SIL Global
Language and Culture Archives

Journal of Translation
ISSN 1558-7282 (online)
https://siljot.org

Reasoning Styles and Types of Hortatory Discourse

Stephen H. Levinsohn

Journal of Translation 2 (2), 2006: 1–10.
https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-8PNHV

License

©2006, SIL Global

Made available under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

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

Reasoning Styles and Types of Hortatory Discourse

Stephen H. Levinsohn

Stephen Levinsohn has a doctorate in Linguistic Science from the University of Reading, England. He and his wife, Nessie, became members of SIL in 1965 and worked with the Inga people in Colombia. The Inga New Testament was completed in 1996. He is an international linguistics and translation consultant for SIL

Abstract

This paper presents a modification of the types of supportive information that Breeze (1992) identified for hortatory discourses as a basis for bringing out the mismatches that are most likely to occur when translating from a verb-object (VO) language to an object-verb (OV) language. Earlier sections review the factors that underlie Longacre's (1996) classification of texts into four broad categories and outline what characterizes mainline information for each genre. They are followed by illustrations of deductive and inductive reasoning from Koiné Greek and Ancient Hebrew, since deductive reasoning tends to correlate with instructional exhortations and inductive reasoning with attempts to persuade.

1. Introduction: Broad categories of genre[1]

Longacre (1996) makes use of plus and minus values for a set of four features to categorize texts into genres. The two primary features are contingent temporal succession and agent orientation. They serve to identify the four broadest categories of genre.

Contingent temporal succession refers to a framework "in which some (often most) of the events or doings are contingent on previous events or doings" (Longacre 1996:9). Thus, in the West African fable in which Tortoise borrows money from Pig and avoids paying it back, Tortoise not paying back the loan is contingent on Pig having first lent him the money. Similarly, in a recipe, putting a cake in the oven is contingent on having first mixed the proper ingredients.

Agent orientation refers to whether the genre deals with "events or doings" which are controlled by an agent (one who performs an action), "with at least a partial identity of agent reference running through the discourse" (Longacre 1996:9). Again, Pig and Tortoise are agents in that fable; the hearer is a (potential) agent in an exhortation or, to use a more inclusive term, "directive" (Kompaoré 2004:40).

The four categories of genre resulting from these two features are presented in table 1:

Table 1. Longacre's four broad categories of genre

		Agent-orientation	
		+	–
Contingent temporal succession	+	NARRATIVE	PROCEDURAL
	–	HORTATORY (directive)	EXPOSITORY

Thus, a narrative discourse (e.g. story) is + agent orientation and + contingent succession (see table 1). A procedural discourse ("how to do it, how it was done, how it takes place") is + contingent succession but – agent orientation, since "attention is on what is done or made, not on who does it" (Longacre 1996:9).

[1] This section is based on Dooley & Levinsohn 2001:7–9.

> A hortatory (directive) discourse (instruction, advice, eulogy, appeal, etc.) is – contingent succession but + agent orientation, since "it deals with how people did or should behave" (Longacre 1996:9).
> An expository discourse (budget, scientific article, etc.) is 'minus' (–) in regard to both features.

The overall genre of an epistle like 1 Corinthians is **hortatory** (Terry 1995:49). This can be deduced from the major headings in Bratcher's (1982) outline of the book: "Disorders in the Church" (1:10–6:20) and "Answers to Questions from Corinth" (7:1–16:4). In them both, Paul is primarily concerned with how the Corinthians should behave.

At the same time, a typical epistle contains many embedded **expositions**. However, as Breeze points out (1992:313, referring to Longacre 1983:3), "the expository passages of the New Testament are not meant simply to expound doctrine for intellectual stimulation but to support the exhortation to the readers 'to live differently from those who are not in the possession of such truth'."

2. Mainline versus supportive material

> "The mainline presents the backbone of the discourse—whether this be the main events of a narrative, the main steps of a procedure, the main points of an argument or the main commands of an exhortation—while the supportive material provides all that is necessary as a background for understanding the story, procedure, or argument as a whole. These different types of information, which work together to communicate the total message of a discourse, can be distinguished from each other by certain language-specific surface features, such as tense and aspect markers, verb forms, conjunctions, special particles, and word order" (Breeze 1992:314).

In all text genres, the default way of presenting **mainline** information is with **topic-comment** articulation.[2]

In a NARRATIVE, sentences that present mainline events typically have **perfective** aspect (the aspect that portrays events or states as a whole—Levinsohn 2005: sec. 5.3.2). When no discontinuity is signalled (e.g., with a pre-nuclear adverbial constituent like "the next day"—Levinsohn 2005: chap. 3), a distinctive verb form is often used (a 'narrative' or 'neutral' form in many African languages, the aorist in Greek, the *wyyqtl* form in Hebrew).

In a PROCEDURE, sentences that present the main steps typically have **imperfective** aspect (the aspect that portrays events or states as not completed at the point of reference—Levinsohn 2005: sec. 5.3.2). When no discontinuity is signalled, a distinctive verb is often used (e.g. a future infinitive in Inga [Quechuan, Colombia], the *wqtl* form in Hebrew).

In an EXHORTATION (DIRECTIVE), we can also expect the main commands to be presented in a distinctive way (e.g. with imperatives rather than a more mitigated form like 'I would like you to...').

In an EXPOSITION "the most static clauses of the language [constitute] its mainline." Static clauses have as their main verb "'be', 'have', or null in place of 'be', or the verb 'remain/stay'" (Longacre 1983:4).

In her analysis of Ephesians (like 1 Corinthians, a basically hortatory text), Breeze excludes the **message framework**—"material that provides a framework for the message without being part of the message itself" (1992:314). The message framework comprises:

---

[2] For discussion of sentence articulations, see Levinsohn 2005: sec. 1.2.2. The following is an example from Greek of a proposition with topic-comment articulation. The proposition has a topic (which is usually the subject—in this case, *I*) and a comment giving information about the topic *I*.

Ἀπολῶ	τὴν	σοφίαν	τῶν	σοφῶν
I.will.destroy	the	wisdom	of.the	wise

I [TOPIC] *will destroy the wisdom of the wise* [COMMENT about *I*]. (1 Cor. 1:19)

Care must be taken not to confuse the term '(propositional) topic' with the topic of a paragraph or longer stretch of speech or writing. "A referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if in a given situation the proposition is construed as being about this referent, i.e., as expressing information that is relevant to and that increases the addressee's knowledge of this referent" (Lambrecht 1994:131). The topic of a proposition is of *current interest*; the referent must either be already established in the discourse or easily related to one that is already established (Lambrecht 1994:164).

- the **introduction**, which "relates the author to the recipients and gives a greeting" (e.g., Eph. 1:1–2, 1 Cor. 1:1–3[3])
- the **closure**, which "consists of personal notes and a benediction" (e.g. Eph. 6:23–24, [4] 1 Cor. 16:19–24).

The rest of the book constitutes the **main body.**

Within the main body, Breeze's (1992) primary distinction is between the mainline hortatory **THESES** and the **supportive** information. This leads to the following classification of 1 Cor. 1:4–17:

4-9 supportive	*I give thanks to my God always for you because of the grace of God that has been given you in Christ Jesus, that/for in every way you have been enriched in him, in speech and knowledge of every kind—just as the testimony of Christ has been strengthened among you—so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ. He will also strengthen you to the end, so that you may be blameless on the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is faithful; by him you were called into the fellowship of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.*
10 HORT. THESIS	*Now I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you be in agreement and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same purpose.*
11-17 supportive	*For* (γάρ) *it has been reported to me by Chloe's people that there are quarrels among you, my brothers and sisters. What I mean is that each of you says, 'I belong to Paul,' or 'I belong to Apollos,' or 'I belong to Cephas,' or 'I belong to Christ.' Has Christ been divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you except Crispus and Gaius, so that no one can say that you were baptized in my name. (I did baptize also the household of Stephanas; beyond that, I do not know whether I baptized anyone else.) For* (γάρ) *Christ did not send me to baptize but to proclaim the gospel, and not with eloquent wisdom, so that the cross of Christ might not be emptied of its power.*

Meyer (1890:13) describes 4–9 as a "conciliatory preamble," which is consistent with Breeze's (1992) comments about Eph. 1:3–14: "In light of the context of the whole letter, this section is viewed as motivational information, designed to evoke in the readers a sense of joy and gratitude to God that will prepare them to receive the forthcoming commands with a proper attitude. This section also lays a foundation for the rest of the letter." In other words, 1 Cor. 1:4–9 **leads up** to the exhortation of 10. This is confirmed by the presence in 10 of the "development marker" δέ, which indicates that what follows builds on and develops from what precedes it.

In contrast, 11*ff* provide support for the **preceding** exhortation and/or for the expository THESES that occur later in the chapter (note the 'be' verbs in *the message about the cross **is** foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it **is** the power of God*—18). This is confirmed by the presence of the strengthening marker γάρ 'for', not only at 11, but also at the beginning of each of the paragraphs into which 10–31 are commonly divided (18 and 26).[5]

[3] Although many commentators call 1 Cor. 1:1–9 the Introduction to the book (e.g. Bratcher 1982:2), they still separate 1-3 from 4–9 (Bratcher 1982:4, 9).

[4] In her article, Breeze (1992) treats 6:21–24 as the closure, but agrees (p.c.) that it is better to limit the closure to 23–24.

[5] In 1:26, βλέπετε may be taken as indicative ('you see') or imperative ('see, consider'). Either way, it appears to function as an **attention getter**. The presence of γάρ 'for' indicates that the function of 26 is to strengthen previous material. In fact, attention getters may be used to give prominence to either hortatory or supportive information. Although they may contain an imperative, they are not automatically mainline exhortations.

3. Inductive Style versus Deductive Style

Inductive writing is characterized as having the thesis statement in the **final** position.

Deductive writing has the thesis statement in the **initial** position (see Connor 1996:42).

We noted in sec. 2 that 1 Corinthians 1:4–9 **leads up** to the exhortation of 10. In other words, these verses could be said to have **inductive** style, with the hortatory THESIS in the final position.

In contrast, the hortatory THESIS of 10 is followed by supportive material (in the first instance, 11–17—Terry 1995:172). In other words, this part of the text has **deductive** style.

In fact, while examples of inductive reasoning periodically occur in 1 Corinthians,[6] much of the book follows deductive reasoning.[7]

Now some examples from **Hebrew**.

When the LORD gives commands to the people of Israel through Moses, He typically uses **deductive** style. Ex. 20:5 provides an example:

5a HORT. THESIS	*You shall not bow down to them or worship them;*
5b supportive	*for (kî) I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God...*

Similarly, when David appeals to God in Psalm 54, he uses deductive style:

1-2 HORT. THESIS	*Save me, O God, by your name and vindicate me by your might. Hear my prayer, O God; listen to the words of my mouth.*
3 supportive	*for (kî) strangers attack me and ruthless men seek my life; they give no thought to God. Selah.*

When the daughters of Zelophehad present a request to Moses, in contrast, they use **inductive** style (Num. 27:3–4):

3-4a supportive	*Our father died in the desert. He was not among Korah's followers, who banded together against the LORD, but he died for his own sin and left no sons. Why should our father's name disappear from his clan because he had no son?*
4b HORT. THESIS	*Give us property among our father's relatives.*

Similarly, when the LORD speaks to Moses in Ex. 3:7–10, He uses inductive style:

7-9 supportive	*I have indeed seen the misery of my people in Egypt. I have heard them crying out because of their slave drivers, and I am concerned about their suffering. I have come down to rescue them from the hand of the Egyptians and to bring them up out of that land into a good and spacious land... Now the cry of the Israelites has reached me, and I have seen the way the Egyptians are oppressing them.*
10 HORT. THESIS	*And now, go. I am sending you to Pharaoh to bring my people the Israelites out of Egypt.*

4. Deductive versus inductive reasoning and instruction versus persuasion

Kompaoré (2004) proposes classifying hortatory discourses according to four parameters. The most significant parameter appears to be what she calls the "volitive weight" of the exhortation (Kompaoré 2004:40).[8] A basic distinction is between **instruction**[9] and **persuasion**:[10]

---

[6] Terry (1995:91) points out "the presence of an inductive argument style in which the reasons, motivational material, and contrastive elements are presented before the actual point of the paragraph is revealed."

[7] Terry observes (1995:172), "These verses also show a strong predominance of right branching paragraphs."

[8] The other three parameters proposed by Kampaoré are:

- **INSTRUCTION**: a speaker or writer (exhorter) considers himsef or herself to have the right or authority to tell the exhortee how to behave (apostolic authority, in the case of Paul's epistles). The Ten Commandments (Ex. 20:2–17) are instructional (one is cited in sec. 3). Directives from employers to employees are typically of this type. In some cultures, parents also have the right to instruct their adult children how to behave once married, etc. This category may even include strong **rebukes** of existing behaviour, as when someone 'instructs' a friend to stop maintaining enmity with another person or to stop being lazy. **Demands** to act in a certain way seem to fit here, too, such as when the Israelites call on Aaron to make them an idol (Ex. 32:1).
- **PERSUASION**: the exhorter "appeals to the **reasoning logic** of the recipient, seeks to convince" (Kompaoré 2004:40). Examples include the request of the daughters of Zelophehad to Moses (cited in sec. 3), David's speech to Solomon (1 Chr. 22:7–16—cited below in sec. 5) and Paul's speech to the philosophers in Athens (Acts 17:22–31). Typically, the exhorter uses persuasion because he or she cannot make the exhortee pursue the desired course of action. However, there are occasions when a person in authority chooses to persuade rather than instruct (e.g. the exhortation of the LORD to Moses in Ex. 3:7–10—cited in sec. 3).

Both major language types (VO and OV) typically use **inductive** reasoning for PERSUASION. However, problems arise when translating an INSTRUCTION from a VO language like Greek, Hebrew or English into an OV language.

In **VO** languages, it is normal for an exhorter to use **deductive** reasoning for INSTRUCTIONS. In natural texts in **OV** languages, in contrast, such texts tend to begin with the THESIS, follow it with supportive material, then close it with a reiteration of the THESIS (an '***inclusio***').[11]

This is illustrated by the following extract from a hortatory text in Menya (Non-Austronesian, Papua New Guinea).[12] The introductory sentences (1–2, part of the message framework—sec. 2) are followed immediately by the first exhortation of the text (3), which is then supported (4–5), before being repeated (6):

1-2 framework	*Concerning me giving my oldest son instruction. I give him instruction such as this.*
3 HORT. THESIS	*My bringing you to school, it's for this: to go to gain knowledge, you are not to be lazy and are always to go.*
4 supportive	*The reason is this: I your father will no longer be alive [one day] and because of that I send you.*
5 consequence	*Then you also will become big and live later and [then] no longer be alive.*
6 HORT. THESIS	*That being the case, you should always be one who goes without being lazy, listens to whatever the teacher teaches you (plural), learns and follows it.*

We shall return to the mismatch between how VO and OV languages handle instructions in sec. 6.[13]

- social relationships between the "exhorter and the exhortee" (Kompaoré 2004:24): power, authority, eldership, knowledge and wisdom superiority
- "action for the benefit of" (Kompaoré 2004:25): exhorter, exhortee, third party, not pertinent
- "directive validity" (Kompaoré 2004:40): incontestable, contestable, open to judgment

[9] Following Longacre (1995:18–20). Kompaoré (2004:27) uses the term "imposition."

[10] Appeals such as that of Psalm 54 are discussed in footnote 13.

[11] *Inclusio* structures involve the "bracketing of a pericope by making a statement at the beginning of the section, an approximation of which is repeated at the conclusion of the section" (Guthrie 1998:14).

[12] The text was written by John Manggo in preparation for a National Translators Course in 1996 and translated by Carl Whitehead.

[13] Kompaoré's "volitive weight" category also includes **APPEALS**: the exhorter, who does not have authority over the exhortee, "appeals to the volition" of the exhortee (Kompaoré 2004:27). An example is David's appeal to God in Psalm 54:1–3 (cited in sec. 3). However, I suspect that it is the **urgency** of the appeal that leads David to use deductive reasoning in this Psalm, as hortatory discourses such as 'Help me! I'm stuck' also use deductive reasoning.

5. Types of supportive information

Breeze (1992:317) distinguishes four types of supportive information in Ephesians: situational, motivational, credential, enabling. The following are her definitions of the four types.

- **Situational** information 'explains the situation or circumstances out of which the discourse arises and why the exhortation is necessary' (Breeze 1992:316). It includes the schematic category that Longacre (1983:3) labels "problem." Breeze (1992) cites Ephesians 2:1–3 as an example.
- **Motivational** information "encourages the hearer to heed the exhortations in the following ways: by giving the reasons for obeying them; by pointing out certain consequences that might occur if a command is or is not heeded; by drawing attention to the ethical, moral, or religious values of the hearer's society that provide the motivation to conform; and by appealing to one's sense of responsibility" (Breeze 1992:315). Most supportive information is motivational.
- **Credential** information "supports the speaker's or author's right to give the commands with the expectation that they be heeded" (Breeze 1992:315). Ex. 20:2 is a particularly clear example: "I am the Lord your God, who rescued you from slavery in Egypt."
- **Enabling** information "informs or reminds readers of what has already been done to help them keep the commands" (Breeze 1992:317). Breeze cites the prayer of Ephesians 3:14–21 as an example.[14]

Application of Breeze's (1992) classification to other hortatory discourses (especially in OV languages) has led to the following modifications:

- The 'situational information' category needs to be extended to include **topic introducers**. The main body of a hortatory discourse often begins with such a sentence, stating the topic to be addressed. An example from Amharic (Semitic, Ethiopia) is 'Although it is not necessary to teach you that good behaviour comes from upbringing, I would like to point out some things' (about the topic of good behaviour). 1 Cor. 7:25 is similar, although it does contain some credential information ("Now concerning virgins, I have no command from the Lord, but I give my opinion as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy").
- It is useful to distinguish **consequences** from **other motivational** information. Even when a passage generally follows the inductive style (sec. 3) in which other supportive information leads up to an exhortation, consequences still tend to follow it.

  This is seen when David charges Solomon to build a house for the LORD (1 Chr. 22:7–16). He begins by describing the situation and giving motivational information that builds up to the exhortations of 11–12. These are followed by the consequences of obeying them (13a), before David concludes the first part of his speech with further exhortations (13b):

7–10 situational/ motivational	*My son, I had it in my heart to build a house for the Name of the LORD my God. But this word of the LORD came to me: "You have shed much blood and have fought many wars. You are not to build a house for my Name, because you have shed much blood on the earth in my sight. But you will have a son who will be a man of peace and rest, and I will give him rest from all his enemies on every side. His name will be Solomon, and I will grant Israel peace and quiet during his reign. He is the one who will build a house for my Name. He will be my son, and I will be his father. And I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel forever."*

[14] In a pre-publication review of this article, an anonymous referee points out that it is often difficult to distinguish enabling and motivational information. "Thus a 'reminder' may function as a 'motivation' in a particular epistle of Paul."

11–12 HORT. THESES	*Now, my son, the LORD be with you, and may you have success and build the house of the LORD your God, as he said you would. May the LORD give you discretion and understanding when he puts you in command over Israel, so that you may keep the law of the LORD your God.*
13a consequences	*Then you will have success if you are careful to observe the decrees and laws that the LORD gave Moses for Israel.*
13b HORT. THESES	*Be strong and courageous. Do not be afraid or discouraged.*

- It is often difficult—and unnecessary—to distinguish between **situational** information and other motivational information (as defined above) that precedes and leads up to an exhortation. See 1 Chr. 22:7–10 above.

6. Distribution of different types of supportive information in VO and OV languages

We are now ready to compare the typical distribution of the most common types of supportive information in VO and OV languages.[15] Table 2 provides a comparison for the two language types.

Table 2. Distribution of supportive information in VO and OV languages

Type of information Language type:	VO	OV
Situational/Topic introducers	precede exhortations	precede exhortations
Consequences	follow exhortations	follow exhortations
'Other motivational': in PERSUASION	precede exhortations	precede exhortations
in INSTRUCTION	follow exhortations	in the middle of *inclusios* (see sec. 4)

Table 2 suggests that, when translating from a VO to an OV language, problems in the order in which the information is presented are most likely to arise when 'other motivational' material such as explanations for exhortations and reasons for obeying them occur in instructional texts. Similar problems arise with explanations for **expository** THESES and reasons for accepting their validity. Such supportive information typically follows THESES in VO languages—an ordering that can be problematic in OV languages.

The following are possible ways of handling such potential mismatches between the two language types when two or more sentences are involved:

- Preserve the deductive style in the receptor language. The danger of this option is that naïve readers of an OV language often treat material that supports a **preceding** THESIS as though it were supporting a **following** THESIS. Consider Ex. 20:4–7, for instance:

4–5a HORT. THESES	*You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. You shall not bow down to them.*
5b–6 supportive	*For (kî) I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing love to a thousand generations of those who love me and keep my commandments.*
7a HORT. THESIS	*You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God.*
7b supportive	*For (kî) the LORD will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.*
8a HORT. THESIS	*Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy.*

[15] I have not yet studied whether credential and enabling information tend to occur in the same place in VO and OV languages.

If 5b is translated without any connective into an OV language,[16] naïve readers may well treat 5b–6 as supporting the THESIS of 7a:[17]

5a HORT. THESIS	*You shall not bow down to them.*
5b–6 supportive	*I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing love to a thousand generations of those who love me and keep my commandments.*
7a HORT. THESIS	[implied *So*] *You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God,*
7b supportive	*The LORD will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.*
8a HORT. THESIS	*Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy.*

- Preserve the deductive style in the receptor language, but introduce the supportive material with a logical connective such as *because* or *The reason (is that)*, even though such a connective is rarely found in natural texts. Unfortunately, the typical effect in an OV language of doing this is to give more prominence to the reason than to the command that it supports (see Levinsohn 1999):

5a hort. thesis	*You shall not bow down to them.*
5b SUPPORTIVE	*The reason: I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, [6]but showing love to a thousand generations of those who love me and keep my commandments.*
7a hort. thesis	*You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God.*
7b SUPPORTIVE	*The reason: the LORD will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.*

- Change the order of the THESIS and supportive material, so that the deductive style becomes inductive:

7b supportive	*The LORD your God will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.*
7a HORT. THESIS	[So] *You shall not misuse his name.*

  This is usually acceptable socio-linguistically if the change of order occurs within a verse or involves the reordering of just two verses. The danger of this option is that changing to inductive style may also change the nature of the exhortation from instruction to persuasion (see sec. 4).

- Some reasons or explanations may be changed to a consequence of obeying the preceding exhortation (this is a very natural option in many OV languages):

7a HORT. THESIS	*You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God.*
7b consequence	*If anyone misuses his name, the LORD will not hold that person guiltless.*

- Use an *inclusio* by repeating part or all of the THESIS after the supportive material (see the extract from Menya, as discussed in sec. 4).

7a HORT. THESIS	*You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God,*
7b supportive	*The LORD your God will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.*
7a′ HORT. THESIS	*So you shall not misuse his name.*

In the case of the commandment of 4–6, the potential for an *inclusio* is already present because 4–5a contains more than one exhortation. If one of them precedes the supportive material of 5b and the other follows it, the result is a very natural *inclusio*:

[16] In Inga, which is an OV language, whenever my co-translator was drafting a verse in which an exhortation was followed by supportive material introduced with "for," his first inclination was to preserve the order of propositions and introduce the supportive material without any conjunction.

[17] The content of 7b makes it less likely that a naïve reader will relate it to 8a.

4 HORT. THESIS	*You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below.*
5b supportive	*I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, [6]but showing love to a thousand generations of those who love me and keep my commandments.*
5a HORT. THESIS	*So you shall not bow down to them.*

7. Application to the Language You are Analysing

The following are suggested steps for analysing a hortatory (directive) text:

1. Identify any sentences of the text that provide the **message framework** (see sec. 2).
2. Identify any exhortations that only function as **attention getters** (see footnote 5).
3. Classify each remaining **sentence** as hortatory (thesis) or as supportive material (see sec. 2).
4. Sub-classify the **supportive** information as credential, enabling, consequences or situational/ other motivational material (see sec. 5).
5. If an expository paragraph is used to present supportive information, identify its THESIS and how the THESIS is supported.
6. When a hortatory or expository THESIS is supported by motivational material other than consequences, is the style typically inductive (with the supportive material preceding the THESIS), deductive (with the supportive material following the THESIS) or a combination of the two (e.g. an *inclusio* with THESES both preceding and following the supportive material)?
7. Classify the text as instruction or persuasion (see sec. 4).
8. Analyse other hortatory (directive) texts to check and expand on your conclusions.

References

Bratcher, Robert G. 1982. *A Translator's Guide to Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians*. London/New York/Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

Breeze, Mary. 1992. Hortatory discourse in Ephesians. *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5 (4): 313–47.

Connor, Ulla. 1996. *Contrastive Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Guthrie, George H. 1998. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Books.

Kompaoré, Anne E. Garber. 2004. *Discourse Analysis of Directive Texts: The Case of Biblical Law*. M.A. Thesis, Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Elkhart IN.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 1999. Ordering of propositions in OV languages of Brazil. *Notes on Translation* 13 (1):54–56.

———. 2005. *Self-instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis*. Online at https://mail.jaars.org/~bt/narr.zip.

Longacre, Robert E. 1983. Exhortation and mitigation in First John. *Selected Technical Articles related to Translation* 9.3–44.

———. 1995. Building for the worship of God: Exodus 25:1–30:10. In Bodine, Walter R. ed. *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers,* 21–49. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 1996. *The Grammar of Discourse*. 2nd edition. New York: Plenum.

Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. 1890. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians*, translated from the fifth edition by D. Douglas Bannerman. Revised and edited by William P. Dickson. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Terry, Ralph Bruce. 1995. *A Discourse Analysis of First Corinthians*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and The University of Texas at Arlington.