Language and Culture Archives

Initial elements in a clause or sentence in the narrative of Acts

Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation No. 4

Stephen H. Levinsohn

This document is part of the SIL International Language and Culture Archives.

More resources are available at: www.sil.org/resources/language-culture-archives.

CONTENTS

START is to be published by the Translation Department of the Summer Institute of Linguistics at least twice each year as suitable technical articles become available. The publication is dependent upon the voluntary contribution of materials from its readers and from members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in study programs. Since the publication is intended to stimulate creative interaction, the articles will not necessarily represent the author's "final word" on any topic, nor are the opinions expressed in them to be regarded as the official position of the Translation Department of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. Send articles, reactions to articles, and general observations and comments to the Editor at: International Linguistics Center, 7500 West Camp Wisdom Road, Dallas, Texas 75236. Permission to use these articles, either in full or in part, must be obtained from the Editor.

START is sent out on a 'standing order' basis. The price will vary according to the size of the issue but will not exceed $1.00 per copy. Billing will be done annually. Please address all communications regarding subscriptions to:

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
Dallas Center Book Store
7500 West Camp Wisdom Road
Dallas, Texas 75236

INITIAL ELEMENTS IN A CLAUSE OR SENTENCE IN THE NARRATIVE OF ACTS[1]
Stephen H. Levinsohn

(Resumé of Part I of the thesis "Relationships between Constituents beyond the Clause in the Acts of the Apostles"—submitted for a Ph.^ .f the Department of Linguistic Science, University of Reading by Stephen H. Levinsohn.)

0. Introduction and Overview

The purpose of this resumé is to outline my conclusions concerning factors which affect the selection of the initial element of sentences in the narrative framework of Acts, for the benefit of those students of the book who do not wish to wade through hundreds of pages of detail. For that reason I do not include all the reasoning which underlies my conclusions, nor do I discuss how individual passages exemplify them. For such details the reader is referred to Part I of the thesis.

The order of elements within successive sentences* of the narrative[2] of Acts is affected by the need to relate them to their context. This need also influences the form of the element selected.

[*For the purposes of this paper, I use the term "sentence" in a restricted sense to refer to a single nuclear independent clause, together with those clauses which are subordinated to it. Independent clauses linked by some conjunction are viewed as separate sentences, even if there are grounds for analyzing them as a complex of coordinated clauses (e.g., 17:32).

Statistically, more clauses and sentences of the narrative in Acts begin with the verb than with the subject. In the Appendix to Part I of the thesis, I note 720 clauses whose subject or Theme is different from that of the clause or sentence to which they relate. In a maximum of 264, the subject precedes the verb; the subject follows the verb in 310; and no separate subject is present in 146. I therefore take the order Verb-Subject as the norm (cf. also Blass et al. 1961, §472(1)) and explain why there are deviations from it.]

Elements are placed at the beginning of a sentence, or at least prior to the verb to which they relate, for three reasons which correspond to Sections 1, 2, and 3.

Section 1: Luke begins a sentence with a thematic, temporal, or spatial "basis" (Beneš 1962:6) when the sentence is to be related to its context primarily by contrast with or replacement of a corresponding aspect of the last events recorded. For example, if a "transitional temporal phrase" (Blass et al. 1961, §472(3)) opens a sentence, it not only establishes a temporal setting for the forth-coming event(s), but also replaces the temporal setting of the previous one(s), and indicates that the primary basis for relating the new event(s) to the old is temporal (cf. Sec. 1.1).

If no replacement basis occurs at the beginning of a sentence, this is signifi-cant, because it means that "continuity of situation" with the context is to be assumed. Apart from any modifications stated in an initial participial clause, the cast of participants remains unchanged, as does the spatio-temporal setting for the events. (Consequently, the use of a participial clause to begin a sentence, rather than a subordinated clause of time (a temporal basis), is meaningful; cf. Sec. 1.2.)

The overall scheme for relating a sentence to its context may be summarised as follows:

initial element	significance (primary relationship to context)
subject (Theme)	thematic basis; change of Theme
transitional temporal expression	temporal basis; change of temporal setting
spatial expression	spatial basis; change of spatial setting
other	continuity of situation

Section 2: It is generally recognised that "emphasis on an element in the sentence causes that element to be moved forward" (Blass et al. 1961, §472(2)). However, only a minority of the elements which occur at the beginning of a clause or sentence are placed there to emphasise them. For instance, out of approximately 250 passages in which the subject begins the sentence, emphasis on its size or extent accounts for no more than 11%, whereas the subject is the thematic replacement basis in 30-40%.

Section 3: The largest number of cases of forefronted* subjects involve "temporary focus". This anticipates a switch of attention to a different subject through whose initiative the story will develop. Alternatively, particularly within a reported conversation, the speech (event) concerned is an "intermediate step" in an exchange which has yet to be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

[*I use the term "forefronted" to refer to elements which precede the nuclear part of the clause or sentence. In connection with subjects, "forefronted" is synonymous with "precedes the verb". Consequently, a "forefronted" subject is not necessarily the first element in the sentence; it occurs before its verb, but some other element (e.g., a temporal basis; c.f. Sec. 2) may precede it.

When only part of a phrase precedes the verb and the rest follows it (e.g., τις ἦν μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά 'there was a disciple named Tabitha', 9:36), I consider the phrase to be forefronted.

When an element could pertain to either of two clauses, it is considered to follow the first verb, rather than to be forefronted with respect to the second. Compare, for example, ἰδὼν-δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς τὸν λαόν 'And when Peter saw it, he addressed the people', 3:12.

In connection with the forefronting of subjects, I am concerned only with the binary distinction between when the subject (Theme) does or does not precede its verb. I find no evidence to suggest that the rules for forefronting subjects need to take account of the absence of a separate subject. In other words, for the purposes of this resumé, a clause such as εἶπεν-δέ 'and he said' functions like εἶπεν-δὲ ὁ Πέτρος 'and Peter said', rather than ὁ-δὲ εἶπεν 'and he said'.]

1. The Replacement Basis and Continuity of Situation

If a text is to be a meaningful unity, rather than a string of unconnected assertions, then successive sentences must relate to their context. One form of cohesion with the context is achieved by beginning a sentence with what Beneš calls

the "basis" or point of departure, viz. "the sentence opening which...is directly linked to the context".

In the narrative of Acts, the most common reason for placing an element at the beginning of a sentence is to indicate the basis for relating it to its context. The element may be thematic (e.g., 9:1 below), temporal (e.g., 23:11), or spatial (e.g., 9:36)[3]; and the Theme (subject) or spatio-temporal setting established by forefronting the element *replaces* the corresponding Theme or setting which was applicable to the previous events (this last being stated overtly or only implied; cf. below).

The basis for relating 9:1 to its context is *thematic*. Following the description of Philip's activities as he travelled to Caesarea (8:40), attention switches to Saul. In other words, there is a change of Theme, and this is represented by the placement of the new Theme (subject) at the beginning of the sentence. Any chronological relationship between the events is irrelevant; the basis for linking them is a switch of attention from the one subject to the other:[4]

(8:40) Philip was found at Azotus, and passing on he was preaching the gospel to all the towns till he came to Caesarea.

(9:1) Ὁ-δὲ Σαῦλος...προσελθὼν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ (2) ᾐτήσατο παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς....
'Now Saul...going to the high priest asked him for letters to the synagogues at Damascus....'

The basis for relating 27:3 to its context is *temporal*. Τῇ ἑτέρᾳ 'the next day' both establishes the temporal setting for the next event(s) and also replaces the last setting (the previous day*):

(27:2) And embarking in a ship of Adramyttium which was about to sail to the ports along the coast of Asia, we put to sea....

(3) τῇ-τε ἑτέρᾳ κατήχθημεν εἰς Σιδῶνα....
'and the next day we put in at Sidon....'

[*The earlier temporal setting may not have been established by means of a temporal expression. John Callow pointed out to me that in 21:3 τῇ ἑτέρᾳ relates back to the day when "we" embarked in the ship (27:2), but not necessarily to the temporal expression which begins 27:1, "when it was decided that we should sail for Italy". (A reference to a point in time establishes the temporal setting for an indefinite number of events.) Nevertheless, "the next day" represents a change of temporal setting with respect to 27:2.]

The basis for relating 9:36 to its context is *spatial*. Ἐν Ἰόππῃ 'in Joppa' both establishes a spatial setting for the following events and also replaces the previous one (Lydda, 9:32-35):

(9:35) And all the residents of Lydda and Sharon saw Aeneas, and they turned to the Lord.

(36) Ἐν Ἰόππῃ-δέ τις ἦν μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά....
'Now at Joppa there was a disciple named Tabitha....'

I follow Beneš in considering the basis to be distinct from the Theme (topic) of the sentence (though the Theme may also be the basis, as in 9:1 above). For example, a traditional analysis into topic and comment of 12:1 (Κατ' ἐκεῖνον-δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέβαλεν 'Ηρῴδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς χεῖρας κακῶσαί τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. 'About that time Herod the king laid violent hands upon some who belonged to the church.') classifies "Herod the king" as the topic about whom the comment "laid violent hands..." is made (cf., for instance, Hockett 1958:201). This leaves the adverbial phrase of time as the basis of the assertion, indicating that the new incident is to be related to the previous one primarily with respect to time.

In Section 1.1 I discuss the implications of beginning a sentence with a "replacement basis", and consider the circumstances under which a potential basis is not forefronted. Then, in Section 1.2 I argue that, if no replacement basis occurs, there is "continuity of situation" with the context.

If a sentence begins with ἐγένετο and its subject is an infinitival clause, the phrase which immediately follows ἐγένετο is considered to be initial in the sentence (cf. Blass et al. 1961, §472(3)). For example, in 'Εγένετο-δε μετα ἡμέρας τρεῖς συγκαλέσασθαι αὐτον 'It happened that after three days he called together' (28:17), I consider the adverbial phrase of time to be the temporal basis for relating the sentence to its context. The function of ἐγένετο is discussed in the Appendix to this resumé.

1.1 The Replacement Basis

In this section I first make some general observations concerning the nature of the replacement basis (Sec. 1.1.1). I then consider some specific details when the basis is temporal (Sec. 1.1.2) or thematic (Sec. 1.1.3).

1.1.1 General Observations. I stated above that, in the narrative of Acts, one reason for placing Themes or adverbial expressions at the beginning of a sentence is to indicate the basis for relating the sentence to its context by contrast or replacement. That this is so is best seen by considering passages in which a potential basis does not begin the sentence.

(a) If an element is to be the basis for relating the sentence to its context by replacement, then there must be a corresponding element in the context (overtly stated or implied) which it replaces. If the element cannot be related to a corresponding element, then it does not begin the sentence.

For example, when Cornelius is introduced in chapter 10, the first reference to time is ὡσεὶ περὶ ὥραν ἐνάτην τῆς ἡμέρας 'about the ninth hour of the day' (10:3). This expression is not forefronted, because it cannot be related to any previously stated or implied temporal setting. The basis for relating the new incident to the last one is not temporal (cf. the forefronting of the subject in 10:1), nor is there any temporal setting to which to relate, within the confines of the new incident to date:

(9:43) And Peter stayed in Joppa for many days with one Simon a tanner.

(10:1) 'Ανὴρ δέ τις ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ὀνόματι Κορνήλιος... (3) εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι φανερῶς ὡσεὶ περὶ ὥραν ἐνάτην τῆς ἡμέρας ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθόντα πρὸς αὐτόν.... 'Now a certain man at Caesarea named Cornelius...saw clearly in a vision about the ninth hour of the day an angel of God coming to him....'

(Cf. also 18:9: ἐν νυκτί 'at night' does not relate 18:9 to the time of the previous events and so is appropriately rendered "one night" (RSV).)

(b) If a basis relates its sentence to the context by replacement of a corresponding aspect, then it must present a change in the aspect concerned. If an element does not convey a change in that aspect, it cannot be a replacement basis and is not forefronted.

In 18:7, for instance, because ἐκεῖθεν 'from there' refers to the spatial setting of the last events, it is not forefronted:[5]

(18:4-6) (This describes Paul's ministry in the synagogue, concluding with his announcement that he was going elsewhere.)

(7) καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν...
'And leaving there (he went to the house of a man named Titius Justus)...'

(Cf. also 2:41b: ἐν τῇ ἡμερᾳ ἐκείνη 'on that day' indicates that the 3000 people added to the church resulted from the events of the particular single day concerned, but implies no change of temporal setting, and so is not forefronted.)

(c) On occasion, there are two or more potential means of relating a sentence to its context by replacement. In that case, the preferred relationship is reflected in the initial element actually chosen.

For instance, the fact that 20:6 begins with ἡμεῖς 'we', rather than with one of the adverbial phrases, indicates that the replacement basis for relating 20:6 to 20:5 is thematic, not temporal or spatial. In other words, the preferred relationship between 20:5 and 6 is that of comparison or contrast (cf. also 1:5 and 13:14):

(20:5) οὗτοι(-δὲ) προελθόντες ἔμενον ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρῳάδι· (6) ἡμεῖς δε ἐξεπλεύσαμεν μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀζύμων ἀπὸ Φιλίππων....
'These went on and were waiting for us at Troas, (6) but we sailed away from Philippi after the days of Unleavened Bread....'

Similarly, in 10:1 above, Luke is concerned primarily with a change of Theme to the new participant, Cornelius, rather than with the change of location. (Contrast 9:36: the incident of 9:36ff explains how Peter came to be in Joppa, ready for Cornelius to send for him. The location of the incident is of primary importance.)

(d) Luke not only chooses between potential means of relating a sentence to its context by replacement; he also has the option of not opening a sentence with a replacement basis, when the potential exists for him to do so. On occasion, the motivation is clear. In 5:21, for instance, by not forefronting ὑπο τον ὄρθρον 'at daybreak', the relationship with 5:19f of command and fulfilment is given preference over the change of temporal setting, and the impression is avoided that the apostles delayed going into the temple:[6]

(5:19) An angel of the Lord...said, (20) "Go and stand in the temple and speak to the people...."

(21) ἀκούσαντες-δὲ εἰσῆλθον ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἐδίδασκον.
'And when they heard this, they entered the temple at daybreak and began to teach.'

However, in the case of 13:14b, the motivation is less clear:

(13:14a) And they passed on from Perga and came to Antioch...

(14b) καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐκάθισαν.
'and they went into the synagogue on the sabbath day and sat down.'

(15) μετὰ-δὲ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου....
'After the reading of the law....'

A possible explanation is that 13:14b is of a "preliminary" nature (cf. Thesis Part II, Sec. 1.2.1 on the use of καί) and is simply setting the scene in general for the nuclear events of 13:15ff, which have their own specific temporal setting. (Compare Sec. 1.2 on the implications of not beginning a sentence with a replacement basis.) Alternatively, "on the sabbath day" is simply an afterthought, making explicit what would otherwise be assumed.

In 8:6, the clause ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοὺς καὶ βλέπειν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει 'when they heard him and saw the signs which he did' may be present to explain why the crowds gave heed to Philip's message, rather than to establish a new temporal setting. (Cf. also 10:9: περὶ ὥραν ἕκτην 'about the sixth hour'.)

I conclude that all the evidence suggests that the position of a potential basis in the sentence is significant. At the beginning of the sentence, it indicates the specific means for relating the sentence to its context by replacement. Otherwise, it implies that some other relationship with the context is to the fore.

1.1.2 Temporal Bases. As Blass et al. (1961, §472(3)) note, "transitional temporal phrases" commonly precede the other constituents of a sentence in narrative. This is to be expected. Since the backbone of narrative is characterised by chronological progression, it is natural that the basis for relating new events to their context by replacement should normally be temporal, when a change of temporal setting occurs. Nevertheless, when a previous temporal setting is not replaced (e.g., 10:3) or changed (e.g., 2:41b), or when some other relationship with the context is to the fore (e.g., 20:6, 5:21), then the transitional temporal expression does not begin the sentence.

Forefronted expressions which establish a new point of reference in time generally replace an earlier point in time as setting. However, they are also used to define a specific point within the more extensive period which was the setting for the last event(s) described. The basis for relating the forthcoming event(s) to the previous one(s) is temporal, but the vague span of time which was the previous setting is replaced by a specific point within that span.

In 16:13, for instance, "on the sabbath day" is a specific point within the period "some days" of 16:12:

(16:12) We remained in this city some days.

(13) τῇ-τε ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐξήλθομεν ἔξω τῆς πύλης....
'And on the sabbath day we went outside the gate....'

This same principle holds when a vague temporal phrase such as ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις 'in these days' is used. The expression as such refers to the period of the last event(s), but the use of the aorist following the phrase indicates that Luke,

in fact, is designating a particular point within that period as the new setting.
Cf., for example, 1:15:

   (1:14) All these with one accord were devoting themselves to prayer....

   (15) Καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἀναστὰς Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἶπεν....
   'In those days Peter stood up among the brethren and said....'

   1.1.3 Thematic Bases. In general, when events performed by different subjects
occur simultaneously* (e.g., 12:16 below) or are not related chronologically (e.g.,
9:1 above), then they are related thematically. In other words, the subject (Theme)
of the second is forefronted, and the new Theme replaces the previous one.

[*Two events are not simultaneous if the second is a response to the first (e.g.,
6:2) or if it is the efficient cause of the first (e.g., 21:36).]

   In 12:16, for instance, Peter's action took place while the people inside were
arguing over who could be at the door. His action is not in response to the last
speech they made. Rather, there is a switch of attention from them to him:

   (12:15c) They were saying (to the maid), "It is his angel!"

   (16a) ὁ-δὲ Πέτρος ἐπέμενεν κρούων·
   'But Peter was continuing to knock;'

   However, Luke may choose to relate two events thematically, even when they are
in chronological sequence, in order to compare or contrast the actions of the
different subjects.

   This is exemplified by 27:42f. When the ship carrying Paul and other prisoners
runs aground (27:41), the soldiers want to kill them all, but the centurion rules
otherwise. The centurion's action is in response to the soldiers' suggestion (cf.
"kept them from carrying out their purpose"). However, the forefronting of the
reference to the centurion indicates that Luke chooses to relate the sentences
thematically and to contrast the desires of the two groups, thus downgrading the
sequential relationship:

   (27:42) The desire of the soldiers was to kill the prisoners, lest any should
   swim away and escape;

   (43) ὁ-δε ἑκατοντάρχης βουλόμενος διασῶσαι τον Παῦλον....
   'But the centurion wishing to save Paul (kept them from carrying out their
   purpose, and ordered those who could swim to throw themselves overboard....)'

   (Cf. also 20:6, discussed in Sec. 1.1.1c.)

   Among other passages in which the sentences are related thematically, the
following are noteworthy:

   6:7: This verse is not presented as the result of the last incident (contrast
   Newman and Nida 1972:133; NIV); rather, there is a switch of attention to the
   general spread of the Gospel (cf. "now" NEB), and the verse may be viewed as
   transitional (cf. Cadbury 1926:395; Thesis, Part II, Sec. 1.2.2.3).

   9:27: Barnabas' action is contrasted with that of the rest of the disciples

(cf. "but" AV, RSV, etc.; contrast Newman and Nida 1972:195).

13:50: The action of the Jews is contrasted with that of the Gentiles (13:48f)
(cf. "but" AV, RSV, etc.), even though it may also have been a response.

16:22b: The magistrates' action is compared with that of the crowd, rather
than being presented as a response to it (contrast Lenski 1961:670).

In 17:14b, the use of τε rather than δέ indicates that the statement about
Silas and Timothy is not in contrast with the assertion of 17:14a about Paul (cf.
Thesis, Part II, Sec. 2.2). This is confirmed by his not placing the subject before
the verb:

(17:14a) Then the brethren immediately sent Paul off on his way to the sea;

(14b) ὑπέμειναν-τε ὅ-τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐκεῖ.
'and both Silas and Timothy remained behind there.'

A correct interpretation hinges on the meaning of ὑπομένω 'remain', which indicates
that Silas and Timothy remained *behind* (Arndt and Gingrich 1957:853) when Paul was
sent away. In other words, ὑπομένω focusses, not on their continuing to stay
(ἐπιμένω 'stay' (10:48b, 21:10)), but on the result of Paul's leaving (cf. also
Luke 2:43).

[Note: When ἰδού 'behold' or καὶ (...) ἰδού 'and (...) behold' is used in connec-
tion with the introduction of a new participant (Arndt and Gingrich 1957:371b), the
subject always precedes the independent verb of the sentence (e.g., 8:27b). This
may reflect a restriction on the order of phrases imposed by the presence of ἰδού,
rather than the forefronting of a thematic basis.]

Although the majority of thematic bases are subjects, in a few sentences, the Theme
which is forefronted is an element in an oblique case; and the subject is part of
the Comment. (Cf. for example, 27:39b: κόλπον...τινα 'a certain bay'). In 4:32
(Τοῦ-δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία 'Now the multitude of the
ones having believed was of one heart and soul'), an illuminating rendering might
be, "Now concerning the multitude of believers, their heart and soul were one."

[Note: In copulative sentences involving the dative of possession or quality, the
Theme is generally the element in the dative case, not the surface subject; e.g.,
21:9.]

Further evidence that the basis concerns the Theme rather than the subject is
provided by "existential-locative" sentences (Kahn 1966:245-265). When the exis-
tence of a person or object is stated, reference to him/it generally follows the
verb, even though the sentence concerned is not in sequence with the last event
described.[7] Compare, for example, 9:10:

(9:10) ῏Ην δέ τις μαθητὴς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὀνόματι ᾿Ανανίας....
'Now there was a certain disciple in Damascus named Ananias.'

Firbas (1971:97) points out that the person whose existence is posited is not the
Theme of the sentence (cf. the use of the dummy subject "there" in English).
Consequently, the sentence cannot be related thematically to its context!

1.2 Continuity of Situation

In Section 1.1 I have argued that the forefronting ⌐⌐ ⌐ thematic, temporal, or spatial element indicates the nature of the basis for relating the sentence concerned to its context by replacement. The absence of a replacement basis is also significant, in that it implies that there is "continuity of situation" with respect to the context.

Within narrative, "continuity of situation" between two independent clauses means that, apart from any modifications described in an initial participial clause, the spatio-temporal setting of the events described in the independent clauses remains unchanged, as does the cast of participants. So, for example, a new participant may be introduced to a scene in which other people are interacting. If there is continuity of situation, then, apart from the arrival of the new participant, the cast remains unchanged, as does the spatio-temporal situation and any other pertinent circumstances.

This principle is illustrated in 5:17. The reintroduction of the religious authorities follows a section in which the habitual activities of the early church are described, and in particular, the way the crowds flocked to the apostles (5:12-16). By reintroducing the authorities in connection with a participial clause, it is understood that they are placed on the stage which has been set by the previous verses. Consequently, when the following independent clause states that "they were filled with jealousy", the reason for the jealousy is to be deduced from the immediate context, and does not need to be made explicit:

(5:16) The people also used to gather from the towns around Jerusalem, bringing the sick and those affected with unclean spirits, and they were all healed.

(17) Ἀναστας-δε ὁ ἀρχιερευς....
'But the high priest, rising up (...was filled with jealousy....)'

When independent clauses X and Y are contiguous to a genitive absolute (GA) whose subject is different from that of the preceding sentence (X), then the principle of continuity extends beyond the requirement that the cast and spatio-temporal situation remain unchanged. For example, if the same participants are interacting in both independent clauses, then their roles vis-à-vis each other may not be reversed, if a GA is used between them.8

This is illustrated in 18:5f. Paul is subject of both independent clauses, and the Jews are undergoers. Even though these roles are temporarily reversed in the GA itself, between the independent clauses they remain unchanged:

(X) (18:5) When Silas and Timothy arrived from Macedonia, Paul occupied himself with preaching, testifying to the Jews that the Christ was Jesus.

(GA) (6a) ἀντιτασσομένων-δὲ αὐτῶν....
'But when they resisted....'

(Y) (6b) he shook out his garments and said to them....

No such requirement exists, if a temporal basis introduces the second sentence. In 9:22f, for instance, there is a change of role between Saul and the Jews in the independent clauses which are contiguous to the temporal clause:

(X) (9:22) Saul...confounded the Jews who lived in Damascus, by proving that Jesus was the Christ.

(GA) (23a) Ὡς-δὲ ἐπληροῦντο ἡμέραι ἱκαναί,
'Now when many days had passed,'

(Y) (23b) the Jews plotted to kill him;

[Note: This does not mean, when two independent clauses are contiguous to a temporal basis, that there cannot be continuity of situation between the events concerned, other than the change of setting. The presence of the basis indicates that the new sentence is to be related temporally to the context. However, it conveys nothing about the continuity of situation or otherwise between the events. In contrast, the use of a GA, or more accurately, the absence of a replacement basis, implies continuity of situation between them.]

In the majority of passages characterised by the absence of a replacement basis, continuity of situation between the relevant events is pedantically obvious. However, in a few passages such continuity is not immediately apparent, unless the absence of a basis is taken into account.

This is illustrated in 18:12. Having moved from the synagogue because of opposition from the Jews (18:7), Paul receives an assurance from the Lord that no one will harm him while he stays in Corinth (18:9f). Consequently he remains there (18:11). However, the fresh initiative of the Jews in 18:12 looks like changing the situation (cf. "but" RSV):

(X) (18:11) And he stayed a year and six months teaching the word of God among them.

(GA) (12a) Γαλλίωνος-δὲ ἀνθυπάτου ὄντος τῆς Ἀχαΐας
'And when Gallio was proconsul of Achaia'

(Y) (12b) the Jews made a united attack upon Paul and brought him before the tribunal....

The use of the GA in 18:12, rather than a temporal clause, implies that Luke, in fact, perceived a continuity of situation between 18:9-11 and the following events. Since Paul is involved in both sets of events, this must mean that no reversal in his fortunes occurs. As the incident of 18:12ff unfolds, this becomes clear. The charges against Paul are rejected by Gallio (18:14-16), and it is this decision which makes it possible for him to remain for the eighteen months of 18:11 (cf. Bruce 1954:377). In other words, the incident is recorded to explain how it was that Paul was able to remain so long, and the GA of 18:12 has a significant role to play in indicating this continuity of topic and direction. Contrast this with 14:5, in which the intervention of the Jews does bring Paul's stay to an end (cf. 14:3), and a temporal clause is used.

Another example is 7:30 (not D). The GA πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν τεσσεράκοντα 'when forty years had passed' implies that the line of reasoning which Stephen is pursuing continues, notwithstanding the lapse of time. This becomes apparent in 7:35 when he states, "This Moses whom they refused, saying, 'Who made you a ruler and a judge?'" (referring to the incident of 7:26-29 which precedes the GA), "God sent as both ruler and deliverer" (referring to the incident of 7:30-34 which follows the GA).

Consider also 23:12. The absence of a temporal basis implies that Luke saw a direct relationship between the Lord's promise to Paul that "you must bear witness also at Rome" (23:11) and the plot by the Jews to kill him. On learning of the plot, the tribune immediately decides to send Paul to Caesarea—the first stage of his journey to Rome.

1.3 Summary

I conclude that Luke uses a very straightforward and systematic scheme for relating each new piece of information to its context. He has the option of relating the new information by replacement events which display a change of time, location, or Theme. He does this by opening the sentence with the appropriate basis which has the effect of displacing a corresponding aspect of the last events recorded. If he selects none of these elements as the basis for the new sentence, then continuity of situation with the context is to be assumed.

[Note: In this last case, natural progression in time (narrative) and/or topic (reasoned argument) between the events of one sentence and the next presumably is implied, since the events of successive sentences characterised by the absence of a replacement basis are generally in sequence.]

2. Emphasis

It is generally accepted that emphasis influences the order of elements in Greek, and that one way to emphasise a phrase is to place it early in its clause in violation of the natural order of constituents. (Cf., for example, Winer 1882:684.) However, only a minority of the elements which occur at the beginning of a clause or sentence are placed there to emphasise them. For instance, I consider that not more than eleven percent of the subjects which precede their verb do so because their size or extent is being emphasised.

The same sentence may contain both a replacement basis and an emphasised element, in which case the basis occurs first:

(13:44) Τῷ-δε ἐρχομένῳ σαββάτῳ σχεδον πᾶσα ἡ πόλις συνήχθη ἀκοῦσαι τον λόγον τοῦ κυρίου.
'The next sabbath (basis) almost the whole city (emphasised Theme) gathered together to hear the word of the Lord.'

Elements which are emphasised by forefronting include subjects whose extent or size is significant, the duration or frequency of an event, the goal of movement, and a variety of adverbial expressions. An element is often emphasised because it highlights information which is "of particular interest or significance" (K. Callow's "focus", 1974:52) for a subsequent development. For example, in 13:44 above, the subject is forefronted because it was the size of the crowds which led to the Jews' jealousy (13:45). Similarly, in the temporal clause of 25:14, πλείους ἡμέρας 'many days' is forefronted because it was the duration of King Agrippa's stay with Governor Festus which induced the latter to introduce the topic of Paul (as a further way of occupying the king's time). Compare also 17:19 (ἐπι τον Ἀρειον Πάγου ἤγαγον 'they brought (Paul) to the Areopagus'); the goal is probably forefronted because it was "a venerable institution" (Bruce 1954:351), and therefore a particularly auspicious place in which to present the Christian message.

Alternatively, an element is given "emphatic prominence" because it "highlights an item of information which will be surprising to the hearer" (loc. cit.). For

example, the duration of Paul and Barnabas' ministry in 14:3 is noteworthy, in view of the prevailing circumstances (14:2):

(14:2) But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles and poisoned their minds against the brethren.

(3) ἱκανὸν-μὲν-οὖν χρόνον διέτριψαν παρρησιαζόμενοι....
'So they remained for a long time, speaking boldly....'

Similarly, in 17:10 (εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπῄεσαν 'they went into the Jewish synagogue'), the goal might be unexpected, after the Jewish opposition experienced in the last town.

I do not suggest that a reason for emphasising an element is always to be found in the context. Nevertheless, the fact that a reason can often be discerned, lends credence to the claim that the forefronting of a reference (whether to the extent* or size of a subject, to the duration or frequency of an action, or to the goal of movement) is intended to emphasise that aspect of the event.[9]

[*Negative subjects are always forefronted in the narrative of Acts (e.g., 18:17b). This may reflect a syntactic constraint on the order of constituents, rather than emphasis on the (negative) extent to which something is true.]

Occasionally a forefronted subject consists of a noun (phrase) governing a genitive, with the genitive initial. Since a genitive normally follows the noun which governs it (cf. Winer 1882:239), a discussion of the forefronting of the phrase must also account for the forefronting of the genitive. Thus, in 16:26c (πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ ἀνέθη 'everyone's fetters were unfastened'), the phrase as a whole is forefronted because it is the thematic basis (16:26c is not in sequence with 16:26b), while πάντων 'of everyone' is presumably forefronted to underline the extent of those affected (contrary to expectation, it was not just Paul and Silas).

3. Temporary Focus

Of all the instances in which a subject (Theme) precedes its verb only half are forefronted because they are emphasised or are replacement bases of a sentence. The other half generally involve the subject of a response to the previous event and indicate that he/it is in "temporary focus". This term covers a variety of situations, which I discuss below.

About half the time, a subject is brought into temporary focus in anticipation of a change of subject and initiative (Sec. 3.1). This is seen most clearly when the activities of different individuals or groups are to be contrasted. Not only is the second subject generally forefronted (as the thematic basis, Sec. 1), but the first subject also is forefronted, in anticipation of the switch of attention to the second.[10]

In 13:13f, for instance, the group (οἱ περὶ Παῦλον 'the ones around Paul') arrives in Perga. It then divides into two—John returns to Jerusalem, and the rest of the group continue their journey as planned. The story does not develop from what John did. Rather, it follows the activities of the rest of the group. Consequently, John is only temporarily in focus, in anticipation of the switch of attention to the others:

(13:13a) The ones around Paul...came to Perga...

(13b) Ἰωάννης-δὲ ἀποχωρήσας ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.
'And John departing from them returned to Jerusalem.'

(14) αὐτοὶ-δὲ....
'And/But they....'

The anticipatory nature of temporary focus may be compared with what Chafe (1974:119) calls "contrastive pitch" in oral English. If the reply to the question "What did you (pl.) do in town?" were, "I went shopping and/but John went to a museum", "I" would carry a characteristic "contrastive pitch drop". This pitch drop is anticipatory in nature. It is present even when the second part of the contrast is left unstated (loc. cit.). For example, if the reply above had simply been, "I went shopping", there would still have been a definite implication that John did not go shopping. (This is demonstrated by the need for John to add "and I did, too", if that were not the case.) Forefronting the subject for temporary focus in Acts is similar; like contrastive pitch, it anticipates a further and corresponding assertion (involving a different subject).

Elements in temporary focus function like emphasised elements, in that they follow a replacement basis, if one occurs:

(27:39) Ὅτε-δὲ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο, τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἐπεγίνωσκον, κόλπον δέ τινα κατενόουν....
'Now when it was day (basis), the land (Theme in temporary focus) they did not recognise; but a bay they noticed....'

However, Chafe (loc. cit.) gives a number of reasons why contrastiveness (and, by extension, temporary focus) should not be viewed as a form of emphasis. (Cf. also Hutchins' (1975) distinction between "normal (unmarked) thematization", "contrastive" and "emphatic thematization".)

A second aspect of temporary focus occurs mainly within the confines of a reported conversation. Typically, the "intermediate steps" in conversational exchanges are introduced with a forefronted subject (Sec. 3.2). Compare, for example, 10:3f (10:4a is the "intermediate step" between the initial greeting and the speech which brings the conversation to a satisfactory conclusion):

(10:3) ...(Cornelius) saw clearly in a vision an angel of God coming in and saying to him, "Cornelius".

(4a) ὁ-δὲ...εἶπεν....
'And he...said, ("What is it, Lord?")'

(4b) ...εἶπεν-δε αὐτῷ....
'...and he said to him, ("...(5) And now send men to Joppa....")

(The next sentence records that Cornelius did as instructed.)

3.1 The Anticipation of a Change of Subject and Initiative

I have already referred to the forefronting of a subject or Theme in anticipation of a contrastive statement about another Theme (cf. 13:13b and 27:39 above). Temporary focus in anticipation of a change of subject and initiative also manifests itself in other ways, the principal ones of which I outline below.

(a) An interesting case of "temporary focus", which is found in about a dozen passages, concerns a person who desires to perform some act; but his wish is *frustrated* by some other participant. In 5:33, for example, the people whom the apostles had addressed were wanting to kill them. In this they were frustrated, because Gamaliel counselled otherwise (cf. 5:40):

(5:29-32) (This records the apostles' speech to the council.)

(33) Οἱ-δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπρίοντο καὶ ἐβούλοντο ἀνελεῖν αὐτούς.
'The hearers were enraged and were wanting to kill them.'

(34) But a Pharisee in the council named Gamaliel...stood up... (35-39) and said to them, "Men of Israel, take care what you do with these men...."
(40) (This records their compliance with his advice.)

In the above example, the forefronting of the subject of 5:33 anticipates the change of initiative represented in Gamaliel's intervention. They are in temporary focus because the direction of development of the story is not determined by their initial desire.

Further clear examples of forefronting, anticipating the frustration of an intention, are found in 9:29b; 14:13; 19:30 (GA), 33b; 21:26; 25:9; 26:21; 27:30 (GA). Other possible instances include 15:37, 27:12, and 28:6a,b (GA). Less certain are 14:11 and 21:27 (variant word orders exist).

(b) On a number of occasions, in the middle of an incident which concerns a Christian leader, a human or supernatural being appears without previous introduction, performs an action which affects the Christian leader, and then is mentioned no more in the incident. The presence of this person is of interest only insofar as his act affects the Christian leader. Consequently, he comes only temporarily into focus, and the reference to him is forefronted.

This is seen in 17:15. In 17:14 the Christians send Paul away from Berea. It is clear from the context that Luke is concerned primarily with Paul, and 17:16 begins a new incident in which he is involved. Prior to this, however, his previously unintroduced guides take the initiative by conducting him to Athens (cf. Lenski 1961:705). Luke's only interest in these "minor participants" (Levinsohn 1978a:75f) is in the effect their initiative has on Paul. I interpret the forefronting of reference to them as indicating that they come into temporary focus in this way:

(17:14) Then the brethren immediately sent Paul off on his way to the sea....

(15) οἱ-δὲ καθιστάνοντες τὸν Παῦλον ἤγαγον ἕως 'Αθηνῶν....
'Those who were conducting Paul brought him as far as Athens....'

(16) Now while Paul was awaiting them (Silas and Timothy) at Athens....

Compare also 5:22 (the officers), 9:38 (the disciples), 17:10 (the brothers), and 28:3 (a snake). Examples involving the fleeting intervention of a supernatural agency include 8:39 (the Spirit), 16:9 (a vision), and 16:26 (an earthquake; cf. (c) below).

(c) In a few passages, participant A is in the process of performing an action (with the verb in the imperfect) when an event occurs involving a previously

unintroduced participant B, which takes the story off in a new direction. The reference to A is forefronted, because he is only temporarily in focus, since the story develops not from his act but from the new develорmᶜⁱt involving B.

In 16:25, for instance, Paul and Silas (A) are praying and singing hymns to God, when an earthquake (B) occurs (cf. (b) above). The earthquake sets the story off in a completely new direction. The forefronted reference to Paul and Silas anticipates this intervention and change of direction:

(16:25a) Now about midnight

(25b) Παῦλος καὶ Σιλᾶς προσευχόμενοι ὕμνουν τὸν θεόν...
'Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns to God...'

(26) and suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened.... (27) When the jailer...saw that the prison doors were open....

(Cf. also 12:21ff and 20:7ff.)

(d) On a number of occasions, the introductory reference to a *new* participant is forefronted. One explanation for this is that he only comes into temporary focus as subject; the primary interest is in the Christian leader who was featured in the last events recorded. The forefronting anticipates that the Christian leader, rather than the new participant, will occupy the initiating role as the story develops.

This is exemplified in 9:36. I have already suggested (Sec. 1.1.c) that the importance of this incident lies in its explanation of how Peter came to be in Joppa, ready for Cornelius to send for him (cf. Newman and Nida 1972:199 on the way the incidents in Lydda and Joppa "prepare the way" for the incident involving Cornelius). This being so, Tabitha comes into temporary focus only, in anticipation of the arrival of Peter in Joppa, as a result of her death (the reference to the disciples who send for Peter (9:38) is also forefronted; cf. (b) above).

(9:36) Ἐν Ἰόππῃ-δέ τις ἦν μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά....
'Now at Joppa there was a disciple named Tabitha....'

(The reference to Tabitha is not the Theme of the sentence, which is "existential-locative"; Sec. 1.1.3.)

Other examples include 8:9, 10:23c (if εἰσῆλθεν 'he entered' is read in 10:24), and 28:15.

(e) It is no coincidence that the subject is nearly always forefronted when μέν 'on the one hand' occurs. I argue in Part II, Sec. 3.2 of the thesis that μέν is always prospective and that the event described in connection with it is "transitional". This being so, the subject is always in temporary focus, either because attention immediately switches to a fresh initiator (e.g., 8:25 below), or because his act is an intermediate step in some exchange (cf. Sec. 3.2).

In 8:25, the final reference to Peter and John provides the transition from the incident in which they were involved (8:14-24) to the incident which begins with the reintroduction of the deacon, Philip (8:26). They thus come into temporary

focus (μέν 'on the one hand'), following which attention immediately switches to the angel (initiator) and Philip.

> (8:25) Οἱ-μὲν-οὖν διαμαρτυράμενοι καὶ λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου ὑπέστρεφον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα....
> 'Now when they had testified and spoken the word of the Lord they returned to Jerusalem....'

> (26) But (δέ) an angel of the Lord said to Philip....

Other examples, some of which anticipate a contrastive statement, include: 1:1, 8:4, and 9:31.)

3.2 Intermediate Steps in an Exchange

The reference to the speaker of the final speech of a closed* conversation between two or more people is forefronted in about half the exchanges recorded in Acts. However, if the conversation consists of three or more speech acts, the reference to the speaker of the second and other nonfinal speeches is nearly always forefronted. The forefronting of the reference to a new speaker indicates that his speech is only an intermediate step in the exchange and that it fails to "resolve" the conversation, i.e., achieve the goal of the exchange or bring it to a satisfactory conclusion.

[*A "closed" conversation is one in which each new speaker and addressee is drawn from the speakers and addressees of previous speeches (e.g., 9:10-15, 23:1-5), rather than being introduced to the scene, prior to taking part. Thus, Peter's speech in 2:14ff is not part of the closed conversation of 2:7-13, because he intervenes from outside the group of people who were talking together. (Cf. also 23:16f.) In addition, a conversation is not "closed" if the verbal response of the last addressee is separated from the record of the last speech, for example, by a sentence describing his initial nonverbal response (e.g., 2:37). (Cf. also 8:34.)]

An example of a closed conversation which is resolved is provided in 10:3f. The final speech act (10:4bff) is the "Resolving Utterance" (RU)—it achieves the goal of the exchange, since the angel persuades Cornelius to send men to Joppa to fetch Peter (cf. 10:7f). The previous speech (10:4a) is an intermediate step towards this goal (i.e., it is a "Continuing Utterance" (CU) which leads up to the final speech), and the reference to the speaker is forefronted.[11]

> (IU)* (10:3) ...he (Cornelius) saw clearly in a vision an angel of God coming in and saying to him, "Cornelius".

> (CU) (4a) ὁ-δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ καὶ ἔμφοβος γενόμενος εἶπεν....
> 'And he stared at him in terror, and said, ("What is it, Lord?")'

> (RU) (4b) εἶπεν-δὲ αὐτῷ....
> 'And he said to him, ("Your prayers and your alms have ascended as a memorial before God. (5) And now send men to Joppa....")'

[*IU = "Initiating Utterance".]

In 9:10-15, however, the equivalent speech to that of 10:4bff begins with a forefronted reference to the speaker (9:11), because the other party then introduces an objection (9:13f; cf. below on the use of ἀποκρίνομαι), and the exchange is only

resolved by the speech of 9:15f:

> (9:10a) Now there was a disciple at Damascus n˼ ˂˂˄ Ananias.

(IU) (10b) The Lord said to him in a vision, "Ananias".

(CU) (10c) ὁ-δὲ εἶπεν....
      'And he said, ("Here I am, Lord.")'

(CU) (11) ὁ-δὲ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν....
      'And the Lord said to him, ("Rise and go to the street called Straight,
      and inquire in the house of Judas for a man of Tarsus named Saul....")'

(CU) (13) ἀπεκρίθη-δὲ 'Ανανίας....
      'But Ananias answered, ("Lord, I have heard from many about this man, how
      much evil he has done....")'

(RU) (15) εἶπεν-δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος....
      'But the Lord said to him, ("Go....")'

> (17) And Ananias departed....

     Other examples of closed conversations which are resolved include 10:21(IU)-22
(CU)-23(RU); 19:2a(IU)-2b(CU)-3a(CU)[12]-3b(CU)-4(RU); 21:37a(IU)-37bf(CU)-39(RU);
22:7(IU)-8a(CU)-8b(RU); and 22:18(IU)-19f(CU)-21(RU). In 23:1(IU)-2(CU)-3(CU)-4(CU)-
5(RU), Paul resolves the exchange in 23:5 by acquiescing—he effectively apologises
for his earlier remark of 23:3, prior to adopting a different tactic (23:6; cf.
Bruce 1954:452).)

     In many of the conversations recorded in Acts, the final speech of the exchange
leaves the matter under discussion unresolved, and a forefronted reference is made
to the last speaker. Many conversations are unresolved because the participants
fail to reach agreement by the end of the exchange (e.g., 12:14f below) or because
the speaker has not yet achieved his goal (e.g., 10:13ff).

     In 12:14f, an argument is recorded between Rhoda and the rest of the disciples
as to who is at the gate. Since the argument is not resolved until the door is
opened (12:16b), all the speeches of the continuing conversation begin with a fore-
fronted reference to the speaker:

(IU) (12:14) Recognising Peter's voice, in her joy she did not open the gate
         but ran in and told that Peter was standing at the gate.

(CU) (15a) οἱ-δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπαν....
      'They said to her, ("You are mad.")'

(CU) (15b) ἡ-δὲ διϊσχυρίζετο οὕτος ἔχειν.
      'But she insisted that it was so.'

(CU) (15c) οἱ-δὲ ἔλεγον....
      'They were saying, ("It is his angel.")'

> (16) But Peter continued knocking....

Other examples of closed conversation which are unresolved because the partici-
pants fail to reach agreement include 4:7(IU)-8(CU); 4:18(IU)-19f(CU)-21(CU); 5:8a
(IU)-8b(CU)-9(CU); 7:1(IU)-2ff(CU); and 25:36(IU)-37(CU)-38(CU). Of particular note
is the extended exchange between Governor Festus, King Agrippa, and Paul (25:24-
26:29)—Paul seeks to convince his audience to accept Christianity (26:29); Agrippa
is at best "almost persuaded" (26:28).[13]

In 10:13-16 there is a closed conversation which is unresolved because the ˅
final speaker has not yet achieved his goal. The angel's rebuke (10:15) fails to
persuade Peter to change his attitude. (Cf. 10:16. "Did Peter refuse a second and
even a third time after that first forceful warning? It seems so." (Lenski 1961:
405))

(IU) (10:13) There came a voice to him, "Rise, Peter; kill and eat."

(CU) (14) ὁ-δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν....
       'But Peter said, ("Not at all, Lord....")'

(CU) (15) καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν....
       'And the voice came to him again a second time, ("What God has cleansed,
       you must not call common.")'

(16) This happened three times, and the thing was taken up at once to
heaven.

(Cf. also 21:33(IU)-34a(CU)-34b(CU).)

Other exchanges are not resolved because, although the participants are not
necessarily in conflict, the overall goal of the passage is not realised in the
exchange.

This is evident in 28:17-21. Paul's words to the Jews in Rome (28:17-20) lead
the latter to express interest in his views on Christianity (28:21f). However, the
matter which he raises, and about which they comment, viz., Christianity and "the
hope of Israel" (28:20,22) is not explored. Rather, the exchange leads to the
arrangement of a *later* meeting to debate the whole issue. Consequently, the speech
of 28:21f by the Jews, though a positive response to Paul's comments, is only an
intermediate step and does not conclude the matter he raises.

(IU) (28:17) ...when they had gathered, he said to them, ".... (19) ...I was
       compelled to appeal to Caesar—though I had no charge to bring against my
       nation. (20) For this reason therefore I have asked to see you and speak
       with you, since it is because of the hope of Israel that I am bound with
       this chain."

(CU) (21) οἱ-δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπαν....
       'They said to him, (".... (22) ...we desire to hear from you what your
       views are....")'

(23) Having appointed a day for him, they came to him at his lodging in
great numbers. And he expounded the matter to them from morning till
evening....

Other examples of "intermediate steps" include: 8:31 (followed by a quotation
from Scripture; the conversation itself is resolved in 8:35), 12:22 (the

intervention of an angel (12:23) brings the exchange to an unexpected conclusion!), and 22:28b (although Paul's answer disposes of the tribune's "red herring" of 22:28a, the wider issue of Paul's right not to be exami.... by torture (22:25) remains unresolved until 22:29). Compare also the forefronting of the reference to the voice from heaven in each of the accounts of Saul's conversion (9:5, 22:10b, 26:15)—the command to enter Damascus is only an intermediate step in a confrontation presumably designed to change Saul from a persecutor of the Christians to a Christian himself. In the case of the reasoned argument of chapter 22 (delivered to an audience hostile because of Paul's ministry to the Gentiles), the exchange of 22:12-16 with Ananias is also unresolved, which suggests that the various speeches recorded in 22:10-21 all lead up to a single goal, viz., that of showing that it was the Lord who commanded Paul to go to the Gentiles.

A speech may be an intermediate step because the *same* speaker has yet to make a further speech before the exchange is concluded. (Cf., for instance, 2:38, 16:31, and 21:20a.)

Occasionally, reference to the speaker of an intermediate step is not fore-fronted. This is for one of two reasons:

(a) The previous speech was given in connection with a verb of perception, and technically no change of subject occurs between the sentences. (Cf. 9:4f, "he heard a voice saying to him...εἶπεν-δἑ ('and he said')...." and 11:7f. However, this does not always happen (e.g., 22:8.)

(b) The speech concerned is not in a tight-knit relationship to its predecessor. The speeches in a closed conversation usually enjoy a tight-knit relationship to each other. By this I mean that the new speaker takes up the same topic as that of the previous speech and develops the conversation from the point at which the last speaker left off. In addition, he generally directs his speech to the person to whom he is responding.

In a formal setting, such as a trial or council meeting, however, each speaker addresses himself, not to the last speaker, but to the president or to the council as a whole. (Cf. 15:6ff and 24:2ff.) Furthermore, the speeches often are not a direct response to the contents of the last speech (cf. especially 15:13ff, which refers back, not to the speech of 15:12, but to that of 15:7-11). Speeches given in a formal setting probably do not therefore enjoy a tight-knit relationship with each other.

The tight-knit relationship between successive speeches is also broken in 9:13 and 22:28 (each introduced by ἀποκρίνομαι 'answer'). In both passages, previous speeches had developed the conversation in a single direction, and the matter in hand should have been resolved by the last one recorded. However, the addressee of this last speech now makes a "counter-assertion" (Longacre 1976:172) which sets the conversation off on a new tack and may be considered to break the tight-knit relationship characteristic of the previous speeches.[14] Passages like 10:14 and 22:19 suggest that a counter-assertion only breaks the tight-knit relationship if a definite direction has been established over several speeches. In both examples, the counter-assertion immediately follows the opening speech of the exchange.

The marking of speech acts in a closed conversation as "intermediate steps" towards a goal suggests that a (tight-knit) reported conversation does not function like a series of nonverbal events in sequence. Rather, it is a single event

complex, consisting of a set of steps which together are the equivalent of a non-verbal event. (Elements which break the tight-knit nature of an exchange are treated like individual nonverbal events; cf. above.)

Confirmation for this view of reported conversations is found in other languages. For example, in Teribe (Chibchan language in Panama), the quotative verb used to introduce speeches in a reported conversation is not normally in the completed (punctiliar or aorist) form characteristic of events in sequence in narrative, but is in the incomplete (nonpunctiliar or imperfect) form (Koontz, forthcoming). In Inga (Quechuan language in Colombia), the enclitic *ca*, which introduces each "distinctive" event as a narrative progresses (cf. Thesis, Part II, Sec. 1.1), is generally absent when the second and subsequent speeches of an exchange are recorded (cf. Levinsohn 1976:128f).[15]

I suspect that reported conversations are viewed as the equivalent of single nonverbal events in all languages, when certain conditions are met. Many narratives are concerned primarily with the unfolding of a series of (basically nonverbal) events. Conversations then fit into the development of the narrative, only insofar as they produce nonverbal results, or else as the speech itself is the goal of the exchange (e.g., 13:15ff).

Note that, although the vast majority of examples of "intermediate steps" are found in closed conversations, in a few passages part or all of the exchange is nonverbal.

Verses 9:40f illustrate a closed exchange in which both the response to the initial speech (IU) and the resolving action which completes the realisation of the original intention are nonverbal. When Peter tells Dorcas to get up (9:40b), she only partly complies with his order (9:40c), so he has to complete the process himself. Verse 9:40c is thus an intermediate step in the fulfilment of Peter's intention, and its subject is forefronted.

(IU) (9:40b) ...and turning to the body, he said, "Tabitha, rise (ἀνάστηθι)."

("CU") (40c) ἡ-δὲ ἤνοιξεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον
        ἀνεκάθισεν.
        'And she opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter, she sat up.'

("RU") (41) δοὺς-δὲ αὐτῇ χεῖρα ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν;
        'And giving her his hand, he lifted her up;'

(Cf. also 3:5. However, in other closed exchanges which include nonverbal responses, the subjects of potential "intermediate steps" are not forefronted; cf. 12:7ff and 22:2.)

Both 3:5 and 9:40c closely parallel verbal "intermediate steps" in that they occur within closed exchanges. However, the general principle that the subject of an intermediate step is forefronted appears to extend beyond closed exchanges to other passages. In 21:39f, for instance, Paul asks the tribune to let him speak to the people (21:39). On receiving permission, he achieves this goal in two stages—first he quiets the people by signalling to them (21:40a—the intermediate step X); then, when they become quiet, he actually addresses them (21:40bf).

(21:39) Paul replied (to the tribune), "...I beg you, let me speak to the people."

(X) (40a) And when he had given him permission,

ὁ Παῦλος...κάτεσεισεν τῇ χερι τῷ λαῷ.
'Paul...motioned with his hand to the people;'

(40b) and when there was a great hush, he spoke to them... (22:1) "Brethren and fathers, hear the defence...."

Other examples include 21:32b, and in connection with μὲν οὖν 'therefore', 23:18. Less straightforward is 4:24:

(4:23) When they were released they went to their friends and reported what the chief priests and the elders had said to them.

(X) (24) οἱ-δὲ ἀκούσαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἦραν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἶπαν·
'And when they heard it, they lifted their voices together to God and said, (".... (29) ...grant to thy servants to speak they word with all boldness....")'

(31) And when they had prayed, the place in which they were gathered together was shaken; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with boldness.

In this passage, Luke is concerned with how the apostles respond to the authorities' ban on their preaching (cf. also 5:40f). The response is in two stages. First they pray for boldness (4:24-30). Then, as a result of the supernatural answer of 4:31a,b, they actually continue their preaching (4:31c). As far as the conflict with the authorities is concerned, this second act is the crucial one. Consequently, the prayer of 4:24-30 may reasonably be viewed as an intermediate step towards this goal.

Finally, it is possible that a whole incident may be treated as an "intermediate step". In 25:12ff, following Paul's appeal to Caesar in 25:11, the subjects of a whole series of sentences are forefronted. The first is Governor Festus' reply of 25:12 (perhaps considered by Luke to be the first step towards the goal of sending Paul off to Caesar). The following sentence does not introduce the actual dispatch of Paul (this is not described until 27:1). Instead, it records the arrival of King Agrippa (25:13). The subsequent events in the exchange between Festus and Agrippa also have forefronted subjects, including, in many MSS, that of 25:22b. Thus, it is not inconceivable that every event which occurs prior to Paul's next appearance in the story is described with a forefronted subject, implying that they are only "intermediate steps":

(25:11) (Paul said), "....I appeal to Caesar."

(X₁) (12) τότε ὁ Φῆστος...ἀπεκρίθη·
'Then Festus...answered, ("You have appealed to Caesar; to Caesar you shall go.")'

(X₂) (13) Now when some days had passed,

Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Βερνίκη κατήντησαν εἰς Καισάρειαν....
'Agrippa the king and Bernice arrived at Caesarea (to welcome Festus.)'

(X₃) (14) And as they stayed there many days,

...ὁ Φῆστος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον λέγων·
'Festus laid Paul's case before the king, saying,....'

(CU) (22a) Ἀγρίππας-δὲ πρὸς τὸν Φῆστον·
'And Agrippa said to Festus, ("I should like to hear the man myself.")'

(?CU) (22b) (ὁ-δὲ) αὔριον, φησίν,...
'"Tomorrow", said he, "you shall hear him."'

3.3 Concluding Comments

In this section, I have suggested that the reason why contrastiveness, frustrated intention, intermediate steps in a conversational exchange, etc., are all characterised by the forefronting of the subject is that they share a common feature, viz., temporary focus on the subject, in anticipation of a change of subject and initiative (Sec. 3.1), or because his act is but an intermediate or nonfinal step in the exchange (Sec. 3.2). It does not follow that a single feature should characterise such situations in other languages. Different languages choose to bring out varying features of each situation. So, although I can identify the means by which Inga expresses contrastiveness and intermediate steps in a conversational exchange, I find no recurring feature which they have in common. Similarly, in languages which employ a "frustrative" marker specifically to indicate, among other things, that an intention was not realised, I would not expect necessarily also to find a recurring feature shared by frustrated intention and contrastiveness, which might be identified as a mark of "temporary focus".

I therefore conclude that, although the forefronting of some subjects in Acts may usefully be labelled "temporary focus", this does not imply that such a feature will be marked consistently on a more universal basis.

APPENDIX

Ἐγένετο and an Infinitival Clause

In the introduction to Section 1, I noted that, if a sentence begins with ἐγένετο 'it came to pass' and its subject is an infinitival clause, then the phrase which immediately follows ἐγένετο is considered to be the "initial" element in the sentence. Blass et al. (1961) suggest that, in such a situation, ἐγένετο is "meaningless" (§472(3)), and that "the purely pleonastic ἐγένετο of which Lk. is especially fond, owes its origin to an aversion to beginning a sentence with a temporal designation" (1961, §442(5)). This hypothesis is not borne out by the evidence in Acts. At least 90% of the time, the transitional temporal expression itself begins the sentence. On only five occasions is the expression displaced from its initial position by ἐγένετο. Furthermore, in 9:3 ἐγένετο actually follows the temporal expression.

Winer (1882:406) notes that the infinitival clause "is to be regarded as the (enlarged) subject of ἐγένετο". The construction is particularly appropriate when Luke wishes to indicate that an expected event materialised. For example, in 27:22-26, Paul had predicted that everyone would be saved from the sea. The subject of ἐγένετο in 27:44b alludes to this:

(27:44b) καὶ οὗτος ἐγένετο πάντας διασωθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.
'And thus it came to pass (for) all to be saved on the land.'

This might be rendered, "And so everyone's escape to land materialised" (i.e., "And so it turned out that everyone did escape to land, as predicted").

Compare also the use of ἐγένετο within a temporal clause in 10:25 and 21:1,5. The construction is also appropriate in 11:26b, the preferred reading being αὐτοῖς, which Lenski (1961) interprets as a dative of advantage: the events recorded happened to or for "them".

More commonly, however, the subject of ἐγένετο is the specific circumstance for the following nuclear events. Furthermore, as Newman and Nida (1972:93) note, this use of ἐγένετο "is one of Luke's favourite devices for marking a transition in an episode". The events prior to ἐγένετο provide the general background against which the following nuclear ones unfold; the subject of ἐγένετο itself is the specific circumstance for those events; then, following the sentence introduced with ἐγένετο the nuclear ones are presented.

For example, 9:1f records the events which underlie Paul's journey to Damascus and thus provide the general background to the happenings of 9:3bff. The specific circumstances of these latter are described in the infinitival clause which is the subject of ἐγένετο:

(9:1) Saul, still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord, went to the high priest (2) and asked him for letters to the synagogues at Damascus, so that if he found any belonging to the Way...he might bring them bound to Jerusalem.

(3   Ἐν-δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ,
'Now as he journeyed he approached Damascus,'

(3b) and suddenly a light from heaven flashed about him.

(Other examples include 9:37 and 28:17.)

A whole incident may provide the general background to the next incident. For example, Paul's interaction with the disciples in Ephesus (19:2ff) has as its specific circumstance his encounter with them when he arrived there (19:1: the subject of ἐγένετο). However, more general background to the incident is provided by the description of Apollos' earlier ministry in Ephesus (18:24ff; cf. "he knew only the baptism of John" (18:25) and "into John's baptism" (19:3b). Ἐγένετο both marks the transition from an incident which supplies background details of relevance to the next incident and also introduces the specific circumstances of that incident. (Other examples include 4:5, 9:43, and 16:16.)

This use of ἐγένετο is found frequently in Luke's Gospel (cf. Reiling et al. 1971:22f). Notice, for instance, Luke 1:8,41,59. Further study is needed of passages in which the incidents which are continguous to ἐγένετο appear to be unrelated (e.g. Luke 2:1 and 6:12).

In summary, when ἐγένετο begins a sentence in Acts and its subject is an infinitival clause, the construction is deliberately chosen so that an event rather than a person is subject. Sometimes the construction records the occurrence of an event whose realisation was to be expected from the context. More commonly, it

marks the point of transition from events which contribute background details for the following nuclear events to the nuclear events themselves. In that case, the subject is an event which is the specific circumstance of the incident.

FOOTNOTES

[1]I am grateful for all the help and guidance I received in preparing my thesis from Professor F. R. Palmer (my supervisor in the Department of Linguistic Science at the University of Reading), and also from Dr. J. C. Callow and Professor G. D. Kilpatrick.

[2]Luke's history recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, if one excludes the speeches which he reports, may loosely be classified as "narrative"; its overall framework is chronological; and it is concerned primarily with actions performed by specific people or groups (cf. Forster (1977:3-6) on the factors which distinguish text genres). The hypotheses and principles outlined in this resumé are based on the "narrative" framework of Acts (i.e., excluding the embedded speeches).

Because the order of elements at the beginning of a clause or sentence is dependent on the context, I do not discuss rank-shifted articular clauses (e.g., 25:7) or a clause which is the verbal object of another clause (e.g., 23:35). The reason for this is that it is not clear whether the primary influencing factor is the clause within which they are embedded, or whether these factors are to be sought outside the immediate linguistic context. In 23:35 (κελεύσας ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ τοῦ Ἡρῴδου φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτόν 'commanding that he be guarded in Herod's praetorium'), for instance, it is not obvious whether the adverbial phrase of place is to be related by contrast with the place in which the comment was uttered (it is the spatial basis of the clause; cf. Sec. 1) or whether its position is determined by factors independent of the linguistic context (e.g., it contrasts with some expected location; cf. Sec. 2).

[3]In reasoned argument, a further basis is conditional (e.g., 25:11). However, Haiman (1978:564ff) suggests that conditions should be viewed as a special type of Theme.

[4]When examples are cited, the pertinent material only is given in Greek (usually UBS, third edition), and the expression under particular consideration is underlined. A free English translation follows (based on the RSV but modified where appropriate, in order to reflect more closely the structure of the Greek). Any context quoted is also based on the RSV. (Note: I make no reference to the existence of variants in the examples cited, unless this is germane to the point being discussed.)

[5]If this argument can be extended to Luke's Gospel, I would reject the generally preferred reading at the beginning of Luke 11:53 (Κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ 'And as he went forth from there'), and follow the Textus Receptus (λέγοντος-δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτούς 'And as he said these things to them'), on the ground that the forefronting of ἐκεῖθεν is inappropriate in this context; the movement is from the scene of the previous events.

[6]J. Callow pointed out to me that the temporal expression could not have preceded ἀκούσαντες 'having heard', and, if placed between the clauses, it would not have been clear to which clause it pertained. If the temporal expression were to begin the sentence, ἀκούσαντες would presumably be omitted.

[7]Callow and Wilson (1977) find that, in Paul's letters, the most common word order in finite existential "be" clauses which are not affected by syntactic restrictions is Verb-Subject, whereas in predicative "be" clauses it is Subject-Complement-Verb. This is consistent with the principle stated here.

[8]This principle implies, in 15:2b, that the unnamed "they" refers to the men from Judea (15:1), as in Codex Bezae (D), rather than to the Christians in Antioch ("the brethren", Bruce 1954:302).

[9]The punctuation of 26:22 is sometimes debated:

(26:22) ἐπικουρίας οὖν τυχὼν τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (,) ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης (,) ἕστηκα μαρτυρόμενος μικρῷ-τε καὶ μεγάλῳ....
'I have had the help that comes from God (to this day), and so I stand here (to this day) testifying both to small and great.'

The attachment of the temporal expression to the second clause would imply that this aspect of the assertion was being emphasised.

[10]Forefronting an element to bring it into temporary focus, though distinct from forefronting the basis, may well be related to it. Further study is needed, particularly of the constraints placed upon the second of a pair of contrasted statements. It is not unlikely that the constraint on bases which relate to the context (viz., that they must replace a *corresponding* element of the context) and those on a *following* assertion when an element is forefronted because it is in temporary focus are basically the same.

[11]Longacre (1976:169-172) employs the terms "initiating utterance" (IU) (to refer to any initiating question, proposal, or remark), "continuing utterance" (CU), and "resolving utterance" (RU). I have adopted his terms, but not with the precise meaning which he attaches to them. For example, he uses "resolving utterance" to refer to any speech which answers a question, responds to a proposal, or evaluates a remark. The term "continuing utterance" he reserves for speeches which counter an initiating utterance. His analysis of 10:10ff would probably contrast with mine as follows:

(10:10a)	IU, Proposal	my analysis:	IU
(10b)	RU, Response		CU
(11f)	IU, Proposal		CU
(13f)	CU, Counter-Remark		CU (Counter)
(15f)	CU, Counter-Proposal		RU

One of the complaints which I have with Longacre's analysis is that I find no evidence that his resolving utterances are marked in any distinctive way in the quotation margins, whereas a number of languages, including Greek, indicate that a speech resolves a conversation (in the sense in which I use "resolve" in the thesis) or else that it continues the exchange. I therefore restrict the terms "initiating utterance" and "resolving utterance" respectively to a speech which opens a conversation and one which brings a conversation to a satisfactory conclusion. For convenience, I refer to all the intermediate speeches as continuing utterances, although further distinctions can validly be made (cf. discussion of 9:13f (p. 18)).

[12]The preferred reading in Nestle and Aland (1975) is εἶπεν-τε (maybe a copyist's error, repeating 19:2a; the use here of τε I find strange). I follow the

UBS preferred reading (ὁ-δε εἶπεν), since Paul's second question is only an intermediate speech. (There are further variants.)

Erasmus' addition to the text of 9:6 (τρέμων-τε καὶ θαμβῶν εἶπε 'and trembling and astonished, he said') is also contrary to the principle of this section, since the speech of 9:6 does not resolve the conversation. The same applies to the addition to the preferred text at 8:37; Philip's statement of 8:37a was not a resolving utterance. (In addition, according to my analysis of ἀποκρίνομαι (Thesis, Part I, Sec. 1.2.5.4), the eunuch's response (8:37b) should not have been introduced with that verb.)

[13]In 5:29 (not D), 11:9, 19:15, and 21:13 (not D), ἀποκρίνομαι introduces the final speech of an exchange. This speech may be considered to resolve the matter under consideration, albeit without bringing the participants into agreement, because it "clinches the argument" by stating a position which is indisputable: "This is where I stand, and nothing you say or do will make me change", or "This is an unanswerable objection". Contrast the examples of unresolved exchanges cited here.

[14]In 1978b:vi, I note that the form of the quotation margin is distinct in the Chibchan languages of Panama when the speech act it introduces is "contrary to expectation".

[15]In 1978a:122, I note that the "final pronouncement" in a reported conversation in Inga is marked as the climax of the exchange and is introduced in a different way from the previous speeches. A parallel with resolving utterances in Acts is evident.

REFERENCES
(cited in this resumé)

Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W. 1957. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and adapted by W. Bauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Beneš, E. 1962. "Die Verbstellung im Deutschen, von der Mitteilungsperspektive her betrachtet." PhP 5:6-19. Translated by P. E. Garvin in T. A. Sebeok (ed.) *Current Trends in Linguistics* 1. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Blass, F.; Debrunner, A.; and Funk, R. W. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bruce, F. F. 1954. *The Book of Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Cadbury, H. J. 1926. "The Summaries in Acts." In F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. 1: *The Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 392-402. London/New York: Macmillan.

Callow, J. C., and Wilson, H. M. F. 1977. *Factors Affecting Clause Patterns in "To Be" Clauses in Paul's Letters*. MS.

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

Chafe, W. L. 1974. "Language and Consciousness." *Language* 50:111-123.

Firbas, Jan. 1971. Review article in *Journal of Linguistics* 7:91-101.

Forster, D. Keith. 1977. "The Narrative Folklore Discourse in Border Cuna." In *Discourse Grammar: Studies in Indigenous Languages of Colombia, Panama, and Ecuador* 2, pp. 1-23. Edited by R. E. Longacre. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Haiman, J. 1978. "Conditionals are Topics." *Language* 54:564-589.

Hockett, C. F. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. London/New York: Macmillan.

Hutchins, W. J. 1975. "Subjects, Themes, and Case Grammars." *Lingua* 35:101-133.

Kahn, C. H. 1966. "The Greek Verb 'To Be' and the Concept of Being." *Foundations of Language* 2:245-265.

Koontz, C. forthcoming. *Teribe Verbs: What, Where, and Why*. MS.

Lenski, R. C. H. 1961. *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.

Levinsohn, S. H. 1976. "Progression and Digression in Inga (Quechuan) Discourse." *Forum Linguisticum* 1:122-147.

_____. 1978a. "Participant Reference in Inga Narrative Discourse." In *Anaphora in Discourse*, pp. 69-135. Edited by J. Hinds. Linguistic Research Inc.

_____. 1978b. "La estructura del diálogo en el discurso narrativo." *Lenguas de Panamá* 5. Panama City: Instituto Nacional de Cultura.

Longacre, R. E. 1976. *An Anatomy of Speech Notions*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.

Nestle, E. and Aland, K. 1975. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 25th ed. United Bible Societies.

Newman, B. M., and Nida, E. A. 1972. *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*. United Bible Societies.

Page, T. E. 1886. *The Acts of the Apostles*. London/New York: Macmillan.

Reiling, J. and Swellengrebel, J. L. 1971. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*. United Bible Societies.

"UBS." Aland, K.; Black, M.; Metzger, B. M.; and Wikgren, A. (eds.). 1967. *The Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies.

Winer, G. B. 1882. *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Translated by W. F. Moulton. 9th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.