

THE STRUCTURE AND MESSAGE OF TITUS IN LIGHT OF A LINGUISTIC THEMATIC ANALYSIS

A. Moises Zumaeta
McMaster Divinity College
mzumaeta@icloud.com

Introduction

In Isaiah 1:18 the translators of the Reina Valera 1960 have rendered the text as follows: “si vuestros pecados... fueren rojos como el carmesí, vendrán a ser como blanca lana.” The last clause of the sentence—“vendrán a ser como blanca lana”—does not follow the most common pattern of syntactical ordering in Spanish, a language characterized by the fixed placement of its clause constituents. Unlike English that usually places the adjective before the noun it modifies, in Spanish the adjective almost always follows the noun, unless, of course, the writer or speaker desires to convey a message that extends beyond what is written, as is the case with this particular example. The translators of the Reina Valera, by placing the adjective “blanca” before the noun “lana” follow the most marked syntactical ordering in order to draw attention to the adjective. The unwritten message the translators want to emphasize by this marked syntactical linguistic choice is the high quality or degree of “whiteness” that God is able to accomplish, irrespective of how sinful and corrupt human beings are. This simple example shows us at least three important principles in regard to how language means. First, languages are semiotic systems that present users with multiple choices in the network that they are required to make, whether consciously or unconsciously, in order to communicate meaningfully. Second, the message of a text, whether this be a clause, clause-complex, paragraph, or a complete discourse,

extends beyond the message of individual lexemes and their relationships; the ordering of the different constituents also contribute to the meaning of the message. Third, some choices, due to their unmarked characteristics, have more potential for meaning making and hence they require more attention from the part of the analyst.

Linguists of various schools of thought, aware of these language realities, have advanced various theories that give due attention to these linguistic features and assist analysts in their interpretation of different kinds of texts. One of the most important theories, born out of Prague School of Linguistics, is what has come to be known as the functional sentence perspective (FSP), a theory of thematization which I will use in this essay to analyze the discourse of Paul's epistle to Titus. Thus, the purpose of this paper is twofold. The first goal is to describe and define the two thematic elements of theme and rheme at the various ranks of a given discourse and then adapt a version of FSP for the analysis of Koine Greek. Using this optimized version of FSP, a second objective is to determine the discourse structure of Paul's epistle to Titus and how is it that the notions of theme and rheme contribute to the explicit and implicit message of Titus.

Toward a Definition of Theme and Rheme

In order to provide a working definition of theme and rheme that is objectively applicable at the various ranks of the discourse in Greek, it is necessary to first survey the different ways these two notions have been understood in relationship to each layer of language in languages that are distinct from each other. Thus, Mathesius' pioneering theory in relationship to Czech will be first examined, followed by a description of Halliday's and Brown and Yule's adaption of the FSP theory to English.

Mathesius and His Functional Sentence Perspective

According to Josef Vachek, when it comes to studying and understanding the syntactical structure and function of language, the most important contribution born out of Prague's linguistics is perhaps Mathesius' functional approach for analyzing the sentence.¹ Vachek's assertion is not an exaggeration for Mathesius' contribution has proven to be fundamental—a required first step for language analysis—in our understanding for how language means, not only at the clause and sentence level, but also at levels beyond the sentence.² While recognizing that some sentences may consist of one element,³ Mathesius points out that the majority of sentences contain two basic content elements, the basis of the utterance—the theme—and the nucleus of the utterance—the rheme.⁴ The theme, according to Mathesius, is that part of the sentence that contains “things relatively familiar or most readily available to the speaker as the starting point.”⁵ The rheme, on the other hand, is that part of the sentence that “expresses something relatively new and contains what is asserted by the sentence.”⁶ Put differently, the theme of the sentence

¹ Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague*, 88. Mathesius' contribution and influence is not limited to his functional approach to the sentence. One could very well argue that, as the founder of the linguistic school of Prague and because of his insistence in studying language synchronically four years before the publication of F. de Saussure's *Cours* (1915), Mathesius could be considered one of the fathers, alongside Saussure, of modern linguistics. See Vachek, “Vilem Mathesius as Forerunner,” 5.

² Daneš rightly states that “[t]he relevance of functional sentence perspective for the organization of discourse (or text) is beyond doubt.” Daneš, “Functional Sentence Perspective,” 106. Porter, who applies the Functional Sentence Perspective, pioneered by Mathesius, to determine the epistolary form or structure of the NT in functional terms, also observes that Mathesius' contribution was significant “for bridging the gap between structuralism and functionalism, which became a hallmark of the Prague Circle; for identifying meaning at the sentence level; for foreshadowing development of what has come to be known as text-linguistics or discourse analysis by noting information flow as separate from syntax; and for suggesting that grammar is more than syntax and can be expressed in meaningful structures at the sentence level and beyond.” Porter, “A Functional Letter Perspective,” 11.

³ Mathesius, *Functional Analysis of Present Day English*, 82–83.

⁴ Mathesius, *Functional Analysis of Present Day English*, 81.

⁵ Mathesius, “Functional Linguistics,” 127.

⁶ Mathesius, “Functional Linguistics,” 126.

refers to the known fact or facts available to us from the previous context and the rheme to the new information, which further develops the theme, and enriches the knowledge of the reader.⁷ Mathesius further explains that, although the theme and rheme may at times coincide with the grammatical subject and predicate of the sentence, this is not always the case, particularly in languages whose word-order pattern is plastic. As a consequence of this, the syntactical slot that the theme and rheme may fill in a plastic language will also vary. When the sentence follows the “objective order” the theme will precede the rheme; when it follows the “subjective order,” the rheme will occupy the first syntactical slot.⁸

From the above description of Mathesius’ theory on the FSP one may get the impression that the concepts, definitions, and their subsequent application are clear and straightforward: (1) the theme always identifies the known or readily available information, whereas the rheme describes the new information; (2) the theme and the rheme do not always coincide with the grammatical subject and predicate; and consequently, (3) they never have a fixed position in the sentence. However, even though each of the three descriptions is built logically upon each other—the known and new information logically results in the mismatch of the theme and rheme with the grammatical subject and predicate, which in turn results in the varied syntactical placement of the theme and rheme—applying them as Mathesius suggests does not always work

⁷ Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague*, 89.

⁸ Mathesius, “Zur Satzperspektive,” 208. Mathesius assesses the subjective choice of the speaker to follow either the objective and subjective order on the basis of his observation of the speaker’s emotional response in Czech. When the speaker is calm, he observes, the tendency is to follow the objective order; when they are excited the order is reversed, i.e. the speaker follows the subjective order. Notwithstanding the truiness of this observation in the Czech language, one may question its value concerning other languages, particularly when it comes to the written aspect of the language, by authors to whom we do not have access to consult and verify the emotions they intended to convey through their writings.

effectively, due to the fact that the most fundamental element of Mathesius' FSP theory, the notions of known and new, could be difficult to objectively identify, and in fact, may be understood differently by two different linguists. Mathesius himself shows the difficulty of, at times, assessing what is known and what is new in a sentence, as evidenced by the following statement:

When we start to speak about something which cannot yet be referred to as a known fact, then from the complex of the notions included in the statement we anticipate one as given, i. e. as a notion that naturally presents itself, and we make it the starting point. A similar instance is *Na břehu jezera stál hoch...* [On bank of-lake stood boy]. Here again everything is new, but from this complex of new facts *břeh jezera* [the bank of the lake] is anticipated as something given that readily presents itself. The local determination is selected as the theme and the remaining part of the statement, *stál hoch* [a boy was standing], is conceived as its rheme.⁹

In addition to the difficulty of assessing what is known and what is new information, Mathesius also recognizes that the theme, in at least some fusional languages, occupies the first syntactical slot in the sentence. In regard to Czech which word order is plastic, he observes that “the theme is placed in the initial section of the sentence, whatever sentence element may express it, the final section of the sentence being reserved for the rheme.”¹⁰ This apparent contradiction caused others to question Mathesius' notion of theme and rheme. In his posthumously published article in 1962, *The Czech Language and General Linguistics*, František Trávníček disagrees with Mathesius that the theme must be thought of as referring to the known information. It is his opinion that the theme should identify the sentence element that is joint to

⁹ Mathesius, *Functional Analysis of Present Day English*, 82. Firbas, who follows Mathesius' functional model upon which he builds his theory of communicative dynamism, points out that “[c]onveyance of known information is not the essential feature of the theme” [Firbas, “On Defining the Theme,” 268.] but “a much narrower criterion” [Firbas, “Exploring Vilém Mathesius,” 13.] which one may call the principle of retrievability.

¹⁰ Mathesius, *Functional Analysis of Present Day English*, 85.

the object of the thought. Consequently, for Trávníček the theme would always have to occupy the first syntactical slot in the sentence.¹¹

Another factor that contributes to the confusion regarding Mathesius' description of theme and rheme, a confusion evidenced by the divergent redefinitions for the same two terms in various linguistic models, is Mathesius' polyvalent usage of the two (actually more than two) words in similar contexts. It is commonly acknowledged that Mathesius' most common terms to identify these two basic parts of the sentence were *základ* (basis/foundation) and *jádro* (nucleus/core). However, that was true—at least in regard to the word *základ*—only of his later, post 1939 writings. In his earlier writings, Mathesius used the words *tema* and *východiště*, both of which are translated with their English equivalent theme.¹² Firbas, observes that while Mathesius clearly used theme (*tema* and *východiště*) to refer to that part of the sentence “which is considered to be introductory and to convey something that is present, known both to the speaker and to the listener,” he also uses theme to identify the known facts, not in relation to the individual sentence, but “to a stretch of text extending beyond the individual sentence.”¹³ The same is true concerning the word foundation/base (*základ*). Mathesius also uses this word in relationship to the individual sentence as well as a stretch of text beyond the individual sentence.¹⁴ Thus, at least in regard to the notion of theme, Mathesius seems to think, whether consciously or unconsciously, that its application could be extended beyond the sentence level.

¹¹ Firbas, “On Defining the Theme,” 269–73.

¹² The term “rheme,” which replaced “nucleus” was coined by Firbas because, in his opinion, nucleus had too narrow of a connotation. See Firbas, “Some Thoughts,” 94, note 9.

¹³ Firbas, “Exploring Vilém Mathesius,” 5, 8.

¹⁴ Firbas, “Exploring Vilém Mathesius,” 10.

Theme, Rheme, Given, and New

Mathesius' functional approach for examining the clause¹⁵ could be described, without exaggeration, as one of the most iconic contributions in linguistics that steered the course for a proper analysis and understanding of how language works and conveys meaning. However, as already shown, Mathesius' lack of disambiguation or explicit description of what constitutes what is known and what is new as well as his tendency for identifying the theme, at least in Czech, with the first syntactical slot of the clause, required more refining and development. This is precisely what M. A. K. Halliday attempts to do in his functional grammar in regard to the English language. Halliday observes that there are two distinct configurations of structural functions in relationship to the clause—the clause unit and the information unit.¹⁶ Thus, one can conceive a kind of thematization that takes place in relationship to two concepts, that even though at times overlap with one another, are, nevertheless, functionally distinct.¹⁷ This leads Halliday to differentiate between theme with what is known and between rheme with what is new information.

According to Halliday it is the two basic parts of the clause—the theme and the rheme—that constitute it as a meaningful message. The theme serves “as the point of departure of the message” and the rheme as that part which develops the message.¹⁸ Given that the theme is the

¹⁵ Even though Mathesius talks about the sentence throughout his discussion of theme and rheme, on some occasions he equates the two, which seems to indicate that he understood not only a sentence, as we traditionally understand it, as having a theme and a rheme, but the clause also. For instance, just to cite one example, on page 87 he speaks of “[o]ne-element verbless thetic sentences,” and then in the following page he refers to the same thing as a “verbless thetic clause.” Mathesius, *Functional Analysis of Present Day English*, 87–88.

¹⁶ Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 287. It is important to keep in mind that one information unit may at times be composed of one clause; however, this is not necessary.

¹⁷ Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 39. See also Halliday, “Language Structure and Language Function,” 160–64.

¹⁸ Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 38.

point of departure in the clause, it must, thusly, occupy the first syntactical slot. Although Halliday concedes that languages other than English may express the theme differently, he points out that “if in any given language the message is organized as a Theme-Rheme structure, and if this structure is expressed by the sequence in which the elements occur in the clause, then it seems natural that the position for the Theme should be at the beginning, rather than at the end or at some other specific point.”¹⁹ Thus, Halliday takes the theme and the rheme as always having a fixed position in the clause, at least in English. At the same time, he maintains Mathesius’ view that the theme will not always coincide with the grammatical subject of the clause, for theme may be expressed by means of an adverbial group or a prepositional phrase.²⁰

Unlike Mathesius’ description of theme as conveying the familiar or most readily available information, and rheme as providing the new information, because Halliday takes theme and rheme as being syntactically fixed in the clause, he makes a distinction between theme-rheme and given-new. For Halliday theme has to do with the point of departure, not with the known information, even though the two may at times coincide. Likewise, rheme constitutes the remainder of the clause message, not necessarily the new or unknown information. The given is the information that is recoverable by the speaker, whereas the new is the non-recoverable information on the part of the listener.²¹ Since Halliday understands the sequence of information units as constructing the spoken discourse, and thus, being realized “as a pitch contour, or TONE,” he concludes that the way one is to identify the given and the new is through

¹⁹ Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 39.

²⁰ Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 39.

²¹ Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 277.

phonological means. The element with tonic prominence would constitute the culmination of the new information, which in turn would reveal to us the given information—that part of the information unit with the least tonic prominence.²²

Halliday's understanding that thematization takes place at more than one level—at the clause and beside the clause—which leads him to view theme and rheme as syntactically fixed, and given and new as non-fixed, is a helpful development of Mathesius' theory of FSP. However, since his criteria for determining what constitutes known and new information is based on tonicity, his suggestions provide no help for the analysis of the kind of thematization that takes place beside and above the clause in non-spoken text.

Theme, Topic Entity, and Staging

When describing Mathesius' theory of the FSP, it was shown that throughout his writings he used three Czech terms (*tema*, *základ*, and *východiště*) to identify the theme of a sentence (clause). It was also shown that, at times, Mathesius used these three same words to identify a known fact (a theme) not only of a single sentence, but of a stretch of text that extended to multiple sentences (or clauses). In other words, although Mathesius did not elaborate a theory of thematization beyond the single sentence, he, nevertheless, seemed to rightly think that a complex-clause and perhaps even a paragraph also had a single theme. This unstated but assumed multi-clause thematization on Mathesius' part, is what Brown and Yule describe in their *Discourse Analysis* as “staging.” Following Grimes' definition of staging as a kind of thematization above the linear

²² Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 275.

organization of the clause,²³ they argue that in a discourse there is often a theme that identifies “the grammatical subjects of a series of sentences” which is developed by other elements in a given textual stretch.²⁴ This thematic element in the clause-complex, which has the status of “main character,” is thus foregrounded causing other discourse referents to stay in the background. To avoid confusion at this level of thematization, Brown and Yule relabel the thematic unit as the writer’s or speaker’s “topic entity.”²⁵

In a similar venue to Halliday, Brown and Yule also recognize that thematization takes place at different levels in the communication process. They agree with Halliday that at the clause level the theme is “the left-most constituent of the sentence” and the rheme is “everything else that follows.”²⁶ Thus, for Brown and Yule the theme and the rheme at the clause level have a fixed position. At the clause-complex level they suggest that the theme is the explicit subject or main participant/character of the message, which implies that it does not have a fixed position. As already pointed out, to avoid confusion at this level of thematization Brown and Yule suggest to identify the thematic unit as the “topic entity.” This topic entity is, of course, related to the notions of given and new. However, unlike Halliday, Brown and Yule argue that the new information is given, not on the basis of tonicity, but by means of the indefinite article, which signals the introduction of a new entity, later evoked or referred to by the definite article.²⁷

Brown and Yule’s differentiation between the kind of thematization at the clause level and at the

²³ Through this concept of staging, Grimes seeks to maintain a parallel distinction between “the semantic choice of theme” and “the designation of the constituent in the grammar as the TOPIC by means of appropriate signaling devices.” Grimes, *Thread of Discourse*, 324.

²⁴ Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 135.

²⁵ Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 137.

²⁶ Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 126.

²⁷ Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 187.

complex-clause level is very helpful for it provides a better model for the analysis of a text that extends beyond the clause. However, their notion of recoverability of the new information on the basis of the article, does not work for languages that do not have a definite or indefinite article, such is the case of Greek.²⁸

From the unstated assumption in Mathesius' part and the explicit recognition of a thematic unit in, beside, and above the clause by Halliday and by Brown, and Yule—although labeled differently—it is undeniable that thematization takes place at different levels of the communication process. Furthermore, the fact that Mathesius' theory consisted in the analysis of the function of the sentence in Czech and this theory was later adapted and applied to English (and other languages²⁹), reveals to us that the two features of every message, whether this message consists of a clause, sentence, paragraph, or discourse, is a constant phenomena present in most (if not every) language.³⁰ Also, each thematic feature relates the corresponding information at the various strata with the notions of *Given* and *New*. In the case of the clause the *Given* is the first syntactical element, the *New* is the development of that first syntactical element; in the case of the clause-complex, the *Given* is the explicit actor of the process chain, and the *New* is everything else, including the different processes, that describe the action of the actor; in the case of the paragraph and discourse, the *Given* is the main topic or idea and the *New* is the development of that topic.

²⁸ See Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 61.

²⁹ For Japanese, see Fukuda, "The Thematizer 'Wa' in Japanese." For Spanish, see Arús Hita, "Theme in Spanish."

³⁰ Recognizing this truth, particularly in regard to the clause-complex and paragraph, in no way denies the reality that one of the features (the rheme or whatever other label we may give it) may and often does extend across multiple sentences. See Porter, "A Functional Letter Perspective," 14.

An Optimized Thematization Model for Koine Greek

If our goal is to properly examine the functional meaning of a discourse (text), we must give due attention to all levels of context of the given discourse. A model of thematization that addresses the various levels of the discourse with specific designations for the *Given* and the *New* at every rank of the discourse is, thus, necessary. This is precisely what Porter and O’Donnell seek to provide by means of their three-level approach for thematic analysis, a model which will be followed in the thematic analysis of Paul’s epistle to Titus in the next section of this essay.

Level	Function	Realized Through		Definition
DISCOURSE & PARAGRAPH	Topic	Semantic shift	Semantic Boundaries	Establishment of a new semantic environment for the discourse
	Comment	Semantic continuity		Support information for the current topic
SENTENCE(S)	Theme	Change of subject	Participant Involvement	The change of participant as actor of process chain
	Rheme	Additional verbal elements		Additional process information for current actor (extension of process chain)
CLAUSE	Prime	First group element	Group Order	Who or what the clause is focused upon
	Subsequent	Remaining group elements		Development of the prime

Table 1: Porter and O’Donnell’s Three-Level Thematization Model³¹

As one can observe in table 1, Porter and O’Donnell conceive a text as being organized in three major ranks—the clause, the sentence, and the paragraph—each rank with its own thematic

³¹ Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 56–57.

structure, jointly contributing to the overall message of the discourse.³² Each rank is realized by different linguistic elements in the discourse: the paragraph rank realized by semantic boundaries, the sentence rank realized by participant involvement, and the clause rank realized by the syntactical positioning of the thematic and rhematic elements. Following Halliday’s understanding of theme and rheme at the clause level, Porter and O’Donnell also view the thematic element as that point of departure in the clause that is developed by the rhematic structure which follows it. Thus, for them both the thematic and rhematic element are syntactically fixed, the former always preceding the latter. Unlike Halliday, at this level of the discourse, Porter and O’Donnell prefer to use the terms *prime* to identify the thematic unit and *subsequent* to identify the rhematic unit, while reserving their counterparts *theme* and *rheme* for the next rank in the discourse, the clause-complex or sentence.³³ Porter and O’Donnell define prime “as who or what the clause is focused upon” and subsequent “as the development of the prime.”³⁴ In the clause εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται (Titus 1:10), the prime would be the predicator εἰσὶν, while (γὰρ) πολλοὶ καὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται would be identified as the subsequent of the clause. In the first clause in Titus 1:13—ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής—the nominal group ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη would be the prime and ἐστὶν ἀληθής would be the subsequent. In the next clause of the same verse—δι’ ἣν αἰτίαν ἔλεγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμωσ—this time the prime will be the prepositional phrase δι’ ἣν αἰτίαν, whereas the

³² Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 55.

³³ Although Porter and O’Donnell later observe that their choice for reserving *theme* and *rheme* to identify each thematic structure at the sentence level may create confusion due to the “long history of application at the clause level,” their choice is in line with the original terminology chosen by Mathesius himself. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 62.

³⁴ Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 57.

subsequent is formed by ἔλεγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως. These three examples show that the prime may consist of a single lexeme or a word group that function as a single syntactical unit, and that it may coincide, but does not need to, with the grammatical subject of the clause. It must also be borne in mind that some clauses, particularly verbless clauses—may only have one thematic element, the prime, as is the case of καλοδιδασκάλους in Titus 2:3.

At the sentential level of the discourse the two thematic elements that conform the message are the theme and the rheme. Unlike the case of the clause, the theme and the rheme do not have a fixed syntactical position, and thus, do not always correspond with the prime and subsequent. However, when they do coincide they must be noted as “the most marked combination.”³⁵ The reason for this mismatch between prime-subsequent and theme-rheme is because the theme identifies the current actor in the process chain and the rheme describes the supplementary process information for the given actor.³⁶ In Greek the actor is the explicit subject of the process chain, which for the most part is determined by case and not syntactical placement. Also, since the theme governs the various verbal processes, it must be the theme of an independent clause, which in turn, will often result in the extension of the rheme over multiple clauses and even sentences (see Figure 1), to the point that some complete and complex

³⁵ Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 62.

³⁶ Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 62. This use of theme at the multi-sentential level is similar to Brown and Yule’s notion of “topic entity.” Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 137.

sentences may not have a theme (see Figure 2).³⁷ Porter and O'Donnell also point out that the theme should be the explicit subject and not the implied subject embedded in the verb.³⁸

Thematic Unit ₉	
Theme ₉	Rheme ₉
ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη	ἐστὶν ἀληθής
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Rheme ₉	
δι' ἣν αἰτίαν	ἔλεγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως
Prime _B	Subsequent _B

Rheme ₉	
(ἵνα) ὑγιαίνωσιν	ἐν τῇ πίστει
Prime _C	Subsequent _C

Rheme ₉	
μὴ	προσέχοντες Ἰουδαίκοις μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφόμενων τὴν ἀλήθειαν
Prime _D	Subsequent _D

Rheme ₉	
ἀποστρεφόμενων	τὴν ἀλήθειαν
Prime _E	Subsequent _E

Figure 1: Rheme Extended over Multiple Clauses

³⁷ The rheme of the message will continue over multiple sentences until there is a change in participant in the discourse. It has long been recognized, beginning with Mathesius himself, that not every sentence always has a theme. Firbas rightly notes that “sentences can be themeless and/or transitionless, but unless truncated (left unfinished) they cannot be without a rheme.” Firbas, “On Defining the Theme,” 112.

³⁸ Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 62.

Thematic Unit₁₄	
Rheme₁₄	
τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις	ἀρνοῦνται
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Rheme₁₄	
βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι	
Prime_B	

Figure 2: Clause-Complex without a Theme

The next level of thematization in Porter and O’Donnell’s model takes place at the paragraph rank with its corresponding thematic elements of topic and comment. Notwithstanding the fact that the terms topic and comment have also been used as synonyms for theme and rheme at the clause level, their use by various linguists with a broader sense, identifying the central themes of a given discourse, persuades Porter and O’Donnell of their suitability to describe the kind of thematization that takes place in the paragraph. The thematic element of topic is defined by the authors as “the establishment of a new semantic environment for the discourse.” In turn, the rhematic element of comment is defined as “supporting information for the current topic.”³⁹ Since thematization at this level of the discourse is realized by semantic boundaries, which are marked by a variety of linguistic elements (discourse markers, semantic field, tense-form, etc.), the mode for discovering the topic is by paying attention to the shifts or changes of these various elements in a given paragraph. The combinations of shifts in conjunctions, temporal deixis, semantic fields, tense-forms, etc., will establish the new semantic environment for the

³⁹ Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 67.

discourse,⁴⁰ enabling the analyst to objectively determine the boundaries of a paragraph. Once the delimitations of the paragraph is established, the analyst should then proceed to trace the various thematized elements at the clause and sentence level, giving special attention to those thematic elements that reoccur as well as those that are marked, for they will inform them “to build a composite picture of the topic and the paragraph.”⁴¹

Thematization in Titus

Now that I have defined and described a theoretical model of thematization that properly addresses the various levels of discourse, it is time to proceed with its application. In what follows, I will examine, at every rank of the discourse, Paul’s epistle to Titus, making important observation and drawing valuable conclusions in regard to the grammar, structure, and message of Titus.

Thematization at the Clause Level

According to the opentext annotated linguistic resource,⁴² between the three chapters of Titus there are 140 clauses, 47 main clauses (signaled in red in appendix 1) and 93 subordinated clauses. (Many of the subordinated clauses are embedded within other main and subordinated ones.) Of the 140 clauses 43 of them have as their prime the predicator, 34 the complement, 26

⁴⁰ Traditionally paragraph divisions are often established on the basis of discourse makers (*δέ, και, γάρ*, etc) and a common sense reading of the text. Porter and O’Donnell point out, however, that since discourse markers have a wide range of usage and therefore “function on a number of different levels,” the criteria for determining the limitations of a paragraph must include the analysis of “other co-textual factors.” Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 68.

⁴¹ Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 70.

⁴² <http://opentext.org/texts/NT/Tit.html>

have adjuncts, and 22 of them have subjects.⁴³ Among the main clauses which prime is the predicator, seven of them begin their subsequent with the subject (c1_15, c1_28, c1_35, c1_45, c2_32, c3_8, c3_42), six with the complement (c3_1, c3_17, c3_29, c3_36, c3_45, c3_46), and one with an adjunct (c2_41). There is only one primary clause that has the predicator *παρακάλει* as its prime, but without a subsequent (c2_41). Of all the clauses which prime is the complement and have a predicator, five begin their subsequent with the imperative mood (c2_15, c2_40, c3_28, c3_30, c3_40), four with the indicative mood (c1_2, c1_4, c3_15, c3_18), three with the subjunctive mood (c1_7, c1_24, c2_31), two with the participle (c1_12, c2_21). However, eleven of all these clauses begin their subsequent with the infinitive (c1_26, c1_31, c1_46, c2_12, c2_24, c3_2, c3_4, c3_5, c3_6, c3_25, c3_43). Seven of the clauses which prime is the complement are verbless (c1_43, c1_49, c2_10, c2_18, c2_19, c3_21, c3_26). Of these verbless clauses, four do not have a subsequent (c1_49, c2_10, c2_18, c2_19). As far as the clauses that have the grammatical subject as their prime, nine of them are followed by the complement (c1_1, c1_10, c1_16, c1_32, c1_42, c2_4, c2_23, c2_43, c3_41), eight by the predicator (c1_11, c1_37, c2_1, c2_2, c2_20, c2_37, c3_13, c3_27), and 5 by adjuncts (c1_5, c1_34, c1_36, c2_6, c3_48).

The above data confirms Porter's assertion "that Greek constituent order at the clause level is not nearly so 'free' as some grammarians would have interpreters to believe."⁴⁴ The recognition of a not-so-fluid nature of Greek has important implications for the interpretative process; for, as we will see, the more common syntactical patterns should not be over-interpreted

⁴³ This figure excludes the analysis of the following clauses because they are embedded, functioning as a word group within the clause: c1_8, c1_27, c1_44, c1_47, c2_3, c2_9, c2_22, c2_26, c2_28, c2_30, c2_35, c3_20, c3_23, c3_34, c3_39, and c3_47. They are identified in appendix 1 by means of brackets.

⁴⁴ Porter, "Word Order and Clause Structure," 200.

on the basis of syntactical positioning. In other words, although it is certain that the NT writers—at least the writer of the epistle to Titus—may highlight some elements of the discourse by means of a syntactical positioning, this highlighting is only true when the pattern is a marked one, that is, when it breaks from the common, unmarked pattern.⁴⁵ For instance, it would be incorrect to affirm that, in Titus, Paul is trying to emphasize a certain course of action on the basis of the fronted positioning of the predicator. An argumentation along these lines would be faulty, for as we have shown, the prime of the great majority of clauses is the predicator, being the most unmarked pattern in the syntax. Using Mathesius' words, we may consider this syntactical pattern as the objective order. A similar error would be committed if, in the case of clauses which prime is the complement, the interpreter finds some kind of emphasis or interpretative nugget in the prime for it precedes an infinitive verb. Again, as it has been shown, in the clauses where the prime is the complement, the subsequent that begins with an infinitive is the most unmarked pattern and, therefore, should not be over-interpreted. The opposite may be true concerning clauses which prime is the subject of the clause, since this is the most marked pattern. This becomes particularly important when the clause is an independent one, where the prime may coincide with the theme of the clause-complex, drawing attention or giving prominence to the theme and, thus, signaling a change in participant, which, in turn, may help us to better define the boundaries of a given paragraph or pericope (more on this below).

⁴⁵ Porter, "Word Order and Clause Structure," 190.

Thematization and the Sentence Level

The thematic analysis at the sentence level shows the presence of 24 themes throughout the discourse: Παῦλος (theme₁), χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη (theme₂), τὸν ἐπίσκοπον (theme₄), πολλοί (theme₅), οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς (theme₆), τις (theme₇), Κρήτες (theme₈), ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη (theme₉), πάντα (theme₁₀), οὐδέν (theme₁₁), αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις (theme₁₂), σύ (theme₁₅), πρεσβύτας (theme₁₆), πρεσβύτιδας (theme₁₇), δούλους (theme₂₂), ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις (theme₂₇), μηδεὶς (theme₃₁), ἡμεῖς (theme₃₃), ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (theme₃₄), ὁ λόγος (theme₃₅), ταῦτά (theme₃₇), οἱ ἡμέτεροι (theme₄₄), οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες (theme₄₅), ἡ χάρις (theme₄₇).

Many of these themes, because they coincide with the prime of the clause, having therefore a marked function, are to receive special attention in the examination of the discourse. Not much needs to be said about the importance that the themes Παῦλος (theme₁) and χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη (theme₂) have in the discourse. However, the fronted position of Κρήτες (theme₈) in the quote regarding the so called prophet should inform the reader of the difficult situation in which Titus may be ministering, especially when this prophet qualifies the Cretans with the modifier ἀεί. The prime position of theme₉—ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη—draws attention to its prominence in the discourse and motivates the reader to denounce the prophet's xenophobic characterization of the Cretans. A similar statement will be made in 3:8, though the theme there will not coincide with the prime. The theme πάντα (theme₁₀) in 1:15, which nominal predicate is καθαρά foregrounds the degree of morality which believers are to look for in their teachers. This is further strengthened by the fact that in the following statement it is the complement which occupies the

slot of prime and not the theme (thematic unit₁₁), as if the apostle were emphasizing, on the one hand, the degree of holiness a godly teacher is to strive for and, on the other hand, the corrupt nature of those who have not pursued the purity that defines a godly teacher. The theme *σύ* in thematic unit₁₅, is of special importance, not only because it is the only explicit subject that identifies Titus in the whole discourse (besides his name in the salutation), but also because it identifies the main actor in the discourse, whose responsibility is to carry out Paul's injunctions, which permeates the whole letter.⁴⁶ The themes *πρεσβύτας* (theme₁₆), *πρεσβύτιδας* (theme₁₇), *δούλους* (theme₂₂) introduce new actors to whom Paul's injunctions are addressed. Their prime position foregrounds them in the discourse. Among the original recipients of the letter, these individuals are to pay special attention to the instructions Paul, through Titus, expounds. Theme₃₄ in 3:4—*ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*—is a subordinate clause that functions as the subject of the sentence that extends through multiple clauses until verse 7. This whole word group highlights the theological truth, which is the foundation of the Christian ethos and praxis. This theological truth is none other than the kindness and love of the triune God and savior for humanity, manifested through the atoning death of Jesus Christ and the enlivening work of the Holy Spirit, with the subsequent result of eternal life and a special status in God's family. A similar theological topic is presented in 2:11 with the theme *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις* (theme₂₇), although not in prime position. Hence, it is legitimate to argue that theme₃₄ (*ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία*) may be the reintroduction of the same participant in

⁴⁶ Between 2:1 and 3:14—as a matter of fact even before 2:1—other participants will be introduced by Paul, which may warrant the division of multiple sub-paragraphs. However, the theme *σύ* will be recalled implicitly at various parts in the discourse in the form of the second person imperative, suggesting in this way that 1:5—3:14 includes two major sections of the epistle, the body and the paraenesis.

2:11, though labeled somewhat differently. The last two themes that coincide with the prime are ταῦτά (theme₃₇) and ἡ χάρις (theme₄₇). The former directs the reader's attention to value the things written and commanded by Paul as good and profitable (rheme₃₇), and the latter highlights Paul's desire that his readers experience God's grace.

Thematization at the Paragraph Level

Our thematic analysis at the clause and sentence level gives us the tools to more accurately examine the larger units in Titus' discourse. (See Table 2: Letter and Paragraph Sections with Topic in p. 30) The first major section is, of course, the opening of the letter covered in thematic units 1 and 2.⁴⁷ In this first section of the letter, the thematized subject—Παῦλος δοῦλος θεοῦ—with the elaborate description of the apostle's calling and task, is also the topic of the paragraph. Paul, as well as his calling as an apostle to bring the knowledge of truth, which leads to godliness, is the known information, thus establishing the first semantic environment of the discourse. The comment of the topic would, therefore include the recipient Titus and the greeting. This paragraph division coincides with that of NA28 and UBS5.

The second major section, which constitutes the body of the epistle, delimited by the marker τούτου χάριν (1:5)⁴⁸ and the introduction of a new actor or theme in thematic unit₄₅ (οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες), encompasses thematic units 3 to 44. However, before we formulate the topic of the whole section, it is necessary, first, to define the boundaries of the subsections or

⁴⁷ In his *A Functional Letter Perspective*, Porter notes that most Pauline letters have a five-part functional structure—Opening, thanksgiving, body, paraenesis, and closing. At the same time he observes that not all of the Pauline letters “have all five of the proposed parts” Porter, “A Functional Letter Perspective,” 20. Titus is one of such exceptions. This brief epistle lacks the thanksgiving and paraenesis sections, although the whole letter may be considered paranetic in nature.

⁴⁸ Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 781, 817.

paragraphs with their respective topics. The second paragraph is developed between verses 5 and 9 of chapter 1. (Our divisions also agree with NA28 and UBS5.) This is indicated, in addition to the discourse purpose marker *τούτου χάριν*, by the theme *τὸν ἐπίσκοπον* (theme₄), which connects thematic unit₄ with thematic unit₃—*πρεσβύτερος* was part of the rheme in thematic unit₃ and is another way of referring to the overseers in the discourse—and which rheme extends all the way to verse 9. The abundance of semantic domains 33 (Communication, 8x), 88 (Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior, 9x) and 69 (Affirmation, Negation, 6x), which in turn is contrasted with semantic domain 89 (Relations, 12x), provides cohesion to the paragraph, warranting in this way a semantic unity. Also the high number of lexemes from domains 33 and 88 shows that the topic of the paragraph is concerned with the doctrinal and moral qualifications (both in speech and in behavior) of those who are to serve the church as elders. Hence a topic title for this paragraph may be, “Paul’s description of the doctrinal, and moral qualifications of potential elders.”

Paragraph number three consists of verses 10 to 16 of chapter 1. Unlike NA28 and UBS5 which understand these verses to contain two paragraphs (vv.10–12a and 12b–16), our thematic analysis suggests that they should be considered as one single unit that deals with the false teachers residing in Crete (Hellenistic Jews?). The beginning of this paragraph is signaled both by the conjunction *γάρ* and the participant shift from *τὸν ἐπίσκοπον* to *πολλοί* (theme₅). The theme *πολλοί* is further defined or restricted as *οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς* (theme₆).⁴⁹ That these two themes should be understood as identifying the same group of people, thus justifying the semantic unity

⁴⁹ Theme₈—*Κρῆτες*—should not be understood as referring back to the false teachers because it, not only introduces a new actor in the discourse, but also identifies the individuals whom the false prophet is characterizing by means of his quote.

of the paragraph, is evinced by the many negative lexical items that characterized the false teachers. For instance of the 10 lexemes of domain 33 (Communication) 4 have a negative connotation (*ματαιολογος, ἐπιστομίζω, μῦθος, ελεγχω*); of the 5 lexemes from domain 31 (Hold a View, Believe, Trust) 3 are negative in their sense (*φρεναπάτης, ανατρεπω, ἄπιστος*); and of the 8 lexemes from domain 88 (Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior) 3 are negative in their basic meaning (*αἰσχροός, μιαίνω, ἀποτόμως*). The high index of these specific domains, especially with their negative sense, provide cohesion to the paragraph and inform the reader of the topic's content, which may be described as, "Paul's description of the heretical and immoral characteristics of the false teachers in Crete."

The beginning of a new paragraph at the opening of chapter 2 is signaled by the discourse marker *δέ* and the introduction of the explicit subject *σύ* (theme₁₅), which identifies Titus, the recipient of the letter. This paragraph extends all the way to thematic unit₂₆ (v. 10). In addition to Titus (in its reduced form), other actors included in this paragraph are: *πρεσβύτας* (theme₁₆), *πρεσβύτιας* (theme₁₇), and *δούλους* (theme₂₂). Because of the presence of these various actors NA28 understands 2:1–10 to consist of three paragraphs. (Here, UBS5 deviates from NA28 and views 2:1–19 as a single paragraph.) Although this paragraph consists of four themes, *σύ* should be considered as the global theme of the paragraph for it plays an important thematic role in the paragraph. There are at least two reasons for this assertion: (1) *σύ* is the subject of the two main finite verbs in the paragraph (*λάλει* in v. 1 and *παρακάλει* in verse 6), which indicates that Titus is the main theme of the process chain; and (2) all the other themes have as their predicator the infinitive form, which in turn functions as the object of the two verbs of perception to indicate

indirect speech.⁵⁰ In addition to the high number of lexemes from domains 25 (Attitudes and Emotions, 6x), 33 (Communication, 11x), and 88 (Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior, 9x), the repetition of the adverb *ὡσαύτως* in verses 3 and 6 gives cohesion to the whole unit. The topic of this paragraph could be expressed as, “Titus’ task to teach and exhort specific groups in the church to live in accordance to Christian belief.”

The next paragraph consists of verses 11 to 14 of chapter 2. Again, both the discourse marker *γάρ* and the shift in participant—the new theme in this paragraph is *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*—indicate the beginning of a new subsection. Knowing where the paragraph begins does not present any challenges. Determining where the paragraph ends is what poses some difficulty.⁵¹ The editors of NA28 and UBS5, as well as some commentators indicate that the paragraph should end in verse 15.⁵² There are a few linguistic reasons, however, that suggest the paragraph should end in verse 14. One of the first major indicators that verses 11 to 14 constitute a single unit is the shift in verbal aspect. Before verse 11 and after verse 14 the majority of verbs have imperfective aspect. Of the 22 verbs between verses 1 and 10, only one of them has perfective aspect (*ἐντρέπω* in verse 8). All the verbs between 2:15 and 3:2 have imperfective aspect. Conversely, between verses 11 and 14 six verbs have perfective aspect and only two verbs imperfective aspect. This semantic shift in verbal aspect not only differentiates this paragraph from the ones that precede and follow it, but also gives it cohesion. Moreover, the wording used to construct the theological description of God’s past, present, and future salvation

⁵⁰ Porter, *Idioms*, 197, 270–71.

⁵¹ The main difficulty for determining where this paragraph ends has to do with the fact that the next theme is *μηδείς* (theme₃₁), which is introduced in the second part of verse 15. However, one may argue that Paul is implicitly introduced as a participant at the beginning of verse 15 in the verbal form *λάλει*.

⁵² See Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 219; Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 318.

of humanity does not appear after verse 14. The lexemes *θεός* from domain 12 (Supernatural Beings and Powers), *σωτήριος* and *σωτήρ* from domain 21 (Danger, Risk, Safe, Save), *ἀσέβεια* and *εὐσεβῶς* from domain 53 (Religious Activities), and *μέγας*, *δόξα*, and *καθαρίζω* from domain 79 (Features of Objects) are all present between verses 11 and 14, but they do not appear in the verses that follow. These linguistic features are a strong evidence that verses 11 through 14 should be viewed as a single paragraph. We may render the topic of this paragraph as, “Paul’s description of God’s past, present, and future transformation of humanity, on the basis of his grace and Christ’s salvific work.”

The fifth paragraph in the discourse of Titus begins in 2:15 with the discourse referential *ταῦτα*, which is in prime position in thematic unit₂₈. The major difficulty in beginning a new paragraph at this juncture is that there is not a change in participant until thematic unit₃₁, where the theme *μηδείς* (also in 2:15) is introduced. Titus (*σύ*, theme₁₅) is still the subject of the main finite verbs (*λάλει*, *παρακάλει*, and *ὑπομίμησκε*), and hence, he is the theme of the process chain that is picked up in 2:15. In that sense, one may say that 2:11—14 is a parenthetical paragraph. However, as already mentioned, the referential marker *ταῦτα*, change in verbal aspect for all verbs (all of them with imperfective aspect), and different semantic domains—domains 13 (Be, Become, Exist, Happen), 28 (Know), 29 (Memory and Recall), 36 (Guide, Discipline, Follow), 39 (Hostility, Strife), 77 (Ready, Prepared) are not present in the former paragraph—suggest that this small subsection should be considered as a single paragraph. Additionally, another important topical distinction is that in this paragraph the injunctions are directed to the church in general as

opposed to specific groups. The topic of this paragraph may be formulated as follows, “Titus’s task to teach and exhort the church in general to live in accordance to Christian belief.”

Paragraph number seven is developed in 3:3–7 and it encompasses thematic units 33 and 34. The introduction of the theme *ἡμεῖς* (theme₃₃) coupled with the postpositive conjunction *γάρ* signal its starting point. The temporal markers *πότε* (v. 3) and *ὅτε* (v. 4) connect both thematic units into a cohesive paragraph, even though the amount of verbs with imperfective and perfective aspect are somewhat similar (6 with perfective aspect and 5 with imperfective aspect). When it comes to a theological and soteriological emphasis this paragraph is very similar to the one developed in 2:11–14. In fact this theological emphasis is highlighted by the prime position of the theme *ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλάνθρωπία*, which gives it prominence and guides the reader to pay special attention. The language chosen by the apostle to construct the theological message also gives cohesiveness to the unit. Some of these words are *θεός* and *πνεῦμα* from domain 12 (Supernatural Beings and Powers), *σώζω* and *σωτήρ* from from domain 21 (Danger, Risk, Safe, Save), *πλανάω* from domain 31 (Hold a View, Believe, Trust), *λουτρόν* from domain 53 (Religious Activities), and *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* from domain 93 (Names of Persons and Places). These lexical items, in conjunction with the main theme of the paragraph, also help us discover the topic of the paragraph which is formulated as follows, “Paul’s description of God’s kindness and grace, activated by the work of the Son and the Holy Spirit, through which He transforms sinners.”

The last two paragraphs of this second major section in the discourse of Titus comprise verses 8 to 11 (thematic unit₃₅ to thematic unit₄₀) and 12 to 14 (thematic unit₄₁ to thematic unit₄₅)

of chapter 3. Our division coincides with both NA28 and UBS5. The beginning of paragraph eight (3:8–11) is signaled by the introduction of the a new theme—ὁ λόγος (theme₃₅). The theme ταῦτά (theme₃₇) also corresponds to this subsection because it is an explicit reference to περὶ τούτων. Paragraph number nine begins with the temporal conjunction ὅταν and, although no new theme is introduced until thematic unit₄₄ (οἱ ἡμέτεροι), the change in verbal aspect suggest that verses 12 to 14 should be viewed as a different paragraph. Of the thirteen verbs in 2:8–11, ten have imperfective aspect and three stative aspect. In regard to 2:12–14, of the ten verbs four have imperfective aspect, five perfective aspect, and one stative aspect. Following the exhortatory tone of the whole epistle, these two paragraphs are further instructions for Titus, with the only difference that the instructions related to Titus himself and other specific individuals. A fit topic title for paragraph eight may be, “Paul’s injunction to Titus to be careful in his teaching and his conduct,” and for paragraph nine, “Paul’s injunction to Titus to minister to specific individuals.”

Now that we have examined the boundaries of each paragraph and provided topical formulations for each one of them it is time to briefly justify the reason why they should be viewed as belonging to the second major section—the body of the epistle. What joins all of these paragraphs together as conforming the body of the epistle is the paraenetic nature of every unit. This is evident, among other things, by the abundance of lexemes belonging to domains 33 (Communication) and 82 (Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior) in almost every paragraph. (Domain 82 is present in every paragraph and domain 33 is lacking only in two paragraphs.) Also, even though there are many themes that warrant the divisions of various subsections, theme₁—σὺ—because it is the direct subject of many imperative verbs in the

discourse across multiple paragraphs, should be considered as the global theme of the whole discourse. As God's instrument transformed by his grace, Titus is meant to communicate Paul's doctrine and injunctions to the various groups and individuals within the church so that they too may be transformed by God's divine work. A topic title for this unifying discourse theme, which is woven throughout the various paragraphs of the epistle's body and which captures the main message of the discourse, may be expressed as follows, "God's salvation of human kind, applied through Christ's redemptive work, is to be reflected in a moral, spiritual, doctrinal, and filial transformation."

The third and last section of the epistle corresponds with the greeting and the final blessing. Three thematic units conform this section (thematic units 45, 46, and 47). Theme₄₅ identifies the new participants sending the greeting—*οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες*— and thus warrants the section break. Theme₄₇, which coincides with the prime of the clause, brings to the foreground Paul's farewell for Titus and the church. An appropriate topic title for this section may be, "Paul's greeting and farewell to Titus and the church."

Section Division	Section Topic	Paragraph Division	Paragraph Topic	Thematic Unit
1:1–4 (Opening)	Paul and his calling to preach the life-transforming gospel	1:1–4	Paul and his calling to preach the life-transforming gospel	1–2
1:5—3:14 (Body)	God’s salvation of human kind, applied through Christ’s redemptive work, is to be reflected in a moral, spiritual, doctrinal, and filial transformation.	1:5–9	Paul’s description of the doctrinal, and moral qualifications of potential elders	3–4
		1:10–16	Paul’s description of the heretical and immoral characteristics of the false teachers in Crete	5–14
		2:1–10	Titus’ task to teach and exhort specific groups in the church to live in accordance to Christian belief	15–26
		2:11–14	Paul’s description of God’s past, present, and future transformation of humanity, on the basis of his grace and Christ’s salvific work	27
		2:15—3:2	Titus’s task to teach and exhort the church in general to live in accordance to Christian belief	28–32
		3:3–7	Paul’s description of God’s kindness and grace, activated by the work of the Son and the Holy Spirit, through which He transforms sinners	32–34
		3:8–11	Paul’s injunction to Titus to be careful in his teaching and his conduct	35–40
		3:12–14	Paul’s injunction to Titus to minister to specific individuals	41–45
3:15 (Closing)	Paul’s greeting and farewell to Titus and the church	3:15	Paul’s greeting and farewell to Titus and the church	46–47

Table 2: Letter and Paragraph Sections with Topic

Conclusion

The purpose of this essay has been to provide a description of the theory of thematization, also known as the FSP, and a functional definition of the two thematic elements present in every layer of discourse. It has been recognized that there are thematic elements, each of which correspond to the notion of *Given* and *New*, at the clause, clause-complex, and paragraph level, that need to be properly analyzed in order to determine the structure of a discourse. Because Porter and O'Donnell' implement helpful definitions and labels for every *Given* and *New* component at each rank of the discourse—prime-subsequent at the clause level, theme-rheme at the clause-complex level, and topic-comment at the paragraph level—we have followed their approach in our analysis of Paul's epistle to Titus. The importance of this structural thematic analysis lies in the fact that the meaning of a text—in this case the discourse of Titus—is constructed by the language user, not only through the explicit description of the message (content), but also through the syntactical arrangement of the message, whether this is done consciously or unconsciously. Our thematic analysis of Titus has helped us confirm that even though Greek is not an order-fixed language, it is not completely free, for there are syntactical patterns that are more commonly used by the language user. This observation, has, in turn, enabled us to more objectively capture the message of Titus through the juxtaposition of prime and theme. Since in Greek coincidence between prime and theme is a marked feature of the language, when the writer adopts this pattern he is highlighting or giving prominence to a specific content feature of the discourse. The overall message of the discourse is also expressed by the way the writer structures his whole discourse into a coherent unity and, as we have seen, a thematic analysis at all ranks gives us better tools for determining the boundaries of subsections within the discourse.

Appendix 1: Prime and Subsequent Analysis in Titus

The following table contains the thematic analysis at the clause level in Titus. The clause numbering follows that of the annotated NT by the opentext.org project. Clause numbers in red identify the primary clauses in the text. All embedded clauses, functioning as a word group within the clause, are enclosed in brackets.

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
1:1–3	1_1	Παῦλος δοῦλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου	Τίτω γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν	Subject
	1_2	ἦν	ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνιων	Complement
	1_3	ἐφανέρωσεν	(δὲ) καιροῖς ἰδίῳ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι	Predicator
	1_4	ὁ	ἐπιστεύθη ἐγὼ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ	Complement
1:4	1_5	χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη	ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν	Subject
1:5–6	1_6	τούτου χάριν	ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ	Adjunct
	1_7	(ἵνα) [τὰ λείποντα]	ἐπιδιορθώσῃ	Complement
	1_9	(καὶ) καταστήσῃς	κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους	Predicator
	1_10	(ὡς) ἐγώ	σοι διαταξάμην	Subject
	1_11	(εἶ) τίς	ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ	Subject
	1_12	τέκνα	ἔχων πιστά	Complement
	1_13	μὴ	ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας	Adjunct
	1_14	ἢ	ἀνυπότακτα	Adjunct
1:7–9	1_15	δεῖ	-	Predicator
	1_16	(γὰρ) τὸν ἐπίσκοπον	ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον	Subject

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
	1_17	μή	αὐθάδη	Adjunct
	1_18	μή	ὀργίλον	Adjunct
	1_19	μή	πάροινον	Adjunct
	1_20	μή	πλήκτην	Adjunct
	1_21	μή	αἰσχροκερδῆ	Adjunct
	1_22	ἀλλά	φιλόξενον φιλάγαθον σώφρονα δίκαιον ὄσιον ἐγκρατῆ	Adjunct (?)
	1_23	ἀντεχόμενον	τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου	Predicator
	1_24	(ἵνα) δυνατὸς	ἦ	Complement
	1_25	(καὶ) παρακαλεῖν	ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῆ ὑγιαίνουσα	Predicator
	1_26	(καὶ) [τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας]	ἐλέγχειν.	Complement
1:10a	1_28	εἰσὶν	(γὰρ) πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται	Predicator
1:10b–11	1_29	μάλιστα	οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς	Adjunct
	1_30	δεῖ	-	Predicator
	1_31	οὓς	ἐπιστομίζειν	Complement
	1_32	οἵτινες	ὄλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν	Subject
	1_33	διδάσκοντες	-	Predicator
	1_34	ἃ	μή δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν	Subject
1:12a	1_35	εἶπέν	τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης	Predicator
1:12b	1_36	Κρήτες	ἀεὶ ψεῦσαι, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί	Subject
1:13–14	1_37	ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη	ἐστὶν ἀληθῆς	Subject
	1_38	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν	ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως	Adjunct
	1_39	(ἵνα) ὑγιαίνωσιν	ἐν τῇ πίστει	Predicator
	1_40	μή	προσέχοντες Ἰουδαίκοις μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων	Adjunct
	1_41	ἀποστρεφομένων	τὴν ἀλήθειαν	Predicator
1:15a	1_42	πάντα	καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς	Subject
1:15b	1_43	[τοῖς (δὲ) μεμιαμμένοις] καὶ ἀπίστοις	οὐδὲν καθαρὸν	Complement
1:15c	1_45	(ἀλλά) μεμΐανται	αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις	Predicator
1:16a	1_46	θεὸν	ὁμολογοῦσιν εἶδέναι	Complement
1:16b	1_48	τοῖς (δὲ) ἔργοις	ἀρνοῦνται	Adjunct

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
	1_49	βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι	-	Complement
2:1	2_1	σὺ	(δὲ) λάλει	Subject
	2_2	ἃ	πρέπει τῇ [ὕγιαινούσῃ] διδασκαλίᾳ	Subject
2:2	2_4	πρεσβύτας	νηφαλίους εἶναι, σεμνοὺς, σώφρονας	Subject
	2_5	ὕγιαίνοντας	τῇ πίστει τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ὑπομονῇ	Predicator
2:3a	2_6	πρεσβυτίδας	ὡσαύτως ἐν καταστάματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς	Subject
2:3b	2_7	μὴ	διαβόλους	Adjunct
2:3c	2_8	μὴ	[οἴνῳ πολλῶ δεδουλωμένας]	Adjunct
2:3d-5	2_10	καλοδιδασκάλους	-	Complement
	2_11	(ἵνα) σωφρονίζωσιν	τὰς νέας	Predicator
	2_12	φιλάνδρους	εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους σώφρονας ἀγνάς οἰκουροὺς ἀγαθὰς,	Complement
	2_13	ὑποτασσομένας	τοῖς ἰδίῳ ἀνδράσιν	Predicator
	2_14	(ἵνα) μὴ	ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημῆται	Adjunct
2:6-8	2_15	τοὺς νεωτέρους	ὡσαύτως παρακάλει	Complement
	2_16	σωφρονεῖν	-	Predicator
	2_17	περὶ πάντα	σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον καλῶν ἔργων ,	Adjunct
	2_18	ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν σεμνότητα	-	Complement
	2_19	λόγον ὑγιῆ ἀκατάγνωστον	-	Complement
	2_20	(ἵνα) ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας	ἐντραπῇ	Subject
	2_21	μηδὲν	ἔχων [λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον]	Complement
2:9a	2_23	δούλους	ἰδίῳ δεσπότης ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πᾶσιν	Subject
2:9b	2_24	εὐαρέστους	εἶναι	Complement
2:9c	2_25	μὴ	[ἀντιλέγοντας]	Adjunct
2:10a	2_27	μὴ	[νοσφιζομένους]	Adjunct
2:10b	2_29	(ἀλλὰ) [πᾶσαν πίστιν]	ἐνδεικνυμένους [ἀγαθὴν]	Complement

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
	2_31	(ἵνα) τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ	κοσμοῦσιν ἐν πᾶσιν	Complement
2:11–14	2_32	ἐπεφάνη	(γὰρ) ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις	Predicator
	2_33	παιδεύουσα	ἡμᾶς	Predicator
	2_34	(ἵνα) [ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας]	σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι	Predicator
	2_36	προσδεχόμενοι	τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	Predicator
	2_37	ὅς	ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν	Subject
	2_38	(ἵνα) λυτρώσεται	ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας	Predicator
	2_39	(καὶ) καθάριση	ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων	Predicator
2:15a	2_40	ταῦτα	λάλει	Complement
2:15b	2_41	(καὶ) παρακάλει	-	Predicator
2:15c	2_42	(καὶ) ἔλεγχε	μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς	Predicator
2:15d	2_43	μηδεὶς	σου περιφρονεῖτω	Subject
3:1–2	3_1	ὑπομίμησθε	αὐτοὺς	Predicator
	3_2	ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις	ὑποτάσσεσθαι	Complement
	3_3	πειθαρχεῖν		Predicator
	3_4	πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν	ἐτοιμοὺς εἶναι	Complement
	3_5	μηδένα	βλασφημεῖν	Complement
	3_6	ἀμάχους	εἶναι ἐπεικειεῖς	Complement
	3_7	πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πραύτητα	πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους	Complement
3:3	3_8	ἤμεν	(γὰρ) ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς στυγητοί	Predicator
	3_9	πλανώμενοι		Predicator
	3_10	δουλεύοντες	ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις	Predicator
	3_11	ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ	διάγοντες	Adjunct
	3_12	μισοῦντες	ἀλλήλους	Predicator

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
3:4–7	3_13	(ὅτε δὲ) ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία	ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ	Subject
	3_14	οὐκ	ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ	Adjunct
	3_15	ἃ	ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς	Complement
	3_16	ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος		Adjunct
	3_17	ἔσωσεν	ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου	Predicator
	3_18	οὗ	ἐξέχεεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν	Complement
	3_19	(ἵνα) [δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι]	κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν κατ’ ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου	Adjunct
3:8a	3_21	πιστὸς	ὁ λόγος	Complement
3:8b–c	3_22	(καὶ) [περὶ τούτων]	βούλομαί σε [διαβεβαιοῦσθαι]	Adjunct
	3_24	(ἵνα) φροντίζωσιν		Predicator
	3_25	καλῶν ἔργων	προΐστασθαι	Complement
	3_26	οἱ πεπιστευκότες	θεῶ	Complement
3:8d	3_27	ταῦτά	ἐστὶν καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις	Subject
3:9a	3_28	μωρὰς (δὲ) ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς	περιίτασο	Subject
3:9b	3_29	εἰσὶν	(γὰρ) ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι	Predicator
3:10–11	3_30	αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον	μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ	Complement
	3_31	εἰδῶς	-	Predicator
	3_32	(ὅτι) ἐξέστραπται	ὁ τοιοῦτος	Predicator
	3_33	(καὶ) ἁμαρτάνει	[ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος]	Predicator
3:12a-b	3_35	(ὅταν) πέμψω	Ἄρτεμᾶν πρὸς σὲ ἢ Τύχικον	Predicator
	3_36	σπούδασον	-	Predicator
	3_37	ἐλθεῖν	πρὸς με εἰς Νικόπολιν	Predicator
3:12c	3_38	ἐκεῖ	(γὰρ) κέκρικα [παραχειμάσαι]	Adjunct
3:13	3_40	Ζηναῖν τὸν νομικὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶν	σπουδαίως πρόπεμψον	Complement

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
	3_41	(ἵνα) μηδέν	αὐτοῖς λείπη	Subject
3:14	3_42	μανθανέτωσαν	(δὲ καὶ) οἱ ἡμέτεροι	Predicator
	3_43	καλῶν ἔργων	προΐστασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας	Complement
	3_44	(ἵνα) μὴ	ᾧσιν ἄκαρποι.	Adjunct
3:15a	3_45	ἀσπάζονται	σε οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες	Predicator
3:15b	3_46	ἄσπασαι	-	Predicator
	3_47	τοὺς φιλοῦντας	ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει	Predicator
3:15c	3_48	ἡ χάρις	μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν	Subject

Appendix 2: Theme and Rheme Analysis in Titus

This third appendix contains the thematic analysis at the clause-complex or sentence level in Titus. The clause analysis of primes and subsequents is also provided (with some adjustments) in order to indicate when a prime coincides with a theme.

Thematic Unit ₁	
Theme ₁	Rheme ₁
Παῦλος δοῦλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου	Τίτῳ γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινήν πίστιν
Prime _A	Subsequent _A
Rheme ₁	
ἦν	(δὲ) καιροῖς ἰδίῳ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι
Prime _B	Subsequent _B
Rheme ₁	
ἐφάνερῳσεν	(δὲ) καιροῖς ἰδίῳ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι
Prime _C	Subsequent _C
Rheme ₁	
ὃ	ἐπιστεύθη ἐγὼ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ
Prime _D	Subsequent _D
Thematic Unit ₂	
Theme ₂	Rheme ₂
χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη	ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₃			
Rheme ₃			
τούτου χάριν	ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτη	(ἵνα) τὰ λείποντα	ἐπιδιορθώση
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B
Rheme ₃			
(καὶ) καταστήσης	κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους	(ὡς) ἐγώ	σοι διαταξάμην
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D
Rheme ₃			
(εἶ) τίς	ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ	τέκνα	ἔχων πιστά
Prime _E	Subsequent _E	Prime _F	Subsequent _F
Rheme ₃			
μὴ	ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας	ἢ	ἀνυπότακτα
Prime _G	Subsequent _G	Prime _H	Subsequent _H

Thematic Unit ₄			
Rheme ₄			
δεῖ	(γὰρ) τὸν ἐπίσκοπον	ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον	
Prime _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B	
Rheme ₄			
μὴ	αὐθάδη	μὴ	ὀργίλον
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D
Rheme ₄			
μὴ	πάροιον	μὴ	πλήκτην
Prime _E	Subsequent _E	Prime _F	Subsequent _F

Rheme ₄			
μή	αἰσχροκερδῆ	ἀλλὰ	φιλόξενον φιλάγαθον σώφρονα δίκαιον ὄσιον ἐγκρατῆ
Prime_G	Subsequent_G	Prime_H	Subsequent_H

Rheme ₄			
ἀντεχόμενον	τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου	(ἵνα) δυνατὸς ᾦ	
Prime_I	Subsequent_I	Prime_J	Subsequent_J

Rheme ₄			
(καὶ) παρακαλεῖν	ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὕγιαινούσῃ	(καὶ) τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας	ἐλέγχειν
Prime_K	Subsequent_K	Prime_L	Subsequent_L

Thematic Unit ₅		
Rheme ₅	Theme ₅	Rheme ₅
εἰσὶν	(γὰρ) πολλοὶ	ἀνυπότακτοι ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	

Thematic Unit ₆			
Rheme ₆	Theme ₆	Rheme ₆	
μάλιστα	οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς	οὓς	δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	Prime_B	Subsequent_B

Rheme ₆			
οἵτινες	ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν	διδάσκοντες	ἂ μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν
Prime_C	Subsequent_C	Prime_D	Subsequent_D

Thematic Unit ₇		
Rheme ₇	Theme ₇	Rheme ₇
εἶπέν	τις	ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	

Thematic Unit ₈	
Theme ₈	Rheme ₈
Κρήτες	ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₉			
Theme ₉	Rheme ₉		
ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη	ἐστὶν ἀληθής	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν	ἔλεγγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B

Rheme ₉			
(ἵνα) ὑγιαίνωσιν	ἐν τῇ πίστει	μὴ	προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D

Rheme ₉	
ἀποστρεφόμενων	τὴν ἀλήθειαν
Prime _E	Subsequent _E

Thematic Unit ₁₀	
Theme ₁₀	Rheme ₁₀
πάντα	καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₁₁		
Rheme ₁₁	Theme ₁₁	Rheme ₁₁
τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις	οὐδὲν	καθαρόν
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	

Thematic Unit ₁₂	
Theme ₁₂	Rheme ₁₂
(ἀλλὰ) μεμΐανται	αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Thematic Unit ₁₃	
Rheme ₁₃	
θεὸν	ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Thematic Unit ₁₄	
Rheme ₁₄	
τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις	ἀρνοῦνται
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Rheme ₁₄	
βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι	
Prime_B	

Thematic Unit ₁₅			
Theme ₁₅	Rheme ₁₅		
σύ	(δὲ) λάλει	ἃ	πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	Prime_B	Subsequent_B

Thematic Unit ₁₆			
Theme ₁₆	Rheme ₁₆		
πρεσβύτας	νηφαλίους εἶναι, σεμνούς, σώφρονας	ὑγιαίνοντας	τῇ πίστει τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ὑπομονῇ
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B

Thematic Unit ₁₇	
Theme ₁₇	Rheme ₁₇
πρεσβύτιδας	ὡσαύτως ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₁₈	
Rheme ₁₈	
μη	διαβόλους
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₁₉	
Rheme ₁₉	
μη	οἴνω πολλῶ δεδουλωμένας
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₂₀			
Rheme ₂₀			
καλοδιδασκάλους	(ἵνα) σωφρονίζωσιν	τὰς νέας	
Prime_A	Prime_B	Subsequent_B	
Rheme ₂₀			
φιλάνδρους	εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους σώφρονας ἀγνάς οἰκουργοὺς ἀγαθὰς,	ὑποτασσομένας	τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν
Prime_C	Subsequent_C	Prime_D	Subsequent_D
Rheme ₂₀			
(ἵνα) μὴ	ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημῆται		
Prime_E	Subsequent_E		

Thematic Unit ₂₁			
Rheme ₂₁			
τοὺς νεωτέρους	ὡσαύτως παρακάλει	σωφρονεῖν	
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	Prime_B	
Rheme ₂₁			
περὶ πάντα	σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον καλῶν ἔργων	ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν, σεμνότητα,	λόγον ὑγιῆ ἀκατάγνωστον
Prime_C	Subsequent_C	Prime_D	Subsequent_D
Rheme ₂₁			
(ἵνα) ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας	ἐντραπῆ	μηδὲν	ἔχων λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον
Prime_E	Subsequent_E	Prime_F	Subsequent_F

Thematic Unit ₂₂	
Rheme ₂₂	
δούλους	ἰδίοις δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πᾶσιν
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₂₃	
Rheme ₂₃	
εὐαρέστους	εἶναι
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₂₄	
Rheme ₂₄	
μὴ	ἀντιλέγοντας
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₂₅	
Rheme ₂₅	
μὴ	νοσφιζομένους
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₂₆	
Rheme ₂₆	
(ἀλλὰ) πᾶσαν πίστιν	ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθὴν
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Rheme ₂₆	
(ἵνα) τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ	κοσμῶσιν ἐν πᾶσιν
Prime _B	Subsequent _B

Thematic Unit ₂₇	
Rheme ₂₇	Theme ₂₇
ἐπεφάνη	(γὰρ) ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Rheme ₂₇			
παιδεύουσα	ἡμᾶς	(ἵνα) ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας	σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι
Prime _B	Subsequent _B	Prime _C	Subsequent _C

Rheme ₂₇			
προσδεχόμενοι	τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	ὅς	ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
Prime _D	Subsequent _D	Prime _E	Subsequent _E

Rheme ₂₇			
(ἵνα) λυτρώσῃται	ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας	(καὶ) καθάρισις	ἑαυτῶν λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων
Prime _F	Subsequent _F	Prime _G	Subsequent _G

Thematic Unit ₂₈	
Rheme ₂₈	
ταῦτα	λάλει
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₂₉	
Rheme ₂₉	
(καὶ) παρακάλει	
Prime _A	

Thematic Unit ₃₀	
Rheme ₃₀	
(καί) ἔλεγε	μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₃₁	
Theme ₃₁	Rheme ₃₁
μηδεῖς	σου περιφρονεῖτω
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₃₂			
Rheme ₃₂			
ὑπομίμησθε	αὐτούς	ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις	ὑποτάσσεσθαι
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B

Rheme ₃₂		
πειθαρχεῖν	πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν	ἐτοίμους εἶναι
Prime _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D

Rheme ₃₂			
μηδένα	βλασφημεῖν	ἀμάχους	εἶναι ἐπεικειεῖς
Prime _E	Subsequent _E	Prime _F	Subsequent _F

Rheme ₃₂	
πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πραΰτητα	πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους
Prime _G	Subsequent _G

Thematic Unit ₃₃				
Rheme ₃₃		Theme ₃₃	Rheme ₃₃	
ἡμεν		(γάρ) ποτε(καὶ) ἡμεῖς	ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, στυγητοί	
Prime _A		Subsequent _A		
Rheme ₃₃				
πλανώμενοι		δουλεύοντες	ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις	
Prime _B		Prime _C	Subsequent _C	
Rheme ₃₃				
ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ		διάγοντες	μισοῦντες	ἀλλήλους
Prime _D		Subsequent _D	Prime _E	Subsequent _E

Thematic Unit ₃₄			
Theme ₃₄		Rheme ₃₄	
(ὅτε δὲ) ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία		ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ	
Prime _A		Subsequent _A	
Rheme ₃₄			
οὐκ		ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ	
Prime _B		Subsequent _B	
Rheme ₃₄			
ἃ	ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς	ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος	
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	
Rheme ₃₄			
ἔσωσεν	ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου		
Prime _E	Subsequent _E		

Rheme ₃₄	
οὐ	ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν
Prime _F	Subsequent _F

Rheme ₃₄	
(ἵνα) δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι	κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου.
Prime _G	Subsequent _G

Thematic Unit ₃₅	
Rheme ₃₅	Theme ₃₅
πιστὸς	ὁ λόγος
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₃₆	
Rheme ₃₆	
(καὶ) περὶ τούτων	βούλομαί σε διαβεβαιουῖσθαι
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Rheme ₃₆	
(ἵνα) φροντίζωσιν	καλῶν ἔργων προϊστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ
Prime _B	Subsequent _B

Thematic Unit ₃₇	
Theme ₃₇	Rheme ₃₇
ταῦτά	ἐστὶν καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit₃₈	
Rheme₃₈	
μωρὰς (δὲ) ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς	περίῃστασο
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Thematic Unit₃₉	
Rheme₃₉	
εἰσὶν	(γὰρ) ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Thematic Unit₄₀		
Rheme₄₀		
αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον	μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ	εἰδῶς
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	Prime_B

Rheme₄₀			
(ὅτι) ἐξέστραπται	ὁ τοιοῦτος	(καὶ) ἀμαρτάνει	ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος
Prime_C	Subsequent_C	Prime_D	Subsequent_D

Thematic Unit₄₁			
Rheme₄₁			
(ὅταν) πέμψω	Ἄρτεμᾶν πρὸς σὲ ἢ Τύχικον	σπούδασον	ἔλθειν πρὸς με εἰς Νικόπολιν
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	Prime_B	Subsequent_B

Thematic Unit₄₂	
Rheme₄₂	
ἐκεῖ	(γὰρ) κέκρικα παραχειμάσαι
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Thematic Unit ₄₃			
Rheme ₄₃			
Ζητᾶν τὸν νομικὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶν	σπουδαίως πρόπεμψον	(ἵνα) μηδὲν	αὐτοῖς λείπη
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	Prime_B	Subsequent_B

Thematic Unit ₄₄		
Rheme ₄₄	Theme ₄₄	Rheme ₄₄
μανθανέτωσαν	(δὲ καὶ) οἱ ἡμέτεροι	καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρεῖας
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	

Rheme ₄₄	
(ἵνα) μὴ	ὥσιν ἄκαρποι.
Prime_B	Subsequent_B

Thematic Unit ₄₅		
Rheme ₄₅		Theme ₄₅
ἀσπάζονται	σε	οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες
Prime_A	Subsequent_A	

Thematic Unit ₄₆	
Rheme ₄₆	
ἄσπασαι	τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Thematic Unit ₄₇	
Theme ₄₇	Rheme ₄₇
ἡ χάρις	μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν
Prime_A	Subsequent_A

Appendix 3: Semantic Domain in NA27 Paragraph Divisions

This second table presents the analysis of Nida's semantic domains of every paragraph in Titus as delimited by NA27.

Paragraph 1: 1.1–4			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:4	τέκνον	9.46	People
1:1–4	θεός (x5)	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
1:4	πατήρ	12.12	
1:3, 4	σωτήρ (2x)	21.31	Danger, Risk, Safe, Save
1:4	εἰρήνη	22.42	Trouble, Hardship, Relief, Favorable Circumstances
1:2	ζωή	23.88	Physiological Processes and States
1:2	ἐλπίς	25.59	Attitudes and Emotions
1:4	χάρις	25.89	
1:1	ἐπίγνωσις	28.18	Know
1:3	φανερῶ	28.36	
1:1	ἐκλεκτός	30.93	Think
1:4	πίστις	31.102	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
1:1	πίστις	31.85	
1:3	κήρυγμα	33.258	Communication
1:2	ἐπαγγέλλομαι	33.286	
1:3	ἐπιταγή	33.326	
1:3	λόγος	33.98	
1:3	πιστεύω	35.5	Help, Care For
1:1	εὐσέβεια	53.1	Religious Activities
1:1	ἀπόστολος	53.74	
1:3	ἴδιος	57.4	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
1:4	κοινός	57.9	
1:3	καιρός	67.1	Time
1:2	πρό	67.133	
1:2	χρόνος	67.133	
1:2	αἰώνιος	67.96	
1:1	ἀλήθεια	72.2	True, False
1:4	γνήσιος	73.1	Genuine, Phony
1:1	δοῦλος	87.76	Status

Paragraph 1: 1.1–4			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:2	ἄψευδής	88.4	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
1:2	ἐπί	89.27	Relations
1:1, 3, 4	κατά (4x)	89.8	
1:3	δέ	89.87	
1:1	καί	89.92	
1:4	καί	89.92	
1:4	καί	89.92	
1:1	δέ	89.94	
1:3	ἐν	90.1	Case
1:4	ἀπό	90.15	
1:3, 4	ἐγώ (3x)	92.1	Discourse Referentials
1:3	αὐτός	92.11	
1:1-4	ὁ (5x)	92.24	
1:2-3	ὅς (2x)	92.27	
1:1, 4	Ἰησοῦς (2x)	93.169	Names of Persons and Places
1:1	Παῦλος	93.294	
1:4	Τίτος	93.364	
1:1, 4	Χριστός (2x)	93.387	

Paragraph 2: 1.6–9			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:5	πόλις	1.88	Geographical Objects and Features
1:6	τέκνον	10.36	Kinship Terms
1:6	ἀνήρ	10.53	
1:6	γυνή	10.54	
1:7	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
1:6, 7, 9	εἶμί (3x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
1:6	ἐν	13.8	
1:8	φιλάγαθος	25.105	Attitudes and Emotions
1:9	παρακαλέω	25.15	
1:7	αἰσχροκερδής	25.26	
1:9	ἀντέχω	31.49	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
1:6, 9	πιστός (2x)	31.87	
1:9	διδαχή	33.224	Communication

Paragraph 2: 1.6–9			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:9	διδασκαλία	33.236	
1:5	διατάσσω	33.325	
1:9	ἐλέγχω	33.417	
1:6	κατηγορία	33.428	
1:6, 7	ἀνέγκλητος (2x)	33.433	
1:9	ἀντιλέγω	33.455	
1:9	λόγος	33.98	
1:8	φιλόξενος	34.58	Association
1:6	ἀνυπότακτος	36.26	Guide, Discipline, Follow
1:5	καθίστημι	37.104	Control, Rule
1:7	οἰκονόμος	37.39	
1:7	ἐπίσκοπος	53.71	Religious Activities
1:5	πρεσβύτερος	53.77	
1:6	ἔχω	57.1	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
1:5	λείπω	57.43	
1:6	εἶς	60.1	Number
1:5	ἐπιδιορθόω	62.4	Arrange, Organize
1:5, 7	ὡς (2x)	64.12	Comparison
1:6	μή (6x)	69.3	Affirmation, Negation
1:7	δεῖ	71.21	Mode
1:9	ὑγιαίνω	72.15	True, False
1:5	ἐν	83.13	Spacial Positions
1:5	ἀπολείπω	85.65	Existence in Space
1:8	δίκαιος	88.12	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
1:7	πλήκτης	88.137	
1:7	ὀργίλος	88.175	
1:7	αὐθάδης	88.206	
1:8	ᾄσιος	88.24	
1:7	πάροινος	88.288	
1:8	ἐγκρατής	88.84	
1:8	σώφρων	88.94	
1:6	ἀσωτία	88.96	
1:8	ἀλλά	89.125	Relations
1:6	ἤ	89.139	
1:7	γάρ	89.23	

Paragraph 2: 1.6–9			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:9	έν	89.5	
1:5, 9	ἵνα (2x)	89.59	
1:5	χάριν	89.6	
1:6	εἰ	89.65	
1:9	κατά	89.8	
1:5	καί	89.87	
1:5	κατά	89.9	
1:9	καί	89.92	
1:9	καί	89.93	
1:5	ἐγώ	92.1	Discourse Referentials
1:6	τις	92.12	
1:5, 7, 9	ὁ (7x)	92.24	
1:5	οὗτος	92.29	
1:5	σύ (2x)	92.6	
1:5	Κρήτη	93.508	Names of Persons and Places
1:9	δυνατός	74.2, 74.4	Able, Capable

Paragraph 3: 1.10–12a			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:11	οἶκος	10.8	Kinship Terms
1:10	περιτομή	11.51	Groups and Classes of Persons and Members of Such Groups and Classes
1:10	εἰμί	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
1:12	γαστήρ	23.19	Physiological Processes and States
1:10	φρεναπάτης	31.13	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
1:11	ἀνατρέπω	31.72	
1:11	ἐπιστομίζω	33.124	Communication
1:11	διδάσκω	33.224	
1:12	ψεύστης	33.255	
1:10	ματαιολόγος	33.378	
1:12	εἶπον	33.69	
1:10	ἀνυπότακτος	36.26	Guide, Discipline, Follow
1:12	προφήτης	53.79	Religious Activities
1:11	κέρδος	57.192	Possess, Transfer, Exchange

Paragraph 3: 1.10–12a			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:12	ἴδιος	57.4	
1:10	πολύς	59.1	Quantity
1:11	ὅλος	59.29	
1:10, 12	ἐκ (2x)	63.2	Whole, Unite, Part, Divide
1:12	αἰεί	67.86	Time
1:11	μή	69.3	Affirmation, Negation
1:11	δεῖ (2x)	71.21	Mode
1:10	μάλιστα	78.7	Degree
1:12	κακός	88.106	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
1:12	θηρίον	88.119	
1:11	αἰσχροός	88.15	
1:12	ἀργός	88.248	
1:10	γάρ	89.23	Relation
1:11	χάριν	89.6	
1:10	καί	89.92	
1:10	καί	89.93	
1:12	αὐτός (2x)	92.11	Discourse Referentials
1:12	τις	92.12	
1:11	ὅστις	92.18	
1:10	ὁ	92.24	
1:10	ὁ	92.24	
1:11	ὅς (2x)	92.27	
1:12	Κρής	93.507	Names of Persons and Places

Paragraph 4: 1.12b–16			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:14	ἄνθρωπος	9.1	People
1:16	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
1:13, 16	εἰμί (2x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
1:16	βδελυκτός	25.188	Attitudes and Emotions
1:15	συνείδησις	26.13	Psychological Faculties
1:16	οἶδα	28.1	Know
1:14	προσέχω	30.35	Think
1:15	νοῦς	30.5	

Paragraph 4: 1.12b–16			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:13	πίστις	31.102	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
1:15	ἄπιστος	31.106	
1:14	ἀποστρέφω	31.62	
1:14	μῦθος	33.13	Communication
1:16	ὁμολογέω	33.221	
1:13	μαρτυρία	33.264	
1:14	ἐντολή	33.33	
1:13	ἐλέγχω	33.417	
1:16	ἀρνέομαι	34.48	Association
1:16	ἀπειθής	36.24	Guide, Discipline, Follow
1:16	ἔργον (2x)	42.42	Perform, Do
1:15	καθαρός (3x)	53.29	Religious Activities
1:15, 16	πᾶς (2x)	59.23	Quantity
1:16	ἀδόκιμος	65.13	Value
1:14	μή	69.3	Affirmation, Negation
1:13	ἀληθής	72.1	True, False
1:13	ὑγιαίνω	72.15	
1:14	ἀλήθεια	72.2	
1:16	ἀγαθός	88.1	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
1:15	μαίνω (2x)	88.26	
1:13	ἀποτόμως	88.74	
1:15	καί (2x)	89.102	Relations
1:15, 16	δέ (2x)	89.124	
1:15	ἀλλά	89.125	
1:13	αἰτία	89.15	
1:13	ἐν	89.5	
1:13	ἵνα	89.59	
1:16	πρός	89.7	
1:14-16	καί (4x)	89.92	
1:13	διά	90.44	Case
1:13, 15	αὐτός (2x)	92.11	Discourse Referential
1:15	οὐδεὶς	92.23	
1:13-16	ὁ (8x)	92.24	
1:13	ὅς	92.27	
1:13	οὗτος	92.29	

Paragraph 4: 1.12b–16

Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:14	Ἰουδαϊκός	93.171	Names of Persons and Places

Paragraph 5: 2.1–5

Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:3	οἶνος	6.197	Artifacts
2:2	πρεσβύτης	9.31	People
2:3	πρεσβῦτις	9.37	
2:5	άνήρ	10.53	Kinship Terms
2:5	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
2:2, 4	εἶμί (2x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
2:2	ὑπομονή	25.174	Attitudes and Emotions
2:4	φίλανδρος	25.37	
2:4	φιλότεκνος	25.38	
2:2	ἀγάπη	25.43	
2:2	πίστις	31.102	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
2:4	σωφρονίζω	33.229	Communication
2:1	διδασκαλία	33.236	
2:3	καλοδιδάσκαλος	33.249	
2:3	διάβολος	33.397	
2:5	βλασφημέω	33.4	
2:1	λαλέω	33.7	
2:5	λόγος	33.98	
2:5	ὑποτάσσω	36.18	
2:3	δουλόω	37.27	Control, Rule
2:3	κατάστημα	41.8	Behavior and Related States
2:5	οἰκουργός	46.3	Household Activities
2:3	ἱεροπρεπής	53.6	Religious Activities
2:5	ἴδιος	57.4	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
2:3	πολύς	59.11	Quantity
2:3	ὡσαύτως	64.16	Comparison
2:1	πρέπω	66.1	Proper, Improper
2:4	νέος	67.116	Time
2:3, 5	μή (3x)	69.3	Affirmation, Negation
2:1-2	ὑγιαίνω (2x)	72.15	True, False

Paragraph 5: 2.1–5			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:5	ἀγαθός	88.1	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
2:5	ἀγνός	88.28	
2:2	σεμνός	88.47	
2:2	νηφάλιος	88.87	
2:2, 5	σώφρων (2x)	88.94	
2:1	δέ	89.124	Relations
2:4-5	ἵνα (2x)	89.59	
2:3	ἐν	89.84	
2:1,2,4,5	ὁ (8x)	92.24	Discourse Referentials
2:1	ὅς	92.27	
2:1	σύ	92.6	

Paragraph 6: 2.6–8			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:6	παρακαλέω	25.15	Attitudes and Emotions
2:8	ἐντρέπω	25.196	
2:6	σωφρονέω	32.34	Understand
2:7	διδασκαλία	33.224	Communication
2:8	ἀκατάγνωστος	33.415	
2:8	λέγω	33.69	
2:8	λόγος	33.98	
2:8	ἐκ	39.6	Hostility, Strife
2:8	ἐναντίος	39.6	
2:7	ἔργον	42.42	Perform, Do
2:8	ἔχω	57.1	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
2:7	τύπος	58.59	Nature, Class, Example
2:7	πᾶς	59.23	Quantity
2:6	ὡσαύτως	64.16	Comparison
2:6	νέος	67.116	Time
2:8	ὑγίης	72.14	True, False
2:8	φαῦλος	88.116	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
2:7	καλός	88.4	
2:7	ἀφθορία	88.43	
2:7	σεμνότης	88.46	

Paragraph 6: 2.6–8			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:7	έν	89.5	Relations
2:8	ἵνα	89.59	
2:7	περί	89.6	
2:8	περί	90.24	Case
2:7	παρέχω	90.91	
2:8	ἐγώ	92.1	Discourse Referentials
2:7	σεαυτοῦ	92.1	
2:8	μηδεῖς	92.23	
2:6-8	ὁ (3x)	92.24	

Paragraph 7: 2.9–10			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:10	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
2:9	εἰμί	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
2:10	σωτήρ	21.31	Danger, Risk, Safe, Save
2:9	εὐάρεστος	25.94	Attitudes and Emotions
2:10	ἐνδείκνυμι	28.51	Know
2:10	πίστις	31.88	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
2:10	διδασκαλία	33.224	Communication
2:9	ἀντιλέγω	33.455	
2:9	ὑποτάσσω	36.18	Guide, Discipline, Follow
2:9	δοῦλος	37.3	Control, Rule
2:9	δεσπότης	57.13	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
2:10	νοσφίζω	57.246	
2:9	ἴδιος	57.4	
2:10	πᾶς (2x)	59.23	Quantity
2:9, 10	μή (2x)	69.3	Affirmation, Negation
2:9	πᾶς	78.44	Degree
2:10	κοσμῆω	79.12	Features of Objects
2:10	ἀγαθός	88.1	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
2:10	ἀλλά	89.125	Relations
2:9	έν	89.5	
2:10	ἵνα	89.59	
2:10	έν	89.8	

Paragraph 7: 2.9–10

Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:10	ἐγώ	92.1	Discourse Referentials
2:10	ὁ (3x)	92.24	

Paragraph 8: 2.11–15

Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:11	ἄνθρωπος	9.1	People
2:14	λαός	11.12	Groups and Classes of Persons and Members of Such Groups and Classes
2:11, 13	θεός (2x)	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
2:11	σωτήριος	21.28	Danger, Risk, Safe, Save
2:13	σωτήρ	21.31	
2:11, 13	ἐπιφαίνω (2x)	24.21	Sensory Events and States
2:13	μακάριος	25.119	Attitudes and Emotions
2:12	ἐπιθυμία	25.12	
2:15	παρακαλέω	25.15	
2:13	ἐλπίς	25.61	
2:14	ζηλωτής	25.77	
2:12	παιδεύω	33.226	
2:15	ἐλέγχω	33.417	
2:15	λαλέω	33.7	
2:12	ἀρνέομαι	34.48	Association
2:14	λυτρόω	37.128	Control, Rule
2:15	ἐπιταγή	37.42	
2:12	ζάω	41.2	Behavior and Related States
2:12	αἰών	41.38	
2:12	κοσμικός	41.39	
2:14	ἔργον	42.42	Perform, Do
2:12	ἀσέβεια	53.1	Religious Activities
2:12	εὐσεβῶς	53.6	
2:14	δίδωμι	57.71	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
2:14	περιούσιος	57.5	
2:14	πᾶς	58.28	Nature, Class, Example
2:11	πᾶς	59.23	Quantity

Paragraph 8: 2.11–15			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:12	ἐν	67.136	Time
2:12	νῦν	67.38	
2:15	περιφρονέω	76.25	Power, Force
2:15	πᾶς	78.44	
2:13	μέγας	79.19	Features of Objects
2:13	δόξα	79.18	
2:14	καθαρίζω	79.18	
2:13	προσδέχομαι	85.6	Existence in Space
2:14	ἀνομία	88.139	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
2:12	δικαίως	88.15	
2:14	καλός	88.4	
2:11	χάρις	88.66	
2:12	σωφρόνως	88.94	
2:14	ἀπό	89.122	Relations
2:11	γάρ	89.23	
2:14	ἵνα	89.59	
2:15	μετά	89.79	
2:12-15	καί (8x)	89.92	
2:12	ἵνα	90.22	Case
2:14	ὑπέρ	90.36	
2:12-14	ἐγώ (4x)	92.1	Discourse Referentials
2:15	μηδεῖς	92.23	
2:11-14	ὁ (8x)	92.24	
2:14	ἑαυτοῦ (2x)	92.25	
2:14	ὅς	92.27	
2:15	οὗτος	92.29	
2:15	σύ	92.6	
2:13	Ἰησοῦς	93.169	Names of Persons and Places
2:13	Χριστός	93.387	

Paragraph 9: 3.1–3			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:2	ἄνθρωπος	9.1	People
3:1-3	εἰμί (3x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen

Paragraph 9: 3.1–3			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:3	έν	13.8	
3:3	ἐπιθυμία	25.2	Attitudes and Emotions
3:3	ἡδονή	25.27	
3:2	ἐνδείκνυμι	28.51	Know
3:1	ὑπομιμνήσκω	29.1	Memory and Recall
3:3	πλανάω	31.8	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
3:3	ἀνόητος	32.5	Understand
3:2	βλασφημέω	33.4	Communication
3:1	πειθαρχέω	36.12	Guide, Discipline, Follow
3:1	ὑποτάσσω	36.18	
3:3	ἀπειθής	36.24	
3:3	δουλεύω	37.25	Control, Rule
3:1	ἐξουσία	37.38	
3:1	ἀρχή	37.56	
3:2	ἄμαχος	39.24	Hostility, Strife
3:3	διάγω	41.3	Behavior and Related States
3:1	ἔργον	42.42	Perform, Do
3:3	ποικίλος	58.45	Nature, Class, Example
3:1-2	πᾶς (3)	59.23	Quantity
3:3	ποτέ	67.9	Time
3:1	ἔτοιμος	77.2	Ready, Prepared
3:1	ἀγαθός	88.1	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
3:3	φθόνος	88.16	
3:3	μισέω	88.198	
3:3	κακία	88.199	
3:3	στυγητός	88.204	
3:2	πραΰτης	88.59	
3:2	ἐπεικῆς	88.63	
3:3	γάρ	89.23	Relations
3:1	πρός	89.7	
3:3	καί (3x)	89.92	
3:2	πρός	90.58	Case
3:3	ἐγώ	92.1	Discourse Referentials
3:1	αὐτός	92.11	
3:2	μηδεῖς	92.23	

Paragraph 9: 3.1–3

Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:3	ἀλλήλων	92.26	

Paragraph 10: 3.4–7

Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:4	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
3:5	πνεῦμα	12.18	
3:7	γίνομαι	13.48	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
3:5	σώζω	21.27	Danger, Risk, Safe, Save
3:4, 6	σωτήρ (2x)	21.31	
3:7	ζωή	23.88	Physiological Processes and States
3:4	ἐπιφαίνω	24.21	Sensory Events and States
3:4	φιλανθρωπία	25.36	Attitudes and Emotions
3:7	ἐλπίς	25.59	
3:7	δικαιώω	34.46	Association
3:5	παλιγγενεσία	41.53	Behavior and Related States
3:5	ἔργον	42.42	Perform, Do
3:5	λουτρόν	53.43	Religious Activities
3:7	κληρονόμος	57.139	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
3:5	ἀνακαίνωσις	58.72	Nature, Class, Example
3:4	ὅτε	67.3	Time
3:7	αἰώνιος	67.96	
3:5	οὐ	69.3	Affirmation, Negation
3:6	πλουσίως	78.15	Degree
3:5	δικαιοσύνη	88.13	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
3:5	ἅγιος	88.24	
3:7	χάρις	88.66	
3:4	χρηστότης	88.67	
3:5	ἔλεος	88.76	
3:4	δέ	89.124	Relations
3:5	ἀλλά	89.125	
3:5	ἐκ	89.25	
3:7	κατά	89.4	
3:7	ἵνα	89.59	
3:5	διά	89.76	

Paragraph 10: 3.4–7			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:5	κατά	89.8	
3:5	έν	89.84	
3:4, 5	καί (2x)	89.92	
3:6	διά	90.4	Case
3:5	ποιέω	90.45	
3:6	ἐπί	90.57	
3:6	ἐκχέω	90.89	
3:4-6	ἐγώ (5x)	92.1	Discourse Referentials
3:5	αὐτός	92.11	
3:4-7	ὁ (7x)	92.24	
3:5-6	ὅς (2x)	92.27	
3:7	ἐκεῖνος	92.3	
3:6	Ἰησοῦς	93.169	Names of Persons and Places
3:6	Χριστός	93.387	

Paragraph 11: 3.8–11			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:8, 10	ἄνθρωπος (2x)	9.1	People
3:9	γενεαλογία	10.26	Kinship Terms
3:8	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
3:8, 9, 11	εἶμι (3x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
3:9	περιῖστημι	13.157	
3:8	βούλομαι	25.3	Attitudes and Emotions
3:11	αὐτοκατάκριτος	30.119	Think
3:8	φροντίζω	30.2	
3:8	πιστεύω	31.85	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
3:8	πιστός	31.87	
3:11	οἶδα	32.4	Understand
3:9	μωρός	32.58	Communication
3:10	νουθεσία	33.231	
3:8	διαβεβαιόομαι	33.322	
3:9	νομικός	33.337	
3:9	ζήτησις	33.44	
3:8	λόγος	33.98	

Paragraph 11: 3.8–11			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:10	παραιτέομαι	34.41	Association
3:8	προΐστημι	35.12	Help, Care For
3:10	αίρετικός	39.17	Hostility, Strife
3:9	ἔρις	39.22	
3:9	μάχη	39.23	
3:8	ἔργον	42.42	Perform, Do
3:10	εἶς	60.1	Number
3:10	δεύτερος	60.49	
3:11	τοιούτος	64.2	Comparison
3:9	μάταιος	65.37	Value
3:8	ῶφέλιμος	65.4	
3:9	ἀνωφελής	65.5	
3:10	μετά	67.48	Time
3:11	ἐκστρέφω	88.265	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
3:11	ἁμαρτάνω	88.289	
3:8	καλός (2x)	88.4	
3:9	δέ	89.124	Relations
3:9	γάρ	89.23	
3:8	ἵνα	89.59	
3:8-11	καί (8x)	89.92	
3:11	ὅτι	90.21	Case
3:8	περί	90.24	
3:8, 11	ὁ (4x)	92.24	Discourse Referentials
3:8	οὗτος (2x)	92.29	
3:8	σύ	92.6	

Paragraph 12: 3.12–14			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:14	εἶμι	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
3:12	πέμπω	15.66	Linear Movement
3:13	προπέμπω	15.72	
3:12	ἔρχομαι	15.81	
3:14	μανθάνω	27.15	Learn
3:12	κρίνω	30.75	Think

Paragraph 12: 3.12–14			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:14	ἔργον	42.42	Perform, Do
3:13	νομικός	56.37	Courts and Legal Procedures
3:14	χρεία	57.4	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
3:13	λείπω	57.43	
3:14	ἄκαρπος	65.34	Value
3:12	παραχειμάζω	67.166	Time
3:12	ὅταν	67.3	
3:13	σπουδαίως	68.65	Aspect
3:14	προΐστημι	68.67	
3:12	σπουδάζω	68.79	
3:14	μή	69.3	Aspect
3:14	ἀναγκαῖος	71.39	Mode
3:12	ἐκεῖ	83.2	Spacial Positions
3:12	εἰς	83.47	
3:12	πρός (2x)	84.18	Spacial Extensions
3:14	καλός	88.4	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
3:12	ἦ	89.139	Relations
3:12	γάρ	89.23	
3:13	ἵνα	89.49	
3:14	ἵνα	89.59	
3:13	καί	89.92	
3:14	καί	89.93	
3:14	δέ	89.94	
3:14	εἰς	90.23	Case
3:12	ἐγώ	92.1	Discourse Referentials
3:13	αὐτός	92.11	
3:13	μηδεῖς	92.23	
3:13-14	ὁ (3x)	92.24	
3:14	ἡμέτερος	92.5	
3:12	σύ	92.6	
3:13	Ζηναῖς	93.139	Names of Persons and Places
3:13	Ἀπολλῶς	93.33	
3:12	Τυχικός	93.369	
3:12	Ἄρτεμῆς	93.42	
3:12	Νικόπολις	93.543	

Paragraph 13: 3.15			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:15	φιλέω	25.33	Attitudes and Emotions
3:15	χάρις	25.89	
3:15	πίστις	31.102	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
3:15	ἀσπάζομαι (2x)	33.2	Communication
3:15	πᾶς (2x)	59.23	Quantity
3:15	μετά (2x)	89.108	Relations
3:15	ἐν	89.119	
3:15	ἐγώ (2x)	92.1	Discourse Referentials
3:15	ὁ (3x)	92.24	
3:15	σύ (2x)	92.6	

Bibliography

- Arús Hita, Jorge. "Theme in Spanish." In *The Routledge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics*, edited by Tom Bartlett and Gerald O'Grady, 194–212. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Daneš, František. "Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organization of the Text." In *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*, edited by František Daneš, 106–28. *Janua Linguarum* 147. Prague: Academia, 1974.
- Firbas, Jan. "On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis." In *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague 1*, edited by Joseph Vachek, 267–80. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1966.
- . "Has Every Sentence a Theme and Rheme?" In *Language Form and Linguistic Variation: Papers Dedicated to Angus McIntosh*, edited by John Anderson, 98–115. *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 15. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1982.
- . "Exploring Vilém Mathesius' Use of the Term Theme." *Linguistica Pragensia* 1 (1996) 5–23.
- . "Some Thoughts on the Function of Word-Order in Old English and Modern English." *Sbornik Praci Filosoficke Fakulty Brnenske University* 6.A5 (1957) 72–98.
- Fukuda, Kazuo. "A Consideration of the Thematizer 'Wa' in Japanese." In *Language and Function*, 147–60. *Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics* 49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002.
- Grimes, Joseph E. *The Thread of Discourse*. *Janua Linguarum* 207. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.
- Guthrie, Donald. *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 14. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990.
- Halliday, M.A.K. "Language Structure and Language Function." In *New Horizons in Linguistics*, edited by John Lyons, 140–65. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.

- . *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 1985.
- Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Louw, J. P. and E. A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Mathesius, Vilém. “Zur Satzperspektive im modernen Englisch.” *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 155 (1929) 202–10.
- . *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. Translated by Libuše Dušková. Paris: Mouton, 1975.
- . “Functional Linguistics.” In *Praguiana: Some Basic and Less known Aspects of Prague Linguistics School*, edited by Josef Vachek and Libuše Dušková, 121–41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983.
- Porter, Stanley E. “Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Phillipians as a Test Case.” *Filologéa Neotestamentaria* 6.12 (1993) 177–205.
- . *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Biblical Languages: Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- . “A Functional Letter Perspective: Towards a Grammar of Epistolary Form.” In *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, 9–31. *Pauline Studies* 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Porter, Stanley E. and Matthew B. O’Donnell. *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Theory, Application, and Result*. Forthcoming.
- Vachek, Josef. *The Linguistic School of Prague: An Introduction to Its Theory and Practice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.
- . “Vilem Mathesius as Forerunner of Contrastive Linguistic Studies.” In *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics. The Polish-English Contrastive Project*, edited by Jacek Fisiak, Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University, 1980.