

METHODS IN NEW TESTAMENT DISCOURSE ANALYSIS
by Matthew McDill

Discourse analysis (DA), or text-linguistics,¹ is a discipline within the field of linguistics² that has recently been employed as an approach to interpreting Scripture.³ George Guthrie defines linguistics as “the study of human language” and explains that it is “especially concerned with the ‘inner workings’ of language, or the various aspects of a language which must work together to accomplish an act of communication.”⁴ Discourse analysis is linguistic in that it attempts “to analyze a text as an act of coherent communication built on the basis of

¹Noting the different terms used to refer to this method, Jeffrey Reed suggests, “For the sake of consistency, NT discourse analysts should adopt the term ‘discourse analysis’ unless they are specifically doing the type of text linguistics found in older works.” Jeffrey T. Reed, “Discourse Analysis as New Testament Hermeneutic: A Retrospective and Prospective Appraisal,” *JETS* 39/2 (June 1996): 225. “Discourse Analysis” will be the term adopted for this paper.

²After discussing the linguistic areas of semantics, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics, Reed writes, “Discourse analysis involves all of the above disciplines of linguistics and several others.” Jeffrey T. Reed, “Modern Linguistics and the New Testament: A Basic Guide to Theory, Terminology, and Literature,” In *Approaches to New Testament Study*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs, 222–265 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 247. See also Lee Martin McDonald and Stanley E. Porter, *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000), 35.

³Reed and David Black both indicate that discourse analysis began to take shape as a discipline of biblical interpretation in the 1960’s. Reed, “New Testament Hermeneutic,” 226; and David Alan Black, *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 170. One of the earliest and best known introductions of DA into New Testament studies is that of Johannes P. Louw, “Discourse Analysis and the Greek New Testament,” *Technical Papers for the Bible Translator* 24/1 (January 1973): 101–118. See Stanley E. Porter, “Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey,” In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 14–35 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 22.

⁴George H. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 35.

identifiable principles of communication found in languages throughout the world.”⁵ Due to its linguistic nature, DA makes a unique contribution to biblical studies. First, it applies the results of the study of the use of language in general to biblical discourse. Second, in interpreting Scripture, discourse analysts maintain that the meaning of a discourse is best found in paragraphs and larger discourse units instead of just words, phrases and sentences.⁶ Especially for biblical studies, Guthrie provides a useful definition: discourse analysis is “a process of investigation by which one examines the form and function of all the parts and levels of a written discourse, with the aim of better understanding both the parts and the whole of that discourse.”⁷

However, discourse analysts admit that DA is difficult to define.⁸ Silva (who would not refer to himself as a discourse analyst) laments the confusion: “Part of the difficulty is that the term *discourse analysis* is being used by different scholars to describe a bewildering variety of different concerns. . . . Such diversity is unfortunate.”⁹ Reed admits that its diversity is the reason that it is difficult to define, but argues that “diversity does not necessarily spell its

⁵George H. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 39.

⁶Reed explains, “The discourse analyst is also guided by the tenet to examine language at a linguistic level larger than the sentence. This is perhaps the most distinguishing, if not best known, feature of the theory.” Reed, “New Testament Hermeneutic,” 231. See also George H. Guthrie, “Discourse Analysis,” In *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 256.

⁷Guthrie, “Discourse Analysis,” 255.

⁸Reed writes that DA is “not easily defined,” and that it is “one of the least well-defined areas of linguistics.” Reed, “New Testament Hermeneutic,” 223–24. Black explains that “discourse analysis is one of the least understood branches of biblical studies at present.” Black, *Linguistics for Students*, 138. Porter reasons, “It is difficult to define discourse analysis . . . since it is still emerging.” Porter, “Discourse Analysis,” 18.

⁹Moisés Silva, *Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 81.

demise,” instead it is “its greatest strength.”¹⁰ Discourse analysis is difficult to define partly because it does not have a unified methodology.¹¹ As Silva attempts to understand DA, he reports, “The more I read the more lost I feel. Every researcher seems to be following his or her own agenda—usually quite an expansive agenda.”¹²

In 1989, Peter Cotterell and Max Turner commented on “the tentative nature” of DA and that there are “no firm conclusions, no generally accepted formulae, no fixed methodologies, not even an agreed terminology.”¹³ Scott Kellum, in *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33*, mentions Cotterell and Turner’s complaint and writes that “the situation continues. . . . That uniformity is not forthcoming.”¹⁴ Guthrie agrees with this assessment, “Discourse analysis is just now making its way into New Testament critical methodology and is in great need of methodological and terminological development.”¹⁵

¹⁰Jeffrey T. Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, ed. Stanley E. Porter, vol. 136 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1997), 16.

¹¹“There is as yet no single methodology or agreed-upon terminology in discourse analysis.” D. F. Watson, “Structuralism and Discourse Analysis,” In *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments*, ed. Ralph P. Martin and Peter H. Davids (Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1997), 1132.

J. P. Louw describes many different approaches to literature that have been called “discourse analysis.” J. P. Louw, “Reading a Text as Discourse,” In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, ed. David Alan Black with Katharine Barnwell and Stephen Levinsohn (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 19.

¹²Moises Silva, “Discourse Analysis and Philippians,” In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 102.

¹³Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1989), 233. Likewise, Guthrie wrote, “Discourse analysis is just now making its way into New Testament critical methodology and is in great need of methodological and terminological development.”

¹⁴L. Scott Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33* (T & T Clark International: New York, 2004), 136.

In light of this need for methodological development, the purpose of this paper is to consider a number of methods in discourse analysis and to synthesize their various aspects into one coherent methodology. In order to accomplish this, several questions will be answered: 1) What is the object of discourse analysis? 2) Should the discourse analyst begin at the top or bottom level of the discourse? 3) What steps are involved in discourse analysis and what order should these steps be executed?

The Object of Discourse Analysis

Naturally, the first step of discourse analysis is to identify what portion of text will be analyzed. What do discourse analysts say constitutes a “discourse?” Some define a discourse broadly: it “might be a twenty-volume history of the world or a one-word exchange between a parent and child.”¹⁶ Although any act of communication can legitimately be called a discourse, what distinguishes DA from other linguistic disciplines is its concern with larger units of language.¹⁷ Therefore, in the context New Testament DA, a discourse is “a semantic unit of communication which is more than one sentence in length and forms a unified whole.”¹⁸

The importance of DA for biblical studies is that it is based upon the understanding that an author’s words and sentences are most accurately interpreted when considered in their context. Therefore the paragraph or pericope is often emphasized as the most basic unit for

¹⁵George H. Guthrie, “Cohesion Shifts and Stitches in Philippians,” In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 36–53 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 47.

¹⁶Reed, *Philippians*, 17. See also Porter, “Discourse Analysis,” 19.

¹⁷Michael Stubbs, *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language* (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1983), 1.

¹⁸Guthrie, *Structure*, 46. See also Black, *Linguistics for Students*, 138, 171.

understanding the intention of the author.¹⁹ Louw explains this move from the exegete's focus on the word and sentence to larger discourse units and concludes,

The ideal position seems to be that of the largest readily perceptible whole having homogeneity and cohesiveness, and *the pericope* is perhaps the suitable unit to meet this demand. . . . [It is] the smallest sensible unit of a discourse to be taken separately while still having some autonomy of its own and exhibiting its own peculiar structural pattern.²⁰

However, as Louw later indicates, one must not stop here.²¹ On choosing a text to investigate, Reed comments, "This will preferably be an entire discourse, from beginning to end, or if only part of a discourse, it should be explicitly studied in relation to the larger discourse."²² Guthrie also emphasizes a study of the entire discourse, "One need not have time to translate and analyze a whole discourse in order to use aspects of discourse analysis, but a deeper level of understanding will demand that the whole discourse be studied."²³

As one examines a whole discourse, it is important for him to understand that a discourse has various levels. These levels range from the smallest meaningful unit of the text, a morpheme, to the broadest cultural context, the language itself. Table 1 below is a modification

¹⁹Guthrie writes, "It is the paragraph, rather than the colon, which represents the basis for understanding the meaning of the author's main discourse." Guthrie, *Structure*, 47.

²⁰Louw, "Discourse Analysis," 103.

²¹"Therefore, while taking the pericope as the appropriate unit for discourse analysis, we should always be aware that this method is a practical one and not an end in itself. Pericopes as such link together forming larger units building towards the whole. In discourse analysis it may be advisable not only to note the relationships between sentences, but also those between pericopes." Louw, "Discourse Analysis," 103.

²²Jeffery T. Reed, "Discourse Analysis," In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 189-217 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), 194.

²³Guthrie, "Discourse Analysis," 261. Unfortunately many discourse analysts will consider a paragraph syntactically or semantically without considering its place within the entire discourse.

of a similar chart by Reed that depicts the relationships of the various levels of discourse to one another.²⁴

Table 1. Levels of Discourse

Standard Language/Code Variety of Language/Dialect Idiolect	Context of Culture
Genre/Register	Context of Situation
Discourse High-level Division Mid-level Division Paragraph Sentence Clause Phrase Word Morpheme	Co-text

These levels can be divided into two categories: Co-text, “linguistic units that are part of a discourse,” and Context, “extra-linguistic factors that influence discourse production and interpretation . . . context of situation . . . and the context of culture.”²⁵

These levels are related to one another in a hierarchical structure. Robert Bergen notes that at the co-text level, the discourse is “composed of successively smaller organizational units of language” and “each higher level of textual organization influences all of the lower levels of which it is composed.”²⁶ Phrases and words are best understood in the context of the paragraph

²⁴Reed, “Discourse Analysis,” 194-95. Table 1 is the same as his chart except for the addition of ‘morpheme’ as the smallest level and ‘mid’ and ‘high-level divisions’ between paragraph and discourse.

²⁵Reed, “Discourse Analysis,” 195.

²⁶Robert D. Bergen, “Text as a Guide to Authorial Intention: An Introduction to Discourse Criticism.” *JETS* 30/3 (September 1987): 329. Scott Kellum writes, “The higher structures place a

and the paragraph is best understood in the context of the discourse. This hierarchy again emphasizes the importance of analyzing larger units of text and entire discourses for accurate interpretation.

In addition to the various levels of discourse, there are also many aspects of a discourse that can be investigated (see below). This is one reason it seems that so many very different works are called discourse analysis. It is possible to do a discourse analysis of one or several different aspects of any number of levels of a discourse.²⁷ In the end, though, an understanding of the entire discourse is necessary. This paper seeks to propose a method for discourse analysis of an entire discourse at all levels.

Beginning at the Bottom

With these levels of discourse in mind, one may ask, Should the discourse analyst begin at the top or bottom level of the discourse? In one sense, he must start at the top because a certain understanding of the language (Standard Language/Code) is required to begin analyzing the text. Furthermore, whatever may be known about the author's particular use of language (idiolect) and the genre or context of situation is helpful as well.²⁸ Within the text itself (co-text), one might

constraint on the lower structures." Kellum, *Farewell Discourse*, 139. Robert Longacre agrees, "A macrostructure serves as a control on the content of the text."²⁶ Robert E. Longacre, "Towards an Exegesis of 1 John Based on the Discourse Analysis of the Greek Text," In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, ed. David Alan Black with Katharine Barnwell and Stephen Levinsohn, 271-286 (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 280-81.

²⁷For example, Reed examined the participants in 1 Timothy and prominence or theme in Philippians. See Jeffery T. Reed, "To Timothy or Not? A Discourse Analysis of 1 Timothy," In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 90-118 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) and "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, eds. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

²⁸ Reed, "New Testament Hermeneutic," 232.

think of starting at the top because of the hierarchy described above, reasoning that he can only understand the lower levels in light of the entire discourse.

However, any notions that an analyst may have about the author's idiolect, the context of situation, or the structure or theme of the overall discourse must ultimately be derived from and tested against a detailed investigation of the lower levels of the discourse. So the discourse analyst is faced with a situation in which the lower levels are best understood in light of the upper levels, but the upper levels cannot be known without a study of the lower levels. He must somehow approach the text from both the top-down *and* the bottom-up.

So where does he begin? By necessity, he must start at the bottom. Reed describes the process:

Discourse analysts advocate a bottom-up and top-down interpretation of discourse. The analyst might begin at the bottom with morphology, moving up through words, phrases, clauses, sentences and paragraphs/sections/pericopes (i.e. sequences of sentences and embedded sequences of sentences) until reaching the top—namely, the discourse. From here the direction would be reversed to see how the larger discourse influences paragraph construction and on down.²⁹

Guthrie agrees with this approach, but also points out that in practice it is not so neat.³⁰ “One must, in essence, move back and forth between the micro- and macrolevels of the discourse.”³¹ So one begins at the lowest level of the discourse in order to understand the discourse as a whole, he then examines the microstructure again in light of the macrostructure. At the microlevel, he begins by reading words made of morphemes. However, the lowest level that these words take

²⁹Reed, “Discourse Analysis,” 232.

³⁰“One moves from the smallest particulars of the text . . . until one reaches the level of the macro-discourse itself. . . . Then the process is reversed, moving from the highest level of the discourse back down through the discourse constituents.” Guthrie, “Discourse Analysis,” 259.

³¹Guthrie, “Discourse Analysis,” 260.

on the author's meaning is the colon. David Black writes, "The most convenient starting point for the analysis of a discourse is what Louw refers to as the *colon*, the most tightly structured syntactical unit."³²

A Working Method for Discourse Analysis

There are so many aspects of a discourse to analyze that it can become overwhelming.

Louw expresses it well,

There are numerous aspects to be recognized if one intends to read closely. Many readers, however, though they may think they read closely, will rarely stop and check whether all discourse features have been considered. Yet the more one considers, the more one can expect to infer from a text. What is important, however, is to be able to give account of the inferences. There are so many pitfalls that it may be asked whether a complete reading is at all possible.³³

If the discourse analyst agrees that "the more one considers, the more one can expect to infer from a text," he will want to examine every aspect of the discourse that he can. Although there are several writers that describe their methodologies, there does not seem to be any that incorporate all of the aspects of discourse analysis in a logically sequenced method.

The following working methodology is a synthesis of the methods described or executed by Jeffery Reed, Birger Olsson, J. A. Du Rand, David Black, J. P. Louw, John Beekman, John Callow, Robert Longacre, Stephen Levinsohn, George Guthrie, Stanley Porter, James Sawyer, Scott Kellum, and David Allen. As other works are discovered and written in the area of DA, this method will no doubt be modified. The most comprehensive and best organized methodology is presented by George Guthrie.³⁴ Much of his approach has been incorporated

³²Black, *Linguistics*, 139.

³³Louw, "Reading," 19.

³⁴See Gurthrie, "Discourse Analysis," *Structure*, and "Cohesion Shifts."

below. His method has been modified by changing the order of the steps, by adding several steps, and by adding many linguistic devices within those steps.

As indicated above, this proposed method begins from the bottom levels of the discourse and moves to the top, which take up the majority of the analysis. Then the direction is reversed and the discourse is analyzed from the top down, allowing the discourse theme and structure to govern the interpretation of the smaller units. Some discourse analysts begin by attempting to identify unit boundaries from a careful reading of the text and noting the obvious, surface level linguistic clues and content themes. However, a more accurate assessment of boundaries will result if one begins with a detailed study of the cola and moves up through the discourse.

The colon is considered first since it gives the lowest level of context necessary for meaning. A colon is made up of a subject and finite verb and the modifying words and phrases that are grammatically subordinate to them.³⁵ The relationships of the phrases within the cola and the relationships between the cola can be depicted in a syntactical diagram. In the diagram, the independent clauses are placed on the left margin and subordinate clauses and phrases are indented and placed under the word or phrase they modify without changing the word order of the text.³⁶ Then using the same diagram, the dissected parts of the cola are evaluated and labeled semantically (i.e. purpose, manner, means, result, exhortation, question, etc).³⁷ The final step at this level is to make note of the features that indicate prominence.

³⁵Black, *Linguistics*, 139.

³⁶Louw does this in “Reading A Text As Discourse,” and Guthrie explains his method in his *Biblical Greek Exegesis: A Graded Approach to Learning Intermediate and Advanced Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 27ff.

³⁷Guthrie provides a list of semantic categories and examples in *Biblical Greek Exegesis*, 43ff.

In the next step, identifying unit boundaries, one moves from the microstructure to the macrostructure. The analyst is beginning to discover the macrostructure (the overall structure of the discourse), but he is still working with data from the lower levels of the discourse. He identifies unit boundaries by making structural observations from the colon analysis, tracking cohesions shifts, identifying inclusions that mark the beginning and end of units, and by observing the special use of connectives or repeated phrases. Once these basic units are delineated, the analyst now returns to the colon analysis to identify the theme and main idea of each unit.

The next step is to determine the relationships between the units. This is done by observing the progression of the thought or narrative through the units and by identifying the semantic functions of the units in relation to one another (similar to the semantic analysis at the colon level). Next, using the same methods given above to determine unit boundaries and their relationships, the analyst identifies middle and higher level divisions that group smaller units together.

The next step includes an area of discourse analysis that is often neglected, pragmatics or the interpersonal dimensions of discourse. This step includes observations about the relationship between the author and audience, identification of rhetorical features the author uses to influence his audience, and a consideration of the situational context of the discourse. The analyst is now at the top level of the discourse and can consider the highest peaks or areas of prominence in the entire discourse, is able to name the discourse theme and main point, and can identify the genre or type of the discourse.

Finally, the discourse is now approached from the top down. This is done by reevaluating all boundary, theme, and semantic function assignments based on the overall

discourse theme and structure. Exegesis and exposition of units can now be carried out with the discourse structure and themes in mind. As one does a more thorough exegesis of the units, he may have to make even further adjustments to the syntactical and semantic structures.

Table 2. A Working Method for Discourse Analysis

Bottom-up

- 1) Analyze the cola.
 - a. Analyze the basic grammar of the text.
 - b. Identify the cola and their relationship to one another by creating a syntactical diagram.
 - c. Observe the semantic function of each clause and phrase.
 - d. Observe features of prominence.

[Features that may indicate prominence include verbal aspect, repetition of lexical or pronominal forms, word order, clause structure, the peaks of chiasmus structure, finite verbs, hendiadys, proportion (length of treatment), periphrastic repetitions, lists, hyperbole, hypobole, repetition of words in the same semantic field, verbal voice, noun-verb relations (1st/2nd person and sing. more prominent), and formal features of genre.]³⁸

- 2) Identify unit boundaries.
 - a. Make observations from the colon analysis that would indicate paragraph units.
 - b. Track cohesion shifts.

[Note changes in subject, genre, topic, time and location, actor, subject, tense, voice, mood, person, number, reference.³⁹ Also note lexical repetitions, repetition

³⁸See Guthrie, "Cohesion," 38; and M. James Sawyer, "An Analysis of the Larger Semantic Units of Galatians." Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978: Biblical Studies Press, 1998, <http://www.bible.org/docs/nt/books/gal/sawyer/gal-01.htm>, Appendix, Chart 3.

³⁹Guthrie suggests using a chart to track these changes. See the chart in Guthrie, "Cohesion," 53.

of words in the same semantic field,⁴⁰ lexical parallels, and grammatical parallels.⁴¹]

- c. Identify inclusions.
 - d. Observe special use of connectives or repeated phrases.⁴² Also note vocatives, imperatives, interjections, rhetorical questions, genitive absolutes, etc.⁴³
- 3) Name the topic and main idea for each unit.⁴⁴
- 4) Identify how the units relate to one another.
- a. Track the progression of thought or narrative through units.

[This progression may be indicated by logical association, change in time, place, actor, and referents, a unit that reiterates a theme introduced before, and transitional techniques.]
 - b. Identify semantic functions between units.
- 5) Identify higher level divisions.
- a. Note inclusions marking larger divisions.
 - b. Observe lexical cohesion between units.
 - c. Note transitional techniques between units.
 - d. Identify and diagram embedded units⁴⁵ and the themes of each unit and division.⁴⁶

⁴⁰See Guthrie, *Structure*, 50ff. Reed gives three types of word repetitions: “1. Co-reference – words referring to the same thing (pronouns, etc.). 2. Co-classification – words referring to items in the same class. 3. Co-extension – words referring to items in the same semantic field.” Reed, “Discourse Analysis,” 208ff.

⁴¹Sawyer, “Galatians,” Appendix, Chart 3.

⁴²Guthrie, “Cohesion,” 40.

⁴³Sawyer, “Galatians,” Appendix, Chart 3.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Guthrie, “Cohesion,” 41.

⁴⁶Sawyer, “Galatians,” Appendix, Chart 3.

- e. Note how each unit and division functions in larger divisions semantically.
 - f. Identify the introduction, body, and conclusion.⁴⁷
- 6) Observe interpersonal dimensions of discourse.
- a. Note how the author interacts with the audience.

[There are four essential interpersonal functions: offers, commands, statements, questions.⁴⁸ Study the interpersonal function of each clause to see how the author interacts with the reader.]
 - b. Analyze the discourse rhetorically.⁴⁹
 - c. Propose a possible situation context based on interpersonal dimensions as well as what may be known of the author, audience, and date of the discourse.
- 7) Note prominence above the paragraph level (peak).⁵⁰
- [Prominence will be indicated differently in narrative and non-narrative discourses. There are different levels of prominence (its domain).⁵¹ The linguistic indicators of prominence above should be considered here as well. In addition, certain boundary markers and connectives may indicate prominence for a particular paragraph.]
- 8) Identify the theme and main point of the discourse.⁵²
- 9) Identify genre (discourse type).

⁴⁷Sawyer, "Galatians," Appendix, Chart 3.

⁴⁸Reed, "Discourse Analysis," 203.

⁴⁹Olsson, 384-85. Black provides an extensive list of rhetorical devices for examination. Black, *Linguistics*, 132ff.

⁵⁰Sawyer, "Galatians," Appendix, Chart 3.

⁵¹Reed, "Theme," 80-81.

⁵²Reed writes, "An entire discourse, on the other hand, may not have just one theme. This is often true of New Testament discourses, especially those written in the epistolary genre."⁵² Reed, "Theme," 82.

Top-down

- 1) Reevaluate all boundary, theme, and semantic function assignments based on the overall discourse theme and structure.
- 2) Exegesis and exposition of units can now be carried out with the discourse structure and themes in mind.
- 3) As one does a more thorough exegesis of the units, he may have to make even further adjustments to the syntactical and semantic structures.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akin, Daniel L. "A Discourse Analysis of the Temptation of Jesus Christ as Recorded in Matthew 4:4-11." *Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics*.
- Allen, David I. "The Discourse Structure of Philemon: A Study in Textlinguistics." *Scribes and Scripture*. Ed. D. A. Black. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Beekman, Joh, John C. Callow, and Michael Kopeseć. *The Semantic Structure of Written Communication*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1981.
- Bergen, Robert D. "Text as a Guide to Authorial Intention: An Introduction to Discourse Criticism." *JETS* 30/3 (September 1987): 327-336.
- Black, David Alan. *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
- Black, David Alan with Katharine Barnwell and Stephen Levinsohn. *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- Callow, John. "Where Does 1 John End?" In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, 392-406. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Du Rand, J. A. "A Discourse Analysis of 1 John," *Neot* 13 1979: 1-42.
- Cotterell, Peter and Max Turner. *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1989.
- Guthrie, George H. "Cohesion Shifts and Stitches in Philippians." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 36-53. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- _____. "Discourse Analysis." In *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery, 253-271. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001.
- _____. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.

- Guthrie, George H. and J. Scott Duvall. *Biblical Greek Exegesis: A Graded Approach to Learning Intermediate and Advanced Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.
- Kellum, L. Scott. *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33*. T & T Clark International: New York, 2004.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. “Participant Reference in Koine Greek Narrative.” In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, ed. David Alan Black with Katharine Barnwell and Stephen Levinsohn, 31-44. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- Longacre, Robert E. *The Grammar of Discourse: Notional and Surface Structures*. New York: Plenum, 1983. 2nd ed. 1996.
- _____. “Towards an Exegesis of 1 John Based on the Discourse Analysis of the Greek Text.” In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, ed. David Alan Black with Katharine Barnwell and Stephen Levinsohn, 271-286. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- Louw, Johannes P. “Discourse Analysis and the Greek New Testament.” *Technical Papers for the Bible Translator* 24/1 (January 1973): 101-118.
- Louw, J. P. “Reading a Text as Discourse.” In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation*.
- McDonald, Lee Martin, and Stanley E. Porter. *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Olsson, Birger. “First John: Discourse Analysis and Interpretations.” In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, 369-91. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Porter, Stanley E. “Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey.” In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 14-35. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. “How Can Biblical Discourse be Analyzed?” In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 107-116. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- _____. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, ed. Stanley E. Porter, vol. 136. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997.

- _____. "Discourse Analysis." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 189-217. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- _____. "Discourse Analysis as New Testament Hermeneutic: A Retrospective and Prospective Appraisal." *JETS* 39/2 (June 1996): 223-240.
- _____. "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, eds. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. "Modern Linguistics and the New Testament: A Basic Guide to Theory, Terminology, and Literature." In *Approaches to New Testament Study*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs, 222-265. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. "To Timothy or Not? A Discourse Analysis of 1 Timothy." In *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 90-118. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Sawyer, M. James. "An Analysis of the Larger Semantic Units of Galatians." Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978; Biblical Studies Press, 1998, <http://www.bible.org/docs/nt/books/gal/sawyer/gal-01.htm>.
- Silva, Moises. "Discourse Analysis and Philippians." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. *Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Stubbs, Michael. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1983.
- Watson, D. F. "Structuralism and Discourse Analysis." In *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments*, ed. Ralph P. Martin and Peter H. Davids. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1997.