Journal of Language, Culture, and Religion

Article and Book Review Submissions:

Send to Managing Editor: todd_scacewater@diu.edu

Style Guidelines and Journal Scope:

Available at www.diu.edu/JLCR

Articles

Reviews

My God is enkAi: A Reflection of Vernacular African Theology

Joshua Robert Barron
  Africa International University
  joshua.robert.barron@gmail.com

Abstract: In the thirty-two years since Lamin Sanneh published *Translating the Message* (Orbis Books, 1989), there has been a growing awareness of the importance of vernacular languages in Christian life and practice. But it is often still assumed that Christian theologizing is not legitimate unless it is in a European language. In much of Africa, theological education only takes place in the languages of the colonizers—English, French, and Portuguese. This can result in African churches that are ill-equipped to speak relevantly to African situations, as leaders are trained to read, teach, worship, and pray in a foreign language, neglecting their own. Authentic African Christianity requires theologizing in local African languages and invoking God in the names of God in those languages. Though (ironically?) written in English, this paper examines what elements of a vernacular theology might sound like for the Maasai and Samburu peoples of East Africa, exploring the Maa and Sampur names for God and discovering insights for World Christianity as well.

Keywords: Vernacular Theology, Maasai, Intercultural Hermeneutics, Enkai

As the Starting Point of African Theology, "God has a Vernacular Name."[1]

Vernacular names for God not only tell us something of a people's conception(s) of God, but often reveal aspects of God's character. Jesus tells us that "every expert in the law who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the owner of a house who brings out of his treasure what is new and old" (Matthew 13:52, NET). When we know the Scriptures well, we bring treasures old in the faith to share as new treasures in Christ with our people. As Kwame Bediako reminds us, "Mother tongues and new idioms are crucial for gaining fresh insights into the doctrine of Christ" (1998, 111; see also Bediako 1995b). Historically Africans have "responded to Christian preaching by recognizing God in their 'pre-Christian' past and in their vernacular languages, even where there was no active cult of the Being named" (Walls 1996, 187). The task of African theology in particular is "to speak relevantly

---

[1] Walls 2016, 691.

to the contemporary African" (Tutu 1975, 369). This it can only do when "African Christians cease to regard Christianity as a 'white' religion and see it as part of them" (Waliggo 1975, 425). As long as our theologizing is limited to foreign languages, we are handicapped. This is why Nigerian theologian E. Bôlaji Idowu referred to the vernacular as *the key to the soul* (1969a, 24) and insisted "that the urgent predicament of the Church in Africa today is that of the apparent foreignness of Christianity" (1969b, 13). Likewise, Stephen Mutuku Sesi (2009, 32) observes that "it is impossible to contextualize the gospel using a foreign language." Indeed, the wide Christian adoption of the vernacular was no doubt a contributing factor to Christianity's lasting survival in Egypt and Ethiopia just as its ultimate disappearance from North Africa and Nubia was hastened by the lack of a similar degree of vernacularization (see Shenk 1993; Bowers 1985). Thus when we know and use our vernacular language and culture well, we bring out treasures old in our culture to share as new treasures in Christ with the Church at large, which is a gift to World Christianity. In this essay, I will examine traditional Maasai and Samburu names for God, exploring their potential both for enriching the theology of World Christianity and for enabling Maasai and Samburu Christians to develop a deeper understanding of their own faith as authentically Christian and authentically African.

"WE DO NOT KNOW WHAT WE BELIEVE UNLESS WE SAY IT IN OUR OWN LANGUAGE." —
JEAN MARC ÉLA (1988, 164)

Lamin Sanneh rightly insists that "[T]he Bible in the tongue of the people is a theological first step in the divine instruction of the human race" (2012, 35; see also Sanneh 1989 and Sanneh 2009). This necessarily includes the use of vernacular names for God. Such naming enables African followers of Jesus to develop "a doctrine of God that enriches the present Christian understanding of God in Africa" (Muzorewa 2000, 9). Among the Maasai and Samburu, closely related Nilotic peoples living in Kenya and Tanzania, that name (in the Maa language and related dialects) is **enkAi** (properly **ɛnkÁí**).[2] There are a few dialectic differences in pronunciation: **ɛŋkÁí** in Siria Maa (spoken in the Loitâî Hills) and Parakuyu / Baraguyu Maa (spoken primarily in Tanzania); **ŋkÁí** in Chamus Maa and Sampur (*aka* Samburu); and **ɛŋÁí** is sometimes heard in Kenya (Payne and Ole-Kotikash, 2008, s.v. **ɛnk-Áí**; Mol 1996, 3–4; Vossen 1998, 103; *Samburu Dictionary* 2019, 171) and is

---

[2] I am adopting the convention of capitalizing the root rather than the gender prefix, thus **ɛnkÁí** rather than **Ɛnkáí**. This orthographical convention is also used by a number of scholars (e.g., Frankl 1995, 203–204). I am using the adapted IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) notation of Doris Payne throughout (Payne and Ole-Kotikash, 2005, 2008), with the exception of retaining the convention of "ch" as in <u>church</u>, in keeping with the practice of most Maasai writers. In addition to having lived and worked among Maasai communities for fourteen years, I am especially indebted to both Payne and Ole-Kotikash's *Maa Dictionary* and to the published works of Frans Mol (esp. Mol 1996, Mol 1978, and Mol 1995).

common in Tanzania (where it is usually written as "Engai"; Nkesela 2020, 24). It is written as **Enkai** in the Maa Bible (BSM-1991; BSM-2018), **Nkai** in the Samburu New Testament (2019),[3] and often rendered as "Ngai" or "engai" by outsiders. Interestingly, the Bantu Agĩkũyũ, Chagga, and Kamba all use "Ngai" as the customary word for God, adapted from the Maa ɛnkÁí as a loanword (Adam 1997, 35; Hastings 1989, 104; Frankl 1995, 203–204). (Note that *Agĩkũyũ* refers to the people and *Gĩkũyũ* to their language; both are customarily anglicized as "Kikuyu," the Swahili name of the Gĩkũyũ language.) Of course, among Maasai Christians, "the traditional concepts of God" have been sufficiently Christianized that the name **Enkai** refers both to God as historically known by the traditional Maasai community and also to "the God of Christian worship" (Kombo 2007, 10) as known by Maasai believers. **ƐnkÁí** is a single and unique God, a heavenly entity, for both communities and is not conceptualized as one deity among many. Rather the traditional Maasai demonstrate "la croyance en un Dieu celeste unique" ("the belief in a single heavenly God," my translation; Neckebrouck 2002, 74). It is worth noting that the plural form of ɛnkÁí, **ɨnkáitin**, is all but unknown; I have never heard it and have only seen it as a translation of "gods" in the Maa Bible translations. Here I will focus on how the traditional Maasai and Samburu understandings of ɛnkÁí can enrich a Christian theology which is both biblical and vernacular.

"I will send rain for your land in its season, the autumn and the spring rains."
(Deuteronomy 11:14, NET)

Traditionally semi-nomadic pastoralists, the Maasai and Samburu would migrate with their herds based on the patterns of rain. Rain is, of course, crucial to life. As God gives rain, often in response to the prayers of people, sometimes ɛnkáí is used eponymously for moderate to heavy rains (Stoks 1999–2000, 86; Payne and Ole-Kotikash, s.v. ɛnk-áí; Mol 1996, s.v. enk-áí). This intimate connection between rain and the concept of God is common to many African peoples (Sawyer 1968, 25; Kombo 2007, 182–183; Mbiti 1970, 129–139; Kwesi 1984, 52). There is, however, no ontological confusion in the Maasai imagination between ɛnkÁí (*God*) who sends ɛnkáí (*rain*; though the generic term is ɛnchán). Linguist Doris L. Payne notes, "all my consultants reject identifying 'God,' 'the sky,' and 'rain' as the same thing, much as an English speaker would reject identifying 'nonurban countryside' and 'nation' as being the same thing, even though the word country is used for both concepts" (2003, 199). This is similar to usage by other Nilotic groups such as the Karamonjong, Turkana,

---

[3] While linguists recognize Sampur as a dialect of Maa, and while it is generally mutually intelligible with other dialects, it has sufficiently diverged from "standard Maa" (usually as represented by the Purko dialect) to warrant its own Bible translation; Purko and Sampur have a 70% linguistic overlap.

and Kipsigis/Kalenjin (Knighton 1999, 121; Fish and Fish 1996, 4–5). Broadly, **ɛnkÁí** can be understood as "She Who Brings Rain" (Hodgson 2005, 19–67). Sometimes the Maasai will say "**eshá ɛnkÁí**," *God is raining*, or even "**ɛnkÁí ɛsha ɛnkáí**," *God is raining rain* (cp. Assefa and Belachew 2017, 323).

ƐnkÁí is also traditionally associated with mountains and rivers. A culturally important mountain along the Tanzanian-Kenyan border is called **Oldóínyó lɛ́ nkÁí**, *the Mountain of God*; a somewhat active volcano. Beth E. Elness-Hanson discusses a Maasai comparison of this mountain with Mt Sinai in Exodus and Deuteronomy (2017, 117). The water provided by rivers provide life for both humans and livestock. When the rains are plentiful, the grass on which the livestock of the Maasai depend grows lush and green. Thus, another name of God is **Noompees**, "she of the growing grasses" (Voshaar 1998, 137). During the dry seasons, the Maasai herds retreat to the highland pastures, which keep them alive until the rains return. Perhaps this association of rivers and mountains with the upholding of life is why the Maasai conception of God is related to these geographical features. At any rate, **ɛnkÁí** is recognized as a giver of gifts, especially of children, cows, rain, milk, and life (see Hodgson 2005, 26–27). Etymologically **ɛnkÁí** may mean "She who gives life."[4]

This idea of the giving of gifts is retained in the connotation of the Kikuyu *Ngai*, who is recognized as "the divider of gifts among peoples" (Lonsdale 2002, 168; Kibicho 1975, 372). Given the long relationship between the (Bantu) Agĩkũyũ and the (Nilotic) Maasai (see Lawren 1968), including the Gĩkũyũ adoption of the Maa name for God, it is worthwhile to consider the Agĩkũyũ conception of God, which is similar to that of the Maasai:

> *God* (Ngai) is the Supreme being, creator of everything. He has neither father nor mother, lives alone in the sky and cannot be seen by the human eye. Sometimes He comes down to the earth where He dwells in different places. His favourite residence, however, is Mt. Kenya (in Kikuyu: Kiri-nyaga = the mountain of light). Ngai must not be troubled for matters of secondary importance but He must be invoked by the patriarchal family in the crucial moments of the life of a person (birth, circumcision, marriage and death). Moreover, in moments of crisis, such as famine and epidemic, the whole tribe had to implore in a communal way the Supreme Being through specific rituals, led by the elders. ... Lastly, the interaction between the two worlds, visible and invisible, is completed by the belief that *the Spirit of God permeates the world of the living and lifeless beings and is* [*the*] *exclusive source of good* (Bottignole 1984, 34).[5]

---

[4] See Jan Voshaar's long discussion on this etymology, paying especial heed to his footnotes (1998, 133–135; cp. Mol 1996, <u>enk-áí</u>; Payne and Ole-Kotikash 2008, <u>ɛnk-áí</u>). Hans Stoks, on the other hand, suggests a derivation from **ɛnkáré**, the Maa word for *water* (1990, 49).

[5] Italics are those of the author. Note the use of the masculine proverb "He" reflects traditional English usage rather than Gĩkũyũ practice.

MOTHERLY FATHER OR FATHERLY MOTHER?

The use of the feminine pronoun here may bring as much consternation to some in the West as it will bring delight to others. Is God engendered? Yes and no. God Godself transcends human sexuality. Words for "God" are grammatically engendered in many (but not all) languages. In Hebrew, אֵל (*El*) and אֱלֹהִים (*Elohim*) are grammatically masculine, even when referring to Ashtoreth, whom we know in English as "the goddess of the Sidonians" (1 Kgs 11:5, 33). In Greek, there is a masculine/feminine pair: θεός/θεά (*theós/theá*), god/goddess. In the NT and LXX, only the masculine form, *theós*, is used to refer to the God of Israel, who was revealed in Jesus, who was of course incarnate as a human male.

Due to the masculine gender of words for God and to God's taking to Godself the name "Father" in both Jewish and Christian revelation, some have (wrongly) developed the idea that God is ontologically male. Much feminist theology is rooted in the need to reject this error. There is also, of course, much feminine imagery for God in the Bible, such as God comparing Godself to a nursing mother who cannot forget the infant at her breast (Isa 49:15) and Jesus comparing himself to a mother hen protecting her chicks (Matt 23:37; Luke 13:34). Certainly, there are masculine attributes of male humans and feminine attributes of female humans which can be traced to masculine and feminine attributes of God, as both male and female humans are created in God's image. The Church would do well to remember that both fatherhood and motherhood are rooted in God. This can be done without falling into various mother-goddess heresies and idolatries. One striking example is the beautiful ancient Christian hymnody which sings of the believer "drinking pure spiritual milk from the breasts of Christ." Even more striking are the Syriac *Odes of Solomon* 8.14 and especially 19.1–11, which speak of God the Father's breasts being full of milk.

The Maa langauge does not have the engendered difficulties of contemporary English. In Maa, all nouns are grammatically engendered as masculine, feminine, or neuter. The gender is indicated by the articular prefix, which is always attached to the root in the absolute form. In the Maa word for "God," the ɛnk- of **ɛnkÁí** is a feminine prefix; this is in common with other Nilotic languages such as Kipsigis and NgaTurkana (cp. Mojola 2018 and Mojola 2019). As a result, the Maasai have no difficulty ascribing feminine characteristics to God. Among the traditional Arusha Maasai of Tanzania, **ɛnkÁí** is thought of as being "like a mother and a father" and women beseeching God for children sometimes address **ɛnkÁí** as **Yieyíô áí**, "my Mother" (Wagner-Glenn 1992, 129). Yet the Maasai do not envision **ɛnkÁí** / *God* as a sexualized goddess. Likewise, Christian Maasai can pray to **Papa ɛnkÁí te shumata** (*Father God in heaven*) without envisioning a being with male genitalia. Indeed, when it is suggested to Maasai that **ɛnkÁí** as Father is male or, given the grammatically feminine term, is female, the response is invariably either incomprehension of the question or incredulous laughter at

the thought. When the Maasai mock the idea of God having either a male or female sexuality, they are supported by no less than Gregory of Nazianzus, who in his day mocked those who drew from the assignation of a masculine pronoun to God (since θεος / *theos* is grammatically masculine) that God was therefore male (Nazianzen 1952; see Schmidt 1982). Instead, the Maasai recognize that God (ɛnkÁí) is neither male nor female but has both masculine and feminine attributes. The seemingly contradictory need not be mutually exclusive. As African theologian Charles Nyamiti reminds us, "God, being Spirit, is neither male nor female, so that there can be no question of literally applying sexual characteristics to God" (1997, 62).

The Maasai are also untroubled by the question of whether it is more appropriate to refer to God as "he" or "she." Indeed, for the Maasai "the question whether Enkai is He, God, or She, Goddess, or It, is a non-question" (Voshaar 1998, 136). Admittedly the grammatically masculine pronouns *he/him/his* are frequently applied to God in the Greek and Hebrew biblical texts. But again, the use of the grammatically masculine pronoun does not mean that God is inherently male. The Maa language has at least 221 pronouns, specifying not only 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person, number, and grammatical gender, but also such things as chronological or geographical distance from the speaker. But **ninyέ** does duty for the *he*, *she*, and *it* of English. Thus in verses in the Maa translation of the Bible, the third person pronouns, whether personal or possessive, are not gender-specific. Maasai who think in Maa but speak in English, however, will quite comfortably refer to God as "she," in grammatical agreement with the name **ɛnkÁí**. Drawing on African traditions from all over the continent, Mercy Amba Oduyoye confirms that "the African mind contains an image of a motherly Father or a fatherly Mother as the Source of Being" (2002, 95). This is also a fitting description of the Maasai theological worldview; traditional Maasai recognize that **ɛnkÁí** is "the source of everything" (Nkesela 2017, 40).

"IN THE BEGINNING, GOD CREATED THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH."

The Maa verb for *to begin* is <**aitέr**> and the word for earth or land is **ɛnkɔ́p**. Thus when a Maasai hears Genesis 1:1, he or she is likely to think of another traditional name for **ɛnkÁí**—**Naitέrʉkɔ́p**, the Beginner of the Earth.[6] **ƐnkÁí** is thought to live

---

[6] Some Maasai consider this to be a term applied to God, the equivalent of "Creator." Other Maasai consider **Naitέrʉkɔ́p**, literally "she-who-begins the earth" (spelled as either Naiterukop or Naiterokop in secondary literature) not as **ɛnkÁí** at all, but as the first human, the equivalent of "Adam" or perhaps rather of "Eve, the mother of all living." See also Aud Talle's discussion on different Maasai *Naiterukop* trandtions (1998, 129–131).

I should note that **Naitέrʉkɔ́p** is emphatically not the goddess consort of the "great god Ngai," in spite of popular western misconceptions, such as those embedded in the children's story *The Lion's Tail* by Douglas F. Davis, illustrated by Ronald Himler (New York: Atheneum,

in the sky (or heavens) and is known to have created the sky above and the earth below. So one name of **ɛnkÁí** is **ɔlÁítɔ́bírani**, the Maker or the Creator (derived from the verb **aitɔbír**, *to make something, to create*). Sometimes this word **ɔláítɔ́bírani** refers to traditional healers—the Maasai recognize that healing is something **ɛnkÁí** does. Thus healers properly and essentially do the work of God. The more common term, however, for a traditional healer is **ɔlabáani**, a

> Male healer or doctor for people or animals. He may perform surgery, may pray for people to get well, and may undo witchcraft. Traditionally he works from his home, waiting for those who come for treatment. He has acquired his position by virtue of effectively doing such work, and his work is life-long. (Payne and Ole-Kotikash, 2005, 2008; **ɔl-abáani**)

Likewise, an **ɛnkabáani** is a

> female healer or doctor; she may bless women in order to conceive and bear children. She works from her home, waiting for those who come for treatment. She is believed to have acquired her skills from God, and thus has a high position in society. (Payne and Ole-Kotikash, 2005, 2008; **ɛnk-abáani**)

One Maasai Christian worship song is called "**ƆlAbáani, ɔlAnyɔ́rrani.**" The first verse praises God as "Olabaani, Olanyorrani, Netonyorra pooki tung'ani otii enkop," *One-Who-Heals, One-Who-Loves, he has loved all the people who are on the earth* (Dan Crum 2000, 43).[7] (Note also that **nétɔ́nyɔ̄rrā** can be translated equally as "he loved" or as "she loved." I have used "he" here in grammatical agreement with the two nouns, which are grammatically masculine.) In Maasai Christian contexts, God is referred to as **ɔlAbáani** in recognition of God's being the healer of one's soul in the sense of נֶפֶשׁ (*nephesh*), body and heart. With this cultural background, we should not be surprised that Maasai Christians pray with New Testament expectations—they ask and expect to experience God's answers, and sometimes those answers include miraculous healings. If you attend a Maasai women's ministry conference, you are bound to hear many testimonies of healings—perhaps especially of healing from barrenness. Tellingly, women who have borne children are referred to as **ɛntɔ́mɔ́nɔ́ni** (pl., **intɔmɔnɔ́k**)—literally, "one who has prayed well" to **ɛnkÁí**. The proof that she has prayed well is obvious: **ɛnkÁí** has opened the womb of the supplicant and given her a child. It is common throughout Africa, of course, for African Christianity to appropriate Jesus as "giver of life" and as "the healer" (Middleton 2009, 72; Oduyoye 1986, 44).

1980). Such views are clearly based on facile "study" by those who view the Maasai as an exotic curiosity without investing time to know the people, culture, and language.

    [7] Other names, such as **ɔlAitɔ́riani** (*Lord, Ruler*), **ɛnkÁí, ɔlÁrámátani** (*One-who-tends/cares-for*), and **olChekût** (*Shepherd*) are also frequently used in songs of Maasai Christian worship.

Because **ɛnkÁí** answers prayers, one of the Maasai names for God is **Parsaí**, "the one who is to be worshiped, prayed to, beseeched, sacrificed to" (Payne and Ole-Kotikash 2008, s.v. parsaí).

"BELOVED, LET US LOVE ONE ANOTHER, FOR LOVE IS OF GOD AND EVERYONE WHO LOVES IS BORN OF GOD AND KNOWS GOD, FOR GOD IS LOVE."

Long before any missionary shared the Good News about Jesus (**Yesu** in Maa) with the Maasai, they were already speaking of **ɛnkÁí** as **ɔlAnyɔ́rrani**, "the One Who Loves" (grammatically masculine). Two traditional Maasai proverbs explain the nature of love (the Maa noun is **ɛnyɔ́rrátá**; the verb **anyɔ́rr**). "**Ɛbáíki nínyɔ̄r, nímīrēt**" can be translated as "Perhaps you love him/her, yet you don't help him/her." Within human relationships, it is quite imaginable that we profess love for someone and yet there is no actual demonstration of love. We say "we love you" but don't help the supposed beloved, and in fact we often harm instead (whether by sin of commission or sin of omission).

"**Mɛbáíki nínyɔ̄r, nímīrēt**" means "It cannot happen that you love him/her yet you don't help him/her." Thus our actions (or inactions) will belie our words. "The proof is in the pudding," as the traditional English proverb states. James writes "But someone will say, 'You have faith and I have works.' Show me your faith without works and I will show you faith by my works" (2:18, NET). Paul teaches us that "Love does no harm to its neighbor. Therefore, love is the fulfillment of the law" (Rom 13:10, NIV-1984). If we claim to love while either actively harming or refusing to assist, our actions prove that we do not in fact love. "**Mɛbáíki nínyɔ̄r, nímīrēt**." This proverb points to the strong Maasai value of relational reciprocity but also indicates that hate is a natural response to harm, not to love which does no harm; it is similar to the teaching that "we love because he first loved us."

A third proverb similarly asserts **mɛɛ́tai tɔ́nyɔrrai mááibá**—literally "it may not be [that] I loved you [with the result that] you hate me." The Maasai find it improbable that someone truly loving another results in the beloved returning hate to the lover. *It is not possible to love in merely word or sentiment. Love helps those who are loved.* Because the Maasai know this instinctively, they know God as **ɔlAnyɔ́rrani**, the One Who Loves.

In the Greek idiom, the deep compassion that one feels for the suffering is expressed by the verb σπλαγχνίζομαι (*splanchnídzomai*), "to be moved with compassion." Etymologically, we could say that one is "moved in one's guts [by compassion]"—the verb is derived from σπλάγχνα (*splánchna*), "guts, entrails." This verb is used of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:33) and is frequently used of Jesus (Matt; 9:36; 14:14; 15:32; 20:34; Mark 1:41; 6:34; 8:2; Luke 7:13) and is used parabolically of God the Father by Jesus (Matt 18:27; Luke 15:20). The Maasai refer to

God as **ɛnkÁí pʉsɔ́shɔ́kɛ**, etymologically "blue-stomach God" but meaning "the Compassionate God." This idiom for mercifulness or compassion, "blue-stomach" (**pʉsɔ́shɔ́kɛ**), is *only* used of God, never of humans. If a person is compassionate, it is said that his or her stomach is "white" (**ɛnk-ɔ́shɔkɛ**, *stomach*, refers to the internal organ, not to the skin of the abdomen). Thus our human compassion is but a pale shadow to the infinite compassion and mercy of **ɛnkÁí**. It is because God is the *Blue-Stomach God of Compassion* that God is God who acts, responding mercifully to us when we call out to God.

"I am the Good Shepherd."

The Maasai also address **ɛnkÁí** as **ɔlÁrámátani**, "the one who tends and cares." Recall that the Maasai are pastoralists, raising livestock (cows, sheep, and goats). The best known Maa word (among outsiders) for shepherd is **olchekût**; in the Maasai and Samburu cultural contexts, "shepherd" refers to the care of cows and goats as well as sheep. But **ɔlárámátani** is a common word for a human shepherd as well; **ɛnkárámátani** is a shepherdess or female caretaker. (Interestingly, even though the name **ɛnkÁí** is grammatically feminine, God is spoken of as **ɔlÁrámátani**, in the masculine declension, rather than as **ɛnkárámátani**, the feminine declension.) Thus when the Old Testament speaks of Yahweh as the "Shepherd of Israel" or when the Gospel speaks of **Yesu** (*Jesus*) as the "Good Shepherd" (either **ɔlÁrámátani sidai** or **olChekûk sidai**) who takes care (the verb is **aramát**) of his sheep, this both makes immediate sense to the Maasai and also confirms what their own culture tells them about the character of God.

"Unless Yahweh watches over the city, the watcher keeps guard in vain."

An **ɔlarríponi** is a guard, a watchman, a custodian; it is the equivalent of the KiSwahili **asakari**. The Samburu refer to **ɛnkÁí** as **ɔlArríponi**. The Samburu also name God as as Parsarúni, "O our refuge." Maasai Christians often conclude a testimony by saying **etorrípo ɛnkÁí** (God protected) or a farewell greeting with **mikitorrípo Yesu** (may Jesus protect you). Does this not remind us of Old Testament passages such as Ps 121:4, where God is called שׁוֹמֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל (Shomer Yisrael, the Guardian/Watcher of Israel)?

"… no one can say, 'Jesus is Lord,' except by the Holy Spirit." (1 Cor 12:3)
"… if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved." (Rom 10:9 NET)

Maasai and Samburu traditional society lacks kingship traditions, being more egalitarian than hierarchical in nature. Their society has been described as a democratic gerontocracy (Spencer 1965; see also Spencer 1998 and Spencer 2014). But Dorothy L. Hodgson has argued that patriarchalism in Maasai society developed

largely due colonial interference and that the society was formerly more egalitarian (Hodgson 2000a; Hodgson 1999; Hodgson 2005, ix–x). Consequently, the Maa language lacks lexemes equivalent to the English word pair king/kingdom—מֶלֶךְ (*melek*) / מַמְלָכָה (*mamlakah*) in Hebrew and βασιλεύς (*basileús*) / βασιλεία (*basileía*) in Greek. But Maa does have an approximate set of words which Bible translators have used for these ideas. The verb <**aitɔrɛ́**> means to exercise authority, rule, or command; the intransitive form is <**aitɔrisho**>. The noun **ɛnkitɔríá** means "authority" in Maa dialects and "command" in Sampur. In both the Maa and Samburu Bible translations, this is the term used for the biblical *mamlakah* and *basileús* ("kingdom"). One who exercises **ɛnkitɔríá** is **ɔlaitɔ́riani**, "the one who rules, the one who is in charge." (Similarly, in NgaTurkana —the Nilotic language spoken by the Turkana people of Northwest Kenya—**apolou** is either the result of the **ekapolon** doing, or the realm within which the **ekapolon** does, what is indicated by the verb **apolokin.** The Nilotic languages are not alone. In kiSwahili, **ufalme** is the result of the **mfalme** doing what is indicated by the verb **kufalme.**) The member of an ageset who is chosen to serve as **ɔlaigúɛnani** (literally, "the one who gives counsel" but often rendered in English as "chief") is said to be the **ɔlaitɔ́riani**, the ruler, of the ageset. This term is especially important for both vernacular ecclesiology and vernacular Christology among the Maasai who confess "**ɔlAitɔ́riani Yesu,**" *Jesus is Lord.*

"IN A DISCUSSION OF THE CHURCH AS A FAMILY, AGNATIC KINSHIP SYSTEMS ARE NOT
RELEVANT. BUT THE AGE-MATE KINSHIPS ARE GREATLY SO"
(HARRY SAWYERR 1968, 85–86).

There are two terms customarily used for "church" among Maasai Christians in Kenya. One is **enkanísa** and the other is **esírít** (*cohort* or *company* of warriors). **Enkanísa** is a loanword from the Swahili *kanisa*, in turn derived from the Arabic كنيسة (*kaniisa*), which today commonly means simply "church" but properly refers to a "congregation"; it is (or was) a straightforward translation of the Greek ἐκκλησία (*ekklēsía*). In ordinary usage, *kanisa* in Swahili and **enkanísa** in Maa often refer primarily to a "church building," much as "church" in common English usage.

Each Maasai generation is known as an **ɔlají**, or "ageset." This refers to a group of males who were circumcised within the same time period. (Females, regardless of their age, are assigned to their husband's ageset / **ɔlají** when they marry.) Traditionally, circumcision marks the end of boyhood and the beginning of manhood. After a period of ritual impurity and healing, the circumcised young men are recognized as **ilmúrrân** ("the warriors"; the singular is **ɔlmúrráni**) and celebrated as the strength, vitality, and protection of the Maasai community. Each **ɔlají** is organized into several **isírito** (the plural of **esírít**). The **ilmúrrân**

within each **esírít** live together in community, sharing everything—a common vision and purpose as well as material possessions, food, and drink—together in a radically egalitarian κοινωνία (*koinōnia*, "communitarian fellowship"). So **eSírít e Kristo**, usually translated as "the Church of Christ," literally means "the cohort of Christ." Often **esírít** refers to an individual congregation of the Church.

This is the cultural context in which Maasai Christians confess by the Holy Spirit that **ɔlAitɔ́riani Yesu** ("Jesus is Lord"). An **ɔlaitɔ́riani** does not rule over a kingdom or empire, however. The Maasai will say that "Ɔlaigúénani oshî ɔláítɔ́ríání lɔ́ lpɔ́rrɔ̄r lɛnyé" ("The chief, customarily speaking, is the ruler of his age-set"; Payne and Ole-Kotikash, s.v. ɔl-aitɔ́riani). Technically an **olpórrôr** is only half of an ageset (**ɔlají**), but **olpórrôr** can be used as a synecdoche to refer to the whole **ɔlají** (see below). Jesus, then, is **ɔlAitɔ́riani**, the one who rules over each cohort or congregation (**esírít**) of the Church.

> The Masai [*sic*] have a natural concept of the age-group (*ol-porror*) that can be used to teach the unity we have in Christ. *Ol-porror* has a rich conceptual heritage of unity and mutual love. On this concept of love for all men ... the Church can be built. With Christ as the head (*ol-aiguenani*) of the group (*ol-porror*), all men who love and follow Him, regardless of race or tribe, are brothers (*il-alashera*) living a new life of love, freedom, and unity (Benson 1971, 73–74).

Properly speaking, an ageset or age-group is **ɔlají**. An **olpórrôr** (*ol-porror*), or circumcision group, is half of an **ɔlají**. The "right hand" **olpórrôr** is the older half of a given **ɔlají** and the "left hand" **olpórrôr** is the younger half. Among Maasai Christians in Tanzania, **orpórrôr**[8] **lɛ́ nkÁí** (*the circumcision-group of God*) is a common name for the "new brotherhood" of the Church (Mtaita 1998, 162–164). The term **ɔlaigúénani**, typically translated as "chief" and serving to translate the Hebrew *melek* and Greek *basileús* ("king") in Biblical texts means something more like "counselor" or "spokesman," being derived from the verb **aigúén**, "to advise" or "to give counsel with wisdom."

Harry Alphonso Ebun Sawyerr (1909–1986) of Sierra Leone, an important pioneer of modern African Christian Theology, has sharply criticized the adoption of terminologies of traditional Africa chieftainships for Christologies of Christ as Chief as unsuitable (1968, 72–73). This critique is not particularly relevant, however, to this proposed **ɔlAigúénani** Christology, as the Maasai **iláígúénák** (the plural form) have little similarity to the Bantu chieftainships which Sawyerr was discussing. Indeed, the translation of "chief" for **ɔlaigúénani** has more to do with the desire of the British imperialists to find a chief or king with which to treat than with the semantic domain of the term. But as noted above, traditional Maasai

---

[8] In many dialects of Maa, the liquids -l- and -r- in the masculine articular prefixes are interchangeable; **ɔl-** = **ɔr-**, **ol-** = **or-**, etc.

polity was more democratic in nature and this traditional role is distinct from that of **iláígúénák** who are "chiefs" politically appointed by the Kenyan or Tanzanian governments, a holdover from the colonial period.

Among the Maasai, an **ɔlaigúénani** is a "traditional life-long leader of an [**olpórrôr**; *circumcision group*] who advises members of his [**olpórrôr**], arbitrates disputes, and presides over meetings or ceremonies" (Payne and Ole-Kotikash 2008, s.v. ɔl-aigúénani). Thus each **ɔlají** has two **iláígúénák** (the plural of **ɔlaigúénani**), one **ɔlaigúénani** for each **olpórrôr**. Once an **ɔlají** has advanced beyond **múrránó** ("murranhood," the period of being warriors), the two **ilpórrôrî** (the plural of **olpórrôr**) are combined, and both **iláígúénák** must be consulted for matters that effect the whole **ɔlají**. The Church, of course, has but one **ɔlAigúénani**, [9] **Yesu Kristo** (Jesus Christ), who united and unites all the generations as one. It is worth noting that "to all generations" (εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς / *eis pásas tàs geneàs*) in the benediction in Ephesians 3:20–21 becomes "too lporori pooki" (phonetically **tɔɔ́ lpórórî pɔɔkí**) in the Maa Bible. Thus "all generations" is "all **ilpórórî**" (the plural of **olpórrôr**, one half of an **esírít**, an ageset or a generation). The word "church" (ἐκκλησία / *ekklēsía*) in these verses becomes **esírít**. As **ɔlAigúénani**, Jesus unites in himself all generations and all congregations in all places, breaking down the dividing walls of hostility.

<div align="center">

ɛNKÁÍ PARMÚÀÌN—THE GOD OF MANY COLORS

</div>

Paul refers to the multi-colored wisdom of God in Ephesians 3:10. He took the common term ποικίλος (*poikílos*), used in the LXX of Genesis 37:3 to describe Joseph's "variegated" or "many colored" garment, and adds the intensifying and multiplying prefix πολυ- (*polu-*; often transliterated as *poly-*) to coin a new term to describe the multi-variegated, multifaceted, or even multidimensional nature of God's wisdom: πολυποίκιλος (*polupoíkilos*). The "manifold wisdom of God" (so KJV, RSV, ESV, NIV, NASB, *et al.*) approaches the sense but could be stronger. The NET with "multifaceted wisdom" and the NLT with "wisdom in its rich variety" do better. The Maasai address God as *Parmúàìn*, "O One-of-so-many-colors," to refer to their theological belief that God both has many attributes and is in control of all circumstances, whether those are experienced as good or bad. Thus the Maasai speak of **ɛnkÁí nányókíé**, "God who is red," to refer to God's anger or to God as the Master of Life and Death and as **ɛnkÁí nárɔk**, "God who is black," to refer to God's goodness and blessing.[10]

---

[9] In the Christian tradition, the Holy Spirit is also known as a Counselor, a common translation of παράκλητος / *paráklētos*, whence "Paraclete"; in the Maa Bible, however, another word for counselor or guide is used when referring to the Holy Spirit, **olAutaroni**.

[10] A number of western commentators have taken this to refer to two different gods (**inkáitin**), but this likely represents a shallow knowledge of Maa language and culture.

Parmúàìn indicates that God is able to cause anything of any colour to happen or to come to existence. God is in charge of all seasons: the dry season mostly signified by dry brown bushes, grass and trees that have shed all their leaves and the animals that are poor in health; the wet season signified by green grass, bushes and flowering shrubs, trees that have green leaves, and animals that are generally healthy and giving birth to new animals. In all situations, the people are simply telling God that "You are in charge of everything, and have the power to change every shade/colour of life." The people are asking for God's help, for example, especially to change a bad situation (so A. Keswe Mapena ole Lekutit, in Payne 2003, 185–186; and in Payne and Ole-Kotikash 2008, s.v. Parmúain).

As with **ɛnkÁí pʊsɔ́shɔ́kɛ**, the name *Parmúàìn* is only used of **ɛnkÁí** and is never applied to people. When Maasai begin a prayer with "**NáAí Parmúain … ** " they are recognizing the *polupoíkilos* reality of God's nature—God's transcendence and immanence, God's justice and mercy.

"Kara nanu ilo Ora (I am who I am)"

We have seen that many of the Maasai cultural names for God are similar to biblical language for God in the OT and NT, such as God as Shepherd, Guard, Refuge, and Healer. But what about the divinely revealed name יהוה (*YHWH*)? When it comes to handling יהוה in either Bible translations or Christian speech, there are three competing options. This name can be transliterated (e.g., as *Yahweh*), there can be an attempt at translating the presumed meaning of the name based on Exodus 3:14, or the translators can follow the venerable tradition of pretending to read אֲדֹנָי (*ʾǎdōnāy*), δεσπότης (*despótēs*), or κύριος (*kúrios*) when יהוה appears in the OT text. Most English translations opt for Lord or LORD to represent the divine name YHWH.

The first Maa Bible (BSM-1991) was translated from the RSV, with occasional reference to the Living Bible paraphrase, with no reference to the biblical languages. So the established English tradition of using "LORD" was of course continued, yielding "Olaitoriani" (Ɔlaɨtɔ́riani; Maa versions do not use IPA orthography). The revised and corrected Maa Bible (BSM-2018) retained this usage.[11] To the best of my knowledge, this is the route that has been followed in other Nilotic languages, including the Sampur NT. For NgaTurkana, the case is identical to the Maa—the NgaTurkana Bible (*Abibilia Ngakiro Naajokak* 2001) was

---

[11] I was a translation consultant for the recent corrected edition (*Biblia Sinyati* 2018) and argued for a strong vernacularization of the new translation. But some things, like the "Olaitoriani" and a transliteration instead of a translation of all of the βαπτιζ- terms, was too firmly established to challenge successfully. My suggestion to at least capitalize the term as Olaitoriani or OLAITORIANI to inform alert readers where יהוה/*Yahweh* is the underlying name of God in Hebrew was not followed. See also Elness-Hanson 2020.

translated from the GNB/TEV, and so "LORD" appeared for YHWH, yielding **Ekapolon** which is roughly analogous with Ɔlaitɔ́riani in Maa. For Rendille, the NT translation is still underway and the OT hasn't yet been begun. The Kalenjin translation follows suit—the English title "Lord" is more or less translated. In Exod 3:14 in BSM-1991, אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה ("I Am Who I Am") was rendered as "ARA NANU ILO ORA," literally *I-am I that-[previously-mentioned-one] who-is*. In the corrected edition (BSM-2018), this was changed slightly to "KARA NANU ILO ORA;" the addition of the *k-* prefix can indicate a future aspect. For the second phrase, "I AM has sent you," אֶהְיֶה is translated in the first edition as "ARA NANU" (*I AM*) and in the second as "ILO ORA" (*THAT ONE WHO IS*). In my forthcoming Maa-language introduction to the Bible, I include a discussion of these translation issues.

> "… THE CHRISTIAN HAS SOMETHING TO LEARN FROM THE TRADITIONAL AFRICAN;
> NOT IN THE SENSE OF NEW DOCTRINES, BUT IN THE SENSE OF NEW INSIGHTS
> AND NEW WAYS OF UNDERSTANDING GOD" (NYAMITI 1977, 57).

It is in the use of vernacular names, themes, and imagery that we can see that "Christianity in Africa is a truly African experience" (Bediako 2004, 11). The rich variety of names for God in various African contexts, and even within the single context of the Maasai, reflects the "infinite translatability of the Church [and] of Christianity in general" (Kwiyani 2020, 126). As an important "task of African theology is to interpret concepts of God in such a way that African believers feel a natural closeness to the one God" (Muzorewa 2000, 10), an exploration of these different Maasai names for God can help the Maasai Church grow in theological maturity and to become more deeply rooted in Scripture. Kwame Bediako observed that, in Ghana, "the God of the Bible turned out to be the God whose name has been hallowed in vernacular usage for generations" (1995, 55). That is certainly true in the Maasai and Samburu contexts in Kenya and Tanzania as well. But the vernacularization of Christianity in Africa has ramifications beyond the Church in Africa. World Christianity without the contributions of African Christianity (and thus of African cultures and languages) is impoverished. Harry Sawyerr notes that "the Christianization of Africa should mean not only a transplantation of cultures from cultures foreign to Africa but the integration of African culture into the fabric of humanity, thereby adding a new dimension to the already complex polyhedral" (1968, 80).

At the beginning of this essay, I observed that when we know and use our vernacular language and culture well, we are able to bring out from our storehouse treasures old in our culture to share as new treasures in Christ with the Church at large. In using the term "storehouse," in addition to the obvious allusion to Matt 13:52, I am thinking here of the Maa translation of Ps 119:11, "Atushuma

nanu Ororei lino to ltau lai pee maas ng'oki ake tialo iyie" (Olkerempe Le Nkai 119:11, BSM-2018). Here the verb "atushuma" (the past tense of **ashúm**) is both a more accurate and richer translation of the Hebrew צָפַנְתִּי (*ṣāpanĕtî*) than the customary English rendering, "I have hidden." The usual word for "to hide" in Maa is **aisudoó** (and related cognates), which is roughly analogous to the English term. But **ashúm**, similar to the Hebrew צָפַן (*ṣāpan*), has the sense of "to store up provisions in a safe place in order to have immediate access to them when they are needed." When we store up deep reflections both on the insights of vernacular language and culture and on the words of Scripture, our theologizing is prepared to serve the needs of the African churches.[12] I hope that this modest attempt to explore what a Maasai or Samburu vernacular theology might sound like will both encourage other practitioners to embrace and celebrate the use of mother-tongues in African churches and will encourage my Maasai and Samburu siblings-in-Christ to make full use both of Maa culture and language and the Scriptures as they build up the **eSírít e Kristo** in Maasailand and Samburuland. As both groups do so, may they be found faithful stewards who bring out of the storehouse many treasures both old and new.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

Abibilia Ngakiro Naajokak. 2001. The Bible in Turkana. Nairobi: The Bible Society of Kenya.

Adam, Michel. 1997. "Espace et temps chez les Kikuyu du Kenya." *L'Homme* 37 (142): 33–48.

Aguilar, Mario I., ed. 1998. *The Politics of Age and Gerontocracy in Africa: Ethnographies of the Past & Memories of the Present.* Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Assefa, Daniel and Tekletsadik Belachew. 2017. "Values Expressed through African Symbols: An Ethiopian Theological Reflection." *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 41 (4): 312–324.

Barron, Joshua Robert. 2019. "Lessons from Scripture for Maasai Christianity, Lessons from Maasai Culture for the Global Church." *Priscilla Papers* 33 (2): 17–23.

Bediako, Kwame. 2004. *Jesus and the Gospel in Africa: History and Experience.* Theology in Africa Series. Intro. Hans Visser and Gillian Bediako. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Bediako, Kwame. 1998. "The Doctrine of Christ and the Significance of Vernacular Terminology." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 22 (3): 110–111.

Bediako, Kwame. 1995a. *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion.* Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

---

[12] For further examples of this, see my discussions on "Osotua: The Tie that Binds," "Esiankiki Nirikitoi" and "Olopolosu Esita: The Fence-Remover" (Barron 2019, 20–21).

Bediako, Kwame. 1995b. "'How Is It That We Hear in Our Own Languages the Wonders of God?' Christianity as Africa's Religion." Chapter 4 in *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*, 59–74. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Benson, Stanley. 1971. "Christian Communication Among the Masai." *Africa Theological Journal* 4: 68–75.

Biblia Sinyati: te nkutuk oo lMaasai o natisiraki eng'ejuk. 2018. Nairobi: The Bible Society of Kenya. (Abbreviated as "BSM-2018.")

Biblia Sinyati: te nkutuk oo lMaasai o sotua musana o sotua ng'ejuk. Nairobi: The Bible Society of Kenya, 1991 / Dodoma: The Bible Society of Tanzania, 1991. (Abbreviated as "BSM-1991.")

Bottignole, Silvana. 1984. *Kikuyu Traditional Culture and Christianity*. Nairobi: Heinemann Educational Books. (First published in Italian as *Una Chiesa Africana si Interroga: Cultura tradizionale Kikuyo e Cristianesimo*. Brescia, Italy: Editrice Morcelliana, 1981.)

Bowers, Paul. 1985. "Nubian Christianity: The Neglected Heritage." *East African Journal of Evangelical Theology* 4 (1): 3–23.

Crum, Dan (ole Kijabe), ed. 2000. *Emataranyaki Enkai: Isinkolioitin Te Nkutuk e Maa*. 3rd ed. Nairobi, Kenya: Kenya Church of Christ.

Dickson, Kwesi A. 1984. *Theology in Africa*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books; London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Dickson, Kwesi A. and Paul Ellingworth, eds. 1969. *Biblical Revelation and African Beliefs*. London: Lutterworth Press / United Society for Christian Literature; Nairobi: All Africa Conference of Churches.

Éla, Jean Marc. 1988. *My Faith as an African*. Translated by John Pairman Brown and Susan Perry. Foreword by Simon E. Smith. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Elness-Hanson, Beth E. 2020. "YHWH in the KiMaasai Bible." Chapter 8 in *Maasai Encounters in the Bible*, edited by Knut Holter and Lemburis Justo, 121–145.

Elness-Hanson, Beth E. 2017. *Generational Curses in the Pentateuch: An American and Maasai Intercultural Analysis*. Bible and Theology in Africa 24. Ed. Knut Holter. New York: Peter Lang.

Fasholé-Luke, Edward, Richard Gray, Adrian Hastings, and Godwin Tasie, eds. 1975. *Christianity in Independent Africa*. London: Rex Collings.

Fish, Burnette C. and Gerald W. Fish. 1995. *The Kalenjiin Heritage: Traditional Religious and Social Practices*. Kericho, Kenya: Africa Gospel Church.

Frankl, P. J. L. 1995. "The Word for 'God' in Swahili: Further Considerations." *Journal of Religion in Africa* 25 (2): 202–211.

Greenman, Jeffrey P. and Gene L. Green, eds. 2012. *Global Theology in Evangelical Perspective: Exploring the Contextual Nature of Theology and Mission*. Wheaton Theology Conference Series. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic.

Hastings, Adrian. 1989. *African Catholicism*. London: SCM Press.

Hodgson, Dorothy L. [Louise]. 2005. *The Church of Women: Gendered Encounters Between Maasai and Missionaries*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hodgson, Dorothy L. 2000a. "Pastoralism, Patriarchy, and History among Maasai in Tanganyika, 1890–1940." Chapter 4 in *Rethinking Pastoralism in Africa: Gender, Culture & the Myth of the Patriarchal Pastoralist*, edited by Dorothy L. Hodgson, 97–120. Oxford: James Currey.

Hodgson, Dorothy L., ed. 2000b. *Rethinking Pastoralism in Africa: Gender, Culture & the Myth of the Patriarchal Pastoralist*. Oxford: James Currey.

Hodgson, Dorothy L. 1999. "Pastoralism, Patriarchy and History: Changing Gender Relations among Maasai in Tanganyika, 1890–1940." *The Journal of African History* 40 (1): 41–65.

Idowu, E. Bolaji. 1969a. "God." Chapter 1 in *Biblical Revelation and African Beliefs*, edited by Kwesi A. Dickson and Paul Ellingworth, 17–29. London: Lutterworth Press / United Society for Christian Literature; Nairobi: All Africa Conference of Churches.

Idowu, E. Bolaji. 1969b. "Introduction." In *Biblical Revelation and African Beliefs*, edited by Kwesi A. Dickson and Paul Ellingworth, 9–16. London: Lutterworth Press; United Society for Christian Literature; Nairobi: All Africa Conference of Churches.

Kibicho, Samuel G. 1975. "The Continuity of the African Conception of God into and through Christianity: S Kikuyu Case-study." In *Christianity in Independent Africa*, edited by Edward Fasholé-Luke, Richard Gray, Adrian Hastings, and Godwin Tasie, 371–388. London: Rex Collings.

Knighton, Ben. 1999. "The Meaning of God in an African Traditional Religion and the Meaninglessness of Well-meaning Mission: The Experience of Christian Enculturation in Karamoja, Uganda." *Transformation* 16 (4): 120–127.

Kombo, James Henry Owino. 2007. *The Doctrine of God in African Christian Thought: The Holy Trinity, Theological Hermeneutics and the African Intellectual Culture*. Studies in Reformed Theology 14. Leiden: Brill.

Kwiyani, Harvey. 2020. *Multicultural Kingdom: Ethnic Diversity, Mission and the Church*. Norfolk, England: SCM Press.

Lawren, William L. 1968. "Masai and Kikuyu: An Historical Analysis of Culture Transmission." *The Journal of African History* 9 (4): 571–583.

Lning'o Ng'ejuk to nkutuk ee Sampur. 2019. Nairobi: Bible Translation and Literacy (E. A.). (Abbreviated as "Sampur NT.")

Lonsdale, John. 2002. "Kikuyu Christianities: A History of Intimate Diversity." Chapter 6 in *Christianity and the African Imagination: Studies in Honour of Adrian Hastings*, edited by David Maxwell with Ingrid Lawrie, 157–197. Studies of Religion in Africa. Leiden: Brill.

Maxwell, David with Ingrid Lawrie, eds. 2002. *Christianity and the African Imagination: Studies in Honour of Adrian Hastings*. Studies of Religion in Africa. Leiden: Brill.

Mbiti, John S. 1970. *Concepts of God in Africa*. London: SPCK.

Mbuku e kipirte ee rereii le nkutuk ee Sampur: Samburu Dictionary. 2019. Nairobi: Bible Translation and Literacy (E. A.). (Abbreviated as "*Samburu Dictionary*.")

Middleton, Darren J. N. 2009a. "Jesus of Nazareth in Ghana's Deep Forest: The Africanization of Christianity in Madam Afua Kuma's Poetry." Chapter 5 in *Mother Tongue Theologies: Poets, Novelists, Non-Western Christianity*, edited by Darren J. N. Middleton, 61–76. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications.

Middleton, Darren J. N., ed. 2009b. *Mother Tongue Theologies: Poets, Novelists, Non-Western Christianity*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications.

Mojola, Aloo Osotsi. 2019. "The Power of Bible Translation." *Priscilla Papers* 33 (2): 3–7.

Mojola, Aloo O. [Osotsi]. 2018. "Bible translation and gender, challenges and opportunities —with specific reference to sub-Saharan Africa." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 39 (1): Article 1820, 9 pages.

Mol, Frans. 1996. *Maasai Language and Culture.* Lemek, Kenya: Maasai Centre Lemek.

Mol, Frans. 1995. *Lessons in Maa: A Grammar of Maasai Language*. Lemek, Kenya: Maasai Centre.

Mol, Frans. 1978. *Maa: A Dictionary of the Maasai Language and Folklore: English-Maasai.* Nairobi: Marketing & Publishing Ltd..

Muzorewa, Gwinyai H. 2000. *The Origins and Development of African Theology*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock.

Mtaita, Leonard A. 1998. *The Wandering Shepherds and the Good Shepherd: Contextualization as the Way of Doing Mission with the Maasai in the ELT – Pare Diocese*. Mukumira Publication 11. Erlanger, Germany: Erlanger Verlag für Mission und Ökumene / Arusha, Tanzania: The Research Institute of Mukumira University College.

Nazianzen, Gregory. 1952. *The Fifth Theological Oration, On the Holy Spirit* (*Oration 31*). Trans. Charles Gordon Brown and James Edward Swallow. NPNF. 2nd Series. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Vol. 7, 439–443. Edinburgh: T & T Clark; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Neckebrouck, V. [Valeer]. 2002. *Les Maasai et le christianisme: Le temps du grand refus*. Annua Nuntia Lovaniensia 41. Leuven: Peeters.

Nkesela, Zephania Shila. 2017. "A Maasai Encounter with the Bible: Nomadic Lifestyle as a Hermeneutical Question. PhD Dissertation. Stavanger, Norway: VID Specialized University.

Nkesela, Zephania Shila. 2020. *A Maasai Encounter with the Bible: Nomadic Lifestyle as a Hermeneutic Question*. Bible and Theology in Africa 30. New York: Peter Lang.

Nyamiti, Charles. 1997. "The Doctrine of God." Chapter 6 in *A Reader in African Christian Theology*, ed. John Parratt, 57–64. 2nd ed. International Study Guide 23. London: SPCK.

Oduyoye, Mercy Amba. 2002. *Beads and Strands: Reflections of an African Woman on Christianity in Africa*. Theological Reflections from the South. Akropong-Akuapem, Ghana: Regnum Africa.

Oduyoye, Mercy Amba. 1986. *Hearing and Knowing: Theological Reflections on Christianity in Africa*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Parratt, John, ed. 1997. *A Reader in African Christian Theology*. International Study Guide 23. 2nd ed. London: SPCK.

Payne, Doris L. 2003. "Maa Color Terms and Their Use as Human Descriptors." *Anthropological Linguistics* 45 (2): 169–200.

Payne, Doris L., Leonard Ole-Kotikash, *et al.* 2005, 2008. *Maa Dictionary: Maasai* (*IlKeekonyokie, IlPurko, IlWuasinkishu*) *and Samburu*. Eugene: University of Oregon. https://pages.uoregon.edu/maasai/Maa%20Lexicon/lexicon/main.htm.

Sanneh, Lamin. 2012. "The Significance of the Translation Principle." Chapter 2 in *Global Theology in Evangelical Perspective: Exploring the Contextual Nature of Theology and Mission*, edited by Jeffrey P. Greenman and Gene L. Green, 35–49. Wheaton Theology Conference Series. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic.

Sanneh, Lamin. 2009. *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*. American Society of Missiology Series 13. 2nd edition, revised and expanded. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Sanneh, Lamin. 1989. *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*. American Society of Missiology Series 13. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Sanneh, Lamin and Michael J. McClymond, eds. 2016. *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to World Christianity*. Wiley Blackwell Companions to Religion. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Sawyer, Harry. 1968. *Creative Evangelism: Towards a New Christian Encounter with Africa*. London: Lutterworth Press.

Schmidt, Gail Ramshaw. 1982. "De Divinis Nominibus: The Gender of God." *Worship* 56 (2): 117–131.

Sesi, Stephen Mutuku. 2009. "Ethnic Realities and the Church in Kenya." Chapter 2 in *African Missiology: Contribution of Contemporary Thought*, 25–39, by Stephen Mutuku Sesi, Henry Mutua, Alemayehu Mekonnen, Steven Rasmussen, Mark Shaw, Josephine Mutuku Sesi, and Caleb Chul-Soo Kim. Preface by Caleb Chul-Soo Kim. Forward by Douglas Carew. Nairobi: Uzima.

Sesi, Stephen Mutuku, Henry Mutua, Alemayehu Mekonnen, Steven Rasmussen, Mark Shaw, Josephine Mutuku Sesi, and Caleb Chul-Soo Kim. 2009. *African Missiology: Contribution of Contemporary Thought*. Preface by Caleb Chul-Soo Kim. Forward by Douglas Carew. Nairobi: Uzima.

Shenk, Calvin E. 1993. "The Demise of the Church in North Africa and Nubia and Its Survival in Egypt and Ethiopia: A Question of Contextualization?" *Missiology* 21 (2): 133–54.

Spencer, Paul. 2014. *Youth and Experiences of Ageing among Maa: Models of Society Evoked by the Maasai, Samburu, and Chamus of Kenya*. Berlin: De Gruyter Open.

Spencer, Paul. 2004a. *The Maasai of Matapato: A Study of Rituals of Rebellion*. International African Library. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998; New York: Routledge.

Spencer, Paul. 2004b. *The Samburu: A study of gerontocracy*. Routledge Classic Ethnographies. New York: Routledge. (Reprint of 1st edition, 1965.)

Stoks, Hans. 1990. "Enkai, La Réalité Humide des Maasai." *Initiations* 2: 47–52.

Stoks, Hans. 1999–2000. "Hemelen Dauwt: 'God' in de Oostafrikaanse Savanne," *Prana* 116: 85–91.

Talle, Aud. 1998. "Female and Male in Maasai Life: Aging and Fertility." Chapter 4 in *The Politics of Age and Gerontocracy in Africa: Ethnographies of the Past & Memories of the Present*, edited by Mario I. Aguilar, 125–149. Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Tutu, Desmond M. 1975. "Whither African Theology?" In *Christianity in Independent Africa*, edited by Edward Fasholé-Luke, Richard Gray, Adrian Hastings, and Godwin Tasie, 364–369. London: Rex Collings.

Voshaar, Jan [M. H.]. 1998. *Maasai: Between the Oreteti-tree and the Tree of the Cross.* Ker ken Theologie in Context / Church and Theology in Context. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok.

Vossen, Rainer. 1998. *Towards a Comparative Study of the Maa Dialects of Kenya and Tanzania*. Translated from the German by Marion Frank. Nilo-Saharan 2. Hamburg, Germany: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Wagner-Glenn, Doris. 1992. *Searching for a Baby's Calabash: A Study of Arusha Maasai Fertility Songs as Crystallized Expression of Central Cultural Values*. Ludwigsburg, Germany: Phillip Verlag.

Waliggo, John Mary. 1975. "Ganda traditional religion and Catholicism in Buganda, 1948–75." In *Christianity in Independent Africa*, edited by Edward Fasholé-Luke, Richard Gray, Adrian Hastings, and Godwin Tasie, 412–425. London: Rex Collings.

Walls, Andrew F. 2016. "The Transmission of Christian Faith." Chapter 51 in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to World Christianity*, edited by Lamin Sanneh and Michael J. McClymond, 685–698. Wiley Blackwell Companions to Religion. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Walls, Andrew F. 1996. "African Christianity in the History of Religions." *Studies in World Christianity* 2 (2): 183–20.

Identifying the Oral Features in John 8:31–38 and Their Implications for Translation

Jonathan van den Broek
SIL International
Jonathan_vandenbroek@sil.org

Abstract: When translating Scripture, the importance of expressing the meaning clearly, accurately, and naturally is widely accepted, but in focusing attention on content, the form and sound of a text are often neglected. Biblical Performance Criticism provides a framework for analysing biblical texts which takes into consideration the influences of orality on the original composition and the fact that the authors may have made choices based on how the text would sound when read aloud or performed. By applying some of the notions of Biblical Performance Criticism to the text of John 8:31–38, this paper suggests that identifying oral features in a written text and seeking to understand their effect on a hearing audience is a step towards a better understanding of the text. This will enable translators to reflect on ways to render oral features and on how to convey the same effects for contemporary audiences.

Key words: John 8, Bible Translation, Biblical Performance Criticism, Oral Features, Orality, Sound-mapping

INTRODUCTION

Biblical Performance Criticism (BPC, Rhoads 2006; Wendland 2008; Maxey 2009; Maxey and Wendland 2012) provides an interesting framework for analysing biblical texts that can give new exegetical insights and awareness of the possible emotional impact of those texts.[1] This approach can help translators produce livelier, and arguably more "faithful" renderings of the source text. Given the ancient world's high regard for the art of rhetoric (Littau 2011, 1), it can be assumed that authors made compositional and stylistic choices based not only on meaning and content, but also on the impact that form and sound would

---

[1] I wish to thank Lynell Zogbo for her help on this and a previous co-authored study on this subject: (van den Broek and Zogbo 2015, SIL, Dallas), Ernst Wendland for his helpful comments, and Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Jacobus Naudé for encouraging me to pursue this topic for my MA studies at the University of Free State (2017). Any shortcomings remain my responsibility.

have on their audience. Experts agree that the Scriptures contain oral features that are integral to the texts and also that form is a fundamental part of textual meaning (Zogbo and Wendland 2020). Retrieving these features is a step towards enabling translators to determine their original function and explore ways to better render these texts for contemporary audiences.

This study seeks to apply some of the notions of performance criticism to a chosen text, John 8:31–38. Indeed, John's writings provide some of the clearest examples of New Testament texts composed with an oral presentation in mind. In this article, the Greek text is first examined in order to identify oral features and determine how they may have functioned in an oral presentation. The aim is to provide insights that may help facilitate a faithful translation, not just of *what* is said, but also *how* it is said, thus recreating the impact the text would have had on its first hearers/readers.[2]

<center>JOHN 8:31–38</center>

John 8:31–38 was chosen for analysis because it presents an important theological message in a highly animated manner. It records an exchange between Jesus and the Jews which lends itself easily to a study of features of orality. Dan Nässelqvist (2012a, 54) remarks on the richness of oral and literary features in John 1 evidenced not just by its memorable prologue, but also by its abundant use of repetition of thematic sounds or morphemes that "echo throughout the passage." Similarly, thematic sounds may be heard in John 8:31–38 with repetition of the words: ἀλήθεια ("truth") three times, μένω ("remain") three times, and ἐλεύθερος ("free") four times.

In the exchange between Jesus and the Jews, Jesus provokes debate on the source of true freedom and challenges the Jewish belief that "the study of the Law made a man free" (Carson 1991, 349). Jesus redefines slavery in terms of sin and eternal consequences and introduces the concept of redemption as a gift given by the Son.

The exchange is thought to occur in Jerusalem at the Temple, during or shortly after the Feast of the Tents (*sukkoth*). As Craig Keener points out (2003, 747): "Jesus' promise of spiritual freedom was altogether appropriate on a festival commemorating Israel's sojourn in the wilderness after being freed from slavery." Though calling his audience "slaves," Jesus delivers a message of freedom; he has come to liberate and make them *sons* (Beasley-Murray 1987, 134).

---

[2] Current scholarly opinion on the languages Jesus spoke follows Dalman, who stated that although Jesus may have known both Hebrew and Greek, he certainly taught in Aramaic (Porter 1993). If this was the case, then the words we have recorded in John's Gospel are already a translation. I suggest that John crafted these words in such a way as to recreate the scene he is describing, portraying the attitude of the speakers.

While the literary unit has been taken to be 8:31–38, other analyses are possible. George Beasley-Murray (1987, 132) proposed 8:30–36, giving the title, "The Freedom of Jesus and the Slavery of the Jews." Others include verse 38 in the same literary unit: Thomas Brodie (1993, 328) proposes 8:31–38, and Calvin Hendricksen (1953, 50) suggests 8:30–38.

Different semantic, grammatical and, I suggest here, audible features, taken together can help with identifying unit boundaries, some of which are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Verse 31 is marked by the developmental conjunction οὖν ("then"), which provides a weak link back to the previous section (Levinsohn 2000, 82). Also the full noun references to both Jesus and the believing Jews, where pronominal references would be clear to any hearer or reader, are used to signal a new episode or, at the very least, a new paragraph in an ongoing episode. Stephen Levinsohn (2000, 143), along with noting the structural role of full nouns in Greek, also suggests their appearance may indicate that a key speech or action is to follow, a factor which seems to come into play here.

It is also possible that there is a kind of chaining effect between vv. 30 and 31: "While he was saying these things, many believed in him. *So as Jesus was saying to those who had believed in him.*"[3] This would also signal the beginning of a new discourse unit.[4]

Turn-taking could be used for marking divisions in a text, yielding the following results:[5]

Jesus speaks (vv. 31–32), introduced by the words "Then Jesus said" in v. 31
The Jews respond (v. 33), introduced by the words "They answered him" in v. 33
Jesus speaks again (vv. 34–38), introduced by the words "Jesus answered them" in v. 34

Jerome Neyrey (2009, 233) proposes a *pragmatic pattern* in this part and in many parts of the Gospel of John (e.g. John 3:3–5):

Statement - if you remain in my word you will know the truth (vv. 31–32)
Misunderstanding - we have never been slaves (v. 33)
Explanation – they are truly slaves, they seek to kill Jesus (vv. 34–37)

---

[3] All Scripture quotations are from NRSV unless otherwise noted; emphases are mine.
[4] Marchese 1985.
[5] Wendland (p.c.) proposes alternating segments: Jesus' ASSERTIONS: 31–32, 34–38, 39b–41a, the Jews' RESPONSES: 33, 39a, 41b, a pattern that continues throughout the rest of chapter 8, until the Jews finally respond with stones instead of words!

He points to an inclusio (vv. 31 and 37) on the basis of the expression "my words" as τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ in v. 31 and ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς in v. 37, arguably more prominent in sound than in writing. (Note that the similarity in sound of these expressions is even more marked if "ω" and "o" represent the same sound, as Caragounis (1995, 157) and Buth (2012) believe to have been the case at the time it was written. The pattern of statement, misunderstanding and explanation, along with the inclusio lead Neyrey to mark boundaries at vv. 31 and 37 and consider v. 38 as a transition sentence into the next paragraph. Though the inclusio is audibly prominent, making a division at v. 37 would interrupt John's presentation of vv. 34–38 as a single speech segment.

Clearly various divisions may be made according to semantic and grammatical considerations, and in practice it takes a number of features to coincide in order to decide where a division should occur. Given the oral nature of the original text and the fact that writers used sound features in combination with other devices to impose structure on compositions (Lee and Scott 2009, 168), features of sound should be included alongside other considerations in any analysis of text structure.

ANALYSIS OF ORAL FEATURES

Before launching into the text analysis, I will make a brief mention of Greek writing styles. Hellenistic Greek writers were aware of different styles of writing and used these styles to create specific pragmatic effects (Lee & Scott 2009, 111–122). Aristotle, for example, indicates that style is important for both writing and speaking and that style must be appropriately matched to the content of the text such that "neither weighty matters are treated offhand nor trifling matters solemnly" (*Rhetoric* 3.7.1–2, LCL 193: 378–379). Although it cannot be assumed that John was schooled in the art of Greco-Roman rhetorical theory, it is not unreasonable to assume that, like good writers of his time, he crafted his texts to make good use of style. In discussing style, I will use the terminology used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Greek historian and teacher of rhetoric of the first century CE, who divided styles into three categories, "austere," "polished," and "blended" (Lee & Scott 2009, 114).

This analysis follows a methodology of Biblical Performance Criticism described by Lee and Scott (2009) to display the text in terms of what they call a "sound map": a visual display of the text in which repetitive sound patterns, features of sound quality and other sound effects are more easily identified. The text is first divided into cola, where a colon is a complete statement, easy to say in one breath. Then the cola are grouped into periods that represent a complete thought. This analysis helps reveal the aural characteristics of the text, including the flow of the discourse, points of emphasis, and pause. This can be a first step toward finding corresponding ways to express aural features in translation (Nässelqvist 2012a, 49–51).

The Greek text[6] of John 8:31–38 is reproduced below so that recurring or similar sounds line up underneath each other. Lines normally equate to cola but sometimes, for phonological reasons, a colon may be presented in more than one line. Verse numbers are on the left. Following Margaret Lee and Bernard Scott's model, this colometric presentation helps to reveal important sound patterns in the text, confirming the essentially oral nature of text we usually consider "written." Underlining highlights significant words and repetitions.

31a	Ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησ<u>οῦς</u>		
31b	πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαί<u>ους</u>		
31c	Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς <u>μείνητε</u> ἐν	<u>τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ</u>	
31d		<u>ἀληθῶς</u> μαθηταί μού ἐστε	
32a	καὶ γνώσεσθε	τὴν <u>ἀλήθειαν</u>,	
32b	καὶ	ἡ <u>ἀλήθεια</u>	<u>ἐλευθερώσει</u> ὑμᾶς
33a	ἀπεκρίθησαν πρὸς αὐτόν		
33b	<u>Σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐσμεν</u>,		
33c	καὶ οὐδενὶ	<u>δεδουλεύκαμεν</u> πώποτε·	
33d	πῶς σὺ λέγεις ὅτι		
33e			<u>Ἐλεύθεροι</u> γενήσεσθε;
34a	ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,		
34b	Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι		
34c	πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν		τὴν <u>ἁμαρτίαν</u>
34d		<u>δοῦλός</u> ἐστιν	τῆς <u>ἁμαρτίας</u>.
35a	ὁ δὲ	<u>δοῦλος</u>	οὐ <u>μένει</u> ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ <u>εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα</u>,
35b		ὁ <u>υἱὸς</u>	<u>μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα</u>.
36a	ἐὰν οὖν	ὁ <u>υἱὸς</u> ὑμᾶς	<u>ἐλευθερώσῃ</u>,
36b	ὄντως		<u>ἐλεύθεροι</u> ἔσεσθε.
37a	οἶδα ὅτι <u>σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐστε</u>		
37b	ἀλλὰ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι,		
37c	ὅτι	<u>ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς</u> οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.	
38a	ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα	παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ	λαλῶ
38b	καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε	παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς	ποιεῖτε.

---

[6] The Greek text used throughout is the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Edition) unless otherwise specified.

Lining up repeated sounds in this way draws attention to the repetitions, for example: ἐλευθερόω ("to free") in lines 32b, 33e, 36a and 36b; ἀλήθεια ("truth") in 31d, 32a and 32b; and δοῦλός ("slave") in lines 33c, 34d and 35a. In what follows, groupings of cola will be analysed to discover oral features and to show what is conveyed by the sound and structures present. Relevant "sound bits" are marked in bold, and a number in parentheses after each line indicates the syllable count for that line. A fairly literal translation is provided to help illustrate word patterns.

John 8:31a

Then Jesus said to the Jews who had believed in him,

This verse introduces those Jesus is addressing. Looking at the wider context, John 8:1 introduces those Jesus is teaching as "all the people," with subsequent references to "scribes and Pharisees" (v. 3), "Pharisees" (v. 13), and "the Jews" (vv. 22, 48, 52, 57). All other references to Jesus' audience are minimally marked, typical of Greek's marking of major participants. If a group different from the scribes and Pharisees is singled out, this is where full noun phrases would be expected, as is the case here, with the plural perfect participle τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ. This seems to be an indication that the Jews believing in Jesus are a subset of those who are present.

31a	Ἔλεγεν **οὖν** ὁ Ἰησοῦς (7)
31b	πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους, (12)

31a	*said therefore **Jesus***
31b	*to the having-believed in him **Jews***

These first two lines have some audible qualities in the assonance of the repetitive *ου* sound (four times) and the alliterative word final –ς (four times) in 31b.

The speech introducer Ἔλεγεν... πρὸς with addressee in the accusative is a marked construction. The imperfect verb form normally portrays the event as incomplete or habitual. In this verse it is unlikely that it describes a habitual action of Jesus, neither is the event viewed as incomplete. Levinsohn says that in such instances we can consider it to be marked use, maybe due to the fact that this speech "incites or provokes the conversational exchange of the rest of the chapter" (2000, 175). In addition, the πρὸς plus accusative construction may be used here to draw attention to the relationship between Jesus and his listeners (see discussion on v. 33 below, where a similar construction is used).

John 8:31b–32

"If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples; ³²and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free."

31c	Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ (13)	
31d		<u>ἀληθῶς</u> μαθηταί μού ἐστε (9)
32a	**καὶ** γνώσεσθε	τὴν <u>ἀλήθειαν</u>, (9)
32b	**καὶ**	ἡ <u>ἀλήθεια</u> ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς. (13)

31c	*If you continue in the word of me*	
31d		***truly** my disciples you-are*
32a	***and** you-will-know*	***the truth***
32b	***and***	***the truth** will-free you.*

Besides obvious lexical repetition in these words of Jesus there are many other phonological features typical of oral literature.

Lines 31c and 31d include assonance (repetition of vowels) and probable alliteration (repetition of consonants). In 31c, Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ ("if you remain in my word"), the four final words in Greek all end in "ω." This assonance lends a definite acoustic quality to the text which seems to emphasise the words. Jesus is, in fact, contrasting believing in *the Torah* and believing in *his word*. Lines 31c and 31d are particularly rich in "μ" sounds, especially ὑμεῖς μείνητε and μαθηταί μού, which are key phrases occurring at the beginning and end of this pair of lines.

The two middle cola of this period are short and of the same length (nine syllables). On either side are two longer cola, matched in length (thirteen syllables), suggesting a rounded and balanced utterance structured for its acoustic impact. This symmetrical pattern links these four lines together as a unit or "period."

Textual variants of v. 31 may serve to illustrate one possible application of the analysis of oral features. Noted above are the alliterative repetitions of word final "ω," the repeated "μ" sounds and the symmetrical line lengths (13-9-9-13). If these features are taken to be intentional by the author for their acoustic quality, then this could be used as an argument against textual variants which omit the μού in 31d (e.g. ℵ 01) or which omit the τῷ in 31c (e.g. D 05).

Verse 32 is in the form of a sequential progression of clauses, where the comment of 32a, τὴν <u>ἀλήθειαν</u> ("truth"), becomes the topic of 32b, ἡ <u>ἀλήθεια</u>. This is a common pattern of progression in NT Greek.

and	you will know	the **truth**
and	the **truth**	will free you

A combination of features gives prominence to the word ἀλήθεια ("truth") in lines 31d, 32a and 32b. First, the repetition of the word provides rhythm and emphasis. Secondly, in line with Iver Larsen's claim that "Word order is the most common means of showing emphasis in Greek" and "the more to the left an item occurs, the more prominent it is" (2001, 13), word order in 31d marks this word as prominent. Also, the preposing of the word ἀλήθεια in 32b shows the development of his argument concerning the truth.

Thus by bringing together a number of different devices, the Gospel writer seems to format these words of Jesus to be prominent and memorable. Jesus' words are presented in polished style and are therefore recognizably "weighty" (Lee & Scott 2009, 118).

John 8:33

They answered him, "We are descendants of Abraham and have never been slaves to anyone. What do you mean by saying, 'You will be made free'?"

Despite the clearness of the grammatical construction, the intention of this statement is open to debate. Are they forgetting or discounting the long history of slavery of the Jews or have they understood that Jesus was referring to spiritual slavery? The structure seems to fit the pattern of the people misunderstanding something that Jesus says, taking it literally while he gives it a spiritual meaning.

33a	ἀπεκρίθησαν πρὸς αὐτόν (8)
33b	**Σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ** ἐσμεν, (7)
33c	καὶ οὐδενὶ <u>δεδουλεύκαμεν</u> **πώποτε** (11)
33d	**πῶς σὺ** λέγεις ὅτι (5)
33e	<u>Ἐλεύθεροι</u> γενήσεσθε; (8)

33a	(they) answered to him
33b	**Seed of Abraham** (we) are
33c	and to no one have we been enslaved **ever.**
33d	**How you** say that
33e	**free** (you) will become?

The response of the Jews in these lines is presented in a very different style from the words of Jesus. Their composition shows features of austere style (Lee & Scott 2009, 183) compared to the more polished style in which Jesus' words are presented. There is a high concentration of harsh (k) and (p) sounds which may

be significant in oral production.[7] These cola could be described as two independent periods, 33a–c and 33d–e, or even as single independent cola that are not rounded into periods. Either way, there is a distinct lack of rounding or parallelism and the lines are not matched in length.

These lines also utilize word order to give emphasis. Three times a word or phrase is made more prominent by being placed in clause-initial position: σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ("seed of Abraham"), πῶς ("how"), and ἐλεύθεροι ("free"). In addition, the inclusion of the pronoun σύ ("you") in 33d is an emphatic. This marked style indicates not only an emotional response, but the Jews' indignation at what Jesus has said. The semantic content of the word πώποτε ("ever/never"), along with its repetitive sounds (*po-po*) adds to the drama and insistence of this response. These Jews are visibly, or should we say, audibly(!) outraged.

The use of austere style here marks a contrast between these speakers and Jesus. They react strongly to his words, and the structure and sounds used by the author to represent their words reinforce this reaction. In addition, these short, abrupt declarations and accusing question conform to the instructions of Quintillian when he says that "violent themes should be expressed in violent rhythms to enable the audience to share the horror felt by the speaker" (*Institutio* 9.5.127).

The speech introducer ἀπεκρίθησαν πρὸς αὐτόν[8] ("answered towards [or against] him") is a marked construction. In John's gospel, the introduction of an addressee following a verb of speaking is normally achieved with a noun/pronoun in the dative case, e.g. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς "answered him" (v. 34). Introducing the addressee with the preposition πρὸς plus the accusative is less common in John's gospel, occurring about nineteen times[9], compared to more than 200 occurrences of the dative construction. Jenny Read-Heimerdinger (2018) investigated this use of the preposition πρὸς plus the accusative in Acts, where it is the more common construction for introducing an addressee. She concludes that it is a marked construction which is used to underline the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

Of the nineteen occurrences in John, five involve reflexive pronouns and therefore fall into a different category. The remaining fourteen fit the pattern of underlining the relationship between speaker and addressee and in addition could all be considered to include some aspect of confrontation, a question that warrants further study.[10]

---

[7] Lee and Scott (2009, 206) note that consonant stops (k/t/p/x) evoke spitting sounds in Mark 15:29–32. This is an area for further research.

[8] Αὐτῷ rather than πρὸς αὐτόν is found in a number of manuscripts

[9] John 2:3, 3:4, 4:15, 4:33, 4:48, 4:49, 6:5, 6:28, 6:34, 7:3, 7:35, 7:50, 8:31, 8:33, 8:57, 11:21, 12:19, 16:17, 19:24.

[10] There is an interesting parallel in the Old Testament where praying על "against" God rather than ל or אל "to" God was interpreted by the rabbis as implying opposition or emotion

This marked construction, the high concentration of harsh (k) and (p) sounds and consonant clashes, and austere style all give clues as to speaker attitudes, posture, tone of voice and facial expression, important considerations in oral translation, sign language translation, and performance.

John 8:34–36

³⁴Jesus answered them, "Very truly, I tell you, everyone who commits sin is a slave to sin. ³⁵The slave does not have a permanent place in the household; the son has a place there forever. ³⁶So if the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed."

In a strong statement, Jesus makes it clear what he means by slavery—not political slavery but moral failure and rebellion against God. Jesus did not come to overthrow political authorities but to bring freedom from sin.

These verses need to be understood within the Near Middle Eastern culture of the time and with reference to John's normal use of the term "son." Slaves were a normal part of many households. They may have had considerable responsibility and might have "remained," some by choice, in the same household throughout their lifetime. But slaves did not have any rights or security, and certainly had no part in any inheritance. Sons, on the other hand, were permanent members of a family, and even if they left the household, they would remain part of that family and heirs forever. Certainly Jewish hearers or readers would immediately think of the case of Isaac and Ishmael, the free son and the son of the slave (Gen 21).

Though the slave and son are clearly in opposition, for those listening to Jesus, it is not necessarily clear who the son is. In this exchange, the Jews would have immediately put themselves in the role of sons in God's household (Morris 1995, 407), but the statements to come show that Jesus is narrowing in on one particular son.

34a	ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, (9)	
34b	Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι (9)	
34c	πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν	τὴν <u>ἁμαρτίαν</u> (9)
34d	<u>δοῦλός</u> ἐστιν	τῆς <u>ἁμαρτίας</u>. (9)
35a	ὁ δὲ <u>δοῦλος</u>	οὐ <u>μένει</u> ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ <u>εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα</u>, (17)
35b	ὁ <u>υἱὸς</u>	<u>μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα</u>. (10)
36a	ἐὰν οὖν ὁ <u>υἱὸς</u> ὑμᾶς	<u>ἐλευθερώσῃ</u>, (12)
36b	ὄντως	<u>ἐλεύθεροι</u> ἔσεσθε. (9)

---

against God. 1 Sam 1:10 is interpreted in the Talmud as "Hannah spoke brazenly towards heaven" (Habib J ben SI & Finkel AY 1999, 39).

34a	*answered to-them Jesus,*		
34b	*Truly, truly, I-say to you that*		
34c	*everyone the-one doing*	***sin***	
34d		***a slave** he-is*	*of **sin***
35a	*but the*	***slave***	*does not **remain** in the house **unto the age***
35b		*the **son***	***remains unto the age***
36a	*If then*	*the **Son***	*you **frees***
36b	*really*		***free** you-will-be.*

The name, "Jesus" (Ἰησοῦς), appears here but is in no way needed for participant reference. Levinsohn notes that highlighting devices in Greek usually occur *prior* to the highlighted event and often involve "redundancy," as is the case here. Also, a full noun phrase identifying a speaker may be used to introduce a particularly important speech (2000, 197). This slowing down in the flow of discourse is one indication that the speech which follows is an important one.

Indeed, this is made clear by the appearance of the formulaic phrase ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι "Truly, truly, I say to you," used twenty-five times in John's Gospel in Jesus' reported speech to mark as important words he is about to say. Such formulaic language is a type of speech which has been often linked to oral performance (Rhoads 2006, 121). Here it adds solemnity to Jesus' speech, slowing down the discourse, as it marks an upcoming crucial declaration.

Of particular interest in the speech that follow are the repetitive sound patterns, clearly standing out in the colometric presentation of the text. Five pairs of repeated words or phrases occur in these six lines. Each colon picks up and repeats the key word from the colon preceding it:

> ἀμαρτί- "sin" in 34c is repeated in 34d,
> δοῦλός "slave" in 34d is repeated in 35a,
> μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα "remain unto the age" in 35a is repeated in 35b,
> ὁ υἱός "the son" in 35b is repeated in 36a and
> ἐλεύθερ- "free" in 36a is repeated in 36b.

When read aloud it is possible to hear the rhythmic effect that this repetition creates. These repetitions link the stages in the argument and aid with memorization and reproduction of the text. Dan Nässelqvist (2012b, 19) describes a similar pattern in John 1:1–4 as "climbing up the ladder of connecting words," to reach the climax. In John 8:34–36, the ladder climbs from sin to the climax of true freedom in v. 36. In addition, the fronted word order of δοῦλός ("slave") and υἱός ("son") in 34d–36a seems to contrastively highlight that pair of words.

There is parallelism in lines 35a and 35b, a feature which is characteristic of oral literature worldwide (Miller 2011, 79) and specifically noted as a feature of polished Greek style.

Line 36a, ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ ("if then the son sets you free") is a "weighty" statement which includes the key words "son" and "set free" and the double set of conjunctions which seems to slow the speech. John mostly uses οὖν as a resumptive developmental conjunction indicating a return to something in the storyline (Levinsohn 2000, 85). Jesus' words in vv. 34–36 are in response to the indignant question of v. 22 concerning freedom. Verse 35 is a comment that does not directly relate to that question and the conjunction οὖν indicates a return to the theme line. The concluding remark of v. 36b, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε ("truly free you'll be"), stands out: short and to the point with no full nouns or pronouns, this statement is clearly meant to have an impact.

Again Jesus' words are given in polished style in clear contrast to the austere style of the words spoken by the Jews.

John 8:37-38

³⁷I know that you are descendants of Abraham; yet you look for an opportunity to kill me, because there is no place in you for my word. ³⁸I declare what I have seen in the Father's presence; as for you, you should do what you have heard from the Father."

In these verses, Jesus deals with the claims of the Jews that Abraham is their father by first agreeing with them, but then, in accordance with Jeremiah 9:25–26, he makes it clear that in the spiritual realm, any claim to parenthood must be established by right conduct rather than physical ancestry (Carson 1991). There is a textual issue here with some early manuscripts omitting the possessive pronoun "your" from "your father" in v. 38, which, combined with the fact that the form of the verb ποιεῖτε ("do") (2pl) can be both imperative and declarative, gives two different possible renderings. Some versions translate as the NRSV ("you should do"), while others translate as "you do what you have heard from your father." Following this second option, Jesus' conduct displays his origin, and the conduct of his opponents indicates theirs, although the identity of their father is not revealed at this stage (Carson 1991).

These lines (see the chart on the following page) function as a conclusion to Jesus' words on freedom for those who believe in his word (ὁ λόγος). Ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς ("my word") in 37c is an echo of τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ ("my word") in 31c and is made prominent by being fronted. Σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐστε ("you are descendants of Abraham") in 37a is an echo of Σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐσμεν ("We are descendants of Abraham") in 33b and is again made more prominent by being fronted. These repetitions are acoustically prominent features of coherence that link back to the beginning of this particular discourse.

Verse 37 comprises two matched length cola and a lengthened final colon, a form considered to be aesthetically pleasing and described as a rounded period.

37a οἶδα ὅτι **σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ** ἐστε· (10)
37b ἀλλὰ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι, (10)
37c ὅτι ὁ **λόγος** ὁ ἐμὸς οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. (14)

38a ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ (13)
38b καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε. (17)

37a *I know that you are **descendants of Abraham***
37b *but you are trying to kill me*
37c *because **my word** has no place in you*

38a *that which I have seen* **with the Father** *I declare*
38b *so also you,* *that which you have heard* *from (the/your) father* *you do*

Verse 38 is formed by two lines that show grammatical parallelism of a relative clause plus a verb. In both lines the relative clause is made more prominent by fronting, thus emphasising the contrast between what *Jesus saw from his Father* and what *they heard from their father*. Leon Morris (1995) thus notes the following contrasts: "Jesus" vs. "the Jews"; "seen" vs. "heard"; "my Father" vs. "your father"; and "speaking" vs. "doing." This pattern is an argument in favour of the textual variant with "your" (father) as it fits the pattern and structure of the verse. Also in 38b καὶ ὑμεῖς ("you also") is preposed, marking a switch of topic.

TRANSLATION OF PERFORMANCE

The identification of oral features alone is not sufficient to ensure those features are well translated for another audience. They must be interpreted in order to know how they contributed, or may have contributed, to the meaning and impact of the text for the original audience. Without dictating how to translate for a new audience, this section demonstrates an attempt to convey the meaning that was encoded in the oral features of the original so they can be meaningfully re-expressed for a new audience. In the following "translation of performance" (Nässelqvist 2012a, 49), signs which have been identified in the Greek text are translated, annotated, or marked in some way to assist the translator who will convert them into other signs in the translation (Jakobson 1959/2012, 127).

In the presentation of the text below, repeated words are in bold, underlining is used where there is emphasis. In this "translation" an attempt has been made to use the same key word each time it occurs in order to indicate the connections in the text while recognising that this may not always be natural in translation. Formulaic forms (v. 34) have also been maintained quite literally. To convey the emotion in the dialogue, some verbs of speaking have been made more specific. The right-hand column lists the findings from the analysis of oral features.

Translation	Notes
³¹So Jesus challenged	*beginning of section* *challenge that provokes the exchange*
the Jews who believed in him,	
If you **stay** <u>in my teachings</u>	- *words of Jesus in lines 31c–32 hold together as a well-formed statement* - *"stay" is a key expression, linked to v. 35* - *"in my teachings" is given prominence by its acoustic quality, and is linked to v. 37*
(then) you are <u>**truly**</u> my disciples.	- *"truly" is fronted giving emphasis*
³²You will know the **truth**	
and the <u>**truth**</u> will set you free.	- *"truth" is marked for emphasis* - *"free" is a repeated word*
	pause – change of speaker
³³They objected strongly to his words and said:	*adversarial relationship between speaker and hearer is underlined*
But we are **descendants of Abraham!**	- *contrasting style and word choice suggests indignation, even outrage*
We have <u>never</u> been slaves to anyone!	- *"descendants of Abraham," "How," and "free" all given emphasis by word order*
<u>How dare you</u> say (to us)	*emphasis by word order*
We will become <u>**free**</u>!	- *"never" is inherently emphatic*
	pause – change of speaker
³⁴Jesus [looked directly at them] and said:	*speech marked as important (formulaic introduction, slowing down delivery)*
Truly truly I say to you	
<u>Everyone</u> who **sins**	*-the argument advances in steps by repetition of "sin" –*
Is a **slave** to **sin.**	*"slave" – "stay for ever" – "son" – and "free"*
³⁵But the <u>**slave**</u> does not **stay** in the house **for ever.**	*"slave" and "son" are fronted, giving prominence*
It is the <u>**Son**</u> who **stays for ever.**	
³⁶(So then) If the <u>**Son**</u> sets you **free**	*return to theme line, slow down before conclusion*
<u>you'll really be **free**</u>.	*"really free" is a strong conclusion*
	pause – closing of section
³⁷I know that you are **descendants of Abraham**	*links back to v. 33 providing coherence* *prominence by fronting*
The reason that you are trying to kill me	
is that you don't accept **<u>my teachings</u>.**	*links back to v. 31 providing coherence* *prominence by fronting*
³⁸I speak about <u>the things I have seen with my **Father**</u>	*emphasis is given by both contrasting elements and fronting*
But you do <u>the things you have heard from your **father**</u>	*38b contrasts with 38a*

CONCLUSIONS

In this analysis of John 8:31–38 it is clear that "listening" to the text in the original language reveals nuances of meaning and aspects often associated with performance that may otherwise be obscured. Many features typical of oral literature have been identified, including: repetition, rhythm, assonance, alliteration, cola length, word order and more. The function of these features is difficult to determine, though we know that they were important to other first century authors. Sometimes choices seem to have been made to achieve a pleasing sound, or to aid with memorisation and delivery, aspects more normally associated with poetry than prose. At other times the use of a particular feature has a clearly discernible effect on meaning or structure, such as patterns of repetition providing coherence or word order providing emphasis.

There is evidence to suggest that the author used the rhetorical technique of framing the text in contrasting styles in order to influence the reader/hearer, a technique encouraged by teachers of rhetoric in the first century. Jesus' words are presented is what stylists described as 'polished' style, with symmetry, parallelism, cola of matching length and patterns of repetition, which contrasts with the lack of such features in the way the words of his opponents are presented.

This study suggests that an analytical study of ancient texts that seeks to identify and interpret oral features is an important component of exegesis. It can reveal, among other things, contextual information, speaker attitudes and emotions, coherence, and prominence. It has also been shown that this type of study may inform decisions on textual variants. In the context of translation, it enables the translator to explore features in the source text and consider how to create the same effects in a translation for contemporary audiences whether listeners, readers, or signers. The attempt of Biblical Performance Criticism to recreate ancient performances is limited by our ignorance of how oral features were used. As more texts are analysed, a clearer picture will be gained of the use of these techniques to embellish and enrich the text for the original audience, taking us a step closer to translating those features for new audiences.

REFERENCES

Beasley-Murray, George R. 1987. *John, Word Biblical Commentary, Vol 36*. Waco: Word Books.

Brodie, Thomas L. 1993. *The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buth, Randall. 2012. "Η Κοινη Προφορα: Notes on the Pronunciation System of Koiné Greek." Accessed May 5, 2016. https://www.biblicallanguagecenter.com/koine-greek-pronunciation.

Caragounis, Chrys C. 1995. "The Error of Erasmus and Un-Greek Pronunciations of Greek." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 8: 151–185.

Carson, Donald A. 1991. *The Gospel according to John.* Leicester: Apollos.

Habib, Jacob ben Solomon Ibn and Jack A Finkel. 1999. *Ein Yaakov: The Ethical and Inspirational Teachings of the Talmud.* Lanham, MD: Jason Aronson.

Hendricksen, Calvin. 1953. *Exposition of the Gospel according to John.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959/2012. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Venuti L., 2nd ed., 126–132. London: Routledge.

Keener, Craig S. 2003. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary, Vol. 1.* Peabody: Hendrikson.

Larsen, Iver. 2001. "Word Order and Relative Prominence in New Testament Greek: A New Look." *Notes on Translation* 15 (2): 13–27.

Lee, Margaret E. & Bernard B Scott. 2009. *Sound Mapping the New Testament.* Salem, OR: Polebridge.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 2000. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek.* Dallas: SIL International.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 2015. *Self-Instruction Materials on Non-Narrative Discourse Analysis.* Dallas: SIL International.

Littau, Karin. 2011. "First Steps towards a Media History of Translation." *Translation Studies* 4, no. 3: 261–281.

Marchese, Lynell. 1985. "Pronominalization and the Appearance of Full Noun Referents in Godie Discourse." In *Proceedings of the 14th Congress of African Linguistics*, edited by G. Dimmendal, 227–239. Leiden.

Maxey, James A. 2009. "Performance Criticism and Its Implications for Bible Translation: Part 1: Oral Performance and New Testament Studies." *The Bible Translator* 60 (1): 37–49.

Maxey, James A. and Ernst R. Wendland, eds. 2012. *Translating Scripture for Sound and Performance: New Directions in Biblical Studies.* Vol. 6. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Miller, Robert D. 2011. "Oral Tradition in Ancient Israel." In *Biblical Performance Criticism Vol. 4*, edited by Maxey, James A. and Ernst R. Wendland. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Morris, Leon. 1995. *The Gospel according to John.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Nässelqvist, Dan. 2012a. "Translating the Aural Gospel. The Use of Sound Analysis in Performance-Oriented Translation." Pages 49–67 in *Translating Scripture for Sound and Performance: New Directions in Biblical Studies Vol. 6*, edited by Maxey, James A. and Ernst R. Wendland. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Nässelqvist, Dan. 2012b. "Stylistic Levels in Heb 1.1–4 and Jn 1.1–18." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament,* 35 (1): 31–53.

Neyrey, Jerome H. 2009. *The Gospel of John in Cultural and Rhetorical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Porter, Stanley E. 1993. "Did Jesus Ever Teach in Greek?" *Tyndale Bulletin*, 44 (2): 199–235.

Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny 2018. "L'analyse Du Discours Au Service De La Critique Textuelle: Illustrations À Partir Du Livre Des Actes Des Apôtres." In *Philologie Et Nouveau Testament: Principes De Traduction Et D'interprétation Critique* Héritages méditerranéens, edited by J Assaël and C-B Amphoux, 265–283. Aix-en-Provence: Presses Universitaires de Provence

Rhoads, David. 2006. "Performance Criticism: An Emerging Methodology in Second Testament Studies—Part 1." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 36 (3): 118–133.

van den Broek, Jonathan G. 2017. *"A Translation Studies Perspective of Oral-Written Features in John 8:31–37. A Sound Mapping Analysis."* (MA dissertation, University of the Free State).

Wendland, Ernst R. 2008. "Performance Criticism: Assumptions, Applications, and Assessment." *T.I.C. Talk. Newsletter of the United Bible Societies Translation Information Clearinghouse.* 65.

Wendland, Ernst R. 2014. *Prophetic Rhetoric: Case Studies in Text Analysis and Translation*, 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International.

Zogbo, Lynell & Wendland, Ernst R. 2020. *Hebrew Poetry in the Bible. A Guide for Understanding and for Translating.* 2nd ed. New York: UBS.

Participant Reference in Kwakum Narrative Discourse

David M. Hare
World Team
Dave.Hare@WorldTeam.org

Abstract: Study of narrative texts in Kwakum shows that distinctions are made between major characters, minor characters, and props. This article describes how these three types of participants are first mentioned using nouns with qualifiers, nouns without qualifiers, surrogate nouns, and a left-dislocated position for major characters. Participant reference depends on which type of participant is being referred to, with major characters receiving the least coding. Minor characters and props are not generally tracked by pronouns but rather by a noun, with or without a qualifier. Pronouns are usually only used for minor characters or props when they are the object of a verb or when referred to in direct or indirect quotations.

Keywords: Kwakum, Bantu, Discourse Analysis, Participant Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

Kwakum is a sub-Bantu language primarily spoken in the East Region of Cameroon.[1] This study is based primarily on ten narrative texts which are available in full in Hare (2018) or online http://haretranslation.com/the-kwakum-language. Participant reference deals with the manner in which participants are tracked through the course of a narrative. The coherence and cohesion of the text depends on the hearer/reader's ability to follow each participant throughout the story. The narrator selects between nouns, pronouns, deictics, bound elements, and even zero or null reference when referring to these participants. In making these decisions, he clues in the hearer to the relative importance of participants, as well as distinguishing them to avoid ambiguity.

Languages vary in how they track participants. I followed the tracking procedures described in Longacre and Hwang (2012), which include classifying texts, constituent charting, and tracking references to characters and props. Longacre and Hwang claim there are ten discourse operations that influence reference form in languages. These operations are listed in Figure 1.

---

[1] Guthrie classifies it as a sub-Bantu language principally due to the fragmentary class and agreement system (Guthrie 1948). See Hare (2018, 5–8) for more information.

F -	First mention within a story
I -	Integration into the story as central
T -	Tracking routinely
R -	Restaging or reinstatement
B -	Boundary marking episode or sub-episode
C -	Confrontation and/or role change
L -	Locally contrastive/thematic status
E -	Evaluation or comment by the narrator
A -	Addressee in dialogue
X -	Exit

Figure 1: Discourse operations that influence reference form in languages. taken from Longacre and Hwang 2012, 84, figure 6.1

The most salient discourse operations in Kwakum texts are: 1) the first mention, 2) tracking routinely, and 3) local contrast. This paper focuses on the way that major characters, minor characters, and props are introduced and then tracked throughout the body of the narrative.

2.   PARTICIPANT CATEGORIES AND FIRST MENTION OPERATION

In Kwakum narrative discourse, participants belong to one of the following categories: major character, minor character, or prop. "When a participant is first mentioned…the most explicit form of NP tends to be used, with descriptive adjectives or relative clauses" (Longacre and Hwang 2012, 84). In Kwakum, characters tend to be introduced using nouns or nouns with qualifiers.

2.1   *Major Characters*

In Kwakum, major characters tend to be included in the storyline from the beginning to end and quoted directly and indirectly. Major characters tend to command others and have their thoughts revealed, whereas other characters are spoken about in relation to them. There can be more than one major character in a story, as in *Panther and Tortoise Kill Their Mothers* (*Panther*), where both the panther and the tortoise are major characters. These two major characters are introduced in the first sentence of the text which is shown in (1).

Major characters in Kwakum narratives are often first mentioned by name or by a noun that describes them as an archetype for a species (e.g. *sey* 'panther' in (1)), usually within the first few sentences. Most of the time, this first mention occurs in left-dislocated position. Crystal defines **left-dislocation** as "a type of sentence in which one of the constituents appears in initial position and its canonical position is filled by a pronoun or a full lexical noun phrase with the same

reference" (Crystal 1997, 262). In examples (1)–(4), the major character is introduced with a noun in the left-dislocated position, and a resumptive pronoun (bolded for reference) is placed in the canonical position. Left-dislocation is not always used, as in (5) where the major character Bembe is introduced with his name in the canonical subject position. However, in the analyzed texts, left-dislocation occurs in the introduction of all major characters unless they are introduced by name.

(1) | Kakan=aambɔ | bɛ | mɛ | naa | sey | iya | jaklyɛ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| folktale=1SG.POSS | COP | P4 | COMP | panther | and | tortoise |

yɛ	bɛ	nyaalɔ.
3PL	COP	friends

'My folktale is such: the panther and the tortoise were friends.' (*Panther* 1)

(2) | Gwɔgwɔɔnɔ | gwɔɔnɔ | kɔndu | **yɛ** | kɛ | mɛ | ɔ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| small.children | children | girl | 3PL | go | P4 | LOC |

jiki	naa	yɛ	ŋ=kɛ	tokɔ.
river	COMP	3PL	PRS=go	fish.V

'Some small children, girls, they went to the river to go dam fishing.' (*Daughters* 1)

(3) | Saŋg=waambo | **a**'i | mɔɔnɔ | paam | moo | ji | nɛ | kaŋ | bulaawɛ. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| father=1SG.POSS | 3SG'COP | child | man | REL.PRO | COP | with | courage | a.lot |

'My father, he is a very courageous man.' (*Bosco* 2)

(4) | Kwakum | ... | **yɛ** | fuu | mɛ | ɔ | pɛŋ | saa | Égipten | kunwaawɛ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kwakum | | 3PL | come.from | P4 | LOC | side | home | Egypt | near |

'The Kwakum...they came from near Egypt.' (*Origins* 1)

(5) | Bɛ | mɛ | le | naa, | **Bɛmbɛ** | ji | mɛ | jaandɔ | ɔ | kipɛtɔ | kidɔm... |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COP | P4 | thus | COMP | Bɛmbɛ | IPFV | P4 | walk | LOC | time | dry.season |

'So it was that Bembe was walking during the dry season...' (*Bembe* 3)

2.2 Minor Characters

Minor characters are rarely named in a text; usually they are introduced with surrogate nouns that relate them to the major characters. Surrogate nouns include "terms of kinship, social role, and occupation" (Longacre and Hwang 2012, 82). Minor characters are at times quoted directly, but generally in only one episode. They also occur only in sections of a story, not throughout the entire story.

In the story *Panther*, the mothers of the panther and tortoise are extremely important to the plot, but still considered minor characters. They are first introduced in a direct quotation, and in reference to the speakers. They are called

anyanjisi 'our mothers' in (6). In the story *Bembe Thoughtlessly Cuts Off His Leg* (*Bembe*), a minor character is introduced in the inciting incident as *kosu* 'parrot,' as in (7). The character is identified as minor because he only occurs in one episode, even though the coding on the noun is the same. Another indicator that he is a minor character is that in this introduction, *kosu* 'parrot' is not left-dislocated. Minor characters are never found in left-dislocated position.

(6) A   ŋ=kee   nɛ   sey   naa,   "Nyalɔ,   n=lɛnɔ   naa
    3SG   PRS=say with   panther   COMP   friend   PRS=want   COMP

    sɛ   jɔlɔ   **anyanjisi.**"
    1PL   kill   mothers.1PL.POSS
    'He said to the panther, 'Friend, I want us to kill our mothers."' (*Panther* 8)

(7) **Kosu**   n=se   le   tɛsi   gwɛh.
    parrot   PRS=come then   also   over.there
    'Then, the parrot also came over there.' (*Bembe* 7)

2.3 Props

Props can be either human or non-human in Kwakum narratives. Human props are never named or directly quoted. Props are usually passive in the story; or if active they perform only a single role. Props tend to appear and disappear throughout the story without any special introduction or exit strategy. The first mention of a prop can be either a simple noun like *atunje* 'mushrooms' in (8) or a qualified noun like *kibumɔ wɔku* 'certain fruit' in (9).

(8) Jaklyɛ   tɛsi,   a   kɛ   nɔkɔ   gwɛɛ   **atunje.**
    tortoise   also   3SG   go   pick   3SG.POSS   mushrooms
    'The tortoise also, he picked for himself some mushrooms.' (*Panther* 49)

(9) A'i   nɛ   **kibumɔ wɔku**   ɔ   kɔmbɔ   tee   yi
    3SG'PRS.COP   with   fruit   certain   LOC   forest   in   REL

    yɛ   n=dowaa   naa   Kicilakɔŋ
    3PL   PRS=call   COMP   Kichilakong
    'There is a certain fruit in the forest (that) we call Kichilakong.' (*Panther* 32)

The brothers of Shambu (the creator god), in the story *God And His Wives* (*Wives*), also function as props. They are not mentioned by name and only serve the single purpose of clearing the way for the giant stomach of Shambu's twelfth and now pregnant wife Atatawe. They are first mentioned as *gwomɔ* 'people,' seen in (10), and then immediately in the next sentence described as *sambu agwiaŋ yɛɛ* 'god's brothers,' as in (11).

(10) **Gwomɔ**   ji   bee   si.
     people   IPFV   follow   FOC
     'The people were just following (her) around.' (*Wives* 23)

(11) **Sambu agwiaŋ**   yɛɛ   i   bee   si.
     god   brothers   3SG.POSS   IPFV   follow   FOC
     'God's brothers were just following (her) around.' (*Wives* 24)

3.   MAINTENANCE OF IDENTIFICATION

This section describes the manner in which the identification of participants is maintained throughout a story. "Maintenance refers to keeping a concept in an active status and is an in-between process as regards coding resources. Maintaining a concept of active status requires a minimum of coding resources provided there is no ambiguity" (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001, 28). The subsections below describe how the discourse operations **tracking routinely** and **locally contrastive** are used to identify participants. Each of the three types of participants in Kwakum stories are tracked differently and are thus treated separately.

3.1   Major Characters

Per Dooley and Levinsohn above, one would expect minimal coding of characters when tracking routinely, unless ambiguity requires disambiguation. More specifically, Longacre and Hwang claim that the discourse operation of tracking routinely "is expected to use the form least explicit, such as zero anaphora, an affix, or an unstressed pronoun." However, "when a pronoun is not enough for disambiguation...a proper noun or some other stronger form" may occur (Longacre and Hwang 2012, 84).

3.1.1   Tracking Routinely

After the first mention of major characters, they are routinely tracked by pronouns. A noun or the name of the character is used again only when it is needed for reinstatement or restaging. In a case like the story of *Panther And Tortoise Kill Their Mothers*, the presence of two major characters allows for alternating storylines. The two animal characters are introduced by name (see (1) above) and then tracked through the next four sentences with the plural pronoun *yɛ* '3PL.' In (12), *jaklyɛ* 'tortoise' is mentioned by name and becomes the center of attention for the next section. In (12) and (14), the subject pronoun *a* '3SG' refers to the tortoise. The panther, mentioned in both of these sentences, is the object of the verb and is coded as an NP instead of a pronoun. This all points to the conclusion that the center of attention has moved from the panther and

the tortoise together, to the tortoise. References to the tortoise are bolded, whereas references to the panther are underlined.

(12) Jowo   wɔku,   **jaklyɛ**   n=suyɛ.
      day   certain   tortoise   PRS=go.out
      'One day, the tortoise went out.' (*Panther* 6)

(13) **A**   ŋ=kɛ   jee   <u>sey</u>.
      3SG   PRS=go   see   panther
      'He went to see the panther.' (*Panther* 7)

(14) **A**   ŋ=kee   nɛ   <u>sey</u>   naa,   "Nyalɔ,   n=lɛnɔ
      3SG   PRS=say   with   panther   COMP   friend   PRS=want

      naa   sɛ   jolɔ   anyanjisi."
      COMP   1PL   kill   mothers.1PL.POSS
      'He said to the panther, 'Friend, I want us to kill our mothers."' (*Panther* 8)

3.1.2 *Locally Contrastive*

In the *Panther* story, the need for disambiguation is demonstrated in the excerpt shown in (15)–(29). The panther and tortoise agree to kill their mothers for meat. However, they do so in different locations, with the tortoise upstream from the panther. Again, at this point they are being tracked together, primarily using the third person plural pronoun. In (15), the noun *jaklyɛ* 'tortoise' is used to switch the center of attention back to just the tortoise. From (15)–(22), the tortoise is coded by the subject pronoun *a* '3SG.' In (23), the noun *sey* 'panther' is used to switch the center of attention to the panther. In (25)–(27), *a* '3SG' refers to the panther. Finally, (28) begins with *jaklyɛ tɛsi* 'the tortoise also,' which again changes the center of attention to the tortoise. Sentence (29) begins with *a* '3SG' and refers to the tortoise. This demonstrates that while main characters are tracked routinely with pronouns, locally contrastive nouns are used to switch the center of attention as in (15) and (23).

(15) **Jaklyɛ**   mɛ   kɛ   ikombɔ   tee.
      tortoise   P1   go   forest   in
      'The tortoise went into the forest.' (*Panther* 35)

(16) **A**   kɛ   nɔkɔ.
      3SG   go   pick
      'He picked (the fruit).' (*Panther* 36)

(17) **A**   kɛ   kpɔnlɛ   kibumɔ   yɔɔ   bulaaaawɛ.
      3SG   go   pick   fruit   DEM   a.lot!
      'He picked a lot of that fruit.' (*Panther* 37)

(18) **A**   se   lɛɛ   nɛ.
      3SG   come   thus   with
      'He brought (the fruit).' (*Panther* 38)

(19) **A**   jɛkɛ   mɔmɔɔnɔ   myeke.
      3SG   dam.V   small   dam.N
      'He made a small dam.' (*Panther* 39)

(20) **A**   nyɛ   pa   tuplɛ   nciki   yɔɔ.
      3SG   ?   first   mix   water   DEM
      'He mixed that water.' (*Panther* 40)

(21) **A**   nyɛ   pa   tuplɛ   kicilakɔŋ   yɔɔ   ɔ   tete   bulaawɛ.
      3SG   ?   first   mix   Kichilakong   DEM   LOC   inside   a.lot
      'He mixed in a lot of that Kichilakong.' (*Panther* 41)

(22) **A**   nyɛ   se   bukɔ   myeke.
      3SG   ?   come   break   dam.N
      'He broke the dam.' (*Panther* 42)

(23) Boku   nciki   tatlɛ   mɛ   lɛɛ   kɛ   biŋ   yi,   boku   <u>sey</u>
      REL.PRO water   begin   P4   thus   go   down   REL   REL.PRO panther

      jee   mɛ   le   nciki   betaawɛ   yi,   <u>jɛ</u>   naa,
      see   P4   thus   water   red   REL   3SG   COMP

      "O   **nyalaambɔ,**   **aa**   jɔlɔ   nyanjɛɛ."
      oh   friend.1SG.POSS   3SGP1   kill   mother.3SG.POSS
      'When the water began to go downstream, when the panther saw the red water,
      he (said) 'Oh, my friend killed his mother." (*Panther* 43)

(24) <u>A</u>   n=nɛmbɔ   nyanjɛɛ.
      3SG   PRS=grab   mother.3SG.POSS
      'He grabbed his mother.' (*Panther* 45)

(25) <u>A</u>   kɛkɔ   yɛ   mel.
      3SG   cut   3SG   neck
      'He cut her neck.' (*Panther* 46)

(26) <u>A</u>   bandɔ   nyanj<u>e</u>   ɔ   jombɔ   tee.
      3SG   wrap   mother.3SG.POSS   LOC   packet   in
      'He wrapped his mother in a packet.' (*Panther* 47)

(27) <u>A</u>   se   nɛ.
      3SG   come   with
      'He brought (the packet).' (*Panther* 48)

(28) **Jaklyɛ**   tɛsi,   **a**   kɛ   nɔkɔ   **gwɛɛ**   atunje.
     tortoise   also   3SG   go   pick   3SG.POSS   mushrooms
     'The tortoise also, he picked for himself some mushrooms.' (*Panther* 49)

(29) **A**   kɛ   nɔkɔ   tunje   ikombɔ   tee.
     3SG   go   pick   mushroom   forest   in
     'He picked the mushrooms in the forest.' (*Panther* 50)

In dialogue, a locally contrastive discourse operation is often needed to distinguish one major character from another. Quote formulas in Kwakum can include verbs, as in *kee* 'say' in (30) and (33). However, as in (31), there is often no verb at all. In (30), the previous sentence had already identified the tortoise as the center of attention. Thus, the speaker is identified with the third person singular pronoun. However, in (31), the panther is identified by the noun *sey* 'panther,' indicating a switch in speaker. The tortoise is then again identified with a noun in (33), as the speaker changes again. Example (32) is a separate sentence, but the direct speech is continuing from (31). Therefore, no identification is needed.

(30) A   ŋ=kee   nɛ   sey   naa,   "Nyalɔ   n=lɛnɔ   naa
     3SG   PRS=say   with   panther   COMP   friend   PRS=want   COMP

     sɛ   jɔlɔ   anyanjisi."
     1PL   kill   mothers.1PL.POSS
     'He said to the panther, 'Friend, I want us to kill our mothers."' (*Panther* 8)

(31) Sey   naa,   "Nia   jokɔ."
     panther   COMP   1SG.P1   understand
     'The panther (said), 'I understand."' (*Panther* 9)

(32) "Sɛ   lɛɛ   jɔlɔ   ya   jowɔ   wɛŋ?"
     1PL   thus   kill   3PL   day   when.INTR
     "We will kill them on what day?" (*Panther* 10)

(33) Fa   le   si,   **jaklyɛ**   ŋ=ke   naa,   "Tɔɔ   mɛnɔ,
     there   thus   FOC   tortoise   PRS=say   COMP   even   tomorrow

     sɛ'i   nɛ   kul   sɛ   n=jɔlɔ   ya."
     1PL'COP   with   force   1PL   PRS=kill   3PL
     'At that point, the tortoise said, 'Even tomorrow we can kill them."' (*Panther* 11)

When two major characters are talking, pronouns alone can be used to distinguish between them in speech. In (34), the panther and tortoise have come back together to grill their packets of meat. In (35), the panther asks the tortoise if he killed his mother. The panther is referred to with the pronoun *jɛ* '3SG,' which

allows for some ambiguity. This ambiguity is cleared up when the tortoise responds affirmatively in (36), and asks in (37) if the panther saw the blood come down the stream. Clearly, the tortoise is responding here, because he was upstream. The *jɛ* '3SG' in (36) is all that is needed to distinguish between the two speakers. There is no quote formula in (37) because the tortoise is speaking in both (36) and (37).

(34) Y'a   se   lɛɛ   se   saa   beetaa.
      3PL'P1   come   thus   come   make   fire
      'They made a fire.' (*Panther* 53)

(35) Jɛ   naa,   "Ɔ   jolɔ   nyunjeŋ ?"
      3SG   COMP   2SG   kill   mother.INTR
      'He [panther] (said), 'You killed the mother?" (*Panther* 54)

(36) Jɛ   naa,   "Ii."
      3SG   COMP   yes
      'He [tortoise] (replied), 'Yes." (*Panther* 55)

(37) "Ɔ   jee   wɛɛ   kɛki   pyawɔ   mɛh   kɛ   nɛ   biŋ   yi ? "
      2SG   see   NEG   how   blood   P2   go   with   down   REL
      "Didn't you see how the blood went downstream?" (*Panther* 56)

3.2   Minor Characters

While the tracking of major characters coincides with expected norms, minor characters prove to be an anomaly. Minor characters are tracked using full noun phrases instead of minimal coding found in routine tracking of major characters.

3.2.1   Tracking Routinely

After the first mention, minor characters are almost always coded by name or by an NP. In the first clause in (38), Bembe, (a major character) in the story *Bembe*, is reinstated as the center of attention with his name. He is then referred to by the pronoun *a* '3SG' in the second clause in (38). In (39), *kosu* 'parrot' is introduced for the first time in this story. In (40) and (41), based on the tracking for major characters, one would expect to see pronouns. However, what occurs instead is a repetition of *kosu* 'parrot.' I have bolded references to Bembe and underlined references to the parrot.

(38) Mo   **Bɛmbɛ**   mɛh   kɛ   lɛɛ   kɛ   kwalyɛ   ɔ
      REL.PRO   Bembe   P1   go   thus   go   arrive   LOC

      isanjɔ   fɔku,   isanjɔ   lye   tee   **a**   n=nataa   naa
      clearing   certain   clearing DEM   in   3SG   PRS=find   COMP

      sey   mɛ   jih   nyaamo   a   jolɔ   yi.
      panther   P2   eat   animal   3SG   kill   REL

      'When Bembe arrived at a certain clearing, in that clearing he found that a pan-
      ther had eaten an animal (that) he killed.' (*Bembe* 5)

(39) <u>Kosu</u>   n=se   lɛɛ   tɛsi   gwɛh.
      parrot   PRS=come   then   also   over.there
      'Then, the parrot also came over there.' (*Bembe* 7)

(40) <u>Kosu</u>   n=tatlɛ   se   gbomlɛ   naamo   mɛɛ.
      parrot   PRS=begin   come   peck   maggots   3SG.POSS
      'The parrot began to come peck at its (the remains') maggots.' (*Bembe* 8)

(41) Boku   <u>kosu</u>   mɛh   joktaa   naa   **Bɛmbɛ**   fiyaa   yi,
      REL.PRO   parrot   P1   hear   COMP   Bembe   arrive   REL

      <u>kosu</u>   ŋ=kɛ   kawlɛ   ɔ   fyɛti   nɛ   ikɔɔlo.
      parrot   PRS=go   perch   LOC   tree   with   high

      'When the parrot heard Bembe arrive, the parrot went and perched up high in the
      tree.' (*Bembe* 9)

    In certain situations, pronouns can be used to track minor characters. For in-
stance, just after Bembe arrived in the clearing and saw the dead animal, in (42)
he asks the parrot who killed the animal. Bembe is still the center of attention, as
indicated by the pronoun *jɛ* '3SG' in the quote formula. The parrot responds in
(43) and is coded with the noun *kosu* 'parrot.' The parrot's response, however, is
indirect speech and every reference to the parrot within the indirect quotation is
a pronoun. This is due to the indirect quotation, as the parrot would have said, "<u>I</u>
killed that animal," which is encoded in indirect speech as "The parrot said that
<u>he</u> killed that animal."

(42) **Jɛ**   nɛ   <u>kosu</u>   naa,   "Tah   lɛɛ   mɛ   nɔnjɛ
      3SG   with   parrot   COMP   who   then   P2   keep

      kidɔŋ   bupa   nɛhi ?"
      cadaver   animal   DEM.INTR
      'He (Bembe) (said) to the parrot, "Who then left this animal cadaver here?"' (Bembe 12)

(43) <u>Kosu</u>   naa,   jɛ   si   mɛh   jolɔ   bupa   yɔɔ.
      parrot   COMP   3SG   FOC   P1   kill   animal   DEM
      'The parrot (said) that it was he who killed that animal.' (*Bembe* 13)

(44) <u>A'a</u>   bɔ   lɛɛ   dutɔ.
      3SG'P1   PRF   thus   be.satisfied
      'He had eaten to his satisfaction.' (*Bembe* 14)

(45) <u>A'a</u>   kaatɔ.
      3SG'P1   have.enough
      'He had enough.' (*Bembe* 15)

(46) <u>A</u>   cikɔ   moo   yɔɔ.
      3SG   leave   REL.PRO   DEM
      'He left that (part).' (*Bembe* 16)

Minor characters are also at times tracked using pronouns when they are an object of a verb, as in (47), or the addressee in a dialogue, as in (48).

(47) A   kɛkɔ   yɛ   mel.
      3sg   cut   3SG   neck
      'He cut her neck.' (*Panther* 46)

(48) "M=i   gwaa   kɛ   tews'ɔɔ   cawɔku."
      PRS=IPFV   want   go   show'2SG   something
      "I want to show you something." (*Panther* 27)

3.2.2 Locally Contrastive

Overall, during a locally contrastive discourse operation, full noun phrases are used to disambiguate minor characters as well. This is most evident in sections of dialogue. When a major character is speaking to a minor character, the major character is considered the center of attention. Therefore, when the panther asks his mother to go with him to the river, he is first reinstated by the noun *sey* 'panther' in (49). Then in (50), the speaker changes to *nyanjɛɛ* 'his mother.' In (51), the words of the panther are introduced with the simple verbless quote formula *jɛ naa* 'He (said) that ....' The third singular pronoun can be used here because it is in reference to the center of attention, even though the previous statement was made by another character and the minor character is distinguished by a full NP *nyanjɛɛ* 'his mother.'

(49) <u>Sey</u>   nyɛ   nɛmbɔ   nyanjɛɛ.
      panther   ?   grab   mother.3SG.POSS
      'The panther thus grabbed his mother.' (Panther 24)

(50) Nyanjɛɛ　　　ji　　　　lakse　　yɛ　　naa,　　"ɔ　　　n=lɛɛ　　kɛ
　　　 mother.3SG.POSS　IPFV　　ask　　　3SG　　COMP　　2SG　　PRS=thus　go

　　　 nɛ　　　ni　　　wɛŋ,　　　　　　mɔɔnaambɔ ?"
　　　 with　　1SG　　where.INTR　　child.1SG.POSS
　　　 'His mother asked him, 'You are taking me where, my child?' (*Panther* 25)

(51) Iɛ²　　　naa,　　　"Sɛ　　　kɛn."
　　　 3sg　　COMP　　1PL　　go.HORT
　　　 'He (said), "Let's go." ' (*Panther* 26)

(52) "M=i　　　gwaa　　kɛ　　tews'ɔɔ　　cawɔku."
　　　 PRS=IPFV　want　　go　　show'2SG　　something
　　　 ' "I want to show you something." ' (*Panther* 27)

3.3　Props

Most often tracking of props is maintained through nouns, not unlike minor characters. The sentences below are taken from *Bosco's Father Goes To Prison* (*Bosco*). Bosco's father decides to use "ring magic" in order to save his ill father. The full noun *isɛŋ* 'ring' is found in each sentence (53)–(56). The general pronoun *jɛ* '3SG' is used in (56) as well, but it is the (secondary) object of the verb as well as being in the same sentence in which the full noun was also used.

(53) A　　　banjɛ　　　　mɛ　　**isɛŋ.**
　　　 3SG　　practice.magic　P4　　ring
　　　 'He practiced ring magic.' (*Bosco* 15)

(54) A　　banjɛ　　　　mɛ　　**isɛŋ**　nɛ　　yɛklɛ　　yɛ　　ji　　　mɛ
　　　 3SG　practice.magic　P4　　ring　　with　teacher　3PL　IPFV　P4

　　　 dowaa　　　　naa　　Raul　ɔ　　Pulasi.
　　　 call　　　　COMP　Raul　LOC　France
　　　 'He practiced ring magic with a teacher (that) they call Raul in France.' (*Bosco* 15)

---

² Kwakum has three sets of personal pronouns: 1) nominative pronouns, 2) accusative pronouns, and 3) general pronouns. The nominative pronoun only occurs in the subject position (before the verb), the accusative in the primary object position (immediately after the verb complex), and the general occurs: in the secondary object position (following the primary object), in verbless quote formulas and as the object of a preposition, and in focus position. The *jɛ* '3SG' pronoun here is a general pronoun used because of the verbless quote formula. See Hare (2018, 99ff.) for more information.

(55) Yɛ   n=tomlɛ   yɛ   **isɛŋ.**
      3PL   PRS=send   3SG   ring
      'They sent him a ring.' (*Bosco* 15)

(56) Boku   yɛ   tomlɛ   mɛ   lɛɛ   **isɛŋ**   yi,   a
      REL.PRO   3PL   send   P4   thus   ring   REL   3SG

      n=se   fɛ   sanj=ɛɛ   **jɛ**   ɔ   mbɔ.
      PRS=come   give   father=3SG.POSS   3SG   LOC   hand
      'When they had sent the ring, he came and put it [ring] on his father's hand.'
      (*Bosco* 15)

There is a unique phenomenon which occurs only with props in Kwakum stories. After the first mention or reinstatement of the prop, zero anaphora is employed.[3] This is the case of the fruit in the story *Panther*. After being reinstated in (57), the noun or any reference to the noun is omitted in (58). The same thing occurs in the story of Bembe, where the body of an animal is reinstated in (59), and then omitted in (60). Zero anaphora seems to occur especially often following the preposition *nɛ* 'with.'

(57) A   kɛ   kpɔnlɛ   **kibumɔ**   yɔɔ   bulaaaawɛ.
      3SG   go   pick   fruit   DEM   a.lot
      'He picked a lot of that fruit.' (*Panther* 37)

(58) A   se   lɛɛ   nɛ   Ø .
      3SG   come   thus   with   (fruit)
      'He brought (the fruit).' (*Panther* 38)

(59) Bɛmbe   mɛh   toklɛ   bupa.
      Bembe   P1   take   animal
      'Bembe took the animal.' (*Bembe* 29)

(60) A'a   kɛ   nɛ   Ø   ɔ   jal.
      3SG'p1   go   with   (animal) LOC   village
      'He took (it) to the village.' (*Bembe* 30)

Kwakum has a type of impersonal participant that is never named, never introduced, and always tracked using the third person plural pronoun *yɛ* '3PL.' This same practice has been noted in Nɔmaande, where the third plural pronoun "is

---

[3] It is odd that zero anaphora only occurs with props. One would expect zero anaphora to occur with major participants if it occurred with any participant type. Zero anaphora is very rare in Kwakum and is most common following the preposition *nɛ* 'with'; however, full NPs often follow *nɛ* 'with' as well. In all 10 narratives referenced for this paper, full NPs occurred after *nɛ* 'with' for major characters, minor characters, and props, but zero anaphora only occurred with props.

used to refer to some unspecified wider group, such as a community" (Taylor 1994, 96). In the story *Bosco*, Bosco's father went to work for an agricultural agency. Then, as seen in (61), "they" fired him. There is no individual mentioned; it is just a collective "they."

(61)	Boku	a	se	mɛ	gwɛh	yi,	**yɛ**	m=fusɛ	le	yɛ.
	REL.PRO	3SG	come	P4	over.there	REL	3PL	PRS=let.go	thus	3SG

'When he came over there, they fired him.' (*Bosco* 37b)

A particularly confusing event occurs in the story of *Panther*, when the tortoise is going to make the trade between his packet of mushrooms and the panther's packet of meat. First, to give some background, Kwakum has a set of free possessive pronouns which can function independently. For instance, bolded in (64) below, *gwɛɛ* 'his' refers to the breakfast given to Simon's father in the *Story Of Simon's Father's Death* (*Simon*). There is also an emphatic form of the free possessive pronoun bolded in (63). The speaker is telling the *Story Of The Kwakum* (*Story*), and he gives us the name of the original ancestor of the Kwakum people, Chimbuta. In doing so, he emphasizes that he learned this information from *gwaambɔ sanje we* 'my *own* father.'

(62)	Sɛ	m=fe	yɛ	**gwɛɛ.**
	1PL	PRS=give	3SG	3SG.POSS

'We give him his.' (*Simon* 40)

(63)	Bawa	yisi	(kɛki	ni	jɔkɔ	mɛ	nɛ	**gwaambɔ**
	grandfather	1PL.POSS	like	1SG	hear	p4	with	1sg.poss

	sanje	**we**)	ijinɔ	lyɛɛ	bɛ	mɛ	naa	Cimbuta.
	father	DEM	name	3SG.POSS	COP	P4	COMP	Chimbuta

'Our grandfather (like I heard from my own father), his name was Chimbuta.' (*Story* 5)

In (64)–(68) the narrator is distinguishing between two packets. I have bolded all references to the panther's packet and underlined the references to the tortoise's packet. The panther's packet is reintroduced in (64) with *jombɔ moo sey* 'the packet of the panther.' Immediately following, the speaker uses *gwɛɛ* 'his' to refer to the panther's packet, but then distinguishes the tortoise's packet as *gwɛɛ jombo lye* 'his own packet.' Tracking through the rest of the sequence, only the tortoise's packet is referred to using the emphatic construction, which helps the listener to distinguish the two.

(64) Boku   sey   ŋ=kɛ   sandlaa   yi,   jaaklyɛ   n=tɔklɛ

     REL.PRO panther PRS=go urinate   REL   tortoise   PRS=take

     jombɔ   **moo**   **sey.**

     packet   REL.PRO panther

     'When the panther went to urinate, the tortoise took the panther's packet.' (*Panther* 71)

(65) A   m=fɛ   **gwɛɛ**   ndɔɔ   <u>gwɛɛ</u>   <u>jombɔ</u> <u>lye</u>

     3SG   PRS=put 3SG.POSS REL.PRO 3SG.POSS packet DEM

     mɛh   bɛ   yi.

     P2   COP   REL

     'He put his [panther's] (packet) in (the place) where his [tortoise], his packet, was.' (*Panther* 72)

(66) A   n=tɔklɛ   <u>gwɛɛ</u>   <u>jombɔ</u> <u>lye.</u>

     3SG   PRS=take 3SG.POSS   packet   DEM

     'He took his [tortoise], his packet.' (*Panther* 73)

(67) A   m=fɛ   ndɔɔ   **sey**   **gwɛɛ**   mɛ   bɛ   yi.

     3SG   PRS=put REL.PRO panther 3SG.POSS P2   COP   REL

     'He put [his own packet], in the place where the panther's was.' (Panther 74)

(68) A   ŋ=kɔ   totɔ.

     3SG   PRS=again go.back

     'He went back (to his place).' (*Panther* 75)

This emphatic free possessive construction is often used to distinguish two props of the same nature within a narrative, as seen with the packets in this passage.

4.   CONCLUSION

This article offers the first detailed examination of participant reference in Kwakum narrative discourse. The general pattern of tracking is consistent overall with norms described in related languages. However, some unique features exist which distinguish major characters from minor characters and minor characters from props. At first mention, major characters are often identified by a noun in left-dislocated position, but then routinely tracked by pronouns. Minor characters and props are introduced with nouns and then further tracked with qualified nouns rather than pronouns. While props overall follow the tracking features of minor characters, they also can be tracked with zero anaphora at times and with a unique emphatic free possessive construction, when there is a need to disambiguate between two props of the same nature.

ABBREVIATIONS

Ø	Null	NP	Noun Phrase
1	First Person	P1	Immediate Past Tense
2	Second Person	P2	Near Past Tense
3	Third Person	P4	Remote Past Tense
COP	Copula	PL	Plural
COMP	Complementizer	POSS	Possessive
DEM	Demonstrative	PRE	Perfect
FOC	Focus	PRS	Present
HORT	Hortative	PRS.COP	Present Indicative Copula
IMPV	Imperfective Aspect	REL	Relativizer
INTR	Interrogative	REL.PRO	Relative Pronoun
LOC	Locative	SG	Singular
N	Noun	V	Verb
NEG	Negation		

REFERENCES

Crystal, David. 2003. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 5th ed. London: Blackwell.

Dooley, Robert A., and Stephen H. Levinsohn. 2001. *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Guthrie, Malcolm. 1948. *The Classification of the Bantu Languages.* London: International African Institute. Reprinted in 1967. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall.

Hare, David. 2018. "Tense in Kwakum Narrative Discourse." Master's thesis, The Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics. https://www.diu.edu/documents/theses/Hare_David-thesis.pdf.

Longacre, Robert E., and Shin Ja J. Hwang. 2012. *Holistic Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Taylor, Carolyn P. 1994. "Participant Reference in Nɔmaandɛ Narrative Discourse." In *Discourse Features of Ten Languages of West-Central Africa*, edited by Stephen H. Levinsohn, 91–108. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.

Review Article: *Basics of Hebrew Discourse—A Guide to Working with Hebrew Prose and Poetry*[1]

Ernst R. Wendland
Stellenbosch University
erwendland@gmail.com

This modest, but densely packed volume of 288 pages consists of two main PARTS: 1—"Working with Biblical Hebrew [BH] Prose" by Matthew Patton, and 2—"Working with Biblical Hebrew Poetry" by Frederic Clarke Putnam, each of which includes an initial "Expanded Table of Contents."[2] In addition, the book contains a short general "Introduction" by the editor, Miles Van Pelt, the requisite listing of Abbreviations, a "Table of Grammatical Terms" (only *qatal, weqatal, yiqtol, wayyiqtol*), a joint Bibliography, two brief Appendices ("The Question of Meter" and "Gloss, Meaning, and Translation"), and three Indices (Scripture, Subject, Author). According to the Editor, this text is "designed in order to provide students of the Hebrew Bible with a functional introduction to the use and application of discourse analysis as a necessary component to textual analysis and the exegetical process" (11). Discourse analysis, in turn, is defined as "the study of the meaningful relationships that exist between individual clauses in the production of a textual unit, *from individual paragraphs to larger discourse units*" in order to "identify and understand the ways in which texts are ordered and connected to express meaning and logical progression" (11–12, italics added).[3] My overview consists essentially of a summary and selective assessment of the various ways in which the two authors respectively have carried out these objectives, first with regard to BH prose and then to BH poetry.[4]

---

[1] By Matthew H. Patton and Frederic Clarke Putnam (edited by Miles V. Van Pelt), Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic, 2019. I acknowledge with gratitude the critical comments of a peer reviewer and the editor with respect to a first draft of this study; however, they are not responsible for any errors or infelicities that remain.

[2] The two parts share similar formatting and basic structure, but they are otherwise independent, do not reference once another, and each has its own separate table of contents and introduction.

[3] It is with reference, in particular, to the italicized aspects of this objective that the book fails to fully deliver, as will be shown in the following discussion.

[4] This book contains a great amount of detail in terms of the many different aspects of Hebrew grammar that are discussed, and the numerous examples provided along the way. All of this information is important of course, so I must apologize in advance if my selective treatment of the subject matter ignores, downplays, or omits anything really essential to this

PART 1: HEBREW PROSE

In his "Introduction" to PART 1 (ch.1), Patton describes discourse analysis as the process of identifying "the flow of a text" and "how each part relates to the other parts in the text," with particular attention to the "cues" that indicate the relationships between these parts (29). In BH prose we find that chains of *wayyiqtol* verbs are employed to communicate a narrative, while in contrast a sequence of *weqatal* verbs will "provide instructions for a process" (30). The study of discourse is important because "it provides the stimulus and foundation for further literary, historical, and theological study" (31) and also helps to resolve exegetical debates by slowing the reader down so that s/he pays closer attention to the details of a text, in particular, the various relationships between and among its many constituent parts (32). Patton offers a brief but useful "survey of scholarship" with respect to some of the main questions that arise in the contemporary field of BH discourse analysis: sentence types (36); verb forms, clausal relationships, and their discourse functions (37–38); word order; text-types (38–39);[5] various other aspects of discourse syntax and semantics (39); "the evolution of BH" (39); and "the flexibility of different discourse features" (40). Unfortunately, there is no single "definitive and scholarly account," including the present study by Patton's admission, that takes all these issues into consideration in a complete and unified treatment of the field (40–41).

Chapter 2 deals with "discourse relationships" that are manifested between clauses (42). Patton begins with some "basic definitions": clauses, discourse relationships, foreground-background, discourse mode, and discourse type (42–44). He then summarizes and exemplifies "some basic discourse relationships"—first, in **narrative**: *coordinate* relationships (next-event, contrast, simultaneous action, summary, new episode, initiate background), then *subordinate* relationships (result, expansion, circumstance) (45–48). Next, **non-narrative** relationships are surveyed: *coordinate* (next-step, inference, reason, answer, addition), then *subordinate* (purpose, comparison, condition, concession) (49–50).[6] Coordinate

study of the "basics of Hebrew discourse." Since this is a "review article" and not a simple "review" of the book, I engage more critically with the authors concerning a number of exegetical and procedural issues and with occasional reference to some of my own work in BH discourse analysis simply for the sake of comparing approaches and providing alternatives to certain interpretations. At such junctures, readers must of course come to their own conclusions, also with regard to both methodology and pedagogy.

[5] Patton gathers predictive, expository, and hortatory text-types under the classification of "non-narrative" (38–39). However, according to Robert Longacre's categorization (referenced on 38–39), hortatory discourse is distinct from pure narrative by lacking a "time focus" in contrast to expository texts, which lack an "agent focus."

[6] Alternative arrangements of such interclausal semantic relationships exist, notably those that do not distinguish between "narrative" and "non-narrative" texts, for example, Beekman and Callow 1974, 287–312; Nida 1975, 50–65. From these classic studies of discourse "proposi-

relationships "are on the same 'level' with each other," in contrast to subordinate relationships "where a clause depends conceptually upon and in some way supports a clause at a higher level" (45). For each of these relationships, Patton gives a simple definition, an illustrative example, and sometimes also an added "clarification," which reveals the precision needed for such a system of classification, e.g., for the *coordinate* relationship of "next event": "Sometimes B not only follows A, but A causes B. In this case, use 'result'" (46). However, perhaps it would be easier on the reader to restrict such non-applicable alternatives to the spot in the proposed classification where they actually apply—here as a "subordinate" relationship (48). Similarly, the four exceptions given as a clarification for the relationship of "simultaneous time" (47) probably only complicate the simple example that is provided: "A. He ate, B. and drank" (46). In balance, however, it is important to take note of these sequential clausal relations since they certainly affect one's understanding of the biblical text, and hence also its translation into another language as well (as evidenced in the frequent variations exhibited by the standard English meaning-oriented versions).

Chapter 3 takes up the subject of "Element #1 of Biblical Hebrew Prose," namely, "Discourse Markers," which are defined as "any nonverbal words that identify the function of a clause in the discourse," including conjunctions, relatives, interrogatives, adverbs, interjections, and special expressions (51).[7] The following prominent discourse markers are described and exemplified: פֶּן — negative purpose; יַעַן — cause, reason; אֲשֶׁר — relative clause (often indicating expansion, cause, result, condition); כִּי — time when, object complement clause ("that"), cause (also circumstance, condition, expansion, contrast); וְעַתָּה — logical conclusion (inference, summons to action); temporal shift (to present time); וְהִנֵּה — shift in perspective (new point of view, topic, insight, inference); לֵאמֹר — direct speech introducer (53–59). The conjunctive particle *waw* is not considered on its own as a "discourse marker," but only in association with the syntactic structures that it initiates in a text (59–60).

Chapter 4 deals with "Element #2 of Biblical Hebrew Prose (Part 1 of 2)" and focuses on "Verbal Sequences in Narrative" (61). Hebrew verbs are described as conveying meaning on two distinct levels—the *clause* level with respect to tense, aspect, and mood, and also on the *discourse* level, where sequences of clauses are concerned (61–62). After a helpful orientation to "the basics of tense, aspect, and mood" (definition and exemplification), including a schematic chart of "default verbal semantics" (62–64), Patton proceeds to a discussion of the "continuative forms" of the verb on the discourse level of BH prose (65). A

---

tional relations," I developed my system of identifying and displaying such interclausal connections (Wendland 2017, 52–56, 184–185).

[7] For a recent, more systematic and detailed discussion of these discourse-level semantic and pragmatic operators, see van der Merwe, et al. 2017.

somewhat redundant introduction (66–67) precedes a consideration of "important verbal sequences in narrative," which also "convey many other discourse relationships besides continuation" (68). "*Wayyiqtol* is the continuative form in narrative discourse" (68), indicating common discourse functions, such as: next-event, contrast, result, simultaneous event, expansion, and a new episode (68–70). Each of these usages is illustrated by a clear example, which is briefly explained. This is followed by the special case of וַיְהִי, which may be used to mark a new unit, shift in time, result, or simply "a standard *wayyiqtol*" continuity[8] (71–72). There are two types of interruption that may occur in a *wayyiqtol* sequence, thus forming a significant disjunction that may serve a number of important discourse functions. Most common is a *waw+x+qatal* construction ['x' = a syntactic slot that is filled by some other constituent], which is treated later in chapter 6. Then we have the relatively rare *weqatal* form, which may "mark a foregrounded event as climactic or final" or "initiate a background *weqatal* sequence, conveying habitual information" (74). Occasionally, a *weqatal* appears in a *wayyiqtol* sequence "for no apparent reason" (75), but when וְהָיָה occurs "it often introduces a background comment about a habitual action or event" (76).

Chapter 5 carries on from the preceding chapter to consider "Verbal Sequences in Non-Narrative," including law, prediction, instruction, and reports—but not poetry, which is the subject of part two of this book. The most important form for non-narrative prose then is the *weqatal* sequence,[9] which is discussed in terms of two distinct types—first of all, those that convey "discourse functions that mirror *wayyiqtol*," namely: next-step, contrast, result or purpose, simultaneous step, or an expansion of the previous step (78). Second, two "common discourse functions that are unique to *weqatal*" include "if...then" statements and inference, where "the *weqatal* verb concludes something from the foregoing discourse," often a plan of action (79–80). Again, each of these discourse functions is clearly exemplified with an illustration and short exposition. Some "common discourse functions that mirror וַיְהִי" are these: indication of a new unit, a shift in time, result or purpose, and the standard *weqatal* usage (81). The construction *waw + yiqtol* after an imperatival form normally indicates purpose (or goal), but occasionally the context suggests that there is "simply a conjoining of commands or plans" (82). The presence of asyndeton (no initial conjunction) before a verb often indicates reason or inference (82–83). Finally, Patton illustrates several other important verbal sequence functions (84–87):

---

[8] Patton notes that this last usage may often be identified by a following subject noun that agrees in gender and number (73).

[9] Experts in the BH verbal system might query the decision to combine the semantic functions of the *weqatal* verbal form and that involving "a simple *waw* conjunction + *qatal*" (77, fn. 1; cf. p. 73); however, I am not competent to evaluate this distinction, and Patton's reasons seem cogent enough (78).

switching between discourse types, where the new discourse, e.g., a speech, is embedded in the old discourse; a narrative being interrupted by a series of *weqatal* forms recounting a procedure or habitual action; the resumption of a previous verbal sequence; and an "epic restatement," where "a clause will re-state the previous clause, slowing the discourse down and indicating a climax (or 'peak') in the discourse" (87). When reading through this listing of non-narrative verbal constructions, I frequently found myself wondering whether the various discourse functions being attributed to these sequences of clauses can be sufficiently supported on the basis of verb forms alone. Certainly, in the case of the last-mentioned item (peak or climax), there must be other literary-functional indicators present to substantiate or confirm the presence of such points of foregrounded text, e.g., figurative language, repetition, a vocative, and so forth.[10]

"Element #3 of Biblical Hebrew Prose"—"Preposing and Verbless Clauses"—is the subject of chapter 6. "Preposing" is defined as occurring when "a subject, ob-ject or adverbial is placed before the verb" (88).[11] Normally, the preposed element is preceded by a *waw*, but occasionally the latter is missing. A verbless clause is one that includes "a subject and a predicate, where the predicate is not a verb but a noun" (90).[12] It is important to note that preposing a noun or prepositional phrase is significant, or "marked," when that particular element does not need to be fronted (examples of obligatory fronting are given), but are so situated "often to bring something that was not previously in view into new prominence" (90). Annotated examples are then given to illustrate the "common discourse functions for preposing and verbless clauses" (91): contrast,[13] circumstances/reason, addi-tion, introducing a new topic, to initiate background,[14] expansion of a previous idea, and intensification (91–96). According to Patton, intensification occurs "when the preposed element is *already prominent* in the discourse (and hence...not needed to signal a new topic)" (95–96, original italics).[15]

---

[10] See, for example, the discussion in Callow 1974, 49–68; Wendland 2017, 18, 37, 94.

[11] Citing Adina Moshavi 2010, 1.

[12] Patton correctly observes that "participles...should nevertheless be considered 'verbal' in a predicate construction..." (90), and hence they are able to function as a finite verb within a "clause" (42) where a subject (and an optional object or adjunct) is present.

[13] In the case of a contrast, "the preposed [constituent] or verbless clause continues the current discourse mode (foreground or background) but predicates something that differs pointedly from a foreground clause" (91). The item in brackets is required since "preposed" does not refer to a "clause," e.g., 1 Samuel 1:21a, 22a (92).

[14] Perhaps the term "initiate" could be changed to "insert" in order to avoid the implication that the background information being presented at that point in the discourse is topically "new," not being referred to earlier in the text, as in the case of the example given—Gen 12:4 (47, cf. also 94).

[15] Such intensification would include "surprise, emphasis, or other forceful effects" (95). Again, there is a certain ambiguity in designating the initial description of this device (this

Chapter 7 constitutes the core of part one of this book. Here Patton presents "A Process for Discourse Analysis with Hebrew Prose," which "constitutes the foundation for Hebrew exegesis" (97), or discourse analysis. Only three "steps" are involved, but each one is rather complex in that it consists of a number of secondary procedures to be carried out.[16] Step 1 then is to "Separate the Text by Clauses," the intention being to enable "us to see clearly the constituent parts of a text and to consider how these interrelate" (97). This step presents "a simple approach to diagramming Hebrew texts in a word processor" (98). An electronic table is created consisting of a limited number of columns that distinguish the different types of information being recorded and as many lines as are needed to include all the clauses that are discerned in a given text being examined. Other prominent features of the table are these (99–100): (a) the Hebrew word order is preserved; (b) subordinate phrases and clauses are indented to show relationships with the main clause;[17] (c) grey shading is utilized to indicate discourse segments that are embedded, e.g., direct quotations.

Step 2 is to "Analyze Each Clause," which consists of several subordinate steps (103): (A) "Observe Key Factors in a Given Clause," namely: (a) "observe the clause," that is, make a record of all important aspects of the text under examination (e.g., discourse markers, verbal sequences, word order, verbless clauses) according to a set of "rules for the Construction column" on the electronic display chart (104),[18] and (b) "observe [i.e., indicate on the chart noteworthy aspects of] the context" (e.g., discourse type, preceding verbal sequence, instances of background material or text resumption, shift in expected verb forms; 105–106); (B) "Conclude with How the Clause Relates to the Previous Clauses,"[19] that is, summarize on the

---

applies to the chapter title as well): "[P]reposed or verbless clauses can mark surprise, emphasis..." (95). However, it is not an entire clause, in this case, that is preposed, but only one (or more) syntactic element(s) within the clause. Instead of "preposed clauses," "word order" might be a clearer reference, as given on p. 143.

[16] Additional "clarifications" and "exceptions" are attached to Step 1 (98–100) and "rules of thumb" in conjunction with Step 2 (109–110). These are valuable instructions of various kinds, but I wonder how soon it would be before average students become overwhelmed by all the details involved in this method of text charting. It may be compared with a somewhat simpler approach to "spatializing" a BH text as described in Wendland 2017, 10–13.

[17] I do not see why such indenting needs to be done also for "phrases," even those that precede the main clause (100). This procedure would seem to make the charting and display too complex for utility on the "macro-discourse" level, which would include clausal and sentence groupings to indicate distinct "paragraphs" within a longer text (cf. the illustrations on pp. 101–102, 125–126).

[18] For example, "Everything before the verb is included, but all noun phrases, prepositional phrases, and adverbial phrases are replaced with 'x' "; and "everything after the verb is not included" (104).

[19] This sub-step appears to reduplicate much of what was done already during the preceding step (105).

electronic display, any other significant bits of information, including "your sense of the text's inner logic" and "all kinds of relevant broader contexts" (106).[20] Some practical guidelines for step B are further suggested (108–109): (a) "Ask what the speaker is doing with this clause," i.e., conduct a clausal "speech-act" analysis of the text;[21] "Scan lists of possible relationships," i.e., repeatedly re-examine the text in order to detect significant patterns or sequences of lexical and semantic information; and "Be prepared for unusual situations," i.e., be on the lookout for any apparent exceptions to the rules of BH prose composition and try to explain (hypothesize) why these have occurred where they appear in the text (109).

Step 3 is to "Reassess Your Analysis" in order to (a) possibly "revise relationships in light of the whole discourse" and, importantly, (b) to "determine boundaries of larger sections" (111). Sub-step (a) is of course necessary when carrying out any type of discourse analysis. However, I am not convinced that, according to the method that has just been proposed, sub-step (b) will be able to be effectively accomplished by most students (or inexperienced text analysts, translators, etc.). The reason is suggested by the author himself when he states that "our focus on this book has been on clausal relationships," which in my experience is necessary as a first step, but not sufficient "for determining higher-level relationships" (111). In particular, insufficient attention has been given to larger patterns of lexical recursion within the text that create significant instances of "disjunctive parallelism," which is one of the most important markers for indicating discourse boundaries, both "aperture" and "closure," in BH prose (and poetry).[22] In any case, I fully concur with Patton's concluding comment: "discourse analysis teaches us to attend well to texts so we can approach the interpretive question of logical unity [*and thematic coherence*] with as much information as possible" (112). We simply need to add several additional steps that focus, in particular, on the higher-level (paragraph and sectional) units of Hebrew discourse organization.

Chapter 8 presents several worked "Examples of Discourse Analysis with Hebrew Prose" (113). The four texts examined are (114–137): Jonah 1:4a–6b; 1 Kgs 20:23–25; Exod 12:21c–23f; and finally, the longest analysis, 1 Sam 9:26–10:13. With respect to the final study listed (125–137), several questions could be raised: the thematic outline of this fourth passage (138) is helpful as a summary of the preceding charts, but these larger and smaller discourse units do not seem to be indicated and justified within the charts themselves. Such added explanation would assist readers, and especially Bible translators, to critically evaluate the

---

[20] One begins to suspect now that a rather advanced level of prior BH knowledge and capability is presupposed for carrying out this type of text analysis.

[21] The latter portion of this instruction (after each quotation) is my clarification concerning how this might be done (cf. Wendland 2017, 21–22, 212–213).

[22] Disjunctive, or "discontinuous," parallelism is described and exemplified in Wendland, *Studies* 2017, 132–167, 186–195.

formats of the various versions which they comparatively access during their study or, indeed, to establish (and defend) the paragraph and larger sections proposed in their own translation. For example: why end the study at 10:13 (as suggested by "Closing Denouement," 138), when the narrative seemingly continues with וַיֹּאמֶר דּוֹד שָׁאוּל (10:14) at least to 10:16?[23] At the beginning of the posited unit then, would not the two segments distinguished under "Preparation for the Anointing and Speech (9:26–27) not be better analyzed as a single narrative paragraph?[24] Similarly, it would seem advisable, from the perspective of a cohesive BH narrative style, to view 10:9–11 (possibly incorporating also vv. 12–13) into a single paragraph unit, with segments of embedded direct speech, rather than separately as three (five) smaller units.[25] Shown on the next page is a sample (1 Sam 10:9–10, imperfectly reproduced) of a small portion of the preceding text to partially illustrate Patton's elaborate method of displaying a discourse analysis exercise (135).[26]

The sample on the next page is obviously a rather labor-intensive method of analyzing a BH narrative text.[27] The potential benefits of this type of detailed display will depend, of course, on the specific purpose for which it has been carried out. This would need to be set in balance with the amount of time that is available for such an exercise, and perhaps also the degree of expertise of the text practitioners concerned. In the case of parish pastors studying for a sermon on an OT text, or Bible translators engaged in translating the entire book of Samuel according to a limited schedule, this would not seem to be a feasible procedure.

---

[23] Indeed, there may be a valid reason for ending the larger narrative unit at 10:13, or even initiating the "episode" at 9:26 (rather than at 10:9), but that is not apparent from the chart and its details; some additional explanation is needed—somewhat more than what is provided in the notes under each segment of the chart.

[24] Thus, v. 27 begins with a participial construction (הֵמָּה יוֹרְדִים בִּקְצֵה הָעִיר) that follows directly after what was narrated at the end of v. 26.

[25] From this perspective, v. 10 continues from v. 9 (the Masoretic setumah, ס, notwithstanding), which begins with the discourse opener וְהָיָה. The locative expression "there at Gibeah" (שָׁם הַגִּבְעָתָה) recalls the prior instruction given by Samuel to Saul back in 10:5, which situates the setting of the "signs" predicted in vv. 5–7 and referred to then in v. 9 (הָאֹתוֹת).

[26] As mentioned above, after a given discourse analysis display, some explanatory notes are added, for example: "**vv. 10–12:** These three verses stand together in one big relationship to verse 9d, which says that all these signs happened on that day. All three verses expand upon verse 9d, narrating how the signs took place. We can represent a big discourse relationship like this by using a heading (see between v. 9d and v. 10a)" (135). However, a distinct "embedded discourse" covering vv. 11e–f is indicated on the next chart, but this is not clearly distinguished either from another embedding in v. 12a–e, or more importantly, from the narrative closure in v. 13 (137).

[27] In chapter 9 Patton presents a useful "Prose Discourse Analysis Summary Chart," which includes all of the steps outlined in chapter 8 (139–144). This detailed, strongly clause-focused approach may be compared with other proposed procedures for biblical text analysis, one easier, e.g., Barnwell 2020, 77–82; or one harder, e.g., Wendland 2017, 9–26.

Vs	Text	Construction	Discourse Analysis	Translation[28]
9a	וְהָיָה כְהַפְנֹתוֹ שִׁכְמוֹ	*wehayah* + *k* + *inf c*	\/ Circumstances for v. 9c: as he [Saul] turned his shoulder	Then, as [Saul] turned his shoulder
9b	לָלֶכֶת מֵעִם שְׁמוּאֵל	*l* + *inf c*	Purpose for v. 9a: to go from Samuel	To go from Samuel,
9c	וַיַּהֲפָךְ־לוֹ אֱלֹהִים לֵב אַחֵר	*wayyiqtol*	Next after speech in vv. 1e–8g: God changed his heart	God changed his heart,
9d	וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־הָאֹתוֹת הָאֵלֶּה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא:	*wayyiqtol*	Next after v. 9c / summary of vv. 10–12: all these signs happened	and all these signs happened on that day.
	Expansion on Verse 9d	*(vv. 10–12):*	**Narration of How These**	**Signs Happened**
10a	וַיָּבֹאוּ שָׁם הַגִּבְעָתָה	*wayyiqtol*	Initial event (after the predictions in vv. 2–4 took place): they came	When they came to the hill,
10b	וְהִנֵּה חֶבֶל־נְבִאִים	*wehinneh* + *verbless*	Next after v. 10a/shift in topic: the band of prophets [came]	look, the band of prophets [came]
10c	לִקְרָאתוֹ	*l* + *inf c*	Purpose: to meet him	To meet him.
10c	וַתִּצְלַח עָלָיו רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים	*wayyiqtol*	Next: the Spirit rushed	And the Spirit rushed on him
10d	וַיִּתְנַבֵּא בְּתוֹכָם:	*wayyiqtol*	Result: he prophesied	such that he prophesied in their midst.

PART 2: HEBREW POETRY

PART 2 of *Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is authored by Frederic C. Putnam: "Working with Biblical Hebrew Poetry." After an "Expanded Table of Contents" covering the ten chapters of this half of the book (147–149), the author presents an "Introduction" in which he overviews some of the underlying principles that guide his approach to the task. First, some of the important features of BH poetry

---

[28] One will notice that the "translation" does not differ greatly from the text supplied in the "discourse analysis."

are surveyed,[29] especially the ones that differ from those found in prose, for example, the typically "compressed," "elliptical" language of Hebrew poems (152).[30] Some "basic assumptions" of BH poetry are listed, but these do not shed very much light on the designated "poetic function of language" (153).[31] However, the final "conviction," that ultimately "each poem is a word from God" (154), is foundational and must always guide and direct one's interpretation. "The process of discourse analysis" is correctly described as an activity that "must attend to every aspect of a poem...while attempting to balance analysis and appreciation"—in short, how "a text is organized by its grammar and syntax" (154).[32] The "discourse analysis of biblical poems" must pay special attention to the cohesive devices that "create *continuity*, which binds lines together in larger units," and also to the "semantic and morphosyntactic choices" that

---

[29] Differing from the usual figure of "one-third," Putnam estimates that "nearly one-half" of the Hebrew Bible "consists of Poems" (151). Perhaps this would be closer to the mark if "poetic prose" is included in the count.

[30] Several of Putnam's observations may require some further nuancing, for example: "It is often difficult to determine whether or not a poem describes a sequence of any kind" (152). This difficulty may be partially due to the author's rather narrow, clause-focused methodology (as in the case of the approach to analyzing BH prose proposed in PART 1 by Patton). Furthermore, the issue also depends on what sort of "sequence" that one is looking for. The predominant temporal organization of BH narrative is usually (but not always) missing, but a rather stable number of discourse types (genres) that manifest typical patterns of sequential (topical, rhetorical, pragmatic) development are normally discernable, in the Psalter, for example (cf. Wendland 2017, 71–123). Putnam recommends that "studying a poem does not mean asking, "What does it (the poem) mean?" (152). To be sure, analyzing a poem does *not* involve a search for some "hidden message" or "secret" sense (152). It is also true that meaning in the wider sense entails more than semantic "content." Rather, a literary text's total "meaning-package," consists of a number of distinct aspects, or dimensions, including also emotion, attitude, communicative intention, artistry, and effect (impact, appeal)—cf. Jakobson's "six functions of language," which are appropriately noted (153). Later, this principle is clarified when it is pointed out that an important question for discourse analysts to answer is this: "What is the poem about"—i.e., mean (157; cf. "the goal is understanding *in order to explain* the text"; 155, original italics).

[31] One of these would also appear to require some further discussion in order to prevent misunderstanding: "the poem's text is the primary witness to the poem, not its proposed history (i.e., the details of the poet's life, or when or why it was composed" (153). This is correct, but it would be helpful to add something to the effect that no biblical poem occurs in isolation; rather, each one appears within an *intra*-textual context (e.g., a prophetic book) as well as a "canonical corpus," where the influence and effect of *inter*-textual reference and resonance must always be considered as an essential part of the hermeneutical process. This is especially applicable in the case of the Psalter, where one psalm is frequently composed (and/or editorially situated) in relation to others having a similar form, content, or function within the collection (cf. Ho 2019).

[32] "Lexical repetition" and "rhetorical concentration," at least, should be added to Putnam's "grammar and syntax" (cf. Wendland 2017, 4–24). Technically speaking, "grammar" includes "morphology" and "syntax."

disrupt an established pattern to create a "*discontinuity*," or "seam," between poetic lines (155, original italics).[33]

The recommended procedure for analyzing the discourse of Hebrew poetry consists of four basic "steps": (a) *gloss* the text, creating a rough initial translation; (b) *parse* the verbal forms; (c) lineate the text, one clause per line; and (d) *describe* each line—its syntax, predicate grammar, semantics, *type* and *logical* relationship to preceding lines (156).[34] Although "this process will at first seem to be laborious" (especially for non-academic students), it is designed "to discern how the poet used his or her linguistic resources to organize the poem['s]" development of thought and to offer "insights of a kind that are rarely noticed (or are, at least, rarely commented on)" (156–157).

"Glossing and Parsing the Poem" is the subject of chapter 2, which consists of two steps: (a) "determining poetic lines," with each clause being set off on a separate line, and (b) "glossing the Hebrew text," which means to provide a word-for-word translation (158–159). The suggested symbols or designations for glossing are provided in a reference "key" (159). All verbs in the text must then be "parsed," that is, identified on the chart by a system of standardized symbols, for which another "key" is given, e.g., Q = **Q**al, m = masculine, 3 = 3rd person, C = **C**ohortative, V = imperati**V**e (161). Several diagrams of stages in the parsing and glossing procedure of the short Ps 117 serve as helpful visual examples in this chapter.

In chapter 3, Putnam deals with "Poetic Lines and Structure," since he considers "line length…[to be] a discourse-level device that the biblical poets used to organize their poems" (164). Therefore, "the first step in reading a biblical poem is to determine where lines begin and end" (164),[35] since this is "the easiest device to see once the text is set out in lines" (177). For the purposes of discourse diagramming then, "a poetic line consists of a single clause: one clause per line and one line per clause," while a "word" is defined as "any form preceded or followed (or both) by a blank space" (164–165).[36] Several poetic texts are then analyzed with

---

[33] Putnam states that "parallelism…is neither unique nor necessary to biblical poetry" (155), a position that I would disagree with (2017, 177–198). However, in the next sentence he affirms that "it [parallelism] is a cohesive feature of biblical poems, a linguistic resource that helps make biblical poems examples of *patterned language*" (155, original italics). In fact, poetry consists of parallelisms on all levels and with regard to all types of linguistic structure.

[34] This line/clause-centered methodology is thus similar to that described and applied by Patton with reference to BH prose in PART 1 of this book.

[35] It is observed that "Hebrew poems do not use rhyme or meter as structuring devices" (164); however, it may be added that prominent sound patterns (alliteration, assonance, paronomasia) are often utilized in order to highlight the presence of a discourse aperture, closure, peak, or climax (Wendland 2017, 209–210, 255–256).

[36] It may be noted here that "words joined by *maqqef* [hyphen] remain separate words" (165). As for the "clause," it is not clear (164) whether this designation includes poetic lines such as the following (Ps. 1:5b): "and sinners in the community of the righteous" (וְחַטָּאִים בַּעֲדַת צַדִּיקִים׃).

respect to topic, comment, and number of words through the use of text dia-
grams with accompanying explanations: Ps 117; Ps 2:1–6; Prov 3:1–12; Prov 7:7–11,
14–20; and Ps 146 (165–176). Discontinuities in terms of line length (number of
words), whether being significantly longer or shorter than surrounding lines, are
regarded as possible indicators of structurally significant "seams" within a poetic
text.[37]

A potential problem with this methodology concerns how one determines
line length, and several instances appear where a plausible division could be pos-
ited in what Putnam designates as an extra-long, hence significant, line in He-
brew. For example, verses 2b and 6 in Ps 2 are displayed as seven- word lines in
the display (167), whereas I would partition each into two shorter lines at the
Masoretic line-divider *atnach*: (עַל־יְהֹוָה וְעַל־מְשִׁיחוֹ // וְרוֹזְנִים נוֹסְדוּ־יָחַד) and
(עַל־צִיּוֹן הַר־קָדְשִׁי // וַאֲנִי נָסַכְתִּי מַלְכִּי). Putting too much emphasis on a sin-
gle feature can also lead to possibly erroneous structural conclusions, for exam-
ple, identifying Ps 146:6a as being "the longest line in the poem" and a poetic unit
aperture. In contrast, line 6a could be divided as follows: (עֹשֶׂה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ //
אֶת־הַיָּם וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בָּם), whereas the aperture for this lengthy strophe is
manifested at v. 5: "Blessed is he whose help is the God of Jacob…" (אַשְׁרֵי שֶׁאֵל
יַעֲקֹב בְּעֶזְרוֹ).

Chapter 4 turns to the analysis of "Verbal Forms," even though "the function
of verbal conjugations is far less predictable in Hebrew poetry than in prose"
(178). Nevertheless, it is argued that "verbal predicate morphology is a powerful
tool in the hands of a skilled poet, one that can be varied at will to support the
poem's content in any number of ways" (195). Diagrams analyzing the poetic
lines of sample texts according to person, gender, number, stem, and conjuga-
tion are given to illustrate this: Pss 117; 113; 1; 121; 98; 119:25–32; and 13 (179–194).
These analyses are very detailed and, in most cases, helpful in revealing the basic
micro-structure of a given text. However, some points of disagreement may oc-
casionally arise, for example, with regard to the following conclusion in the
analysis of Ps 121: "The equally distinctive substantive predicates in 5a–b (the
final occurrence of the substantive/nominal participle שֹׁמְרֶךָ, '[your] watch-
man,' and צִלְּךָ, 'your shade') mark the end of the poem's second major section
(3a–5b)" (187). In contrast, one might view verse 5 as beginning a short strophe

---

[37] In Putnam's analysis, a "seam," or significant discontinuity, may occur within a strophe,
or poetic "paragraph," e.g., "between [v]1b and 2a and between 2b and 2c" of Ps 117 (253). It
might be better to reserve this term to designate higher-level discourse breaks that occur on
the macro-structure of a poetic text, e.g., between strophes or stanzas. Some proposed line
lengths are debatable, for example, Ps 2:2, which is analyzed as a bicolon (3+7 lexical units).
However, the verse is divided more naturally following the Masoretic verse-divider *atnach*
into three lines (3+3+4) as follows: יִתְיַצְּבוּ מַלְכֵי־אֶרֶץ / וְרוֹזְנִים נוֹסְדוּ־יָחַד / עַל־יְהֹוָה
וְעַל־מְשִׁיחוֹ: The same argument can be made for the other extra-long line identified in 2:6
(167).

that ends after v. 6. Thus, the double occurrence of YHWH (יְהוָה) in the two lines of v. 5 indicate a strophic aperture, as does their paired appearance in vv. 7a and 8b, marking the concluding and climactic strophe.[38]

We move to the "Type of Clause" in chapter 5, which focuses on another aspect of verbal morphology, that is, grouping "a poem's lines according to their type of clause, which can be revealed by verbal conjugation" (196). The text charting is again done in several stages—first, a sequential line listing of the BHS Hebrew text alongside and English gloss, and second, with a listing of vertical columns according to the type of clause: *yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*, Participle, *qatal*, Verbless, and Imperative (moving from left to right horizontally). Two psalms are analyzed this way: 29 and 13 (196–201). In the case of Ps 29, "the zone of turbulence that marks the poem's peak" is identified as vv. 9c–10a ("...and in his temple all cry 'Glory!' – The LORD sits enthroned over the flood..." [NIV]) (200). While one could probably come to this conclusion on the basis of a close analysis of the English translation alone, the Hebrew text is definitely required to discern what is the more likely thematic "peak point" of this psalm, namely, vv. 10–11.[39]

In section II of this chapter Putnam discusses "clause-initial *w*[*aw*] + pronoun," for this construction "signals a shift in primary reference from one character to another" or a shift in topic (202). This is illustrated with reference to Ps 55:22a–24c (202–203). It would be helpful if the display chart would somehow indicate, perhaps via footnotes, the potential *macro*-structural significance of all the *micro*-textual shifts that are indicated, i.e., four breaks in the space of three verses, including two that occur within the same verse. These features are discussed later (204) but not with reference to the psalm's larger discourse organization.[40]

In section III of chapter 5, the significance of "predicate morphology and structure" is considered, specifically "changes in some aspect of the verbal form—person, number, gender, stem, or conjugation (or any combination thereof)—that indicate the main breaks in the poem" (204). The difficulty, as illustrated in the example of Ps 2:1a–6, is one's definition of a "main break" in the

---

[38] The initial הִנֵּה of v. 4 and its back-shifted subject שׁוֹמֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל mark v. 4 as the closure of the strophe beginning in v. 3. In sum, Ps 121 consists of four symmetrical strophes, each having an introductory verse, which the second verse then develops, building up to a thematic peak in v. 8 and the final line מֵעַתָּה וְעַד־עוֹלָם.

[39] Psalm 29 gives a good example of the distinction between the **hortatory** (emotive) "**climax**," as noted in v. 9 (being the distinctive concluding utterance of the sequence of "voice of the LORD" proclamations in vv. 3–9), while vv. 10–11 function then as the psalm's **thematic** "**peak**" point. I come to the latter conclusion based on the chiastic word order of v. 10, which underscores Yahweh's royal rule over nature and his people (יְהוָה לַמַּבּוּל יָשָׁב וַיֵּשֶׁב יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ לְעוֹלָם), while v. 11 features a topical reversal with an inclusio, as highlighted by the word order (cf. v. 1) and the perfect outcome for his people in the final word—"peace" (יְהוָה עֹז לְעַמּוֹ יִתֵּן יְהוָה יְבָרֵךְ אֶת־עַמּוֹ בַשָּׁלוֹם).

[40] To this end, one might suggest that v. 22 and 23c represent the closing thematic peak of Ps 55, while the enclosed portion of v. 23a–b expresses its hortatory climax.

text. Here v. 2b is indicated as being the marker of a seam in Ps 2, and indeed a shift does occur there, e.g., the change from a 2nd person to a 3rd person plural reference to the protagonists (nations, kings, etc.), and other detailed morphological features do link verses 1–2. But does this represent a break ("seam") on the strophic (poetic paragraph) level of the psalm? In this case, one must assess the structural "value" of phonological and morphological features over against those of a lexical and semantic nature. One could argue in contrast that the principal poetic disjunction is found after v. 3 and the direct quotation uttered there by all those "opposed to the LORD and his Anointed One" (עַל־יְהוָה וְעַל־מְשִׁיחוֹ, v. 2b), thus marking the close of strophe one (2:1–3).[41]

Chapter 6 is concerned with "Syntax" and word order since in BH poetry "the usual verb—subject—object (VSO) structure of the main clauses in a narrative...occur much less frequently and rarely reflects the form of the verbal predicate..." (206). Two examples of lineally diagramming the syntax of a poem's clauses are presented (Ps 117 and Eccl 3:1–8), including features such as: conjunction, object (direct/indirect), predicate, subject, finite verb, vocative, prepositional phrase, and *waw*, which are charted by means of symbolic abbreviations (207).[42] The point is that such "labels condense a great deal of information and make continuities and discontinuities more obvious" (208). Readers will have to assess the reality of the preceding assertion for themselves, or whether the complexity of the proposed system of annotation defeats its potential utility. In any case, the observation that the last two lines of Eccl 3:1–8 manifest a "subtle zone of turbulence" (212) might be modified to include the whole of 3:8—thus, all *four* lines occurring in a syntactically similar[43] but lexically contrastive, chiastic arrangement ("...a time to **love** and a time to *hate*; a time of *war* and a time of **peace**" – עֵת לֶאֱהֹב וְעֵת לִשְׂנֹא עֵת מִלְחָמָה וְעֵת שָׁלוֹם).

The subject of "Semantic Cohesion" is dealt with at length from various perspectives in chapter 7, which is investigated first in terms of two related factors: "(1) *semantic cohesion*—repeated and varied references to the same idea or

---

[41] Footnote 33 contributes to the discussion of this point with respect to the issue of "line length." One might observe that footnote 8 on p. 204 repeats footnote 7 on p. 203. In addition, it raises the question as to how or on what textual basis one is to carry out the following directive (added italics): *"Readers of a poem must distinguish the poet's voice from the voice or persona of the poem*; the use of the first person does not imply that a poem describes the poet's own experience, feeling, situation, etc.—the poem may be a work of the imagination. It is always more helpful (and safer) to refer to what the poem/text says' or to say, or to say, 'the poet wrote rather than 'the poet says/said'."

[42] One might query why these same syntactic elements, and their symbolic designators, were not introduced in the first half of the book when the various aspects of BH narrative were being investigated—in chapter 4 perhaps.

[43] In this case, the *lamed* in each of the two concluding key lexical items mimics that found in the preceding sequence of infinitive constructs (Eccl 3:1–8a).

thing;[44] and (2) *participant reference* ... repeated references to characters and objects mentioned in the poems" (214, original italics). In order to display semantic cohesion in a poetic text, Putnam recommends "assigning a symbol (like consecutive letters of the alphabet) to each functional unit in a line and then repeating those symbols when the same thing is referred to in following lines" (215). He also indicates the total number of words in a line and the number of words in each lexical unit.[45] A sample of what such a display looks like is shown below with reference to Ps 117:1–2 (216):

Line	BHS Text	Semantics			Morphosyntax	
1a	הַלְלוּ אֶת־יְהוָה כָּל־גּוֹיִם	a.b.c	a.b.c	4:1.1.2	P/v-O-S	2mpDV
1b	שַׁבְּחוּהוּ כָּל־הָאֻמִּים׃	a¹+b¹.c¹	a¹+b¹.c¹	3:1.2	P/v-O-S	2mpDV
2a	כִּי גָבַר עָלֵינוּ חַסְדּוֹ	a.b.c	d.e.f	4:2.1	cj-P/v-pp-S	3msQP
2b	וֶאֱמֶת־יְהוָה לְעוֹלָם	c¹.a¹	f.d¹	3:2.1	w+S-pp	pp
2c	הַלְלוּ־יָהּ׃	a.b¹	a.b¹	2:1.1	P/v-O-S	2mpDV

There is no doubt that this is an excellent procedure to follow for carrying out a precise micro-structural analysis of the biblical poem. But one wonders how effective, indeed feasible, it would be to apply to a much longer text—that is, for most practical purposes: preparing a sermon, Bible study, exegetical class lecture, or Bible translation. Three more passages are displayed and annotated in this detailed manner: Ps 113; Prov 6:12–19, which is accompanied by several of the other types of charts;[46] and Ps 1 (218–226).

---

[44] Apparently, this is a reference to the crucial feature of "parallelism."

[45] With regard to the total word count, conjunctions, negations, the direct object marker, and other "function words...are counted as part of the following content word" (215). But this is a debatable procedure, at least with regard to conjunctions and negations, which arguably have a certain independent semantic value and function.

[46] In connection with Prov 6:12–15, it is asked: "This wisdom poem combines line length, morphology, syntax, and semantic continuities and discontinuities [as displayed on the charts] to signal the shape of the poem and to raise questions in the minds of *readers*, questions like these: Why do lines 14b–15b have finite verbal predicates?" (221, italics added). One wonders, however, what effect such features would have on the *hearers* of the biblical text. From their perspective, more obvious structural indicators would probably be needed, for example, the beginning of this short poem being manifested by a new topic ("a scoundrel and villain"—NIV) announced in v. 12a, with its end point being marked by the initial "Therefore" (עַל־כֵּן) in v. 15 and the conclusion of a standard "sin [12–14] leads to punishment [15]" topical sequence. Finer literary and exegetical insights or supportive evidence would be revealed by Putnam's meticulous line-based analysis, and it is indeed helpful for that purpose.

Another microstructural device for creating cohesion in BH poetry is the *chiasm*, "a two-part rhetorical figure in which the order of elements in the first part is reversed in the second; … [it] is most common between two parallel lines" (227). The examples used to illustrate this are Pss 121:6; 98:2; 1:6; 2:1–2; and 113:2–3. The last passage shows that "chiasms also occur across verse 'boundaries'" (231); however, the significance of the chiasmus here is that it serves to mark the "closure" of the first strophe of Ps 113 (vv. 1–3).[47] It should also be noted that an extended chiasmus (i.e., consisting of two or more "parts") is a common feature of BH poetry, thus functioning to structure and create cohesion within larger sections of text (strophes, stanzas) and even complete poems.[48] Putnam suggests that ellipsis, the elision of one or more elements of a clause, is "perhaps the most powerful linguistic cohesive device" because it is based on "the reader's need to fill the gap by importing the missing term from the context," usually "from the immediately preceding line" (232–233). In addition to the usual Ps 117, two other poetic texts are considered in detail, primarily on the level of the individual poetic line and with special reference to the occurrence of ellipsis: Ps 114 (234–239) and Prov 17:27–28 (239–241). "Participant tracking" with respect to character reference through nouns, pronominal forms, and verbal affixes (both subjects and objects) is the last cohesive feature to be considered (241–243), with these examples charted and discussed: Ps 117; Ps 15; Prov 6:6–11; Ps 121; and Ps 13 (242–250).[49] Again, the methodology focuses on the sequence of line forms, with no reference to larger (more inclusive) or distinctive poetic structures within the discourse, for example, the short introductory and concluding units of Ps 15 (vv. 1, 5c) (243), or the four similar constituent strophes of Ps 121 (vv. 1–2, 3–4, 5–6, 7–8) (248).

The final poetic feature to be included in one's analysis is "Logical Cohesion" (chapter 8), with reference to a poem's argument progression or thematic development, which "depends on its semantic content line by line" (251). A poetic line is described as being composed of "four basic kinds of information": a statement, question, command or prohibition, condition (151).[50] "Two basic relationships

---

[47] Again, I would disagree that verses 2–3 "are the longest lines in Ps 113," consisting of seven lexical units each (232). Instead, both lines may be broken naturally (phonologically) at the medial atnach, for example Ps 113:2 – מֵעַתָּה וְעַד־עוֹלָם // יְהִי שֵׁם יְהוָה מְבֹרָךְ ("Let the name of the LORD be praised // both now and forevermore"—NIV), that is, in a 4+3 rhythmic word patterning.

[48] For example, see the chiasmus, or concentric structure, that spans Ps 30:1–12 (Wendland 2017, 61).

[49] The category "participant tracking" might better expanded to what may be termed "topic tracking"—that is, including not only persons, but also non-agents like חֶסֶד and אֱמֶת (cf. footnote 28, p. 243).

[50] It could be suggested here that a "speech-act analysis" might be more precise and helpful in this exercise.

between consecutive lines" are investigated (253):[51] "continuity" (e.g., similarity, contrast, exemplification, temporal progression, cause-effect sequence, imperative with motive, and explanation) and "discontinuity," that is, any point where there is a break or interruption with respect to a continuity. A "full analysis" (i.e., involving several different, sequential line displays) is carried out with regard to four texts: Ps 117; Ps 103:1–2; Ps 119:25–28; and Prov 6:6–11 (252–260). The difference between a micro- and a macro-discourse perspective is revealed in several of the analytical conclusions that are drawn, for example: "The cohesive devices in Ps 103:1–2 both bind these lines together as a unit and set them off from what follows" (255). It is also important to note from a larger discourse perspective that vv. 1–2 introduce a closely-knit series of five participles that declare the attributes of YHWH, which close out at the end of the strophe in the *yiqtol* finite verb תִּתְחַדֵּשׁ ("it [your youth] renews itself") of v. 5b; a new strophe then begins in v. 6, as marked by a recurrence of the psalm's principal agent and object of praise, יהוה. Similarly, in the text of Prov 6:6–11 (258–261), a major internal, strophic break would seem to appear, as indicated in the NIV, not at the end of "the longest line" in v. 7,[52] but rather between verses 8 and 9, where the structural aperture of the latter is marked by the initial rhetorical question and a repetition of the topic term "sluggard" (עָצֵל). In any case, Putnam's granular analysis clearly reveals the intricate interlinear relationships of sound, sense, and syntax that provide this pericope as a whole with a great deal of literary cohesion and coherence (261).

In his brief "Conclusion," Putnam reiterates some of the important reasons for paying serious attention to "discourse analysis" when investigating biblical poetry (262), with yet another overview of Ps 117 as studied according to the methodology proposed in this book (263). The following quote best summarizes for me both the strengths and the weaknesses of this approach: "Discourse analysis compels us to be attentive, offering us tools to see what is there in the texts that that the poets composed by viewing the text from different standpoints. Lineating the text and analyzing the syntax and semantics of each line help us consider what is going on in each line and how it relates to the preceding line(s)" (262). Indeed, this line-based approach is an excellent way to explore the intricacies of the micro-structure of a BH poem, but it is not adequate to enable one to deal effectively with the macro-structure, where patterned sets of lines and strophes are involved.

---

[51] Semantic, pragmatic, and/or logical continuities and discontinuities also need to be analyzed on the strophic (and larger) level of poetic discourse composition (Wendland 2017, 29–69).

[52] To be sure, the long single line of v. 7 is a prominent aspect of the first strophe (vv. 6–8); however, it may also be viewed as serving to set up the figurative comparison of v. 8. Often the analyst must comparatively evaluate a number of phonological, lexical, and semantic poetic features together in order to determine precisely where the key points of a poem occur—its *aperture*, *closure*, and optional internal *peak* (thematic) and/or *climax* (pragmatic).

Two further "Examples of Discourse Analysis with Hebrew Poetry" in full detail are presented in chapter 10: Ps 13 and Prov 15:31–33 (264–269). This is followed by two short appendices: "The Question of Meter" (271–272)[53] and "Gloss, Meaning, and Translation" (273–276).[54]

The *Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is a well-organized, clearly written text that I can readily recommend as a valuable resource for all intermediate second-year students of Biblical Hebrew, theological students, and parish pastors who wish to brush up on their Biblical Hebrew.[55] This book admirably provides much needed supplementation for certain intricate aspects of BH prose and poetry that are often ignored in the standard textbooks. While a great number of text examples and analytical charts are already provided, if a second edition is envisioned (my recommendation), perhaps a number of periodic exercises could also be included to challenge students to carry out the recommended discourse analysis proce- dures for themselves on a graded sequence of significant biblical passages. Sug- gested answers might then be supplied in an appendix for them to check their results against answers provided by the authors. In this connection, as pointed out in the preceding review, the chief limitation of this book might also be ad- dressed—namely, the fact that the concentrated focus on individual lines and sequences of lines, while definitely contributing to one's knowledge of "textual analysis and the exegetical process" (11), often tends to blur one's perspective on the structure of the textual forest as a whole due to predominant attention being devoted to all the trees. Thus, the detailed clause-focused methodology does not significantly encourage or enable students to explore the higher layers of Hebrew compositional organization (for example, the patterned combinations of lines to

---

[53] "In sum, it seems appropriate to 'delete meter as a category for understanding Hebrew poetry'" (272, citing D. L. Peterson and K. H. Richards). I would agree with this conclusion if "meter" is being referred to in the technical sense: "Meter is the measure of sound patterning in verse, occurring when a rhythm is repeated throughout a passage of language with such regularity that a base unit (such as a foot) becomes a norm and governs poetic composition" (Green, 2012, 872). However, "rhythm" in terms of the number of accented lexical units within a poetic line (normally consisting of 3–5) is important, as Putnam also recognizes (164–165), whether to establish patterns of rhythmic repetitions within a larger poetic section, or equally important, obvious exceptions to such an established pattern.

[54] Some helpful observations and examples are found in this appendix, for example, with regard to definitions: "In addition to semantic range, words also have what might be called a 'load,' as in the expression 'a *loaded* term.' A word's 'semantic load' refers to the combination of its *denotation* ('dictionary meaning') and *connotation* (associated emotive or implicit cul- tural function)" (273, original italics). Furthermore, it is pointed out that "many [Hebrew] words have connotations that are [were] obvious to native speakers but are invisible to [con- temporary] foreigners" (276).

[55] Certain aspects of the methodology might also need to be simplified in order to render it more "user-friendly" to those who require only a "quick and dirty" practical overview of a text's micro-structure, for example, pastoral exegetes and Bible translators in the field.

form interrelated strophes, stanzas, and larger poetic units). For that, a more broadly conceived, multi-level discourse-analysis approach will be needed, ideally, in a future edition of this very practical, hence commendable teaching-learning tool.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

Barnwell, Katherine. 2020. *Bible Translation: An Introductory Course in Translation Principles*. 4th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Beekman, John, and John Callow. 1974. *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Callow, Kathleen. 1974. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Green, Roland, ed. 2012. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. 4th ed. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP.

Ho, Peter. 2019. *The Design of the Psalter: A Macrostructural Analysis*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick.

Moshavi, Adina. 2010. *Word Order in the Biblical Hebrew Finite Clause*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Nida, Eugene A. 1975. *Exploring Semantic Structures*. Munich, GR: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

van der Merwe, C. H. J., J. A. Naudé, and J. H. Kroeze. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 2nd ed. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Wendland, Ernst. 2017. *Studies in the Psalms*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Book Reviews

Boler, Michael. 2020. *Introduction to Classical & New Testament Greek: A Unified Approach*. Washington, DC: Catholic Education Press. 450 pp.

Most Greek teaching grammars focus either on Classical (Attic) or Koine (New Testament) Greek. Specializing in one era equips students principally either to read documents from the fifth and fourth century BC or the first two centuries AD. Classical grammars have been used principally in university Classics departments, while Koine grammars are typically intended for use in seminaries or Bible colleges. Michael Boler has attempted to bridge this divide.

Classical and Koine Greek are fundamentally the same language. Although four hundred years of language change will not leave a language untouched, the literary canon of the Classical authors had an even greater conservative effect on Greek than the language of Shakespeare and the King James Bible have had on modern English. The vast majority of the morphology and syntax of both stages of Greek is identical. The changes introduced are the result of Greek becoming the language of wider communication for the eastern Mediterranean world. For instance, peculiarities of Attic have disappeared (θάλαττα – θάλασσα), and some words have simplified their spelling (γιγνώσκω – γινώσκω, ἐθέλω – θέλω). In addition, subtler elements of Greek morphology are being simplified: the optative mood is rapidly declining, and many complicated third declension nouns are being replaced with simpler second declension synonyms (παῖς – παιδίον, οἶς – πρόβατον, ναῦς – πλοῖον). Similarly, some μι-verbs are beginning to have ω-verb by-forms (e.g. ὄμνυμι – ὀμνύω). Consequently, once the complexities of Classical Greek are mastered by the student, it is quite simple to point out the few changes or simplifications that occurred in the Koine era.

This is exactly what the author of this textbook does: in effect, this is a grammar of Classical Greek with brief discussion of areas where Koine is different. The ten reading sentences in each chapter are drawn from a variety of sources, including the New Testament and the most important Classical authors. The twelve to fifteen vocabulary items introduced in each chapter aim to present the most common words in the exercises of the chapter, so students should not have the headache all too common in most Greek textbooks of learning a set of words that barely appear in their current exercises. I only wish the glossary at the back of the book indicated in which chapter a word is assigned. The other appendices include full paradigms, summary of important syntax issues, and supplementary exercises for each chapter.

The forty chapters follow a fairly typical order of topics. The alphabet (ch. 1) and first and second declension nouns (chs. 2–3) are quickly followed by the present active indicative and imperative (ch. 4). The third declension (chs. 8–9) is followed by various pronouns scattered over the following dozen chapters alternating with the future, imperfect, and aorist tenses (chs. 11–12), as well as middle and passive forms (chs. 14–16). Interestingly, participles (chs. 19–21) and contract verbs (chs. 24–26) are introduced before the perfect and pluperfect (chs. 27–29), and the μι-verbs (chs. 30–31)—often relegated to the last chapters of a textbook—come before the subjunctive and optative moods (chs. 32, 34). The final chapters of the book are devoted to the most important elements of Greek syntax, such as conditions (chs. 35–37) and the sequence of moods (ch. 40).

Turning to the physical book itself, the fonts are easy to read, and the wide margins and generous space around exercises provide room for annotations. I wonder if the paperback binding might fall apart, especially after repeated use by an instructor. There is also an ebook edition available, apparently.

Who will find this textbook the most helpful? Classics faculty at Christian liberal arts colleges—those in the same situation as Michael Boler—may find this the perfect textbook. I feel privileged that I began my own formal Greek studies with Classical Greek, and only after I had a reasonable facility with authors such as Xenophon did I turn to the Greek of the Bible, which I found refreshingly easy. I wish I had time to teach my own students Classical Greek first before turning to the later Koine, but I suspect that my fellow teachers in seminary or ministry-training contexts will find their students less tolerant of the niceties of Attic grammar when what they really want is to dive into the biblical text as quickly as possible.

Joshua L. Harper
Dallas International University

Evans, Vyvyan. 2019. Cognitive Linguistics: A Complete Guide. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 858 pp.

Over the last 30-40 years, the approach known as Cognitive Linguistics (CL) has expanded rapidly, led by a growing number of researchers.[1] The book under

---

[1] A personal note: As a graduate student at Berkeley in the mid-80s I got to experience some of the early work in cognitive linguistics firsthand: Charles Fillmore's Frame Semantics and his work with Paul Kay on early Construction Grammar; George Lakoff and Eve Sweetser's work on metaphor and categorization; Len Talmy on lexical semantics and typology; and John Ohala on phonological categorization. Because Evans refers to each of these scholars in his book, it has brought back much of that early excitement and given me a renewed appreciation for developments in the field since then.

review is based on a volume with a similar title, co-authored by Vyvyan Evans and Melanie Green.

Evans presents the major proposals within all the subfields of CL. He has achieved his goal to "map out the cognitive linguistics enterprise from a number of perspectives, beginning with the most general perspective and gradually focusing on more specific issues and areas" (p. 2). The clarity of the explanations and the careful organization of a large amount of material make this bulky volume especially useful. Each chapter concludes with a summary, an annotated list of references for reading in the primary literature, and discussion questions.

The theories that fall under the umbrella of CL are also included in the larger set of functional theories of language, theories that treat language use and the communication situation as shapers of linguistic form. CL shares this perspective but adds a strong claim for a direct tie between conceptual and linguistic structures.

Evans has written a wide-ranging introduction to work in CL that should be of interest both to scholars as well as students new to linguistics. The book has thirty chapters grouped into five parts.

Part I gives a general introduction and overview to CL. Early on, Evans presents the two "key commitments" of CL as defined by George Lakoff over thirty years ago: the "Generalization Commitment" and the "Cognitive commitment." These commitments appear throughout the book as motivations for analyses. Most would argue that generative linguistics also has a generalization commitment, a feature of any scientific enterprise. However, the generative approach limits generalizations to those that can be captured within formal systems and it assumes language processing is due to a specialized mental component. The key difference for CL is the addition of the cognitive commitment which assumes language processing directly reflects general cognitive principles.

Part II, "Conceptual Structure," introduces some of the best-known elements of CL: image-schemas, Idealized Cognitive Models, and Conceptual Metaphor. The same topics appear again in Part III, "Semantic Structure." Such repetition is a natural result of CL's insistence that semantic structure reflects conceptual structure.

Part III presents the role of encyclopedic information in CL semantics and introduces Charles Fillmore's Frame Semantics and Ronald Langacker's notion of "domains." Fillmore uses "frame" to refer to the prototypical scenario evoked by a word. Knowing what the word means involves knowing the structure of experience associated with it. In formal theories, such aspects of encyclopedic meaning typically come into play in pragmatics, rather than semantics, a point I will return to later.

The same section includes an introduction to network relations among semantic units, with discussion of polysemy and Lakoff's radial categories. Evans then presents a further development, based on some of his own work, which he calls Access Semantics. It shares the basic features of CL semantics but "also provides

a methodological framework for conducting semantic analysis of lexical concepts" (p. 471).

The last two chapters of Part III provide a clear summary of Gilles Faucconier's work on "mental spaces" and "blends" from the 1990s to the present. Unlike the mapping in metaphor between conventional domains, mental spaces are constructed in the very process of understanding. In understanding a discourse, the listener uses sentences with underspecified semantics to construct mental spaces that are linked by properties, events, anaphora, etc. "Hence, meaning construction is a dynamic process, and is inseparable from context" (p. 523).

Evans presents later work by Faucconier and Mark Turner expanding the idea of mental spaces to include "conceptual integrations" or "blends." In such constructions, understanding requires the combination of two or more spaces, resulting in a blended space that emerges in the act of interpretation.

Evans begins part IV, "Grammar," by providing a short but clear presentation of assumptions in standard generative grammar as a point of contrast with two of the major theories within CL: Cognitive Grammar and Construction Grammar. The former was initially developed by Langacker and the latter got its start with Fillmore and Paul Kay. Both approaches treat constructions as basic units of grammar, in contrast to formal syntax which considers constructions to be simply epiphenomenal results of rules and constraints.

In his introduction to Langacker's Cognitive Grammar, Evans devotes chapters to categories of the lexicon and of grammatical constructions. Like most categories in CL they are based on semantics and conceptual structure and are prototypical rather than classical categories.

For Construction Grammar, Evans reviews the seminal studies by Fillmore and colleagues of the "Let alone" and the "What's X doing Y" constructions in English. Such irregular constructions are typically ignored in formal approaches that focus on what is considered "core grammar." However, work by Adele Goldberg has demonstrated the importance of Construction Grammar in the analysis of the core ("normal" constructions) such as argument structure and transitivity, as Evans shows.

Evans closes Part IV by reviewing CL approaches to evolutionary change in language, including grammaticalization, metaphor extension and general semantic change.

In Part V, "Applications and extensions of CL," Evans reviews CL approaches to society and social behavior by Croft and by Herder, the study of narrative and literature, drawing especially on work by Len Talmy and Mark Turner, and closes with a discussion of gesture and sign language as their study is enriched by CL.

The book has a fair amount of repetition for two good reasons: it is aimed at an audience that includes those new to the field, and several issues are relevant in more than one section. Other than handbooks, I know of no other volume

that covers so much of CL so well, especially for readers new to the field. However, some of those readers may come away mistaken, thinking that linguists in formal theories have no way of accounting for the processing of encyclopedic information, metaphor, figures of speech, and other special forms. Relevance Theory and other post-Gricean approaches in pragmatics specifically address such issues as they try to account for the processes the listener follows from a spare syntactically-driven formal semantics to a full interpretation of the speaker's meaning. CL and formal approaches differ on where one draws the line between semantics and pragmatics—or whether such a line should be drawn at all. But there is also a deeper debate of the relation between conceptual structure and linguistic form. Evans has done a remarkable job of presenting CL's "cognitive commitment" to relate linguistic structure to general cognitive principles.

James K. Watters
SIL International

Everett, Daniel L. *How Language Began: The Story of Humanity's Greatest Invention*. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2017. 330 pp.

This is an ambitious book that gives an account of the origin of human language from an evolutionary perspective. Daniel Everett teaches Cognitive Science at Bentley University and has published extensively, building on decades of linguistic field work. *How Language Began* is aimed at marking the inauguration of human language but it also offers a sweeping view of language itself.

Everett argues that language is a "culturally acquired invention" which began around two million years ago with *Homo erectus* (p. 160). There are two major distinctives here. First, this means that language is not hard-wired in the human brain and, second, this means that language is much older than is commonly thought. Noam Chomsky is the most visible target throughout *How Language Began*, but Everett tackles an assortment of scholars and positions.

The book has four sections. Part One situates Everett's theory of language origins within his take on the story of human evolution. Part Two focuses on the biological enabling of language. Part Three offers a description of how grammar and gesture fit into his picture of language and its origins. It may seem odd to have an entire chapter on gesture, but this is crucial for Everett's "holistic and multimodal" view of language (p. 230). Part Four explores the inherent connectedness of language and culture as Everett believes this provides a better explanation for the phenomena of language than cerebral hard-wiring.

At the centre of this debate is the definition of language itself. Everett centers his interpretation on communication while arguing that the Chomskyan view

sees language as a "disembodied object, along the lines of a mathematical formula" (p. 68). In this latter view, an acutely developed grammar (in particular, hierarchical recursive grammar) is the fundamental characteristic of human language. Thus, where this is not present, there is no language. Everett works to show that Chomsky significantly overplays both the presence and role of grammar.

He restricts the role of grammar by demonstrating that languages show a wide variety of grammatical complexity. He classifies languages as G_1 (basic linear grammar), G_2 (hierarchical grammar), or G_3 (has both hierarchy and recursion). Much of Everett's other work focuses on classifying Amazonian languages with this metric and showing that a G_1 language is still a real, functional language. Even a simple, linear grammar "can actually express everything needed by a particular culture and is 'expandable' to fit additional needs if the culture becomes more complicated" (p. 61). Thus grammar (in the Chomskyan sense) cannot be the prime indicator of language because it is not uniformly present. For Everett, "much of grammar is a cultural choice. The form of a grammar is not genetically predestined" (p. 222).

A second way that Everett undercuts the priority of grammar is by emphasizing other factors in the communication process. The prominent role he gives these other factors is why noting his argument for language as "holistic and multimodal" is important. Language "engages the whole person – intellect, emotions, hands, mouth, tongue, brain" but it also requires "access to cultural information and unspoken knowledge" (p. 230). Everett calls this "dark matter," and it forms a major part of his broader project. He often circles back to point out that grammar does less than we think because dark matter does so much more than we realize.

The core of language for Everett is the use of symbols for communication. He argues that humans invented language by moving through the pattern of sign progression outlined by Charles Peirce. Language happens in the move from an index (a footprint which tells you that a cat walked by) to an icon (a painting of a footprint to represent a cat) to a symbol (a word which means 'cat') (p. 86). The first step adds the element of intentionality and the second that of arbitrariness. Symbols are then broken down into smaller parts and those parts become available to build the more complex symbols and structures which lead to grammar. For this latter process, Everett builds on Charles Hockett's "duality of patterning" but emphasizes his conception of dark matter in its mechanism (p. 204). Thus, language began as humans used symbols for communication about two million years ago and its development was directed by a variety of biological and cultural factors but not a purported language gene.

This is a strikingly wide-ranging book. He supports his central claim from many perspectives and crosses several disciplinary boundaries. Although this makes his argument more internally compelling, it may also stretch it a bit thin because it is vulnerable at each point where it is pulled across a sharp and vigorous debate. I imagine that specialists will have quibbles, caveats, and contradictions in many places.

There are also times where the distance between his narrative and the available evidence widens and a reader should note the portion of his evidence which is indirect. For example, he says that only "language is able to explain the *Homo erectus* cognitive revolution" but of course cannot point to any item of *erectus* language itself (p. 106). It is not that we can find *erectus* using language, it is rather that we find *erectus* doing things that imply (or demand?) language. Yet the strength of the book is in the attempt to account holistically for language. His criticisms of other positions tend to point out that they narrowly focus on one aspect or another.

Readers should note that Everett is dismissive of a Christian perspective. The epigraph for the Introduction is the following caustic exchange: "In the beginning was the Word (John 1:1). No, it wasn't (Dan Everett)." I question what a similarly comprehensive account of language would look like if it was resourced by the biblical-theological tradition, especially with regard to humankind being made in the image of God.

At times it is hard to follow how the material being discussed serves the central question. Everett is an engaging writer but there is a lack of sign-posting which even simple subheadings would have gone a long way to resolve. There are extended descriptions of how language works that seem distant from his main point. This may be necessary, especially in the genre of 'popular science,' but it can make his arguments hard to follow. Still, the author's enthusiasm keeps the technical material from degrading into textbook drudgery.

How Language Began is well worth reading for a full orbed account of human language. Surely we all get somewhat blinded as we sink further into the contours of our own specializations and it is worth taking time for a wider look. Everett's expertise and courage in this undertaking should not be dismissed. Further, this book gives a refreshingly realistic look at language in all its complexity. I am grateful for the reminders that language is primarily vocal, rather than textual, and that it always leaves much unsaid. Some background in linguistic literature would be helpful but I am not sure that it is necessary. Everett is a polarizing figure who is worth listening to, even if it often means having him alongside to disagree with.

Tyler Horton
SIM (Serving in Mission)

Longenecker, Bruce W. 2020. *In Stone and Story: Early Christianity in the Roman World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. 292 pp.

Reading the New Testament contextually requires many years or decades immersed in the archaeological remains and the primary sources of the Greco-Roman world. In this volume, Longenecker focuses largely on the archaeological

remains of Pompeii and Herculaneum while integrating primary literary sources for further illumination of first-century life. Pompeii is an archeologist's dream because it was encased in volcanic ash from the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in AD 79. In modern times, archaeologists have reconstructed most of the town, an extensive number of graffiti have been translated and published, and the results are now largely available online. Nearby Herculaneum offers similar evidence but plays a more minor role in the book. Both towns sat about 150 miles south of Rome, which means that these cities frozen in time give us a window into first-century Roman life in a way that no other archaeological site can.

The book is written largely for students, although scholars less familiar with the Greco-Roman world and missionaries who teach in any capacity would benefit as well. In accord with that audience, Baker has produced a beautiful book with solid binding, full color images throughout (often two images per page) on high-quality paper that make the images shine, and a two-column layout. The book has an inviting feel that lends itself toward use as a textbook.

Longenecker divides the book into nineteen "probes" into the lives of typical people from these two towns. These probes divide into four parts: "protocols" of engagement, of popular devotion, of social prominence, and household effectiveness. Put differently, Longenecker introduces his methodology and then surveys first-century Roman religion, society, and ethics. Although the chapters do not follow a uniform template—this is sometimes refreshing and sometimes frustrating—Longenecker typically surveys a theme such as "deities and temples" from the evidence in the two Roman towns and then finds some points of contact with early Christianity. The book is student-friendly and requires little background knowledge of the Greco-Roman world in order to benefit from the discussions.

I was interested in this volume as a potential textbook for teaching New Testament backgrounds to undergraduates, but became less enthusiastic when Longenecker explained that he takes the Pastorals, Ephesians, and Colossians as pseudepigraphal (pp. 22–23). He gives no background on debates about pseudepigraphy, nor any reasons for his position on these epistles. Students then may be confused, especially if this is the first time they have encountered claims of pseudepigraphy. His position has hermeneutical implications on the topics of slavery, family, and women, namely that the apostles are "sometimes differing in their assessment of how the novelty of their worldview was to take shape in concrete form in their first-century world" (p. 250). This position seems to create division and contradiction in the New Testament, rather than the more palatable (even if vague) "tension," and all that based on certain readings that are partially based on late dates for certain epistles. For such a peripheral aspect of the work, its exclusion would have eradicated a large stumbling stone for its use in introductory, Evangelical, and missions contexts.

Insights in the book divide into helpful, thought-provoking, and doubtful. The first category by far contains the greatest number of examples. I was helped to get a better picture of Roman slavery by reading about the graffiti that read, "Take advantage of the cook [sexually], whenever you like, as it suits you," and by learning that the *peculium* (money that a slave could accrue to buy his or her freedom) could be taken at any time by a master (pp. 184–185). A survey of the graffiti in Pompeii also showed how literate the town was, and how literacy was a spectrum and not a binary (p. 149). The book is delightfully filled with helpful insights such as these. A thought-provoking insight is that, since households had idols and shrines in prominent places, Paul and other missionaries would have encountered these idols all the time and not just in dedicated worship spaces. But one wonders whether the typical Pompeiian house layout and the presence of shrines was really that uniform throughout the Empire—from Asia to Egypt to Italy. A doubtful insight is that the priest and Levite who passed by the beaten man in the Parable of the Good Samaritan did so because of an Epicurean "state of detachment" (p. 167). Surely the priest and Levite had purity concerns and were not in any evident way influenced by Epicureanism. Another doubtful insight is that Paul relies on the Roman idea of a corporate *genius* to address his churches (pp. 84–86). More likely is that Paul's corporate thought comes from Jewish understandings of Old Testament passages that exhibit what has been called corporate identity or representation.

While Longenecker may sometimes over-read parallels between the Roman world and the New Testament, sometimes he is more sensitive to the author/recipient divide. He notes how public memorials in Pompeii intended to give a lasting social memory of a person, and this may have been the contextual background to how the Corinthians heard Paul write of memorializing Jesus. But he rightly distinguishes that from Paul's and Jesus' understandings of "remembrance," which were influenced by Passover (pp. 243–244).

The entire question of reading parallels brings up the issue of whether this book's methodology is the best for introducing students to New Testament backgrounds. N. T. Wright has suggested that the New Testament has four contexts: second Temple Judaism, the Roman Empire, Hellenism, and the first-century church. Longenecker focuses on the Roman Empire and discusses the first-century church, but discusses the latter not comprehensively and only as it evinces parallels to Roman society. Hellenism is absorbed by focus on the Empire, and second temple Judaism is not considered in the book. The result is a one-sided portrayal of the New Testament's background. A comprehensive textbook on the background of the New Testament is *not* Longenecker's purpose, and insofar as he seeks to bring these artifacts from Pompeii and Herculaneum into conversation with the New Testament (p. 24), he succeeds. But this picture of early Christianity must be balanced by what is likely its more formative influence: Judaism.

Despite some of the above critical evaluations, I found the book engaging, enlightening, and enriching. Many of Longenecker's insights will outlast his book into my personal engagement with the New Testament. I am thankful for his desire to bring the New Testament alive, and for Baker's excellent production of the book. I would recommend it to anyone that needs an accessible and illustrative introduction to the Roman side of New Testament backgrounds.

<div align="right">

Todd A. Scacewater
Dallas International University

</div>

Noonan, Benjamin J. *Advances in the Study of Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic: New Insights for Reading the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic. 336 pp.

Five years after the release of Constantine R. Campbell's *Advances in the Study of Greek* (Zondervan, 2015), its Old Testament counterpart has arrived. Benjamin J. Noonan, associate professor of Old Testament and Hebrew at Columbia International University, has ably filled an immense research gap. Arguably, no comparable study detailing the state of ongoing questions in biblical Hebrew and Aramaic linguistics has appeared since that of Nahum M. Waldman's *The Recent Study of Hebrew* (Eisenbrauns, 1989). The layout of the book is inviting and attractive and contains ten main chapters, a bibliography, and Scripture, subject, and author indexes. Noonan's introduction clearly identifies the purpose of this book, which is "providing an accessible introduction to the world of Biblical Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic scholarship" (p. 25). He further clarifies that this presentation is not meant to be topically comprehensive, but rather that it intentionally focuses on areas in which there have been "significant advances—and in some cases, controversy—in the field" (p. 26).

Since many students and even professional scholars may be largely unacquainted with the diverse discipline of linguistics proper, chapter 1 provides an overview of the various applications of linguistics and surveys five key theoretical frameworks: Comparative Philology, Structuralism, Generative Grammar, Functionalism, and Cognitive linguistics. For each of these schools of thought, Noonan provides a short history, an overview of its major tenets, and a review of major trends in its application to Hebrew and Aramaic studies. The second chapter further sets the stage by contributing a history of scholarship on Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. The chapter ends with a review of current reference grammars, monograph series, and journals that frequently discuss the languages of the OT. The only apparent misstep in this chapter is the discussion of *Linguistics*

for Hebraists (edited by John A. Cook and Robert D. Holstedt, forthcoming) as if it was already published. It seems somewhat audacious to make sweeping evaluative comments about a volume that, as of the writing of this review, still has not been released.

Chapter 3, "Lexicology and Lexicography" gives a short overview of lexical semantics (the platform of monosemy is oddly absent) and evaluates the various Hebrew lexica available. In his concluding remarks, Noonan firmly states that approaches based in Cognitive Linguistics are the best way to move forward. Chapter 4 surveys different approaches to the Hebrew and Aramaic verbal stems.

Chapter 5 addresses the important issue of "Tense, Aspect, and Mood." For biblical Hebrew, Noonan divides the literature into "Tense-Prominent," "Aspect-Prominent," "Mood-Prominent," and "Functional" theories. He advises that further research must take into account "linguistic typology," "grammaticalization," "comparative Semitics," and the ways the uses of the verbal system changed over time (p. 143).

Chapter 6 covers "Discourse Analysis." While the wide variety of investigations using this label makes it difficult to summarize accurately, Noonan nonetheless could be more precise when he states, "The modern linguistic framework for discourse analysis entails three foundational concepts: coherence and cohesion, discourse units and relations, and information structure" (p. 146). While these three concepts are certainly common in most textbooks on discourse analysis, they are by no means comprehensive. Indeed, Noonan himself draws from Michael A. K. Halliday in this section, and yet Noonan's "three foundational concepts" fall under the umbrella of merely one of Halliday's three "metafunctions" (in this case, the "textual"; Halliday's other categories are the "ideational" and the "interpersonal"). Moreover, Noonan says discourse analysis falls under the domain of pragmatics, which assumes a certain approach in which there is a clear distinction between semantics and pragmatics that is not representative of all practitioners. Noonan's literature survey uses the headings of "Tagmemic," "Distributional," "Information Structure," and "Inter-Clausal" approaches. The use of the label "Information Structure" is unhelpfully broad, as Noonan himself notes that this includes studies based on both the functionalism of Simon C. Dik and the cognitivism of Knud Lambrecht (p. 158). Absent entirely is any mention of approaches drawing on Halliday's systemic-functional linguistics (such as Colin M. Toffelmire, *A Discourse and Register Analysis of the Prophetic Book of Joel* [Brill, 2016]). In his concluding comments Noonan indicates a preference for the "information structure" and "interclausal" approaches due to their having a "solid foundation in current linguistic methodology" (p. 179). But the underlying theoretical frameworks available can vary dramatically, hence the resultant divergence of opinions regarding the questions being posed to the text as well as what counts for evidence (i.e., top-down vs. bottom-up). While Noonan is by no means required to champion one specific

model, this kind of blanket endorsement need not discourage the reader from considering other approaches to discourse analysis.

Closely related to the discussion of information structure in chapter 6 is "Word Order," the topic of chapter 7. In contrast to the prescriptions given in the previous chapters, here Noonan advises that scholars should focus on "clearly defining the notion of basic word order without overreliance on a specific linguistic framework" (p. 199), although use should be made of "linguistic typology" (p. 200). Following chapter 8 ("Register, Dialect, Style-Shifting, and Code-Switching"), chapter 9 tackles "Dating Biblical Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic Texts." This chapter offers a particularly detailed overview of the various arguments regarding the controversial dating of the Aramaic portion of Daniel. Finally, chapter 10 addresses "Teaching and Learning the Languages of the Hebrew Bible." Here, Noonan ultimately endorses Communicative Language Teaching.

This book will be of immense benefit to students taking their first exegesis course as well as professional scholars. The collections of annotated bibliographies assembled by Noonan enable one instantly to grasp the diversity of current scholarly opinions on a given topic, a service that is largely not provided by the available reference grammars. Additionally, for students caught up in the inherent challenges of learning to sight-read and perform basic syntactical analysis of Hebrew (or Aramaic), the idea of learning yet another language—the "metalanguage" of linguistics—simply to be able to discuss the ancient text intelligently can be overwhelming. Noonan has greatly reduced the inherently intimidating nature of linguistics proper, a discipline often foreign to practitioners of biblical studies. For readers not conversant in German, French, or Modern Hebrew, Noonan likewise provides a means of comprehending the fruits of foreign-language scholarship. Nonetheless, the plethora of different linguistic approaches that Noonan praises in different places throughout chapters 3 through 9 ought to raise the question: is "linguistics" merely a tool that biblical scholars and translators can draw from when convenient to deal with discreet issues, or should it play a foundational role in formulating a holistic framework regarding what language is and how it ought to be studied as a whole?

David J. Fuller
McMaster Divinity College

Okesson, Gregg. 2020. *A Public Missiology: How Local Churches Witness to a Complex World.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. 276 pp.

The world we live in is demonstrably complex. The labyrinthine plotline of 2020—like something out of a Christopher Nolan film—only further proved

that fact. The racial reckoning, political upheaval, and general overabundance of vitriol (at least in the U.S.) have cast a rather unappealing light on the public realm, prompting missionally-minded Christians to ask the question: "How do we witness to a complex world?" In *A Public Missiology*, Gregg Okesson answers this question through a careful examination of the interaction between sacred and secular. For Okesson, the most efficacious "bridge" to span the chasm between sacred and secular is the local congregation, which is "a different kind of public in and for the world" (p. 56). Okesson's goal is "to show how congregations can enter into the open weave of publics and witness in and through them, via interpenetration" (p. 54).

A Public Missiology is divided into two parts. The first part, "Public Witness" (chs. 1–5), builds a kind of theoretical scaffolding on which Okesson builds his public missiology, namely the role of local congregations in witnessing to societal complexity. The second part, "Congregations and Public Witness" (chs. 6–9), begins with a chapter on methodology (ch. 6) and includes three case studies on real congregations in Kenya, Canada, and the U.S. Together, they give a detailed image of what an applied public missiology looks like.

Chapter 1 delineates five problems in witnessing to the public realm. The divorce of theology from public life (problem 1) and from missiology (problem 2) along with a reluctance to embrace public complexity (problem 3) leads to a thin, one-dimensional witness to a thick, multi-dimensional public (problem 4) and ultimately a reversion to "individual, technological, problem-solving solutions in the face of highly complex social problems" (problem 5, p. 35). Simply put, Okesson claims that "we don't have the resources for crossing the domains" (p. 36) or are unwilling to access them.

Chapter 2 explores the complexity of the public realm. Essentially, the public realm is composed of various smaller elements (economics, politics, entertainment, ecology, etc.) that interact with each other in such a way as to create a kind of "thickness." Okesson's term "thickness" refers to multi-dimensionality or the interaction of domains; the interaction itself he calls "movement."

Chapter 3 illustrates that the *Missio Dei* utilizes movement, first within the Trinity, then within creation, and finally within humanity, culminating in the incarnation and ministry of Jesus to create a thick, complex story that ends in the "redemption of the entire world" (p. 71). Ultimately, "who God is and how God creates provide the very basis for how we, the people of God, participate in God's mission" (p. 83). Okesson demonstrates that the mission of God moves from particularity to universality but never leaves particularity behind.

Chapter 4 defines public missiology as "congregational witness that moves back and forth across all 'spaces' of public life to weave a thickness of the persons of the Trinity for the flourishing of all life" (pp. 95–96). Okesson asserts that

public missiology is congregational, soteriological, and based in the movement of the persons of the Trinity. He agrees with Newbigin in that "[s]alvation is a making whole and therefore it concerns the whole" (p. 114). When a local church identifies itself within the movement of the trinity, they create a thick identity to be woven into their surroundings, thus better positioning themselves to witness in and for publics.

Chapter 5 focuses on the various kinds of movement that happen within congregations as they witness to the public realm from within. Okesson argues that "what takes place in the context of gathering is as much part of public witness as what happens on the outside" (p. 122) and that, "inside a congregation, publics get converted to the gospel of Jesus Christ... they show the world there is a different way of being human" (p. 141). This conversion happens through means such as liturgy, sermons, and song.

Chapter 6 begins part 2 with a robust, if introductory, methodology of congregational study that moves, generally, from the theoretical to the empirical and, specifically, from theology to ethnography. Okesson posits that through ethnographic research we can identify the patterns, or "habitus," of a congregation, ascertaining how they interpenetrate the publics around them from within. "A congregation's complexity is a gift to its surrounding publics. The thicker the lines existing in and around any location, the greater the likelihood for public witness" (p. 170).

Chapters 7–9 take the reader on a virtual tour of three international congregations which reveal the types of complexity found in local congregations and their interactions with the public realm. A congregation in Kenya connects "thick doxology" with agricultural development; a congregation in Canada connects "thick place" to witness to Montreal; and a congregation in the States connects "thick identity" to race and ethnicity in Nashville.

An endorser on the back cover touts the work as "a bold signal that a new movement in mission thinking is underway." I found Okesson's book to be a clear articulation of a way of thinking that has been lying quietly underneath the surface of contemporary missiology. It is not so much a *new* way of thinking as it is a precise analysis of an age-old problem: "How do we witness to a complex world?" Okesson's answer (thesis) is that "congregations participate in different movements, lending them a witness capable of interpenetrating the thickness of the public realm to witness to it from within" (p. 5). In other words, complexity witnesses to complexity. I think this is a rather intuitive yet unambiguous and accessible conclusion. Indeed, the local congregation exists in the public realm and is situated to be used as God's instrument to reach an increasingly complex world.

The supreme value of the book lies in its creation of space for dialogue between philosophically-driven Western missiology and the social sciences (anthropology, sociology, etc.). *A Public Missiology* will be most appreciated by students of

missiology, local missionally-minded pastors, and especially by church planters around the world. At times, the language is rather esoteric, but Okesson gives plenty of detail and metaphors to clarify his ideas. *A Public Missiology* is a welcome addition to my shelves that I will reference for years to come.

<div align="right">

Charles M. Davidson
Dallas International University

</div>

Tenbrink, Thora. 2020. *Cognitive Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 271 pp.

Thora Tenbrink in this volume introduces a field of study called Cognitive Discourse Analysis (CODA), which is concerned with the relation between language-in-use and cognition. Tenbrink relies on a multitude of previously published social-scientific studies in which she has tended to focus on how human participants think and talk about spatial objects and relationships. Therefore, cognition in spatial domains is the recurring example throughout the volume. The aim of the volume is not only to provide some data on how discourse (defined here as "language-in-use") relates to cognition, but to demonstrate "some well-established and systematic ways to do so" (p. 37). That is, Tenbrink is concerned to go beyond our intuition about how discourse gives evidence of our cognitive processes by providing examples of doing so systematically and relying on specific types of data.

Chapters 1–3 introduce CODA (ch. 1), explain how discourse and language have been related to thought in previous research (ch. 2), and summarize three conceptual frameworks from which Tenbrink draws insights (ch. 3). These frameworks are cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, and Systemic Functional Linguistics. The concepts within these frameworks provide Tenbrink with the tools she needs to provide linguistically- and data-based evaluations of discourse in order to draw conclusions for cognitive processes.

Chapters 4–7 provide eight perspectives from which one may analyze discourse. Tenbrink defines one of the perspectives, surveys how it relates to discourse based on previous research, and then provides an example based on her own previously published studies of how this perspective can illuminate cognitive processes. These eight perspectives are attention, perspective, granularity, certainty, inference, transformation, communication, and cognitive strategies. Certain linguistic features are helpful for analyzing various perspectives, such as discourse markers for cognitive strategies and modality for certainty.

Chapters 8 provides a practical account of how to practice CODA, including procedures for carrying out experiments, parameters for experimental design,

and how to collect and analyze the data. Chapter 9 considers other ways to use language to study cognition and how CODA can be used to enlighten some of those other methodologies.

This volume is written clearly and introduces CODA well. It also provides a good survey of ways that aspects of cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, and Systemic Functional Linguistics can be used in an eclectic way to analyze discourse from different perspectives. The volume is also supported by a vast wealth of evidence from both theoretical linguistics and social-scientific experiments.

Three issues with the book make me question whether Tenbrink has succeeded in her stated aim (p. 37) to show how CODA provides "systematic" ways of analyzing discourse in order to draw conclusions about cognitive processes that go beyond bare intuition. First, many of the results of her studies are unsurprising and rather intuitive. Examples include architects and non-architects talking about building design in different ways (pp. 114–116); experts on a topic including fewer uncertainty markers than novices (p. 140); painters, sculptors, and architects producing "more elaborate descriptions than the group without any particular spatial expert background" when looking at spatial models (p. 102); and directions for strangers being more elaborate than for themselves (p. 192).

Secondly, sometimes her conclusions could seem circular. Tenbrink concluded that it was "[m]ost interesting" that those with higher spatial skills could better describe the location of objects in a mock scene of a collapsed building (p. 155). But it seems her only evidence that some had "higher spatial skills" was that they described space better, which is circular and not exactly interesting.

Third and most importantly, there seems to be little rigor in defining what conclusions go scientifically beyond intuition. She mentions throughout each of her studies both quantitative and qualitative observations (e.g., "The quantitative results revealed very clear patterns…," p. 140), with results that often accord with intuition. But what would really take us beyond intuition would be an index of each of the factors that she studies, with specific and rigorous specifications of how data maps onto the index. In particular, the index should include data from other large corpora so that the studies have a good amount of comparative data. It is possible that this sort of rigor is evident in the original studies that Tenbrink has published and that she simply had space constraints in this volume, but this sort of rigor would have helped to achieve the aim of the book more effectively. I have not found in general from these studies that I learned much about human cognition beyond what is generally intuitive.

Some of her conclusions, though, even if they are intuitive, have interesting implications for other fields. In one study she found that humans did not think or talk about routes in the same way that a map system did (e.g., humans would include more detail at difficult spots; p. 128). This observation is somewhat intuitive, but useful for researchers in artificial intelligence and natural language processing.

In another study, participants were asked to think aloud while solving a problem, to record it retrospectively, and to write an explanation for a friend. In all three text-types, while thinking aloud they tended to use temporal discourse markers to mark individual actions. Yet, in the other two tasks, the temporal discourse markers marked generalized subtasks and procedures (p. 187). Those studying discourse markers might be similarly interested to see how text-types and occasion of writing or speaking affect how discourse markers function. These conclusions interspersed throughout the book do show promise for CODA being of use to those in other language-related fields.

Todd A. Scacewater
Dallas International University