

A P P E N D I X B

Transition Markers

Participial clauses account for a remarkably high proportion of episode-initial material. Matthew uses such participial links much more than Mark or Luke.

These participles fall into two groups with respect to their cases though there is a small residue. In many instances there is a nominative participle which is syntactically attributive to the subject of the main verb of the sentence (or the first main verb, if there is more than one). Rather rarely, the participle simply gives added information about an already named subject; 1:19 is the only clear example of this, and the participle there is the verb 'to be', which may have a unique distribution.

In many cases, as already noted in section 3.2.1, a nominative participle has the effect of bringing an already named participant into the foreground in a narrative or dialogue passage. In Act 1 we may list examples in 1:24, 2:3, 14, 21, 3:7, 15, 4:21, 8:8, 10, 9:2, 4, 8, 11, 19, 23. It is interesting to observe that the participle in these examples always precedes the name of the participant if this is given. An exception is in 9:22, where the name comes first, but is followed by *two* participles. If the participant is already clear in the flow of the story, the name may be replaced by an article which then precedes the participle (2:9, 4:20, 22, 9:12, 31).

Many of the above examples are not episode initial. Where nominative participles do occur at the beginning of an episode, they seem to have a double function. In terms of the discourse flow, they mark some degree of transition and in terms of the participant alternation, they retain focus on the last major participant (4:12, 18, 8:14, 18, 9:1, 9, 12:9, 14:13, 15:29).

In a large number of other examples the participle is in the genitive, a "genitive absolute" construction. In many cases these have the effect of backgrounding a participant and switching focus on to another participant or event (1:18, 20, 5:1, 9:10, 33, 11:7). When in episode-initial position, a genitive absolute also has a double function. In terms of participants, it puts someone into the background and in terms of the discourse flow, by the very switch of focus, it marks a transition point (2:1, 13, 19, 8:1, 5, 28, 9:18). In quite a few cases, the genitive absolute is followed by *ὅσοι*, which seems to emphasize the switch of focus (1:20, 2:1, 13, 19, 8:1, 9:18, 12:46, 20:29, 26:47, 28:11).

There are a few places where a genitive absolute does not involve a participant, but is a means of giving a temporal setting e g 8:16, 27:1, 57.

The residue of participial forms show the dative case, as required by the following main verb (8:23, 9:27, 28). They also seem to involve a focus switch. But why the participle is in the dative in these examples, when it is in the genitive in the similar syntactic context of 1:20, 5:1, 8:1, 5, 28, 9:18 is hard to determine. By the canons of classical style the residual examples are more "correct".

Another item which is of frequent occurrence at transition points is $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$. Sometimes it seems to have the purpose of reintroducing a character who has not been mentioned for some time, or who has not been in focus for some time (e g 3:13, 9:14) but usually it seems to be just a vague link word without any very precise reference to time.

Finally a brief word about settings of time and place. In episode-initial position, it is rare to have both specified. Chronological order was evidently not one of Matthew's primary interests, at least in the bulk of his narrative, for place settings are considerably more common, at least in Act 1. Only in 2:1 and 3:1 are there time references to events outside the narrative itself, and these are not quite what a modern historian would wish to see. Events are often loosely related to each other by $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$, and occasionally by tighter links (e g 8:18, 23, 28, 9:18, 12:46).