MENTAL REPRESENTATION OF JOHN 13:31–38:
A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS APPROACH

DAN-ADRIAN PETRE
UNIVERSITATEA ADVENTUS DIN CERNICA
adrian.petre@uadventus.ro

Abstract: The farewell discourse (John 13:31-16:33) is a key hermeneutical text in the Gospel of John. It helps the reader understand the significance of Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension, and its impact on the post-Easter Christian community. The first part of the discourse (John 13:31-38) was recently analyzed from various perspectives. Yet, while the text unit has been charted, the various linguistic signals placed in the text by the writer are not fully analyzed. This analysis is needed for an adequate mental representation that accords with the writer's intended message. The purpose of this paper is to apply Stephen H. Levinsohn's discourse analysis method to John 13:31-38 to outline an adequate mental representation regarding this passage. Despite some limitations inherent to a bottom-up approach, this method has several hermeneutical contributions. First, it offers ample support for the coherence of the text. Second, based on the constituent order, it helps the reader choose between existing interpretations. Third, this method clarifies the role of the historical present coupled with participant reference. The Johannine biblical-theological horizon of the reader can be broadened by Levinsohn's methodology.
Keywords: mental representation, discourse analysis, John 13, Stephen H. Levinsohn.

1. Introduction

The farewell discourse (John 13:31–16:33) is a key hermeneutical text in the Gospel of John. It helps the reader understand the significance of Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension (Brown 1970, 581), and its impact on the post-Easter Christian community (Hoegen-Rohls 1996, 5). The first part of the discourse (John 13:31–38) was recently analyzed from various perspectives (Tolmie 1995; Stube 2006; Kobel 2011). Nevertheless, it seems that there is a "stasis" in the literary reading methods of John's Gospel; new methods are needed to appreciate the "dynamism of the text." Discourse analysis is one of the proposed methods (Porter 2015c, 294). While the text unit has been charted,[1] the various linguistic signals placed in the text by the writer are not yet thoroughly analyzed. This analysis is

---

[1] See, for example, Stephen H. Levinsohn's chart of the discourse features of John at https://scholars.sil.org/sites/scholars/files/stephen_h_levinsohn/bart/johnbart.pdf.

needed for an adequate mental representation that accords with the writer's intended message. As such, the purpose of this paper is to apply Stephen H. Levinsohn's discourse analysis method to John 13:31–38 to outline an adequate mental representation of this passage.

This study is delimited to analyzing John 13:31–38 by using Levinsohn's discourse analysis method. Only those methodological aspects relevant and applicable to the chosen passage are presented and used. The interaction with various Johannine interpreters of the chosen passage is limited to using relevant examples from their writings. Levinsohn's methodology represents the basis for this research, with the awareness that other methodologies exist. It is not the purpose of this study to critically assess other methodologies. Nevertheless, the hermeneutical contributions and the methodological limitations of Levinsohn's approach are evaluated.

2. Methodology

"Discourse analysis is not a thing: it is things," notes Stanley E. Porter, recognizing the interplay of various linguistic elements within the approach (Porter 2015c, 133). As a "relatively new" member of the New Testament interpretation field, this approach uses a "linguistically robust methodology" to explore the extra-sentential meaning of a passage (Campbell 2015, 148). The author signals the meaning of a text by using various linguistic markers, building a specific discourse-pragmatic structure. The linguistic markers assist the reader in forming an adequate mental representation of the discourse. While the semantic content indicates what is added, "discourse-pragmatic structuring relates to where it is added and how it relates to what is already there" (Dooley/Levinsohn 2000, 31).[2] Exploring these linguistic signals helps the reader better interpret the text.

There are at least four types of discourse analysis (Campbell 2015, 150–152). This paper uses the *Summer Institute of Linguistics* approach, as presented in the writings of Stephen H. Levinsohn (Levinsohn 2000; 2015a; 2015b).[3] Levinsohn approaches translation not as a word-for-word process but from a text-linguistic perspective. As such, he explores the extra-sentential structure of the text, analyzing the function of different constructions to clarify the way sentences are linked in paragraphs depending on the text genre. His approach is a functional one, presupposing a certain structural analysis. In Levinsohn's opinion, the functional textual-linguistic approach better apprehends how discourse is formed and

---

[2] This is a free electronic version of the book, available at https://www.researchgate.net /publication/248657183_Analyzing_Discourse_A_Manual_of_Basic_Concepts).

[3] His methodologies for narrative and non-narrative discourses are available online (https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/68643 and https://www.sil.org/resources/ archives/68640).

understood. This avoids several pitfalls, like not realizing that "a perfectly good syntactic rule or semantic definition accounts for the feature being analyzed" or "not relating text-linguistic observations to a valid syntactical rule or semantic definition" (Levinsohn 2015a, 2). Its basic assumptions are that (1) choice implies meaning, (2) there is a difference between the property of expressions (semantics) and the meaning in relation with the use of expressions (pragmatics), and (3) the use of a marked form conveys its meaning (Levinsohn 2015a, 2–4).

Levinsohn's methodology has seven steps.[4] The first step is to identify the text's type or genre. There are four primary types: narrative, procedural, behavioral, and expository. These can appear separate or can be embedded in others.[5] While narrative and procedural texts are based upon a chronological organization, they differ on whether they are agent-oriented (narrative) or not (procedural). Both behavioral texts (agent-oriented) and expository texts (not agent-oriented) are organized conceptually (Levinsohn 2015a, 11). Furthermore, the hortatory texts (part of behavioral texts) can be divided into instruction or persuasion texts (Levinsohn 2015b, 5).

The second methodological step is to chart the text, displaying it in a simplified form (Levinsohn 2015b, 6). First, a new line is reserved for every clause. Second, the text is structured in several columns, indicating (1) the reference number, (2) the connectives, initial vocatives, the pre-nuclear constituents and their subordinate clauses, (3) the nucleus (verb, subject, object, oblique constituents), and (4) the post-nuclear constituents. Third, a horizontal line separates each new sentence. Fourth, the order of the material is kept the same. Fifth, different styles are set for the text and its translation, the latter being placed after each sentence of the text.

The third methodological step concerns the constituent order. One important device to mark discontinuities is placing constituents at the beginning of a sentence. Given that a fundamental principle underlying Levinsohn's pragmatic approach is verb-initial as a default order in Greek clauses,[6] when adverbial or nominal constituents are placed before the verb they indicate a marked order. This signals either (1) a point of departure or (2) a specific constituent focus. A point of departure is a bi-directional marker that conveys information already present in the discourse or directly related to it. As such, it can indicate a switch or a renewal in the reader's mental representation. When the conveyed information is new or needs to be re-established, the initial constituents give focal prominence either to the

---

[4] Given the space limitations for this research, only a methodological overview is presented here. For more details, see Levinsohn's materials on discourse analysis.

[5] See the introduction for part IV in the revised edition of his book (Levisohn 2011). This revised yet unpublished edition was made available through the author's kindness. The sections rather than the pages are used for reference.

[6] The first position marks the most prominent clausal element in Greek (Porter 2005, 296).

constituent itself, or to the verb that follows (Levisohn 2011, sec. 2.5). As a result, the focus indicates "what the speaker intends as the most important or salient change to be made in the hearer's mental representation" (Dooley/Levinsohn 2000, 31). The constituent order follows four default ordering principles.[7] When this order is violated, the marked ordering indicates focal prominence.

While the constituent order of each sentence reveals how the information is conveyed intra-sententially, the manner whereby information is conveyed inter-sententially is revealed by the presence or absence of coordinating conjunctions. The fourth methodological step explores how the relations between propositions are signaled by using conjunctions. In the Gospel of John, there are four primary forms of linkage between propositions: asyndeton (Ø), καί, δέ, and οὖν (Levisohn 2011, sec. 5.3). When the information is included in the same context, asyndeton indicates a close connection. When the information belongs to different units, then asyndeton reveals no direct connection between the information involved (Levisohn 2011, sec. 7.2; Beekman/Callow 1974, 288–291). When asyndeton is used for a verb-initial sentence, it is equivalent to καί. It indicates that the information introduced should not be considered a new development added to the context but associated with or added to the previous information. In addition, καί has two major functions. First, it associates information in specific contexts. Second, it adds one or more events to the context (Levisohn 2011, sec. 5.3.2). The conjunction δέ indicates that the information introduced should be considered a new development to the context. When the relation between two propositions reflects a true contrast, δέ functions as adversative. If only one part of the contrast is identified, then δέ is connective (Levisohn 2011, sec. 7.1). The final form of linkage, conjunction οὖν, marks a developmental progression, either inferentially or resumptive/continuative (Levisohn 2011, sec. 7.4).

The fifth methodological step deals with the default patterns of participant reference (Dooley/Levinsohn 2000, 56). There are two important features of participant reference: status and salience. The status of a participant refers to its activation in the discourse. This can be of three types: (1) activated (introduced in discourse), (2) active, or (3) reactivated/reintroduced (Levisohn 2011, sec. 8.2). The importance of a participant in a discourse, also called salience, is indicated by using two basic strategies (Levisohn 2011, sec. 8.3): (1) a VIP (very important participant) strategy and (2) a look-back strategy.

The sixth methodological step enables the reader to identify the boundaries between the semantic units like statements, paragraphs, and sections. Only when certain conditions are fulfilled, surface features can constitute valid supporting

---

[7] These are: (1) *verb - pronominal constituents - nominal constituents*; (2) *core constituents - peripheral constituents*; (3) *propositional topic - nonverbal constituents of the comment*; (4) [when (1) - (3) do not apply] *supporting constituent - dominant focal element* (Levisohn 2011, sec. 3.1–3.4).

evidence.[8] Starting from the proposition level up to the section level, each semantic unit is related to the other either through a relation of addition or association (Beekman/Callow 1974, 287–291). When a semantic unit develops another unit, the relation between them is one of addition. When it supports another semantic unit, the relation is of association.

The seventh methodological step intertwines the results of the previous steps to outline the formation of an adequate mental representation. As such, it represents the entities, the properties, or the relations created within a theological discourse. Also described using the cover term of "concepts," the entities, properties, and relations compose a mental representation (Dooley/Levinsohn 2000, 26). A mental representation reflects what the reader of a discourse mentally models as a coherent wholistic apprehension. Modeling this analogous representation implies an overlap between the mental representation of the participants in the discourse and the mental representation of the reader. Nevertheless, the two remain distinct.

3. Discourse Analysis of John 13:31–38

3.1. Establishing the Text Type

The majority opinion is that the farewell discourse begins at John 13:31, marking 13:31–38 as a literary unit (Thompson 2015, 295; Martin/Wright IV 2015, 241; Engberg-Pedersen 2017, 262). This unit is placed within the larger narrative framework comprising the second half of John's Gospel (13:1–21:25). In 13:31–38, the narrative orienters (31a–b, 36a, 36c, 37a, 38a) punctuate the text by marking several utterances taking place in a compound dialogue. Each dialogical paragraph (31c–35c; 36b; 36d–f; 37b–d; 38b–e) is agent-oriented and has a logical linkage. According to its genre, 13:31–38 can be classified as a collage of behavioral texts embedded into a narrative framework.

3.2. Charting the Text

The selected text for analysis is charted below according to the second methodological step. The first column marks the reference number of the verses from John 13, with the letters indicating the order of clauses in each verse. The second column indicates the pre-nuclear constituents. Here also, connectives and initial vocatives are shown in **bold type** and *italicized bold type*, respectively. The third column presents each sentence's nucleus, followed by the post-nuclear constituents in the fourth column. A word-by-word translation is indicated for each sentence in *italic type*, followed by an English translation. Finally, the footnotes present some

---

[8] Levinsohn lists several surface features, together with their validity conditions (Levisohn 2011, sec. 17.2).

arguments for a specific option. Below is the textual chart, which represents the basis for the following steps.[9]

Ref. no.	Pre-nuclear constituents	Nucleus	Post-nuclear constituents
31a	Ὅτε **οὖν** ἐξῆλθεν, *when therefore [he] went out*		
31b		λέγει Ἰησοῦς· *said Jesus*	
	Therefore, when he had gone out, Jesus said:		
31c	νῦν *Now*	ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου *is glorified the Son of Man*	
	"Now the Son of Man is glorified,[10]		
31d	**καὶ** ὁ θεὸς *and God*	ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ· *is glorified in him;*	
	and God is glorified in him;		
32a	[εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ], *[if God is glorified in him,]*		
32b	καὶ ὁ θεὸς *also God*	δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, *will glorify him in himself*	
	[if God is glorified in him,][11] God will also glorify him in himself,		
32c	**καὶ** εὐθὺς *and at once*	δοξάσει αὐτόν. *[he] will glorify him.*	
	and at once he will glorify him.		
33a	**τεκνία**, ἔτι μικρὸν *children, for a little while*	μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι· *with you [I] am;*	
	Children, for a little while[12] I am with you;		
33b		ζητήσετέ με, *[you] will look for me*	
	You will look for me		
33c	**καί** καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις *and just as [I] said to the Jews*		

Ref. no.	Pre-nuclear constituents	Nucleus	Post-nuclear constituents
33d	ὅτι ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω *that where I am going* ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν, *you not able to come,*		
33e	καὶ ὑμῖν *also to you*	λέγω ἄρτι. *[I] say now.*	
	and just as I said to the Jews: 'Where I am going, you are not able to come,' also now I say to you.		
34a	Ἐντολὴν καινὴν *a commandment new*	δίδωμι ὑμῖν, *[I] give to you*	
34b			ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, *that [you] love one another*
34c	καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς *just as [I] have loved you*		
34d			ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους. *that also you should love one another.*
	A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another: just as I have loved you, so you should also love one another.		
35a	ἐν τούτῳ *by this*	γνώσονται πάντες *[they] will know all*	
35b			ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταί ἐστε, *that my disciples are,*
35c			ἐὰν ἀγάπην ἔχητε *when love [you] have* ἐν ἀλλήλοις. *for one another.*
	By this all will know that you are my disciples, when you have love for one another."		
36a		Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· *Said to him Simon Peter*	
	Simon Peter said to him:		
36b	**κύριε,** *Lord,*	ποῦ ὑπάγεις; *where are [you] going?*	
	"Lord, where are you going?"		
36c		ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ] Ἰησοῦς· *answered [him] Jesus:*	
	Jesus answered [him]:		
36d	ὅπου ὑπάγω *where [I] am going*	οὐ δύνασαί *not [you] are able*	
36e			μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι, *me now to follow*
	"Where I am going, you are not able to follow me now,		
36f		ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον. *[you] will follow but later.*	
	but you will follow me later."		

Ref. no.	Pre-nuclear constituents	Nucleus	Post-nuclear constituents
37a		λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· *Said to him Peter,*	
	Peter said to him:		
37b	*κύριε*, *Lord,*	διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί *why not am [I] able*	
37c			σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι; *you to follow now?*
	"Lord, why am I not able to follow you now?		
37d	τὴν ψυχήν μου *the life my*	ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω. *for you [I] will lay down.*	
	I will lay down my life for you."		
38a		ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς· *answered Jesus:*	
	Jesus answered:		
38b	τὴν ψυχήν σου *the life your*	ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; *for me [you] will lay down?*	
	"You will lay down your life for me?		
38c	ἀμὴν ἀμὴν *truly truly*	λέγω σοι, *[I] say you,*	
38d	οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ *by no means rooster*	φωνήση *will crow*	
38e			ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς. *until [you] deny me thrice.*
	Truly, truly I say to you, by no means will the rooster crow until you deny me thrice."		

3.3. Intra-Sentential Constituent Order

At this stage, the constituent order of each sentence is analyzed. Levinsohn's chart represents the starting point. He does not justify the claims underlaying the display. This section of the paper attempts to do that. The elements relevant to this step are presented for each sentence. The word-by-word translation is kept under the text written in *italics*. Several markers are used to indicate the function each variation has. The symbol "[…]" indicates the constituent(s): Sit […] Sit - situational point of departure; Top […] Top - referential point of departure; FP […] FP - focal prominence; Emb […] Emb - preposed focal constituent of a phrase or embedded clause; Split […] Split - the second part of a split focal constituent.

The first clause of the unit analyzed, John 13:31a–b, Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν, is a situational point of departure within a narrative topic-comment articulation:

> 13:31a–b   Sit Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν, Sit λέγει Ἰησοῦς·
>   *when therefore [he] went out said Jesus*

It indicates a temporal discontinuity with the previous sentence, repeating the comment about Judas' sudden exit (the same verb, ἐξῆλθεν, is used in 13:30b). In addition, the temporal adverbial clause marks a switch towards Jesus' speech, which follows the previous dialogue (John 13:18–30).

The next sentence,

> 13:31c ᵠᵗ νῦν ᵠᵗ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
> *Now is glorified the Son of Man*

is introduced by a temporal adverb (νῦν), which functions as situational point of departure. It marks the beginning of Jesus' speech, renewing the point of departure of the previous sentence (31a, Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν). It introduces a different episode in the same setting. The rest of the sentence has a topic-comment articulation.

With the introduction of a pre-verbal referential subject (ὁ θεὸς), the sentence

> 13:31d καὶ ᵀᵒᵖ ὁ θεὸς ᵀᵒᵖ ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ·
> *and God is glorified in him;*

marks the beginning of an increased series of referential points of departure (in 13:32a, 32b, 33d). As part of a reasoned argument, ὁ θεὸς indicates a new propositional topic, which represents a switch from the previous subject (ὁ υἱὸς, 13:31c). In the following sentence,

> 13:32 ᵠᵗ [εἰ ᵀᵒᵖ ὁ θεὸς ᵀᵒᵖ ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ], ᵠᵗ καὶ ᵀᵒᵖ ὁ θεὸς ᵀᵒᵖ δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ,
> a–b [*if God is glorified in him,*] *also God will glorify him in himself*

the clause εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ is a situational point of departure indicating a contrast between the already begun glorification and the impending glorification (ἐδοξάσθη vs. δοξάσει). In both clauses of the sentence, ὁ θεὸς functions as a referential point of departure, marking a renewal of the previous propositional topical subject. The next sentence,

> 13:32c καὶ ᶠᵖ εὐθὺς ᶠᵖ δοξάσει αὐτόν.
> *and at once [he] will glorify him.*

gives focal prominence to the temporal adverb εὐθὺς. The prominence is for emphasis proper, given that glorification is not expected somewhere in the distant future but is imminent. This anticipated glorification brings another unexpected matter, which is indicated by giving focal prominence to ἔτι μικρὸν. It is new information that intensifies the force of the event:

> 13:33a τεκνία, ᶠᵖ ἔτι μικρὸν ᶠᵖ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι·
> *children, for a little while with you [I] am;*

The following nuclear clause stands as a sentence itself:

> 13:33b ζητήσετέ με,
> [*you*] *will look for me*

The sentence does not have any point of departure with a *verb - pronominal constituent* default ordering. As such, this verb-initial sentence marks continuity with the context. A comparative adverbial clause establishes a point of departure:

13:33   καί ^{Sit}καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι ^{Top}ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ^{Top} ^{Top}ὑμεῖς ^{Top}
c–e   *and   just as [I] said to the Jews   that   where I   am going   you*
         οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν, ^{Sit} ^{FP}καὶ ὑμῖν ^{FP} λέγω ἄρτι.
         not able   to come,   also to you [I] say now.

In this complex comparison sentence, a reported speech is embedded, introduced by ὅτι. The reported speech has two referential points of departure: ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω and ὑμεῖς. The first represents the primary basis for relating the reported speech to the context. In addition, it becomes the focus of Peter's question in 13:36b (indicated by the interrogative particle ποῦ). The second referential point of departure, ὑμεῖς, functions as a topical subject marking a switch from the previous subject (ἐγὼ). Therefore, it implies a discontinuity of action. The following comment is negated: the Jews cannot go where Jesus can. In the second part of the complex sentence, the καὶ ὑμῖν constituent is placed before the verb, proffering focal prominence to the direct pronominal object. The comparison is surprising: although the disciples are part of a group that seems opposite to the Jews, they are confined to the same limitations as the Jews.

The next sentence is also complex:

13:34   ^{FP}Ἐντολὴν   καινὴν ^{FP} δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους,
a–d   *a commandment new   [I] give to you that [you] love one another*
         ^{Sit}καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ^{Sit} ἵνα ^{FP}καὶ ὑμεῖς ^{FP} ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.
         just as [I] have loved you   that   also you   should love one another.

The nominal anarthrous phrase, Ἐντολὴν καινὴν, is placed before the verb to give it focal prominence. New information is brought to the mental representation of the hearer/reader. Its content is explained by the substantival ἵνα clause placed in the post-nuclear position (ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους). A situational point of departure introduces the following subordinate clause, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς. This indicates the comparison base for the second ἵνα clause. The departure point marks a switch to information already established in the context (cf. John 13:1). In 13:34d, the pronominal constituent (καὶ ὑμεῖς) is preposed for focal prominence, re–establishing the fact that the disciples themselves must love one another (cf. John 13:15–17).

In the next verse, the expression ἐν τούτῳ presents a situational point of departure that renews the previous comparison (καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς):

13:35   ^{Sit}ἐν τούτῳ ^{Sit}γνώσονται   πάντες ὅτι ^{Emb}ἐμοὶ ^{Emb} ^{FP}μαθηταί ^{FP} ἐστε,
a–c   *by this   [they] will know all   that   my   disciples   are,*
         ἐὰν ^{FP}ἀγάπην ^{FP} ἔχητε ^{Split}ἐν ἀλλήλοις. ^{Split}
         when   love   [you] have   for one another.

The possessive adjective ἐμοὶ is placed before the noun for emphasis, being embedded in the predicate nominative of the ὅτι clause. The noun μαθηταί is placed before the copula for focal prominence. The focus is intended to change the information already present in the mental representation of the hearers/readers by underlining a contrast between a disciple and a *true* disciple of Christ. A disciple is not only chosen by Christ but imitates Christ's example of sacrificial love. This is strengthened by preposing ἀγάπην, thus giving focal prominence to the noun, which occurs only here in John 13–14. The noun ἀγάπην is split from ἐν ἀλλήλοις for pragmatic reasons: love (ἀγάπην) is in focus, rather than ἀγάπην ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

The following sentence (13:36a) introduces Peter's question (13:36b):

> 13:36a   Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος·
>   *Said to him Simon Peter:*
> 13:36b   κύριε, ^{FP}ποῦ ^{FP}ὑπάγεις;
>   *Lord, where are [you] going?*

This introductory sentence has a default order (*verb - pronominal constituent - nominal constituents*), indicating continuity with the previous context. In his question, introduced by the vocative κύριε, Peter recognizes the referential point of departure indicated by Jesus earlier (ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, 13:33d). The question itself has an identificational articulation. The fact that Jesus is going is presupposed, and the question word itself (ποῦ) is in the focal pre-verbal position.

The response of Jesus continues the dialogue. This is indicated by the absence of any point of departure in the introductory sentence:

> 13:36c   ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ] Ἰησοῦς·
>   *answered [him] Jesus:*

The place indicated with the interrogative particle ποῦ by Peter is placed in the initial position of the next sentence:

> 13:36   ^{Top}ὅπου ὑπάγω ^{Top}οὐ δύνασαί ^{Top}μοι ^{Top FP}νῦν ^{FP}ἀκολουθῆσαι
> d–e   *where [I] am going not [you] are able me now to follow*

The adverbial clause ὅπου ὑπάγω indicates a referential point of departure which renews the information already presented in 13:33d. The negation οὐ placed before the verb δύνασαί signals that the second part of the topic - comment articulated sentence is negated. In the post-verbal infinitival clause, the pronominal constituent μοι is placed in the initial position as a referential point of departure, renewing the information given in 13:33c–e. The temporal adverb has focal prominence, attempting to change Peter's mental representation of his ability to follow Jesus by offering a selection between alternatives. The alternative is presented in 13:36f:

> 13:36f   ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον.
>   *[you] will follow but later.*

Peter's reply comes promptly:

> 13:37a   λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος·
> *Said to him Peter,*

Like sentences 36a and 36c, 37a has a default order, marking continuity within the previous dialogue:

> 13:37   κύριε, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί.   ᵀᵒᵖ σοι ᵀᵒᵖ ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι;
> b–c   *Lord, why not am [I] able   you to follow   now?*

Introduced by the vocative κύριε, the interrogative question διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί has a topic-comment articulation, echoing Jesus' statement from 36d. In the comment, the pronoun σοι is a referential point of departure for the following infinitival clause, renewing the previous referential point (μοι, 13:36e).

In the following sentence,

> 13:37d   ᶠᴾ τὴν ψυχήν μου ᶠᴾ ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω.
> *the life   my   for you [I] will lay down.*

the noun phrase τὴν ψυχήν μου is placed in the initial position for emphasis proper. The new information is intended to be added to Jesus' mental representation. Jesus' dubitative counter-question takes the same noun phrase (with the pronoun changed to second person singular), and gives it focal prominence to underline a contrasting alternative:

> 13:38a   ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς·
> *answered   Jesus:*
> 13:38b   ᶠᴾ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ᶠᴾ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις;
> *the life   your for me   [you] will lay down?*

Jesus explains this alternative in the rest of verse 38:

> 13:38   ᶠᴾ ἀμὴν ἀμὴν ᶠᴾ λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ   ᶠᴾ ἀλέκτωρ ᶠᴾ φωνήση
> c–e   *truly truly   [I] say to you, by no means rooster   will crow*
>   ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς.
>   *until   [you] deny me thrice.*

The expression ἀμὴν ἀμὴν has focal prominence, bringing new and unexpected information to the mental representation of the hearer/reader: Peter will repudiate Christ. In the following comment, the noun ἀλέκτωρ is placed immediately after the negative particle and before the verb, indicating its focal prominence. The noun introduces an event that will confirm Jesus's disownment by Peter.

3.4. Inter-Sentential Linkage Relations

The inter-sentential linkage relations are presented below. The sentences are referenced by their verse numbers, as presented in the chart outlined above. The first sentence, 31a–b, relates to the previous context by using the conjunction οὖν.

It is used resumptively, marking the return to the main storyline after the short digression of 13:30 (ἦν δὲ νύξ, *and it was night*). The connective introduces Jesus' speech, which represents a new development for what follows. In 31c, which opens the speech, asyndeton is used. It marks a relation of simultaneity, indicating the time when the glorification of the Son of Man takes place. The next sentence, 31d, is introduced using the conjunction καί. In this context, the fact that God is glorified in Christ is not a new development but information of equal status with 31c, hence associated with it. Asyndeton connects 32a–b with the previous sentence. In the textual variants where 32a is missing, καί (32b) functions as a conjunction, adding new information to the context. Accepting the presence of 32a, καί functions as an adverb in 32b, given that it conjoins noncontiguous constituents. The constituent which καί modifies (ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτω) is parallel to the constituent to which is added (εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ). Given the weak support for 32a, it seems that the asyndeton introducing 32a–b functions as an additive καί. The following sentence, 32c, adds a chronological sequence to the context (εὐθὺς) using the conjunction καί to associate 32c with 32b.

Significantly, a vocative (τεκνία) introduces the next juxtaposed sentence. The initial vocative indicates that a separate unit follows. As such, the asyndeton introducing 33a signals no direct connection between the information of 33a and 32c. In relation to the central concept of glorification appearing in 31b–32c, sentence 33a introduces Christ's fleeting presence with his disciples. Asyndeton connects 33a with 33b. Sentence 33b is nuclear, with the verb in the initial position. It follows that asyndeton functions as καί. In this context, it adds information to the context. After being present for a little while, Jesus leaves his disciples to look for him. The next sentence explains by adding the reason for his suggested absence: Jesus goes where humans cannot go (33d). The conjunction καί (33c) conjoins 33c–e as additional information: Jesus also tells his disciples that he goes where they cannot go.

The complex sentence that follows, 34:a–d, is introduced by asyndeton. There is no direct connection between this sentence and the previous one. Asyndeton here introduces an independent nuclear statement ('Εντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν), that is not developed from or associated with the previous. The new commandment in the nucleus is introduced as a new topic, and explained by the comment in the first ἵνα clause (ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους). The next clause (34c) brings additional support to the nucleus, clarifying through a comparison (καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς) what loving one another means. The comparison is explained by using a second ἵνα clause (ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους). The point of similarity is the verb ἀγαπάω, while the point of difference is the subject-object switch (I-you, you-one another).

The next sentence, 35a–c, is juxtaposed by asyndeton. The close connection with the previous sentence indicated by asyndeton is strengthened by a situational point of departure (ἐν τούτῳ). The relation between the nucleus (ἐν τούτῳ

γνώσονται πάντες) and the support clause of 35c is a consequence-condition. The ὅτι clause supports the generic nucleus by specifying the content of knowledge people have. The next introductory narrative sentence, 36a, is also juxtaposed by asyndeton. Given that the clause begins with a verb, asyndeton functions as additive καί. The narrative sentence introduces Peter's question. This interrogative sentence (36b), introduced by a vocative (κύριε), indicates discontinuity. Juxtaposed by asyndeton, the sentence is independent from the previous narrative sentence. The speaker asks about the place where Jesus is going, referencing to an information presented several sentences before (33d).

Jesus' speech is introduced by a narrative sentence (ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ] Ἰησοῦς). This sentence is juxtaposed by asyndeton, which functions as additive καί (36c). Asyndeton also begins the first sentence of the new speech, independent from the previous one (36d–e, ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι). The complex sentence represents a conversational exchange revealing that Peter cannot go where Jesus is going. The clause ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαί (36d) has a reason - result relation with the last clause of the sentence (36e, μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι). The second sentence of Jesus' speech (36f, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον) is introduced by δέ. The information represents a new development, contrasted with 36d–e: Peter will be able to follow Jesus later.

The following narrative sentence (37a, λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος) is introduced by asyndeton, which functions as additive καί. Peter's reply to Jesus' speech follows (37b–c), juxtaposed with asyndeton. It is an independent sentence, part of the conversational exchange. The use of vocative (κύριε) with asyndeton signals a discontinuity in the sentence flow. The clause κύριε, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί (37b) has a reason - result relation with σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι. Peter questions the reason for Jesus' statement to negate the result. The next sentence (37d) is juxtaposed with asyndeton in close relation to the previous sentence. Peter's new reason implies a modified result: he is willing to lay down his own life for Christ.

The next sentence, 38a (ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς), introduced by asyndeton functioning as additive καί, marks Jesus' reply. Also introduced by asyndeton as an independent sentence, 38b (τὴν ψυχήν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις) questions Peter's assertion from 37d (τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω). The last sentence (38c–e), juxtaposed with asyndeton, has no direct connection with the previous one. A new topic is introduced. The clause ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι (38c) is supported by 38d (οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ) and 38e (ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς) in an associative relation of topic-comment. The comment is represented by Jesus' prediction that Peter will deny him three times before the rooster crows. The last two clauses, 38d and 38e are in a relation of orienter-content.

3.5. Participant Reference

In John 13:31–38, as in the rest of the Gospel, Jesus, as a participant, enjoys a VIP status.[13] Being already introduced (activated) in chapter 13, he is reactivated in 31b by a reference to his name ('Ιησοῦς). According to the rule mentioned in methodology (step 5), this reference should be articular. Nevertheless, in John's Gospel, an anarthrous form is used to "mark as important the referent or, more often, his initiative or speech" (Levinsohn, 2011, sec. 9.2.3)[14] Coupled with the presence of a historical present (λέγει), the paragraph comprising Jesus' speech (31c–35c) is highlighted in the section. In addition, the anarthrous reference gives Jesus thematic prominence. The next sentence, 31c, uses the articular full noun phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου to indicate an apparent change of subject. Nevertheless, the title also refers to Jesus, being reactivated here from its last use in 12:34. In 13:31d, ὁ θεὸς is reactivated as a minor participant by using a complete noun phrase.[15] In 32a–b, the default encoding is violated for ὁ θεὸς as an active participant. Using a marked encoding (noun phrase) helps remove reference ambiguity and highlights the divine action of glorification. In 32c, the rules of default encoding are followed for the same subject.

As the VIP of discourse, Jesus is referred to with minimal encoding in 33a, as reflected in the verb inflection (εἰμι). The default encoding is also followed in 33b, where the verb inflection refers to the previous pronoun of 33a (ὑμῶν). In 33c, the reference to Jesus is kept minimal through verbal inflection. In 33d the reference to Jesus is over-encoded by pronoun ἐγὼ, marking Jesus' action of leaving as prominent. The second clause of 33d activates a minor participant (the group of the Jews) by using a referential point of departure (ὑμεῖς). In 33e, the reference to Jesus is encoded by using minimal verbal inflection. The same minimal reference to the global VIP appears in 34a.

In clause 34b, the default encoding is used for the activated minor participant (the disciples). As a non-subject in 34a, the group becomes the subject of 34b. Minimal verb inflection is used for reference (ἀγαπᾶτε). In 34c, the major participant (Jesus) is implicitly referred to by verbal inflection (ἠγάπησα). Violating the default encoding rule, the following clause (34d) makes an overt reference to the disciples by using a personal pronoun (ὑμεῖς). Prominence is thus given to the

---

[13] This is hinted by ἐξῆλθεν, a verb of movement away from the location where Jesus is. The subject of the verb is Judas, an active participant in the previous section. In a default encoding, no overt reference is made to him.

[14] Although several important textual witnesses have the name anarthrous (P[66], ℵ, B), others (e.g. A, C, D) have the definite article before 'Ιησοῦς (NA[28], 349).

[15] "Notionally, MAJOR PARTICIPANTS are those which are active for a large part of the narrative and play leading roles; minor participants are activated briefly and lapse into deactivation" (Dooley/Levinsohn 2000, 60).

requisite reciprocal love. Reference to a new minor participant is made in 35a (πάντες) without any introduction. The presence of others is presumably known. In 35b and 35c, no overt reference indicates the disciples as participants.

In the next sentence, 36a, Σίμων Πέτρος is reactivated. The anarthrous reference to Peter, coupled with the historical present (λέγει), indicates a cataphoric function: it is not Peter's question that is highlighted, but Jesus' answer that follows. Minimal reference is made to Jesus in 36b, given that he is Peter's speech's addressee and the global VIP. The answer Jesus gives (36d–f) is introduced by the passive aorist of ἀποκρίνομαι, indicating that the speech is highlighted. The previous addressee is over-encoded in 36c using his proper name ('Ιησοῦς). In addition, being anarthrous, it seems that thematic prominence is given to Jesus. Verb inflection is used for VIP reference in the first clause of 36d. In 36d–f, the addressee (Peter) is referred to by using the default encoding (verb inflection).

A historical present (λέγει) introduces Peter's reply in 37a by using an articular noun phrase (ὁ Πέτρος). As such, the sentence has a cataphoric function, highlighting not Peter's speech but Jesus' reply (38a–e). This reply is introduced by a historical present (ἀποκρίνεται) followed by an anarthrous reference to Jesus. It highlights the speech and gives 'Ιησοῦς thematic prominence. No overt reference is made to Peter in the content of the couplet's speeches (37b–d and 38b–e). In 38c, minimal reference to Jesus is made through verbal inflection (λέγω). At the end of the section, a minor participant (ἀλέκτωρ) is activated by being associated with Peter. Being introduced for the first time, is anarthrous.

3.6. Inter-Unit Progression

In John 13:31–38, several surface features functioning as boundary markers have strong evidential support. The first clause of the unit, 31a, indicates a return from the supportive information offered in 13:28–30 to the main theme of having love for one another (as introduced in John 13:1). As such, the use of οὖν (31a) marks the beginning of a new unit. In addition, the aorist of ἐξέρχομαι (ἐξῆλθεν) represents a backward reference, which connects the "tail" of verse 30 with the "head" of verse 31. This evidence strongly suggests that 31a marks the beginning of a new section. This section follows chronologically the previous one, developing the discourse by adding new information.

The content of the section naturally falls into two major paragraphs: 31a–35c and 36a–38e.[16] These paragraphs comprise five speeches (31b–35c; 36a–b; 36c–f; 37a–d; 38a–e). Each of these speeches is introduced by a speech-orienter clause (31b, 36a, 36c, 37a, 38a). In 31b, the historical present λέγει is cataphoric, giving

---

[16] Both NA[28] and the UBS[5] mark these two units as paragraphs.

prominence to what follows, not to the speech that it introduces.[17] In 36a, the historical present λέγει introduces the first speech (36a–b) of a couplet (36a–f). The second part of the couplet (36c–f) is introduced by ἀπεκρίθη. The same applies to the following couplet, where λέγει introduces the first speech (37a–d) and ἀποκρίνεται the second speech (38a–e).

The content of the first speech of Jesus (31c–35c) marks the first paragraph of the section. This can be divided in three statements. The first statement (31c–32c) is introduced by a temporal point of departure (νῦν) which provides supportive evidence for a boundary. In addition, a chiastic structure is evident in this statement, having the concept of glorification central to it. The chiastic structure encloses 31c–32c as an autonomous paragraph.

The statement represents a return to the main theme line of chapter 13, appearing before the section wherein Jesus foretold his betrayal (13:21–30). It further develops the discourse opening the entire section with the theme of glorification, which is amplified in the second part of the Gospel.

The second statement (33a–e) is juxtaposed by asyndeton and introduced by a vocative (τεκνία). As such, support evidence for a boundary marker is present. This statement develops the previous semantic unit, being in a relation of addition with it. New information is added to the discourse: Jesus will be present with his disciples for a while and then leave where they cannot go.

The third statement (34a–d) comprises several delimiting surface features. First, 34a is juxtaposed by asyndeton coupled with a complement-taking predicate (Ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι … ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους), offering supportive valid evidence for a boundary (Levinsohn 2011, sec. 17.2.1). Second, there is a parallelism between 34b, 34d, and 35c. All subordinate sentences have the concept of love for one another central.

Third, ἐν τούτῳ seems to be used as a summary statement ending the unit. Reference is made to 34a–d: by obeying Jesus 'new commandment, the disciples are known as Christ's disciples. The statement is also in relation of addition with the previous one, developing the discourse with the theme of reciprocal love as a new commandment from Jesus.

The second paragraph (36a–38e) comprises four statements in two speech couplets. The paragraph offers information supporting the previous paragraph. It relates to a part of the first paragraph, clause 33d. The first statement (36a–b), Peter's question about the place Jesus goes, inquires for specific information. It relates to identification with the previous statement (33a–e). The second statement (36c–f), Jesus 'reply, has a relation of addition to Peter's question. It represents a conversational exchange, developing the paragraph. The third statement (37a–d)

---

[17] The occurrence of historical present per se does not necessarily indicate a boundary marker, but points to what follows in the narrative (Levinsohn 2011, sec. 12.2).

refers back to the nucleus of 36d (οὐ δύνασαί). It is a relation of comment (37a–d) - nucleus (36d). The fourth statement represents the second half of the conversational exchange between Jesus and Peter. It develops the paragraph, adding the betrayal prediction as new information in the discourse.

3.7. Mental Representation

While the surface structure of John 13:31–38 indicates a section with two paragraphs comprising seven statements, the deeper semantic structure sees a collage of behavioral statements set in a narrative frame. Already having a certain apprehension of the narrative in chapter 13, the author tells the reader that verse 31 marks a temporal discontinuity. This is indicated by a point of departure, which marks the beginning of a new section (*Therefore, when he had gone out*, 31a). Judas' exit from the room indicates that the disruption caused by the betrayer has passed for now. The main theme line can be resumed.

As the most important participant in the story, Jesus receives thematic prominence. The participant is easily identified in the mental representation of the reader. Moreover, the author highlights Christ's speech, signaling that what follows represents new and important information the reader needs to grasp (*Jesus said*, 31b). Once attention is captivated, the conceptual content of Jesus' speech is presented (31c–35c). The reader can identify three statements' boundaries, indicating that Jesus conveys three main concepts. The first statement (31c–32c) has glorification as a central concept. The reference to Jesus as the Son of Man was already established for the reader; now is reactivated. The information that the Son of Man is glorified (*Now the Son of Man is glorified*, 31c) needs to be associated with the fact that God is glorified in him (*and God is glorified in him*, 31d). Introducing God as a participant by using a referential point of departure cognitively anchors the associative relation. The reader intuits that glorification transcends the earthly horizon, having celestial overtones. Employing a marked encoding for reference to God, the author highlights the divine action of glorification (*[if God is glorified in him,] God will also glorify him in himself*, 32a–b). In addition, resorting to a comparison, he indicates a contrast between the already-begun glorification and the impending glorification. The imminent character of glorification is divulged by giving focal prominence to the temporal element of 32c (*and at once he will glorify him*). This sense of imminence intends to change the reader's mental representation.

The second statement (33a–e) introduces the concept of Christ's departure to the context of the previous statement. The anticipated glorification brings an unexpected event. The author gives focal prominence to a phrase indicative of temporal shortness (*children, for a little while*, 33a). The information is intended to make a mental change: imminent glorification implies fleeting presence. Jesus is referred to with minimal encoding, and the author uses positive language (*I am with*

you, 33a), intensifying the tension. The cognitive extension is consolidated by adding other relevant information: the disciples will look for Jesus' physical presence (*You will look for me*, 33b), but they will not be able to meet him. The author compares what Jesus told the Jews and what Jesus is telling the disciples. A previous episode is actualized (*and just as I said to the Jews: 'Where I am going, you are not able to come,'* 33c–d). Jesus' departure is stressed, while the ability of the Jews to follow is restrained. Next, the author switches from the minimal encoding of disciples as participants to their focal prominence as addressees (*also now I say to you*, 33e), strengthening the point of similarity: the disciples are confined to the same limitations as the Jews.

The third statement (34a–35c) brings the concept of reciprocal love to the forefront. The author signals a new cognitive change by giving focal prominence to the commandment Jesus gives (*A new commandment I give to you*, 34a). The participant reference is kept minimal in 34a–34c to help the reader penetrate the meaning of Jesus' utterance. The content of the new commandment is introduced by a supporting clause (*that you love one another*, 34b) and explained through a comparison (*just as I have loved you, so you should also love one another*, 34c–d). The point of similarity is the verb *to love*, while the point of difference is the subject-object switch (Jesus-disciples, disciples-one another). The overt reference to the disciples in the second part of the comparison emphasizes the exigency of disciples to love one another (34d). The following summary clause evinces that this represents the semantic gist of Jesus' speech (*By this all will know*, 35a). The reader is not surprised by the reference to other people; they are presumably known. The amazement comes in the following clause (*that you are my disciples*, 35b). The author gives focal prominence to *my disciples*, signaling a change that should take place in the reader's mental representation. A disciple of Christ is not just only chosen by Christ but called to imitate Christ's example of sacrificial love. This idea is further strengthened by giving *love* focal prominence in the next proposition (*when you have love for one another*, 35c).

The discourse continues with two speech couplets, easily identified by the reader. These represent a conversational exchange between Peter and Jesus. In the first couplet, the reference to Peter is marked as cataphoric (*Simon Peter said to him*, 36a). The reader needs to look beyond Peter's question. The identificational articulation of the sentence reveals that Peter presupposes Jesus' departure: the destination comes into focus (*Lord, where are you going?* 36b). The reader reflects on Peter's salient interest and turns to Jesus' answer for clarification. The author gives thematic prominence to Jesus and his reply (*Jesus answered [him]*, 36c). The situational point of departure (*Where I am going*, 36d) renews in an explicit manner the information already presented (*you are not able*, 36d). The reason Jesus offers for Peter's inability is indicated as an undisclosed location. The reader's anticipation to receive information about a location is not fulfilled. Keeping the participant reference minimally encoded, the author gives the temporal aspect focal

prominence (*to follow me now*, 36e). This temporal focus is intended to change the reader's mental representation: it is not "where?" but "when?" that is relevant. Once the informational structure is extended, several constituents consolidate it. These mark a new development, contrasted with the previous proposition (*but you will follow me later*, 36e).

The second speech couplet (37a–38e) again introduces Peter in a marked cataphoric order (*Peter said to him*, 37a). The reader is directed to the highlighted speech, which follows Peter's. Like Peter, the reader can be intrigued by the informational structure received. The next query comes as no surprise: *Lord, why am I not able to follow you now?* (37b–c). The reader perceives that Peter questions the reason for Jesus' previous statement to negate the result. His argument is brought into focal prominence (*I will lay down my life for you*, 37d). This focal proposition is intended to challenge Jesus' mental representation as it implies a modified result. The bold statement also challenges the reader. Jesus' reply keeps Peter's focal constituent in prominence (*Jesus answered: You will lay down your life for me?*, 38b). Nevertheless, a different change is brought to the reader's mental representation, contrary to that intended by Peter. An emphatic, unexpected statement follows Jesus' dubitative counter-question: *Truly, truly I say to you, by no means will the rooster crow until you deny me thrice* (38c–e). The prediction is surprising, expanding the reader's mental representation to include the possibility of betrayal. Jesus strongly denies Peter's argument. The mention of the rooster's crow introduces an event that will confirm Jesus' disownment by Peter.

4. Methodological Evaluation

In all seven steps presented above, the interaction between participants was followed closely to accurately extend and consolidate the reader's mental representation (or understanding). It appears that Levinsohn's methodology can broaden Johannine biblical-theological horizon in several ways. The following section assesses Levinsohn's discourse analysis approach. The methodological evaluation first suggests several significant hermeneutical contributions, pointing out some distinctive insights the method proffers. Second, the methodological evaluation indicates several methodological limitations. After this assessment, the study concludes with several observations regarding the usability of Levinsohn's methodology.

4.1. Hermeneutical Contributions

Levinsohn's discourse analysis approach has several important hermeneutical contributions. First, it looks at the text from a semantic-functional perspective. It presupposes that a text is coherent and gives a solid argument to support this

presupposition. The text is not only an array of disconnected meaningful words but a tapestry of intertwined meaningful concepts. As in John 31a–38e, discourse analysis explores the deep structure of a text, not only its surface structure. It points out that the disagreement regarding the structure and composition of the chosen passage focuses too much on apparent disunity rather than on its coherence in the context.[18] As the above analysis shows, the conjunction οὖν anchors section 31a–38e in its context. The various semantic propositions, statements, and paragraphs are interrelated in conceptual relations discernible by the reader (Beekman/Callow 1974, 288). Furthermore, while in traditional grammar, there is a perceived confusion regarding the role of connectives, discourse analysis affirms that connectives are markers "of a conceptual relationship *of some kind*" (Runge 2010, 18–19).

The second contribution of Levinsohn's approach concerns the significance of the word order in a sentence. Given that Greek has a verb-initial constituent order, any alteration implies an authorial choice. When a constituent precedes the verb, it may indicate a point of departure or a focal position.[19] Clarifying each constituent's role enhances interpretation, helping the exegete "to choose between existing interpretations" (Levinsohn 2006, 20). Rather than choosing according to one's intuition, the decisions about the exegetical significance need to respect the informational semantic structure of the text (Runge 2010, 184). For example, in 33e, ἄρτι does not occupy an emphatic position but καὶ ὑμῖν does.[20] Hence, the comparison is between participants, not between their temporal frameworks. Another example is 37c. One commentator wonders whether the author uses ἄρτι instead of νῦν for emphasis or as a stylistic variation (Borchert 2002, 100–101). Discourse analysis eliminates the first option, given that ἄρτι does not have focal prominence. While obvious preposed constituents like ἐντολὴν καινὴν (34a) are correctly identified by various commentators as prominent (Morris 1995, 562), other focal constituents are less or at all explored.[21] In addition, no difference is

---

[18] For example, Schnackenburg argues that 34a–34d is an editorial addition but adds that "it is very much in the spirit of the evangelist and fits in very well" (Schnackenburg 1982, 53). This ambiguous position is rejected by Barrett, who states that the entire section of 31a–38e "anticipates the themes, and even the form, of chs. 14–16; in this it constitutes an argument for the unity of chs. 14–16 in their present form" (Barrett 1978, 449).

[19] For example, Bernard sees οὖν in 31a as emphatic (Bernard 1999, vol. 2, 476). Schnackenburg indicates νῦν in 31c as emphatic (Schnackenburg 1982, 49). Both seem to confuse the role of these connectives, substituting focal prominence for situational points of departure.

[20] By contrast, Ridderbos points to the comparison between the Jews and the disciples two times (Ridderbos 1997, 474–475, 477).

[21] For example καὶ ὑμῖν (33a), ὅπου ὑπάγω (36d), or ἀλέκτωρ (38d) are usually neglected. Others, like μαθηταί (35b) or ἀγάπην (35c) are not treated as emphasized constituents. The tendency is to emphasize the verbs in 34b or 34d. Compare Brown' treatment of love

made between focal prominence as emphasis proper (new information) or contrast accent (changes in the already existing informational structure).

A third contribution concerns the use of historical presents coupled with participant reference (in 31b, 36a, 37a, and 38a). While some Greek grammarians are divided between dramatic use, tense reduction, or change of setting or character (Runge 2010, 125–128), discourse analysis indicates that the historical present highlights either a speech or has a cataphoric function.[22] With a marked participant reference, the use of historical presents helps the reader better understand the interaction between participants. For example, the thematic prominence given to Jesus in 31b dismisses the confusion regarding the role of his speech (31b–35c); if the speech is highlighted, then it plays a key role in the farewell discourse. Another example is the manner Peter is reactivated. In both interventions, the speech orienters (36a and 37a) have a cataphoric function. As such, the emphasis is not on Peter's questions per se but on Jesus' answers.[23]

4.2. Methodological Limitations

No hermeneutical method can be comprehensive in the treatment of a text. Levinsohn's discourse analysis approach makes no exception. Apart from its contributions, there are also several methodological limitations. First, as a bottom-up strategy, finding meaning in the surface structure as one moves to "higher levels of abstraction" becomes increasingly difficult (Porter 2015c, 138). In this context, an adapted top-bottom approach increases the usability of discourse analysis.[24]

(Brown 1970, 612–614) with Lenski's emphasis on the relation between the concept of "disciple" and that of "love" (Lenski 1942, 962).

[22] Campbell states that "historical presents that introduce discourse utilize the present tense-form because they are leading into a proximate-imperfective context (discourse). In such cases, the proximate-imperfective nature of discourse 'spills over' to the verb that introduces it" (Campbell 2008, 66). Although the formulation "they are leading into" seems to indicate a certain discursive role, Campbell limits his analysis to the surface structure. Cf. Porter, who states that "the 'historic' Present is used at those places where the author feels that he wishes to draw attention to an event or series of events" (Porter 2010, 196). Although using Porter's approach for non-λέγω historical presents, Leung excludes λέγω historical presents from his study of John's Gospel, reflecting a traditional understanding that these no longer carry "rhetorical force" (Leung 2008, 704).

[23] Kysar's says at the beginning of his treatment of 36a–38e that "in v. 36 the attention shifts to Peter and his forthcoming denial" (Kysar 1986, 216). From a discourse analysis perspective, it seems that Peter's intervention projects the attention on how Jesus answers him, rather on his own uncertainties.

[24] As such, Levinsohn's approach can move beyond a potential criticism that was raised against his sentence-level methodological limitation. See, for example, Porter's criticism

Second, Levinsohn's methodology is limited as regards intertextuality. Although dealing with intertextuality within a given book, interacting with the Old Testament background is critical.[25] Third, while integrating some references to the text's rhetoric (counterpoints, rhetorical parallelism, instruction, persuasion), Levinsohn's method seems more focused on the semantics of a text than on what the texts do.[26] A fourth limitation is that the approach does not explore in-depth the sociolinguistic dimensions of the text (Porter 2015c, 142).[27]

5. Conclusion

Apart from these limitations and other minor details still debated,[28] Levinsohn's method is profitable in analyzing a discourse both at a clause level and beyond. The resulting mental representation best illustrates the efficacy of Levinsohn's methodology. Of course, his approach needs to be understood as a starting point in an integrative effort to include some aspects addressed only tangentially by Levinsohn.[29] This study asserts that Levinsohn's methodology can broaden the reader's Johannine biblical-theological horizon. If this is true for the reader, it is left for him or her to decide. Notwithstanding, as the discourse continues, each reader is invited to analyze its semantic world.

(Porter 2015a, 26). Furthermore, a top-bottom approach can broaden the understanding of John's Gospel (Porter 2015b).

[25] For example, the love commandment needs to be analyzed in relation with its Old Testament background, given that it "echo[es] the language of the essential substance of the law of Moses" (Keener 2003, 924).

[26] Rhetorical analysis helps the reader understand why, for example, the repetition τὴν ψυχήν σου has "a strong rhetorical quality and minimal informational quality" (Estes 2013, 139). While discourse analysis indicates that the expression has focal prominence, it does not offer an explanation of its rhetorical nature.

[27] Although mentioning social relationship as part of the factors influencing the form of exhortation chosen, Levinsohn does not go into details explaining it (Levinsohn 2015b, 73–74). For example, see Engberg-Pedersen's presentation of John 13:33–35 as the rhetorical *propositio* for the whole farewell discourse (Engberg-Pedersen 2017, 262–266). Illustrative is also the social background of the vocative τεκνία (Keener 2003, 921–923).

[28] See, for example, Porter's criticism of the article as a criteria for markedness (Porter 2015c, 369).

[29] W. Randolph Tate proposes an integrative method which unfortunately does not include discourse analysis (Tate 2008).

Bibliography

A. Primary Sources

NA[28] = *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger. 28th ed. Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

UBS[5] = *The Greek New Testament.* Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger. 5th ed. Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2014.

B. Secondary Sources

Barrett, C. K., *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text.* 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.

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

Bernard, J. H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John.* ICC. 2 vols. 1928, Repr., Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1999.

Borchert, Gerald L., *John 12–21.* NAC 25B, Nashville, Broadman & Holman, 2002.

Brown, Raymond E., *The Gospel according to John (XIII–XXI)*, AB 29A, New York, Doubleday, 1970.

Campbell, Constantine R., *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 2015.

Campbell, Constantine R., *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 2008.

Dooley, Robert A., Stephen H. Levinsohn. *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts*, SIL International, 2000.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *John and Philosophy: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel,* N,w York, Oxford University Press, 2017.

Estes, Douglas, *The Questions of Jesus in John: Logic, Rhetoric and Persuasive Discourse*, BibInt 115, Leiden, Brill, 2013.

Hoegen-Rohls, Christina, *Der nachösterliche Johannes: die Abschiedsreden als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zum vierten Evangelium*, WUNT 84, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Keener, Craig S., *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols., Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2003.

Kobel, Esther, *Dining with John: Communal Meals and Identity Formation in the Fourth Gospel and Its Historical and Cultural Context*, BibInt 109, Leiden, Brill, 2011.

Kysar, Robert, *John.* ACNT, Minneapolis, Augsburg, 1986.

Lenski, R. C. H., *The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel.* Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book, 1942.

Leung, Mavis M., "The Narrative Function and Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present in the Fourth Gospel.", *JETS* 51.4 (2008), 703–20.

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

Levinsohn, Stephen H., *Discourse Features of the Greek New Testament: A Coursebook on Its Information Structure and Other Devices*, 2nd ed. Dallas, SIL International, 2011.

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

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

Levinsohn, Stephen H. *The Relevance of Greek Discourse Studies to Exegesis.* "Journal of Translation" 2.2 (2006), 11–21.

Martin, Francis, Wright William M. IV., *The Gospel of John,* Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture, Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2015.

Metzger, Bruce Manning, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament,* 4th ed. London, United Bible Societies, 1994.

Morris, Leon, *The Gospel According to John*, 2nd ed. NICNT, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1995.

Porter, Stanley E., *Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey.* Pages 14–35 in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter, and D. A. Carson, LNTS, London, Bloomsbury, 2015a.

Porter, Stanley E., *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. 1994, Repr., Sheffield, Sheffield Academic, 2005.

Porter, Stanley E., *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2015b.

Porter, Stanley E., *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice,* Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2015c.

Porter, Stanley E., *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, Edited by D. A. Carson, SBG 1, 1989, Repr., New York, Lang, 2010.

Ridderbos, Herman N., *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, Translated by John Vriend, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997.

Runge, Steven E., *The Lexham Discourse Greek New Testament*, Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2008–2014.

Runge, Steven E., *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*, Lexham Bible Reference, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *The Gospel According to St. John*, Translated by David Smith and G. A. Kon, Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament 3, New York, Crossroad, 1982.

Stube, John Carlson, *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse,* LNTS 309, New York, T&T Clark, 2006.

Tate, W. Randolph, *Biblical Interpretation.* 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2008.

Thompson, Marianne Meye, *John: A Commentary.* NTL. Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 2015.

Tolmie, D. F., *Jesus' Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1–17:26 in Narratological Perspective*, BibInt 12, Leiden, Brill, 1995.

Wallace, Daniel B., *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids Zondervan, 1996.