

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

A. Moises Zumaeta

McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON, Canada

Abstract: Vilém Mathesius’s most important contribution to the field of linguistics is the theory of the Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP). According to this theory, the message of an utterance is construed by two content elements designated as “theme” and “rheme.” Mathesius’s analysis was constrained to the clause; however, he indicated that theme and rheme are present at various strata of discourse. By presenting and applying an optimized version of FSP for Koine Greek, this article strives to determine the discourse structure of Paul’s epistle to Titus and hence the central message of its content. (Article)

Keywords: FSP, thematization, theme, rheme, Prague Linguistics, staging, clause

1. *Introduction*

In Isa 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, which usually places an 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 more distinctive message, 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 that they are required to make, whether consciously or unconsciously, in order to communicate meaningfully. Second, the message of a text, as expressed by clauses, clause-complexes, and paragraphs, extends beyond the meaning of individual lexemes and their grammatical relationships; the ordering of grammatical constituents also contributes to the meaning of the message. Third, some choices, due to their marked characteristics, require more attention on 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 texts. One of the most important theories,¹ born out of the Prague School of Linguistics, is what has come to be known as the functional sentence perspective (FSP),² a theory of thematization which I will use in this essay to analyze the discourse of Paul’s Epistle to Titus. The purpose of this paper is twofold. My first goal is to describe and define thematic

1. The importance and lasting impact of this theory can be assessed by the number of publications that continue to appear since Mathesius first introduced the concept. For a record of many of these publications, see Drápela and Dušková, *Bibliography of Functional Sentence*. It is this voluminosity of research that drives Uhlířová to assert that “the FSP theory is one of the most valuable pieces of scientific knowledge offered by Czech functional linguistics (in continuation to the classical period of the Prague Linguistic Circle) to the linguistic world during the second half of the last century and at the beginning of the present century” (Uhlířová, “Martin Drápela,” 75).

2. Even though the theory was pioneered by Mathesius, the label “functional sentence perspective” was given by Firbas, who used it as a translation equivalent for Mathesius’s Czech “aktuální členění větní yětné.” See Firbas, “Round Table,” 4–5.

elements at various linguistic ranks and then to adapt a version of FSP for the thematic analysis of Koine Greek. Using this optimized version of FSP, my second objective is to determine the discourse structure of Paul's Epistle to Titus and how it is that the notions of theme and rheme contribute to the explicit and implicit message of the letter.

2. *Toward a Definition of Theme and Rheme*

In order to provide a working definition of theme and rheme that is objectively applicable at various ranks of 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's pioneering theory in relationship to Czech will be examined first, followed by a description of Halliday's and Brown and Yule's adaptation of the FSP theory to English.

2.1 *Mathesius and His Functional Sentence Perspective*

According to Josef Vachek, when it comes to studying and understanding the syntactical structure and functions of language, the most important contribution born out of Prague linguistics is perhaps Mathesius's functional approach for analyzing the sentence.³ Vachek's assertion is not an exaggeration, for Mathesius's contribution has proven to be fundamental—a required first step for language analysis—in our understanding of how language means, not only at the clause and sentence level, but also at levels beyond the sentence.⁴ While

3. Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague*, 88. Mathesius's contribution and influence are 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 five years before the publication of F. de Saussure's *Cours* (1916), Mathesius could be considered one of the fathers, alongside Saussure, of modern linguistics. See Vachek, "Vilem Mathesius as Forerunner," 5.

4. 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

recognizing that some sentences may consist of one element,⁵ 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.⁶ 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.”⁷ 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.”⁸ Put differently, the theme of the sentence expresses a known fact or facts available to us from the previous context, and the rheme expresses new information, which further develops the theme, and enriches the knowledge of the reader.⁹ Mathesius further explains that, although the theme and rheme may at times coincide with the grammatical subject and predicate of a sentence, this is not always the case, particularly in languages whose word-order pattern is plastic (i.e. flexible). 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.¹⁰

Sentence Perspective, pioneered by Mathesius, to determine the epistolary form or structure of the NT in functional terms, also observes that Mathesius’s 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).

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

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

7. Mathesius, “Functional Linguistics,” 127.

8. Mathesius, “Functional Linguistics,” 126.

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

10. Mathesius, “Zur Satzperspektive,” 208. Mathesius assesses the subjective choice of the speaker to follow either the objective and subjective

From this description of Mathesius's theory, one may get the impression that the concepts, definitions, and their subsequent application are clear and straightforward: (1) the theme always expresses known or readily available information, whereas the rheme expresses 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 effectively, due to the fact that the most fundamental element of Mathesius's 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.¹¹

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 trueness of this observation in the Czech language, one may question its value concerning other languages, particularly when it comes to written language.

11. Mathesius, *Functional Analysis of Present Day English*, 82. Firbas, who follows Mathesius's functional model when building his own theory of

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, in 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.”¹² This apparent contradiction caused others to question Mathesius’s 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 joined to the object of the thought. Consequently, for Trávníček the theme would always have to occupy the first syntactical slot in the sentence.¹³

Another factor that contributes to the confusion regarding Mathesius’s description of theme and rheme, a confusion evidenced by the divergent redefinitions for the same two terms in various linguistic models, is Mathesius’s polyvalent usage of the two (actually more than two) words in similar contexts. It is commonly acknowledged that Mathesius’s most common terms to identify these two basic parts of the sentence were *základ* (‘basis’ or ‘foundation’) and *jádro* (‘nucleus’ or ‘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* ‘topic’ and *východiště* ‘starting point,’ both of which are routinely translated by the English *theme*.¹⁴ Firbas observes that, while Mathesius clearly used these

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). This criterion is the principle of retrievability.

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

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

14. 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 n. 9.

terms (*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 them to identify the known facts, not in relation to the individual sentence, but “to a stretch of text extending beyond the individual sentence.”¹⁵ The same is true concerning the term *základ* ‘foundation.’ Mathesius uses this word in relationship to both the individual sentence as well as a stretch of text beyond the individual sentence.¹⁶ 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.

2.2 Theme, Rheme, Given, and New

Mathesius’s functional approach for examining the clause 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.¹⁷ However, as already shown, Mathesius’s 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.¹⁸ Thus, one can conceive a kind of thematization that takes

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

16. Firbas, “Exploring Vilém Mathesius,” 10.

17. 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, he speaks of “[o]ne-element verbless thetic sentences,” and then on the following page he refers to the same thing as a “verbless thetic clause.” See Mathesius, *Functional Analysis of Present Day English*, 87–88.

18. Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 287. It is important to keep in mind

place in relationship to two concepts, which at times overlap with one another but which are nevertheless functionally distinct.¹⁹ This leads Halliday to differentiate between theme and known information, as well as between rheme and new information.

Halliday reserves the terms *theme* and *rheme* for the kind of thematization that pertains to the clause unit. 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.²⁰ Given that the theme is the point of departure in the clause, it must, therefore, 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.”²¹ 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’s view that the theme will not always coincide with the grammatical subject of the clause, because the theme may be expressed by means of an adverbial group or a prepositional phrase.²²

For the kind of thematization that pertains to the information unit, Halliday proposes the labels *given* and *new*. These labels parallel those of *theme* and *rheme*, but do not exactly correspond with them. It is here that Halliday most clearly departs from Mathesius. Mathesius conceives the theme as that part of the

that one information unit may at times be composed of one clause; however, this is not necessary.

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

20. Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 38.

21. Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 39.

22. Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 39.

sentence that expresses the most readily available information and the rheme as that part that provides new information. This is not so for Halliday. As already discussed, for Halliday theme has to do with a point of departure, not with known information, even though the two may at times coincide. Likewise, the rheme constitutes the remainder of the clause's message, which is not necessarily new or unknown information. In an information unit, however, the given expresses information that is recoverable by the speaker, whereas the new expresses information that is non-recoverable from the perspective of the listener.²³ Since Halliday understands information units as units of spoken discourse, and thus, as being realized "as a pitch contour, or TONE," he concludes that the way to identify given and new is through phonological analysis. The element with tonic prominence will culminate the new information, which in turn reveals the given information—i.e. that part of the information unit with the least tonic prominence.²⁴

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

2.3 Theme, Topic Entity, and Staging

As just explained, throughout his writings Mathesius used three Czech terms (*tema*, *základ*, and *východiště*) to identify the theme of a sentence. Also, 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. In other words, although Mathesius did not elaborate a theory of thematization beyond the single sentence, he nevertheless seemed to rightly think that thematization occurs at

23. Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 277.

24. Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 275.

higher levels of discourse. This unstated but assumed multi-sentence thematization is what Brown and Yule describe in their *Discourse Analysis* as “staging.” Following Grimes’s definition of staging as a kind of thematization above the linear organization of the clause,²⁵ 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.²⁶ This thematic element, 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 refer to this thematic unit as the writer’s or speaker’s “topic entity.”²⁷

In a similar vein to Halliday, Brown and Yule also recognize that thematization takes place at different levels of discourse. 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.”²⁸ Thus, for Brown and Yule, theme and rheme at the clause level have fixed positions. At a larger discourse 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, at this level of thematization Brown and Yule refer to 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 new information can be identified, 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.²⁹ Brown and Yule’s differentiation between thematization at the clause level and above is very helpful for it provides a better model for the

25. 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).

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

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

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

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

analysis of a text that extends beyond the clause. However, their notion that new information can be identified with reference to the definite article does not work for languages that lack a definite and indefinite article, such as Greek.³⁰

From the above discussion, it seems undeniable that thematization takes place at different levels of discourse.³¹ Also, each thematic level relates to the general notions of *Given* and *New*. In the case of the individual clause, the *Given* is the first syntactical element, the *New* is the development of that first syntactical element; above this, the *Given* is the explicit actor of a process chain, and the *New* is everything else that describes the action of the actor; finally, in the case of whole paragraphs or even texts, the *Given* is the main topic or idea and the *New* is the development of that topic.

3. *An Optimized Thematization Model for Koine Greek*

If our goal is to examine the functional meaning of a discourse (text), we must give due attention to all levels of the given discourse. A model of thematization is thus necessary that addresses the various levels of the discourse with specific designations for *Given* and *New* at every rank of a discourse. This is precisely what Porter and O'Donnell seek to provide by means of their three-level approach for thematic analysis, the model that I will follow in my thematic analysis of Paul's Epistle to Titus.³²

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

31. Although we should be careful in asserting that the two thematic units present in, beside, and above the clause are linguistic universals, this prudence does not mean that we are to avoid investigating these type of linguistic patterns in other languages. In fact, the presence of thematic and rhematic elements in Czech, English, as well as a few other languages (for Japanese, see Fukuda, "The Thematizer 'Wa' in Japanese," 147–60 and for Spanish, see Arús Hita, "Theme in Spanish," 194–212) may be a good indication that they are a multilingual common pattern.

32. For an application of the same approach to other discourses in the NT, see Dvorak and Walton, "Clause as Message," 31–81, esp. pp. 42–58.

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
CLAUSE COMPLEX	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 Model³³

As one can observe in Table 1, Porter and O'Donnell treat a text as being organized in three major ranks—the clause, the clause complex, and the paragraph—each rank with its own thematic structure, jointly contributing to the overall message of

33. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 104.

the discourse. For each rank thematization is realized by different linguistic elements in the discourse: at the paragraph rank it is realized by semantic boundaries, at the clause complex rank it is realized by participant involvement, and at the clause rank it is 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, both the thematic and rhematic elements 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 term *prime* to identify the thematic unit and *subsequent* to identify the rhematic unit, reserving the terms *theme* and *rheme* for the next rank in the discourse, which they call the clause-complex (or sometimes simply the "thematic unit").³⁴ Porter and O'Donnell define prime "as who or what the clause is focused upon" and subsequent "as the development of the prime."³⁵ 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 ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμῳς—the prime is the prepositional phrase δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, whereas the subsequent is formed by ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμῳς. These three examples show that the prime consists of a single word group that functions 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

34. Although Porter and O'Donnell later observe that their choice of *theme* and *rheme* for thematic structure at the clause complex 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. See Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 110.

35. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 105.

be borne in mind that some clauses, particularly verbless clauses—may only have one thematic element, the prime, such as *καλοδιδασκάλους* in Titus 2:3.

At the sentential level, the two thematic elements are the theme and the rheme. Unlike prime and subsequent in the clause, theme and rheme do not have a fixed syntactical position and thus do not always correspond with prime and subsequent. However, when they do coincide, they must be noted as “the most marked combination.”³⁶ The reason for this mismatch between prime-subsequent and theme-rheme is that the theme identifies the current actor in the process chain and the rheme describes the supplementary process information for the given actor.³⁷ In Greek the actor is the explicit subject of the process chain, which for the most part is determined by grammatical 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 (see Table 2), to the point that some clause complexes may not have a theme (see Table 3).³⁸ Porter and O'Donnell also point out that the theme should be an explicit subject and not an implied subject embedded in a finite verb.³⁹

36. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 110.

37. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 110–11. This use of theme at the multi-sentential level is similar to Brown and Yule's notion of “topic entity.” See Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 137.

38. 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 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).

39. Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 111.

Thematic Unit ₉			
Theme ₉	Rheme ₉		
ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη	ἐστὶν ἀληθής	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν	ἔλεγγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B
Rheme ₉			
(ἴνα) ὑγιαίνωσιν	ἐν τῇ πίστει	μὴ	προσέχοντες Ἰουδαίκοις μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D
Rheme ₉			
ἀποστρεφόμενων	τὴν ἀλήθειαν		
Prime _E	Subsequent _E		

Table 2: Rheme Extended over Multiple Clauses

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	

Table 3: Clause-Complex without a Theme

The next level of thematization in Porter and O'Donnell's model takes place at the paragraph rank through the 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 persuades Porter and O'Donnell of

their suitability to describe thematization that takes place within a paragraph. The thematic element of topic is defined as “the establishment of a new semantic environment for the text.” In turn, the rhematic element of comment is defined as “supporting information for the current topic.”⁴⁰ Since thematization at this level of discourse is realized by semantic boundaries, which are marked by a variety of linguistic elements (discourse markers, semantic fields, tense-forms, etc.), the identification of a topic requires paying attention to shifts or changes involving these various elements. Combinations of shifts in conjunctions, temporal deixis, semantic fields, tense-forms, etc., will establish a new semantic environment for the discourse, enabling the analyst to objectively determine the boundaries of a paragraph.⁴¹ Once the boundaries of a paragraph are established, the analyst can proceed to trace the various thematized elements at lower levels, 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 of the paragraph.”⁴²

4. *Thematization in Titus*

Now that I have defined and described a theoretical model of thematization that 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 observations and drawing valuable conclusions in regard to the grammar, structure, and message of Titus.

40. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 116.

41. Traditionally paragraph divisions are often established on the basis of discourse makers (δέ, καί, γάρ, etc) and a commonsense 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.” See Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 118.

42. Porter and O’Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, 119.

4.1 *Thematization at the Clause Level*

According to OpenText.org, across the three chapters of Titus there are 140 clauses, 47 primary clauses and 93 secondary clauses.⁴³ (Many of the secondary clauses are embedded within other primary and secondary clauses.) Of the 140 clauses, 43 have as their prime a Predicator, 34 a Complement, 26 an Adjunct, and 22 a Subject.⁴⁴ Among primary clauses whose prime is a Predicator, seven begin their subsequent with a Subject (c1_15, c1_28, c1_35, c1_45, c2_32, c3_8, c3_42), six with a Complement (c3_1, c3_17, c3_29, c3_36, c3_45, c3_46), and one with an Adjunct (c2_41). There is one primary clause that has the Predicator *παρακάλει* as its prime, without any subsequent (c2_41). Of all the clauses in which the prime is a Complement and there is also 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), and two with a participle (c1_12, c2_21). However, eleven of these clauses begin their subsequent with an 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 whose prime is a 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 any subsequent (c1_49, c2_10, c2_18, c2_19). As for clauses that have a grammatical Subject as their prime, nine begin their subsequent with a Complement (c1_1, c1_10, c1_16, c1_32, c1_42, c2_4, c2_23, c2_43, c3_41), eight with a Predicator (c1_11, c1_37, c2_1, c2_2, c2_20, c2_37, c3_13, c3_27), and 5 with an Adjunct (c1_5, c1_34, c1_36, c2_6, c3_48).

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

44. 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 square brackets.

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."⁴⁵ The recognition of a not-so-fluid nature of Greek has important implications for the interpretive process; for, as we will see, the more common syntactical patterns should not be over-interpreted on the basis of syntactical positioning. In other words, although it is certain that the NT writers may highlight some elements of a discourse by means of syntactical positioning, this highlighting is only true when the pattern is a marked one, that is, when it breaks from the common, unmarked pattern.⁴⁶ 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 a Predicate. An argumentation along these lines would be faulty, for, as we have shown, the prime of the great majority of clauses is a Predicate, this being the most unmarked pattern in Paul's syntax.⁴⁷ Using Mathesius's words, we may consider this syntactical pattern as the objective order. A similar error would be committed if, in the case of clauses whose prime is a Complement, the interpreter finds some kind of emphasis or interpretive significance in the prime because it precedes an infinitive verb. Again, as has been shown, in clauses where the prime is a Complement, a 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 whose prime is a Subject, 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

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

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

47. For the sake of comparison, I have also examined the clauses in Philemon and the numbers there confirm that the Predicate is the most unmarked prime. Of 48 clauses in Philemon, there are 13 Predicates as prime, 12 Adjuncts, 12 Complements, and 9 Subjects. If we include the Predicate ποιῆσαι, which is the prime of an embedded one word clause in v. 14 and the Predicate λέγω, which is embedded in an Adjunct phrase functioning as prime in v. 21, this would give us 15 Predicates in fronted position.

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).

4.2 *Thematization and the Clause Complex Level*

My thematic analysis at the clause complex level shows the presence of 23 themes throughout the discourse: Παῦλος (theme₁), χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη (theme₂), τὸν ἐπίσκοπον (theme₄), πολλοί (theme₅), οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς (theme₆), τις (theme₇), Κρῆτες (theme₈), ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη (theme₉), πάντα (theme₁₀), οὐδέν (theme₁₁), αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις (theme₁₂), σύ (theme₁₅), πρεσβύτεας (theme₁₆), πρεσβυτίδας (theme₁₇), δούλους (theme₂₂), ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις (theme₂₇), μηδεῖς (theme₃₁), ἡμεῖς (theme₃₃), ὁ λόγος (theme₃₅), ταῦτα (theme₃₇), οἱ ἡμέτεροι (theme₄₄), οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες (theme₄₅), ἡ χάρις (theme₄₇).

Many of these themes, because they coincide with the prime of a clause and therefore have a marked function, ought 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 Κρῆτες (theme₈) in the prophet's quotation is a semantic indicator meant to capture the attention of the reader. If this positioning is redactional,⁴⁸ Paul may be trying to emphatically inform the readers that the prophet, to whom he attributes the quotation, perceives himself as ethnically and morally superior to the Cretans, whom he qualifies as ἀεὶ ψευῶνται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί 'eternal liars, evil brutes, and lazy gluttons.' And if this prophet is a representative member of the opposition group,⁴⁹ who are

48. Though impossible to know for certain, it is very likely that Paul had fronted the theme himself for rhetorical purposes. Porter acknowledges that "the quotation is unusual in that it is not a formal or formulaic introduction to the quotation, as Paul often uses elsewhere, but one that is adapted to context" (Porter, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 749).

49. Scholars are divided as to the identity of the prophet. A good majority believe that the prophet is the Cretan philosopher Epimenides (Stegemann, "Anti-Semitic and Racist Prejudices," 289; Huizenga, 1–2

ἀνυπότακτοι ‘rebellious,’ ματαιολόγοι ‘empty talkers,’ φρεναπάται ‘deceivers,’ and people οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν ‘who must be silenced,’ Paul may also be trying to highlight the difficulty of the environment in which Titus has to minister.

Theme₉—ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ‘this testimony’—is also emphatic, because it coincides with the prime of the next clause unit. If the testimony, which Paul qualifies as being ἀληθής ‘truthful,’ refers back to the actual quotation, then Paul may be affirming the prophet’s evaluation of Cretans. However, if it describes Paul’s own testimony concerning οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς ‘those of the circumcision group,’ which includes the quotation as a piece of evidence against the false teachers, Paul would then be denouncing the prophet’s xenophobic characterization of the Cretans.⁵⁰ It is very likely that Paul is doing the latter, for, by placing ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ‘this testimony’ in prime position, Paul may be trying to reorient his audience back to his argument of denunciation, which was interrupted by the apparently abrupt quotation.

The reason for the marked theme πάντα (theme₁₀) in 1:15, which is further elaborated by its rheme καθαρὰ τοῖς καθaroῖς ‘are pure to the pure,’ may be because Paul is trying to foreground the degree of morality that believers are to expect from their teachers. This is further strengthened by the fact that in the following statement it is the Complement that 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.

Timothy, Titus, 139 n. 11; Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 198–99; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 397; Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 209). Others believe that the prophet is the poet Callimachus (Swete, *Theod. Mops. II*, 242 n. 18). And a third group argues that the prophet is one of the false teachers who opposes Paul’s Christians mission (Lemme, “Über Tit. 1, 12,” 133–44).

50. Allen provides a strong case that, here, Paul is acting as a witness in a court case in defense of the Cretans. See Allen, “The Pastoral Epistles,” 510–11.

The theme $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ 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.⁵¹ The themes $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\acute{\upsilon}\tau\alpha\varsigma$ (theme₁₆), $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\acute{\upsilon}\tau\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma$ (theme₁₇), and $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (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 that Paul, through Titus, expounds. The theme $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (theme₃₁) is a reference back to the three previous themes (perhaps to themes that were further back in the discourse). Its markedness highlights Paul's priority that the congregation is to respect and honor their pastor, Titus. Both semantically and syntactically, Paul is driving home the point that no one in the congregation is allowed to treat him with contempt.

The last two themes that coincide with the prime are $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ (theme₃₇) and $\eta\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ (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 lead their lives informed and enabled by God's grace. Indeed, the fronted position and the arthrous composition of $\eta\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ may be a final attempt by Paul to stamp in his readers' hearts and minds the topic of God's grace and kindness toward sinners, developed in 2:11–14 and recalled in 3:3–7.

4.3 *Thematization at the Paragraph Level*

My thematic analysis at the clause and clause complex levels gives us the tools to more accurately examine the larger

51. Between Titus 2:1 and 3:14—as a matter of fact even before 2:1—other participants are introduced by Paul, which may warrant a division into multiple sub-paragraphs. However, the theme $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ will be recalled implicitly at various points in the discourse in the form of a second person imperative, suggesting that 1:5—3:14 includes two major sections of the epistle, the body and the paraenesis.

discourse units in Titus.⁵² The first major section is, of course, the opening of the letter covered in thematic units 1 and 2.⁵³ 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, encompasses thematic units 3 to 44. It is delimited by the marker τούτου χάριν (1:5)⁵⁴ and by the introduction of a new actor or theme in thematic unit₄₅ (οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες). However, before we formulate the topic of this section, it is necessary, first, to define the boundaries of the subsections or paragraphs with their respective topics. The second paragraph is developed in 1:5–9. (Our divisions also agree with NA28 and UBS5.) This is indicated not only by the discourse purpose marker τούτου χάριν but also 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 1:9. 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

52. See Table 4 on p. 64.

53. 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.

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

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 could be, “Paul’s description of the doctrinal and moral qualifications of potential elders.”

Paragraph number three consists of 1:10–16. Unlike NA28 and UBS5, which understand these verses to contain two paragraphs (vv. 10–12a and 12b–16), my thematic analysis suggests that they should be considered a single unit that deals with the false teachers residing in Crete (Hellenistic Jews?). The beginning of this paragraph is signaled by both 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). That these two themes should be understood as identifying the same group of people, thus justifying the semantic unity of the paragraph, is evinced by the many negative lexical items that characterize the false teachers. For instance, of the 10 lexemes from domain 33 (Communication), four have a negative connotation (ματαιολόγος, ἐπιστομίζω, μῦθος, ἐλέγχω); of the five lexemes from domain 31 (Hold a View, Believe, Trust), three are negative in their sense (φρεναπάτης, ἀνατρέπω, ἄπιστος); and of the eight lexemes from domain 88 (Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior), three are negative in their basic meaning (αἰσχροῦς, μαιίνω, ἀποτόμως). The high index of these specific domains, especially with their negative sense, provides cohesion to the paragraph and informs 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 Titus 2 is signaled by the discourse marker δέ and by 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 (2:10). In addition to Titus (referred to by a 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 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 v. 6), which indicates that Titus is the main theme of the process chain; and (2) all the other themes have as their Predicator an infinitive form, which in turn functions as the Complement of the two verbs of perception to indicate indirect speech.⁵⁵ 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 *ᾧσαύτως* in vv. 3 and 6 gives cohesion to the whole unit. The topic of this paragraph could be expressed as, “Titus’s task to teach and exhort specific groups in the church to live in accordance with Christian belief.”

The next paragraph consists of 2:11–14. Again, both the discourse marker *γάρ* and a shift in participants—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.⁵⁶ The editors of NA28 and UBS5, as well as some commentators, indicate that the paragraph ends in v. 15.⁵⁷ There are a few linguistic reasons, however, that suggest the paragraph ends in v. 14. One of the first major indicators that vv. 11–14 constitute a single unit is a shift in verbal aspect. Before v. 11 and after v. 14 the majority of verbs have imperfective aspect. Of the 22 verbs

55. Porter, *Idioms*, 197, 270–71.

56. 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 v. 15. However, one may argue that Paul is implicitly introduced as a participant at the beginning of v. 15 in the verbal form *λάλει*.

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

between vv. 1 and 10, only one of them has perfective aspect (*ἐντρέπω* in v. 8). All the verbs between 2:15 and 3:2 have imperfective aspect. Conversely, in 2:11–14 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 of humanity does not appear after v. 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 vv. 11 and 14, but they do not appear in the verses that follow. These linguistic features provide strong evidence that vv. 11–14 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 at the outset of thematic unit₂₈. The major difficulty in seeing a new paragraph at this juncture is that there is not a change in participant until thematic unit₃₁, where the theme *μηδείς* is introduced. Titus (*σύ*, theme₁₅) is still the grammatical subject of the main finite verbs (*λάλει*, *παρακάλει*, and *ὑπομίμνησκε*), 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*, the change in verbal aspect (all verbs with imperfective aspect), and the 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 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 with 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) as well as the postpositive conjunction *γάρ* signals its starting point. The temporal markers *πότε* (v. 3) and *ὅτε* (v. 4) connect both thematic units into a cohesive paragraph, even though the number of verbs with imperfective and perfective aspect is somewhat similar (six with perfective aspect and five with imperfective aspect). When it comes to a theological and soteriological emphasis, this paragraph is parallel to the one in 2:11–14. Indeed, much of the wording that provides cohesion to the paragraph is very similar to the wording in 2:11–14. Some of these words are *θεός* and *πνεῦμα* from domain 12 (Supernatural Beings and Powers), *σώζω* and *σωτήρ* 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). The instantiation of these various lexical items help us to identify the topic of the paragraph which may be 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 of Titus comprise 3:8–11 (thematic unit₃₅ to thematic unit₄₀) and 3:12–14 (thematic unit₄₁ to thematic unit₄₅). This division coincides with the paragraph divisions in NA28 and UBS5. The beginning of paragraph eight (3:8–11) is signaled by the introduction of a new theme—*ὁ λόγος* (theme₃₅). The theme *ταῦτα* (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 suggests that vv. 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 being that the instructions relate to Titus himself and to other specific individuals. A title for paragraph eight could 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 explain why they should be viewed as belonging to a second major section of the epistle—the body section. What joins all of these paragraphs together as the body of the epistle is their paraenetic nature. 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 in only two paragraphs.) Also, even though there are many themes that warrant the divisions of various subsections, theme₁, *σύ*, because it is the explicit subject of many imperative verbs in the discourse across multiple paragraphs, should be considered 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, could be expressed as, “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 contains a greeting and final blessing. Three thematic units comprise this section (thematic units 45, 46, and 47). Theme₄₅ identifies new participants sending the greeting—*οἱ μετ’ ἐμοῦ πάντες*—and thus warrants a section break. Theme₄₇, which is the prime of its clause, brings to the foreground Paul’s farewell to Titus and the

church. An appropriate topic title for this section could be, “Paul’s greeting and farewell to Titus and the church.”

Section Division	Section Topic	Paragraph Division	Paragraph Topic	Thematic Unit(s)
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’s task to teach and exhort specific groups in the church to live in accordance with 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 with 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

Section Division	Section Topic	Paragraph Division	Paragraph Topic	Thematic Unit(s)
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 4: Letter Sections and Paragraphs and Their Topics

5. Conclusion

The goals of this essay have been to provide a description of thematization and an analysis of thematic elements in every layer of Paul's Epistle to Titus. It has been recognized that there are thematic elements, each of which corresponds to the notion of *Given* and *New*, at the clause, clause-complex, and paragraph levels, all of which need to be properly analyzed in order to determine the overall thematic 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—I have followed their approach in my analysis of Paul's Epistle to Titus.

The importance of my 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 understanding of its messages (content) but also through the syntactical arrangement of its messages, whether this is done consciously or unconsciously. My thematic analysis of Titus has helped to confirm that, even though Greek is not a fixed-order language, it is not completely free, for there are syntactical patterns that are more commonly used. This observation, has, in turn, enabled me to more objectively capture the message of Titus by observing relationships between primes and themes. Since in Greek coincidence between prime and theme is a marked feature of the language, when a 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.

6. Appendixes

Appendix 1: Prime and Subsequent Analysis of Titus

The following table contains a thematic analysis of Titus at the clause level. The clause numbering follows that of the OpenText.org project. Clause numbers in *italics> identify primary clauses. Embedded clauses functioning as a word group within a clause are enclosed in brackets.*

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
1:1–3	<i>1_1</i>	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	ἐπηγγέλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων	Complement
	1_3	ἐφάνερωσεν	(δὲ) καιροῖς ἰδίῳ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι	Predicator
	1_4	ὁ	ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ	Complement
1:4	<i>1_5</i>	χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη	ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν	Subject

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
1:5–6	<i>I_6</i>	τούτου χάριν	ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ	Adjunct
	<i>I_7</i>	(ἵνα) [τὰ λείποντα]	ἐπιδιορθώσῃ	Complement
	<i>I_9</i>	(καὶ) καταστήσῃς	κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους	Predicator
	<i>I_10</i>	(ὥς) ἐγώ	σοι διαταξάμην	Subject
	<i>I_11</i>	(εἰ) τίς	ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος, μιᾷς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ	Subject
	<i>I_12</i>	τέκνα	ἔχων πιστά	Complement
	<i>I_13</i>	μὴ	ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας	Adjunct
	<i>I_14</i>	ἢ	ἀνυπότακτα	Adjunct
1:7–9	<i>I_15</i>	δεῖ	-	Predicator
	<i>I_16</i>	(γὰρ) τὸν ἐπίσκοπον	ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον	Subject
	<i>I_17</i>	μὴ	αὐθάδη	Adjunct
	<i>I_18</i>	μὴ	ὀργίλον	Adjunct
	<i>I_19</i>	μὴ	πάροινον	Adjunct
	<i>I_20</i>	μὴ	πλήκτην	Adjunct
	<i>I_21</i>	μὴ	αἰσχροκερδῇ	Adjunct
	<i>I_22</i>	(ἀλλὰ) φιλόξενον φιλάγαθον σώφρονα δίκαιον δσιον ἐγκρατῇ	-	Complement
	<i>I_23</i>	ἀντεχόμενον	τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου	Predicator
	<i>I_24</i>	(ἵνα) δυνατὸς	ᾗ	Complement
	<i>I_25</i>	(καὶ) παρακαλεῖν	ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὕγιαινούσῃ	Predicator
	<i>I_26</i>	(καὶ) [τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας]	ἐλέγχειν.	Complement
1:10a	<i>I_28</i>	εἰσὶν	(γὰρ) πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται	Predicator
1:10b– 11	<i>I_29</i>	μάλιστα	οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς	Adjunct

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
	1_30	δεῖ	-	Predicator
	1_31	οὐς	ἐπιστομίζειν	Complement
	1_32	οἵτινες	ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν	Subject
	1_33	διδάσκοντες	-	Predicator
	1_34	ἃ	μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν	Subject
1:12a	1_35	εἰπέν	τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης	Predicator
1:12b	1_36	Κῆρυττες	ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί	Subject
1:13–14	1_37	ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη	ἐστὶν ἀληθής	Subject
	1_38	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν	ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως	Adjunct
	1_39	(ἵνα) ὑγιαίνωσιν	ἐν τῇ πίστει	Predicator
	1_40	μὴ	προσέχοντες Ἰουδαίκοις μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων	Adjunct
	1_41	ἀποστρεφόμενων	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	(ἀλλὰ) μεμΐανται	αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις	Predicator
1:16a	1_46	θεὸν	ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι	Complement
1:16b	1_48	τοῖς (δὲ) ἔργοις	ἀρνοῦνται	Adjunct
	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 [ὑγιαίνουσῃ] διδασκαλίᾳ	Subject
2:2	2_4	πρεσβύτας	νηφαλίους εἶναι, σεμνοὺς, σώφρονες	Subject

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
	2_5	ὕγιαίνοντας	τῇ πίστει τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ὑπομονῇ	Predicator
2:3a	2_6	πρεσβύτιδας	ὡσαύτως ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς	Subject
2:3b	2_7	μὴ	διαβόλους	Adjunct
2:3c	2_8	μὴ	[οἶνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας]	Adjunct
2:3d-5	2_10	καλοδιδασκάλους	-	Complement
	2_11	(ἵνα) σωφρονίζωσιν	τὰς νέας	Predicator
	2_12	φιλάνδρους	εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους σῶφρονας ἀγνάς οἰκουργοὺς ἀγαθὰς,	Complement
	2_13	ὑποτασσομένας	τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν	Predicator
	2_14	(ἵνα) μὴ	ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημῇται	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 ὑγιᾶ ἀκατάγνωστον	-	Complement
	2_20	(ἵνα) ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας	ἐντραπῇ	Subject
	2_21	μηδὲν	ἔχων [λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον]	Complement
2:9a	2_23	δούλους	ἰδίοις 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

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
2:10b	2_29	(ἀλλὰ) [πᾶσαν πίστιν]	ἐνδεικνυμένους [ἀγαθὴν]	Complement
	2_31	(ἵνα) τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ	κοσμῶσιν 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	ἑαυτῶ 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) ἔλεγε	μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς	Predicator
2:15d	2_43	μηδεὶς	σου περιφρονεῖτω	Subject
3:1–2	3_1	ὑπομίμησκε	αὐτοὺς	Predicator
	3_2	ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις	ὑποτάσσεσθαι	Complement
	3_3	πειθαρχεῖν		Predicator
	3_4	πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν	ἐτοίμους εἶναι	Complement
	3_5	μηδένα	βλασφημεῖν	Complement
	3_6	ἀμάχους	εἶναι ἐπεικεῖς	Complement

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
	3_7	πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πραῦτητα	πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους	Complement
3:3	3_8	ἡμεν	(γάρ) 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
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	οὐ	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]	βούλομαι σε [διαβεβαιοῦσθαι]	Adjunct
	3_24	(ἵνα) φροντίζωσιν		Predicator
	3_25	καλῶν ἔργων	προϊστασθαι	Complement
	3_26	οἱ πεπιστευκότες	θεῷ	Complement

Verse	Clause	Prime	Subsequent	Prime Function
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	περίστασο	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) ἀμαρτάνει	[ὦν αὐτοκατάκριτος]	Predicator
3:12a-b	3_35	(ὅταν) πέμψω	Ἄρτεμῆν πρὸς σέ 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	Ζηνᾶν τὸν νομικὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶν	σπουδαίως πρόπεμψον	Complement
	3_41	(ἵνα) μηδὲν	αὐτοῖς λείπη	Subject
3:14	3_42	μανθανέτωσαν	(δὲ καὶ) οἱ ἡμέτεροι	Predicator
	3_43	καλῶν ἔργων	προϊστασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας	Complement
	3_44	(ἵνα) μὴ	ὥσιν 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 second appendix contains a thematic analysis of Titus at the clause-complex level. 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 κοινὴν πίστιν
Prime _A	Subsequent _A
Rheme ₁	
ἦν	(δὲ) καιροῖς ἰδίῳ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι
Prime _B	Subsequent _B
Rheme ₁	
ἐφανερώσεν	(δὲ) καιροῖς ἰδίῳ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι
Prime _C	Subsequent _C
Rheme ₁	
ὁ	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	(ὥς) ἐγώ	σοι διαταξάμην
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D
Rheme ₃			
(εἰ) 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	πάροινον	μὴ	πλήκτην
Prime _E	Subsequent _E	Prime _F	Subsequent _F
Rheme ₄			
μὴ	αἰσχροκερδῇ	ἀλλὰ	φιλόξενον φιλάγαθον σώφρονα δίκαιον ὅσιον ἐγκρατῇ
Prime _G	Subsequent _G	Prime _H	Subsequent _H

Rheme ₄			
ἀντεχόμενον	τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου	(ἵνα) δυνατὸς	ἢ
Prime _i	Subsequent _i	Prime _j	Subsequent _j
Rheme ₄			
(καὶ) παρακαλεῖν	ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ	(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	ἀ μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D

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

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

Thematic Unit ₉			
Theme ₉	Rheme ₉		
ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῆ	ἐστὶν ἀληθής	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν	ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμῳ
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B
Rheme ₉			
(ἴνα) ὑγιαίνωσιν	ἐν τῇ πίστει	μὴ	προσέχοντες Ἰουδαίκοις 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	
Rheme ₁₂	Theme 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	ῥαυτὸς ἐν καταστάματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₁₈	
Rheme ₁₈	
μὴ	διαβόλους
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₁₉	
Rheme ₁₉	
μή	οἷνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₂₀			
Rheme ₂₀			
καλοδιδασκάλους	(ἵνα) σωφρονίζωσιν	τὰς νέας	
Prime _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B	
Rheme ₂₀			
φιλόανδρους	εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους σώφρονας ἀγνὰς οἰκουργοὺς ἀγαθὰς,	ὑποτασσομένας	τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D
Rheme ₂₀			
(ἵνα) μή	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 ὑγιῇ ἀκατάγνωστον
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D
Rheme ₂₁			
(ἵνα) ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας	ἐντραπῇ	μηδὲν	ἔχων λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον
Prime _E	Subsequent _E	Prime _F	Subsequent _F

Thematic Unit ₂₂	
Theme ₂₂	Rheme ₂₂
δούλους	ιδίοις 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 ἀγαθήν
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 σωτῆρος 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	
(καὶ) ἔλεγε	μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₃₁	
Theme ₃₁	Rheme ₃₁
μηδείς	σου περιφρονείτω
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₃₂			
Rheme ₃₂			
υπομίμνησκε	αὐτοὺς	ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις	ὑποτάσσεσθαι
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B
Rheme ₃₂			
πειθαρχεῖν	πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν		ἐτοίμους εἶναι
Prime _C	Prime _D		Subsequent _D
Rheme ₃₂			
μηδένα	βλασφημεῖν	ἀμάχους	εἶναι ἐπεικειῖς
Prime _E	Subsequent _E	Prime _F	Subsequent _F
Rheme ₃₂			
πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πρᾶττητα			πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους
Prime _G			Subsequent _G

Thematic Unit ₃₃			
Rheme ₃₃	Theme ₃₃	Rheme ₃₃	
ἤμεν	(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		
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		
ἀ	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		
οὗ	ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν	
Prime _F	Subsequent _F	
Rheme ₃₄		
(ἵνα) δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι		κληρονόμοι γεννηθῶμεν 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	βούλομαι σε διαβεβαιοῦσθαι
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Rheme ₃₆	
(ἴνα) φροντίζωσιν	καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ
Prime _B	Subsequent _B

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

Thematic Unit ₃₈	
Rheme ₃₈	
μωρὰς (δὲ) ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς	περίῃστασο
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₃₉	
Rheme ₃₉	
εἰδὲν	(γὰρ) ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₄₀			
Rheme ₄₀			
αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον	μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νοουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ	εἰδῶς	
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	
Rheme ₄₀			
(ὅτι) ἐξέστραπται	ὁ τοιοῦτος	(καὶ) ἁμαρτάνει	ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος
Prime _C	Subsequent _C	Prime _D	Subsequent _D

Thematic Unit ₄₁			
Rheme ₄₁			
(ὅταν) πέμψω	Ἀρτεμῶν πρὸς σὲ ἢ Τύχικον	σπούδασον	ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με εἰς Νικόπολιν
Prime _A	Subsequent _A	Prime _B	Subsequent _B

Thematic Unit ₄₂	
Rheme ₄₂	
ἐκεῖ	(γάρ) κέκρικα παραχειμάσαι
Prime _A	Subsequent _A

Thematic Unit ₄₃			
Rheme ₄₃			
Ζηνᾶν 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
μανθανέντωσαν	(δὲ καὶ) οἱ ἡμέτεροι	καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας
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 NA28 Paragraph Divisions

This table presents a list of Louw and Nida's semantic domains for every paragraph in Titus as delimited by NA28.

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	

Paragraph 1: 1.1–4			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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
1:2	ἀψευδής	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, 4	καί (3x)	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	

Paragraph 1: 1.1–4			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	άνήρ	10.53	
1:6	γυνή	10.54	
1:7	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
1:6, 7, 9	εἶμι (3x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
1:6	έν	13.8	
1:8	φιλάγαθος	25.105	Attitudes and Emotions
1:9	παρακαλέω	25.15	
1:7	αἰσχροκερδής	25.26	
1:9	άντέχω	31.49	Hold a View, Believe, Trust
1:6, 9	πιστός (2x)	31.87	
1:9	διδαχή	33.224	Communication
1:9	διδασκαλία	33.236	
1:5	διατάσσω	33.325	
1:9	έλέγχω	33.417	
1:6	κατηγορία	33.428	
1:6, 7	άνέγκλητος (2x)	33.433	
1:9	άντιλέγω	33.455	
1:9	λόγος	33.98	
1:8	φιλόξενος	34.58	Association

Paragraph 2: 1.6–9			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	εἷς	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	ὕγιαίνω	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	ὅσιος	88.24	
1:7	πάροινος	88.288	
1:8	ἐγκρατής	88.84	
1:8	σώφρων	88.94	
1:6	ἄσωτία	88.96	
1:8	ἀλλά	89.125	Relations

Paragraph 2: 1.6–9			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
1:6	ἦ	89.139	
1:7	γάρ	89.23	
1:9	ἐν	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	τίς	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

Paragraph 3: 1.10–12a			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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
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	

Paragraph 3: 1.10–12a			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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 (2x)	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	εἶμί (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	
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	

Paragraph 4: 1.12b–16			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	ὕγιαίνω	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

Paragraph 4: 1.12b–16			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	
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	ἀνὴρ	10.53	Kinship Terms
2:5	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
2:2, 4	εἶμι (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	

Paragraph 5: 2.1–5			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:5	βλασφημέω	33.4	
2:1	λαλέω	33.7	
2:5	λόγος	33.98	
2:5	ὑποτάσσω	36.18	Guide, Discipline, Follow
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
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	

Paragraph 5: 2.1–5			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	ὑγιής	72.14	True, False
2:8	φαῦλος	88.116	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
2:7	καλός	88.4	

Paragraph 6: 2.6–8			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:7	ἀφθορία	88.43	
2:7	σεμνότης	88.46	
2:7	ἐν	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

Paragraph 7: 2.9–10			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
2:9	δεσπότης	57.13	Possess, Transfer, Exchange
2:10	νοσφίζω	57.246	
2:9	ἴδιος	57.4	
2:10	παῖς (2x)	59.23	Quantity
2:9, 10	μή (2x)	69.3	Affirmation, Negation
2:9	πάς	78.44	Degree
2:10	κοσμέω	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	ἐν	89.5	
2:10	ἵνα	89.59	
2:10	ἐν	89.8	
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

Paragraph 8: 2.11–15			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	Communication
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	παῖς	58.28	Nature, Class, Example
2:11	παῖς	59.23	Quantity
2:12	έν	67.136	Time

Paragraph 8: 2.11–15			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	μηδεὶς	92.23	
2:11-14	ὁ (8x)	92.24	
2:14	ἐαυτοῦ (2x)	92.25	
2:14	ὅς	92.27	

Paragraph 8: 2.11–15			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	εἶμι (3x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
3:3	ἐν	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

Paragraph 9: 3.1–3			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	ἕτοιμος	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	
3:3	ἀλλήλων	92.26	

Paragraph 10: 3.4–7			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:4	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers

Paragraph 10: 3.4–7			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	δικαίω	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	

Paragraph 10: 3.4–7			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	
3:5	κατά	89.8	
3:5	ἐν	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

Paragraph 11: 3.8–11			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:8	θεός	12.1	Supernatural Beings and Powers
3:8, 9, 11	εἶμι (3x)	13.1	Be, Become, Exist, Happen
3:9	περίστημι	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	διαβεβαιόμαι	33.322	
3:9	νομικός	33.337	
3:9	ζήτησις	33.44	
3:8	λόγος	33.98	
3:10	παραιτέομαι	34.41	Association
3:8	προΐστημι	35.12	Help, Care For
3:10	αἰρετικός	39.17	Hostility, Strife
3:9	ἔρις	39.22	
3:9	μάχη	39.23	
3:8	ἔργον	42.42	Perform, Do
3:10	εἷς	60.1	Number
3:10	δεύτερος	60.49	
3:11	τοιούτος	64.2	Comparison

Paragraph 11: 3.8–11			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:9	μάταιος	65.37	Value
3:8	ώφέλιμος	65.4	
3:9	άνωφελής	65.5	
3:10	μετά	67.48	Time
3:11	έκστρέφω	88.265	Moral and Ethical Qualities and Related Behavior
3:11	άμαρτάνω	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

Paragraph 12: 3.12–14			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:12	κρίνω	30.75	Think
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	ἥ	89.139	Relations
3:12	γάρ	89.23	
3:13	ἵνα	89.49	
3:14	ἵνα	89.59	
3:13	καί	89.92	

Paragraph 12: 3.12–14			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
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	Ζηνᾶς	93.139	Names of Persons and Places
3:13	Ἀπολλῶς	93.33	
3:12	Τυχικός	93.369	
3:12	Ἄρτεμᾶς	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	

Paragraph 13: 3.15			
Reference	Lexeme	Domain #	Domain Name
3:15	ἐγώ (2x)	92.1	Discourse Referentials
3:15	ὁ (3x)	92.24	
3:15	σὺ (2x)	92.6	

Bibliography

- Allen, Isaiah. "The Pastoral Epistles." In *Discourse Analysis of the New Testament Writings*, edited by Todd A. Scasewater, 467–519. Dallas: Fontes, 2020.
- 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.
- Drápela, Martin, and Libuše Dušková. *A Bibliography of Functional Sentence Perspective 1956-2011: Czech and Slovak Authors, Firbasian Approach Oriented*. Brno: Masaryk University, 2015.
- Dvorak, James D., and Ryder Dale Walton. "Clause as Message: Theme, Topic, and Information Flow in Mark 2:1–12 and Jude." *BAGL* 3 (2014) 31–81.
- Firbas, Jan. "Exploring Vilém Mathesius' Use of the Term Theme." *Linguistica Pragensia* 1 (1996) 5–23.
- . "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.
- . "On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis." In *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague 1*, edited by Joseph Vachek, 267–80. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1966.

- . “Round Table on Functional Linguistics, 1 April 1993, University of Vienna: Prof. J. Firbas.” *Vienna English Working Papers* 3 (1994) 4–5.
- . “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: To the Memory of Jan Firbas*, edited by Josef Hladký, 147–60. *Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics* 49. Amsterdam: 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*. TNTC 14. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990.
- Halliday, M. A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 1985.
- . “Language Structure and Language Function.” In *New Horizons in Linguistics*, edited by John Lyons, 140–65. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
- Huizenga, Annette Bourland. *1–2 Timothy, Titus*. *Wisdom Commentary Series* 53. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2016.
- Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Lemme, Ludwig. “Über Tit. 1, 12.” *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 55 (1882) 133–44.
- 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.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Pastoral Epistles*. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Mathesius, Vilém. *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. *Linguistic & Literary Studies in Eastern Europe*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1983.
- . “Zur Satzperspektive im modernen Englisch.” *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 155 (1929) 202–10.

- Mounce, William D. *Pastoral Epistles*. WBC 46. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Porter, Stanley E. "A Functional Letter Perspective: Towards a Grammar of Epistolary Form." In *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, 9–31. PAST 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Biblical Languages: Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- . *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2023.
- . "Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case." *FilNeot* 6 (1993) 177–205.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Matthew Brook O'Donnell. *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Text-Generating Resources*. T&T Clark Library of New Testament Greek 2. London: T&T Clark, 2024.
- Stegemann, Wolfgang. "Anti-Semitic and Racist Prejudices in Titus 1:10–16." In *Ethnicity and the Bible*, edited by Mark G. Brett, 271–94. BINS 19. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Swete, H. B. *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii. The Latin Version with the Greek Fragments*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1882.
- Uhlířová, Ludmila. "Martin Drápela, a Bibliography of Functional Sentence Perspective 1956–2011. Czech and Slovak Authors, Fribasian Approach Oriented. With an Introductory Study by Libuše Dušková." *Linguistica Pragensia* 25 (2015) 75–77.
- 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.