirm, refine, and even correct previous interpretations. The final portion of this chapter examines prospective issues, charting the future paths for Gospel studies in the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism and suggesting ways that the research in this project can be tested, extended and applied to other Scriptural passages.

6.1 Comparative Commentary Analysis

The four commentaries used for this analysis have been chosen as representative on the basis of their distinct theological traditions and methodological approaches. These commentaries generally reflect various strands of theological traditions and the various methodological approaches that have been followed in Lukan commentaries. These four Lukan commentaries are: i. François Bovon in the *Hermeneia* series, ii. Luke Timothy Johnson's commentary in *The Sacra Pagina* series, iii. Joel B. Green in the *New International Commentary* series, and iv. Mikeal C. Parsons in the *Paideai New Testament Commentary series*.[636]

The *Hermeneia* commentary series, which includes Bovon's Luke commentary, is unique in that it avoids imposing any one particular theological tradition with the objective to deliver diligent biblical study through philological, textual-critical and genre studies.[637] Bovon's Luke commentary involves these four approaches: i. source criticism with Markan priority and additional L-sayings,[638] ii. larger passages, particularly in their introductory portions, interprets smaller subsequent passages,[639] iii. Lukan preference for Semitisms and the use of the LXX over rhetorical devices,[640] and iv. genre issues regarding smaller units in

---

[636] François Bovon, *Hermeneia- A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Luke 1:1-9:50* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), Luke Timothy Johnson, *Sacra Pagina: The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1991), Joel B. Green, *The New International Commentary on The New Testament: The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), Mikeal C. Parsons, *Paideai Commentaries on The New Testament: Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015). The critical literature review in Ch. III §3 additionally included Vernon K. Robbins and David P. Moessner. However, since none of these scholars perform an exhaustive analysis of Luke's Gospel, and particularly the Lukan scenes analyzed in this project, they are no longer referenced in the present chapter.

[637] Bovon, *Hermeneia- A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Luke 1:1-9:50*, xi, 3.

[638] Ibid.*, 5.*

[639] Bovon, *Hermeneia, 3.* Bovon structures Luke's' Gospel into four parts, derived from thematic considerations: i. Luke 1:1-4.14 as prologue and symmetry of John and Jesus, ii. 4.14-9:50 as Jesus' activity in Galilee, iii. 9:51-19:27, Jesus enroute to Jerusalem, and iv. 19:28-24:53, Jerusalem events.

[640] Ibid. *3-5*

Luke's Gospel are generally established, while the overall genre of Luke's Gospel itself is a matter of ongoing debate.[641]

While the *Hermeneia* series avoids the imposition of a particular theological tradition, the *Sacra Pagina* commentary series upholds Roman Catholic distinctives and espouses an eclectic and inclusive use of methodologies.[642] Johnson's approach to Luke's Gospel largely avoids source or form-critical issues in favor of a literary analysis of Luke's Gospel.[643] His literary analysis involves four general lines of approach; i. the use of literary analogies from the ancient worlds, utilizing these as the background for Lukan stories, the means for which Luke's Gospel develops important themes,[644] ii. close attention to plot as the persuasive force of a story, iii. focus on the precise location of various units, insofar as the relationship to neighboring stories bears as much meaning as the content within a story itself,[645] iv. approaching Luke's Gospel as Hellenistic history and structured around prophetic fulfillment and geographical elements.[646]

The *New International Commentary of the New Testament* series is broadly evangelical in persuasion, seeking to incorporate modern scholarship alongside pastoral concerns.[647] Green's commentary on Luke distances from older historical critical methods, namely, source, form and redaction criticisms, and instead, pursues a narrative-critical approach. More specifically, Green's narrative critical approach focuses on causality and teleology as the dual

---

[641] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* "Whereas consensus reigns regarding the genres of the smaller units, there is debate about the genre of the work as a whole…" 5.

[642] Johnson, *Sacra Pagina: The Gospel of Luke*, ix.

[643] Ibid., xi-xii.

[644] Ibid., xii.

[645] Ibid., 4. Regarding plot, Johnson intends to focus on characters who perform actions, insofar as character description and character reactions reveal a story's intention. Johnson's focus on Lukan intention through relationships derives from the Lukan prologue in 1.1-4, where the sequence of narratives mediates persuasive intent. 4-5.

[646] As opposed to Hellenistic biography. Johnson's support for Hellenistic writing derives from the similarities of the Lukan prologue with ancient Hellenistic histories, the inclusive, world-wide scope of Jesus'' mission, and his instinctual emphasis on causality. 5-10. However, Johnson does not deny the use of Semitisms or Luke's use of biblical models throughout his narrative. 12-13.

[647] Green, *The New International Commentary on The New Testament: The Gospel of Luke*, vii.

mediums for persuasive intent.[648]

Finally, Parsons' commentary on Luke in the *Paideai Commentaries on The New Testament* provides three particular benefits to this project. First, Parsons was among the three noteworthy Lukan rhetorical scholars presented in the critical literature review in Ch. III §3. Parsons thus provides a specific point of comparison with this project. Second, while all three of those scholars specialize in classical rhetorical analysis of Luke, Parsons' work is distinctive in that he alone performs an exegetical analysis of the whole of Luke's Gospel in his commentary. Third, Parsons' employment of classical rhetoric in Luke includes specific and detailed use of Theon's rhetorical handbook. Parsons' commentary therefore provides a unique interpretive window into the potential benefits that this project offers, namely, the exegetical benefits in the convergence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism.

6.2 Comparative Analysis of Three Representative Commentaries

6.2.1 Luke 3:21-22

Table 6.2.1 lays out this project's answers to the five comparative questions outlined in §1 above followed by the comparative analysis of the commentaries.

Table 6.2.1
Answers to five comparative questions for Luke 3:21-22.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	Luke 3.21 and 3.22. This scene also introduces a new Lukan sequence from 3:21 to 4.44
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Tightly integrated message involving single clause complex
3. What is prominent in this scene?	The closing information in v. 22: the Spirit's descent on Jesus and heavenly accolade
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Because it is a mixed chreia with action and saying as reflexive messages.
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate that Jesus is the coronate divine son

Regarding textual boundaries, all four commentators identify vv. 21-22 as a distinct scene, a complete unit within itself. However, support is not derived from linguistic criteria, but rather from what the authors deem to be thematic relationships in Luke.[649] Unfortunately,

---

[648] Joel B. Green, *The New International Commentary*, 2-6, 11-20.

[649] Bovon refers to Ἐγένετο δέ, but the phrase itself does not influence his textual boundaries as he places vv. 21-22 back with vv. 1-20. Bovon, *Luke*, 118. Neither Johnson nor Green mention this discourse marker.

seeking to discern textual themes apart from linguistic criteria inevitably results in subjectively organizing Luke's Gospel according to one's own preconceptions or understanding, discerning relationships that may not be warranted by the text itself. Not surprisingly then, all four scholars differ as to the relationship of vv. 21-22 to the surrounding Lukan units. Bovon links Jesus' baptism most closely to vv. 1-20, leading him to focus largely on Jesus' baptism as it relates to John's ministry.[650] In contrast, Johnson associates Jesus' baptism integrally with vv. 21-38, leading him to focus on the theme of identity, interpreting Jesus' baptism and subsequent genealogy as a "a single emphatic statement." [651] Distinct from the first two, Green sees Luke 3:21-4:13 as constituting a single overarching unit, leading him to interpret these three units as preparatory for his divine mission in his Nazareth sermon.[652] Finally, Parsons links this scene to both the genealogy and wilderness temptations, wherein Jesus' baptismal experience confirms his calling as Messiah while subsequent temptations displays Jesus' particular type of Messiahship.[653]

 Contrary to these findings, this project bases textual boundaries on discourse analysis, enabling relationships to be determined on the basis of discourse features. This project identifies 3.21-22 as a distinct scene and also the first scene in a group of scenes, which constitutes a new Lukan sequence from 3.21-4.44. The importance of this identification is tied to the overarching purpose of this scene.

---

[650] Bovon, *Hermeneia- A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Luke 1:1-9:50*, 128-129. Bovon refers to individual units as episodes and periscopes and places the life of Jesus into three literary units, the first of which is 4:14-9:50, regarding Jesus in Galilee. 2-3. Bovon refers to 3:1-22 as a "new section," even though he acknowledges that "Ἐγένετο δέ… suggests a transition: the main concern shifts from John to Jesus." 117-118. He later observes: "Jesus' baptism appears as a conclusion and a transition." 128. Nevertheless, placing vv. 21-22 together with vv. 1-20 leads Bovon to focus upon John's baptismal ministry and Jesus' own baptism, to the exclusion of discussing the manner by which vv. 21-22 sets the stage for subsequent information in Luke. In fact, in vv. 23-38 he only once refers to Jesus' baptism: "In another sense, he is for Luke the Son of God through the conception by the Spirit, through the disclosure of his sonship at his baptism, and through the resurrection." 137.

[651] Johnson, *Sacra Pagina: The Gospel of Luke*, 70. Johnson further comments, "With the baptism account, Luke shifts attention completely to Jesus." Ibid.*,* 70.

[652] Green, *The New International Commentary on The New Testament: The Gospel of Luke*, 184. Green writes: "Luke 1:5-2:52 may present the *possibility* of Jesus' mission as Son of God but 3:1-4:13 establishes its *probability*…Luke 3:1-4:13, therefore, assures us that Jesus will take up his divine mission and adds to our belief that God's aim will in fact be realized." 160, 161. By associating vv. 21-22 with Jesus' genealogy and temptation, Green is able to identify sonship and Jesus' reception of the Spirit as integral to Luke's subsequent genealogy. Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 184.

[653] Parsons, *Paideai Commentaries on The New Testament: Luke,* 69.

Bovon attends chiefly to v. 22 but devotes twice as much space to the heavenly voice than to the reception of the Spirit in determining elements of prominence or focus. [654] Johnson's literary analysis leads him to devote equal attention to both v. 21 and v. 22, drawing on source and redaction criticism and concentrating on the theme of prayer. Unlike Bovon, Johnson addresses the Spirit's descent, but neglects the heavenly voice in comparison.[655] Green assigns prominence to the whole of v. 22, identifying the Spirit's descent and the heavenly voice as the two "foci' or "foregrounded" events in this scene.[656] Green also chooses to prioritize the divine voice, stating that, "Central to Jesus' preparation is his identity as Son of God (3:22, 38, 4:3,9) and experience of the Spirit (3:22, 4:1, 9). These two are intricately linked…with the latter foundational to the former." [657] Parsons devotes equal space to the significance of John's baptism and the motivation for Jesus' desire for baptism, addressing the variety of rhetorical devices by which the scene highlights "…Jesus' origins as God's 'beloved Son'." [658]

While four scholars intuitively sense that v. 22 is most prominent, failure to give equal prominence to the Spirit's descent and heavenly voice results when discourse features are overlooked. Against subjective intuitions, this project attends to various levels of discourse analysis in order to objectively identify elements of prominence, resulting in thereby recognizing the equal prominence given to both the Spirit's descent and the heavenly voice.

The three commentators also disagree on the form of this scene. Bovon identifies this scene as a merger between a commissioning story and the apocalyptic genre. [659] Johnson

---

[654] Bovon comes closest by observing: "Everything that Luke has so far written about Jesus serves to prove that he is God's Son. In view of 1:31-32, the readers are not learning something completely new. What is new is only that Jesus is here now, receives the Spirit ad hears the voice himself…" 129.

[655] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 71. In his sidebar, Johnson gives equal space to the Spirit and the voice. After surveying various proposals for the meaning of the Holy Spirit he writes: "These and other suggestions are not persuasive, yet- such is the nature of symbols- all are possible." 69. Evidently, Johnson does not correlate the Spirit's decent with the divine voice, even though he identifies the import of Psalm 2:7.

[656] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 185-87.

[657] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 184. In other words, while the two events are linked by thematic sharing, Jesus' experience of the Spirit is logically, if not temporally, dependent on his sonship.

[658] Parsons, *Luke,* 70.

[659] Bovon, *Hermeneia, 128.* On the one hand he writes: "Luke historicizes the event, although not in the sense of a commissioning story, since there is no commission… [the Spirit's decent provides] A traditional apocalyptic vision in connection with an audition is transformed into a historical scene with divine intervention." 128. But later he refers to the commissioning function of this scene: "For his mission (more than for himself), he

identifies the form of this scene as a story, and Green avoids precise terminology for the scene altogether, though like Bovon he places emphasis on the apocalyptic elements in the scene.[660] Parsons calls this scene both "an account" and also "a narrative." With such an identification Parsons incorporates a variety of rhetorical strategies within this scene, including; *ecphrasis*-the heaven opening and Spirit decent, *omen*-the triad of heaven opening, Spirit decent, and heavenly voice, and *signs*, with all of these devices pertaining to *bios* literature that extols the greatness of the individual.[661] While it is commendable that Parsons incorporates Theon's rhetorical exercises, notably lacking is any support that this scene constitutes a narration, rather than a chreia, as this project contends. Because this project maintains that this scene constitutes a chreia, and its requisite virtue of concision, there is necessarily a negation of additional rhetorical strategies, contra Parsons' contentions. Parson's identification of this scene as a narration, however, broadens his understanding of the expedient point of this scene resulting in Parson giving detailed attention to earlier elements in the scene, namely, John's baptism and Jesus' motivation for baptism.[662] As is now evident, diverse approaches to genre arise because of the absence of clearly defined linguistic criteria by which to structure the scene and to determine its form, as well as the lack of recognition given to the rhetorical contexts, which is suggested by Theon's rhetorical exercises. This scene's structure is a single clause complex and tightly integrated message with two elements of prominence at its culmination. This structure, aided by rhetorical criticism, results in identifying this scene as a mixed chreia exercise, consisting of both an action, the Spirit's descent on Jesus, and a saying, the heavenly accolade. Accordingly, both elements are equally prominent and serve as reflexive truths.

The congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism in this project results in a clear answer to the fifth question: what is the overarching purpose of the author for this scene? The clear answer, absent in all four commentaries, is that Jesus is the coronate divine son. There is another purpose for this scene. Returning to the issue of textual boundaries and sequencing and in keeping with the pattern of the encomion exercise, Jesus' coronation

---

now receives the affirmation and the gift of divine power" which Bovon connects vv. 21-22 to the transfiguration account as "the second stage of Christ's commission." 129,130.

[660] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 185-86. "This scene is set in the world of apocalyptic, with its emphasis of divine mystery." 185. Green refers to this scene as a pericope and scene, within the larger world of Lukan narration.

[661] Parsons, *Luke,* 69.

[662] Ibid., 68-70.

provides the formative evaluative praise for actions that Jesus will subsequently perform. Throughout the larger sequence of 3.21-4:44, Jesus is praised insofar as his actions correspond to his regal coronation.[663] Following the encomion pattern, this sequence addresses Jesus' bodily and external goods, meaning that it addresses Jesus' tribe, reputation, official position, and so on, as that which provides fundamental information by which he is evaluated. The text-external expectation is that in this sequence the reader will learn much about Jesus' personhood through the activities and accolades of others who respond to him. The encomiastic expectation is that "Actions are praised on the basis of the occasion and whether someone did them alone or was the first or when no one else acted, or did more than others or with few helpers..."[664] In the next sequence of 5.1-38, Jesus' self-initiated and solitary actions, since goods of the mind and action, particularly those performed willfully and singularly, follow bodily and external goods in the encomion arrangement and provide a strong basis for praising Jesus.

6.2.2 Luke 3:23-39

Table 6.2.2
Answers to five comparative questions for Luke 3:23-39.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	Luke 3.23 and 3.39 and the second scene in the sequence extending from 3.21 to 4.44
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Initial clause complex (v. 23) followed by string of genitive of relationships (vv. 24-38)
3. What is prominent in this scene?	v. 23: Jesus' 'reign' at thirty years
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Genealogy as a component of the encomion as it relates to Jesus' regal coronation
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To display Jesus' reign, corresponding to his regal predecessors, especially King David

Regarding textual boundaries, all four commentators agree with the findings in this project in identifying vv. 23-38 as a distinct scene, a complete unit within itself. Despite agreement on textual boundaries, Bovon alone appeals to discourse features for support, specifically noting the distinctive grammar of this scene related to the string of genitives of relationship.[665] However, the lack of attention to objective discourse features leads the commentaries to integrate the genealogy scene to the neighboring scenes in diverse ways,

---

[663] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 50

[664] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata,* 51

[665] Bovon writes: "The baptism account, which breaks off sharply, is linked loosely with the genealogy by v.23." and also observes that 4:1 begins a distinct scene: "Grammatically, he becomes the subject of the verbs. On the basis of what he has received and inherited from God, he begins to act." Bovon, *Hermeneia, 136, 139.*

resulting in differing understandings of this scene's overarching purpose. Bovon maintains that there is little to no thematic cohesiveness between Jesus' baptism and the genealogy; instead, there is a close thematic relationship between Jesus' genealogy and his wilderness temptations. As a result, Bovon accentuates that Jesus' humanity is on display, underlining the dangerous nature of his subsequent temptations.[666] On the opposite end, Johnson closely connects Jesus' baptism and genealogy, integrating these scenes so that the genealogy of Jesus is less about human ancestry and principally about his divine nature as relating to the Spirit's supernatural work in his conception.[667] Likewise, Parsons writes: "To emphasize Jesus' origins as God's Son (see also 3:22), Luke characterizes Adam as the Son of God (3:38b)…the reference here prepares the audience to hear Jesus' temptation narrative as the 'undoing of Adam's sin'."[668] Green asserts that the genealogy relates to the larger sequence from 3:1-4:13, and emphasizes Jesus' identity as genuinely human, while also genuinely divine, through his earlier conception by the Holy Spirit.[669]

In examining the structure of this scene and prominence, none of the authors note the marked clause complex in v. 23,

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὢν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο…

Lack of attention to this discourse feature is unfortunate, since this clause complex constitutes the prominent information of this scene and that to which the whole of vv. 24-38, the string of genitives of relationship, are anchored. Perhaps because the salience of this clause is not recognized, the semantic range of ἀρχόμενος is not explored in the commentaries, nor is the possibility that thirty years corresponds to David's reign.

Regarding the form of this scene, all four scholars concur that this scene constitutes a genealogy; however, there is a lack of attention on the genealogy as a specific medium for the encomion rhetorical exercise. Also missing is a detailed discussion over the precise relationship between the divine accolade at Jesus' baptism that involves the use of the Davidic Psalm 2 and Jesus' genealogy which pulsates with Davidic regality.[670] In accordance with encomiastic

---

[666] Bovon, *Hermeneia, 137.*

[667] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 72.

[668] Parsons, *Luke,* 70.

[669] 188-191.

[670] However, Bovon and Johnson do associate vv. 23-38 with ancient biographies. Bovon, *Hermeneia, 136,* Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 72.

rhetoric, Jesus' genealogy is closely associated with his baptismal experience. His coronation correlates to his regal ancestry, pertaining to Theon's discussion of bodily and external goods. In placing the genealogy after Jesus' baptism, and invoking Davidic correspondence, the text-external expectation is that Jesus is praised insofar as his subsequent actions correspond to his regal coronation and Davidic genealogy.[671]

6.2.3 Luke 4:1-14a Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.3
The five exegetical considrations in the commentary comparisons for Luke 4:1-14a.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	4:1 and v. 14a
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Developmental units of information
3. What is prominent in this scene?	Forty days, Jesus' authoritative responses
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Narration and syncrisis exercises
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate Jesus' regal sonship through his authoritative commitment to God's Law, comparative to David's encounter with Goliath.

Regarding question 1 in Table 6.2.3, this project has identified the scene as comprising vv.1-14a, based on discourse features. However, none of the commentators here concur with this assessment. Instead, all four identify vv. 1-13 as comprising the temptation scene, leaving aside v. 14a with Jesus' return to Galilee in the power of the Spirit.[672] However, the application of discourse analysis leads to the inclusion of 4.14a and offers an exegetical insight to this scene and importantly, reveals something of the author's likely intention. That is, by

---

[671] Address the historicity of Luke's genealogy is of little consequence as Luke's rhetorical interests operate by comparing Jesus actions to his predecessors.

[672] Bovon, *Hermeneia, 149.* Bovon identifies 4:1-13 as a distinct scene, even while acknowledging that vv. 14-15 look backward to Jesus' temptations. Bovon writes: "Typically for Luke's episodic style, v. 13 establishes a definite conclusion. Since v. 1 clearly introduces the pericope, the boundaries in the text are distinct." 149. Unfortunately, Bovon offers no criteria in support except to note that Luke tends to present short summaries between episodes. 3. Johnson also identifies 4:1-13 as a scene, observing that reference to the Holy Spirit in v. 14 provides a summary statement that is both transitional and introductory to the new scene in vv. 14-30. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 78. Green likewise concurs, however he offers the most support for this textual boundary, "And 4:1-13 is set off from 4:14 by its geography (the undesignated wilderness versus Galilee); by parallel actions of 'returning'; and especially by the active presence of the devil…" Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 190-191. Green does acknowledge the thematic nexus between Jesus' endowment with the Spirit and his sonship and that of his public ministry. 191.

referencing the Spirit's anointed empowering of Jesus at the start and close of this scene, Jesus' regality is viewed through the lens of a continuous Spirit-anointing experience, his temptation ordeals being framed around the message of divine favor that rests upon him. Verse 14a ensures the reader that while Jesus is a faithful and regal son to God, his activities are not self-originating. Rather, his true regal sonship is expressed in his thorough commitment to the Torah, that is, God's regal law and presence sustains him in the wilderness.

In the absence of the linguistic tools of discourse analysis, the commentaries determine prominence on the basis of, first, the individual scholar's understanding of the scene's form and second, the selection of certain elements that each deems significant. Parsons, however, invokes communication theorists and what is called the 'recency effect,' by which a lasting impression is left upon the audience with the final information of a narration. As such, Parson's identifies Jesus' third temptation at the Temple to be especially significant; the Temple serving Lukan theology as the locus of conflict for God's people.[673] Parsons writes: "Jesus… in the climax of the story refuses to test God; his obedience is in sharp contrast to- indeed reverses- the disobedience of God's first son, Adam (3:38)."[674]

Regarding form, the four commentaries agree in identifying Jesus' wilderness temptations as belonging to the narrative genre, though none of the authors consider the narration exercise according to ancient rhetorical handbooks.[675] Even Parson, who commonly follows ancient rhetorical strategies, fails to take into account the global action of this scene and in a way that incorporates the themes and narrative elements of all three temptations, following instead modern communication theorists.[676] Consequently, the lack of attention paid to rhetorical criticism means that no commentary attempts to identify the global action of the scene nor prominent narration elements that assist in its epideictic function. Several of the scholars appear to approach this scene as both a narration and a fable, since their exegesis involves an examination of images of corresponding truths, a heavy emphasis on overlaid figural terminology, and a focus on pivotal actions that Jesus performs.[677]

---

[673] Parsons, *Luke,* 72.

[674] Parsons, *Luke,* 72.

[675] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 75, Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 140, Green, *The Gospel of Luke,*190.

[676] Parsons, *Luke,* 71-72.

[677] Bovon's approach sharply contrasts with this project, for not only does he view the temptation scene as preparation for Jesus' ministry, rather than displaying his first regal victory, but also dismisses the presence of the syncrisis exercise. "Luke, who does not intend to write parallel lives, promptly introduces, alongside and after

A lack of attention to the occurrence of the narration and syncrisis exercises in this scene results in several commentators relying upon selective symbolism to determine the scene's overarching purpose. For example, Bovon sees *haggadic mishrashim* in this scene. Accordingly, he identifies creative symbolism in several spatial and temporal elements, selecting the wilderness and forty days for special interest and reflecting Israel's wilderness experiences. By symbolically comparing Israel to Jesus, Jesus is represented as superior to Moses and Israel.[678] Bovon's use of the *haggadic mishrashim* leads him to ground the *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus' temptation around polemical challenges to the Jesus movement, specifically that Jesus is the Messiah.[679] Bovon maintains that Luke's creative symbolism in storytelling ultimately serves to establish Jesus as a pious Jew, the one by whom God decisively delivers his people, but only through the "path of service and obedient sonship." [680] Bovon's approach of situating Luke's Gospel within a Jewish context is commendable, and while this project encourages additional context-linguistic resources for Lukan exegesis, the use of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism may actually serve to strengthen Bovon's claims regarding Jesus as the piously obedient Jew.

Similar to Bovon, Johnson's emphasis on symbolism also determines his understanding of the scene's purpose. By means of spatial-temporal information, Johnson invokes a comparison between Jesus and Moses, Israel, and the prophet Elijah.[681] Johnson's identification of the overarching purpose for this scene is linked to shared themes among the surrounding scenes. Because divine sonship forms the fulcrum for Johnson's understanding of Jesus' nature which is revealed at his baptism, the temptation functions to demonstrate the quality of Jesus' sonship. The overarching purpose of this scene is ultimately about Jesus' display of true loyalty

---

John, the main character- Jesus. Until 4:13, we are still in the preparatory stages. Only then does Luke signal the beginning of Jesus' activity, in the more extensive scene of his first public appearance in Nazareth…" Bovon, *Hermeneia, 2.*

[678] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 142. Bovon notes that Luke's temptation account "demonstrates the ingenious haggadic work of the first Christian teachers, who did not hesitate to unite various figures in Jesus: if Jesus bears Moses' characteristics, he also takes on the function of the nation loved by God, as the 'son of God'." 143.

[679] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 145.

[680] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 145. "Salvation comes through suffering and death. This biblical theology is not recited incidentally. It serves as the answer to a criticism, not of miracles, but of the cross of Christ."

[681] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 76.

to God, expressed by a denial of grandiose actions instead of engaging in selfless service to God.[682]

Green's approach is distinctive among the commentaries in that he employs a rhetorical exercise called the *topoi* to interpret the scene. As a *topoi*, stock images or elements form the basis for understanding a given scene. Green asserts that the stock images include the wilderness, the Holy Spirit, and Jesus' sonship and mission. The result is similar to that of Bovon and Johnson in that Green also compares Jesus' testing in the wilderness to ancient Israel's wilderness wanderings. In addition, by means of such *topoi*, Jesus shows himself to be the true son through severe testing.[683] According to Green, there are two overarching purposes for the scene. One purpose is to demonstrate Jesus' competence for ministry as expressed in his severe testing and victory, reflecting a consistent theme among Jewish traditions.[684] The second purpose is to show that Jesus' fidelity and fitness for ministry is revealed by comparing and contrasting his faithful commitment to God and Israel's own faithfulness to God.[685] Finally, as noted above, Parsons links the genealogy and the temptation scenes in order to contrast Jesus with Adam, displaying Jesus' refusal to test God since he is the obedient Son.[686]

While the shared interpretive conclusions of the commentators offer insights into Luke's Gospel such as Jesus' piously obedient commitment to God's reign, this project offers other distinct benefits. Objective, clear, and rhetorically appropriate answers in Lukan exegesis may be discerned through the use of text-internal and text-external resources. Discourse analysis makes determining textual boundaries possible, which in the case of Jesus' temptations provides a better understanding of Jesus' Spirit-anointed sonship. Discourse analysis also provides the meaning of identifying prominent narration elements, such as ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα, Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, and ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ… εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ, and

---

[682] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*. "We can read this entire account against the backdrop of first-century Palestinian upheaval and popular messianic expectation, and recognize that, in Luke's understanding, Jesus eschewed the option of a violent, military, zealot vision of God's kingdom in Israel." Johnson maintains that a true understanding Christology leads to existential praxis, whereby followers of Jesus are called to reflect the selfless posture of their master. 77. For Johnson then, Jesus' defeat of the devil leads Johnson to see Jesus' subsequent works as a "mopping-up operation." 75.

[683] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 191.

[684] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 191.

[685] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 192-196.

[686] Parsons, *Luke, 72.*

ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν. With these in place, rhetorical criticism provides conventional forms to justify this prominence, and specifically, the rhetorical narration and syncrisis exercise. The congruence of these two methods provides better discernment of the author's overarching purpose, to demonstrate that Jesus is the true regally anointed son whose resolute action against the devil, and to uphold God's regal law which surpasses David's own victory over Goliath.[687]

6.2.4 Luke 4:14b-29 Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.4

Answers to five exegetical considerations of the commentary comparisons for Luke 4:14b-29.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	4.14b and v. 29
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Center point within vv. 20-22
3. What is prominent in this scene?	vv. 20-22: vivid responses to Jesus' words and v. 24 related to Jesus' prophetic office
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Narration
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate Jesus' prophetic sonship, corresponding in mission and opposition to Elijah and Elisha

Similar to the temptation scene, the findings in this project differ from the commentators regarding textual boundaries. However, while Johnson and Bovon include vv. 14-30 in their scene analysis, Green identifies vv.16-30 as a more distinct unit, whereas vv.14-15 serves as bridge material, linking Jesus' anointing to the previous scene and setting the stage for Jesus' subsequent teaching ministry.[688] Regarding the final textual boundary of this scene, all four scholars include v. 30 with Jesus escape from the crowds, whereas applying the linguistic tools of discourse analysis, it can be seen that Luke intended the scene to close at v. 29. The particular feature that indicates this is the forefronting of the clause in v. 30, αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο, which, by signaling a point of departure, introduces a new scene. Moreover, if Jesus' escape is deemed so necessary in closing out the

---

[687] Like David, Jesus experiences the wilderness and Jerusalem, is anointed by the Holy Spirit, experiences forty days of challenges by a fierce foe, and throughout is shown to be the regal son of divine pleasure. Because the syncrisis exercise carries the expectation that one of these two individuals is superior in their global action, a close examination of their actions is necessary. Whereas David' action is material, involving a sling and stone and sword, Jesus' action is verbal and non-material. Whereas David's words are a prelude to his material global action, Jesus words constitute the action itself. Comparatively, then, Jesus is shown to be greater than David. First, he utilizes less than David in his victory, that is, Jesus' mere words create narrative transformations over against David's material weaponry and subsequent victory. At the same time, Jesus utilizes more than David in his victory, namely, Jesus' words singularly uphold the very words of Torah.

[688] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 204-5. Bovon also identifies vv. 14-15 as transitional, *Hermeneia,* 149.

Nazareth scene, it is surprising that Luke chose to express his deliverance with a participle before the main verb, since participles have the effect of relegating the action it expresses to the background[689]. While this project employs objective linguistic support, there are exegetical consequences in including v. 30. Jesus' escape from the crowds detracts from this scene's focus on Jesus' teaching authority that Luke intended. For example, Bovon's inclusion of v. 30 leads him to observe the depth of realism in the scene, and furthers the notion that Jesus' time had not yet come, indicating his omnipotence.[690] Green's inclusion of v. 30 leads him to focus upon the scene's finale as a way of communicating Jesus' commitment to God.[691] Parsons' inclusion of Jesus' deliverance leads to a string of questions and then this statement: "More fruitful than pondering the mechanics of the deliverance, however, are its theological purposes."[692] For Parsons, the deliverance of Jesus means that as a prophet Jesus must die in Jerusalem, and moreover, that he must fulfil his divine vocation.[693] As it stands, these commentaries illustrate why the author of Luke's gospel excluded Jesus' miraculous escape within the present scene. As was shown in Ch. III § 3.3, the triad of narration virtues: plausibility, clarity and conciseness, unilaterally achieve an effective narration. Accomplishing these virtues entails that the present scene orchestrates around the principal and fundamental global action; Jesus' prophetic announcement in the Nazareth synagogue. On the contrary, including Jesus' miraculous rescue, would result in a reduction or minimizing of the scene's global action. In short, the inclusion of Jesus' release would distract the reader from the chief matter at hand, a

---

[689] Steven Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 248-252.

[690] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 156-7. Johnson compares Jesus' escape to other famed characters in the ancient world, Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 80.

[691] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 219. Contrary to such suggestions, this project argues that v. 30 belongs with the subsequent scene, on the basis of the fore-fronted participant which marks a new point of departure, as discussed in Ch. II. §3.1 Thus, that miraculous escape, itself evidence that God is protecting Jesus as the Messiah, provides the basis for Jesus' encounter with the demonic in Capernaum. In so doing, focus is upon Jesus' prophetic fulfillment, and not upon supernatural elements. Similarly, this project does not include v. 14a within this textual boundary. A such, Jesus' Spirit-anointing bookends the scene demonstrating his regal ministry. In v.14b-29, Jesus' Spirit-anointing is renewed, but when such occurs in vv. 18-19, it serves to activate the relation of the Spirit to Jesus' prophetic office. The importance of v 14b to the temptation is that it reaffirms Jesus' verbal authority and sets the stage for his prophetic contest in vv. 14b-29. In both cases, his anointed office is displayed by his verbal commitment to the Torah. Reference to the Spirit's work in Jesus may serve to activate the relationship between Jesus and the three offices within ancient Israel; king (4:1-14a), prophet (4:14b-29) and priest (5:17-26). If this is correct, it correlates nicely to Luke 24:44 wherein Jesus is the fulfillment of the Law of Moses (priestly), the Prophets (prophet), and the Psalms (regal).

[692] Parsons, *Luke,* 83.

[693] Parsons, *Luke,* 84.

point well illustrated by the commentators' preoccupation with Jesus' divine release. In instances of what may initially appear to be an unusually placed textual boundaries, one may be tempted to abandon the resource of discourse analysis. However, the best course of action, represented by this project, is to retain the insights of discourse analysis but to also converge them with the insights of rhetorical criticism. That is, regarding the textual boundaries of this Lukan scene, discourse analysis provides the 'what', while rhetorical criticism provides the 'why'.

Analysis of constituent order, process types, clause complex analysis and scene analysis have all signaled that vv. 20-22 constitutes prominent information. In comparison, the commentators rely upon diverse preconceptions of prominent information. While Bovon allots equal space to a variety of verses in his exegesis, he gives less attention to vv. 25-30. While Bovon appears to assign a level of prominence to vv. 20b-21, his lack of attention to the ecphrasis exercise leads him to appeal to contemporary narratological insights. He writes: "…Luke is dramatizing the scene… The first sentence…contains explosive material: today this biblical passage is fulfilled." [694] Johnson appears to assign prominence to the Isaianic citation in vv. 18-19 which he sees as programmatic for this scene, since it demonstrates that Jesus is a prophetic Messiah and addresses his subsequent mission. Johnson observes that Jesus' subsequent words and the crowd's response indicates a central theme of prophetic rejection. Like Johnson, Green views Jesus' Isaianic reading as especially prominent, while also observing the important structural threefold alternation between Jesus and the crowds.[695] Parsons also places emphasis upon Jesus' reading of Isaiah.[696] Parsons justification is unique, however, in that Parsons identifies a chiastic structure in vss. 16b-21, alternating between responses from the crowds and Jesus. As such, the central element in vss. 18-19 is most prominent; Jesus' reading of Isaiah. Such a structure is highly significant for Parsons: "Here then, in a nutshell at the beginning of Luke's Gospel is a precis of Jesus' public ministry as Messiah in Isaianic idiom. The rest of the story unfolds the ways in which Jesus preaches good

---

[694] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 154. Bovon summarizes this scene by writing: "Jesus' word, which announces God's message and the intermediary role of the Messiah, is programmatic. Equally programmatic is the soteriological content and also, unfortunately, the human rejection." 157.

[695] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 207.* Green goes on to note that vv. 16b-20 are set apart structurally in a chiastic pattern with the Isaiah text as central, and also by the use of narrative time, the action is slowed down, drawing 'special attention' to the Isaiah passage that Jesus read. 209-211.

[696] Parsons, *Luke,* 81.

news…"[697] Such comparative analysis reveals that discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism provides a window into reading the text in line with ancient literary and linguistic conventions rather than based upon contemporary interpretations or upon various theological presuppositions.

All four commentators agree that the form of this scene constitutes a narrative.[698] At the same time, the commentaries overlook Theon's discussion of rhetorical conventions. Consequently, there is no focus on the function of a narration as there is no fixed attention on a global action and incorporating any auxiliary marked narration elements that together serve a particular rhetorical function. The scholars do not take into account the presence of the ecphrasis and syncrisis exercises in this scene. The commentaries are not necessarily wrong, but using Theon's text-external approach offers three distinct insights into how this scene operates. First, because the form of this scene is a narration exercise, the global action is the focal point. Because discourse analysis identified prominence in vv. 20-22, the global action of this scene is Jesus' verbal declaration of Isaianic prophetic fulfillment. Second, alongside the global action, an ecphrasis also occurs in vivid description that draws the audience into the event, witnessing Jesus' declaration as emotionally engaged spectators. Third, a syncrisis also occurs in this scene, activated by two other prominent discourse features that occur in this scene. The first occurs in v. 24, οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν and the second in vv. 28-29 as it relates to the crowd's hostile response to Jesus. As a *syncrisis*, comparison is made between Jesus and Elijah and Elisha for these prophets were also unwelcome, ministering in surprising ways and yet facing stark opposition. Jesus specifically refers to these two prophets in vv. 25-27.

Using a syncrisis in this scene yields the text-external expectation that subsequent scenes will likewise sustain a comparison between Jesus, the anointed prophetic son, and Elijah and Elisha. The use of the syncrisis means that subsequent scenes will display the extent to which Jesus meets or surpasses his prophetic predecessors, an approach that accords with the Lukan pattern in this sequence. Whereas the first scene referenced a Spirit-anointing with Davidic correspondence, leaving subsequent scenes to display his superiority to David, this

---

[697] Parsons, *Luke,* 82.

[698] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 151. For Johnson, a "story," *The Gospel of Luke*, 75. Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 207. More particularly,* Johnson views this narrative as Luke's adaptation of a "conflict story," consistent with the other Synoptics. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 80.

second reference of Spirit-anointing invokes a prophetic correspondence, entailing that subsequent scenes will display Jesus' superiority to Elijah and Elisha.

The final exegetical consideration is the author's overarching purpose. The congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism results in a clear identification of the purpose that Jesus' announcement of mediating Isaianic blessings demonstrates that he is a prophetic son whose ministry, like Elijah and Elisha, is both surprising and provoking in its opposition. Such a clear and precise purpose statement reveals that the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism offers significant exegetical rewards. Because this project employs a robust approach to Halliday's metafunction of language involving relevant text-internal and text-external resources, Lukan exegesis need not succumb to subjective considerations or thematically based associations when seeking to identify a scene's boundaries, structure, prominence, form, and purpose.

6.2.5 Luke 4:30-37 Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.5

Answers to five exegetical questions in the commentary comparisons of Luke 4:30-37.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	v. 30 and v. 37
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Center point occurring in vv. 33-35
3. What is prominent in this scene?	Jesus and the demon's verbal exchange
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Narration, ecphrasis and syncrisis
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate Jesus' superior prophetic office, compared to Elijah, and by means of his singular verbal authority to heal.

The application of discourse analysis criteria has shown that Luke 4:30-37 represents a distinct scene of first exegetical consideration of textual boundaries. This identification is in contrast with the structural divisions of the three representative commentators, since they do not include v. 30 and also include additional scenes within their purview. Bovon considers vv. 31-37 a distinct scene but views vv. 31-32 as summary material. Nonetheless, Bovon does incorporate a linguistic indicator, namely, imperfective use, and thereby views vv. 31-32 as a summary unit. This is the only discourse feature he refers to, whereas geographical thematic considerations largely dictate his analysis as the precise ending of the scene in v. 37.[699] Like Bovon, Johnson also begins his analysis in v. 31, but includes all the information to v. 44, cumulatively interpreting these as a swift series of vignettes. In contrast to Bovon's understanding of the imperfective as indicating a textual boundary of sorts, Johnson interprets

---

[699] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 158-9. Imperfects in vv. 31-32 include ἦν διδάσκων, ἐξεπλήσσοντο, and ἦν.

the imperfect as simply denoting a durative, ongoing process.[700] In Johnson's case, textual boundaries are identified by Markan priority.[701] Similar to Johnson, Green interprets vv. 31-44 as a singular pericope comprised of several smaller stories. Like Johnson, Green does not appeal to discourse features in his support for textual boundaries. Instead, he discerns textual boundaries around chronological, geographical and thematic considerations which he sees as exhibiting internal cohesiveness.[702] Parsons identifies vv. 31-37 as a 'story' within an interconnected series of scenes held together by chronology and geography, consisting of two stories; vv. 31-37 and vv. 38-39, and one summary statement; vv. 40-44. Most important for Parsons, however, is the thematic relationship among these scenes; Jesus' previous Nazareth announcement of release for captives is displayed in these present scenes.[703]

This project analyzes the structure and form of the scene in vv. 30-37 as a constituting rhetorical narration, involving a global action, surrounding auxiliary narration elements. The structure of the scene confirms this identification with the presence of all six process types and a central point. The commentators, however, while they all agree that the exorcism unit represents a narration, offer no linguistic support and their exegesis would have been reinforced by an awareness of Theon's discussion of the narration convention with requisite focus on the global action.

Since discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism are absent in these commentaries, issues of prominence are instead identified by associating this scene thematically with previous scenes, particularly Jesus' Nazareth proclamation. Bovon associates this scene with Jesus' Nazareth announcement, finding prominence in the demonic acclaim that Jesus is the holy one of God, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. Bovon maintains that this scene has three overarching purposes, to display Jesus' special relationship to God, to showcase his enactment of his divinely-anointed prophetic mission, and to display Jesus' powerful words.[704] Similarly, Johnson identifies prominence by tying Jesus' Nazareth announcement of liberating captives to his performance in Capernaum. Consequently, Johnson interprets the purpose of this scene as a demonstration of

---

[700] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 83.

[701] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 85.

[702] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 220-1.*

[703] Parsons, *Luke,* 84.

[704] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 158-60.

264

Jesus' prophetic nature and mission."[705] Green also associates the Capernaum exorcism with his programmatic mission in vv. 16-30.[706] Like Bovon, Green focuses on the demons' acclaim of Jesus as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ and the authoritative nature of Jesus' rebuke, showcasing Jesus' verbal authority. [707] Green asserts that the purpose of this scene is to recall Jesus' divine origin and to show that he aligns with God's mission.[708] As noted above, Parsons links this scene to the Nazareth announcement of release for captives in 4:18, consequently, he writes "The response to Jesus, whether positive or negative, is an important element throughout this section…Once again, the response to Jesus and his authority-this time, his authoritative actions-is highlighted."[709] As such, Parsons gives attention both to the demon's and crowd's response to Jesus, and to Jesus himself. And, while Parsons helpfully identifies echoes from five texts within the Jewish Scriptures reflected in the demon's response to Jesus, such an insight abruptly shifts to Markan and Lukan themes in order to discern textual significance.[710] Further, Parsons both neglects to identify the presence of the syncrisis and ecphrasis exercises in the scene, and to interpret this narration according to Theon's virtues, particularly plausibility and the global action.

The assertions of these scholars, while generally in line with what emerges from this project, would have greater force by pointing to the linguistic support that confirms them. An appropriation of Theon's rhetorical exercises alongside marked discourse features would supplement their identification of the scene's overarching purpose. The commentators correctly identify Jesus' authoritative words as central and reflective of his prophetic mission. However, several marked discourse features that signal prominence occur in vv. 33-35, related to Jesus' encounter with the demon. Prominence is signaled by several discourse features, such as marked constituent order, a process type conglomerate, distinct elaborating clause complexes,

---

[705] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 85.

[706] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 220.*

[707] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 22, 224.2.*

[708] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 223.* Green finds support in Acts 3:14, 4:27,30, as well as 2 Kings 4:9, Ps 106:16, Jer 1:5, and Sir 45:6. Green rightly identifies that the phrase, Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, reflects Jewish texts (Judg 11:12, 2 Sam 16:10, 19:22, 1 Kgs 17;18, 2 Kgs 3:13).

[709] Parsons, *Luke*, 84.

[710] Parsons, *Luke,* 85.

the solitary aorist verb ascribed to Jesus' action, ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, and finally, the concentric center of the scene of as the demon's shout, καὶ ἀνέκραξεν…

These marked features revolve around Jesus' global action, his rebuking exorcism of the demon, καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς… and are associated with Jesus' rebuke of the demon, specifically, its authoritative nature, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει, and the demon's attribution of Jesus, οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. Incorporating the principles of Theon's handbook allow these marked narration elements to address Jesus' action and his person. The greatness of Jesus' action is addressed in his authoritative verbal exorcism, and his personhood is addressed through his prophetic office. These two narration elements constitute the epideictic chief point of this scene that Jesus' action of powerfully excising a demon by his words demonstrates his prophetic office as the holy one of God.

While discourse analysis and Theon's narration discussion provide clarity and precision to the commentators' findings, this scene can further be examined by the ecphrasis and syncrisis exercise. The ecphrasis, as vivid language, emotionally draws the audience into the exorcism event, καὶ ῥίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Using a syncrisis, Jesus is compared to another participant. The demon's attribution of Jesus is prominent in this scene, so the syncrisis is activate here, specifically in the idiom in v. 34, Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνν. As Chapter IV §6.5, this idiom reflects 1 Kgs 17:18, lexically and conceptually. Luke's Gospel draws a comparison between Jesus and Elijah in his encounter with the widow from Zaraphath, regarding her recently deceased son. By comparing Jesus' global action, his authoritative healing of the demoniac that consists solely in his words, and Elijah's multiple activities that eventuate in the healing the dead widow's son, the conclusion is that Jesus' prophetic office surpasses Elijah's.[711] Incorporating the ecphrasis and syncrisis thereby supplements the overarching purpose of this scene that Jesus' action of powerfully excising a demon by his words demonstrates his prophetic office as the holy one of God, surpassing even the prophet Elijah.

6.2.6 Luke 4:38-39 Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.6

---

[711] While the commentaries generally discern the prophetic impulse of this scene, they do not appeal to linguistic or rhetorical support, resulting in a lack of comparison between Jesus and Elijah. For example, while Bovon rightly acknowledges the prophetic impulse of this scene, he fails to identify the correspondence between Jesus and Elijah and its significance. Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 162-3. Instead, Bovon notes that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ correlates to Judges 13:7, 16:7, and Psalm 106.

Answers to the five exegetical questions of commentary comparison for Luke 4:38-39.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	v. 38 and v. 39
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Center point in vv. 38b-39a
3. What is prominent in this scene?	The request and Jesus' immediate verbal healing
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Narration and syncrisis
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To again demonstrate Jesus' superior prophetic office compared to Elijah, by focusing on his immediate verbal authority to heal.

All four commentators concur with the results of this project regarding textual boundaries, namely, that vv. 38-39 constitutes a distinct scene. As with the previous scenes, the authors do not take into account discourse features for their support, but instead justify their decision on the basis of chronological-spatial and thematic distinctions.[712]

The scholars identify prominent elements in this scene by associating it scene with Jesus' Nazareth proclamation.[713] Slight variation occurs between the commentaries' views on the scene's overarching purpose. Bovon views this scene as a demonstration of God's goodness and power in the Messiah.[714] Johnson sees the overarching purpose as a demonstration of Jesus' liberation, namely, the healing of sickness.[715] Green's use of narrative analysis leads to a dual overarching purpose for this scene, praise for Jesus' healing ability and praise for the

---

[712] Bovon considers vv. 38-39 a story, which he identifies by the change of setting Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 163-4. Johnson identifies vv. 38-39 as one of a series of vignettes, comprising the whole of vv. 31-44. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 85. Green similarly analyses the whole of vv. 31-44, since the various episodes are similar in chronological-spatial and thematic interests. Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 221.* Parsons, *Luke,* 84.

[713] In Bovon's commentary the theme of Jesus' liberation and Jesus' reference to Elijah leads him to emphasize the shared posture of Jesus and Elijah over the infirmed, καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς. However, Bovon's attention to correspondence here is misguided, for this clause is backgrounded to the main clause, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετ. Since it is not marked, certainty of correspondence with Elijah is lessened. Bovon helpfully considers the importance of Jesus' "verbal action," noting that Jesus' verbal authority is prevalent throughout Luke. Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 164. While such a comparison concurs with what has been identified in the analysis of the scene in this project, Bovon's lack of attention on marked discourse features causes him to overlook the immediacy of Jesus' healing effect as another important point of comparison between Jesus and Elijah, παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα. Green's analysis also identifies some significance in Jesus' posture over the infirmed, but rather than consider a comparison with Elijah, he views' Jesus' posture as consistent with exorcism practices in the ancient world. Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 225*.

[714] "…not only the might of Jesus and the omnipotence of God that stand in the foreground, but also the goodness of the saving Messiah." Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 164.

[715] "…Luke tightly binds the two forms of wonderworking, by using the verbs 'rebuke' both for the unclean spirit and the fever and having both inhabitants 'depart'. The announce program of the Prophet to 'free captives' begins to be carried pit in these 'liberations' of those captive to spiritual and physical sickness." Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 85.

woman who responds to Jesus in gratitude.[716] For Parsons, the healing by Jesus is akin to an exorcism, and so capitalizes on the woman's closing response to Jesus of hospitality.[717]

While these four representative commentaries address the greatness of Jesus' healing in this scene in varying degrees, the use of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism provides increased clarity and precision. The scene is structured around developmental units and contains a number of process types so that the exegete can classify it scene as a narration. Following Theon's handbook, the expectation is that this scene focuses on a global action, and further, that the rhetorical function of this scene is achieved by means of prominent auxiliary elements. Identifying prominence, however, involves the use of discourse analysis since it enables the exegete to locate the global action. On this basis, the global action in this scene occurs as the solitary clause complex and constitutes the symmetrical center of the scene, which is that Jesus' action consists of his verbal rebuke of the fever and the associated element of cause, the request for Jesus to heal the woman. Discourse analysis also enables the exegete to identify that the greatness of Jesus' action is on display, with marked constituent order addressing the immediacy of the healing, $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\mu\alpha$ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\delta\iota\eta\kappa\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\iota$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tauo\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$. Bringing these findings together, the scene's overarching purpose is that Jesus' action of immediately healing the woman demonstrates the greatness of his verbal authority.

The occurrence of another rhetorical exercise in this scene deepens one's understanding of the overarching purpose that Luke seems to have expressed. This scene includes syncrisis comparisons between Jesus and David, Elijah, and Elisha, as previous scenes do. As discussed in Chapter IV §7.5, Jesus' healing of the infirmed is comparable to Elisha's healing of leprous Naaman and the Shunnamite's dead son. In both cases, the immediacy of Jesus displays his superiority. In Elisha's healings, significant and prolonged activities were performed before healings resulted. In comparison, Jesus' healing derives solely by his word, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\pi\upsilon\rho\epsilon\tau$, producing an immediate result, $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\mu\alpha$ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$. The chief point is discovered through the syncrisis exercise, and can be stated with increased precision and clarity, that Jesus' action of verbally rebuking a fever with immediate results demonstrates that his prophetic ministry exceeds even that of Elisha.

---

[716] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 225-6.

[717] Parsons, *Luke,* 86.

As with previous scenes, the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism offers significant exegetical benefits by providing clarity and precision in Lukan exegesis. By attending to marked features of discourse analysis, the exegete is able to objectively locate the global action of this scene and also to identify that the highlighted clause, παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα, signals the prominent element in this scene. Simultaneously, rhetorical criticism provides a framework to incorporate the prominent speed in which Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law and also to involve a comparison between Jesus and Elisha demonstrating that Jesus' is the superior prophet.

6.2.7 Luke 4:40-41 Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.7
Answers to the five exegetical consisiderations of commentary comparison of Luke 4:40-41.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	v. 40 and v.41
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Linear development, frequent imperfective use, and a culminating close
3. What is prominent in this scene?	Jesus' physical touch on all the infirmed and the demon's utterance of Jesus' Messiahship
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Mixed chreia
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate that Jesus' authoritative excising rebuke and the demons' confession are reflexive truths.

This project shares with the majority of commentaries in identifying that vv. 40-41 constitutes a distinct scene, though as in previous scenes, the commentators rely on somewhat subjective assessment of thematic associations to justify these boundaries rather than on the more objective basis of discourse features. Parsons approach is unique in that he considers the whole of vv. 40-44 as one scene, comprised of a summary statement in vv. 40-41, and a closing in vv. 42-44.[718] The four representative commentaries generally refer to the form of this and the surrounding scenes as a vignette of stories, sharing similar themes, settings and characters.[719] Parsons is distinctive, however, in briefly invoking rhetorical criticism, citing this scene as an example of Luke's entire gospel as *bios*, where words and deeds reveal the greatness of a character. Such an observation is explored but nonetheless, this is an instance where Parsons incorporates Theon's narration insights into Lukan exegesis at a deep level.

---

[718] Parsons, *Luke,* 86-87.

[719] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 163-4, Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 85, Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 219-27.*

Where the Lukan scholars are relatively inattentive to the scene's structure and form, this project brings clarity by means of congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism. Using discourse analysis, the scene consists of linear progression and a closing climactic structure. Rhetorical criticism enables the exegete to identify the form of this scene as a chreia, aligning with Theon's discussion of the virtues of a chreia wherein expedience typically occurs at a scene's closing.

Marked discourse features have indicated that prominence pertains both to Jesus' physical touch on the infirmed in v. 40b, τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν, and the demon's utterance in v. 41, τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. As Chapter IV §8.5 has shown, where prominent information in a chreia pertains to both an action and saying, a mixed chreia is present, consistent with Theon's rhetorical handbook. The expedient point of this scene is Jesus' Messianic nature which is displayed by his physical-inclusive healing touch and the demon's confession. Given that this scene is a mixed chreia, both elements are reflexive truths, that is, Jesus' Messianic nature is revealed in his inclusive healings and revealed in the demon's confession.[720] The overarching purpose of this scene in concise form is that Jesus is the Messiah by way of inclusive healings and the confessions of demons.

The four representative commentaries devote equal attention to both v. 40 and 41. Applying the insights of discourse analysis, however, corrects such an approach that views prominence equally throughout all portions of this scene. Better still is an approach that incorporates marked discourse features and ancient rhetorical conventions. In the commentaries' absence of these tools, results vary as to what constitutes the overarching purpose of this scene. Bovon focuses on Jesus' healings in v. 40 and determines that the purpose is to portray "The kindhearted Messiah takes upon himself the task of the Hellenistic doctor." [721] Johnson's emphasis differs, in that he largely addresses the demon's confession, noting that it contains remarkably accurate information about Jesus that reveals the overarching

---

[720] Whereas in 3.21-22 the divine voice confessed Jesus' anointed nature and the Spirit rests upon Jesus, in this scene the demons confess Jesus' anointed nature, and his hand rests upon others.

[721] Bovon does tie the demon's confession of Jesus' messianic nature with the devil's own confession, and observes that: "...they employ their confession as a defensive tactic to awaken the impression that 'We are orthodox and are thus not vulnerable to you, Jesus'." Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 164. Bovon closely ties Luke's account to Mark's Gospel in order to identify themes and arrangement. Consequently, Bovon's employment of Markan priority minimizes any detailed analysis, since here he believes that Luke's Gospel provides general summary statements from Mark.

purpose.[722] Green's approach is also distinct, for while he compares Jesus' touch with the Jewish Scriptures, he ends up finding little correspondence, and concludes that Jesus' touch may reflect God's powerful hand in creation and redemption. Consequently, Green sees the overarching purpose of this scene as a display of God's power actively at work in Jesus.[723] Finally, Parsons sees both the words of the demons and Jesus' activity as revealing he is the Messiah, fulfilling the purpose of *bios* writings. As noted above, Parsons' attention to a particular action in revealing the greatness of an individual is one of the most helpful and relevant observations in keeping with Theon's handbook.[724]

6.2.8 Luke 4:42-44 Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.8
Answers to the five exegetical considerations of the commentary comparisons for Luke 4:42-44.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	v. 42 and v.44
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Linear development a culminating close
3. What is prominent in this scene?	Jesus' inclusive mission to proclaim and verbal enactment in synagogues
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Mixed chreia
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate that Jesus maintains, in speech and action, his anointed mission

While the first three commentators regard textual boundaries by identifying vv. 42-44 as a distinct scene, though again without the support of discourse features, Parsons, as noted in the previous scene, includes this unit with the unit of vv. 40-41. As with the previous scene, the commentaries tend to distribute their attention to several portions of the scene when considering prominence. For example, whereas Bovon's commentary devotes equal attention to v. 42 and v.43, he largely overlooks v. 44, calling that portion a "summary," and he focuses instead strictly on geographical issues.[725] Similarly, Johnson focuses on various elements of the

---

[722] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 84-5.

[723] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 226.* As with the previous scenes, all three commentaries associate the purpose of this scene to Jesus' Nazareth proclamation. Green's approach is representative: "Slowly, Luke is developing his portrayal of Jesus as the regal prophet whose salvific activity fulfills the missionary program drafted in 4:18-19." Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 226.*

[724] Parsons, *Luke,* 86.

[725] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 164. He writes: "…Jesus' geographical sphere of activity is here Judea. By 'Judea' Luke seems to mean not only the southern part but the entire country." Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 165. Regarding v. 42, Bovon identifies the topos rhetorical exercise. Specifically, a topos reflecting the dialogue between Hector and Andromache in *The Iliad*. Using a topos as his guide, Bovon writes: "For this interpretation, the words 'from leaving them' are decisive. 165. It is not clear why Bovon cites a rhetorical topos, and yet fails to identify the form of this scene as a mixed chreia. The unfortunate effect is that his analysis of the topos in v. 42, foregrounds its importance and backgrounds vv. 43-44. On the contrary, this project argues that v. 42 presents circumstantial backgrounded information, and that vv. 43-44 constitutes foregrounded information. Further still, while Bovon

scene, while neglecting that prominence that occurs in v. 44. For Johnson, this portion simply serves as a summary of the report.[726] Green's approach to the overarching purpose of this scene is representative insofar as he views it as demonstrating the divine necessity that accompanies Jesus' mission and kingdom focus.[727] Parsons' accentuates both Jesus' identity, as God's Son and the divine necessity of his mission.[728]

The first three representative commentaries agree that the form of this scene constitutes a unified story, sharing with the neighboring stories a set of common themes, settings, and characters, while Parson simply sees this as a unit, a portion of the entire scene in vv. 40-44.[729] By interpreting this scene as a narration the first three scholars focus on characters and various thematic elements. For example, Green's understanding that this scene constitutes a narration leads him to focus on character analysis, comparing the crowd's lack of understanding in this scene to that of the devil previously.

In contrast, drawing on the principles of the *Progymnasmata*, Chapter IV §9.6 has shown that this scene constitutes a mixed chreia, consistent with the structure and marked features in this scene, and reflecting Theon's discussion in his *Progymnasmata* where a chreia is characterized by brevity and a culminating expedient point. Regarding brevity, discourse analysis reveals that the scene's structure consists of a majority of clause simplexes as well as a paucity of process types, thereby facilitating its concision. Regarding the expedient point, marked discourse features occur at the close of the scene achieving the teachable focus which consists of Jesus' saying Καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί, and followed by his corresponding action, καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας. Because this scene constitutes a mixed chreia, Jesus' speech and action are reflexive truths. Jesus'

---

observes that Jesus' inclusive outreach is on display, he utilizes the circumstantial and backgrounded information in v. 42, to make his point.

[726] "The summary statement generalizes the incidents reported." Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 84-85.

[727] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 227.* A one sentence footnote addresses the whole of v. 44. Helpfully, Green canvasses previous scenes, tying together the good news and the kingdom of God. However, because he clusters the scenes within 4:14-44 as exhibiting a distinctive internal coherence, Green fails to incorporate how the present scene provides an inclusio to Jesus' anointed baptism. Green identifies 4:42-44 as an inclusio to 4:14-15. As a result, he discusses the relationship between 4:42-44 and other scenes within 4:14-42. 203, 227.

[728] Parsons, *Luke,* 87.

[729] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 165, Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 85, Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 219-27,* Mikeal C. Parsons, *Luke, 84-87*

commitment to inclusively evangelize parallels his broad outreach throughout the Judean synagogues. Thus, in this project it emerges that Luke's overarching purpose for this scene is to demonstrate Jesus' inclusive gospel outreach, revealed in both his words and actions.

Because this scene closes out the Lukan sequence from 3.21-4.44, rhetorical criticism also assists the exegete in surveying the Lukan landscape through the lens of the encomion exercise, which begins by addressing bodily and external goods and then relates good of the mind and action.[730] The last scene in 3.21-4.44 concludes with relevant information pertaining to Jesus' bodily and external goods. This mixed chreia scene addresses Jesus' training, or faithfulness to the inclusive gospel mission. Accordingly, for the next Lukan sequence of 5.1-39, the text-external expectation, as expressed in terms of Halliday's concepts, is that subsequent scenes will address Jesus' goods of mind and specific actions performed on his own initiative. The expectation is that Jesus will act in accord with or exceed expectations provided in 3.21-4:44.[731] Whereas the first sequence presented Jesus as largely passive, responding to others' initiatives and attributions, the second sequence will address Jesus as initiating actions, intending to show the extent to which Jesus acts consistent with, or exceeds, the information provided in the previous sequence.[732]

The scholars' disuse of discourse features and ancient rhetorical conventions has ironically been an intuitive utilization of the principle choice implies meaning as discussed in Chapter II §2.2. The interpreter's subjective choice to focus on certain elements, apart from objective controls, confers special meaning on those elements that each commentary chooses as appropriate. Unsubstantiated choices in textual prominence reflect interpretive subjectivism. The congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism provides a valuable corrective,

---

[730] Jesus' inclusive proclamation of the gospel in this scene provides a bridge between the first and second sequence. In the first sequence, Jesus was introduced as the son of divine pleasure, and near its close, Jesus again receives appellation that he is the son of God. After the divine pronouncement at Jesus' baptismal coronation, Jesus proceeds into the wilderness. In the present scene, a similar pattern occurs at the close of the sequence. Where appellation of Jesus' sonship includes demonic challenges and the wilderness. In the present scene, however, Jesus is alone in the wilderness. The seeking crowds could implicitly represent continued demonic opposition to Jesus, but because in the previous scene the demon concedes Jesus' sonship, the subsequent scene is both distinctive and progressive. There is a pattern, however, in that following both wilderness experience, 4:1-14a and 4:42-44, Jesus in tends to spread his mission (4:14b-29, 5:1-11), which is followed by issues of uncleanness (4:30-37, 5:12-16), remarkable healing and exorcisms (4:38-41, 5:12-26) and then returns once again to Jesus' mission (5:27-39).

[731] Theon notes that the issue is whether an individual "'…used the advantage prudently and as he ought." Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 51.

[732] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 51. Theon advises, "Actions are praised on the basis of the occasion and whether someone did them alone or was the first or when no one else acted…"

providing objective linguistic criteria and an ancient and relevant rhetorical framework that congruently serve to signal and guide Lukan exegesis.

6.2.9 Luke 5:1-11 Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.9
Answers to five exegetical issues from the commentary comparisons found in Luke 5:11.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	5.1 and v. 11
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Developmental units and central point
3. What is prominent in this scene?	Catch of fish and nets breaking, Peter's falling at Jesus' feet, Fear at catch of fish, Jesus' reported speech to Peter
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Mixed chreia
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate that Jesus maintains, in speech and action, his anointed mission

The commentators agree with the findings presented in Chapter V §1.1 for textual boundaries that Luke 5:1-11 constitutes a distinct scene. Bovon's analysis seems to incorporate some elements of discourse analysis with his discussion of Ἐγένετο δὲ… in v.1. Nonetheless, he views this discourse feature as merely signaling a new paragraph, not a new sequence, which this project has done.[733] Bovon's analysis of higher level boundaries runs distinctly counter to the principles advocated in this project: "Luke divides the life of Jesus into three literary units. Jesus is active chiefly in Galilee (4:14-9:50)…Until 4:13, we are still in the preparatory stages." [734] In support, Bovon relies on thematic inferences, that is, symmetrical alternations between stories about John the Baptist and Jesus. Likewise, Green is guided by thematic considerations in his higher-level boundaries, clustering 5:1-6:11 together and noting that these scenes involve Jesus' ministry as "concrete interactions with Jewish people..." [735] Parsons identifies a thematic unity comprising seven scenes, beginning in 5:1-11 with Jesus' catch of fish and closing in 6:16 with Jesus' calling of the twelve. Unfortunately, no support is offered as to why these seven constitute an inner-related sequence.[736]

The scholars provide no comment on the scene's structure, except Green, and Parsons who slightly modifies Green's work. In their view, this scene is reminiscent of commissioning

---

[733] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 167. He writes: "these expressions usually appear at the beginning as a sort of signal for a new paragraph."

[734] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 2.

[735] Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 227.* Johnson utilizes general themes to identify relationships among various stories, though his approach is driven largely by source-critical concerns. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 94-95.

[736] Parsons, *Luke,* 87.

scenes in the Jewish Scriptures. Accordingly, there are four units in 5:1-11, which Parsons organizes as: i. introduction in vv. 1-3, ii. encounter in vv. 4-7, iii. reaction, or protest in vv. 8-9, and iv. commission in vv. 10-11.[737] Instead, this project has identified three issues related to the scene's structure, which in turn relate to the form of the scene. First, the abundance of process types with an abundance of relational processes which represents two or more entities in some type of relationship. Second, the frequency of δέ indicates a series of developmental units in the scene, with each associated with some manner of fishing activity as the narration moves on. Third, the central point of the scene occurs with the catch of fish in vv. 6-7. According to the rubrics of Theon's handbook, the form of this scene reflects the narration rhetorical exercise. As a narration, the scene thereby revolves around a global and central action, accompanied by marked narration elements, whether person, time, place, manner, and cause, which together achieve the overarching purpose for the scene. The global action of the scene is Jesus' great catch of fish, confirmed by the several marked discourse features that surround that action. Jesus' action of catching fish incorporates a host of other fishing activities, his drawing crowds, fish, and climactically, Peter and his companions, because each developmental unit involves Jesus in some fishing activity. In response to the great catch of fish, the catch of Peter and his companions involves the majority of marked discourse features, their responses to the great catch of fish. Jesus is thereby shown to be the great fisherman, the Lord who also lays claim to sinners, Ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε .

Chapter V §1.5 identified a syncrisis in this scene. Throughout the first sequence, Jesus has been compared to notable predecessors, including David and Elijah and Elisha. These comparisons show that Jesus' fishing activities corresponds to Elisha, particularly in providing for the needy.[738] As a syncrisis, Luke's intent can be interpreted as being to display one participant's actions as superior to another, in which case Jesus' action is again superior. Whereas Elisha is capable of providing food for the needy, Jesus is capable not only of catching fish, but also a host of sinful participants, who will in turn draw others. The overarching purpose of this scene is clearly stated as Jesus' action of catching fish and sinful men demonstrates that his provisions exceed that of Elisha. As in Chapter V §1.5, there is an important thematic relationship between this scene and the three subsequent scenes in vv. 12-

---

[737] Parsons, *Luke,* 87; Green, *The Gospel of Luke, 233.*

[738] Elisha's actions include resurrecting the dead in 2 Kings 4:18-37 (compare to Luke 4:31-41), feeding the needy in 2 Kings 4:38-44 (Luke 5:1-11) and healing a leper in 2 Kings 5:1-14 (Luke 5:12-16).

39, a thematic relationship supported by the use of Ἐγένετο δὲ in v. 1…. The information provided in this scene both introduces a new sequence and functions to frame the sequence around a sustained presentation of Jesus' relationship with the sinful and unclean. Whereas the first Lukan sequence in 3.21-4.44 revolved around Jesus' coronate and prophetic sonship, the second sequence orients to Jesus' associations with the sinful and unclean, an unclean leper, a paralytic needing forgiveness, and finally, a tax collector and his sinful entourage. The present sequence thereby principally compares Jesus to priestly predecessors.[739]

Bovon, Johnson, Green, and Parsons identify the form of this scene by various names; a pericope, story, episode, and narration respectively.[740] Parsons, however, is unique in not only identifying this scene as a narration, but also that it contains a chreia in v. 10, and additionally the scene constitutes as an elaborated chreia.[741] Parsons' rhetorical approach is salutary, particularly the attentiveness to various rhetorical exercises within Theon's handbook. That said, Parsons does not distinguish a narration and an elaborate chreia, and consequently, he overlooks the global action of this scene as it pertains to Jesus, and instead accentuates those who follow Jesus.[742]

---

[739] If this scene continues to address Jesus' prophetic ministry, then it appears to present a theme both ominous and complex, weaving in possible allusions to Isaiah 6, and the summons to response amidst rebellion within the people of Israel. This observation would provide some metaphorical tendencies to Jesus' going out from the shore and into the deep of the abyss, particularly speeches:

ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπαναγαγεῖν ὀλίγον, and, Ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν. Scholars have identified allusions to Isaiah Ch. 6 in Luke 5:8. If Isaiah's ministry is also nascent in Luke's Gospel, then there is the portend of rejection and judgment for those within Israel who do not respond favorably to Jesus' proclamation, which may explain why "fishing for men" is potentially ambiguous, yet also characteristically negative among the Old Testament prophets, as in Ezek. 29:4-5, Habakkuk 1:14-17, and Amos 4:2. Such a theme is consonant with John the Baptist's stated ministry of Jesus in 3:15-17, attended by both the Holy Spirit and fire, chaff and grain, salvation and judgment. With this approach, Jesus' action of catching fish scene demonstrates that not only is he the great fishermen, one whose activity aligns with Elisha of old, but also that his ministry results in confrontation and response, repentance toward blessing or rejection toward judgment. Jesus' Nazareth proclamation underscores such themes.

[740] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 167-8, Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 89-95, Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 227-30. Bovon, however, identifies the variety of metaphors present in this scene, and calling it a 'midrash' of previous Markan material 167, 169-172. Parsons, *Luke,* 87-89.

[741] Parsons, *Luke,* 89.

[742] Parsons, *Luke,* 89. Parsons blurs the lines between the chreia and a narration without justification from the rhetorical handbooks or an explanation of the exegetical consequences. This project contends that the narration and chreia are two different rhetorical exercises in form, structure, and focus. As has been shown, whereas the chreia exercise focuses on the closing information of a scene, Lukan narrations focus on a global action that tends to occur near the middle of the scene. Parsons does, however, seek to incorporate the significance of Jesus in this scene, writing: "The use of the commissioning form casts Jesus in the role of divine agent and Peter as divinely appointed prophet." 89. It is also noteworthy to see that while Parsons acknowledges that this scene constitutes a

Consistent with their previous approaches to lengthier narrations, the first three commentaries search for metaphors in order to identify what elements are prominent in this scene. Bovon asserts, "Modern exegetes take various aspects of the text as central…For me, the metaphor of the catch of fish and the responsibility of proclamation are central...Jesus if the first fisher of people; his catch is immense."[743] The metaphorical form of this scene thus leads him to assign prominence and purpose to elements he deems significant. Bovon identifies the two assisting boats as representative of the twofold nature of the church, comprised of both Jews and Gentiles.[744] Ultimately, Bovon views the overarching purpose of this scene as a display of Jesus' ability to catch both fish and people.[745]

In contrast, Johnson's approach leads him to focus on both Jesus and Peter. For Johnson, the purpose of this scene is that it "reveals something of Jesus' prophetic power, as well as of Peter's faith and future role."[746] From the standpoint of discourse analysis and the findings of this project, Johnson's emphasis on Peter's exemplary role lacks critical linguistic support.[747] Similar to Johnson, Green's approach focuses on Peter though with emphasis on the notion of discipleship, that is, appropriate responses to Jesus.[748] Like Johnson's, Green's

---

story, and rightly invokes the virtue of plausibility, his identification of this virtue is chiefly deposited in the element of causality that occurs in 4:16-30. 88.

[743] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 171.

[744] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 171-172. Theon's definition of a narration includes non-fiction and fiction. A narration differs from a fable in their respective virtues. A fable's virtues include i. useful instruction, ii. clarity (simple style), and iii. plausibility (with plausibility as the seamless correspondence between an image and truth), while a narration's' virtues include i. credibility (presence of narration elements), ii. clarity and iii. conciseness (providing a chief point). In Luke 5:1-11, the expansive use of narration elements and vivid description entails that it cannot be a fable because a fable demands a simple style in order to achieve its useful instruction. This project identifies vv. 1-11 as narration exercise and that throughout the three units of the scene, Jesus is involved in attracting or drawing entities to himself, whether it be crowds, fish and people. Considering Jesus a "great fisherman," while partly metaphorical, is grounded in connotations consistent with the scene's intent. For instance, one may use other words to describe the chief point, and instead of 'fisherman', one might call Jesus the "great drawer" or the "Lord of fish and men." Jesus' words to Peter supports the notion that he is the great fishermen, especially in the play on words, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν.

[745] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 167.

[746] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 89. For Johnson, this scene reveals "Peter's narrative significance," even as Peter provides a representative role as Luke's Gospel unfold. Johnson continues, "Most of all, Peter is portrayed as a man of faith… he places his trust in the word of the prophet." Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 90-91.

[747] Jesus' exclusive praiseworthiness is supported by the conjunctive δέ. Jesus is the only represented participant in all three developmental units, indicating that he is the VIP and singularly praiseworthy throughout.

[748] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 230. Green does not entirely neglect the portrait of Jesus in this scene, though it is largely backgrounded. Foregrounding Peter's portrait serves to reveal that Jesus interacts with sinners,

understanding of Luke's intent is that Peter demonstrates an exemplar, one who is willing to follow Jesus' instructions, who experiences a theophanic vision, and requisite virtues of trust and humility.[749] In effect, Green's circumscribing of vv. 1-3 as preliminary and backgrounded material, leads him to minimize the role that Jesus plays in the scene.[750] Similarly, because Parsons identifies this scene as both an elaborated chreia and a commissioning story, emphasis is principally given to Jesus' call as it relates to others. To this end, Parsons writes: "…the emphasis in this structure is clearly on Jesus' commission to Simon and the others to be fishers of people… as well as the authorial audience, who in the process of hearing the story are also challenged to take up this mission."[751]

6.2.10 Luke 5:12-16 Commentary Comparisons

Table 6.2.10

Five exegetical considerations from commentary comparisons of Luke 5:12-16.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	v. 12 and v. 16
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Developmental units and central point
3. What is prominent in this scene?	Immediacy of leprous healing, physical touch, leper falling, Jesus' charge
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Narration and syncrisis
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	To demonstrate that Jesus maintains, in speech and action, his anointed mission

Regarding textual boundaries, Chapter V §2.1 demonstrated textual boundaries in vv. 12-16 which constitutes a new scene by virtue of the discourse feature ἐγένετο in v. 12 and in v.17 that introduces a new unit. As associated with the first scene in this sequence, this scene also addresses Jesus' relation with sinners and the unclean. Concerning the representative commentaries, all four identify vv. 12-16 as a distinct scene. Bovon helpfully notes that the use of Καὶ ἐγένετο in v.12 signals a new unit, an observation that is overlooked in Johnson and

---

and that he is a prophet. 231. Nevertheless, Green forthrightly states that in v. 4 "…the narrative focus narrows to Peter, where it will remain until v. 11." 232.

[749] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 230-235.

[750] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 231. Green admits that focusing on the disciples is awkwardly placed, "Although this section begins with the call of the first disciples, disciples are either conspicuously absent (5;12-26, 6:6-11) or appear as little more than cardboard figures, undeveloped characters (5:30-6:5). This is startling because Jesus explicitly calls these fishermen for the purpose of active ministry…." Green's response provided to note that the book of Acts will address their catch of men, that they are still learners, and that they still model in this scene a proper response to Jesus. 228. This project offers a simpler and more sound solution in identifying factors that point to Luke's intention of spotlighting Jesus, not the disciples.

[751] Parsons, *Luke,* 89.

Green who rely principally upon thematic considerations and source and narrative-critical tools as a basis for determining a scene's boundaries.[752]

The commentators generally refer to the form of a scene as a story.[753] Bovon identifies several equally textual prominent intentions: i. Jesus displays a willing love, ii. he risks direct contact with lepers, iii. Jesus is a law-abiding Jew, and finally, iv. he provides holistic community integration.[754] Without recourse to linguistic criteria and a unifying rhetorical framework, Bovon's selection of prominence remains subjective. Johnson's use of source criticism leads him to state that this scene "heightens the impression of a Hellenistic thaumaturge."[755] Simultaneously, he claims that the scene also upholds its Jewish environment, so that Jesus is shown here to be a prophet who cares for the outcasts while also maintaining Jewish Law. Regarding Jesus' injunction to go to the priest, Johnson writes "…his motivation for sending the healed man to the priest is obscure…"[756] Ultimately, Johnson identifies prominent information with the close of the scene and Jesus' departure into the desert.[757] Green's analysis largely turns on portraying Jesus as a prophet, specifically seeing a close relationship between Jesus and Elisha's healing of leprous Namaan, and the importance of Leviticus 13-14 for this scene.[758]

Bovon identifies the purpose of the scene as "…the earliest community understood the healings, particularly those of lepers, as the work of the Messiah, and a legitimizing sign of him."[759] Green maintains that the overarching purpose is to demonstrate Jesus' boundary-

---

[752] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 173. Parsons also identifies 'And it happened' as a typical Lukan opening to a new scene. *Luke,* 90.

[753] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 174, Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 95, Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 235-238. Both Bovon and Johnson refer to the scene as a 'story,' though Green prefers to use the more ambiguous term, "pericope."

[754] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 176-177.

[755] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 95.

[756] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 95.

[757] Johnson writes, "…that he withdrew into desert places is not inconsistent with the image of the sage (*Life of Apollonius*, 1:16)." Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 95.

[758] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 236-237. Unfortunately, even though Green invokes a parallel Jewish account, the function of the syncrisis fails to register, that is, no attempt is made to address the manner by which Jesus' healing is superior to Elisha's.

[759] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 174.

breaking ministry as well as his faithfulness to Mosaic Law.[760] As with the previous scene, Parsons focuses in the present scene on the closing information that follows the miracle.

However, Parsons here invokes a linguistic feature, the adversative conjunctive, ἀλλά in v.14, leading to a discussion of the contrastive nature of the leper's response in comparison to the Markan account.[761]

On the basis of this scene's structure, developmental progression and a central point, this project has also identified this scene as a narration. However, when the approach is taken to interpret this scene according to ancient narration conventions instead of modern ones, the global action of this scene is pivotal and assisted by marked narration elements. As a narration, the global action of Jesus is the prominent means of praising Jesus, supplemented by additionally marked narration elements. The marked discourse features in this project centered on v. 13, and the global action consists in Jesus' touch of the leper. That touch leads to marked information regarding the immediate healing, εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Once healed, Jesus' charge regarding visiting the priest constitutes prominent information.

Jesus' healing touch includes the syncrisis exercise, comparing Jesus' action with the priestly ministry toward lepers, because Jesus' global action of touching the leper is also associated with two marked clauses related to an instant cure and a priestly injunction. As a comparison of leprous activities, Leviticus 13-14 provided the means for assessing the superiority of Jesus' action. Lukan marked elements of Jesus' physical touch and the instant healing of the leper function to show that Jesus' response to lepers far exceeds the activities of Levitical priests. Summarizing the findings of Chapter V §2.5, the overarching purpose of this scene is that Jesus' action of willingly healing a leper with his touch and words, and with immediate results, demonstrates that he is far greater than the Levitical priests.

This project closely follows marked discourse features in order to ascertain textual boundaries, a scene's structure, and elements of prominence. With these discourse features in place, rhetorical criticism, aided by Theon's handbook, enables the exegete to identify the conventional form of this scene, and by incorporating the marked elements, the congruence of both methods results in a clear and precise understanding of the scene's overarching purpose.

---

[760] "Jesus is presented as one who is both able and willing to cross conventional boundaries in order to bring good news. On the other hand, his practices are in harmony with Moses for he sends the man to the priest for the legislated inspection and offering." Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 238-239.

[761] Parsons, *Luke,* 90.

Consequently, interpretive rewards rely upon the insights provided by both methods, where discourse analysis enables the exegete to determine boundaries and prominence, and rhetorical criticism enables the exegete to locate Lukan scenes within their conventional frameworks and associated text-external expectations.

6.2.11 Luke 5:17-26 and the Convergence of Method

Table 6.2.11

Answers to the five exegetical issues on the convergence of method in Luke 5:17-26.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	v.17 and v. 26
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Developmental units and central point
3. What is prominent in this scene?	The forgiveness extended and elements surrounding the immediate healing.
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Narration
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	Jesus' ability to forgive sins is confirmed by his instantaneous healing of the paralytic

Chapter V §3.1 demonstrated that the textual boundaries found in vv. 17-26 constitute a new scene on the basis of ἐγένετο in v. 17 that functions as a transition marker, and temporal markers in v. 17, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν and in v. 27, Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα… This scene is situated within the higher-level boundary of the sequence of vv. 1-39. As noted in the previous scenes, this sequence specifically addresses Jesus' associations with the sinful and unclean and his priestly ministry. All four of the representative commentaries identify the textual boundaries vv. 17-26 as a distinct unit. However, the commentators do not take into account discourse features in support of textual boundaries and by the same token, they overlook both the sequence and the significance of this scene in addressing Jesus' outreach to sinners and the unclean.[762]

This project has identified that the form of this scene corresponds to a narration rhetorical exercise. This scene is oriented to Jesus' global action and marked narration elements that elaborate the means for praising Jesus. The three commentators concur, calling this scene a narrative or story.[763] The importance of utilizing structural analysis to support the form of a given scene sets this project apart. In this scene, the narration form is confirmed by several

---

[762] Bovon appears to use source criticism for identifying this scene's boundaries, *Hermeneia,* 178-179. Similarly, Johnson employs source criticism, *The Gospel of Luke*, 93-96. Green instead employs narrative criticism, particularly regarding characterization distinctions, *The Gospel of Luke,* 239. Parsons however, does identify the Lukan 'And it happened' as introducing this scene, but without addressing Greek linguistic factors in support of this assertion. Parsons, *Luke*, 90.

[763] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 180, Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 95, Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 239.

indicators: the manifold use of process types and clause complexes, developmental units of δέ, and a central point concerning the global action.

This project has utilized the discourse analysis element of prominence to identify marked elements in the scene. The Pharisees complain over Jesus' claim of forgiving the paralytic central to the scene, being the concentric center of the scene. In addition, the scene's distinctive clause complexes, represented in Jesus' response to the Pharisees, provides additionally prominent information, one that is also associated with Jesus' forgiveness of the paralytic. The representative commentaries vary in the issue of prominence. Bovon devotes equal attention on the healing of the paralytic and the opposition provoked by Jesus' pronouncement. Bovon draws a sharp contrast between the paralytic who is forgiven and filled with praise and the Pharisees.[764] Johnson places prominence on elements that relate to Jesus as the prophet of Israel, and specifically, Jesus' ability to read the thoughts of his opponents.[765] Green assigns equal prominence to both Jesus' healing of the paralytic and the forgiveness he extends.[766] Parson's accentuates three aspects of this scene; i. paralytic friends as "persistent and resourceful", ii. the relationship of suffering and sin, and iii. Jesus' healing and forgiving authority.[767] In the case of all four commentaries, taking account of discourse features would serve as a check to confirm or correct their preconceptions regarding prominent elements within this scene.

This project has identified the scene's overarching purpose from the global action that consists of Jesus' verbal authority, εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ, resulting in the paralytics' healing. At the same time, the central verb of this scene addresses Jesus' ability to forgive sins. Incorporating Theon's discussion of narration elements shows that both marked features operate in conjunction, displaying the global action and the cause of that action. Jesus' desire to display his ability to forgive sins is what causes him to take action in healing the paralytic.

---

[764] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 180-181.

[765] To this end he writes, "…that Jesus can read the thoughts of his opponents takes on added significance in Luke's Gospel, where such an ability is axiomatic for one who is a true prophet." Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 95. In fact, the majority of Johnson's comments serve to uphold the notion of Jesus' prophetic ability, surveying previous Lukan texts in support, such as Simeon's prophecy and Jesus' Nazareth proclamation.

[766] Green writes: "Jesus' question (v. 23), then, does not call his listeners to rank the relative difficulty of forgiving sins or of causing a paralytic to walk; rather, his query serves to draw an equation…we are to understand that the need, paralysis, is addressed through the announcement of forgiveness." Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 242.

[767] Parsons, *Luke*, 90-92.

Jesus healing of the paralytic validates his dual authority, over both sin and paralysis.[768]

Concerning the commentaries and the scene's purpose, the authors tend to uphold both the healing and forgiveness, though with differing weights. While Bovon addresses Jesus's dual activity of healing and forgiving, he ultimately settles on Jesus forgiveness as the overarching purpose.[769] Johnson sees two equal purposes, to demonstrate that Jesus is the prophet-Messiah in whom God works to heal and forgive, and one who causes divisions among the people.[770] Green sees two overarching purposes, that Jesus can meet both the need to paralysis and sin, thereby confirming that he brings the release and restoration that he earlier proclaimed in Nazareth.[771] Parsons follows Green in emphasizing both Jesus' authority to heal and to forgive sins. At the same time, Parsons lessens the focus on Jesus by attributing the causality of healing to the paralytic's friends, thereby minimizing the focus on Jesus' global action. Parsons writes: "Jesus, God's Messiah, has the power to heal illnesses and the authority to forgive sins-all because of four friends who, rather than sitting around trying to guess what sin had been committed…had the faith and persistence to bring the paralyzed man…"[772]

Drawing on the principles of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism allow a greater degree of precision and clarity in the findings of the commentators, demonstrated in the manner in which the scholars seek to address Jesus' dual actions of healing and forgiveness. Their findings of prominent discourse elements rely on subjective impressions and there is confusion over the relationship between Jesus' forgiveness and healing. In contrast, addressing a variety

---

[768] The virtue of praiseworthiness is particularly appropriate in this scene given that the majority of behavioral processes involve doxology, as indicated in Table 6.1.12.

[769] "Verses 23-24 are not saying that forgiveness is easier than the miracle. On the contrary, forgiveness is weightier than the miracle, which is only illustrating the deeper reality…forgiveness is not tangible. The drive toward legitimizing signs is so important for the young Christian movement, explains, in part, the role and significance of miracle stories in Synoptic tradition." Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 180-181. In concluding the scene, Bovon focuses particularly on the notion of forgiveness, since it offers a restorative life, over against discussions of suffering which are natural components within an unjust system. 184.

[770] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 95-96.

[771] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 239. Green works back and forth bringing both actions into focus, for example, "…the issue of Jesus' competence moves to the center, with the healing of the paralytic temporarily out of focus." 241-242. "From Jesus' point of view, healing paralysis and forgiving sins have the same therapeutic end in this case." Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 239. It also appears plot analysis supports the notion that Jesus' dual activities are congruent, at least in some manner. "Jesus' power to heal and authority to forgive sins are manifest in the paralytic's return to his home." 239.

[772] Parsons, *Luke,* 92.It is unfortunate that even though Parsons' commentary is the most thoroughgoing in providing a rhetorical lens for Lukan scenes, here again he does not utilize Theon's narration discussion for exegetical praxis, failing to incorporate a narration's virtues as it relates to Jesus' global action.

of marked discourse features and aligning them with an appropriate text-external convention results in increased exegetical clarity and precision.

6.2.12 Luke 5:27-39 and the Convergence of Method

Table 6.2.12
Answers to the five exegetical questions of the convergence of method for Luke 5:27-39.

1. Where do textual boundaries occur?	v.27 and v. 39
2. What is the structure of this scene?	Three rounds of culminating speeches
3. What is prominent in this scene?	Circumstance of dining with sinners, two culminating speeches.
4. Why does the scene take this form?	Elaborated chreia, saying chreia, fable
5. Overarching purpose for this scene?	Jesus' feasting with sinners displays that he is doctor, arrived bridegroom, and new clothe

Regarding textual boundaries, Chapter V §4.4 demonstrated that vv. 27-39 constitutes a new scene on the basis of the pre-verbal constituent in v. 27, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν, which as a temporal marker indicates a point of departure for this scene, and the use of ἐγένετο δέ in 6:1, indicates a new scene. As the final scene in the sequence, it also addresses Jesus' associations with the sinful and unclean. In this light, the present scene presents Jesus' feasting with Levi and disreputes and relates such matters to issues of purity. The scene is distinct among all the scenes analyzed in this project in that it is comprised of three rhetorical exercises, an elaborated chreia in vv. 27-32, a responsive chreia in vv. 33-35, and a fable in vv. 36-39. These exercises were identified by means of structural analysis, corresponding to Theon's rhetorical handbook and include the frequent use of clause simplexes, and prominent information associated with Jesus' words.

All four scholars identify vv. 27-39 as constituting a bounded unit, though Parsons' analysis is somewhat ambiguous, for while he initially treats vv. 27-39 as one scene, he later treats vv. 27-28 separately as a "call account".[773] The basis for identifying these textual boundaries depends on the relevance of ancient meal conventions. Bovon, Johnson and Green associated vv. 27-39 as one unit because they view it as a Roman symposium, which consists of three rounds of speeches during a banquet.[774] Despite agreement on the general symposium form and textual relationships, differences do arise among the commentators regarding how

---

[773] Parsons, *Luke,* 87, 92-93.

[774] In the second course eating and discussing occurred. Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 186. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 97. Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 244-245. Green also writes: "Given the connectives Luke employs in vv. 33, 36…we should treat vv. 27-39 as a single scene…" 245. Unfortunately, Green does not identify what connectives he has in mind.

various informational units relate within the scene. Such disagreement arises because the scholars do not appeal to firm, clearly defined principles but rather to general notions and thematic associations. For example, Bovon identifies two units occurring in this scene, a commissioning unit in vv. 27-28, and a dinner discussion in vv. 29-39, with three parables at the close in vv. 36-39.[775] Johnson structures the scene differently, with: i. the call of Levi in vv. 27-28, ii. the banquet as the occasion for the objection in vv. 29-32, iii. the fasting conversation in vv. 33-35, and iv. three parabolic statements in vv. 36-39 "providing an interpretation of the entire sequence."[776] Green's approach differs slightly from Johnsons with this structure: i. a setting in vv. 27-29, ii. table talk on companions in vv. 30-32, iii. table talk on fasting in vv. 33-35, and iv. parable reflections in vv. 36-39. [777] Finally, while Parsons treats this scene as a "call account", he follows this structure: i. vv. 27-28, ii. an elaborated chreia in vv. 29-32, and iii. a parabolic discourse in vv. 33-39.[778]

On the analysis set out in Chapter V, and prominence in the first elaborated chreia in vv. 27-32, prominent information occurs in v. 29, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ

ἄλλων [οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν]/ κατακείμενοι. This portion is prominent because it contains the sole elaborating clause complex and constitutes the central verbal element in the scene. Jesus' table gathering with tax collectors provides the orienting circumstance for the chreiai and fables that follow. Nevertheless, while v. 27 provides important circumstantial information, consistent with chreia form, the reported speech in v. 31-32 is also marked, revealing the expedient point that Jesus is the doctor for the sick who calls sinners to repentance.

In the subsequent saying chreia in vv. 33-35, prominence occurs with Jesus' culminating speech, specifically, Jesus' response to why he feasts while others fast. As a saying chreia, the expedient point or the overarching purpose demonstrates that Jesus' activity of feasting with sinners is entirely appropriate in light of the season, since he, the bridegroom, has come to his feast. Last, the parable of vv. 36-39 continues the association of Jesus' feasting activity with sinners and facilitated by the fable's virtue of imaged-corresponding truth, the analogies of a doctor and bridegroom correlate to Jesus' mission of feasting with sinners. Jesus'

---

[775] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 186-187.

[776] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 99.

[777] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 245.

[778] Parsons, *Luke,* 92-96. Parsons does not assign vv. 27-28 to any particular form.

association with tax collectors represents new wine and new clothes; with his arrival as doctor and bridegroom the older patterns of associating with sinners, avoidance and fasting, are inappropriate. Further still, for those who try to assimilate old and the new approaches to purity, the result is irreparable damage.[779]

The commentators' view of prominence is typically tied to thematic associations. Bovon maintains that prominence in vv. 29-32 is assigned to the comprehensive message, that God bestows grace on sinners. Bovon identifies the purpose of vv. 33-35 is to reveal that "For Jesus, the time of his presence is a wedding day…. Finally, vv. 36-39 explain how one should receive God's grace, namely, with wisdom and faith.[780] Ultimately, Bovon fails to integrate these three units into an overarching thematic message. For example, his lack of focus on the scene's opening and orienting circumstance in vv. 27-29, where Jesus' banquets with sinners, leads to his uncertainty over the precise meaning of the closing fables in vv. 36-39.[781] On the contrary, this project contends that by means of discourse features the entire scene contains an integral, though developing thematic relationship, shared between the three rhetorical exercises. In this light, the first elaborating chreia in vv. 27-32 provide the circumstance to which the other two subsequent exercises orient to it. In contrast to Bovon's approach to the fables meaning, the textual boundaries indicate that Jesus' closing fables thematically relate to the feasting circumstance. In this manner, the meaning of the fable is clear: Jesus' feasting with sinners is the new cloth. Damage results when integrating old practices with the newness that Jesus brings.

Johnson asserts that the scene's overarching purpose is to answer objections regarding Jesus' table companions, shown by contrasting Jesus' program to then-current approaches to piety and ascetics.[782] Unlike Bovon, Johnson ties the units together more integrally with each

---

[779] Purity damage is explicated in Luke Ch. 6 as it relates to Jesus and Sabbath observance.

[780] Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 191. "The fundamental meaning of the parable is that individuals should receive the gift of God with wisdom sufficient for it. In the context of fasting, Pharisaic practice no longer has the correct attitude of faith." Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 194. Regarding another purpose, Bovon addresses vv. 27-28: "…Luke has narrated two commissionings in 5:1-11 and 5:27-28, separated by a miracle story, which perhaps anticipate the two faces of the church: the Jewish Christian community and the Gentile Christian community, which consists of sinners." Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 190.

[781] "The image is not very clear, because the practice of fasting required by the Pharisees seems to be the old piece that should not be patched onto the new Christian garment." Bovon, *Hermeneia,* 193. Seamlessly integrating the fables in vv. 36-39 with the feasting and expedient point in vv. 27-32 would largely resolve what is opaque for Bovon.

[782] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 99.

unit building upon the other.[783] Like Johnson, Green unifies the whole of the scene around table fellowship and Jesus action of associating with sinners in vv. 27-29.[784] However, while Johnson and Green grasp the unifying nexus of the scene, Jesus' feasting with sinners, their findings remain only intuitively correct, unsubstantiated and without the objective support that discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism offers. Parsons three-fold structure in this scene entails a distinct purpose for each unit: vv. 27-28 address "the radical nature of Jesus' call to discipleship", vv. 29-32 reveal Jesus' defense for associating with sinners and the "degree to which those, like Simon, James, John, and now Levi, have left everything to take up the mission of Jesus to proclaim 'release'", and finally, vv. 33-39 provide, "a series of analogies intended to surprise the audience" regarding Jesus' views as the ancient way and the Pharisees representing the novel way.[785]

6.2.13 Comparative Commentary Evaluation

The comparative analyses of the commentaries demonstrate that practical exegesis of Luke 3:21-5:39 benefits from utilizing both discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism in combination. In the case of discourse analysis, the exegete is greatly aided by an empirically based, and concrete linguistic approach which identifies marked discourse features that serve as prominent information within a given scene. Thus, rather than succumb to thematically based generalizations or rendering every element of a scene as equally prominent, as frequently practiced by the commentaries above, discourse analysis provides clear means for ascertaining those elements in a scene that are textually marked as prominent. The importance of identifying prominence is aptly reflected in Robert Longacre's dictum:

> The very idea of discourse as a structured entity demands that some parts of discourse be more prominent than others. Otherwise, expression would be impossible. Discourse

---

[783] "Answering the first attack, Jesus uses the standard medical imagery…He is the physicians who calls where the sick are…Answering the second attack, Jesus applies to himself the biblical image of the bridegroom," Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 99. Specifically, one cannot fit this Gospel to the outcasts with its accessibility for all humans, within the perceptions and precepts of a separatist piety."

[784] Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 245. However, the nexus is impaired slightly by his comment, "Both questions- the one concerning the appropriateness of eating with tax collectors and sinners and the other concerning fasting- are broadly concerned with the maintenance of clear boundaries between groups." 245. He rightly observes that vv. 27-29 serve to "…establish the setting and provide the topical impetus for the table talk to follow." Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* 246. For Green, the 'great feast' is most prominent in this scene, providing the orienting frame for Jesus' comments in vv. 30-32.

[785] Parsons, *Luke,* 93-95. The middle unit Parsons briefly identifies, somewhat confusingly, as both a chreia and an elaborated chreia. However, it is not at all clear where both of these units occur, nor why Parsons appeals to an elaborated chreia rather than a responsive chreia, as most closely reflects Theon's handbook.

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. [786]

As shown in Chapter II §2.2, the principles of choice imply meaning, default-markedness, and prominence features, contribute significantly toward identifying prominent information within a given Lukan scene. Most importantly, the use of such principles reflects Halliday's metafunction of language, particularly the textual and ideational modes of communication that consists of various levels of analysis; constituent order, process types, clause complex, and a scene structure.

However, in order to more fully appreciate the Lukan intention, there is also the need to incorporate Halliday's third metafunction of language, communication as interpersonal, that is, the clause as exchange. Here, rhetorical criticism is capable of incorporating prominent information by means of an ancient rhetorical framework. To this end, Theon's handbook offers relevant text-external framework that integrates marked discourse features alongside the form and function of various rhetorical exercises. Rhetorical criticism provides the Lukan exegete with a staged socio-literary context in which Lukan communication may have been transmitted and received. The representative commentaries commonly offer other text-external methods, narratological, thematic, or subjectively-based approaches. The issue is whether these approaches are appropriate or relevant for exegeting Luke's Gospel. To the extent that such approaches are found wanting, the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism offers a relevant alternative, or at the very least, a supplementary methodology. The comparative analyses above have raised the issues as to whether the approaches typically taken in Lukan exegesis take into account Halliday's metafunction of language and whether these do so consistently, comprehensively, and appropriately. Where practical exegesis of Luke's Gospel falls short, this project seeks to offer a significant alternative and positive contribution.

6.3 Springboard for Future Research

While this project has argued for the practical application and congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, additional issues remain to be explored that are outside the scope of this project. Four issues for further research include, i. a comparison to other textual traditions, ii. application to other Gospel texts, iii. additional discourse analytic approaches, and iv. additional rhetorical approaches.

---

[786] Robert E. Longacre, "Discourse Peak as Zone of Turbulence," in *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form,* ed. J.R. Wirth, (Michigan: Karoma, 1985), 83.

6.3.1 A Comparison of Textual Traditions

This project has utilized the N-A 28 eclectic text since it is the basis of all modern commentaries. A potential area to explore would be the comparison of manuscript traditions, to consider how the results obtained by applying a combination of the two methodologies, discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, might differ when applied to manuscript texts that are known to have existed rather than the hypothetical text of the N-A, which was reconstructed without recourse to the insights of discourse analysis. Given that the variant readings between manuscripts frequently involve aspects of discourse analysis,[787] a comparative textual analysis might serve future Lukan studies by investigating manuscripts in depth and comparing them against each other.

Additional manuscript traditions such as the ancient Jewish texts may also yield relevant findings. While this project compares the Lukan text with the LXX, there are many other early Jewish texts to consider, such as the Hebrew Masoretic Text, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Peshitta, where a combination of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism could be applied.[788] Consequently, while this project compares Jesus to David, Elijah and Elisha, these have been viewed primarily from the vantage point of the LXX, but a further consideration of additional Jewish texts would be necessary to see if these potentially also reveal Lukan rhetorical strategies.[789]

---

[787] Discourse features have been examined with particular reference to Luke's Gospel in the work of Joseph Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae*. Also see Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism.*

[788] In addition to the absence of narration details in the LXX regarding David and Goliath and reflected in Luke 4:1-14a, Luke's account of Jesus reading from Isaiah in Luke 4:16-19 also indicates that Luke is using sources other than the LXX. R. Steven Notley, "Jesus' Jewish Hermeneutical Method in The Nazareth Synagogue," in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality, Vol. 2*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (New York: Journal for the Study of the New Testament, T&T Clark, 2009), 46-59. While beyond the scope of this project, further research might consider textual variants and other editions regarding the elective tex. It was recently announced that a new edition has been planned: http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2018/03/a-new-naubs-in-202122.html. Such research also applies to the Septuagint, whether one uses the Rahlfs or Gottingen critical editions, or other texts related to the Jewish Scripture.

[789] For example, using Hebrew texts instead of the LXX in Luke 1:49 indicates that Isaiah 57:15 is activated in order to directly support God's care for the lowly. This stands in contrast with the common approach that Luke's Gospel references Psalm 111:9. Kai Akagi, "Luke 1:49 and the Form of Isaiah in Luke: An Overlooked Allusion and the Problem of an Assumed LXX Text," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 138 (2019): 183-201. See also Courtney J. P. Freisen, "Getting Samuel Sober: The 'Plus' of LXX 1 Samuel 1:11 And its Religious Afterlife in Philo And The Gospel of Luke," *JTS* 67 (2016): 453-478. Also George J. Brooke, "Comparing Matthew and Luke in the Light of Second Temple Jewish Literature," *JSNT 41* (2018): 44-57. Maurice Casey's works have been instrumental in placing Luke within a largely Jewish context. Maurice Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (England: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Finally, while this project incorporates Lukan lexical-functional similarities with the LXX as part of rhetorical considerations, there are other ways by which to establish intertextuality with the Jewish Scriptures as well as oral traditions, such as allusions and echoes, items that this project has not explored.[790] Similarly, while this project utilizes Greco-Roman rhetoric by way of the syncrisis exercise, Jewish literature during the time of the New Testament was certainly not devoid of literary comparisons.[791]

6.3.2 Application to Further Gospel Texts

Because this project has considered two sequences in Luke's Gospel, future analysis should extend to include the rest of this Gospel. Such analysis would serve to confirm, refine, and develop the findings of this project regarding the practical congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism. While this project has shown that Luke 3.21-5:39 works in concert with the practical application of these two methods, on text-internal and one text-external, further study is needed in order to indicate whether the conclusions of this project are faithful to the whole of Luke's Gospel. The author of Luke may have been writing randomly, or following additional rhetorical conventions, or conventions that were not as widely disseminated as those in the large Greco-Roman socio-literary tradition. Whereas this project has shown that the two Lukan sequences display a consistent pattern of the use of discourse features, namely, those that indicate textual boundaries, a scene's structure, and prominence, as well as rhetorical forms that correspond to Theon's *Progymnasmata*, future analysis is necessary for the whole of Luke's Gospel in order to maintain the confident application of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism.

By the same token, while this project has selected a limited portion of scenes in Luke's Gospel, future application should extend to include the other Gospels. For example, incorporating discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism in Mark's Gospel may not yield the same results as it did in Luke's Gospel. Mark, as well as his audience, may have had a lesser

---

James G. Crossley, ed., *Judaism, Jewish identities and the Gospel Tradition: Essays in Honour of Maurice Casey* (London: Equinox, 2010).

[790] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016). For a helpful overview of various approaches, see "Leroy A. Huizenga "The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory" *Journal of the Study of the New Testament,* 38 (2015) 17-35. See, though, apt criticism made of Hays' work, in e.g. Ben Witherington's blog, https://www.patheos.com/blogs/bibleandculture/2016/04/20/richard-hays-echoes-of-scripture-in-the-gospels-a-review/, where further helpful reflection on the use of Jewish traditions in the New Testament writings can be found.

[791] Serrano, *The Presentation in the Temple: The Narrative Function of Luke 2:22-39 in Luke-Act,* 104-124.

familiarity with rhetorical conventions. The discourse principle of choice implies meaning, enumerated in Chapter II §2.2, entails that within a scene in Mark's Gospel various discourse features within the language system may be selected in order to produce the author's desired outcome. Mark's Gospel may choose to depict a global action by some material process, whereas Luke's Gospel may have chosen to represent a global action by means of a verbal process. For example, whereas Jesus' global action of raising of Peters mother-in-law in Luke is by a verbal process, words of rebuke over the fever,

καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν. In Mark's Gospel, the global action consists rather of the material process,

καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός: καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός.

The traditional criticisms, source, form, and redaction may need to be reevaluated and assessed based on linguistic and rhetorical criteria, rather than on subjective preconceptions. As this project has sought to demonstrate, apart from linguistic and social parameters, the outcomes of the traditional methodologies tend to be subjective, lacking precision and clarity. Great gains may lie ahead in incorporating practical congruence of discourse analysis in other Gospels, or even other texts within the New Testament corpus.[792]

6.3.3 Additional Discourse Analytic Approaches

This project has provided a specific though eclectic, text-internal discourse analytic method, derived from Halliday, Levinsohn, Read-Heimerdinger, and other linguists. Regarding the text-external resource, Theon's *Progymnasmata* has been selected as one available handbook within the broader world of ancient rhetorical criticism. While this project has sought to demonstrate that these two specific approaches are useful in drawing out textual meaning in the two sequences in Luke's Gospel, the two approaches utilized in this project do not exhaust available approaches within discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism.

For example, one approach in discourse analysis is Relevance Theory. This approach to linguistics takes careful account of how the shaping of a text arises from the author's interaction with the audience. Attention is given to implications, nuances, representations that develop within an audience's mental map as the text develops, and the shared conceptual

---

[792] Rhetorical approaches to the Gospels, such as by Roland Meynet, tend to structure scenes thematically, rather than by objective linguistic criteria. The result is thematic associations which tend to be subjective and restrictive. Roland Meynet, *A New Introduction to The Synoptic Gospels* (Miami Florida: Convivium Press, 2010).

framework between a speaker and audience. Such considerations are relevant within a given communication and operate concurrently to achieve a speaker's intended purpose.[793] Exploratory studies in applying Relevance Theory to Luke's Gospel may reveal nuances or shades of meaning that though resident within the text, may be neglected by investigations that are focused on semantics and syntax.[794]

6.3.4 Additional Rhetorical Critical Approaches

While different discourse analytic approaches may be explored, the same may be said of rhetorical critical approaches and the range of rhetorical handbooks that could be utilized in order to identify further the conventions that are likely to have been familiar in the world of Luke and his audience. For example, Aristotle's work on Greek tragedy, *The Poetics*, may shed additional light on Lukan narration scenes related to the structure, form, and text-external expectations.[795] Aristotle's approach is distinctive in that it is primarily plot-oriented, fundamental to a narration and developing in three discreet units; beginning, middle, and end. Aristotle's plot-centered analysis may be particularly effective because it engages the pathos of an audience, arising specifically at the moment of a narration's reversal, that is, the change of fortune for a character.

Plot-centered analysis focuses on the issue of recognition, that is, a new awareness of the central character transmitted through information previously unknown but now revealed. Whereas Theon's approach is focused attention on the global action, and marked auxiliary narration elements, since these achieve the chief rhetorical purpose of a scene, Aristotle's approach focuses on the plotline continuum, specifically reversal and recognition, and for the purpose of emotional engagement with the audience. Such an approach provides a differing lens by which to frame a narration, alongside a different set of text-external expectations as to the purpose of a scene and what constitutes prominent information or how prominent information is encountered by the audience of Luke's Gospel.

6.3 Evaluative Summary

The studies of selected passages in Luke's Gospel that have been carried out in this project are intended as an illustration of an approach to New Testament exegesis that can be

---

[793] Deirdre Wilson, Dan Sperber, "Relevance Theory" G. Ward, L. Horn, eds., *Handbook of Pragmatics*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).

[794] Gene L. Green, *Relevance Theory and Theological Interpretation: Thoughts on Metarepresentation*, *Journal of Theological Interpretation* Vol 4. No 1 (Spring 2010), 75-90).

[795] *Aristotle's Poetics,* transl., Anthony Kenny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

extended and developed. The studies presented here have sought to explore specifically how two hitherto independent approaches to the New Testament writings, discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, may function together to complement each other and enhance the understanding of the text.

What this project has reveals is that each method, on its own, is incapable of fully addressing the complexity of meaning that inhabits various Lukan scenes. For example, in the case of rhetorical criticism, and as detailed analysis of Parson's commentary indicates, the lack of a robust linguistic analysis of the form and functions of a scene tends to result in the exegete employing modern literary sensibilities regarding the textual boundaries as well as identifying the form and function of various Lukan scenes through subjectively based criteria and often inconclusive statements, warranting further analysis and refinement.[796]

Jesus' baptism in Luke 3:21-22 provides a case in point. Notably absent in Parsons' analysis is linguistic support, for instance, in the assertion that vv. 21-22 constitute a distinct scene. Moreover, even though Parsons rightly places emphasis on the scene's closing information, the Spirit's descent and divine voice, no indication is given as to why v. 22 contains prominent information in relation to the previous verse, at least from a linguistic standpoint.[796] In other words, without linguistic evidence for the scene's boundary, form, and function, Parson's rhetorical appeal lacks both exegetical rigor and concrete support. As a result, his appeal to a variety of rhetorical strategies remains unsubstantiated and appears subject to the whims of whatever rhetorical exercise a given exegete finds appropriate. In any case, Parsons' approach serves to demonstrate that the congruence of discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism is highly advantageous for Lukan exegesis.

At the same time, while discourse analysis provides a robust, empirically-based account of discourse features and functions, thereby alerting the Lukan exegete to matters like textual boundaries and prominence, it cannot provide on its own, answers as to why various textual boundaries occur, or why various elements within a scene signals prominent information. To remedy this deficit, rhetorical criticism provides meaningful text-external factors relative to Luke's audience and the Greco-Roman socio-cultural context. In this light, rhetorical criticism, aided by Theon's handbook, serves to fill in exegetical gaps and to answer questions raised by discourse analysis.

---

[796] Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 55.

For example, while Stephen Levinsohn's use of discourse analysis enables the exegete to subsequently discern textual boundaries, as displayed in Ch. IV §5.1, there are scenes like Luke 4:14b-29 that defy perception and warrant further consideration as to 'why' the scene is bounded in this manner.[797] As comparative commentary analysis revealed, all four scholars include Jesus' escape from the hostile Nazareth crowds in v. 30 within the scene of Jesus' Nazareth proclamation. Fortunately, rhetorical criticism capably addresses why v. 30 is not included with Jesus' Nazareth proclamation. That is, as Ch. VI §2.4 suggested, the Nazareth scene focuses on the global action of Jesus' prophetic announcement of Isaianic fulfillment. This is fitting because, according to Theon's narration account, a beneficial narration should avoid information that "distracts the thought of the hearers and results in the need for a reminder of what has been said earlier."[798] In this respect, including Jesus' miraculous escape from the crowds within the bounds of Jesus' synagogue proclamation would invariably eclipse the narration virtue of clarity, obfuscating the chief point of the narration. Evidence for Theon's concern for narration clarity is aptly illustrated in the four comparative commentaries examined, for in their detailed discussions of Jesus' miraculous escape, Jesus' central prophetic announcement is inevitably backgrounded.

Returning to the scene of Jesus' baptism in Luke 3:21-22, apart from the use of rhetorical criticism the Lukan exegete is not able to fully incorporate Levinsohn's discourse findings relative to Luke's audience. For instance, as observed in Ch IV §2.6, the discourse feature in v. 21, ἐγένετο, points to foregrounded information, namely the Spirit's descent on Jesus and the divine attribution. Such an observation is entirely in keeping with Theon's chreia exercise wherein the expedient point is achieved at the scene's closing. The structure and prominence of the scene, discerned by discourse analysis, enables the exegete to concretely identify this scene as a chreia exercise. Moreover, because this scene represents a mixed chreia, the Lukan exegete is encouraged to identify the reflexive truth pertaining to the Spirit's descent and divine attribution. Discourse analysis on its own is incapable of discerning such a socio-literary expectation. Moreover, the use of ἐγένετο also serves another function for discourse analysts, signaling that Jesus' baptismal experience provides the general circumstance and thematic underpinning for subsequent scenes. With this in mind, rhetorical criticism fills in the

[797] Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *Luke's Demonstration: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 55.

[798] Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 30.

exegetical gaps. For, from a rhetorical, text-external perspective, Jesus baptism thereby serves as the interpretive underpinning by which to evaluate Jesus' subsequent actions. In other words, for Luke's audience, successive actions of Jesus are evaluated relative to the foundational information provided in this scene, namely, that Jesus is the divinely coronated Messiah.

In summary, the thesis of this project is that both discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, when diligently pursued, do indeed combine to function as a concrete and testable, merger of both text-internal and text-external resources that better enables the exegete to understand textual meaning in their early context, particularly with regard to the structure of his narrative, the focus of each section and the relevance of contemporary literary and rhetorical conventions to the writing. In order to test and extend the claims of the thesis further, the methodology could be applied to the rest of the Gospel, potentially refining it by building a larger store of data; the conclusions could be developed by using different manuscripts of the Gospels as well as different sources of the Jewish traditions on which Luke appears to draw; other ancient literary conventions could also be considered, not least Jewish exegetical traditions, and finally, the findings of this project could be applied to other Gospels, as tools to serve for a comparisons of the different Gospels.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, A. K. M. *Handbook of Postmodern Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. *Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Adams, Sean A. "Luke's Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism, 3* (2006): 177-191.

Akagi, Kai. "Luke 1:49 and the Form of Isaiah in Luke: An Overlooked Allusion and the Problem of an Assumed LXX Text," *Journal of Bibical Literature, 138* (2019): 183-201.

Alba-Juez, Laura. *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice.* Newcastle, U.K: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.

Alexander, Loveday. "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface Writing." *Novum Testament.* 28.1 (1986): 48-73. doi:10.2307/1560667.

Alexander, Loveday. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary convention and social context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Allan, Rutger J. "Towards a Typology of the Narrative Modes" in *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*. Edited by Stephanie Bakker and Gerry Wakker. Boston: Brill, 2009.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* New York: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, 1981.

Anderson, Janice Capel and Stephen D. Moore. *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Antoniadis Sophie. *L'Evangile de Luc: Esquisse de grammaire et de style.* University of Paris: Paris, 1930.

Aristotle. *Rhetoric, III.16*. Plutarch, Lives: The Life of Aemelius, 1.1-7, *Life of Alexander*, I. Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Aune, David E. "Luke 1:1-4: Historical or Scientific Prooimon?" in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J.M. Wedderburn*. Edited by Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey and Bruce Longenecker. New York/London: T. & T. Clark, 2002.

Aune, David E. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Ausland, Hayden W. "Poetry, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Plato's Phaedrus," *Symbolae Osloenses*, 84, 2010.

Bakker, Egbert. "Pragmatics: *Speech and Text" Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2010.

Bakker, Egbert. "Storytelling in the Future: Truth, Time, and Tense in Homeric Epic" in *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Bakker, Egbert. "Time, Tense, and Thucydides" *The Classical World*, 100.2 (2007). https://www.jstor.org/stable/25433998

Bakker, Egbert. "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides" in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in Its Linguistic Contexts*. New York: Brill, 1997.

Barclay, John. "Against Apion," in *A Companion To Josephus*. Edited by Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers. Malden, Massachussets: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 2016.

Barney, Rachel. "Gorgias' Defense: Plato and His Opponents on Rhetoric and the Good," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 48.1, 2010.

Bartholomew, Craig, Joel Green, and Anthony Thiselton, eds. *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, *vol. 6.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Press, 2005.

Beavis, Mary Ann. "Parable and Fable," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52.3 (1990): 473-498. https://www.academia.edu/10518804/Parable_and_Fable

Beers, Victor. "Kunstprosa: Philosophy, History, Oratory" in *Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Berry, D. H. and Malcolm Heath. "Oratory and Declamation," in *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period,* edited by Stanley E. Porter. Boston: Brill, 2001.

Berry, Margaret. "What Is Theme? (another) Personal View," in *Meaning and Choice in Language Studies for Michael Halliday*. Edited by Margaret Berry, Christopher Butler, Robin Fawcett, Guowen Huang in vol. LVII. Norwood N.J.: Ablex, 1996.

Best, Ernest, "Mark's Narrative Technique," *Journal of the Study of the New Testament,* 37 (1989): 43-58.

Betz, Hans Deiter, "Jesus' Baptism and the Origins of the Christian Ritual", in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity.* Edited by David Hellholm, Tor Vegge, Oyvind Norderval, Christer Hellholm. Boston: DeGruyter, 2010.

Bhatia, Vijay K. John Flowerdew and Rodney H. Jones, eds. *Advances in Discourse Studies*. New York: Routledge Press, 2008.

Bhatia, Vijay K. *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. New York: Continuum Pub., 2006.

Billings, Bradley S. "'At the Age of 12': The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52), The Emperor Augustus, and The Social Setting of the Third Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies,* 60.1 (2009): 70-89. doi:10.1092/jts/fln149

Birner, Betty J. *Introduction to Pragmatics.* Malden Mass: Wiley Blackwell Publishers, 2013.

Black, David Alan and David S. Dockery, eds. *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Pub., 2001.

Black, David Alan, Katharine Barnwell, and Stephen J. Levinsohn, eds. *Lingusitics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis.* Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992.

Black, David Alan. *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.

Black, David Alan. "The Discourse Structure of Philippians: A Study in TextLinguistics" *Novum Testamentum* XXXVII (1995): 16-49.

Blumhofer, C.M. "Luke's Alteration of Joel 3.1-5 in Acts 2.17-21" *New Test. Stud.* 62 (2016): 499-516.

Bobbitt, David A., "Cicero's Concept of Ethos and Some Implications for the Understanding of Roman Rhetoric." *The Florida Communication Journal* XIX, 1 (1990): 5-12.

Bovon, François. *Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Luke 1:1-9:50.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

Brewer, David Instone, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis Before 70 CE.* Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992.

Brodie, Thomas L. *The Crucial bridge: The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Brodie, Thomas L. *Proto-Luke: The Oldest Gospel account. A Christ-Centered Synthesis of Old Testament History Modelled Especially on the Elijah-Elisha Narrative: Introduction, Text, and Old Testament Model*. Limerick, Ireland: Dominican Biblical Institute, 2006.

Brooke, George J. "Comparing Matthew and Luke in the Light of Second Temple Jewish Literature." *Journal of the Study of the New Testament,* 41 (2018): 44-57.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Brookins, Timothy A. "Luke's Use of Mark as παράφρασις: Its Effects on Characterization in the 'Healing of Blind Bartimaeus' Pericope" (Mark 10.46-52/ Luke 18.35-43)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 34.1 (2011): 70-89.

Buth, Randall. "Participles as A Pragmatic Choice" in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*. Edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch. Bellingham WA: Lexham Press, 2016.

Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography,* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2004.

Cadbury, Henry, J. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke: I, The Diction of Luke and Acts* Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Callow, Kathleen. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

Campbell, Constantine. *Advances in The Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.

Campbell, Constantine. *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.

Chambers, Andy. *Exemplary Life: A Theology of Church Life in Acts*. Nashville, Tenn: B&H Publishing, 2012.

Casey, Maurice. *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. England: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Christophersen, A., ed. *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman world: Essays in Honour of J. M. Wedderburn.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Cotterell, Peter and Max Turner. *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation*. Downer's Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1989.

Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition: from Ancient to Modern Times, 2nd ed. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Crossley, James G., ed., *Judaism, Jewish identities and the Gospel Tradition: Essays in Honour of Maurice Casey.* London: Equinox, 2010.

Cruse, Alan. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*, *3rd ed*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Culy, Martin C., Mikael C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall. *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek New Testament.* Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2010.

Damm, Alex. "Ornatus: An Application of Rhetoric to the Synoptic Problem." *Novum Testamentum,* 45.4, 2003, 338-364. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1561103

Danker, Frederick William. *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Christian Literature, Third Edition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2000.

Decker, Rodney J. *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with reference to Verbal Aspect*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2001.

Denaux, Adelbert. "Style and Stylistics, with a Special Reference to Luke." *Filologia Neotestamentaria,* 19, 2006, 31-51.

DeJonge, Casper, C. *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius Of Halicarnassus On Language, Lingusitics And Literature*. Boston: Brill, 2008.

Denniston, J. D. *Greek Prose Style*, 3rd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 2002.

deSilva, David. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downer's Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press: 2000.

deSilva, David. "Hebrews 6:4-8: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation (Part 1)." *Tyndale Bulletin* 50.1 (1999): 33-57.

Dik, Simon C. *The Theory of Functional Grammar: The Structure of the Clause*, 2nd ed. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997.

Dilts, Mervin R. and George A. Kennedy, eds., *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire: Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara.* New York: Brill, 1997.

Dooley, Robert A. and Stephen H. Levinsohn. *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts*. Dallas Texas: SIL International, 2001.

Dressler, Wolfgang U. "Marked and Unmarked Text Strategies within Semiotically Based NATURAL Textlinguistics," in *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*. Edited by Shin Ja J. Hwang and William R. Merrifield. Dallas Texas: SIL, 1992.

Downing, Gerald. "Words as deeds And Deeds as Words." *Biblical Interpretation*, 3.2 (1995): 129-143. doi.org/10.1163/156851595X00258

Duff, Timothy E. *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*, Oxford University Press: New York, 1999.

Eggins, Suzanne. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 3rd ed. New York: Bloomsbury, 2004,

Elbert, Paul. "An Observation on Luke's Composition and Narrative Style of Questions" *The Catholic Bible Quarterly,* 66.1 (2004): 98-109. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43725140.

El-daly, Hosney M. "On the Philosophy of Language: Searching for Common Grounds for Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis." *International Journal of Academic Research*. vol. 2, no. 6, (Nov. 2010): 244-262.

Ellia, Nicholas J. "Aspect-Prominence, Morpho-Syntax, and a Cognitive-Linguistic Framework for the Greek Verb" in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis.* Edited by Stephen E. Runge and Christopher Fresch. Cambridge: Lexham Press, 2015.

Elliott, Keith J. "An Eclectic Textual Study of the Book of Acts" in *The Book of Acts as Church History/Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte*, et al. Edited by Tobias Nicklas. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Ehrman, Bart D. and Michael W. Holmes, eds. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed. Boston Massachusetts: Brill, 2013.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface: Oxford Surveys in Syntax and Morphology.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Fanning, Buist. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Feldman, Louise. *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press: 1993.

Michael Fishbane, Michael, *The Exegetical Imagination: On Jewish Thought and Theology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Fisk, B. *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of PseudoPhilo*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Freisen, Courtney J. P. "Getting Samuel Sober: The 'Plus' of LXX 1 Samuel 1:11 And its Religious Afterlife in Philo and the Gospel of Luke," *Journal of Theological Studies,* 67 (2016): 453-478

Freytag, Gustav. *Technique of The Drama: An Exposition of Dramatic Composition and Art*. Translated by Elias J. MacEwan, 3rd ed. Chicago: Scott, Foreman and Company, 1900.

Garland, David. *Exegetical Commentary in The New Testament: Luke*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method 2nd ed.* New York: Routledge Publishing, 2005.

Gee, James Paul and Michael Handford, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* New York: Routledge Press, 2012.

Geeraerts, Dick and Hubert Cuyckens, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra and Dionysis Goutsos. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction, 2ⁿᵈ ed*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Gibson, Craig, trans. *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Givon, T. *Functionalism and Grammar*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing, 1995.

Goldhill, Simon. "Rhetoric and the Second Sophistic," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, ed. Eric Gunderson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 41-61. doi:10.1017/CCOL978052186043

Graham, Linda J. "The Product of Text and 'Other' Statements: Discourse Analysis and the Critical Use of Foucault." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* vol. 43, no. 6, (2011).663-674.

Green, Joel, ed. *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: William B Eerdmans Pub., 1995.

Green, Joel B. *The New International Commentary on The New Testament: The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Green, Joel B. "Learning Theological Interpretation from Luke" in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, Anthony C. Thiselton. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Gene L. Green. "Relevance Theory and Theological Interpretation: Thoughts on Metarepresentatio." *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, 14.1 (2010), 75-90.

Grimes, Joseph E. *The Thread of Discourse*. New York: Mouton Publishers, 1975.

Grishakova, Marina and Sorokin, Siim. "Notes on Narrative, Cognition, and Cultural Evolution." *Sign Systems Studies,* 44.4 (2016): 542-561, 550.

Gruen, Erich, S. "Jewish perspective on Greek Culture and Ethnicity," in *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History.* Edited by Friedrich V. Reiterer, Beate Ego, Tobias Nicklas. Boston Massachusetts: DeGruyter, 2016.

Gunn, David M. "Narrative Criticism," in *An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application: To Each Its Own Meaning*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1999.

Gunderson, Eric, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Guthrie, George H. "Discourse Analysis," in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*, editors David Alan Black and David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2001.

Habinek, Thomas. *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory: Blackwell Introductions to The Classical World*. Malden Mass.: Blackwell Pub., 2005.

Holladay, Carl R. *Acts: A Commentary*. Louisville KY: John Knox Press, 2016.

Robert G. Hall, "Josephus' Contra Apionem and Historical Inquiry in the Roman Rhetorical Schools," in *Josephus' Contra Apionem*. Edited by Louise H. Felman, John R. Levinson. New York: Brill., 1996.

Halliday, M. A. K. "A Brief Sketch of Systemic Grammar." *On Language and Linguistics.* Edited by Jonathan Webster. New York: Continuum, 2003.

Halliday, M. A. K. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, *2nd ed.* London: Edward Arnold, 1994.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.

Heath, Malcolm. "John Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians," in *Biblical Interpretation,* 12.4 (2004): 369-400. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568515042418578.

Hezser, Catherine. "Form Criticism Of Rabbinic Literature," in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer, Florentino Garcia Martinez, Didier Pollefeyt, and Peter J. Tomson. Boston, Massachusetts: Brill Publishers, 2009.

Hezser, Catherine. "The Torah Versus Homer: Jewish and Greco-Roman Education in Late Roman Palestine," in *Ancient Education and Early Christianity*. Edited by Matthew Ryan Hauge and Andrew W. Pitts. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark. 2016.

Hidary, Richard. "Classical Rhetorical Arrangement and Reasoning In The Talmud: The Case of Yerushalmi Berakhot 1:1," *AJS Review* 34.1 (April 2010): 33-64.

Hidary, Richard. *Rabbis and Classical Rhetoric: Sophistic Education and Oratory in the Talmud and Midrash*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2018.

Hock, Ronald F. "Observing a teacher of Progymnasmata," in *Ancient Education and Early Christianity*. Edited by Matthew Ryan Hauge and Andrew W. Pitts. New York: Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2016.

Hock, Ronald F. and Edward N. O'Neil. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: Volume I. The Progymnasmata.* Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.

Hock, Ronald F. and O'Neil, Edward N. *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.

Horrell, David G., Bradley Arnold, and Travis B. Williams. "Visuality, Vivid Description, and the Message of 1 Peter: The Significance of the Roaring Lion (1 Peter 5:8)." *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 132.3 (2013): 697-716. doi:10.2307/23487894.

Hosney, M. El-daly. "On the Philosophy of Language: Searching for Common Grounds for Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis," *International Journal of Academic Research*, 2.6 (2010): 248-252, 257-258

Yan Huang, Yan. *Pragmatics: Oxford Textbook s in Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Yan Huang, Yan. *The Oxford Dictionary of Pragmatics.* Oxford*:* Oxford University Press, 2012.

Huizenga, Leroy A. "The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory" *Journal of the Study of the New Testament,* 38 (2015) 17-35.

Hwang, Shin and William R. Merrifield, eds. *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*. Dallas Texas: SIL,1992.

Hyland, Ken and Brian Paltridge, eds. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Discourse Analysis.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011.

Henderson, Jeffrey, ed. *Plutarch Lives VII,* Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Iverson, Kelly R. and Christopher W. Skinner*,* eds. *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.

Iverson, Kelly R. and Christopher W. Skinner. *Textual Connections in Acts*. no. 31. Atlanta: SBL, Scholar's Press, 1987.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Sacra Pagina: The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

Just, Arthur A. Jr., ed. *Ancient Christian Commentary On Scripture: Luke*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press: 2003.

Katula, Richard A. "The Origins of Rhetoric: Literacy and Democracy in Ancient Greece," in *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*, *3rd ed*. Edited by James J. Murphy and Richard A. Katula. Mahwah, N.J.: Hermagoras Press, 2003.

Keck, Lenader E. and Martyn, J. Louis, eds. *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. London: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Keesmaat, Sylvia. *Paul and his Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Kurz, William S. J. "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 171-195.

Kurz, William. "Promise and Fulfillment in Hellenistic Jewish Narratives and in Luke and Acts" in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Kennedy, George, A. *A New Introduction to Classical Rhetoric*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Kennedy, George, A. *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kennedy, George, A. *Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Kennedy, George A. "Historical Survey of Rhetoric," *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.- A.D. 400.* Leiden: Brill Publishers, 1997.

Kennedy, George A. *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Kennedy, George A. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. trans., Atlanta: SBL, 2003.

Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 BC- 300 AD*. Princeton New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1972.

Kloppenborg John S. and Joseph Verheyden, eds. *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Compositionon of Luke*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Kraus, Manfred. "Theories and Practice of the Enthymeme" in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*. Edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Ubelacker. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.

Kreider, Glenn R. "Jesus The Messiah as Prophet Priest, And King." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 176 (Apr-June 2019): 174-187.

Kroeger, Paul R. *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-functional Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Laird, Andrew, ed. "The Value of Ancient Literary Criticism," in *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism*. New York; Oxford University Press, 2006.

Lapin, Hayim. *Rabbis as Romans: The Rabbinical Movement in Palestine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Lambrecht, Knud. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental representations of Discourse Referents*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Landau, Tamar. *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric, and the Herod Narratives*. Boston Massachussets: Brill, 2006.

Langacker, Robert W. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Lee, Jae Hyun. *Paul's Gospel in Romans: A Discourse Analysis of Rom 1:156-8:39*. Boston: Brill Publishers, 2010.

Levinsohn, Stephen J. *Discourse features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed.* Dallas Texas: SIL International, 2000.

Levinsohn, Stephen J. "Participant Reference in Koine Greek Narrative," in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis. Textual Connections in Acts*. Edited by Black, David Alan, Barnwell. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman, 1992.

Levinsohn, Stephen L. *Textual Connections in Acts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1987.

Lieberman, Saul. *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942.

Litfin, Duane A. *Paul's Theology of Preaching: The Apostle's Challenge to the Art of Persuasion in Ancient Corinth,* rev. and enl. ed. Grand Rapids: IVP Academic, 2015.

Litwak, Kenneth D. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005.

Loney, Alexander C. "Narrative Structure and Verbal Aspect Choice in Luke" *Filologia Neotestamentaria,* 18 (2005), 3-31.

Longacre, Robert E. *The Grammar of Discourse*, 2nd ed. Dallas Texas: SIL, 1996.

Longacre, Robert E. "A Top-Down, Template-Driven Narrative Analysis, Illustrated by Application to Mark's Gospel" in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. Sheffield Academic Press: England, 1999.

Longacre, Robert E. "Discourse Peak as Zone of Turbulence," in *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form.* Edited by J. R. Wirth. Michigan: Karoma, 1985.

Mack, Burton and Vernon K. Robbins. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels.* New York: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008.

Malherbe, A. J. "The Christianization of a Topos (Luke 12:13-34)." *Novum Testamentum* 38.2. Leiden, Bill Publishers, 1996, 123-135.

Mann, William C. and Sandra A. Thompson. "Relational Discourse Structure: A Comparison of Approaches to Structuring Text by 'Contrast,'" in *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, Dallas, Texas: SIL, 1992, 19-45.

Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956.

Martin-Asensio, Gustavo. *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles: A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Martin, J. R. and David Rose. *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*. Oakville, Conn.: Equinox Publishing, 2008.

Martin, Michael. "Philo's Use of Syncrisis: An Examination of Philonic Composition in the Light of the Progymnasmata", *PRST* 30/3 (2003): 271-97.

Mathewson, David. "Language of the Apocalypse." *NTS* 35 (1989): 582-603.

Mathewson, David. "Verbal Aspect in the Apocalypse of John: An Analysis of Revelation 5." *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008): 58-77.

Matthiessen, Christian M. I. M. and Kazuhiro Teruya, Marvin Lam, eds. *Key Terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics*. New York: Contiuum Publishers, 2010.

Mealand, David. "Luke-Acts and the Verbs of Dionysius of Halicarnassus" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 10.63 (1997), 63-86.

Menzie, Stephen L and Stephen R. Haynes, eds. *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.

Mercer, Calvin C. *Norman Perrin's Interpretation of the New Testament: From Exegetical Method to Hermeneutical Process*. Mercer University Press, Macon Georgia, 1986.

Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edition. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.

Meyer, Michel, "Aristotle's Rhetoric." *Topoi*, 31 (2012): 249-252.

Morgan, Teresa, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Murphy, James J. and Richard A. Katul. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*, *3rd ed.*, eds. Mahwah, N.J.: Hermagoras Press, 2003.

Meynet, Roland. *A New Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels.* Miami, Florida: Convivium Press, 2010.

Meynet, Roland. *Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric*. England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Meynet, Roland. *Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric*. England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Middleton, J. E. Parker. "Anonymous Seguerianus," in *Classical Rhetoric's and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*. Edited by Michelle Ballif and Michael G. Moran. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2005.

Moessner, David, ed. *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy.* Trinity Press: Harrisburg, PA, 1999.

Moessner, David, ed. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative, 2nd ed*. New York: Continuum, 1998.

Moessner, David. "Reading Luke's Gospel as Ancient Hellenistic Narrative" in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation*, ed. Craig C. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, Anthony C. Thiselton. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Moessner, David, ed. "The Triadic Synergy of Hellenistic Poetics in the Narrative Epistemology of Dionysius Of Halicarnassus and the Authorial Intent of the Evangelist Luke (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-8)," *Neotestamentica* 42.2 (2008): 289-303.

Moore, Stephen D. and Yvonne Sherwood. *The Invention of the Biblical Scholar: A Critical Manifesto*. Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 2011.

Moore, Stephen D. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989.

Moyise, Steve. *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.

Muilenberg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 88.1 (1969), 1-18. doi:10.2307/3262829

Napoli, Maria. *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek.* Italy: FrancoAngeli, 2006.

Newman, Barclay M. and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*. London: United Bible Societies, 1973.

Notley, Steven. "Jesus' Jewish Hermeneutical Method in The Nazareth Synagogue," in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality,* 2. Edited by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias. New York: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament,* T&T Clark, 2009.

Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland 26th ed. Stuttgart Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.

O'Banion, John D. "Narration and Argumentation: Quintilian on Narratio as the Heart of Rhetorical Thinking." *Rhetorica*, 1987, 5.4; 325-351, 335.

O'Halloran, Kay L. ed. *Multimodal Discourse Analysis: Systemic-Functional Perspectives*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004.

Oliver, Isaac W. *Torah Praxis After 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts*. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Parsons, Mikael C. *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*. Peabody Mass: Hendrickson Pub., 2007.

Parsons, Mikael C. "Luke and *The Progymnasmata*: A Preliminary Investigation into the Preliminary Exercises" in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, eds. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Mikael C. Parsons, *Paideai Commentaries On The New Testament: Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015).

Mikael Parsons and Michael Wade Martin, *Ancient Rhetoric and the New Testament: The Influence of Elementary Greek Composition* (Baylor University Press: Waco, TX, 2018).

Paulston, Christian Bratt and Tucker, G. Richard, eds. *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*. Malden Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell Pub., 2003.

Penner, Todd and Caroline Vander, eds. *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Atlanta: Stichele, SBL, 2003.

Penner, Todd. "Reconfiguring the Rhetorical Study of Acts: Reflections on the Method in and Learning of a Progymnasmatic Poetics," *PRSt* 30 (2003): 425-439, 433.

Pepe, Cristina. *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Boston: Brill, 2013.

Penella, Robert J. "The Progymnasmata In Imperial Greek Education" in *The Classical World,* 2011.

Pervo, Richard. Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles. Philadelphia: Fortress press, 1987.

Pitts, Andrew, W. "Hellenistic Schools in Jerusalem and Paul's Rhetorical Education," in *Paul's World*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Boston: Brill 2008.

Porter, Stanley E. and Carson, D. A., eds. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*. Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press. 1993.

Porter. Stanley E., ed. *Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Porter Stanley, E. ed. *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in The Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.- A.D. 400.* Boston: Brill Academic Pub., 2001.

Porter, Stanley E. and Reed Jeffrey T., eds. *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. England; Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Porter, Stanley E. ed. *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament.* Lieden: Brill Publishers, 1997.

Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of The Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Porter, Stanley. "In Defense of Verbal Aspect." *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Porter, Stanley E. *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015. Martin C. Culy, Mikael C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall*, Luke: A Handbook on the Greek New Testament* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2010, 8, 10, 16, 55, 117-118.

Porter, Stanley E. and Bryan R. Dyer. "Oral Texts? A Reassessment of the Oral and Rhetorical Nature of Paul's Letters in Light of recent Studies," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 55.2 (2012).

Porter, Stanley E. and Dennis L. Stamps, eds. *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Porter Stanley E. and O'Donnell, Matthew Brook, eds. *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. England: Sheffield Press, 2009.

Porter, Stanley E. and Thomas H. Olbricht. eds. *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference.* England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Porter, Stanley E. *Verbal Aspect* in *the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood.* New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Powell, Mark Allan. *What Is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* (5.14.1).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, Editio altera *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart Germany: Deutsche Bibelsegellschaft, 2006.

Reed, Jeffrey T. "Discourse Analysis as New Testament Hermeneutics: A Retrospective and Prospective Appraisal." JETS 39/2 (June 1996): 223-240.

Reed, Jeffrey T. "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis" in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson. England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. "Luke's Use of ὡς and ὡσεί: Comparison and Correspondence as a Means to Convey his Message" in *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi filologici di Greco biblioc in onore di padre Lino Cignelli,* OFM Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Analecta 68, ed. R. Pierri. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.

Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny and Rius-Camps, Josep *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles According to Codex Bezae*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny and Stephen H. Levinsohn. "The Use of the Definite Articles before Names of People in the Greek Text of Acts with Particular reference to Codex Bezae." *Filología Neotestamentaria*, 5 1992.

Ressuguie, James L. *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Rice, Peter. "The Rhetoric of Luke's Passion: Luke's Use of Common-place to Amplify the Guilt of Jerusalem's Leaders in Jesus' Death." *Biblical Interpretation* 21.3 (2013): 355-376.

Rius-Camps, Josep and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition,* Vol. I. Acts1.1–5.42: Jerusalem. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004.

Rhoades, David, Joanna Dewey and Donald Michie, eds. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, *2nd ed.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

Robbins, Vernon K. "Dionysius's Narrative 'Arrangement' (oikonomia) as the Hermeneutical Key to Luke's Re-Vision of the 'Many'," in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman world: Essays in Honour of J. M. Wedderburn.* Edited by A. Christophersen. Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Robbins, Vernon K. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Harrisburg PA: Trinity Press, 1996.

Robbins, Vernon K. David B. Gowler, L. Gregory Bloomquist, Duane F. Watson, eds. *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Robbins, Vernon K. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative, 2nd ed*. New York: Continuum, 1998.

Robbins, Vernon K. "Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric and Rhetoric in Ancient Narrative" in *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1996, 368-384.

Robbins, Vernon, K. "Pronouncement Stories and Jesus' Blessing of the Children: A Rhetorical Approach," *Semeia*, 2 (1983): 42-74.

Robbins, Vernon K. "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* ed. David P. Moessner. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press: 1999.

Robbins, Vernon K. *The Invention of Christian Discourse*. Winona Lake, IN: Deo Pub, Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Robbins, Vernon K. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Disocurse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology*. London: Routledge Press: 1996.

Robbins, Vernon K. *Sea Voyages and Beyond: Emerging Strategies in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Winona Lake, IN: Deo Pub., Eisenbrauns, 2010.

Rowe, Galen O. "Style," *The Classical Handbook of Rhetoric in The Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.- A.D. 400.* Edited by Stanley Porter. Boston: Brill Academic Pub., 2001.

Ruis-Camps, Josep and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *Luke's Demonstration to Theophilus: The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles Acording to Codex Bezae*. London: T & T Clark, Ltd, 2012.

Ruis-Camps, Josep and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *"*The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition I. Acts1.1–5.42: Jerusalem*."* Journa of the Study of the New Testament. New York/London: T. & T. Clark, 2004.

Runge, Stephen E. *Discourse Grammar of the New Testament Greek: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis.* Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Pub., 2010.

Runge, Steven E. and Christopher J. Fresch. *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*. Bellingham WA: Lexham Press: 2016.

Ruitherford, Richard. "The Greek of Athenian Tragedy" in *Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Edited by Egbert J. Bakker. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Russell, Walt. "The Anointing With The Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts," *TrinJ* (1986): 47-63.

Rydbeck, Lars and Stanley Porter; trans Denis Searby. *Selected Writings on the New Testament, Greek Language and Greek Culture in the Post-classical Era*. Tubingen: Mohr Siebck: 2005.

Sampley, Paul J. and Peter Lampe, eds. *Paul and Rhetoric*. New York: Continuum International Publishers, 2010.

Schellenberg, Ryan S. *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education: Comparative Rhetoric And 2 Corinthians 10-13*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Schiappa, Edward and Jim Hamm. *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric.*" Edited by Ian Worthington. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2007.

Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton, eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden Mass.: Blackwell Pub., 2001.

Schmidt, Daryl, F. "Rhetorical Influences and Genres" in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy,* ed. Moessner, David. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1999.

Haim Schwarzbaum, Haim. "Talmudic-Midrashic Affinities of Some Aesopic Fables," in *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. Edited by Henry A. Fischel. New York: Ktav Publishing, 1977.

Seland, Torrey. "Philo and Classical Education," in Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria. Edited by Erkki Koskenniemi. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2014.

Serrano, Andres Garcia. *The Presentation in the Temple: The Narrative Function of Luke 2:22-39 in Luke-Acts*. Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2012.

Sherwood, Aaron. "Paul's Imprisonment as the Glory of the Ethne: A Discourse Analysis of Ephesians 3:1-13." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 22. 1 (2012): 97-112.

Sicking, C. M. J. and P. Stork. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Simons, Robert. "The Magnificat: Cento, Psalm or Imitatio?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 60.1 (2009): 25-46.

Robert W. Smith. The Art of Rhetoric in Alexandria: Its Theory and Practice in the Ancient World. Prague Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974.

Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Stegman, Thomas D. "Reading Luke 12:13-34 as an Elaboration of a Chreia: How Hermogenes of Tarsus Sheds Light on Luke's Gospel." *Novum Testamentum*, 49 (2007): 328-352. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25442570.

Stern, David. *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Strelan, Rick. *Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospe*l. Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2008.

Strelan, Rick. "A Note on ἀσφαλεια (Luke 1.4)." *Journal of the Study of the New Testament,* 30.2 (2007): 163-171.

Stubbs, Michael. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Surburg, Mark P. "Ancient Rhetorical Criticism, Galatians, and Paul at Twenty-five Years." *Concordia Journal*. 30.1-2 (2004): 13-39.

Usher, S. *Greek Orators III: Isocrates Panegyricus and to Nicocles*. Translated and Edited by S. Usher. England: Liverpool Press, 1990.

Taylor, John R. *Linguistic Categorization*, 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Tannen, Deborah, ed. *Analyzing Discourse Text and Talk*. North Carolina: Georgetown University Press, 1981, 178.

Theon's Sophiston Progymnasmata. Edited by Camerarius Joachim, 1500-1574.

Thompson, Geoff. *Introducing Functional Grammar*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Tobin, Tobin. "Controversy and Continuity in Romans 1:18-3:20." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (2, 1993): 298-317.

Too, Yun Lee. *A Commentary on Isocrates' Antidosis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Walker, Jeffrey. *The Genuine Teachers of This Art: Rhetorical Education in Antiquity*. South Carolina: The University of South Carolina Press, 2011).

Wallace, Daniel *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Zondervan: Grand Rapids, 1996.

WardHaugh, Ronald. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, 6th ed.* Malden Mass: Wiley-Blackwell Pub, 2010.

Wardy, Robert. *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato, And Their Successors.* New York: Routledge Press, 1996.

Watson, Duane. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and Its Implications for the Unity Question." *Novum Testatmentum,* 1 (1988): 56.

Watson, Duane. "1 Corinthains 10:23-11:1 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Role of Rhetorical Questions," Journal of Biblical Literature, 108.2 (1989): 301-318.

Watson, Duane F. and Alan J. Hauser. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Watson, Duane, F. ed. *Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Watson, Duane F. and Alan J. Hauser. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes*. Leiden: Brill Publishers, 1994.

Watson, Duane. *The Rhetoric of the New Testament: A Bibliographical Survey.* U.K.: Blandford Forum, Deo Publishing: 2006.

Watson, Duane. "The Rhetoric of James 3:1-12 and a Classical Pattern of Argumentation." *Novum Testamentum* XXXV, 1 (1993): 48-64.

Westfall, Cynthia. *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning*. Library of New Testament Studies 297, London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Widdowson, H. G. *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Witherington, Ben III. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman Pub., 2001.

Worthington, Ian, ed. *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric.*" Malden Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Woodman, A. J. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*. New York: Routledge Pub., 1988.

van Dijk, Teun A. *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

van Dijk, Teun A. *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. California: Sage Pub., 2000.

van Dijk, Teun A. *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Varner, William. "A Discourse Analysis of Matthew's Nativity Narrative." *Tyndale Bulletin*, 58.2 (2007): 209-228.

Webb, Ruth. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Burlington VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

Wheelwright, Philip *Metaphor and Reality*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1962.

Wifstrand, Albert "Epochs and Styles," in *Selected Writings on the New Testament, Greek Language and Greek Culture in the Post-classical Era*. Edited by Lars Rydbeck and Stanley Porter, trans. Denis Searby. Tubingen: Mohr Siebck: 2005.

Willi, Andreas "Register Variation," in *Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World: Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. "Relevance Theory" in *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Edited by Laurence R. Horn and Gregory L. Ward, Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics, 16. New Jersey: Blackwell, 2006.

Wirth, J. R. *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form.* Michigan: Karoma, 1985.

Witherington, Ben. "Richard Hays Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels." *Patheos* blog (2016). https://www.patheos.com/blogs/bibleandculture/2016/04/20/richard-hays-echoes-of-scripture-in-the-gospels-a-review/

Witheringtom. Ben III, "'Almost Thou Persuadest Me…': The Importance of Greco-Roman Rhetoric for the Understanding of the Text and Context of the NT" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 58.1 (2015). July 1, 2019 https://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/58/58.../JETS_58-1_63-88_Witherington.pdf

Witherington III, Ben. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1998.

Witherington III, Ben. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman Publishing, 2001.

Witherington III, Ben. *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament,* Eugene Oregon: Cascade Books, 2009.

Yamada, K. "A Rhetorical History: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles" in *Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, Edited by Stanley E. Porter and T.H. Olbricht. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Yang, Yan. "The Rich Ruler (Luke 18:18-30) and Chreia Rhetorical Practice in Roman Empire- Luke's Strategy to Exhort the Rich Ordo in Roman Society." *Asia Journal of Theology*, 26.1 (2012): 3-28.

Yassif, Eli. *The Hebrew Folktale: History, Genre, Meaning*. Translated by Jacqueline Teitelbaum. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2009.