

**PATTERN
ANALYSIS
METHODOLOGY**

An Innovative Approach to Literary Structures

A Structural-Rhetorical Methodology for Pericopes

Thomas B. Clarke

Version 1.65

**Pattern Analysis Methodology:
An Innovative Approach to Literary Structures,
A Structural-Rhetorical Methodology for Pericopes**

© 2024 by Thomas B. Clarke

Thomas B. Clarke Publications
Dillsburg, Pennsylvania 17019

ISBN 978-0-9816213-7-1
Printed in the United States of America

www.ThomasBClarke.com

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any other means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or any other—except for brief quotations without the permission of the author.

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®, Copyright ©1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 (NASB 95) by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Tom@ThomasBClarke.com

In preparing this manuscript I have but one hope,
that in some way it will help restore
the Holy Bible to its rightful position.

May You, O Lord, use this work towards that end.

Contents

Abstract	xi
Preface	xii
1. What is Pattern Analysis?.....	1
1.0. Overview of Pattern Analysis.....	1
1.1. How to Use This Manuscript	2
1.2. Terminology.....	3
1.3. Project Scope.....	5
1.4. Objective	6
1.5. Methodology.....	7
1.6. Results to Date.....	8
1.7. The Voice of the Holy Spirit	10
1.8. Importance of Pattern Analysis.....	11
2. The Demarcation Model.....	14
2.0. Overview of the Demarcation Model	14
2.1. Background of the Demarcation Model	15
2.2. Markers and First-element Frames.....	16
2.2.1. Identification of Markers.....	16
2.2.2. Location of Markers	19
2.2.3. First-element Frames.....	22
2.2.4. Consistency of Demarcation Devices	23
2.3. Verification of Demarcation	24
2.3.1. Well-Documented Themes.....	24
2.3.2. Cohesive Themes.....	25
2.3.3. Subjectivity.....	27
2.3.4. Continuity.....	28
2.4. Demarcation Case Studies	29

2.4.1. Peter Called Two to be Raised	29
2.4.2. Belshazzar	29
2.4.3. Love One Another.....	31
2.4.4. Nadab and Abihu	32
3. The Structural Model.....	34
3.0. Overview of the Structural Model	34
3.1. My Structural Process	36
3.2. Basic Structures and Substructures	39
3.3. Structural Case Study.....	42
3.3.1. Name of the Basic Literary Device.....	43
3.3.2. Topic of the Pericope	43
3.3.3. Beginning Marker or Frame	43
3.3.4. Symmetric Elements.....	43
3.3.5. Sub-Unit Markers.....	44
3.3.6. Asymmetric Elements	44
3.3.7. Closing Summary	45
3.3.8. Chiasm Substructure	45
3.4. Lettered Devices	46
3.4.1. Chiasm.....	46
3.4.2. Parallel Symmetry.....	47
3.4.3. Immediate Repetition.....	49
3.4.4. List.....	51
3.4.5. Consistency of Lettered Devices	53
3.5. Asymmetric Devices	55
3.5.1. Extra	56
3.5.2. Absence.....	58
3.5.3. Transposition.....	58
3.5.4. Variation	60
3.5.5. Consistency of Asymmetric Devices.....	61
3.6. Non-Lettered Devices	61
3.6.1. Summarization.....	62

3.6.2. Preliminary	63
3.6.3. Frames	64
3.6.4. Imperative.....	66
3.6.5. Parenthesis.....	67
3.6.6. Consistency of Non-lettered Devices	68
3.7. Structure Combinations.....	68
3.7.1. Composite.....	68
3.7.2. Structure Split.....	69
3.7.3. Link	71
3.7.4. Drill	72
3.7.5. Consistency of Structure Combinations	73
4. The Rhetorical Model.....	74
4.0. Overview of the Rhetorical Model.....	74
4.1. My Rhetorical Process	78
4.2. Rhetorical Case Study.....	79
4.2.1. First/First.....	80
4.2.2. Extra	81
4.2.3. Last/Last.....	82
4.2.4. Closing Summary	82
4.2.5. Question	83
4.2.6. Documentation of the Rhetoric.....	84
4.3. Lettered Devices	85
4.3.1. Center Point	86
4.3.2. First/Last	87
4.3.3. First/First and Last/Last	87
4.3.4. Corresponding Elements	88
4.3.5. Correlation of Sequences	90
4.4. Asymmetrical Devices.....	92
4.4.1. Extra	92
4.4.2. Absence.....	94
4.4.3. Transposition.....	95

4.4.4. Variation	98
4.5. Non-lettered Devices	99
4.5.1. Summarization.....	99
4.5.2. Preliminary	100
4.5.3. Frames	100
4.5.4. Parenthesis.....	101
4.6. Grammatical Devices	101
4.6.1. Imperative.....	102
4.6.2. Question	102
4.6.3. Interjection.....	104
4.6.4. Repetition	105
4.7. Comparative Devices	106
4.7.1. Comparison and Contrast	106
4.7.2. Intensification.....	107
4.7.3. Amplification.....	109
4.8. Link.....	110
4.9. Consistency of the Rhetorical Model	112
5. Final Case Study	115
5.0. Overview of Exodus 19 and 20	115
5.1. Pericope Demarcations	115
5.2. Basic Structure	116
5.3. Parallel Symmetry and Variation	117
5.4. Frame (First Element)	119
5.5. Closing Summary and Decalogue.....	120
5.6. Frame (Second Element).....	121
5.7. Application.....	122
6. Concluding Thoughts	124
6.0. Overview of Pattern Analysis's Innovation	124
6.1. Consistency of Methodology	124
6.2. Implications of Pattern Analysis	129
6.3. Further Investigation	130

6.4. Application.....	131
6.5. A Love Response	132
Appendix: The Pattern Analysis Software	134
Glossary of Terms	138
Bibliography.....	149
Scripture Index.....	152
Back Cover.....	159

Figures Within This Manuscript

Figure	Title
1.	1 John 4:7–19 (Structure)
2.	1 John 4:7–19 (Rhetoric)
3.	Leviticus 9:23 – 10:3 (Excerpt)
4.	Literary Structure of Acts 2:1–13
5.	Two Indentation Schemes for Proverbs 4:24,25
6.	Schema for Matthew 13:24–30, 36–43
7.	Acts 2:2–6 (First/First)
8.	Acts 2:2–6 (Extra)
9.	Acts 2:2–6 (Last/Last)
10.	Acts 2:7–13 (Structure)
11.	Acts 2:7–13 (Questions)
12.	Rhetorical Analysis of Acts 2:1–13
13.	Schema for Psalm 100
14.	Schema for Isaiah 6:8–13 (Excerpt)
15.	Schema for Ezra 5:7 – 6:11 (Excerpt)
16.	Schema for Acts 1:9–12
17.	Sub-Unit Markers in Exodus 19,20
18.	Schema for Exodus 19,20
19.	Schema for Exodus 19:10–17
20.	Schema for Exodus 19:3–9
21.	Schema for Exodus 19:18 – 20:18
22.	Schema for Exodus 20:19–26

In addition, three hundred (300) figures are intended for access through the internet. See [Online Figures in Pattern Analysis Methodology](https://emphasisinbible.com/paf/online-figures-in-pam.html), <https://emphasisinbible.com/paf/online-figures-in-pam.html>.

Abstract

This document presents a consistent methodology to analyze literary structures and rhetoric of pericopes (topical collections of verses) throughout the Bible. Pattern Analysis is an innovative approach that utilizes a variety of literary devices, not just chiasms—it is a substantial modification of Walsh's *Style and Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative* methodology. Included is a demarcation model (placement of markers), a structural model (organization of repeating elements), and a rhetorical model (recognition of persuasive and emphatic messages). The structural and rhetorical devices comprising these models appear consistently in every genre. These findings are based on roughly 21,000 of the 31,000 verses in the Bible. Software is available in prototype form so students may someday analyze their own structures, document their understanding of how the pericope persuades them, and view their analyses on dynamic web pages. This consistent Pattern Analysis methodology gives clarity to the Holy Spirit's emphases within pericopes as He inspired various human authors.

Preface

Increasingly more and more Bible students are becoming fascinated with literary structures. My study of that topic began over twenty years ago with limited formal biblical training—I was a designer and developer of computer software for most of my professional career. That background offered me a valuable perspective in the analysis of patterns. I am a persistent and curious man on a search to learn more. Like a small clump of moss, I find myself writing to a forest of redwoods. I pray this research and its subsequent software will prove helpful to those with a background in biblical studies.

I first learned about literary structure in 2002 with a discussion about *chiasms*.¹ I read Jerome Walsh's *Style and Structure in the Biblical Hebrew Narrative* twelve years later.² That manuscript was a significant input for this current work. Many fresh insights into literary structure are presented in that manuscript. Without Walsh's presentation and understanding, this research project and associated document may have never started.

Walsh introduces literary devices such as parallel symmetry, immediate repetition, alternation, and intensification. He particularly intrigues me with his statement that an *asymmetric* anomaly such as an insertion, deletion, or other structural disturbance is an intentional device that “draws a reader's attention. This gives asymmetry great potential as a literary tool.”³ He also observes that there can be multiple emphatic locations in a structure, not just an emphatic *center point*.⁴

Walsh wrote about the biblical Hebrew narrative, Genesis to Esther. Considering his structure and rhetorical emphasis teachings, God began to nudge me to validate his approach. Could I apply that methodology to every verse in the Bible? Would modifications be necessary? I became

1. A typical chiasm is an *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'* arrangement, and a parallel symmetry is an *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'* structure. The web page <https://www.bible-discernments.com/joshua/whatisachiasm.html> describes the chiasm.

2. Jerome T. Walsh, *Style and Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001).

3. *Ibid.*, 8.

4. *Ibid.*, 14.

particularly curious to see if his statements about emphatic locations were verifiable. I first responded to God's call in 2016.

As of this writing, a verse-by-verse analysis of seventy percent (70%) of the Bible has been completed. I prepared a means to consistently organize the text, *Pattern Analysis Software*, that applies to Genesis to Revelation. Walsh's approach, heuristic observations, and input from others led to the methodology explained in this manuscript. There are no stray or unattached verses.

In the seventh year of this project, various frequency analyses from the software database were performed. I wanted to see if there was clustering in some of the genres or if the results were reasonably consistent.⁵ These frequency analyses show that each genre has surprisingly consistent composition patterns. Each metric for the nine (9) major genres appears in similar proportions (Section 1.7, *Frequency Analyses*, and Section 6.1, *Consistency of Methodology*).

I am indebted to my daughter, Becky Hanusa, who provided critical insight at crucial points in the development of Pattern Analysis. Bob Schlenkler taught me how to develop dynamic HTML web pages.⁶ Toward the end of this project, Jeffery Wolfe, Randolph Vail, and Larry Wray offered critique of the findings and offered much support. I am deeply indebted to them all.

The examples in this methodology are mine. One cannot write about biblical issues without biases. I am a teacher of the Bible and a reader with reactions and discernments like anyone else. I am also fallible, which means I am human and can make mistakes. It is in that light that I invite comments from others.

Chapter One: What is Pattern Analysis? introduces this methodology. This chapter presents some foundational techniques that help distinguish Pattern Analysis.

Chapter Two: Pattern Analysis Fundamentals should help clarify some possible confusions that might otherwise arise.

Chapter Three: The Demarcation Model presents Pattern Analysis's approach to separate one pericope from another—markers within the pericope are also identified. As each new analysis is developed, identification of demarcation is a necessary first step in that process.

5. These analyses have nine genres: Torah, Non-Torah Narrative, Poetry/Wisdom, Major Prophets, Minor Prophets, Synoptic Gospels, Johannine Books, Paul's Epistles, and Other NT Writings.

6. Bob Schlenkler is the creator of *The Open Scroll*, <https://www.theopenscroll.com/>.

Chapter Four: The Structural Model identifies how pericopes are organized. Key elements of structures are defined with examples of each.

Chapter Five: The Rhetorical Model examines how the structured organization of a literary unit points to certain emphatic locations. A case study illustrates this persuasion based on Acts 2.

Chapter Six: Final Case Study analyzes Exodus 19 and 20. This robust literary unit shows many of the techniques presented in this manuscript.

Chapter Seven: Concluding Thoughts reviews the more significant findings, their implications, and their application. A summarization of the methodology's consistency is also included.

Appendix: The Pattern Analysis Software describes proprietary software on a laptop: a database that stores the demarcation, structural, and rhetorical data for each pericope, and a front-end application that manipulates the data. It is hoped that an organization will use this software as a prototype for a version that would be publicly accessible. Much of the richness and ingenuity of Pattern Analysis may be found in that software. Hopefully, students will someday analyze their structures and document their rhetorical understandings with that software.

Glossary provides a definition of various words and phrases from this manuscript.

Figure 1: 1 John 4:7–19 (Structure)

CHIASM (IMPERFECT):

... love one another: God abides in us and perfects His love in us...

BEGINNING MARKER: Beloved, (v7A)

a personal address

SUM let us love one another, for love is from God; (v7B)

OPENING SUMMARY: God's love is to love one another

IMMEDIATE REPETITION SUBSTRUCTURE ... the love for others is because of God...

a and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. (v7C)

love infers one knows God

a' The one who does not love does not know God, for God is love. (v8)

not love infers one does not know God

b By this the love of God was manifested in us, that God has sent His only begotten Son into the world so that we might live through Him. (v9)

God sent Jesus so we might live

b' In this is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins. (v10)

God sent Jesus to die for our sins

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Beloved, (v11A)

a personal address

FRAME if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. (v11B)

God loves so we love one another

A No one has seen God at any time; (v12A)

we have not seen God in this world

B if we love one another, God abides in us, and His love is perfected in us. (v12B)

loving one another perfects His love in us

C By this we know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He has given us of His Spirit. (v13)

we abide in God and He in us

D

no text

E We have seen and testify that the Father has sent the Son to be the Savior of the world. (v14)

we testify that Jesus is the Savior of the world

E' Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him, and he in God. (v15)

if we testify Jesus is the Son of God, he abides with God

D' We have come to know and have believed the love which God has for us. God is love, (v16A)

EXTRA: that we know God's love for us

C' and the one who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him. (v16B)

those who love abide in God and God in him

B' By this, love is perfected with us, so that we may have confidence in the day of judgment; (v17A)

His love is perfected within us

A' because as He is, so also are we in this world. (v17B)

God is in this world, as we are

PARENTHESIS There is no fear in love; but perfect love casts out fear, because fear involves punishment, and the one who fears is not perfected in love. (v18)

love is not perfected when we fear punishment

FRAME We love, because He first loved us. (v19)

God loved us first, so we love

Figure 2: 1 John 4:7–19 (Rhetoric)

Rhetoric

This is an IMPERFECT CHIASM: when we love one another, God abides in us and perfects His love in us. The word *Beloved* appears in the two markers (verses 7A and 11A) which address us in a personal way.

1) The OPENING SUMMARY, verses 7 to 10, is an emphatic argument for the remaining verses 11 to 19. Verse 7B states we are called to love because God gave that provision. In order for God to abide in us and love one another, we must first know that Jesus's death for our sins was the complete love sacrifice for us. The *a'* element is an AMPLIFICATION of *a*, as is the *b'* element an AMPLIFICATION of *b*.

2) The two FRAME elements, verses 11B and 19, make a strong point to love one another. God loves us, so therefore we are called to do the same to others.

3) God's abiding love is stressed in the two *B* CORRESPONDING ELEMENTS. Our love is perfected when we love one another, for then God lives within us in His perfect love. With that love, we can have certainty of our judgment on that final day (verse 17A).

4) The *C* CORRESPONDING ELEMENTS are important statements for they confirm how we know that God lives within us. That is, the presence of the Holy Spirit assures us that we live with God: *we in Him and He in us*.

5) We know that the EXTRA *D'* element is emphatic because there is no similar text between verses 13 and 14. The emphasis stated in verse 16A that God not only loves us, He is love (see also verse 8). That statement, *God is love*, is widely quoted which should confirm the sense of emphasis in those two verses.

6) The two *E* CENTER POINT elements of the chiasm (verses 14 and 15) incorporate the power of testifying and confessing Jesus, thereby allowing God to abide in him and him in God.

7) The PARENTHESIS in verse 18 is a corollary about how fear from punishment inhibits the understanding of perfect love.

1. What is Pattern Analysis?

A pericope (pronounced *pur-ic'-o-pee*, not to be confused with the word *periscope*) is a unit of literature such as a story, poetic piece, or prophesy. Pattern Analysis is the study of pericopes: how they are organized and how they persuade.

1.0. Overview of Pattern Analysis

Every narrative story, every poetic piece, every prophesy, every epistle, every apocalyptic writing—the entire Bible—is composed of pericopes. Every verse belongs to a pericope. How can I state that every pericope in the Bible obeys the methodology outlined in this manuscript? I can't—as of 2024, only seventy (70%) of the Bible has been completed—but the New Testament and Minor Prophets have been completed, and at least 50% of each remaining book has been analyzed. What can be stated is that every verse analyzed to date obeys this methodology, and there is strong consistency from one genre to the next. That consistency applies to the organization of each pericope and their persuasions.

Pattern Analysis—that is, this study of pericopes—exists for the sake of drawing people closer to God through the Bible. More than an academic approach that shows how scriptures are organized, Pattern Analysis asks the student to document how and what these organizations emphasize. In that process, awareness of the text and its meaning can become more personal. Therein lies its strength: to better know Father God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

Pericopes (or literary units) discuss a *topic* that spans one or possibly several paragraphs in the Bible.⁷ My study of patterns shows the average pericope length is eighteen (18) verses: some shorter, others longer.

7. Wilt and Wendland define a pericope as “a self-standing unit of discourse at the paragraph level of [a] structural organization.” Timothy Wilt and Ernst Wendland, *Scripture Frames and Framing: A workbook for Bible translators* (African Sun Media, Stellenbosch, South Africa, 2008), 269.

Pattern Analysis presents one complex but consistent methodology for each pericope of the Bible's sixty-six books. These pericopes have *literary structures*, that is how they are organized. Seminary students typically learn about *chiasms*, one of the organizational methods.⁸ Pattern Analysis investigates how these organizational methods add persuasion to the pericope, otherwise known as the structure's *rhetoric*. Through this analysis of literary structure and rhetoric, a deeper understanding of the biblical text emerges.

Most people in their congregations have not considered how biblical stories, poems, or prophecies are organized—for those that pursue Pattern Analysis, their approach to scriptures should be dramatically enhanced. Some have recognized there are many other organizational devices in addition to the chiasm.⁹ This manuscript may be the first to suggest that these various pericope organizations provide compelling evidence of One persuasive and inspired voice.

The goal is for the Bible student to see with their eyes, hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts (Isaiah 6:10). Over and over, chapter by chapter, book by book, Pattern Analysis enables scholars and laymen to grasp this unifying message and underlying intent through these pericope organizations. With Pattern Analysis, Bible students are offered an opportunity to discover the text for themselves. Students in this way grasp deeper understanding as they search for meaning and relationships within each passage, and then document their work.

1.1. How to Use This Manuscript

This manuscript is somewhat different from traditional teaching platforms. One major difference is in the use of internet-based dynamic web pages. Figure 1, *1 John 4:7–19 (Structure)* and Figure 2, *1 John 4:7–19 (Rhetoric)*, show the traditional approach to illustrative figures. They are located immediately before Chapter One. Instead, this manuscript normally uses dynamic web pages instead of the static figures to show an interactive view of the biblical text. If one clicks on a hyperlink such as [1 John 4:7–19](#), a web page is opened with the combined structure and rhetoric. Notice the effect when the mouse (or finger on screen-sensitive displays) is moved across the screen. [1 John 4:20 – 5:12](#), the next sequential pericope, offers a better illustration of the color changes.

8. The most commonly known organization of a literary structure is a chiasm. See my web page, *What is a Chiasm (or Chiasmus)?*, <https://www.bible-discernments.com/joshua/whatisachiasm.html>.

9. For example, a frequently found literary structure is a parallel symmetry (Section 3.4.2 *Parallel Symmetry*).

There are three hundred web pages associated with this manuscript that illustrate various concepts—this would be very cumbersome on a paper document. To help with that complexity, an index to these web pages is available at [Online Figures in Pattern Analysis Methodology](https://www.emphasisinbible.com/paf/online-figures-in-pam.html).¹⁰ It is recommended that to best understand this manuscript, one should view each online web page on a computer or tablet. In that way, this manuscript will be on one side, and its example(s) will appear on the opposite side:



NOTE: Despite their smaller size, larger cell phones may work when viewed in landscape mode. A computer or tablet would be a more ideal solution.

In addition to these internet teaching examples, the glossary at the end of this manuscript may supplement the various terms in this manuscript. That [Glossary of Terms](https://www.emphasisinbible.com/paf/pattern-analysis-glossary.pdf) is also available on the internet, <https://www.emphasisinbible.com/paf/pattern-analysis-glossary.pdf>. The dynamic web pages are not available through that glossary.

Thirty-seven (37) pericopes are used in this manuscript. A list of the web pages for these selected pericopes can be viewed at [Literary Units in Pattern Analysis Methodology](https://www.emphasisinbible.com/paf/literary-units.html), which is <https://www.emphasisinbible.com/paf/literary-units.html>. That list can be helpful when attempting to find literary units with similar characteristics.

1.2. Terminology

Many people like to learn from examples—this manuscript uses dynamic web pages to teach how concepts behave. When these web pages are opened, **GREEN** coloration identifies the location of these terms. For example, click on these two hyperlinks, [1 John 4:7–19](#) and [1 John 4:7–19](#). Both instances use the same web page. The first highlights the opening summary including a substructure,

10. <https://www.emphasisinbible.com/paf/online-figures-in-pam.html>

while the second identifies two center point elements towards the bottom of the web page. The following web pages illustrate some of the more common Pattern Analysis terms:

Basic structure—The major structural organization of a pericope: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Topic—A pericope’s central and unifying thought: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Element—The scriptural text along with the label, reference, and theme: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Element label—Identifiers that appear before the scriptural text: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Theme—Brief paraphrases of an element’s scriptural text: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Substructure—A set of elements that add understanding of a basic element: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Subtopic—The unifying thought of a substructure: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Summarization—An opening, closing, or substructure closing of a unit: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Frame—A pair of elements that enclose other elements: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Rhetoric—Descriptions of how the pericope persuades the individual: [1 John 4:7–19](#)

Pattern Analysis breaks each pericope into *elements*, each containing the Scriptures. A pericope or literary unit is a collection of elements, each with a documented *theme* paraphrasing the associated biblical text. The *element label* which appears on the left side of each scriptural text is an identifier. In Pattern Analysis, uppercase letters are used for the basic structure and lowercase letters substructure elements. Their colors may be either red or blue, such as SUM or SUB-UNIT MARKER. The red elements such as SUM or FRAME or A or X can have persuasive value which are documented in the rhetoric.

The element’s *themes* are often related and help persuade the reader. As a learning tool, analysts can learn much about the biblical text by preparing their own thematic paraphrases. Once these paraphrases are complete, group meetings may be helpful to gain insight and affirmation in what the text is saying.

Substructures, such as the immediate repetition substructure in [1 John 4:7–19](#), are seldom mentioned in literature. The words within the substructure and their organization add depth of meaning to the parent basic element. In the above example, vv. 7C–10 add additional understanding to v. 7B. By clicking **Hide**, the substructure will not be displayed—then a click on **Show** will make

that substructure reappear. This Hide/Show feature becomes increasingly important during analysis of the rhetoric.

1.3. Project Scope

Pattern Analysis is both a research and a development project. From a research perspective, it sought to determine if Walsh's methodology for analysis of literary structures would apply to the entire Bible, or if modifications would be necessary to make it applicable. The development effort is centered around those teaching materials deemed necessary to instruct others to learn and use this methodology in their own analyses.

Pattern Analysis looks at the entire Bible, Genesis to Revelation. It is not a study of micro-structures that might look at one or a couple verses, nor does it study the organization of an entire book. Rather, it looks at the pericopes which usually span just one or sometimes a few paragraphs. It applies uniformly to all Bible genres: poetry is no different than narratives.

The NASB 95 was selected as the Bible translation of choice for both the research and development portions.¹¹ This current manuscript, *Pattern Analysis Methodology*, uses the NASB 95. The number of examples in this manuscript are limited because the Lockman Foundation's copyright restricts quotation to no more than five hundred (500) verses without their express written permission.

Rigor is added through the Pattern Analysis Software, specialized computer software that, among other things, requires documentation that helps engage the student's heart. As of the date of this publication, the software is in prototype form only. When publicly available, the output of their analyses is expected to be dynamic web pages, potentially similar to the above-mentioned web pages. The software was designed so that, with some small modifications, other translations or the original languages—Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic—could be used.

Some initial rules were established from this project's onset. For example, each of the sixty-six books must have analyses for at least three contiguous chapters. Also, no verses of the NASB 95 translation were to be paraphrased, modified, rearranged, or skipped. The boundary for each analysis

11. The NASB 95 translation is based on formal equivalence, believing that a more literal translation would minimize the rearrangement of words from the original source.

was to be the pericope. A computer repository was created for storage and retrieval of each analysis. A format for creating each structure was part of the initial design plan, later named the Pattern Analysis Research Language (PARL). A mechanism for presenting all results as dynamic web pages was decided at a later date.

1.4. Objective

The purpose of this manuscript is to present the basic methods for uncovering the Holy Spirit's emphatic voice through patterned themes. While this methodology is based on 21,000 of the Bible's 31,000 verses, it has not undergone a scholarly critique. As of March 2024, that review is needed. The method is consistent across all Bible genres, which should draw some attention—it is hoped scholars will add comments that help refine the contents.

The study of literary structure throughout the Bible is well-documented.¹² Scholarly analysis often concentrates on *micro-level* structures, which consider the arrangement of a verse, stanza, or smaller unit.¹³ *Macro-level* arrangements are larger units of the text. Recently, discourse analysis has been developed to look at these arrangements.¹⁴ Some analysts look at still larger structural units such as an entire book.¹⁵ Pattern Analysis uses a *pericope-level* approach.

As mentioned in the Preface, Pattern Analysis began as a validation of Walsh's *Style and Structure in the Biblical Hebrew Narrative*.¹⁶ That is, the structural literary devices and associated locations for emphasis. He presented many literary devices, not just the chiasm that is more commonly known. These include devices such as parallel symmetry, alternation, and various forms of asymmetry. Walsh concentrated on Genesis to Esther with a focus on 1 and 2 Kings. My

12. Lund was the first in the United States to publish a significant work on chiasmus structures. Since then, many have contributed to the topic. Nils W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in the Form and Function of Chiastic Structures*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942).

13. For example, Berlin looked at the parallelism of Hebrew lines. Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*, (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985).

14. Scacewater subdivides macrostructures into global-level and local-level units of varying sizes and types. Todd A. Scacewater, *Discourse Analysis of the New Testament Writings*, (Dallas: Fontes Press, 2020, ed. Todd A. Scacewater), 24–7.

15. Dorsey found structures, mostly chiasms, that spanned entire Old Testament books. Within the larger books, he found smaller structures that covered multiple chapters. David A. Dorsey, *The Literary Structure of the Old Testament: A Commentary on Genesis-Malachi*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999).

16. Walsh, *Style and Structure*.

questions were: could his methodology be applied to the entire Bible, would modifications to that methodology be necessary, and are his observations about emphatic locations verifiable? I was particularly interested if those emphatic locations present a consistent means to discern the Holy Spirit's voice. A software approach was deemed helpful in analyzing, documenting, presenting, and retrieving these efforts.

Pattern Analysis began as a validation of Walsh's methodology for all biblical structural literary devices and the associated locations of emphasis.

This project's scope is the entire Bible, and the subject is each pericope (literary unit). It looks at three areas: the literary structure within the pericopes, the structure's rhetoric, and the presentation of each pericope. The structure is the pericope's organization of related elements, and the rhetoric is the emphasis based on each organization. The focus is on discovering the Holy Spirit's persuasive voice as given to various human authors.

1.5. Methodology

Classical approaches to literary structure have looked at the arrangement of the *A*, *B*, and *C* lettered sequences. The most common chiasm, for example, is an *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'* sequence. Little attention has been given to the embellishment of the pericope by those portions outside the structure. That is, the focus has been on the structure, not the pericope. A house has a structure, but a residential property will typically have a house and a driveway and landscaping. One owns the property, not just the house.

Therefore, Pattern Analysis includes non-structural methods such as markers, preliminary information, and summarizations. These methods add color and beauty to the property. Pattern Analysis is a toolbox of methods. It includes three models: a *demarcation model*, a *structural model*, and a *rhetorical model*. These are described in Chapter Three, Four, and Five respectively. The Pattern Analysis Software ties it all together and makes it accessible, as described in the Appendix. The result is one consistent methodology for analysis of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation.

The demarcation model determines the boundaries of each pericope and the significance of certain *markers* in the middle and end of a pericope. The structural model presents the organization of parallel patterns within each pericope. The rhetorical model documents the reader's

understanding of the Holy Spirit’s emphatic words. That is, identifying locations within each structural organization helps uncover substantial and persuasive thoughts for the reader.

Pattern Analysis is a search for more than structure. According to the rhetorical model, there are specific locations for each structural literary device to investigate for their persuasive value. Pattern Analysis suggests that the Holy Spirit is the voice that somehow spoke thematically to many different so-called authors. The search then is, How does He lead and motivate the reader?

The rhetorical model asks how the Holy Spirit leads and motivates through various structural parts of the pericope to convict the reader.

The Pattern Analysis Software brings together these three models. Currently in prototype mode, this software is essential for helping the analyst discover each analysis, apply good rigor, and categorize each pericope. The demarcation model is an integral part of the structural model, and the rhetorical model is dependent on a good analysis through the structural model. Presentation of completed analyses is an output of this software. Unlike static pieces of paper, when the descriptive documentation is complete, web pages are produced that allow dynamic changes of color.

The Pattern Analysis Software provides the ability to create and modify analyses, review each for common mistakes, query the analysis repository in multiple ways, and export analyses for presentation or review. The software does not perform the analysis—that is left to the person to help increase their understanding. The analysis output is presented as dynamic HTML web pages such as [1 John 4:7–19](#).

1.6. Results to Date

As of this writing in 2024, every verse of the New Testament and the Minor Prophets has been analyzed using this method. The other portions of the Old Testament have been analyzed by sampling at least fifty percent (50%) of every book. That is, roughly 21,000 of the 31,000 verses (70% of the Bible) have been analyzed. A list of the individual books may be seen at [Books Analyzed by Pattern Analysis](#). All 21,000 analyzed verses conform to this methodology, although nine (9) were rendered as parenthetical because they may not be part of the original text.¹⁷ To state this

17. By using a process known as text criticism, scholars have identified certain locations where the earliest versions of the Bible do not appear to be part of the original manuscript. The NASB 95 placed brackets—“[” and “]”—around twenty-two that are most suspicious. The nine that may be questioned for conformity to the

another way, of the roughly 21,000 analyzed verses, 20,991 conform well to the structured organizations of this methodology. The consistency of Pattern Analysis in every book is so strong that it would be surprising to learn there is an exception in the remaining portions.

Walsh's methodology is robust, but the implementation and validation of his work was challenging at times. By creating the Pattern Analysis Software that would apply to the entire Bible, the issue was that there were anomalies in the text that could have been better addressed. Numerous false starts developed in those early days, making many initial analyses immature. A continual struggle was how to convert portions of his approach consistently.

Pattern Analysis uses Walsh's methodology as a basis, but differences became apparent. Some of those differences are identified in the footnote below.¹⁸ These differences and the Pattern Analysis Software are considered significant enough to call this methodology Pattern Analysis. The various challenges with Walsh's methodology do not diminish his *Style and Structure* manuscript's contribution to biblical scholarship.

Pattern Analysis attempts to add rigor to the individual analyses by incorporating rules into the Pattern Analysis Software. Each analysis in this methodology focuses on the pericope: markers identify the beginning of every pericope, the structural organization of each pericope is classified into literary devices such as a chiasm, and rhetorical devices such as a center point and summarization, provide the reader with an understanding of persuasion. The two most common structural devices—the chiasm and the parallel symmetry—have been studied by many modern scholars, but there is more in Pattern Analysis. For example, a *substructure* can enhance the understanding of its parent element, a *preliminary* statement can present background information before the structure, and rhetorical devices such as *first/last* or *extra* can provide potential locations for emphasis.

pattern analysis methodology were rendered as a parenthesis. While the remaining thirteen seem to obey the rules of this model, that does not prove they were originally there. Interestingly, the NASB 2020 has removed some of those nine verses and marked the remainder as not part of the Majority Text. Those nine are Matthew 17:21; 18:11; Mark 15:28; 16:20B; Luke 17:36; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:6B-8A; and 28:29.

18. Some of the refinements, described more fully in subsequent chapters, are the standardization of demarcation rules without a need to know Hebrew or Greek, a more broad approach to identify themes, the identification of substructures as a subset of basic structure elements, the presence of split structures where a topic is continued after a break, the expansion of frames rather than inclusios; the removal of some literary devices from Walsh's methodology as unnecessary, the addition of other structural and rhetorical devices, and the focus on rhetorical analyses based on completed structural analyses.

Pattern Analysis should work with all word-for-word literal translations. For that reason, the NASB 95 translation was used in analyses. Knowing Hebrew or Greek is unnecessary, but a translation based on functional equivalence may not yield consistent results. Access to an interlinear Bible may help resolve questions about word meaning.

Pattern Analysis asks how various parts of the pericope, based mainly on the structure, persuade the reader. How does the Holy Spirit lead and motivate us to the point of conviction? The word “rhetoric” in this manuscript refers primarily to recognizing that certain structural elements are dominant and particularly persuasive to readers. This way, the text can gain greater clarity and provide a more emotive response. The analysis does not attempt to provide interpretive meaning to figures of speech such as metaphors or hyperboles. Nor is it related to Aristotle’s rhetorical model for persuasive speech.¹⁹ Instead, Pattern Analysis investigates how, through the organization of every pericope, the text’s persuasion may be better understood.

1.7. The Voice of the Holy Spirit

My bias in this project should be stated upfront: mine is a search for the emphatic voice of the Holy Spirit. I want to know what the Holy Spirit is attempting to emphasize through the text. As I read Walsh’s manuscript in 2014, I was so intrigued with the thought that the emphasis may be found in regular locations within the narratives. He wrote about emphasis in repetition, emphasis in symmetric structures, emphasis in asymmetric structures, and emphasis in other places.²⁰ While Walsh did not mention Holy Spirit inspiration in his manuscript, it seemed such a challenge: Is it possible that the Holy Spirit organized these pericopes so that His element-level themes would add persuasion to the entire Bible? That became my compulsion, my calling.

Not everyone reading this manuscript will agree with my perspective on the Holy Spirit’s persuasion. My views of Holy Spirit inspiration changed during the multi-year research and development of Pattern Analysis. While I generally agreed that all scripture is God-breathed at the start of this project, I came to see how, over and over, the same basic approaches were being used,

19. Aristotle, *Aristotle’s “Art” of Rhetoric*, trans. by Robert C. Bartlett (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019).

20. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 17,22,25,58,79

regardless of the genre. Please know, if there is a need to be convinced, I respect that position. I too needed to be convinced.

Bible students are often taught that to understand the biblical text, consideration of its genre is important.²¹ Clearly the style of each of the genres is distinctly different. Poetry is so very different from narrative writings. Prophecy and the Epistles are also so very different. It may then strike some as odd that Pattern Analysis presents one complex methodology that is useful and quite consistent across all genres. These findings to date are surprisingly consistent.

In the seventh year of this project, I prepared a frequency analysis of the seven basic structures. When this looked surprisingly consistent, I did the same analysis for substructures. That analysis, [Frequencies of Lettered Devices \(Structural\)](#), looks at the count per hundred instances. The nine major genres are individually compared with each other. On the right side, there is a column labeled “Mean: All Genres” and another column at the end that states “Total Devices.” In that analysis, there is a great deal of similarity between each genre and an equally strong similarity to the Bible as a whole.

In time, fourteen (14) *Frequency Analysis* charts were developed. Most of these other charts show similar results. However, these frequency analyses must be considered tentative. As of this writing in 2024, thirty percent (30%) of the Bible has yet to be scrutinized with Pattern Analysis, and most completed pericopes have not had an independent review. The evidence suggests but does not prove that the Holy Spirit’s voice, as spoken to various human authors, is reasonably consistent from one genre to the next. But it seems reasonable to state that Pattern Analysis is a consistent tool that can be applied equally across the entire Bible, in search for what is persuasive in each pericope.

1.8. Importance of Pattern Analysis

Someday, Bible students in seminaries, college campuses, churches, small groups, or even parochial schools may use software based on the Pattern Analysis methodology to analyze the Bible.

21. For example, Osborne writes, “My primary purpose [in Part 2, *Genre Analysis*] is to enable the reader to note the characteristics of the ancient genres as a key to interpreting biblical texts.” Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2006), 181.

Anywhere in the Bible—Genesis or Romans or Matthew or Isaiah or Psalms—anywhere, students would read and discover it afresh.

Pattern Analysis is a great learning tool for gathering fresh insight from the Bible. Once this is understood, students will hopefully apply the emphatic and persuasive portions of every biblical story, poem, prophecy, and all other portions, regardless of the genre. Reading the text this way, the voice of the Holy Spirit reveals vital truths that can leave lasting impressions. Because this methodology appears consistent across the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, it should be able to be used uniformly by students.

Pattern Analysis is a toolbox full of tools that can help exegetes better grasp the text before them. It adds rigor by requiring documentation, applying specific rules, and allowing various mechanisms to account for difficulties in their analyses. Those difficulties seem to be part of the Holy Spirit's approach to adding emphasis (Section 3.5, *Asymmetric Devices*).

While the Pattern Analysis methodology is complex, it has already shown itself to be reliable. It is based on the Bible's repetition in these literary units. It recognizes that themes are presented and/or repeated for emphasis. The emphasis offers a fresh opportunity to encounter God through the Holy Spirit.

Pattern Analysis has no theological bias—Catholics and Protestants, Reformed and Arminian, Cessationists and Continuationists—all can use this methodology with equal reliability. The approach is based on the scriptures by searching the text for the Holy Spirit's inspiration and emphasis.

There is thinking within modern scholarship that when reading the Bible, specific characteristics of each biblical genre must be considered from one genre to another.^{22,23} For example, the oracles of the prophetic books have a distinctly different tone than the narrative sections. The styles of the poetic and wisdom books are equally diverse. However, the perspective in Pattern Analysis is a structural and rhetorical approach that follows one set of rules for every genre.

22. Douglas Stuart, *Old Testament Exegesis, Fourth Edition, A Handbook for Students and Pastors* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 72.

23. Gordon D. Fee, *New Testament Exegesis, Third Edition, A Handbook for Students and Pastors* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 16.

Therefore, Pattern Analysis explains how each pericope is organized and how rhetorical devices contribute to understanding each narrative, poem, prophecy, and other genres. Pattern Analysis may be used to enhance the exegetical process—it uncovers the consistent influence of the Holy Spirit in stressing key points. The result is a complex yet consistent methodology applied to the entire New Testament and seems to apply equally to all the Old.

2. The Demarcation Model

When one looks at various translations of the same passage, paragraphs sometimes begin at different locations. For readers, that can affect how they understand the story, prophecy, epistle, or other genre. This demarcation model provides rules for the separation of these verse clusters.

2.0. Overview of the Demarcation Model

Demarcation in Pattern Analysis is a method to identify the beginning of a pericope and other specific locations within a pericope. Demarcation is the first of a three-step process and a necessary step before determining a pericope's structure, which is the second step. If the demarcation that identifies the beginning of the pericope is not well analyzed, the ensuing structural analysis and identification of rhetoric is off to a bad start.

This demarcation model adds rigor to each analysis. In the original languages of the Bible, paragraph marks did not exist. Instead, word indicators were placed in the text to identify important locations within a literary unit. Pattern Analysis requires that every pericope starts with either a *beginning marker* or a *first-element frame*. Also, *sub-unit markers* and *ending markers* distinguish middle and closing locations. These are discussed in greater detail in Section 2.2, *Markers and First-element Frames*.

Beginning markers—A beginning marker is a set of words that appear at the start of a pericope to identify the start of a topic. It closes the previous pericope. Examples are a change of location, a change of time, and a divine oracle such as “Then the LORD said ...”. In that way, a new literary unit begins. For example, [Proverbs 4:10–27](#) has a beginning marker in v. 10A.

First-element Frame—If a pericope begins with a frame, it is rendered a first-element frame. Frames can also appear within the pericope, but they are not first-element frames.²⁴ See [Psalm 146:1–10](#).

24. For those familiar with the term *inclusio*, a frame is conceptually similar. See Section 2.2.3, *First-Element Frames*, for further explanation.

Sub-unit markers—When a marker appears within a pericope, it is called a sub-unit marker that serves one of four purposes: the start of a lettered sequence, the beginning of a substructure, the separation of two parts of a basic structure or a substructure, or the start of a new element. A structural analysis can be more straightforward by first identifying sub-unit markers. Most pericopes have two or fewer sub-unit markers. There are six sub-unit markers in [Jeremiah 28:1–17](#): v. 1A, 2A, 5, 10A, 11B, and 17.

Ending markers—Less frequently, an ending marker can appear at either the end of a pericope or at the end of a substructure. For example, v. 9C of [2 Chronicles 5:2–14](#) is an ending marker that appears in the middle of a pericope—it is for a substructure.

2.1. Background of the Demarcation Model

My initial analysis of patterns in Matthew and Exodus began without adequate consideration of demarcation. Walsh's methodologies were used to perform analyses and document each resulting emphasis. Some of these first analyses were very good; some needed to be revised. For those initial analyses which lacked rigor, the demarcation had been ignored and the expected emphases were too often in the wrong locations. Proper demarcation is essential for a good analysis—it must not be bypassed for successful structural and rhetorical analyses of pericopes.

This demarcation model was adapted from Dorsey's method for identifying beginning and ending markers.²⁵ Consideration was then given to Walsh's approach which had many of the same identifiers.²⁶ The model was built heuristically, pericope by pericope, adding each new identifier based on the text. A standardized set of twenty (20) marker identifiers evolved.

Wendland's perspective of multiple markers within a pericope helped refine the model so that sub-unit markers are now included.^{27,28} The first-element frame was developed from Walsh's

25. Dorsey introduced markers such as a title, beginning words, shifts of time, place, characters, themes, genre, and verb tense, mood, or person. Dorsey, *Literary Structure*, 21-3.

26. The use of the repetition as a marker came from Walsh. *Style and Structure*, 119-143.

27. Wendland refers to the analysis of multiple markers as a look at *convergence*. Ernst R. Wendland, *The Discourse Analysis of Hebrew Prophetic Literature: Determining the Larger Textual Units of Hosea and Joel* (The Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, NY, 1995), 64-9, accessed March 23, 2018, Academia.edu.

28. Ernst R. Wendland, *Disjunctive Parallelism in the Psalter* (Lusaka), 15,16, accessed October 5, 2018, Academia.edu.

discussion of partial symmetry.²⁹ The result is a disciplined identification of markers and frames—my analyses improved and became more profound.

2.2. Markers and First-element Frames

Both Walsh and Wendland require knowledge of Hebrew in their demarcation methodologies.³⁰ That requirement to know Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek is a barrier for many modern Christians. One of the initial goals of Pattern Analysis was to see if a methodology could be created that does not require knowledge of original languages. The hope was that this might be possible using the NASB 95 (a more literal translation).³¹ The resulting demarcation model does not require an understanding of those languages.

Pattern Analysis may be unique within scholarship—it requires identification of demarcation at the beginning of the pericope. That is, the first element must specify it is either a beginning marker by specifying an appropriate marker identifier or a first-element frame. That requirement is an example of the rigor within Pattern Analysis.

2.2.1. Identification of Markers

There are twenty (20) possible marker identifiers, as shown below, and may also be viewed at [Marker Identifiers for the Demarcation Model](#). After each definition is an example of the identifier.

A beginning phrase—Words that transition the reader from one theme or topic to another: *But; For this reason; Furthermore; Now; Then; Therefore*. See also v. 3A in [Daniel 5:1–30](#).

A change of characters—An introduction of a new actor or set of actors: *He said to His disciples; Now a new king; He summoned the twelve; Now there was a man*. See also v. 2A in [2 Chronicles 5:2–14](#).

A change of flow—A shift in presentation, sometimes suddenly: *He said, “Who are you?”; It shall come about; Now when they heard this; So also it is written*. See also v. 5A in [Daniel 5:1–30](#).

29. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 57-59.

30. Jerome T. Walsh, *Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009),10.

31. The NASB 95 translation is based on formal equivalence, believing that a translation using functional equivalence could shift the placement of words too much from the original source.

A change of genre—A switch to/from narrative, poetry, prophecy, letters, songs, genealogy: *Now these are the ordinances; A prayer of Habakkuk; These also are proverbs of Solomon.* See also v. 24A in [Matthew 13:24–30,36–43](#).

A change of location—A movement from one physical place to another: *And He led them out; When Elijah returned; Jesus went away from there.* See also vv. 32, 36A, and 39A in [Acts 9:32–43](#).

A change of scene—Something changed, often without mention of a location, time, or other change: *Then another sign appeared; I again saw under the sun; So Joshua burned Ai.* See also v. 14A in [Luke 11:14–26](#).

A change of speaker—Someone else speaks, possibly even the narrator: *God said to Moses; Jesus answered them; Moses therefore spoke.* See also v. 5 of [Jeremiah 28:1–17](#).

A change of time—An apparent reference to time such as hours, days, weeks, on the day of, or afterwards: *After these things; At the end of every seven years; And when eight days had passed; In that day.* See also v. 19A in [John 20:19–29](#).

A change of topic—A different discussion than what preceded the current one: Sometimes the topical change does not have text, as seen in the beginning marker for [1 Corinthians 6:12–20](#).

A divine oracle—Reference to a directive from the LORD: *declares the LORD; Then the LORD said; Then the word of the LORD came to me, saying.* See also vv. 1A, 4A in [Isaiah 56:1–7](#).³²

A genealogy marker—A record of the generations, sometimes as a formula: *[name] reigned [] years; xxx was [] years old; yyy became king in his place; these were the sons of zzz.* See also v. 1A in [Jeremiah 28:1–17](#).

A grammatical change—A significant switch in semantic meaning. For example, a change of nouns/pronouns from “him” to “you”, or verbs such as past to future tenses, or indirect to direct speech. Between vv. 4:17B and 4:18A in [2 Timothy 1:1,2; 4:9–22](#), there is a change from past to future tense. See also v. 22A in [Daniel 5:1–30](#).

A personal address—Vocative words to a recipient: *My brethren; O LORD; O God; O Jerusalem; my beloved; my son; little children.* See also vv. 7A, 11A in [1 John 4:7–19](#).

A poetic marker—*Selah.* See also vv. 4B, 8B in [Psalm 62:1–12](#).

32. In a personal message in 2018, Wendland stated that this identifier is called a *divine oracle*.

A postscript—Concluding words of a structure or a substructure: *And the angel departed; To Him be the glory forever; Thus Moses finished the work.* See also v. 43 in [Acts 9:32–43](#).

A question—Part of the rhetoric: Who? What? When? Why? Will? Have you? How? Is there?: *What do you think? Are these things so? To whom then will you liken God?* See also v. 1A in [1 Corinthians 6:1–11](#).

A repeated phrase—A repetition such as an anaphora or epiphora (many words are defined in the [Glossary of Terms](#)): *I am the LORD your God; And all the people shall say, ‘Amen’; just as the LORD had commanded Moses; Now the rest of the acts of [xxxxx].* See also vv. 6B, 8B, 9B, 10B, 11B in [Amos 4:1–13](#).

A title—The opening words or superscription of a book or psalm: *A Psalm of David; In the beginning; Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus; The words of Amos.* See also v. 1A in [Psalm 62:1–12](#).

An imperative—A strong directive or command: *Beware; Hear, O Israel!; Praise the LORD!; Vindicate me, O God; Remember those who led you; Sing to the LORD a new song.* See also v. 3:12 in [Joshua 3:12; 4:1–9,19 – 5:1](#).

An interjection—An alert of something special: *And behold; Esau said, “Behold”; Woe to him who; Behold, the Son of Man is being betrayed into the hands of sinners.* See also v. 1A in [Isaiah 42:1–9](#).

The marker labeled “an interjection” may require some clarification. Most commonly, an interjection is the word “behold” in the NASB 95. An interjection seems to say that what follows is emphatic, particularly worthy of one’s attention. However, not all instances where *behold* appears are a marker. For example, the word *behold* appears twice in [Isaiah 42:1–9](#). In v. 1, it is the beginning marker for that literary unit. In v. 9, however, *behold* is identified as an interjection, and it is not appropriate to render it as a marker—that word instead adds emphasis to the following words of v. 9.³³ See Section 4.6.3, *Interjection*, for further clarification.

The above marker identifiers can apply equally to beginning, sub-unit, and ending markers within reason. The identifier “a title” would never be a sub-unit marker or an ending marker, and

33. Wendland, in his analysis of Habakkuk, provides an example of *behold* where it is a marker that helps determine how to parse vv. 4 and 5. He suggests that *behold* at the beginning of verse 4 emphasizes and announces the combined thought that groups those two verses together. Wendland, *Prophetic Rhetoric: Case Studies in Text Analysis and Translation*, (Dallas: SIL International, 2014), 433.

“a postscript” would never be a beginning marker. However, the twenty ways that markers are identified in this model have been sufficient for all pericopes analyzed to date.

[2.2.2. Location of Markers](#)

The value of markers is seen in their placement within the structural model. The selection of a “right” marker identifier is much less important than the fact that it was identified. For example, consider the words of Acts 2:1, “When the day of Pentecost had come, they were all together in one place.” That verse could have been rendered as a change of time, a change of location, a change of characters, or a change of scene.³⁴

In Pattern Analysis, the first appearing identifier is often used—in this case the change of time (Pentecost)—because subsequent words may be part of the background information (known as a preliminary in Pattern Analysis) or substructure. Whether that marker is a change of time, a change of scene, or any of the other identifiers does not matter in Pattern Analysis. However, the location of each marker often assists in parsing the pericope. The benefit of markers is that they can help understand the start of a pericope and any flow changes within it.

When analyzing a pericope, identification of potential locations where a marker appears can be beneficial in finding the breaks that occur. For example, a sub-unit marker may identify the separation of two sequences within a structure, such as *A-B-C-X-sub-unit marker-A'-B'-C'*. As mentioned at the beginning of Chapter Two, *The Demarcation Model*, markers have three locations: beginning markers identify the start of a pericope, sub-unit markers appear within the pericope, and ending markers are located at the end. The pericope for [Acts 9:32–43](#) is a good illustration of these various markers—it shows how markers can separate multiple portions of the pericope with a beginning marker, two sub-unit markers, and an ending marker (see also Section 2.4.1, *Peter Called Two to be Raised*).

Beginning Markers: The most common way pericopes are separated in Pattern Analysis is with beginning markers. As of this writing, ninety-two percent (92%) of the pericopes have a beginning marker at the start. The remaining pericopes begin with a frame (Section 2.2.3,

34. Wendland observes that the greater the number of potential identifiers, the greater the certainty it marks the beginning of a new literary unit. Wendland, *Disjunctive Parallelism*, 15-18.

First-element Frames). According to this demarcation model, every pericope must have either a beginning marker or the first element of a frame at the start of the pericope.

For example, [Luke 11:1–13](#) begins a new pericope with a change of time by stating, “It happened that ...”. The next pericope for [Luke 11:14–26](#) starts with a change of scene where a demonic spirit was exorcised. The third pericope beginning in Luke 11:27 is a change of characters as a woman raised her voice in the crowd.

For the pericope that covers [Daniel 5:1–30](#), the beginning marker in v. 1A is rendered as a change of characters because Belshazzar had not been previously mentioned in Daniel:

BEGINNING MARKER: Belshazzar the king held a great feast for a **a change of characters**
thousand of his nobles, (v1A)

Alternatively, it could have been a change of scene or even a change of location. The reason beginning markers are identified is to determine the pericope’s beginning—the choice of one particular identifier over another is far less important than the fact it is located.

Sub-Unit Markers: Identification of beginning markers can be difficult because other markers often exist within a pericope. Words such as “Thus says the LORD”, a change of time, or a personal address can appear after the beginning and before the end of the literary unit—these can be sub-unit markers. A sub-unit marker can indicate the first element of the lettered sequence, the start of a substructure, the separation of two parts of a basic structure or a substructure, or the beginning of a new element. For example, in [Jeremiah 28:1–17](#), v. 2A indicates the start of a lettered sequence, v. 5 separates the *A-B-C* structure from the *A'-B'-C'* structure, v. 10A is the beginning of a substructure, and v. 11B separates the *a-b-c* structure from the *a'-b'-c'* structure.

Some pericopes do not have any sub-unit markers, whereas others might have many. Most generally, the sub-unit markers appear at the beginning of a substructure or a point of change within the structure. [Leviticus 9:23 – 10:3](#) is another example with multiple sub-units.

Ending Markers: The least common of the boundary markers is the ending marker. Sometimes, an ending marker indicates the pericope or substructure is completed, such as Amen. An example of an ending marker occurs at the end of [Jeremiah 28:1–17](#), a postscript.

Another example is the repeated phrase, “And there was evening and there was morning”, at the end of each day in Genesis 1—that phrase is at the end of each substructure.

Pattern Analysis does not require an ending marker for every pericope. In 1969, Muilenberg identified the need “to recognize precisely where and how [a literary unit] begins and where and how it ends.”³⁵ However, in developing one model for both the Old and New Testaments, it became necessary to keep the requirement for a beginning but drop the necessity of an ending.³⁶ In many cases, an ending marker at the close of the pericope is not identified because one is often not clearly discernible.³⁷

Rather than search for an ending marker, as Muilenberg suggests, Pattern Analysis requires a solid structural analysis of each pericope. Pattern Analysis searches for the next beginning marker and topic unity. Therefore, the topical context of the literary unit and its structural organization helps confirm the closing boundary of the pericope, not the presence of an ending marker. Once a marker is identified, a determination is made to see if it is a beginning marker, a sub-unit marker, or an ending marker.

There are many instances in the Pattern Analysis repository where there is a beginning marker with no other demarcation, such as “But thanks be to God” in Paul’s epistles or the divine oracle “Thus says the LORD” in a prophetic book.

Through his demarcation approach, Wendland discusses the identifiers for each aperture and closure of the pericope.³⁸ His methodology, similar to Dorsey and Walsh, includes a process deemed *convergence* whereby a systematic approach identifies the boundaries for larger textual portions. He writes, “The more rhetorical-structural markers that appear together in a given colon or bi-colon,

35. James Muilenburg, “Form Criticism and Beyond”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 9, accessed May 15, 2022, Academia.edu.

36. Wendland observes that the closure of a literary unit often has a strong emphatic value that summarizes the main idea. Pattern analysis recognizes this summarization frequently exists but renders it separately as a *closing summary* because of its rhetorical value. Wendland, *Disjunctive Parallelism*, 17.

37. Wendland refers to a beginning marker as an *aperture* and an ending marker as a *closure*. While he suggests it is possible to identify a closure for each pericope in the Hebraic portions, he recognizes that “practically speaking, it is really necessary for only one of the two ‘sides’ of the border to be strongly marked.” Wendland, *Discourse Analysis*, 30–63, 66.

38. In Pattern Analysis parlance, an aperture is a beginning marker and a closure is an ending marker.

the more likely it is that this particular utterance constitutes a border which either opens or closes some larger compositional segment.”³⁹

Wendland’s discussion of convergence helps emphasize the importance of sub-unit markers. These sub-unit markers are helpful in the second step of Pattern Analysis, identifying the pericope’s structure in Chapter Four, *The Structural Model*.

[2.2.3. First-element Frames](#)

A first-element frame occurs when two elements appear with similar or antithetical themes, and that first frame element is also the *first element* of the literary unit. This discussion about the frame as the first element is a subset of a broader teaching about frames in Section 3.6.3, *Frames*. Like two bookends, frames surround a block of biblical text and may start at various locations throughout a literary unit. Many frames do not start in that first element position, such as [Amos 4:1–13](#). The description in this chapter is limited to those frames that start a literary unit.⁴⁰

The first-element frame starts at the beginning of a literary unit and is a subset of a broader discussion about frames.

Many scholars refer to a device called “an inclusio” which is a pair of bookends with similar words, phrases, or thoughts at or near the boundaries of a literary unit. A frame is a pair of bookends with similar themes that may have significantly different words and one or both ends may include a substructure. An inclusio is a type of frame. Long describes an inclusio as “bracketing a chunk of material with identical words or wording. The textual effect is cohesion, which may mark a boundary in the discourse.”⁴¹ [Psalm 146:10](#) has an inclusio at the beginning and end of the pericope, “Praise the Lord!” It surrounds the entire literary unit starting in verse 1 and is a first-element frame.

Wendland expands the definition of inclusio by stating that it can include “an obvious continuation of a thought pattern at the borders of a given literary unit.”⁴² The frame comprises

39. Wendland, *Discourse Analysis*, 64,65.

40. When a frame identifies the start of a pericope, it is recognized as a *first-element frame*. A frame often begins in the second or third element of the pericope, not the first element. In those scenarios, the start of the pericope is demarked by a beginning marker, not a frame. That broader usage of frames is presented in Section 3.6.3, *Frames*.

41. Fredrick J. Long, *II Corinthians: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015), 271.

42. Wendland, *Discourse Analysis*, 46.

Wendland's continuation of thought. Walsh mentions that a *thematic inclusion* is most certainly possible, yet he dismisses it because he feels it is difficult to demonstrate convincingly.⁴³ The frame in Pattern Analysis would be more akin to a thematic inclusion.

Where an inclusio has similar words, a frame can have similar themes with potentially different words. The two frame elements could be nearly identical or antithetical; one might be considerably longer than the other because it includes a substructure. The result is that a frame may be less obvious than an inclusio.

In Genesis 41, Pharaoh had two dreams. The pericope begins in v. 1 with a frame that introduces the first dream; v. 32 is the second frame element which appears after the interpretation of the two dreams. The repeated dreams ended and would soon come about. The two frames have similar themes, but the wording is considerably different. The second frame element marks the end of the pericope. Because of the difference in wording, the frame in vv. 1 and 32 is not an inclusio.

[2.2.4. Consistency of Demarcation Devices](#)

The demarcation model can be deceptive because, in one respect, it appears to be inconsistent from Genesis to Revelation. The beginning markers and first-element frames are consistent throughout all genres, but the identification of markers is hardly uniform. For example, the poetic marker “Selah” appears in only two books, Paul’s epistles have many more questions than the other books, and the minor prophets have no location changes. The specific type of marker is not consistent, but the necessity of following a demarcation system is very regular.

The point is that every pericope in Pattern Analysis has some form of demarcation at its beginning that flags where each literary unit starts. The chart [Frequencies of Demarcation Devices](#) shows that the beginning marker and first-element frame have strong coherence to the *mean*. The way to read these charts is to first look at the percentages in the column labeled “Mean: All Genres.” These ratios for each genre can then be visually compared with the mean—that comparison is called the variance from the mean. Therefore, the demarcation model shows strong consistency concerning the start of each pericope, Genesis to Revelation. These frequencies are percentages of the total for each genre.

43. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 57.

The mean for all genres with a beginning marker is ninety-two percent (92%), which ranges from a low of eighty-nine percent (89%) to a high of ninety-eight percent (98%). For each genre, the sum of the beginning marker and first-element frame percentages is one hundred percent (100%). To state this another way, every pericope must start with either a beginning marker or a first-element frame. Therefore, the consistency of these demarcation locations is very good from genre to genre.

That consistency is not as true with the other two demarcation devices—the sub-unit markers range from 0.75 to 1.79, and the ending markers are also widely spread.⁴⁴ The variations are most acute in the poetry and Paul’s epistles. This is an area where further investigation may be appropriate.

2.3. Verification of Demarcation

Thankfully there is no Pattern Analysis Police Force. Otherwise, I could now be serving several terms. The rigor embedded in the Pattern Analysis Software was developed because, at times, I could have developed a better analysis. The statement in Section 2.2, *Markers and First-element Frames*, is an example for every pericope in Pattern Analysis must begin with either a beginning marker or a frame. The Pattern Analysis Software checks to ensure that one of the two exists in every pericope—that mistake had been made too often.

Confidence in the reasonableness of the pericope demarcations is directly related to the surrounding verses. The identified demarcations cannot be separated entirely from what is nearby. For example, a change of flow for a sub-unit marker should mean that the portions before and after are reasonably different. The following discussions about themes, cohesiveness, subjectivity, and continuity further clarify the relationship between the demarcation and its surroundings.

2.3.1. Well-Documented Themes

One of the distinct strengths of Pattern Analysis is the requirement that each scriptural element must have a brief but well-documented theme. Each theme should be descriptive, not an

44. It may seem strange that percentages are used for the beginning marker and first-element frame, and decimals for the ending marker and sub-unit marker. When a decimal is used, it would be incorrect to state those metrics exceed 100% in some genres. If more than one instance of a literary device appears within a pericope, the decimal may be greater than 1.0. In the Torah for example, there are two hundred and sixty-eight (268) sub-unit markers in the one-hundred and fifty (150) literary units that have been analyzed. The value 1.79 shown in that chart is computed as 268 / 150.

organizational statement. It is a paraphrase. The meaning and beauty of the scriptures come more alive by simply seeing the text on the left side of the screen and then writing that paraphrased theme on the right.

Organizational themes such as “Eliphaz’s first argument,” “Eliphaz’s second argument,” etc., are weak and should be more descriptive (Job 4:1–5:27). Once the themes are changed to be more descriptive, the structural and rhetorical messages should become more alive and understandable. Preparing a well-documented theme for each element should cause the student to slow down and consider what the text states.

The purpose of each documentation is to paraphrase the text, not delineate events. In an alternating sequence of “He said” and “She said,” the meaning of what they stated is lost. Likewise, a dialog with “Question” and “Response” and the divine words “Command” followed by “Description.” Rather than stating “Background information,” briefly summarize that information; the words “Narrative introduction” should be restated in just a few words; and a conjugate pair that states “Suffering” for each element should be better described. In that way, it is suggested that the analyst will learn more and the cohesiveness will be better demonstrated.

Well-written themes should help reveal the underlying structural organizations and thereby verify the demarcations. When these paraphrased themes are placed next to the biblical text, a better understanding of structure appears.

[2.3.2. Cohesive Themes](#)

Once a tentative structure has been entered into the Pattern Analysis Software, a validation process performs certain checks against a list of common mistakes. Two of the validations are related to cohesiveness. The goal of cohesiveness is to ensure that all the elements of the pericope are related to one *topic* and that each theme within the topic is adequately documented with good similarity to its conjugate pair.

Cohesiveness checks for conformity to one topic and a good representation of the text with its theme.

An example of the topic is shown in [1 John 4:7–19](#). At the top of the pericope, the first line states the name of the basic literary device. The second line displays the topic of the pericope:

CHIASM (IMPERFECT):

... love one another: God abides in us and perfects His love in us...

These words attempt to document the structure's cohesive wholeness briefly. Each topical documentation is one's understanding—it should cause the analyst to review the tentative structure to see if it is one self-contained unit. Dorsey provides a list of techniques that should prove helpful such as sameness of time and similarity of themes.⁴⁵ One of the software validation checks is that this topic documentation has been entered. It also validates that each substructure topic has been stated such as:

IMMEDIATE REPETITION SUBSTRUCTURE ... the love for others is
because of God...

Another validation check is regarding the paraphrase of each element, that is, the element's theme. Several scholars have expressed concern that many published literary structures do not seem to have a reasonable basis for their analysis (Section 2.3.3, *Subjectivity*). To offset that problem, the layout of this methodology's analyses is adapted from Bailey's method for annotating elements. For example, Bailey's *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes* paraphrases each element at its line end.⁴⁶ The words to the right of an element paraphrase that element's theme (see [1 John 4:7–19](#)):

a and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. (v7C) love infers one knows God

In preparing the theme, one must struggle with what that element and all the other elements in that pericope are saying. That struggle is good, don't be misled, for that often leads to a better meaning. In pairing v. 7C with v. 8, one must grapple with how those two elements interact as a pair. Every element in the validation check, with some minor exceptions, must have an identified theme.⁴⁷ That is part of the rigor in Pattern Analysis.

What Pattern Analysis cannot do, however, is validate the quality of each element's pairing. Too often two elements are connected, say *B* and *B'*, where later inspection revealed that one or perhaps both of the two paraphrases are flawed. There is a definite value in stepping away from the analysis for some time. This can also allow the Holy Spirit to correct our thoughts. Confidence that

45. Dorsey, *Literary Structure*, 23-5.

46. Kenneth E. Bailey, *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians*, (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2011).

47. A theme is not required for elements in a list which are one or a few words long. This would include lists such as individual names, the materials used to create the tabernacle, or the sins from a defiled heart. For example, 1 Peter 2:1 might be rendered as a list substructure with five elements so that the individual misdeeds stand out to the reader. It would be redundant to enter the words malice, deceit, hypocrisy, envy, and slander after each misdeed.

the topics and themes are well constructed should lead to greater confidence that the demarcation is also well done.

2.3.3. Subjectivity

We all have personal biases as we read the text—it is impossible to remove subjectivity from our analyses altogether. Instead, attempts should be made to reduce subjectivity to the extent reasonable. One part of that solution was described in Section 2.3.2, *Cohesive Themes*: for every element in the pericope, the conceptual theme is placed on the same line as the biblical text. If a portion of both the translated text and the thematic paraphrase appear on the same line, subjectivity should be reduced. Yet still some subjectivity may creep through.

The paraphrased theme should include the essence or motivation behind the Word. In that way, more subjective analyses will be minimized. But we are all fallible people, this author included.

Several scholars recommend solutions to this subjectivity issue, all of which are worthy of mention. Walsh sees the need for comparable lengths of corresponding pairs or correlated sequences.⁴⁸ However, when one of the two elements in a corresponding pair has a substructure, that length criteria is violated. In this, Pattern Analysis deviates from that criteria. Walsh also states that while elements are often thematic, the themes should be expressed by using the vocabulary of the text itself.⁴⁹ Pattern Analysis somewhat relaxes that vocabulary criteria as too restrictive because an *inferred theme* is sometimes the commonality of two elements.

Regarding subjectivity, Dorsey provides a scathing review of many contemporary analyses of literary structure. He states, “In my opinion, the great majority of so-called chiasmuses and parallel schemes supposedly found in various parts of the Hebrew Bible or in other ancient literature are forced and unconvincing.” Three causes that he cited are *creative titling* (a creative understanding of a literary unit’s title), *illegitimate word-linking* (commonly used words that are linked together), and *illegitimate theme-linking* (concocted or insignificant elements linked together). To the third point, he offered ten recommendations of which the most important seems to be the criteria to stay

48. According to Walsh, if a structure has three corresponding pairs, for example *A-A'*, *B-B'*, and *C-C'*, they should normally have similar lengths. If the structure instead has a correlated sequence with *A-B-C* compared to either *A'-B'-C'* or *C'-B'-A'*, then each *A-B-C* element could be much shorter or much longer than the corresponding sequence. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 11.

49. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 8-10.

with the biblical text in a reasonable way.⁵⁰ In Pattern Analysis, placing paraphrased themes adjacent to the biblical text substantially reduces that possibility—all verses must be accounted for.

Bailey similarly writes, “When there is a structure in the text the relationships between lines are bold and unmistakable. Subtlety is a deadly enemy.” He also strongly argues against allegorical approaches which could lead to almost any understanding of the text. Instead, his solution is to attempt to find meaning through symbolism.⁵¹ Pattern Analysis integrates Bailey’s pairing of biblical text with themes.

[2.3.4. Continuity](#)

When Pattern Analysis was first started, isolated pericopes were sometimes analyzed without consideration of surrounding verses or chapters. For example, the second chapter of Daniel was analyzed without considering chapters 1, 3, and 4. To avoid that initial mistake, this methodology now calls for several pericopes both before and after to be analyzed which gives a greater likelihood that the current pericope is correct. The best is to complete an entire book.

One of the original goals of Pattern Analysis was to have no unattached verses. That is, for any two adjacent pericopes, every verse belongs to one or the other. Unattached verses are deemed *holes*. When a hole separates two pericopes or when a hole appears in the middle of a pericope, they are not contiguous. On the internet, many of the forced and unconvincing literary units are caused by unexplained holes. The goal with Pattern Analysis is complete continuity of each book with no holes.

In Pattern Analysis, a “hole” is any verse(s) not attached to any pericope.

Today I have more confidence in the forty-six (46) books where at least a first draft of every pericope has been completed than the twenty (20) books that still need to be finished. There is an increased likelihood that the demarcation identification (this chapter), the structural analysis (Chapter Four, *The Structural Model*), and the rhetorical review (Chapter Five, *The Rhetorical Model*) are on target for those forty-six books. The result is a more robust methodology and a greater understanding of the text. The themes that appear to the right of each element (cohesiveness) also

50. Dorsey, *Literary Structure*, 33-5.

51. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans: Combined Edition, 1983), xix-xi.

contribute to a strong meaning of how each structure behaves. Therefore, the continuity and cohesiveness of each book provides greater confidence in the pericope's analyzed demarcations.

2.4. Demarcation Case Studies

The following four examples are intended to illustrate some nuances related to demarcation.

2.4.1. Peter Called Two to be Raised

This case study for [Acts 9:32–43](#) illustrates the use of a beginning marker, two sub-unit markers, and an ending marker:

BEGINNING MARKER: Now as Peter was traveling through all those regions, a change of location he came down also to the saints who lived at Lydda. (v32)

This beginning marker could have been rendered as a change of characters (the previous character was Barnabas), a change of time (inferred), a change of scene, or a change of location (the earlier locations were Judea, Galilee, and Samaria). “A change of location” was selected, but it does not matter.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Now in Joppa (v36A) a change of location

This change of location is at the start of the A' element, a parallel symmetry substructure. That six-verse substructure about Peter's command to restore life to Tabitha is equally miraculous as the A element, Peter's imperative command for the paralyzed Aeneas to walk.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: So Peter arose and went with them. (v39A) a change of location

The turning point in the parallel symmetry substructure, v. 39A, marks where Peter decided to see Tabitha. It is a logical division between the $a-b$ and $a'-b'$ elements.

ENDING MARKER: And Peter stayed many days in Joppa with a tanner a postscript named Simon. (v43)

This ending marker is categorized as a postscript, an informational statement that completes this topic.

2.4.2. Belshazzar

Many times in the Bible there are just one or two demarcation locations in a pericope. The example of [Daniel 5:1–30](#) is on the other end of that spectrum, the story about the writing on

Belshazzar's palace wall. The initial identification of the demarcation locations was beneficial when moving to the second part of the analysis, the pericope's structure.

BEGINNING MARKER: Belshazzar the king held a great feast for a thousand of his nobles, (v1A) [a change of characters](#)

Verse 1 identifies Belshazzar for the first time in the book of Daniel. In comparison to Chapter 4, many years have elapsed, the location is different, the large group has not been previously mentioned, and unlike the words of Nebuchadnezzar from the previous chapter, the narrator is now speaking. It could be parsed as a change of characters, a change of time, a change of location, a change of scene, a change of voice, a change of speaker, or a change of topic. The identifier “a change of characters” was selected, but someone else might have chosen another—it is insignificant. Some beginning markers have only one identification—as Wendland states, the abundance of identification choices should indicate it is a beginning marker.⁵²

BEGINNING MARKER: So Darius the Mede received the kingdom at about the age of sixty-two. (v31) [a genealogy marker](#)

Once the beginning marker is identified, the beginning of the next pericope should be established. Verse 31 begins the next pericope because the character Darius had not been previously mentioned in this book. That places the ending boundary of the current structure at v. 30. Verse 31 records a genealogical event as it relates to the kingdom and Darius. Some might render v. 31 as an ending marker for the current pericope, which also seems to have some merit.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Then (v3A) [a beginning phrase](#)

The turning point in v. 3A is particularly helpful in determining the structure of the text. The word “Then” of a parallel symmetry sequence separates the *a-b-c* elements from the *c'-b'-a'* elements.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Suddenly (v5A) [a change of flow](#)

The first word in v. 5, “Suddenly,” flags a sudden change of events. That change is deemed a change of flow. Before that “Suddenly,” there was a drunken party with the worship of false gods. After the “Suddenly,” the presence of God appears in the form of a finger on a hand. This sub-unit marker flags the beginning of the next element, a frame. The change of flow identified by the word

52. Wendland, *Disjunctive Parallelism*, 15-18.

“Suddenly” in v. 5A could have been ignored, but it seemed to be a significant turning point in the story.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Then all the king's wise men came in, (v8A) [a change of characters](#)

The entrance of the king's wise men is a change of characters. It flags the beginning of the *A* element which records the inability of those wise men to either read or interpret what was spoken.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: The queen entered the banquet hall because of the words of the king and his nobles; (v10A) [a change of characters](#)

Immediately before the start of the *A'* element, another change of characters is introduced. The *A'* element is longer than the previous one, for it includes the queen's words through v. 12.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Then Daniel was brought in before the king. (v13A) [a change of characters](#)

Verse 13A begins the *B* element (vv. 13B–16) which is Belshazzar's appeal to Daniel for his wisdom.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Then Daniel answered and said before the king, (v17A) [a change of speaker](#)

Daniel's response to the king's request is the start of the *B'* element, a change of speaker. In that response, the Holy Spirit inspired Daniel to contrast Nebuchadnezzar's repentant heart with that of Belshazzar, as recorded in vv. 17–24.

sub-unit marker: “Yet you, (v22A) [a grammatical change](#)

The words “Yet you” in v. 22A are positioned at the center point of a chiasm between the *a-b-c-d* elements and the *d'-c'-b'-a'* elements. “Yet you” is parsed as a grammatical change because the pronouns changed. In the sequence about Nebuchadnezzar, identified as an *a-b-c-d* sequence, the pronoun “he” was used. The subsequent sequence about Belshazzar, a *d'-c'-b'-a'* sequence, uses the pronoun “you.” The switch in pronouns indicates not just the marker but an important value of sub-unit markers—they can flag a sequence change in a structure or substructure.

SUB-UNIT MARKER: “Now this is the inscription that was written out: (v25A) [a divine oracle](#)

The word of God, a divine oracle, is demarked by these words from v. 25A. The words were not spoken as in the phrase “For thus says the LORD”—they were written. The reading of those words and their interpretation are the closing summary of this pericope.

[2.4.3. Love One Another](#)

One of the oddities of Pattern Analysis is a change of topic when there are no words that indicate this change. This has been briefly discussed in Section 2.2.1, *Identification of Markers*. To further understand this concept, consider two adjacent pericopes: [1 John 4:7–19](#) and [1 John 4:20–5:12](#). Topically speaking, the two pericopes each have a different purpose, yet the second pericope has no clear beginning marker. The pericope for [1 John 4:7–19](#) has two frame elements, the second of which is v. 19 at the end of that pericope. The only clue that this was a topical change is that v. 19 is a frame element. When the last element of the prior literary unit is a frame, an ending marker, or a substructure summary, the following literary unit might be a change of topic.

[2.4.4. Nadab and Abihu](#)

Another problem appears when the beginning of the pericope is not well identified, as illustrated in Leviticus 9:23 – 10:11. When the parallelism is skewed because the beginning is not considered, errancy can creep into the teaching again. This can be seen when it is assumed that the beginning of a chapter is the start of the pericope. The example of Nadab and Abihu presents that problem.

Chapter 10 of Leviticus begins with the phrase, “Now Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron ...”. They had not been previously mentioned in chapter 9 which demarks this as a change of characters. Also, the word “Now” in v. 10:1 could be rendered as a beginning phrase. Therefore, that verse could be a candidate for the beginning marker of this story, either as a change of characters or as a beginning phrase.

However, if v. 10:1A is a beginning marker, God may be viewed as an excessively punitive god when the boys offered strange fire. It seems easy to imagine that any two boys could get into trouble for having fun with the adult’s utensils. Death to innocent boys? Is that the type of God we serve? The answer lies in the treatment of v. 10:1A.

In the Bible, there are a few instances where a verse or two belongs to two pericopes.⁵³ In this situation, we can see that vv. 9:23,24 belong to both a parallel symmetry for Leviticus 9:1–24 and to [Leviticus 9:23–10:11](#). The promise that the glory of the LORD will appear is stated in vv. 9:4,6; that promise was fulfilled in vv. 9:23,24 as the glory fell and the people fell on their faces in praise. But

53. Bailey refers to overlapping structures as a *double-decker sandwich composition*. That is, between the top and bottom pieces of bread in the sandwich, a third piece of bread is common to both parts. Bailey, *Mediterranean Eyes*, 528.

v. 9:23A could also be a beginning marker which states that Moses and Aaron went into the tent of meeting—it could be rendered as a change of location or a change of scene.

If vv. 9:23,24 starts that second pericope, then a potentially better understanding of that seemingly harsh treatment may be understood. In this scenario, vv. 9:23 – 10:11 present a contrast between the holiness of the glory of the LORD and the unholiness of the boy’s fire. Therefore, after the holiness of the LORD is described as His glory, v. 10:1A is a sub-unit marker that demarks the unholiness. Figure 3 shows the first five verses of that structure:

Figure 3: Leviticus 9:23 – 10:3 (Excerpt)

BEGINNING MARKER:	Moses and Aaron went into the tent of meeting. (v9:23A)	a change of location
PRELIMINARY:		
PARALLEL SYMMETRY SUBSTRUCTURE: Moses and Aaron blessed the people, Nadab and Abihu cursed themselves		
a	When they came out and blessed the people, the glory of the LORD appeared to all the people (v9:23B)	the glory of the LORD appeared to everyone
b	Then fire came out from before the LORD and consumed the burnt offering and the portions of fat on the altar; (v9:24A)	fire came out, the offering was burnt
c	and when all the people saw it, they shouted and fell on their faces. (v9:24B)	the people fell on their faces in reverence
sub-unit marker: Now Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, (v10:1A)		
a'	took their respective firepans, and after putting fire in them, placed incense on it and offered strange fire before the LORD, which He had not commanded them. (v10:1B)	strange fire not of the LORD appeared
b'	And fire came out from the presence of the LORD and consumed them, (v10:2A)	fire came out, the two were burnt
c'	and they died before the LORD. (v10:2B)	Nadab and Abihu fell to the ground in death
sum	Then Moses said to Aaron, “It is what the LORD spoke, saying, ‘By those who come near Me I will be treated as holy, and before all the people I will be honored.’” So Aaron, therefore, kept silent (v10:3)	SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY: honor the LORD and treat Him as holy

This structure seems to beg the analyst to compare the two **a** elements with particular focus on the phrase “glory of the LORD.” An antithesis of that phrase could be “strange fire,” a false glory.

The point here is straightforward: careful consideration is required for the demarcation of the beginning marker—erroneous understandings can otherwise appear. When these considerations are followed, the consistency of the demarcation model should be readily seen.

3. The Structural Model

Pattern Analysis is a toolbox of tools to help students discover nuances in the scripture that might otherwise be missed. This chapter describes the components and process to discern a pericope's organization—its structure. By analyzing the structure, the rhetorical messages of the text may be better identified and understood. The focus in Pattern Analysis is not the structure—it is the ability to understand how the structural organization persuades the reader (or listener) into a deeper meaning, exposing what is emphatic. That is, the end product is the rhetoric, not the structure.

3.0. Overview of the Structural Model

Many scholars have written about literary structures, most prominently the chiasmic structures. All the structures are fascinating to unfold, but there is a more profound question: why are they there? The suggestion here is that the structures point to His rhetorical voice. This is not just a search for the center point in a chiasm but for multiple locations within a literary unit. Determination of the structural organization is a necessary step toward the discovery of the Holy Spirit's rhetorical voice within that pericope.

Section 2.3.1, *Well-Documented Themes*, states that Pattern Analysis uses a theme-based approach, not a word-based approach, to pericopes. In this way, a paraphrase appears to the right of the biblical text which is a brief restatement of that text. Each paraphrase is the theme for that element's text. While a search for similar words from the text is generally desirable, paraphrasing can be conceptual and may not use any of those same words.⁵⁴

A word-based approach to themes often looks for words that are either repeated, belong to the same word family, or are antithetical to one another. Instead, this conceptual theme-based approach can expose more of the heart of the Holy Spirit's purpose. For example, in [Leviticus 9:23 – 10:11](#),

54. When the two spies returned from Jericho (Joshua 2:24), they told Joshua that the “inhabitants had melted away.” The thematic paraphrase, “they were filled with fear”, could be used because that describes the effect of the “melted away” words.

the contrast in vv. 9:23 to 10:3 between the holiness of the glory of the LORD and the unholiness of the boy's fire is conceptual, not literal. These themes are connected by holiness/unholiness, words that do not appear in those verses. The connection between holiness and unholiness would be documented in the rhetoric (Chapter Five, *The Rhetorical Model*).

This chapter addresses the structural model, the second part of the Pattern Analysis methodology. The thirty (30) structural devices, including those of the demarcation model, are:

- Absence**—An intentional omission of scripture indicating something is missing.
- Beginning marker**—Indicates the start of a new literary unit.
- Chiasm**—An *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'* or *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'* type of arrangement.
- Chiasm (imperfect)**—An asymmetric chiasm with an absence, extra, or transposition.
- Chiasm substructure**—A chiasmic-shaped sub-unit of an element, may be asymmetric.
- Closing summary**—An emphatic summarization that concludes a basic structure.
- Composite**—A combination of two or three basic structures within a literary unit.
- Drill**—A mechanism to connect a related literary unit, similar to a hyperlink.
- Ending marker**—Indicates the end of a literary unit or a substructure.
- Extra**—An intentional insertion of an element where the corresponding element is blank.
- Frame**—Two elements with a common theme that surround lettered elements in a structure.
- Immediate repetition**—An *A-A'-B-B'* or an *A-A'-B-B'-C-C'* type of arrangement.
- Immediate repetition substructure**—A sub-unit of an element, shaped like *a-a'-b-b'*.
- Imperative**—A strongly worded directive or command, presented as a verb.
- Interjection**—*Behold*, the following words are important!
- Link**—A connection of an O.T. pericope from the N.T. adds emphasis to the New.
- List**—An *A-B-C-D-E* or *1-2-3-4-5* type of arrangement.
- List substructure**—An *a-b-c-d-e* or *1-2-3-4-5* shaped sub-unit of an element.
- Opening summary**—An emphatic summarization near the beginning of a literary unit.
- Parallel symmetry**—A step-like *A-B-C-X-A'-B'-C'* or *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'* arrangement.
- Parallel symmetry (imperfect)**—An asymmetric parallel symmetry with absence, extra, etc.
- Parallel symmetry substructure**—A step-like sub-unit of an element, may be asymmetric.
- Parenthesis**—An annotation to the text that explains tangential yet relevant information.
- Preliminary**—Background information generally located near the beginning of the pericope.
- Question**—A request for information/clarification from another, or a rhetorical question.
- Structure split**—This occurs when a literary unit is continued at a later point in the book.

Substructure summary—An opening or closing summarization within a substructure.

Sub-unit marker—Marks a change within a literary unit, not at the beginning or end.

Transposition—A relocation of elements from their normal sequence.

Variation—When two otherwise corresponding elements have somewhat different themes.

This list of thirty devices is available at [Literary Devices for the Structural Model](#), including an example of each. The three demarcation devices—beginning, ending, and sub-unit markers—were described at the beginning of Chapter Three, *The Demarcation Model*. Three rhetorical devices—imperative, question, and interjection—are described in Section 4.6, *Grammatical Devices*. The remaining twenty-four (24) devices are described in this chapter.

3.1. My Structural Process

Topics and themes were presented in Section 2.3.1, *Well-Documented Themes*, and Section 2.3.2, *Cohesive Themes*. A pericope is an organized gathering of related themes that constitute a topic. While a thematic approach can yield a more profound understanding of the context of a pericope, there is also the potential that imaginative analyses may result.⁵⁵ The following is a description of my approach.

The contemporary approach to understanding a passage starts with multiple text readings before a detailed analysis. That may be necessary for some, but it can sometimes lead to false pairings. One may be able to recall the passage from a previous reading which may be sufficient. Instead, this methodology allows the discovery by tackling one verse at a time: first element, then the second as a comparison of the first, then the third as a comparison of the last two, and so on. When the structure is complete, then the documentation of the rhetoric analysis can lead to further refinement of the structure (Chapter Four, *The Rhetorical Model*). There is so much re-reading of the text in this process that the multiple initial readings may be redundant.

The contemporary approach to diagnosing a passage starts with multiple readings. Instead, Pattern Analysis allows a sequential approach, one verse at a time.

When a new pericope is started, a more literal translation such as the NASB 95 is checked to see where they ended the current pericope. A check is made to ensure the verse following this current

55. Kenneth E. Bailey, *Peasant Eyes*, xix,xx.

pericope is likely a beginning marker. That provides a tentative scope of the present pericope. First, there are the demarcations where beginning markers, sub-unit markers, first-element frames, and ending markers are identified. When the demarcation is complete, the thematic paraphrases of elements are begun. Two or sometimes more verses may be combined to create the element, or a verse may be broken into more than one element. This documentation of themes is much more reliable than simply writing the letters *A*, *B*, *X*, and the like in the margins of a Bible—it yields a fuller understanding of the text. For longer pericopes, multiple edits may prove necessary before an analysis is completed.

A validation process checks the syntax of each entry. The analysis must conform to the Pattern Analysis Research Language (PARL) syntax described in the Appendix: *Pattern Analysis Software*. If there are no issues, the software produces a dynamic web page of the results. Using Acts 2:1–13 as an example, the five steps in my process are:

Download the Bible verses—I begin the analytical process by specifying the start and end of the pericope in the Pattern Analysis Software. This software then copies the desired verses from an external source into a notepad-type editor such as [Acts 2:1–13 Raw](#).

Prepare the structural analysis—Chapters Three, *The Demarcation Model*, and Four, *The Structural Model*, describe how to determine the pericope’s structure. A completed structural analysis may be seen in [Pattern Analysis Research Language \(PARL\) for Acts 2:1–13](#).

Validate the structure—Mistakes will happen when performing a structural analysis. The software attempts to catch many integrity problems but does not check if one’s analysis makes sense. Once the integrity issues have been resolved, a dynamic web page with a list of potential rhetoric locations is produced. See [Acts 2:1–13](#).

Perform the rhetorical analysis—Chapter Five, *The Rhetorical Model*, describes the method for analyzing the structure’s rhetoric. When completed, the output has this form: [Rhetoric for Acts 2:1–13](#).

Validate the rhetoric—Just as the structure may have had integrity problems, the rhetoric may have logic issues. The completed analysis may be seen in [Acts 2:1–13 Completed](#).

Once the beginning marker at the start of this process is identified, I move to the first complete element. There is an immediate question: is it background information, summarization, or a main

part of the story? If this element is background information, the word **PRELIMINARY** is tentatively entered before that line, as in [Mark 2:1–12](#). If that first complete element appears to be a summarization, I tentatively render it as **SUM** which stands for an opening summary (see [Psalm 30:1–12](#)). Otherwise, the uppercase letter *A* is typed before the scripture and prepare the paraphrased theme after the scripture (see [Deuteronomy 30:15–20](#)). Later, at the end of this pericope, I may find that the preliminary, sum, or *A* has a matching pair which may indicate a **FRAME**—but that is later.

Proceeding on, a march has begun from the first element toward the suspected end of the pericope. The question from the previous element becomes the question for the second element with one additional thought: is it background information, summarization, a main part of the story, or a substructure? If the previous element was designated as an *A*, this next element is usually rendered as a *B* element as in [Deuteronomy 30:15–20](#).

When the previous element was a preliminary or a summarization, this next element may be the *A* element that is part of the main story, such as [Mark 2:1–12](#) or [Psalm 30:1–12](#). However, this next element may be part of a substructure. If a preliminary continues to be background information, a substructure such as [Luke 9:51–62](#) is involved. Likewise, if a summarization continues in the same way, it is a substructure as in [Isaiah 42:1–9](#).

When each new element is identified, I briefly paraphrase its theme. Then the next element with its theme, then the next, and the next. Sub-unit markers are classified with their marker identifier, such as v. 5 in [Acts 2:1–13](#).

In moving from one element to the next, a theme similar to a previous element will be identified. That provides a clue as to the type of structure: chiasm, parallel symmetry, immediate repetition, list, or possibly a substructure. In looking at all the prior elements in the pericope, the clarity of the structure increases with each new element. If the second element has a similar theme to the first one, it is probably an immediate repetition and identified with an *A*! If not, it is identified with a *B*. If the third element is similar to the first, it is probably a parallel symmetry with *A* and *B* elements; if it is similar to the second element, it is potentially a chiasm with *A* and *B* elements; otherwise, it is a *C*. Sub-unit markers and *X*center points must be considered.

The overall pattern is often distinguished by comparing the current element to previous elements, not by reading the entire passage to find related themes.

I usually recognize the end of the pericope because either the lettering process is exhausted or the topic changes. Conversely, something within the pericope must be addressed if the structure needs to be more logical or the emphasis seems far-fetched.

Within the text, there can be some asymmetry (Section 3.5, *Asymmetric Devices*). Asymmetry refers to a lack of complete symmetry, such as a normally symmetric Christmas tree where some branches were intentionally removed from one side to draw attention to itself.

Transpositions and other asymmetric differences can make the structure intriguing and part of the fun. When these or anything else of particular importance such as a summarization are found, I try to ignore the temptation to document the rhetoric. Instead, the goal is to complete a first pass of the entire structure before considering what is persuasive and emphatic. A mental note is made of those important locations within the text.

As conjugate pairs such as *B* and *B'* are discovered, slight modifications to one or both themes are often made to clarify their similarities. When all the elements have been completed, the name of the basic structure is entered at the beginning of the pericope with the description of the topic immediately after that. For each substructure with its set of lowercase *a*, *b*, and so on elements, the substructure's name and a description of that subtopic are entered. The Pattern Analysis Software is then instructed to check for blatant mistakes, termed a "validation."

Once those checks are resolved through the Pattern Analysis Software, I move to the rhetorical analysis (Chapter Five, *The Rhetorical Model*). Much more time is spent documenting the pericope's rhetoric than identifying the structural organization—that is how the structural analyses are often refined. The focus on rhetoric is significant because these are potentially the Holy Spirit's emphatic words.

3.2. Basic Structures and Substructures

A quick review of contemporary writings about literary structure reveals little discussion about substructures. However, the concept of substructures is not new. In 1825, Thomas Boys observed many instances with a "parallelism within parallelism; the members of larger parallelisms often

admitting of subdivision and a separate arrangement.”⁵⁶ In Pattern Analysis, a substructure enhances the understanding of its parent element.

Every pericope in Pattern Analysis consists of three types of literary devices: the demarcation devices (Chapter Three, *The Demarcation Model*), the lettered devices (Section 3.4, *Lettered Devices* and Section 3.5, *Asymmetric Devices*), and the non-lettered devices (Section 3.6, *Non-Lettered Devices*). The lettered devices are represented by letters such as *A*, *C'*, or *X* to the left of the scriptures, and non-lettered devices with words such as *SUM* or *PRELIMINARY*.

These three types of devices are part of the basic structure that constitutes the organization of the pericope or substructures. In Pattern Analysis, uppercase letters are used to identify a basic structure and lowercase letters identify a substructure.⁵⁷ The most common basic structure is an *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'-SUM* chiasm. Most pericopes have at least one substructure.

Regarding basic structures, the first line of every pericope (see [1 John 4:7–19](#)) identifies one of these seven (7) possibilities: chiasm, imperfect chiasm, parallel symmetry, imperfect parallel symmetry, immediate repetition, list, or occasionally a composite. A chiasm might have an *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'* organization, a parallel symmetry as an *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'*, an immediate repetition might be arranged as *A-A'-B-B'*, and a list might be *A-B-C-D-E-F-G* or 1-2-3-4-5. An imperfect chiasm might have an *A-B-C-B'-C'-A'* structure and an imperfect parallel symmetry could be organized as *A-B-C-B'-A'-C'*. Occasionally two basic structures are combined in what is deemed a composite. See Section 3.4, *Lettered Devices*, for more details.

Any element may have a substructure such as the three elements, *B*, *C*, and *SUM*, in [Matthew 13:24–30, 36–43](#). There are four substructure organizations: a chiasm substructure such as *a-b-b'-a'*, a parallel symmetry substructure such as *a-b-a'-b'*, an immediate repetition substructure such as *a-a'-b-b'*, and a list substructure such as *a-b-c-d*. As mentioned above, every substructure is part of a parent element within a pericope. The parent element may be a *FRAME*, *PRELIMINARY*, or any other non-lettered or lettered basic elements (such as *A*, *B'*, or *X*).

56. Thomas Boys, *A Key to the Book of Psalms*, (London: L. B. Seeley and Son, 1825), 146, accessed April 16, 2023, Academia.edu.

57. The validation software checks that all basic structures are entered with uppercase letters and all substructures with lowercase letters. Numbers can be used instead of letters to identify each element. For example, a chiasm may also be entered as a *1-2-3-3'-2'-1'* structure.

While Walsh's *Style and Structure* manuscript deepens the understanding of literary structures, there are differences. For example, he reiterated a statement that others have made, that the length of corresponding elements should be approximately the same. Walsh stated that those locations that are not approximately equal are examples of asymmetric variation.⁵⁸ That advice about lengths may not be well-serving.

Early in the development of Pattern Analysis, many examples of this type of variation became apparent. It was decided to render them as a substructure—selection of the term “substructure” is mine. By identifying substructures, emphatic portions of the substructure can be identified. Walsh seemed to understand the concept but did not give it a name.⁵⁹ Each substructure adds depth of understanding about its parent element by pointing to its own emphasis (see Chapter Five, *The Rhetorical Model*).

A basic element may precede the substructure, but not necessarily. Two substructures, one in 1 John and the other in Leviticus, reveal this distinction. In [1 John 4:7–19](#) the phrase “let us love one another, for love is from God” in v. 7B is the basic element, while the *a-a'-b-b'* elements from vv. 7C-10 are the substructure elements. In this pericope, the opening summary is all five elements, v. 7B-10. The four substructure elements belong to the basic element, v. 7B.

The second way substructures appear is exemplified in [Leviticus 9:23 – 10:3](#). The preliminary following v. 9:23A is a basic structure element, and the *a-b-c-a'-b'-c'-sum* parallel symmetry substructure from vv. 9:23B – 10:3 belongs to that preliminary element. However, unlike the previous example, the preliminary element has no words that precede that substructure.

The structure for [1 Corinthians 6:12–20](#) is a chiasm with a preliminary statement and a closing summary. Those two non-lettered devices—preliminary and closing summary—belong to the pericope's basic structure because their understanding cannot be separated from the pericope. The basic chiasm structure is *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'-SUM*. The preliminary and summarization do not surround the chiasm, they are part of it, and the immediate repetition substructure is part of the preliminary.

58. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 7,101.

59. For example, in his analysis of 1 Kings 17:17-24, Walsh subdivided the central *F* sub-unit of this concentric structure into an *a-b-a'-b'* structure but did not otherwise distinguish the smaller unit. Jerome T. Walsh, *1 Kings*, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996). 230,1.

3.3. Structural Case Study

The following literary structure, shown in Figure 4 about the day of Pentecost and also available at [Acts 2:1–13](#), is typical of Pattern Analysis. It serves as a not-overly-complicated example of the structural model by identifying the components within that structure.

Figure 4: Literary Structure of Acts 2:1–13

PARALLEL SYMMETRY (IMPERFECT):

... the day of Pentecost ...

BEGINNING MARKER: When the day of Pentecost had come, they were all together in one place. (v1)	a change of time
A And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. (v2)	a violent noise as they were sitting
B And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, and they rested on each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit (v3,4A)	EXTRA: tongues of fire rested on the disciples; they were filled with the Holy Spirit
C and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit was giving them utterance. (v4B)	the disciples began to speak in tongues
SUB-UNIT MARKER: Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem, devout men from every nation under heaven. (v5)	a change of characters
A' And when this sound occurred, the crowd came together, (v6A)	the violent sound brought the crowd
B'	no text
C' and were bewildered because each one of them was hearing them speak in his own language. (v6B)	the crowd heard them speaking in their own language
SUM CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE ... crowd's amazement ...	CLOSING SUMMARY
a They were amazed and astonished, saying, "Why, are not all these who are speaking Galileans? (v7)	QUESTION: asked why in amazement
b And how is it that we each hear them in our own language to which we were born? (v8)	QUESTION: heard in our own language
x "Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the districts of Libya around Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs-- (v9-11A)	the locations of the many visitors
b' we hear them in our own tongues speaking of the mighty deeds of God." (v11B)	heard in our own tongues
a' And they all continued in amazement and great perplexity, saying to one another, "What does this mean?" (v12)	QUESTION: asked for explanation in amazement
sum But others were mocking and saying, "They are full of sweet wine." (v13)	SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY: some thought they were drunk

3.3.1. Name of the Basic Literary Device

PARALLEL SYMMETRY (IMPERFECT):

As mentioned in Section 3.2, *Basic Structures and Substructures*, there are seven possible basic organizations of each pericope. The first line in Pattern Analysis always identifies the basic literary device ([Acts 2:1–13](#)). In this case, the basic structure is *A-B-C-A'-C'-SUM*, an imperfect parallel symmetry. It is imperfect because there is no text in the *B'* position. A car that is missing a front tire is still a car, just an imperfect one.

By placing the name PARALLEL SYMMETRY (IMPERFECT) on the first line, the Pattern Analysis Software will validate the order of this literary device's *A, B, C, A', B', C'* letters. That name on the first line also instructs the software to point to some potentially important locations where the Holy Spirit's rhetoric may be found (Chapter Five, *The Rhetorical Model*).

3.3.2. Topic of the Pericope

... the day of Pentecost ...

This is a one-line description of the pericope. When viewing many structures, it allows readers to select their desired pericope. It can also communicate the exegete's perspective, possibly even their theological approach.

3.3.3. Beginning Marker or Frame

BEGINNING MARKER: When the day of Pentecost had come, they were all a change of time together in one place. (v1)

As described in Chapter Three, *The Demarcation Model*, the biblical text always informs the reader where a new literary unit begins. Most often this is a beginning marker although sometimes it is a frame. In this case it states, "a change of time" ([Acts 2:1–13](#)). As mentioned in Section 2.2.1, *Identification of Markers*, the beginning words of a literary unit can represent more than one type of marker. In this example for v. 1, it is equally correct to identify it as "a change of location."

3.3.4. Symmetric Elements

- | | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. (v2) | a violent noise as they were sitting |
| B | And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, and they rested on each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit (v3,4A) | EXTRA: tongues of fire rested on the disciples; they were filled with the Holy Spirit |
| C | and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit was giving them utterance. (v4B) | the disciples began to speak in other tongues |

While colors shown on the dynamic web pages are not essential, they allow the reader to visually match conjugate pairs; the Pattern Analysis Software generates them. In that way, the three elements above, *A*, *B*, and *C*, stand out as separate from each other ([Acts 2:1–13](#)).

The biblical text is used without paraphrasing or editing in the structural model. That is, no words are either deleted, changed, or added to the biblical text. However, a verse may be split, as in the separation of v. 4 into v. 4A and 4B. The Pattern Analysis Software catches inconsistencies in verse numbering. For example, if the letter B was accidentally omitted in the marked-up PARL for v. 4B, that mistake would be captured during the validation process.

3.3.5. Sub-Unit Markers

SUB-UNIT MARKER: Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem, devout men a change of characters
from every nation under heaven. (v5)

Section 2.2.2, *Location of Markers*, mentions that the second sequence in parallel symmetry structures often begins with a sub-unit marker. In this case, the first sequence starts at v. 2; the second sequence begins at v. 5 ([Acts 2:1–13](#)). If the sub-unit marker is included in the schema, it would be rendered as an *A-B-C-SubUnit Marker-A'-C'-SUM* structure.

3.3.6. Asymmetric Elements

A'	And when this sound occurred, the crowd came together, (v6A)	the violent sound brought the crowd
B'		no text
C'	and were bewildered because each one of them was hearing them speak in his own language. (v6B)	the crowd heard them speaking in their own language

Asymmetry means that something is unusual about this otherwise symmetric organization. In [Acts 2:1–13](#), note how the *A* and *A'* elements correspond, as do the *C* and *C'* elements. The paraphrased themes to the right of the scripture show good correspondence. In the *A - A'* elements, the violent noise had an effect—the people inside the house and outside seem to have been stunned. The evidence of other tongues and other languages also correspond well in *C - C'*.

For the *B - B'* elements, however, there is no text between vv. 6A and 6B. The result is that vv. 3,4A, the *B* element, is flagged as an *EXTRA*. Walsh described this unusual but intentional design technique as a mechanism to emphasize the extra verses.⁶⁰ As described in Section 3.5.1, *Extra*, it is flagged because its conjugate pair *B'* has no text. Therefore, the *B'* element points to the

60. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 101.

tongues of fire in *B*, vv. 3,4A. Not only did the fire rest on them but they were all filled with the Holy Spirit. Nearly twenty percent of all basic literary units in the Pattern Analysis repository contain an EXTRA element.

3.3.7. Closing Summary

SUM CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE ... crowd's amazement ...

CLOSING SUMMARY

Within the broader scheme of this *A-B-C-A'-C'-SUM* imperfect parallel symmetry, a summarization begins at v. 7 ([Acts 2:1–13](#)). This closing summary spans vv. 7–12, a chiasm substructure that is different from the stair-like steps of the basic parallel symmetry. The organization of the basic structure has no bearing on the organization of the substructure—they are freely mixed despite one being part of the other. That is, the basic structure is stair-like, whereas the substructure is chiasmic.

3.3.8. Chiasm Substructure

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| a | They were amazed and astonished, saying, “Why, are not all these who are speaking Galileans? (v7) | QUESTION: asked why in amazement |
| b | And how is it that we each hear them in our own language to which we were born? (v8) | QUESTION: heard in their own language |
| x | “Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the districts of Libya around Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs-- (v9–11A) | the locations of the many visitors |
| b' | we hear them in our own tongues speaking of the mighty deeds of God.” (v11B) | heard in our own tongues |
| a' | And they all continued in amazement and great perplexity, saying to one another, “What does this mean?” (v12) | QUESTION: asked for explanation in amazement |
| sum | But others were mocking and saying, “They are full of sweet wine.” (v13) | SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY: some thought they were drunk |

This chiasm substructure ([Acts 2:1–13](#)) is an integral part of the closing summary. A brief subtopic statement is required for every substructure—the words “crowd’s amazement” serve that purpose. Then vv. 7–13 reveals the effect that the Holy Spirit’s sudden appearance had on the crowd.

Section 3.2, *Basic Structures and Substructures*, explains that some substructures do not have a preceding basic element. That is the *a-b-x-b'-a'-sum* chiasm substructure in vv. 7–13 is the crowd’s reaction for the closing summary—an element before v. 7 was unnecessary. Sometimes a sub-unit marker appears at the start of the substructure—in this case, there is none.

3.4. Lettered Devices

As stated in Section 3.2, *Basic Structures and Substructures*, the lettered devices are either basic structures with uppercase letters or substructures with lowercase letters that belong to the parent element. They may be chiasms, parallel symmetries, immediate repetitions, or lists. Chiasms and parallel symmetries may be either perfect or imperfect. The chart [Lettered Devices](#) identifies ten (10) basic structures and substructures in Pattern Analysis. An example for each device is provided within that chart.

[3.4.1. Chiasm](#)

Much has been written over the last two hundred years about chiasmic structures.⁶¹ Many have identified, or at least attempted to identify, chiasms throughout the Bible. Their location can vary from a single verse, what might be called a micro-structure, to some very long structures. Some even see chiasms spanning more than one book. The scope of Pattern Analysis is those within a pericope, either a basic structure or a substructure.

A chiasm is a repetition of similar ideas in the reverse sequence.

The first chapter of Walsh's *Style and Structure* is entitled *Reverse Symmetry*. He follows a commonly understood definition where an $A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'$ arrangement is known as "concentric" and a double-centered $A-B-C-C'-B'-A'$ arrangement is a "chiasm." He states that a turning point is "regularly, though not always" found in the center of the structure, particularly in the concentric structures.⁶²

In Pattern Analysis, the search is for the Holy Spirit's emphasis, some of which could be a turning point. This research project finds that nearly all reverse symmetries emphasize the middle, regardless of one-centered X and two-centered structures. Therefore, the distinction between one concentric center point and two is deemed an unnecessary splitting of hairs. In Pattern Analysis, both are referred to as chiasms.

61. For those unfamiliar with this terminology, consider reading my article, [What is a Chiasm \(or Chiasmus\)?](#)

62. Walsh recognizes it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between concentric structures and chiasmic structures. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 13.

Walsh also observes that the first and last elements (he calls them sub-units) often present a strong location for emphasis.⁶³ That is, the two first/last elements, *A* and *A'*, are usually persuasive. The emphasis may not be at the center point—each pericope must be analyzed independently.

We are told in 1 Corinthians that our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit. That pericope, [1 Corinthians 6:12–20](#), is a straightforward *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'-SUM* structure. There are over one hundred other arrangements such as *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'-SUM* or a simpler *A-B-B'-A'* structure. Sometimes a frame surrounds a chiasm, *FRAME-A-B-X-B'-A'-SUM-FRAME*. The most simplistic is an *A-X-A'* ring structure.^{64, 65} For example, see the *a-x-a'* chiasm substructure in vv. 5A–5C in [Isaiah 56:1–7](#).

An imperfect chiasm is an intentional arrangement of a chiasm's symmetry for the sake of emphasis.

As of the date of this writing, thirty-four percent (34%) of the basic literary structures in the Pattern Analysis repository are chiasms. Another thirteen (13%) are nearly chiasmic, deemed an “imperfect chiasm.” An imperfect chiasm occurs when a literary unit contains one or occasionally more asymmetric devices: extra, absence, or transposition (Section 3.5, *Asymmetric Devices*). [Mark 2:1–12](#) is an example of an imperfect chiasm with no corresponding text in the *B* element. Section 3.5.1, *Extra*, discusses this example in greater detail.

[3.4.2. Parallel Symmetry](#)

The second chapter of Walsh's *Style and Structure* is entitled *Forward Symmetry*. He identified a parallel symmetry as an *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'* arrangement and even an *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'-*

63. Walsh readily admits that the distinction in some structures between one and two center points is sometimes subjective. He also acknowledges that the turning point is not always in the center. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 13–14.

64. Ellis considers an *A-B-A'* structure its own category, not combining it with a chiasm. Peter F. Ellis, *Seven Pauline Letters* (Collegeville, MN: Order of St. Benedict, 1982), 15. Wendland, on the other hand, considers an *A-B-A'* ring construction to be a concentric, or chiasmic, structure. Wendland, *Prophetic Rhetoric*, 553.

65. In Pattern Analysis, an *A-B-A'* structure is designated an *A-X-A'* structure. If an *A-X-A'* structure has a first/last emphasis and a center point emphasis, it is a chiasm. Conversely, if that rhetoric is lacking, it is rendered as an *A-X-A'* immediate repetition. The difference is in the emphasis contained in the biblical text.

$A''-B''-C''$ structure.⁶⁶ For those only familiar with chiasmic structures, this may help with situations where the biblical text does not fit their understanding of the chiasmic approach.⁶⁷

A parallel symmetry is similar to a staircase with two or more sets of stairs.

A parallel symmetry may be a basic structure or a substructure. The example in [Leviticus 9:23–10:23](#) provides an example of both. The literary unit opens with a parallel symmetry substructure about two fires: the glory of the LORD and a strange fire, vv. 9:23B–10:3. The contrast between the two fires creates an intensification of the story—both Nadab and Abihu died. The literary unit then continues to vv. 10:4–7, an $A-B-A'-B'$ parallel symmetry. The two B elements, the *last/last* elements due to their position, emphasize the threat of death when the tent of meeting's holiness is disrespected.

A more extended parallel symmetry structure is seen in [Luke 9:51–62](#), an $A-B-C-A'-B'-C'-A''-B''-C''$ structure. A parallel symmetry can be likened to two or more sets of stairs. In this case, there are three sets of stairs where the last step, C'' , is sufficiently different from the other two C elements—that difference is an emphatic device called a *variation* as described in Section 4.4.4, *Variation*.

Walsh's third chapter, *Alternating Repetition*, describes an $A-B-A'-B'-A''-B''$ structure or a more irregular $A-B-A'-B'-A''$ structure.⁶⁸ To Walsh, the B elements in an alternation usually are either a comparison or a contrast with the A elements, or a *progression* from beginning to end. Walsh describes these alternations as a subtype of forward symmetry, having “the same forward thrust as a parallel symmetry.”⁶⁹ This is one way Pattern Analysis altered Walsh's methodology. Many two-part A and B structures were initially rendered as alternations—subsequent review found their emphatic behavior is the same as parallel symmetries. Therefore, all alternations were converted to parallel symmetries, eliminating the definition's duplicity.

66. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 35-45.

67. Dorsey refers to this structural concept as a *parallel arrangement*, a similar name for the same concept. Dorsey, *Literary Structure*, 28-30. Bailey uses the term *step parallelism* for this literary device. Bailey, *Mediterranean Eyes*, 41,42.

68. Walsh renders an $A-B-A'-B'-A''-B''$ structure as an *alternation* whereas Pattern Analysis deems it an example of a parallel symmetry. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 13-56.

69. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 47,48.

For example, the account in Acts 9, where Peter first called Aeneas and then Tabitha to be healed, was initially rendered as a simple $A-B-A'-B'$ alternation. It is now a parallel symmetry ([Acts 9:32–43](#)) which follows the model for other parallel symmetries. The A and A' elements are proclamations for them to rise, and the B and B' elements emphasize the resulting increase of faith of the surrounding people.

In [Acts 9:32–43](#) there is a sub-unit marker in v. 36A before the A' element. Throughout the Bible, parallel symmetries often have a sub-unit marker in that location or before an X element, apparently to separate the parts. Those sub-unit markers can help the student exegete the text.

Just as a frame, preliminary, closing summary, or any other basic elements may have a substructure, so the lettered A , B , C , and other elements may have a substructure. In that same account from [Acts 9:32–43](#), the A' element regarding Tabitha's raising is an $a-b-a'-b'$ -*sum* parallel symmetry substructure. The preliminary introduces the character Tabitha—the two a elements present her location, and the b elements portray the emotive response of the disciples and widows. Then the substructure summary includes the imperative command for her to arise followed by her presentation to the others. In aggregate, vv. 36–41 act as the A' element.

The most common parallel symmetry is an $A-B-C-A'-B'-C'$ -*SUM*, which is quickly followed by an $A-B-C-X-A'-B'-C'$ -*SUM* structure.⁷⁰ For example, in [Judges 2:16–23](#) their disobedience is emphasized in the C and C' elements.

Just as a chiasm can be imperfect, a parallel symmetry may be imperfect for the sake of emphasis. An extra, absence, or transposition marks an imperfect parallel symmetry. The same asymmetric devices—extra, absence, and transposition (Section 3.5, *Asymmetric Devices*)—also apply to imperfect parallel symmetries. The structure for [Acts 2:1–13](#) is an imperfect parallel symmetry, as mentioned in Section 3.3.1, *Name of the Basic Literary Device*.

[3.4.3. Immediate Repetition](#)

Walsh introduces the *immediate repetition*, a symmetric sequence such as $A-A'-B-B'$ or $A-A'-B-B'-C-C'$; in the same second chapter entitled *Forward Symmetry*.⁷¹ However, Walsh downplays its importance by stating, “Symmetry of immediate repetition, therefore, does not seem

70. See [Basic Structures with Parallel Symmetries](#).

71. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 35–45.

to occur as a primary organizing device in biblical Hebrew prose narrative, though it does occur in biblical poetry.”⁷² Pattern Analysis shows that immediate repetitions exist in every genre but not as frequently as chiasms and parallel symmetries (Section 3.4.5, *Consistency of Lettered Devices*).

An immediate repetition is an arrangement where the theme of an element is repeated, and then another element with its repeated theme, and so on if necessary.

An immediate repetition can have an *X* center point, which is also found in chiasms, parallel symmetries, and lists. An example is [1 Corinthians 6:1–11](#) which is an *A-A'-X-B-B'-SUM* structure. The two *B* elements are certainly stronger than the *A* elements by discussing the inheritance of the kingdom of God.

Where most immediate repetitions have two *A* elements and two *B* elements, *A-A'-B-B'*, some structures have two pairs of three: *A-A'-A''-B-B'-B''*. [Psalm 100:1–5](#) is 'one such example. Another arrangement is seen in [Luke 11:1–13](#) which has three pairs of two elements: *A-A'-B-B'-C-C'-SUM*.

Those who have studied parallelism in biblical poetry may find it more challenging to transition to the theme-based approach in Pattern Analysis. The immediate repetition seems similar to the study of grammatical equivalence, the location of synonymous, antithetical, and synthetic organizations of parallel versets, and the identification of cola, versets, verses, strophe, and stanzas.⁷³ Instead, Pattern Analysis focuses on conjugate pairs in a pericope.

Perhaps the example in Figure 5 can reveal the distinction. Consider [Proverbs 4:10–27](#) where vv. 24 and 25 are part of an immediate repetition substructure. In poetic verses, many modern translations divide a verse into two versets with the second verset indented:

Figure 5: Two Indentation Schemes for Proverbs 4:24,25

In many modern translations, the presentation is:

- 24 Put away from you a deceitful mouth
and put devious speech far from you.

72. Walsh acknowledges there are immediate repetitions in what are termed a substructure. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 35,36.

73. See for example, J. P. Fokkeman, *Reading Biblical Poetry, An Introductory Guide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), and Samuel T. S. Goh, *The Basics of Hebrew Poetry: Theory and Practice* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2017).

- 25 Let your eyes look directly ahead
and let your gaze be fixed straight in front of you.

In Pattern Analysis, the presentation is:

- b** Put away from you a deceitful mouth and put devious speech far from you. (v24) **IMPERATIVE: put away deception**
- b'** Let your eyes look directly ahead and let your gaze be fixed straight in front of you. (v25) **IMPERATIVE: focus on righteousness**

In modern translations, the indentation of the second verset draws attention to the equivalence of first and second versets. In Pattern Analysis, the *b* and *b'* elements are equally indented, drawing attention to the similarity between those two elements. The point is straightforward: just as some scholars may focus on the grammatical equivalence of the two versets, many modern Bible translations can make it more difficult for the reader to discover the theme that ties two elements together. The strength of vv. 24 and 25 is in the imperative commands of each, not the subtle relationship of vv. 24A,24B, and then vv. 25A,25B.

This discussion about equivalence is well illustrated in [2 Chronicles 5:2–14](#). In vv. 8,9, there is an immediate repetition substructure, *a-a'-b-b'*. In a poetic way, the two parts of v. 8 show good equivalence in both Hebrew and English. In v. 9, the *b* element is longer than *b'* because of the *ellipsis* of certain words in *b'*, but the equivalence of the two parts remains. An *ellipsis* is the intentional elimination of superfluous words. Therefore, the poetic parallelism of v. 8 and 9 is preserved in this narrative text.

Pattern Analysis looks for commonality, indiscriminate of narrative and poetic portions. Prose moves a story forward in a linear way—not so in Pattern Analysis. Poetry seems to focus on the equivalence of versets—not so in Pattern Analysis. The search in Pattern Analysis is for related themes regardless of the genre. The result is one prose and poetry methodology found within a pericope.

[3.4.4. List](#)

A list is a collection of elements about the same theme or topic. In Pattern Analysis, the first element of a list sequence may be alphabetic (the letter *A* or *a*), or numeric (the number 1). Therefore, a list can be an *A-B-C* or a *1-2-3-4* sequence, and a list substructure can be an *a-b-c* or a *1-2-3-4-5* sequence. A list must contain at least three elements—Proverbs 10:1–22:16 is a list with

hundreds of elements. The Pattern Analysis Software checks to ensure there are at least three elements in each sequence and that they are sequential.

A list is a collection of related elements, rarely in a particular order.

Walsh discusses the repetition of elements which would be an example of a list, but that is not a significant point in his text.⁷⁴ Dorsey develops the discussion of *linear patterns* (a-b-c-d-e) which may take either a chronological form or a variety of other non-numerical arrangements.⁷⁵

Whereas a chiasm may have an emphasis in the first/last positions and a parallel symmetry in either or both the first/first or last/last positions, no element is of greater importance than the other in a list unless the Bible tells us differently. In 1 Corinthians 13:13, love is the most important and greater than faith and hope. Therefore, when considering the fruit of the Spirit in Galatians 5:22 and 23, love has the most significant importance. Usually, other locations within a list may hold an emphasis: a surrounding frame, a summarization, or an occasional *X* center point. For example, in [Amos 4:1–13](#), there is a frame that describes what the LORD will do in His holiness to Israel, and a closing summary in v. 13 presents some attributes of God.

A list is found in the instructions to Timothy in [2 Timothy 1:1,2; 4:9–22](#). The *X* center point in vv. 4:16–18 is a place of emphasis about how the Lord rescued Paul and will in the future, to God be the glory!!

Bullinger presents three types of lists based on the separation of elements: *asyndeton* (no ands), *polysyndeton* (many ands), and *paradiastole* (neither/nor and either/or). For example, there are two asyndeton list substructures in [Psalm 146:1–10](#): the *B* element and the closing summary. In both, the word “and” does not separate elements; in English, a comma or semi-colon is used for separation. Bullinger suggests those lists should be read quickly and taken for their combined value.⁷⁶

The list substructure in [Ezekiel 6:1–14](#) is a polysyndeton of three parts. Bullinger suggests these “and” lists should be read slower and more deliberately.⁷⁷ Likewise the paradiastole of ten unrighteous people in vv. 9B,10 of [1 Corinthians 6:1–11](#) could have been rendered as a list

74. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 8-10.

75. Dorsey, *Literary Structure*, 27,28.

76. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 137-148.

77. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 208-237.

substructure. According to Bullinger, a paradiastole points to a separation or distinction between contrasting themes.⁷⁸

That last element in vv. 9B,10 leads to an interesting question: should a list of similar items be separated into a substructure, or left as an asyndeton, polysyndeton, or paradiastole? There may be no correct answer to that question. That decision may be better left to the exegete.⁷⁹

[3.4.5. Consistency of Lettered Devices](#)

One of the greatest joys concerning Pattern Analysis came through developing the software. I recall my glee when the first dynamic web page was generated. It obviously needed refinement, but the Pattern Analysis Research Language (PARL) and the resultant web page HTML worked!

Another software-related joy came in the seventh year of this development process. I sought to see if there is a pattern bias for any one genre over another. For example, “Are chiasms more frequently found in the narrative portions?”, or “Is there a propensity for other structural devices to appear much more or much less in certain genres?”

Similar to the analysis in Section 2.2.4, *Consistency of Demarcation Devices*, a study of each of the significant portions of the structural model was conducted: ten (10) lettered devices, four (4) asymmetric devices, seven (7) non-lettered devices, and four (4) structure combinations. Of these analyses, [Frequencies of Lettered Devices \(Structural\)](#) is the most compelling.⁸⁰ Each of these shows very good coherence to the mean. For example, the chiasm ranges between twenty-five percent (25%) and forty-two percent (42%). Similar ranges are shown for the chiasm (imperfect), immediate repetition, list, parallel symmetry, and parallel symmetry (imperfect).

Immediate repetitions exist in every genre, but not as frequently as chiasms and parallel symmetries. Nine percent (9%) of the basic structures are immediate repetitions, whereas chiasms

78. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 238-240.

79. Combinations of similar items in Pattern Analysis are often rendered as a list substructure regardless of how the items are separated. The sense is that with the ability to hide and show substructures using the dynamic web pages, readers may be able to glean a stronger meaning of the basic structure with a hidden substructure. However, in vv. 9B,10 they were left together without a substructure because those words should not be hidden. That is, they are too integral to the meaning of the pericope.

80. The literary device entitled Composite, shown with nine (9) literary units in the column entitled Total Devices, is an uncommon pericope. A composite has two or more basic structures (Section 3.7.1, *Composite*).

and parallel symmetries represent eighty-six percent (86%). They are more prevalent in substructures—twenty percent (20%) of all substructures have an immediate repetition arrangement.

When compared to basic structures organized as a list, list substructures appear much more frequently. Four percent (4%) of the basic structures are rendered as a list sequence whereas twenty-four percent (24%) of the substructures are rendered as a list substructure. A list can cover many various topics: genealogical (Matthew 1:1–16), categories of people (chapter 2 of Ezra), tabernacle furniture (chapter 25 of Exodus), inquiry (Romans 10:14,15), or imperative commands (1 Thessalonians 5:14–22).

The substructures are representative throughout each of the genres. That is, the chiasm substructures, immediate repetition substructures, list substructures, and parallel symmetry substructures have ample occurrences throughout each genre. It seems fair to say that none of these genres was underrepresented with any of those substructures, and there is no overabundance within any genre. However, the consistency is not as close as it is with the basic structures.

The consistency of the lettered devices does not stop there. In the following frequency analyses, the uniformity of the chiasm, parallel symmetry, and immediate repetition also show very good correspondence. Those analyses are [Frequencies for Basic Structures with Chiasms](#), [Frequencies for Basic Structures with Parallel Symmetries](#), and [Frequencies for Basic Structures with Immediate Repetitions](#). In these three analyses, the lettered arrangements also show reasonable consistency through the same nine genres. For example, these three chiastic organizations—the *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'-SUM*, the *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'-SUM*, and the *A-B-X-B'-A'-SUM* arrangements—are the most common of the chiastic structures and are reasonably consistent across all genres.

Intuitively, one might think that each genre may have a unique style. The above charts present a different perspective. A popular notion is that each Bible genre has unique characteristics. Fee and Stuart, for example, help the modern scholar and layman ask the right questions of each genre. Their approach is first to determine what the author intended for the audience of that time (exegesis) and then interpret it for modern times (hermeneutics).⁸¹

81. Gordon D. Fee and Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth*, (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 2014), 16-19.

Regarding the lettered devices, no genre is more prominent when compared to the others. These frequency analyses indicate these structures about lettered devices are a consistent methodology throughout the Bible, Genesis to Revelation.

3.5. Asymmetric Devices

In his chapter on asymmetry, Walsh states, “Asymmetry can be one of the most forceful stylistic devices in the biblical Hebrew narrative.”⁸² He then says asymmetry “is not to be confused with the absence of symmetry; it refers to a deviation within an otherwise clear symmetry. In other words, both a symmetrically patterned context and the anomaly of a deviation must be evident for asymmetry to impact the reader.”⁸³

Before reading Walsh’s work, I was baffled as to why some structural organizations did not entirely fit the chiasmic approach. Walsh’s perspective on this substantially extended that understanding. While Walsh’s teachings were very enlightening until this point, that single thought motivated the start of Pattern Analysis three years later. Could Walsh be right?

Asymmetry happens when an element does not have a matching element in its corresponding symmetric location.

Walsh identifies certain asymmetric patterns which he calls unmatched sub-units, transpositions, and non-correspondences.

- For unmatched sub-units, an element is missing. In an $A-B-C-D-D'-B'-A'$ sequence, there is no C' which matches the C element. Walsh considers an emphatic C as an extra and an emphatic C' as a lack.⁸⁴ In Pattern Analysis parlance, these are deemed an *extra* and an *absence*.
- Walsh uses the term *transposition* for those situations when elements match, but their position is not in their expected location such as $A-B-C-D-D'-B'-C'-A'$.⁸⁵ Pattern Analysis uses the same terminology.
- For Walsh, non-correspondence happens when two like-positioned elements are distinctly different. If a pair of elements are substantially different from each other, $A-B-C-D-D'-Y'$

82. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 101.

83. *Ibid.*, 101.

84. *Ibid.*, 101.

85. *Ibid.*, 102.

$B'-A'$, that distinction between C and Y' is non-correspondence.⁸⁶ Pattern Analysis renames the non-correspondence to *variation* for the sake of clarity.

He considers each to be intentional, not an oversight. As affirmed in Section 4.4, *Asymmetric Devices*, they are consistently there for the sake of emphasis.

As the Pattern Analysis Software was developed to properly represent the extra, absence, transposition, and variation, it became necessary to distinguish fully symmetric literary units from those that were not. Therefore, the terms “imperfect chiasm” and “imperfect parallel symmetry” were an outflow of the software development process. The sense is that the word imperfect would be less confusing than the more technically correct name asymmetric.

If an absence, extra, or transposition occurs in a chiasm or parallel symmetry, the Pattern Analysis Software requires the structure to be identified as imperfect because the normality has changed: “imperfect chiasm” or “imperfect parallel symmetry”. However, if the structure includes a variation that does not disrupt the normal order—it may optionally be rendered with an imperfect label. To add further rigor, the Pattern Analysis Software requires that each anomaly’s location be identified in the rhetoric documentation.

Most imperfect structures have just one anomaly in each sequence. If there are two substructures in a pericope, each substructure sequence might have one anomaly but seldom two. There is one major exception, however, the Word given to the seven churches in Revelation 1:9 - 3:22—in that case, there were four transpositions and three absences, all of which are significant.

For the sake of simplicity, substructures are not identified as imperfect in Pattern Analysis, even if an extra, absence, or transposition is present. [Ezekiel 6:1–14](#) is an example, for a transposition appears within a parallel symmetry substructure. The transposition occurs in the c' element, v. 5A within the A element—it would usually be located after v. 6B. The word “imperfect” has been dropped from the substructure, simply calling it a parallel symmetry substructure instead, and the basic structure is a chiasm, an $A-B-B'-A'-SUM$ organization, not an imperfect chiasm.

[3.5.1. Extra](#)

The extra is a most extraordinary literary technique yet found throughout the Bible. When an expected element in an otherwise symmetric structure is not present, Walsh’s method states that

86. Ibid., 102.

one should look for an emphasis.⁸⁷ If the corresponding element is emphatic, it is rendered as an extra. That is, if *C* is present but *C'* is missing AND *C* is emphatic, then *C* is an extra. When *C* is present but *C'* is missing AND *C'* is emphatic, then *C'* is an absence. There are no instances when a symmetric element such as *C'* is missing and the missing *C* is neither an extra nor an absence.

To restate this, an example of an imperfect chiasm might be an *A-B-C-X-C'-A'* arrangement and an imperfect parallel symmetry might have an *A-B-C-A'-C'* organization. The corresponding *B'* element is missing in both examples. That *B* element might be emphatic in which case it is an extra, or it may point to the missing *B'* element which would be an absence.

Pattern Analysis validates Walsh's observation about emphasis: every instance where an element is missing includes an emphasis and an extra is much more common than an absence.⁸⁸ The extra is so unusual that many examples are provided here and in Section 4.4.1, *Extra*.

In the example of the paralytic whose sins were forgiven, [Mark 2:1-12](#), the extra appears in the *B'* element, vv. 10,11, "But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins ... I say to you, get up, pick up your pallet and go home." There is no corresponding text in the *B* element. The omission of the *B* element in this literary unit is not the failure of a scribe or a change by a redactor as some scholars might suggest. That extra *B'* element is an intentional literary technique to draw attention to itself.

The case study for [Acts 2:1-13](#) includes an example of an extra (Sections 4.3.4, *Symmetric Elements*, and 3.3.6, *Asymmetric Elements*). The missing element is in the *B'* position. In vv. 3,4A, the tongues of fire appeared, rested on the disciples, and they were filled with the Holy Spirit. To some, that might be considered a later addition to the text—I suggest it is an intentional place of emphasis instead.

Nearly twenty percent (20%) of the analyzed literary units have this literary device named *extra*—they each contribute a persuasive and emphatic flare to their literary units. Their appearance is like looking at a signature of God.

87. Ibid., 101-3.

88. The distribution throughout the Bible for the four asymmetric devices—extra, absence, transposition, and variation—is shown in [Frequencies for Asymmetric Devices \(Structural\)](#).

Could the extra be an example where the Holy Spirit used this unique form of emphasis to show His signature on all Scripture?

The extra can appear in substructures, just as in basic structures. The *b* element, v. 2B of [Daniel 5:1–30](#), is an example. There is persuasive value through the lack of text in the position of the *b'* element. Nebuchadnezzar had purged the temple which would have been a significant offense to the people but part of God's plan to restore holiness to the temple.

[3.5.2. Absence](#)

As stated in the previous section, when a symmetric pair does not exist, it is either an extra or an absence.

An absence occurs when a symmetric element was intentionally omitted for the sake of emphasis.

A good police investigator will listen carefully to a suspect's repetition of a story. Is there something extra that is occasionally stated? Is something absent that was expected? Is the sequence of events sometimes transposed? Are there variations to the story when repeated? In Pattern Analysis, we are the investigators.

[Psalm 62:1–12](#) well illustrates the power of the absence. When this example is shown to others, they are asked to read first the two *A* and *A'* elements and the comments to the right about silently waiting. There is no text in the *A''* element. Then they read the three *B* elements about what they pursue and the three *C* elements about trust. I then ask them to reread *A*, *A'* and *A''*. The question then is, why do they think the *A''* element is blank? Those who do that quick exercise seem to understand the lack of scripture text quickly. Our omniscient Narrator has provided an example of patiently waiting for the LORD. Is there a better way to demonstrate silent waiting?

Roughly five percent (5%) of the analyzed literary units within the Pattern Analysis repository have an absence. Some are more dramatic than others. Without a structural analysis of parallelism, an absence would likely not be discerned. In some ways it is similar to translating a passage from a source language—some nuances from the original text can be totally missed in the translation.

[3.5.3. Transposition](#)

Walsh continues his thoughts about asymmetry by discussing the transposition.⁸⁹

A transposition occurs when one element is re-arranged to another location.

For an imperfect chiasm, it could be an $A-B-C-X-B'-C'-A'$ arrangement because B' and C' have switched places. In the same way, an $A-B-C-A'-C'-B'$ structure might typify an imperfect parallel symmetry.

Transpositions are a powerful literary device because they can potentially cause the reader to ponder why something is different. For example, consider Cain-Abel-Cain-Abel-Abel-Cain in Genesis 4:1–5. Cain was born first so he was given the first-son status. In the third mention of the two brothers, vv. 4B and 5, the LORD is said to have greater regard for Abel than Cain. Therefore, the two elements are transposed, Abel before Cain, to portray the LORD's revised viewpoint.

The most common transposition is one where two adjacent elements have reversed positions. That is the case in [Psalm 30:1–12](#) which is a $SUM-A-B-C-X-A'-C'-B'$ structure. Another type of transposition is a relocation to a more distant location such as $A-B-C-A'-X-C'-B'-SUM$ in [Lamentations 1:1–9](#) or the $a-b-c-c'-x-a'-b'-sum$ substructure in vv. 3C to 7 of [Ezekiel 6:1–14](#). The rhetorical significance of these three is described in Section 4.4.3, *Transposition*.

When a transposition is suspected in a structure, certainty of the surrounding conjugate pairs is increasingly important. The text in each pair must be clearly similar or antithetical. Otherwise, the problems associated with vivid imaginations will undoubtedly increase.

In a few cases, the elements can be significantly reorganized with more than one transposed element. Even greater caution is necessary when this occurs. These are referred to as *irregular* structures (Section 4.4.3, *Transposition*). For example, the irregular structure for Ezra 5:7–6:11 (an $a-b-c-d-e-f-g-g'-d'-e'-a'-b'-f'$ structure) is described in that section.

I suggest it is usually a mistake to parse a structure as irregular. For example, consider Romans 13:1–10. Someone could submit this as an $A-B-C-D-E-D'-E'-A'-C'-B'-SUM$ structure which would be very irregular.

Too irregular $A-B-C-D-E-D'-E'-A'-C'-B'-SUM$

Better solution $A-B-C-X-A'-C'-B'-SUM$ where X is an $a-b-a'-b'$ substructure

89. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 102,110-4.

I suggest instead this is an imperfect parallel symmetry with an X center point and a transposition: $A-B-C-X-A'-C'-B'-SUM$. The X center point is an $a-b-a'-b'$ substructure in the place of the $D-E-D'-E'$ elements. It is important to consider the potential of a substructure.

In the Pattern Analysis Software, the first relocated element is identified as a transposition. Any other elements that are out of their normal position are not identified. The software checks to see if an exegete has relocated an element but has not identified it, which prevents the structure from being validated. For example, to render a chiasm as an $A-B-C-X-B'-C'-A'$ would not pass the validation process—it is an imperfect chiasm where an emphasis has likely been missed. Likewise, to render an $A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'$ arrangement as an imperfect chiasm would also not pass the validation check because an emphasis may have been stated as inappropriate. The advantage of these and other validation checks is to help the student document potentially emphatic anomalies in their analysis.

3.5.4. Variation

In Pattern Analysis, a variation is based on identifying different themes for two otherwise corresponding elements. Walsh states this *non-correspondence* would be caused by either a considerable difference in length or a substantial difference in themes.⁹⁰ As mentioned in Section 3.2, *Basic Structures and Substructures*, the considerable difference in length is usually caused by a substructure and not an asymmetrical variation. The substructure adds detail to the parent element, not a deviation that adds emphasis to the literary unit. In Pattern Analysis, element length is only considered for a variation when a substructure does not exist.

A variation occurs when a pair of elements are substantially different from each other, $A-B-C-D-D'-Y'-B'-A'$ where Y' does not match its conjugate pair(s).

This means the themes of some elements may be distinctly unique, but they are also not antithetical thoughts. In practicality, subjectivity is more possible with this literary device. For example, in [Luke 9:51–62](#), is the C'' element sufficiently different from the C and C' elements? There is an element of surprise when Jesus stated in v. 62, “No one, after putting his hand to the plow and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.” That surprise seems to indicate that this is a variation.

90. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 101,2.

Consider the blessings given by Moses over the sons of Israel in Deuteronomy 33:1–29. There are twelve tribes mentioned, but two were given notably greater favor: Levi and Joseph. The blessings are far more for those two than the other ten. The elements for Levi and Joseph are rendered as a variation.

The Pattern Analysis database includes examples of variations in the chiasm, parallel symmetry, and list. Jesus' genealogy in Matthew 1:1–16 is three lists of fourteen elements each. Two of those elements are rendered as variations. However, if a variation is suspected in an immediate repetition, it would be rendered differently.

A warning about variations seems appropriate. When parsing a literary unit, the variation device should be used sparingly. That is, the themes for all of the surrounding elements in a literary unit should have clear pairings with each other. The variation should be distinctly different and not antithetical to its pair.

[3.5.5. Consistency of Asymmetric Devices](#)

As stated earlier, when a chiasm or parallel symmetry has an element with no text, that is either an extra or an absence. As shown in the [Frequencies for Asymmetric Devices \(Structural\)](#), the extra is much more common than the absence. With only a few exceptions, the lack of text in one element points either to an extra or absence, and the extra appears much more frequently. As surprising as the extra and absence may be as emphatic devices, their distribution throughout each of the nine genres seems surprisingly consistent. In the same way, the transposition is similarly distributed throughout each of the genres. There is no strong bias towards one genre or another.

However, the fourth device, variation, appears more frequently in the biblical Hebraic narratives. There is a more subjective sense to the variation: at what point is a difference in corresponding elements a variation? As an analyst, it is possible I rendered these situations more often in the Hebraic narrative portions than in the other.

3.6. Non-Lettered Devices

Walsh does not restrict himself to pericopes, but that is his main focus. He presents many alternative schemes to consider for each pericope.⁹¹ In the same way, Pattern Analysis shows that

91. Walsh, *Style and Structure*.

the Bible is not just a collection of chiasms without regard to pericope boundaries. The non-lettered devices fill the gap in the pericope from the lettered devices—chiasms, parallel symmetries, immediate repetitions, and lists—to the beginning and end of each pericope.

Pattern Analysis extends literary structure to the boundaries of the pericope by identifying seven non-lettered devices: three types of summarization, preliminary, frames, imperative, and parenthesis.

The most common of the non-lettered devices are the three types of summarization. They provide some introductory or concluding words. The second most common is the preliminary which provides background information necessary to understand the context of the pericope. The frame, first mentioned in Section 2.2.3, *First-element Frames*, can encapsulate the lettered devices of the pericope. The remaining two devices, the imperative and the parenthesis, complete this list of seven. Each of these brings understanding to the pericope's whole message.

Generally speaking, the classical approach to literary structure has not emphasized these seven devices. Instead, these structuralists often identify chiasms even when the structure does not match the chiasmic approach well. The same can be stated about parallel organizations and even less frequently the immediate repetitions and lists. Pattern Analysis extends these analyses to the walls of the pericope by identifying these additional structural components.

[3.6.1. Summarization](#)

Every closing summary, opening summary, and substructure summary stresses some important point within the pericope—they differ by location within the pericope. When the summarization appears before the *A*, *B*, and *C* elements, it is called an opening summary (see vv. 7B–10 in [1 John 4:7–19](#)). The summarization often appears afterward as a closing summary (see vv. 11,12 in [Psalm 62:1–12](#)). If the summarization occurs within a substructure, it is called a substructure summary (see v. 13D in [2 Chronicles 5:2–14](#)). Closing summaries are very common—nearly seventy percent (70%) of the literary structures in the Pattern Analysis repository have a closing summary.⁹² All three forms of summarization are emphatic.

92. As shown in [Frequencies for Non-Lettered Devices \(Structural\)](#), nearly eighty percent (80%) of the pericopes have either a closing summary or less often an opening summary. A pericope may have more than one substructure which translates to the possibility of more than one substructure summary in a pericope. Therefore, some genres have more than 100% frequency which can be misleading if not understood properly.

Every closing summary, opening summary, and substructure summary stresses some important point within the pericope.

Walsh describes a “concluding epitome” that appears at the end of a literary unit.⁹³ This is comparable to the closing summary in Pattern Analysis. Similarly, Bullinger discusses a figure of speech called a “symperasma” or “concluding summary.” He provides the example of Matthew 1:17 which is “a brief summarization of the preceding sixteen verses.”⁹⁴ Osborne writes about the “conclusio” which summarizes the preceding points and appeals.⁹⁵ For narrative portions, Ryken refers to them as an “end stress.”⁹⁶

Opening and closing summaries may have a basic element, a substructure, or both. For example, [1 Corinthians 6:12–20](#) has just one basic element in v. 20 and no substructure. In [1 John 4:20 – 5:12](#), there is just a substructure that covers vv. 5:6–12 without the basic element text—there is no biblical text between vv. 5:5 and 5:6. And in [Isaiah 42:1–9](#) there is both the basic element in v. 1B and a supporting substructure in vv. 1C–4B. Nearly half of these opening and closing summaries have a substructure.

In the Holy Spirit’s economy, every analyzed basic structure has no more than one summarization. That is, there can be an opening summary or a closing summary, but not both. Likewise, within a substructure there is only one substructure summary in that sub-unit. Of course, there can be multiple substructure summaries in a pericope. For example, in [Daniel 5:1–30](#) there is a closing summary that spans vv. 25–28, and two substructure summaries, vv. 4 and 16C. That observation holds for the entire Bible.

[3.6.2. Preliminary](#)

Across the spectrum of literary units cataloged in Pattern Analysis, a large percentage have closing summaries regardless of the genre. Another frequently appearing literary device is the preliminary. Nearly half of all pericopes have a preliminary portion near the literary unit's beginning.

93. Walsh also states the concluding epitome acts as a “concluding summary.” Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 57,59,60,76–79.

94. E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 468.

95. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral*: 146–7.

96. Leland Ryken, *A Complete Handbook of Literary Forms in the Bible* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2014), 76.

Those two literary devices, the preliminary and the closing summary, are two ways this pericope-based methodology augments more traditional approaches to literary structure.

See [Mark 2:1–12](#) where both are present—the preliminary in v. 2 sets the scene and the closing summary in v. 12B stresses their amazement. The lettered elements of the chiasm, *A* to *A'*, extend from vv. 5 to 12A. In more complex cases, the preliminary may have a substructure—for example, vv. 9:23B–10:3 of [Leviticus 9:23 – 10:11](#) has a substructure for a preliminary, and vv. 10:8–11 as a substructure for the closing summary.

Preliminary elements typically appear immediately after the beginning marker and before the lettered elements. If a preliminary element appears within a substructure, it precedes the lowercase-lettered elements.

The preliminary contains introductory or other background information necessary for the reader to grasp the whole meaning of the pericope.

In his section about partial symmetry, Walsh presents an introductory epitome as a technique that “sets the parameters for subsequent elaboration.”⁹⁷ Kennedy uses the word “proem” as the initial part of a rhetorical arrangement.⁹⁸ Ryken defines “exposition” as the “explanatory material in the opening unit of a story.”⁹⁹ The more common name “preliminary” was selected instead because it better describes this literary device.

A simple example of the preliminary is the description of Hananiah in v. 1B of [Jeremiah 28:1–17](#). Another example is the set of five rhetorical questions in vv. 1B–4 from [1 Corinthians 6:1–11](#).

[3.6.3. Frames](#)

A children’s song begins with the verse: “The wheels on the bus ...”. The rhyme sings about the wipers, the doors, the horn, the people, the baby, the mommy, and then returns to the wheels. The wheels on the bus are the frame. A frame is a repetition of an initial theme without necessarily using the same words. For those familiar with the term *inclusio*, it is a type of frame.

97. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 76-8.

98. George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 23.

99. Ryken, *Handbook of Literary Forms*, 86.

The frame was introduced in Section 2.2.3, *First-element Frames*, as it relates to demarcation. As stated, a frame surrounds a series of lettered elements, either a basic structure or a substructure. Some examples may help clarify the frame.

The frame in [Amos 4:1–13](#) is not a first-element frame. In that example, a beginning marker precedes the first frame element; a closing summary follows the second frame. Between those two frame elements is a list of five corrective actions taken by God, *A-B-C-D-E*. The point is that the frame in this case is not at the exact beginning or at the end of the pericope. This frame does not identify the start of the pericope; a beginning marker does. Sometimes the frame precedes the opening summarization, sometimes afterward.

A frame surrounds a sequence of lettered elements, similar to two bookends. The lettered elements may be either a basic structure or a substructure.

Frames are sometimes emphatic, others not (see also Section 4.5.3, *Frames*). Each part of the frame may be a single element as in the above example, or either part may be a substructure. In [Luke 9:51–62](#), the frame in the immediate repetition substructure is not emphatic but simply a way of demarcation as they entered and left Jerusalem.

In the Holy Spirit's economy, only one pair of frames exists in a unit. That unit may be a basic structure, substructure(s), or both. Each substructure may have a frame and a basic structure may have a frame. An example of both is seen in [Daniel 5:1–30](#). In that example, the king vowed to honor any man who could interpret the handwriting on the wall—that vow was issued in v. 7 and answered in v. 29. A second frame pair, part of the substructure describing the queen's solution, appears in vv. 10B and 12B. That second frame is independent of the two basic frame elements.

The two frames may each include substructures, making them more difficult to discern. This is exemplified in [Exodus 19:1 – 20:26](#), where both of the frames have substructures. It is rendered as a structure with many details: *FRAME-A-B-C-D-E-A'-B'-C'-D'-E'-SUM-FRAME*. The theme of the first frame, vv. 19:3–9 with an *a-b-c-x-c'-b'-a'* substructure, is a conditional promise that the LORD will make them into a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. The theme of the second frame, vv. 20:19–26 with a *sum-a-a'-x-b-b'* substructure, is the people's violation of that promise.

The first part of the frame usually appears at or near the beginning and end of a literary unit, of a substructure, or a portion of the literary unit. In [Matthew 16:13–28](#), an unusually formed frame

surrounds the *A-B-C-D* portions of a parallel symmetry. The second part of the frame typically follows the closing summary, but not always.

[3.6.4. Imperative](#)

An imperative is a directive or command that attempts to compel someone to action. In English, Hebrew, and Greek, the imperative is a verb. In English, imperatives are usually the first word in a sentence or phrase. In Greek, the spelling of the word indicates it is imperative.¹⁰⁰

An imperative is a verb designed to call or command something to take an action:

Do not enter the path of the wicked and do not proceed in the way of evil men. Avoid it, do not pass by it; turn away from it and pass on. (Proverbs 4:14,15)

In this example, the words “Do not enter” and “do not proceed” are imperative verbs, as are the words “avoid” and “turn away.”

An imperative is a directive or command that attempts to compel someone to action.

There are three ways that an imperative may appear in Pattern Analysis, and context determines which applies. An imperative at the beginning of a pericope or in a sub-unit is called an *imperative marker* such as v. 3:12 in [Joshua 3:12; 4:1–9,19 – 5:1](#). If an imperative is found within a lettered element such as the *A*, *C*, and *B'* elements of [Joshua 3:12; 4:1–9,19 – 5:1](#), it is called an *imperative element*. (See also vv. 59 and 60 of [Luke 9:51–62](#)). An imperative element is marked with the word *IMPERATIVE* on the right of the biblical text and is identified by a lettered element, *A* or *B'* or *x*. The least common is an *imperative device* such as v. 2,3A of [Ezekiel 6:1–14](#). An imperative device is identified by the word *IMPERATIVE* on the left of the biblical text. In all three cases, a verb flags the imperative. In an imperative element, a word seems particularly strong, a command. An imperative device is similar to a summarization where the entire element seems strong and commanding.

100. Although the imperative verbs are reasonably easy to identify in English, some specially designed software was incorporated into Pattern Analysis for the identification of potential Koine Greek imperative verbs. A textbook by Long helped assemble a vocabulary of imperative verbs based on word endings, which then was applied to a word-by-word analysis of NA27 Greek words. That vocabulary flags potential imperative locations within a literary unit. Fredrick J. Long, *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Greek Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook* (Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse, 2015), 494-9.

The wall writing example of Belteshazzar’s palace ([Daniel 5:1–30](#)) contains an imperative device. Daniel told the king in v. 17B, “Keep your gifts for yourself or give your rewards to someone else.” The words “keep” and “give” are both imperative. There is imperative strength in that statement to the king. Without that understanding, one might miss Daniel’s complete rejection of recognition.

It was stated in Section 3.6.1, *Summarization*, that there can be only one basic summarization in a literary unit (excluding the substructure summary statements). However, there can be an imperative device and an opening or closing summary. For example, [Isaiah 56:1–7](#) has both an imperative device in v. 1B and a closing summary in vv. 7A–7D.

[3.6.5. Parenthesis](#)

A parenthesis is a minor change of flow which then returns to the earlier discussion. That is, an outer text surrounds an inner text. Parentheses sometimes interrupt for the sake of emphasis.

Walsh presented the parenthesis as a break in the text, like a parenthetical comment.¹⁰¹

We are told in Acts 4:22 that the man healed at Gate Beautiful was over forty years old. In a sense, this is odd because his healing was described in Acts 3:2–8. There is a gap of forty-two verses between his healing and the statement of his age during which Peter addressed the people of Israel. In that case v. 4:22 was rendered as a parenthesis, a digression from Peter’s speech in Acts 4:1–22. It seems to say that Peter’s address to the people of Israel had in mind the supernatural healing of that man.

Wendland defines a parenthesis as a “statement that interrupts a discourse by departing from a main theme or series of events.”¹⁰² It is a digression or otherwise some form of deviation from the current flow of the literary unit. Wendland later describes a parenthesis as a deviation, “a marked departure from a given norm or a shift in expectancy.” That is, a digression from the scripture’s flow.¹⁰³ Bailey describes this device as an “aside,” a sudden interruption of the current topic.¹⁰⁴

101. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 168,9.

102. Ernst R. Wendland, *Analyzing and Translating Hebrew Poetry, with Special Reference to Prophecy and the Book of Haggai*, (Lusaka: Lusaka Lutheran Press, 2021), 306.

103. Ernst R. Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture*, (Dallas: SIL International, 2004), 147,148.

104. Bailey, *Mediterranean Eyes*, 29.

The theme of [1 John 4:7-19](#) might be described as a call to love one another, for God lives within us and He perfects us. Then v. 18 is antithetical to that love message for it deals with fear and punishment. This too was rendered as a parenthesis because it is a marked departure from the overall theme of this literary unit.

[3.6.6. Consistency of Non-lettered Devices](#)

The opening and closing summarizations show reasonably equal distributions across each genre, as shown in the [Frequencies of Non-Lettered Devices \(Structural\)](#). It can be seen that the closing summary appears much more frequently than the opening summary. There are no instances in the database where both an opening and closing summary appear. When considering both, eighty percent (80%) of the literary structures have one or the other of these—there does not seem to be a bias for one literary structure over another.

The substructure summary has more variation from one genre to another, where it appears most commonly in the Torah. There is no explanation for this apparent anomaly.

The frame and the preliminary show good adherence to the mean. They seem to be distributed relatively evenly, with some more variation in the preliminary elements. More than thirty percent (30%) of the pericopes have a basic frame, a substructure frame, or both.

The imperative and parenthesis elements were rendered less frequently than the other literary devices. There seems to be a bias within the Torah for both of those. These books are only fifty-six percent (56%) complete as of the date of this writing, so it is difficult to explain that apparent discrepancy.

3.7. Structure Combinations

Besides the above lettered, asymmetric, and non-lettered organizations of literary units, there are several ways these structured themes may be combined. A composite combines more than one basic structure in a literary unit; a structure split identifies breaks in a literary unit; a link connects a literary unit in the New Testament with a related one in the Old; and a drill helps combine contiguous literary units.

[3.7.1. Composite](#)

Each pericope usually contains just one basic structure which extends from the beginning to the end. It is deemed a composite when two or possibly more basic structures about the same topic are combined into one literary unit. Walsh uses a similar name, “composite symmetry.”¹⁰⁵ For example, a composite might include a parallel symmetry and an imperfect chiasm, both basic structures. In this way, a pericope with one topic may have two (or more) basic structures that extend from the beginning to the end.

A composite combines two or possibly more basic structures about the same topic into a literary unit.

See the example in [John 20:19–29](#) for an understanding of the composite. In that pericope, Jesus presented two signs: He breathed the Holy Spirit on them (a parallel symmetry from vv. 19–23), and He had Thomas touch the holes in His hands (an imperfect parallel symmetry that covers vv. 24–29). These two basic structures belong to one literary unit because they describe the same topic: Jesus’s supernatural appearance to the disciples.

Only nine composites have been identified at the time of this writing—they are not common. Of those nine, five have a frame at the beginning and end, unifying the composite into one topic.

[3.7.2. Structure Split](#)

In great literature, it is common for a sequence, scene, or thought to be presented, placed on hold to discuss something else, and then returned to the first sequence. This is termed a structure split in Pattern Analysis, using the parable of the tares in Figure 6 as an example:

Figure 6: Schema for Matthew 13:24–30, 36–43

PARALLEL SYMMETRY: ... parable of the tares ...

BEGINNING MARKER: a change of genre: another parable	v24A
A a man sowed good seed	v24B
B the enemy sowed tares which also sprouted	v25–28A
C gather the tares and wheat at the time of the harvest	v28B–30

STRUCTURE SPLIT: Jesus spoke two more parables; the parables fulfill prophecy (v31–35)

SUB-UNIT MARKER a change of location: Jesus went into the house	v36A
IMPERATIVE the disciples urged for an explanation	v36B

105. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 81.

A'	the good seed sower is Jesus; the good seed are the sons of God	v37,38A
B'	the sower of the tares is the devil; tares are the sons of the devil	v38B,39A
C'	the reapers harvest at the end of the age	v39B
SUM	God's kingdom will be removed, and those remaining will burn	v40-43

The structure split is that portion between vv. 30 and 36. The challenge with this tares parable is there are three interwoven parables. That is, a parable is stated in vv. 24–30, a second and third parable with a brief discussion about prophecy are a deviation in vv. 31–35, and then the parable interpretation resumes at v. 36. See [Matthew 13:24–30,36–43](#) for the complete solution.

A structure split suppresses non-relevant verses about a topic. It is a placeholder that allows all relevant elements about a topic to be together.

The development of the Pattern Analysis Software led to this mechanism where a topic is continued at a later location within a book. If great literature uses this writing technique, it seems readers of biblical literature should allow the same. They are particularly prevalent in the book of Matthew but are found throughout the Bible.

Bauer and Traina identify a similar device called an “intercalation” which describes a deviation. They wrote, “Intercalation is the insertion of one literary unit in the midst of another literary unit. It usually means a splitting apart of a narrative in order to interpose another narrative within it, causing the reader to pause and to ponder the relationship between the intercalated material and the material that surrounds it.”¹⁰⁶

A structure split is a connective mechanism for the surrounding material whereas an intercalation is the portion in the middle. A structure split can bypass many topics whereas an intercalation typically involves one subtopic. Sometimes the theme of a literary unit is continued many chapters later. The structure split identifies that other topics are present so that all the relevant verses about the initial topic are together. One line marks the structure split so that the emphatic voice of the Holy Spirit may be more readily understood.

The beginning and end of most of epistles attributed to Paul are examples of a structure split. In those, the salutation of grace and peace at the beginning is paired with a corresponding

106. David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academics, 2011), 121,122.

valediction of the same essence at the end. For example, see the second letter to Timothy, [2 Timothy 1:1,2; 4:9–22](#).

A more complicated example appears in the story of the twelve stones placed in the Jordan River, [Joshua 3:12; 4:1–9,19 – 5:1](#). Chapters 3 and 4 of Joshua are split into three interwoven portions:

The crossing of the Jordan (v. 3:1–11,16,17; 4:10)

Twelve stones were taken from the riverbed (v. 3:12; 4:1–9,19 – 5:1)

The priests stepped into the water which was cut off into a heap (v. 3:13–16; 4:18)

A word of caution may be appropriate here. Some students may too easily employ the structure split in their analyses. The rigor of Pattern Analysis calls for preservation of literary unit's logic for the chiasms and parallel symmetries, appropriateness of the literary unit's rhetoric, and analysis of chapters surrounding the literary unit (preferably the entire book). Those portions identified as emphatic (Chapter Five, *The Rhetorical Model*) should make sense based on those rules.

[3.7.3. Link](#)

A link is Pattern Analysis's term for connecting a New Testament pericope back to a pericope in the Old Testament. One or more emphases in the Old Testament pericope are relevant to the New Testament, adding increased understanding of the New.

A link is a pericope-to-pericope connection of an Old Testament set of verses to its New Testament counterpart for the sake of emphasis.

Many modern Bible translations identify New Testament citations from the Old Testament by referencing the address where it came from. For example, a notation for Matthew 27:46, *ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI*, would refer to Psalm 22:1. In the NASB 95 translation of the New Testament, there are three hundred and thirty-five (335) unique citations from the Old. That translation prints all those references in uppercase.^{107,108}

107. Robert Bratcher compiles a cross-reference document that lists the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. That list includes both the formal quotations and some paraphrases and allusions. The scope of links in Pattern Analysis has been restricted to formal quotations only as they appear in the NASB 95. Robert G. Bratcher, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies: 1961, 1984).

108. Some words in the NASB 95 are in uppercase which do not refer to an Old Testament verse. An example is found in Daniel 5:1-30. In that case, the words MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN in vv.

Pattern Analysis takes advantage of the uppercase references by requiring students to enter the associated pericope. That is, they enter the address of the pericope such as Psalm 22:1–31 rather than the single verse Psalm 22:1. Some may prefer to add the quoted verse(s) along with the pericope address: Psalm 22:1–31 (v1), but that is not necessary.

B' About the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice saying, [Psalm 22:1–31 \(v1\)](#)
[“ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI?” that is, “MY GOD, MY GOD,
WHY HAVE YOU FORSAKEN ME?”](#) (v46)

The above example shows the uppercase letters in blue and underlined. That is, the web page treats Psalm 22:1–31 as a hyperlink. When the student identifies a link with the address of the pericope, the Pattern Analysis Software validates the pericope exists. Then it opens a smaller window showing the Old Testament pericope and its rhetorical analysis. In that way, when the student documents the relationship between the Old Testament pericope and that of the New in the rhetoric analysis, both pericopes may be seen together. See Section 4.8, *Link*, which presents the importance of this link device.

When the student moves to the validation step, the software checks that the address of the pericope (Psalm 22:1–31) is in the database. It also verifies that the quoted text is in uppercase and that the Old Testament link has been entered in the rhetorical section.¹⁰⁹

Once the validation has been completed, a dynamic web page appears with the ability to see the New Testament and the linked pericope together. That availability helps with the documentation of the relationship between the two pericopes. For example, see [Revelation 10:1–11](#) where the student can click on the capitalized words in v. 6.

[3.7.4. Drill](#)

Another way literary units may be combined is by using a drill. Drills are used to connect a cluster of adjacent pericopes. For example, in the account of Noah’s flood, six literary units are arranged as an imperfect chiasm, [Genesis 5:32 – 9:29](#).¹¹⁰

25-28 were written on the wall. By identifying each of those verses as a *no-link*, the Pattern Analysis Software does not check for a valid scripture address in the comments.

109. If another translation besides the NASB 95 is desired, software modifications will be necessary to accommodate that scenario.

110. Sorry: both the account of Noah’s flood and the book of Revelation are not publicly available because the copyright restrictions. The NASB 95 prohibits the use of more than five hundred (500) verses in a

While there is a similarity between a link and a drill, the student experiences a difference. When a link is clicked on a tablet or larger computer screen, another web page is opened that spans just the right half of the screen. That allows both the original and linked literary units to be seen simultaneously. However, when a drill is clicked, another web page is opened that fills the entire screen. The back arrow in the browser must be used to return to the original literary unit.

[3.7.5. Consistency of Structure Combinations](#)

The last of the frequency analyses within the structural model is the [Frequencies for Structure Combinations \(Structural\)](#). These results do not reveal any particular conformity to their mean value.

Regarding the composites, there are too few in the database to discuss.

The book of Matthew has many structure splits—a literary unit is often started in one place and continued in another. That technique appears elsewhere but with much less frequency.

The link is directly related to Old Testament references found in the New, which explains why there are no uses of the link in the Old.

The drill combines different literary units at the analyst's discretion. It has been tested on the books of Genesis, Proverbs, Song of Solomon, and Revelation—others might use it for other books. That means it would not have any consistency from one analyst to another.

publication. The various biblical examples in this manuscript were selected in part because of that five hundred verse limitation.

4. The Rhetorical Model

When we look around our homes, we usually don't concentrate on the wood that holds the frame together, the roof that prevents water from coming inside, the wires that carry the electricity, the pipes that bring water to the faucets, or even the windows that keep out the weather when it is either too hot or too cold. Those are the necessary structural items so that colorful carpets and upholstery and curtains and wall hangings and light fixtures and kitchen appointments and bedspreads and towels and ... create a picture of our homes. The items we see are rhetoric that persuades us to feel comfortable where we live.

4.0. Overview of the Rhetorical Model

For any particular literary unit, Pattern Analysis searches for the points of emphasis and persuasion. The rhetorical analysis is prose, an analyst's attempt to document what the Holy Spirit seems to emphasize. This chapter explores how locations within structures can lead to a student's greater understanding of the Holy Spirit's rhetoric.

The end result of Pattern Analysis is not the structure; it is the student's greater understanding of the Holy Spirit's rhetoric.

See the uppercase words in the green box on the right of the [1 John 4:7-19](#) analysis. These uppercase words are rhetorical devices that identify places of persuasive emphasis in that pericope. For example, an OPENING SUMMARY is documented for vv. 7B-10 with two AMPLIFICATIONS. The Pattern Analysis Software performs a quality review of those identified rhetorical devices to improve the rigor of each analysis.

The search to understand the Bible's emphasis is hardly new to Pattern Analysis. Ryken wisely observes, "Rhetoric means two things to literary critics—certain forms or devices (such as dramatic irony or repetition) or the persuasive techniques by which authors or speakers influence their readers or listeners to agree with their viewpoints."¹¹¹ In Pattern Analysis, the perspective is the latter, the

111. Ryken, *Handbook of Literary Forms*, 176.

Holy Spirit's persuasion. The view here is that God attempts through the Holy Spirit to influence people using His persuasive tools.

An example of rhetorical persuasion is Rotherham's *Emphasized Bible*, published in 1902. It presents various techniques that accentuate the English translation based on the Bible's original languages.¹¹² Another example is Hill and Archer's *Discovery Bible*, an online tool for discovering emphasized words.¹¹³

The rhetorical model in Pattern Analysis uses an alternative approach for this persuasion—it is primarily based on the results from the literary structure model, Chapter Four, *The Structural Model*. Once the literary structure is established, specific locations are inquired for their persuasive value. These locations are often based on Walsh's methods for emphasis.¹¹⁴ His observations about emphasis led to my research question: does Jerome Walsh's methodology in *Style and Structure* apply to every verse in the Bible, or are modifications necessary? In particular, are his statements about emphatic locations consistent throughout the Bible?

Walsh did not mention the voice of the Holy Spirit; that is my addition. I was interested if, by finding these places of emphasis, they somehow pointed to the Holy Spirit.

Pattern Analysis is interested in hearing and understanding the voice of the Holy Spirit in the text. It builds upon the synergy of God's Word and the individual—how the Holy Spirit's structural organization persuades an individual. These organizations include a chiasm or an imperfect chiasm, a parallel symmetry or imperfect parallel symmetry, a substructure, a summarization, or any other structural organization. The question becomes, why is the text positioned that way? The Holy Spirit's rhetoric may be discerned by looking at select locations within a structure.

Martin argues for adding pathos into the analysis of the Bible's rhetoric. He encourages the rhetorician to search for “hope or despair, love or hate, trust or fear, admiration or scorn, pride or

112. Joseph Bryant Rotherham, *Rotherham, Emphasized Bible: A Translation Designed to Set Forth the Exact Meaning, the Proper Terminology, and the Graphic Style of the Sacred Original*, (Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 1902; Reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1959).

113. The Discovery Bible, <https://discoverybible.com>, accessed Nov 11, 2023.

114. Walsh, *Style and Structure*. 8,11,14,26,37,52,57,72,73,101-3,107,110-4,145.

shame, joy or despondency,” among other examples. He hopes for the content of the text to reveal that rhetoric.¹¹⁵ Pattern Analysis encourages an emotive response to the text as appropriate.

With few exceptions, the writings of biblical scholars about literary structure focus on the structure’s organization: how the *A*, *B*, and *C* elements are arranged and interrelated. Literary structures can be uncommonly beautiful, but those analyses often do not address how the structure has moved individuals.

Pattern Analysis takes a more holistic approach. It recognizes that structural analysis is necessary to grasp the more important points within each pericope. When the structural analysis is complete, a list of potential rhetoric locations is available (see [1 John 4:7–19](#)) for viewing. That list is based on the structure—it suggests that the analyst should look in specific locations for possible emphasis by the Holy Spirit.

Rhetoric is documentation of what they perceive about the Holy Spirit’s inspirations. Based on the structure and other techniques, it is a collection of thoughts that may be sufficient in themselves. The rhetorical response is a person’s identification of what the holy text says and how they received it.

The documentation of rhetoric looks at devices such as a summarization. This written exercise will hopefully engage our minds and reveal an improved understanding of the text. Each documentation of the appropriate devices searches for the emphatic value within each literary unit. They ask why they are there and what is being communicated through them.

In Pattern Analysis, the exegete’s documentation of rhetoric is an opportunity to grasp a more profound understanding of the Holy Spirit’s messages.

Through this process, the Holy Spirit can open minds and spirits to see something new or unexpected through that rhetoric. Further, the documentation of rhetoric can contribute to the refinement of structural analyses.

What does “rhetorical” mean and how does it differ from “emphasis”? Rhetoric is those thoughts and ideas within a structure that may particularly persuade us of truths within that textual unit. It is those portions that can move us towards greater insight and understanding. It is similar

115. Lee Roy Martin, *Rhetorical Criticism and the Affective Dimension of the Biblical Text*, (Unisa, South Africa, 2014), 344,5, accessed Dec 5, 2022, Academia.edu.

to the central arguments in a legal case that lead to an emphatic conclusion. The emphasis then is a subset of that rhetoric, that portion which can create an emotive response. The emphasis allows us to shake our heads in affirmation of that lesson.

The words rhetoric and emphasis are sometimes interchanged in this manuscript because to do otherwise may be an unnecessary splitting of hairs. What one calls emphatic, another might call persuasive or highly persuasive. Each response is potentially a result of the Holy Spirit's prompting.

Pattern Analysis lists twenty-four (24) potential rhetorical locations that may be identified. See [Literary Devices for the Rhetorical Model](#) which provides an example of each. For those rhetorical devices, only certain ones apply depending on the structure. For example, a chiasm has two first/last elements and a center point—locations where emphasis might be found. Depending on other distinctions, additional emphasis may be found in that pericope. The twenty-four (24) rhetorical devices are:

- Absence**—Applies to chiasms and parallel symmetries; the missing element is significant.
- Amplification**—Often applies to immediate repetitions; the second part embellishes the first.
- Center point**—Applies to all structures, often an *X*; a place of emphasis or turning point.
- Closing summary**—A concluding emphasis at or near the end of a literary unit.
- Comparison**—Two elements or sequences with similar themes.
- Contrast**—Two corresponding elements or sequences with opposing themes.
- Correlation of sequences**—Applies to chiasms and parallel symmetries; *A-B-C* vs. *A'-B'-C'*.
- Corresponding elements**—A comparison or contrast to a conjugate pair.
- Extra**—Applies to chiasms and parallel symmetries; the pair to the missing is significant.
- First/first**—Applies to parallel symmetries, emphasizing the two *A* elements.
- First/last**—Applies to chiasms, emphasizing the two *A* elements.
- Frame**—The repetition of a theme that surrounds a structure; may be emphatic.
- Imperative**—An element with an imperative verb that indicates a strong directive or command.
- Intensification**—An escalation of themes from beginning to end, or outside to middle.
- Interjection**—The word “behold” often points to important words that follow.
- Last/last**—Applies to parallel symmetries, emphasizing the last elements in the pairing.
- Link**—A connection of the emphasis from an OT literary unit to an NT literary unit.
- Opening summary**—An introductory emphasis at or near the beginning of a literary unit.

Parenthesis—Sometimes emphatic annotation of text; it explains related information.

Question—Those queries which cause the reader or listener to slow down and reflect.

Repetition—A restatement of the same words or theme.

Substructure summary—An emphasis at the beginning or end of a substructure.

Transposition—Applies to chiasms and parallel symmetries, a relocation of an element.

Variation—One element in the pairing significantly differs from the other(s).

These rhetorical devices are found throughout the Bible, as seen in Section 4.9, *Consistency of the Rhetorical Model*.

4.1. My Rhetorical Process

The analysis of patterns using this methodology should not stop when the structural analysis is completed. Yes, there is good meat in the structure, sometimes excellent meat. The rhetorical analyses take our thoughts from the logical and mathematical side to the more discerning and literary side. God made us with two sides of our brains; we can exercise both as we read the Bible.

Where the structural analysis is based on logic and relationships, the rhetorical analysis combines those patterns as a literary unit to see the bigger picture.

The following describes the process of documenting the rhetorical emphasis. Once the structure has been created and has passed all validation criteria, a dynamic HTML web page such as [1 John 4:7–19](#) is available. This computer-generated list of potential rhetorical locations—shown on the right-hand green box of the web page—can be used to document the rhetoric. That list identifies places to check for their contribution to persuasion and emphasis. As a narrative, the student then describes which locations are emphatic and why. In this way, this methodology repeatedly helps discern more of the Holy Spirit’s revelation.

A notepad-like editor is used within the Pattern Analysis Software for the documentation. (An enhancement might be integrating a word processor into the software). By documenting this, the rhetoric can be searched along with other literary units, a rudimentary validation can be performed, and the rhetoric’s locations can be saved for further analysis. See [Rhetoric for 1 John 4:17–19](#).

Each analysis is an attempt by an analyst to explain how these rhetorical devices influence one’s understanding of the passage. While a collection of thirty students might reveal some similarities with their analyses, individuality is also important.

Within the documentation, an introductory paragraph presents the name of the basic literary device with uppercase letters and any general comments about the literary unit. Each subsequent paragraph is assigned a sequential item number which should help the analyst with diagnostic issues. At least one rhetorical device is entered using uppercase letters within each numbered item. The validation checks for the presence of those uppercase words that are then compared to the structure for possible mistakes. For example, if a closing summary is identified in the rhetoric but one is not identified in the structure, then a diagnostic is presented with that impossibility. Many other potential mistakes are checked in that software.

If a verse seems particularly emphatic but does not follow the rules for that literary device, there may be a better way to approach the structure.

If the normal locations for emphasis do not seem emphatic, try again. Then it is back to the structural analysis to refine the previous effort. Some elements may be regrouped or adjusted for better consistency. Chiasms might be changed into parallel symmetries or vice versa simply because the rhetorical documentation clarified the structure. Boundaries of literary units might be altered so that a closing summary may be included. Two literary units might be combined into one for greater clarity. This all is to say that a rhetorical analysis can reveal more than just what is persuasive. In that way, the rhetorical analysis can be a self-check on the quality of the structural analysis. In ways only God fully knows, the emphasis begins to speak to us personally.

Emphatic words can express special meanings in the structures. Many nuggets may be found in those potentially emphatic locations. *For the word of God is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword.* Hebrews 4:12.

4.2. Rhetorical Case Study

This case study for [Acts 2:1–13](#) illustrates the rhetorical model. These same verses were previously presented in Section 3.3, *Structural Case Study*. The question in Section 4.0, *The Rhetorical Model*, asked why these structures exist and what is individually communicated through them. The response below is a recollection of how that literary unit persuaded me.

The documentation began with the list of potentially significant locations that appear in the right-hand green box of that web page:

Potential Rhetoric

—Which are persuasive?

—What do they emphasize?

First/First **A, A'** (v2 and 6A)

Extra **B** (v3,4A)

Last/Last **C, C'** (v4B and 6B)

Closing Summary **SUM** (v7–13)

First/Last **a, a'** (v7 and 12)

Center Point **x** (v9–11A)

Substructure Summary **sum** (v13)

[Acts 2:1–13](#) is not an overly complex literary unit: an imperfect parallel symmetry with an *A-B-C-A'-C'-SUM* arrangement. Due to its brevity, many of these elements partake in the pericope's rhetoric. More elements typically play a minor role in the rhetoric in more extended structures. All locations in this pericope are significant.

In the blue paraphrase on the web page, three elements are marked with the word *QUESTION*. Those questions were also significant. Therefore, the rhetoric description includes five literary devices: First/First, Extra, Last/Last, Closing Summary, and Question.

The closing summary in vv. 7–12 provided a fresh understanding. I had read these verses many times before and had concentrated on the evidence of tongues and the filling of the Holy Spirit as emphasized in vv. 3,4A, the extra. This time, “bewildered” in v. 6 and the closing summary in vv. 7–12 stuck out. I saw the effect of this supernatural miracle on the crowd in a new way. Just as the crowd was in awe, I was struck by a similar awe. The Holy Spirit redirected my thoughts and understanding: the crowd's awe in the closing summary was equally supernatural.

[4.2.1. First/First](#)

Figure 7: [Acts 2:2–6](#) (First/First)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>A And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. (v2)</p> <p>B And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, and they rested on each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit (v3,4A)</p> | <p>a violent noise as they were sitting</p> <p>EXTRA: tongues of fire rested on the disciples; they were filled with the Holy Spirit</p> |
|--|--|

C	and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit was giving them utterance. (v4B)	the disciples began to speak in tongues
SUB-UNIT MARKER: Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem, devout men from every nation under heaven. (v5)		a change of characters
A'	And when this sound occurred, the crowd came together, (v6A)	the violent sound brought the crowd
B'		no text
C'	and were bewildered because each one of them was hearing them speak in his own language. (v6B)	the crowd heard them speaking in their own language

The **green** A and A' elements are in the *FIRST/FIRST* position for this parallel symmetry. The words *suddenly* and *a violent rushing wind* in v. 2 create an engaging and emotive sense. The wind filled the whole house. Naturally the crowd rushed to that location. In the same way, these words persuade the reader to engage in the story. My documentation reads,

- 1) The sudden and violent noise in the FIRST/FIRST elements, A and A', brought the crowd together but possibly in fear. A very strong rushing wind accompanied that loud noise. Just as the sound and wind brought the crowd, it engaged me as the reader.

4.2.2. Extra

Figure 8: Acts 2:2-6 (Extra)

A	And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. (v2)	a violent noise as they were sitting
B	And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, and they rested on each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit (v3,4A)	EXTRA: tongues of fire rested on the disciples; they were filled with the Holy Spirit
C	and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit was giving them utterance. (v4B)	the disciples began to speak in tongues
SUB-UNIT MARKER: Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem, devout men from every nation under heaven. (v5)		a change of characters
A'	And when this sound occurred, the crowd came together, (v6A)	the violent sound brought the crowd
B'		no text
C'	and were bewildered because each one of them was hearing them speak in his own language. (v6B)	the crowd heard them speaking in their own language

The *EXTRA* element in v. 3,4A was explained in Sections 4.3.6, *Asymmetric Elements*. It was not happenstance; it was intentional. There are many instances throughout the Bible such as this where the lack of text has pointed to a rhetorical emphasis. The description of the fire which rested on everyone is again emotive. My documentation reads,

2) The EXTRA B element, verses 3 and 4A, presents the tongues as a fire that was distributed onto the disciples—they were filled with the Holy Spirit. To me, this is very emphatic. In their shoes, I picture myself overwhelmed with both fear and wonder at the same time.

4.2.3. Last/Last

Figure 9: Acts 2:2–6 (Last/Last)

A	And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. (v2)	a violent noise as they were sitting
B	And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, and they rested on each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit (v3,4A)	EXTRA: tongues of fire rested on the disciples; they were filled with the Holy Spirit
C	and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit was giving them utterance. (v4B)	the disciples began to speak in tongues
SUB-UNIT MARKER: Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem, devout men from every nation under heaven. (v5)		a change of characters
A'	And when this sound occurred, the crowd came together, (v6A)	the violent sound brought the crowd
B'		no text
C'	and were bewildered because each one of them was hearing them speak in his own language. (v6B)	the crowd heard them speaking in their own language

The word “bewildered” is also emotive in v. 6B. It seems to engage the reader, for they too can be bewildered by this extra-special event. My third documentation for this literary unit reads,

3) The LAST/LAST elements, C and C', introduce their speaking in tongues. And the crowd was bewildered as they spoke the mighty works of God. The skeptic would ask, *What is this?*, while the lover would proclaim *Wow, wow, wow* in a loud voice.

4.2.4. Closing Summary

Figure 10: Acts 2:7–13 (Structure)

SUM	CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE ... crowd's amazement ...	CLOSING SUMMARY
a	They were amazed and astonished, saying, “Why, are not all these who are speaking Galileans? (v7)	QUESTION: asked why in amazement
b	And how is it that we each hear them in our own language to which we were born? (v8)	QUESTION: heard in our own language
x	“Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the districts of Libya around Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs— (v9–11A)	the locations of the many visitors

b'	we hear them in our own tongues speaking of the mighty deeds of God." (v11B)	heard in our own tongues
a'	And they all continued in amazement and great perplexity, saying to one another, "What does this mean?" (v12)	QUESTION: asked for an explanation in amazement
sum	But others were mocking and saying, "They are full of sweet wine." (v13)	SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY: some thought they were drunk

Summarizations, by their nature, add an emphatic flair to literary units. In this case, vv. 7–13 is a *CLOSING SUMMARY* shaped as a chiasm substructure. The two *FIRST/LAST a* elements introduce the reader to the crowd's amazement; the *x CENTER POINT* is a repetition of many people groups; and the *SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY* in v. 13 is a cynical contrast to the amazed others in the crowd. Each of these helped provide an understanding of that second miracle in these thirteen verses: it is likely that some of those who called for the crucifixion of Christ now had their spirits opened.

The fresh importance of this closing summary reads,

4) I have read this story about the impartation of tongues many times, a powerful move of the Holy Spirit. As I prepared this analysis, what particularly struck me came through the CLOSING SUMMARY. There are two groups of people: those from many nations that spoke tongues, identified in the *x CENTER POINT* in verses 9–11A, and devout Jewish people from Jerusalem (verse 5) who were potentially some of the same ones that called for the crucifixion of Jesus. The *FIRST/LAST* elements, *a* and *a'*, state that the Jewish people were amazed, astonished, and perplexed. As I pondered this, I understood there was an equally powerful move of the Holy Spirit to open their hearts and minds. That revelation, especially seen in the *SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY* in verse 13, is the *CONTRAST* between those who were amazed and the skeptics.

4.2.5. Question

Figure 11: Acts 2:7–13 (Questions)

SUM	CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE ... crowd's amazement ...	CLOSING SUMMARY
a	They were amazed and astonished, saying, "Why, are not all these who are speaking Galileans? (v7)	QUESTION: asked why in amazement
b	And how is it that we each hear them in our own language to which we were born? (v8)	QUESTION: heard in our own language
x	"Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the districts of Libya around Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs— (v9–11A)	the locations of the many visitors

b'	we hear them in our own tongues speaking of the mighty deeds of God." (v11B)	heard in our own tongues
a'	And they all continued in amazement and great perplexity, saying to one another, "What does this mean?" (v12)	QUESTION: asked for an explanation in amazement
sum	But others were mocking and saying, "They are full of sweet wine." (v13)	SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY: some thought they were drunk

Some *QUESTIONS* are designed to ask the reader to pause and reflect on their answer. In those cases, the text is intended to slow the reader down and cause them to read the context, listen to what the Spirit is nudging them, gain a fresh understanding, and then respond. Questions often add to the persuasion, but it is a mistake to say that most questions are emphatic. Whether a question is emphatic or not is subjective. My documentation for this fifth rhetoric states,

5) Within the closing summary, there are three QUESTIONS: *Why is this? How is this possible?* and *What does this mean?* I suggest that such questions are part of the narrative and intended for readers to answer for themselves. The Holy Spirit seems to have placed these queries so that the reader must struggle with the meaning of all this. These questions are highly emphatic to me.

4.2.6. Documentation of the Rhetoric

Based on the above documentation for [Acts 2:1–13 \(Completed\)](#), this pericope has more than one emphasis. Nine are listed based on their uppercase lettering. The complete documentation is shown below:

Figure 12: Rhetorical Analysis of Acts 2:1–13

This IMPERFECT PARALLEL SYMMETRY introduces the first manifestation by the Holy Spirit upon the people. Some might include verse 13 in this literary unit, suggesting that while many were amazed at this event, some were not. Others might not include verse 13 because that contrast between drunkenness and Peter's explanation of this event belongs to the next literary unit. I chose to include verse 13 in both literary units.

1) The sudden and violent noise in the FIRST/FIRST elements, A and A', brought the crowd together but possibly in fear. A very strong rushing wind accompanied that loud noise. Just as the sound and wind brought the crowd, it engaged me as the reader.

2) The EXTRA B element, verses 3 and 4A, presents the tongues as a fire that was distributed onto the disciples—they were filled with the Holy Spirit. To me, this is very emphatic. In their shoes, I picture myself overwhelmed with both fear and wonder at the same time.

3) The LAST/LAST elements, C and C', introduce their speaking in tongues. And the crowd was bewildered as they spoke the mighty works of God. The skeptic would ask, *What is this?*, while the lover would proclaim *Wow, wow, wow* in a loud voice.

4) I have read this story about the impartation of tongues many times, a powerful move of the Holy Spirit. As I prepared this analysis, what particularly struck me came through the CLOSING SUMMARY. There are two groups of people: those from many nations that spoke tongues, identified in the x CENTER POINT in verses 9–11A, and devout Jewish people from Jerusalem (verse 5) who were potentially some of the same ones that called for the crucifixion of Jesus. The FIRST/LAST elements, *a* and *a'*, state that the Jewish people were amazed, astonished, and perplexed. As I pondered this, I understood there was an equally powerful move of the Holy Spirit to open their hearts and minds. That revelation, especially seen in the SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY in verse 13, is the CONTRAST between those who were amazed and the skeptics.

5) Within the closing summary, there are three QUESTIONS: *Why is this? How is this possible?* and *What does this mean?* I suggest that questions such as these are part of the narrative and are intended for readers to answer for themselves. The Holy Spirit seems to have placed these queries so that the reader must struggle with the meaning of all this. These questions are highly emphatic to me.

Note that this documentation did not attempt to reference extratextual sources or even other pericopes outside Acts 2:1–13. It neither includes any word studies (although it could) nor pays special attention to imagery or alternative viewpoints. It simply reviews how this Bible student derived unique understandings based on the previously performed structural analysis.

4.3. Lettered Devices

Pattern Analysis searches for the Holy Spirit's persuasive and emphatic rhetoric based on a structure's organization. Scholars such as Dorsey guide the analyst to *the most important* location within a literary unit.¹¹⁶ Pattern Analysis recognizes that, typically, there are multiple important locations in a literary unit—any two exegetes may have different opinions of what is the most important. Two questions are raised by Pattern Analysis: which locations are persuasive, and what do they emphasize? Students are asked to describe how the Holy Spirit moves them. In this way, the Bible can be more personal in meaning and application.

Rather than one location for emphasis, Pattern Analysis presents multiple potential locations in every pericope.

These locations contribute to the student's overall persuasion and emphasis of a literary unit. As of the date of this writing, there are, on average, 6.7 emphatic locations per pericope in the

116. Dorsey, *Literary Structure*, 40,41.

database repository. The rhetoric found in substructures is included in that statement. The Acts 2:1–13 case study for Section 4.2, *Rhetorical Case Study*, has nine (9) distinct rhetorical locations. This approach calls for a closer text reading than some people typically perform.

The search for the Holy Spirit’s persuasion also leads to a potentially different mindset. The study of Acts 2:1–13 does not look at what Dr. Luke experienced or recalled. It does not look at other Bible books or perform a study of select words. It is a verse-by-verse search for what the Holy Spirit thought in His emphatic words to Dr. Luke many years later. It is a search for the Holy Spirit’s rhetoric.

[4.3.1. Center Point](#)

One of the first places to look for emphasis is the center point. Not all structures will have one, but they are generally emphatic when they exist. A center point can be found in four scenarios: chiasms, parallel symmetries, immediate repetitions, and lists.

A center point can be found in four scenarios: chiasms, parallel symmetries, immediate repetitions, and lists. Many times, the center point is emphatic.

The first scenario is those found within a chiasm. Many literary structuralists distinguish between concentric and chiastic structures, as mentioned in Section 3.4.1, *Chiasm*. This analysis found that the distinction is too narrow and inconsistent—therefore both are chiasms in Pattern Analysis. A chiasm can be either a single *X* or an *x* if it is a substructure, a pair such as the *D* and *D'* elements in an *A-B-C-D-D'-C'-B'-A'* structure, or the *b* and *b'* elements in an *a-b-b'-a'* arrangement.

A two-element center point for a chiasm is seen in the *D* and *D'* elements of [Luke 11:14–26](#). There is an *X* center point in [2 Chronicles 5:2–14](#), an emphatic statement that Solomon and the people had been excessively sacrificing many sheep and oxen. In Pattern Analysis, the center point is emphatic in ninety percent (90%) of the basic chiasm structures.

Suppose a parallel symmetry, immediate repetition, or list has a single emphatic element in the middle of the sequence. That is rendered as a center point using the letter *X* or *x* as appropriate. Thirty-five percent (35%) of those structures have an emphatic *X* center point. For example, the *X* center point of [Psalm 30:1–12](#), a parallel symmetry, emphasizes that the LORD made David strong. The immediate repetition shown in [1 Corinthians 6:1–11](#) has an *X* center point in v. 8B that

emphasizes the offense that brothers had been causing fellow brothers. The fourth type of basic structure, a list exemplified in [2 Timothy 1:1,2; 4:9–22](#), has an *X* center point with a substructure.

Sometimes the *X* center point is not in the exact middle of the sequence. Such an example may be seen in [Deuteronomy 30:15–30](#), a parallel symmetry. In that case, the imperative command of the *X* center point to choose life is strongly emphatic.

[4.3.2. First/Last](#)

Walsh identifies that chiasmic structures often have what Pattern Analysis terms a *first/last* emphasis, the *A* and *A'* elements.¹¹⁷ Bauer and Traina present this same emphasis.¹¹⁸ Pattern Analysis states that a chiasmic structure's first/last elements are to be checked for emphatic value. Including the chiasmic substructures, about sixty percent (60%) have a first/last emphasis.

The first/last rhetoric device only applies to chiasms. The first/last positions should always be checked for rhetoric value.

A simple example of the first/last appears in [Matthew 12:9–21](#). The emphasis is seen in the contrast between the withered hand in *A* and his restored hand in *A'*.

Note especially that the emphatic value of the substructure should be included when looking at the first/last for a basic chiasm with a substructure. For example, when the ark was brought into the temple in [2 Chronicles 5:2–14](#), there was a great celebration with lots of singing. That gathering of people and their singing is best seen in the *A'* element (vv. 11–13) where the substructure gives that detail. The first/last emphasis is therefore found in vv. 3 and 11–13.

[4.3.3. First/First and Last/Last](#)

Just as a chiasm will usually emphasize the center point and the ends, a parallel symmetry has its equivalent places of emphasis. That is, just as an analyst should look at each *A-B-C-D-D'-C'-B'-A'* chiasm to see if there is an emphasis in the *D-D'* center point and the *A-A'* first/last elements, so too an *A-B-C-D-A'-B'-C'-D'* parallel symmetry should be investigated for rhetorical value in the *A-A'* first/first and *D-D'* last/last locations. This also applies to parallel symmetry substructures.

117. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 14.

118. Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 121.

The first/first and last/last rhetorical devices apply only to parallel symmetries. The last/last position is much more frequently emphatic than the first/first.

Pattern Analysis shows that the last/last elements in the sequences (the two *D* elements in an *A-B-C-D-A'-B'-C'-D'* arrangement) are often emphatic, and the *A-A'* first/first elements can also be emphatic. That is, sixty percent (60%) of the parallel symmetry structures and substructures have a last/last emphasis, and twenty-five percent (25%) have a first/first emphasis. A first/first emphasis seldom occurs without a last/last emphasis.

The first/first and last/last emphasis was described in Acts 2:1–12 (Section 4.2.1, *First/First* and Section 4.2.3, *Last/Last*). Here are two more examples.

A first/first emphasis is illustrated in [Genesis 2:18–25](#), and a last/last persuasion for the same pericope is shown in [Genesis 2:18–25](#). The problem of aloneness is stated in the first/first, that man had helpers with the animals He created but no suitable human helper. Adam, the first man, named all the living creatures in *A* of the last/last, and he named the woman in the second part, *A'*. Some might call the two *C* elements emphatic and others might not. Adam's choices of names do not seem emphatic, but the likeness of woman to man, *bones of my bones, flesh of my flesh*, may be considered part of the Holy Spirit's persuasion.

A second example is [Isaiah 56:1–7](#) which is rendered an *A-B-A'-B'-SUM* parallel symmetry. The two *A* elements identify some attributes of the one that walks in righteous obedience: he keeps the sabbath, stays away from evil, and keeps His covenant. To that one, v. 5 states he will be blessed with an everlasting name. Therefore, the two *A* elements qualify for first/first rhetorical significance.

Regarding the two *B* elements, they discuss the foreigners and eunuchs who have joined the LORD and have not drifted away. These foreigners do not come from the Jewish bloodline but have joined with the LORD. They “minister to Him, and to love the name of the LORD” (v. 6). Therefore these two *B* elements of [Isaiah 56:1–7](#) also have last/last rhetorical significance.

Note that in both of these examples, the rhetoric builds towards a summarization (Section 4.7.2, *Intensification*). The first/first and last/last in these examples support that more significant and potentially more emphatic position.

[4.3.4. Corresponding Elements](#)

Also known as conjugate pairs, corresponding elements are any two elements paired with each other. Technically speaking, a frame/frame, first/last, first/first, and last/last pairing are corresponding elements, but they already have a name in the context of Pattern Analysis. Instead, Pattern Analysis refers to any conjugate pair that is not named. The significance of these corresponding elements is that they may have rhetorical value and should be checked for that potential. For example, in a chiasmic $A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'$ structure, the two B elements might add considerable conviction to the reader or listener.

At least three elements are required for a corresponding element in chiasms or parallel symmetries. That is, the B element in $A-B-C$ or the b element in $a-b-c$.

Early in the development of Pattern Analysis, the $A-B-C-C'-B'-A'$ -SUM chiasm in [Acts 1:12](#) was challenging. The two B elements are highly emphatic but are neither a first/last nor a center point. The first/last A and A' elements release the apostles to all parts of the earth, and the center point's C and C' elements instruct the apostles that they are not to know future dates and times. But the two B elements foretell the coming baptism of the Holy Spirit and His associated power that would come upon them. That led to a search for other similar situations—the discovery was that they could be an integral part of the rhetoric, not to be discounted. Those situations are deemed corresponding elements in Pattern Analysis.

Not all corresponding elements have emphatic rhetorical value. [Matthew 13:24–30, 36–43](#) is an example of a rhetoric analysis that is in some ways subjective. The two B elements are essential to the story because the enemy had planted some weed seeds, later explained as sons of the evil one. However, this rhetorical documentation does not include those two B elements, although someone else might do otherwise. The B elements are necessary to the story, but they do not drive towards the substructure summary, “The righteous will shine forth as the sun” (v. 43). They do not seem to touch with that same impact.

Another example is the two corresponding B elements in [Matthew 16:13–28](#) and the C elements in [Matthew 16:13–28](#). Most people would probably consider B and B' to be emphatic because the Father announced to Peter that Jesus is the Messiah, and Satan told Peter that his thoughts were inconsistent with God. Similarly, it should be easy to see that C and C' are emphatic because they discuss the building of the church of Jesus Christ. In addition, this parallel symmetry,

FRAME-A-B-C-D-FRAME-X-A'-B'-C'-D'-SUM, has rhetorical value in the question/answer of the frame, the last/last, the *X* center point, and the closing summary. Nearly every part of this pericope plays a rhetorical role in influencing people in multiple ways.

Likewise, it should be easy to see that the two *b* elements within the parallel symmetry substructure of [Ezekiel 6:1–14](#) are emphatic: their altars will be destroyed. There are two other locations within that parallel symmetry: the first/first states that their high places will also be destroyed, and the last/last *c* elements are a prophecy that Israelites would be laid dead before the altar.

[4.3.5. Correlation of Sequences](#)

A correlation of sequences can appear in chiasms, parallel symmetries, and immediate repetitions. It is a block comparison between one set of elements and another. Whether in a basic structure or a substructure, it looks at the similarity or contrast between *a-b-c* and *c'-b'-a'*, or between *a-b-c* and *a'-b'-c'*, or between *a-a'-a''* and *b-b'-b''*. This emphasis is to be found in the comparison of the sets.

A correlation of sequences is a block comparison between two or more sets of elements. It can exist in chiasms, parallel symmetries, and immediate repetitions.

[Psalm 100:1–5](#) compares two responses to the LORD, one joyful and the other thankful, in Figure 13.

Figure 13: Schema for Psalm 100

IMMEDIATE REPETITION

... joy and thanksgiving for the LORD...

BEGINNING MARKER	A title: Thanksgiving.	v1A
A	IMPERATIVE: Joyful shouting	v1B
A'	IMPERATIVE: Glad serving	v2A
A''	IMPERATIVE: Joyful singing	v2B
X	The LORD made us, not ourselves	v3
B	IMPERATIVE: Thanksgiving	v4A
B'	IMPERATIVE: Praise	v4B
B''	IMPERATIVE: Thankful blessing	v4C
SUM	The LORD's lovingkindness is forever	v5

As with other pericopes in the Bible, the correlation of sequences works with the different emphases in the unit. In this rhetorical correlation of joy and thankfulness, an *X* center point emphasis distinguishes our God from humanity, and a closing summary in v. 5 reminds us of His eternal love.

It is a mistake to suggest that the place of emphasis for chiasms and parallel symmetries is to be consistently found in either the center point or the two *A* elements. Not always. That is shown in Isaiah 6:10—the contrast between the *a-b-c* and *c'-b'-a'* elements. Neither the first/last *a-a'* elements nor the center point *c-c'* elements are emphatic. The context of this chiasm substructure begins in v. 8:

Figure 14: Schema for Isaiah 6:8–13 (Excerpt)

SUB-UNIT MARKER:	A divine oracle: the voice of the LORD	v8A
A	Isaiah said, “Send me”	v8B
B	You are sent to people who do not understand	v9
X	CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE: ... contrast between dull and understanding people ...	
a	Render their hearts dull	v10A
b	Ears barely hearing	v10B
c	Eyes seeing poorly	v10C
c'	Otherwise, their eyes see	v10D
b'	Ears hear	v10E
a'	Hearts understand	v10F
sum	Their perception is then corrected	v10G
A'	How long are you sending me?	v11A
B'	Sent until the land is deserted	v11B,12
SUM	Even the remnant will not escape	v13

The LORD asked who would go to, and Isaiah replied, “Send me.” Then the LORD metaphorically described two types of people in v. 10. That correlation of sequences pits those who do not understand against those who do. The contrast is their whole being—hearts, ears, and eyes—and not their hearts, ears, or eyes individually.

Another correlation of sequences appears in [Proverbs 4:10-27](#). While there is no first/last or center point emphasis in Isaiah 6:10, that is not always true. In these eighteen verses from Proverbs, there is a contrast between the *A-B-C* path of the righteous and the *A'-B'-C'* path of the wicked.

There also is a last/last emphasis in *C* and *C'* which compares the life given to the righteous who receive instruction with the consequences given to the wicked.

Note also that Proverbs 4:10–27 is written to “My son.” In the context of the Holy Spirit’s words to an unnamed son, we, the reader and listener, become that son. The correlation of sequences shown in these two paths seems to apply as much today as it did thousands of years ago. If Proverbs is read passively, it was written to Solomon or someone of that era; we are not the target. If read actively, the Holy Spirit’s finger is upon each of us.

4.4. Asymmetrical Devices

Referring back to Walsh’s statement, he says, “Asymmetry can be one of the most forceful stylistic devices in the biblical Hebrew narrative.”¹¹⁹ Restated into the context of Pattern Analysis, “Asymmetry is one of the most forceful stylistic devices that the Holy Spirit used for emphasis in the Bible.” With Pattern Analysis, eighty-five percent (85%) of the basic structures have either a chiasmic or symmetrically arranged parallel organization.¹²⁰ Of that eighty-five percent, the Holy Spirit seems to have established a regular pattern: seven out of ten exhibit a normal arrangement, and three out of ten have an imperfect arrangement. These imperfect arrangements are “most forceful” because the deviations point to strong emphatic and persuasive values.

What human author would regularly organize their thoughts as a chiasm or parallel symmetry for the sake of emphasis? And then, to add additional emphasis, insert an imperfection such as a missing element that points to an extra or absence for stressing their thoughts?¹²¹ The consistent use of asymmetry for the sake of emphasis is strong evidence this is part of the Holy Spirit’s thought process. See Section 6.1, *Consistency of Methodology*, for a complete list of these consistencies.

4.4.1. Extra

119. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 101.

120. The remaining fifteen percent (15%) are either immediate repetitions or lists.

121. In Pattern Analysis, the most difficult pericope was Proverbs 10:1 – 29:27. Ultimately, those twenty chapters were rendered as one very large imperfect chiasm. The *A* element is vv. 10:1-22:16 and the *A'* element is vv. 25:1-29:27. Both *A* and *A'* are list substructures. Those chapters have very little demarcation. It is an imperfect chiasm because the *B'* element, vv. 24:23-29, was transposed before the *C'* element, vv. 24:30-34. Also, micro-structures could have addressed them in a way that would have been similar to Waltke, but Pattern Analysis is designed for more lengthy literary units. Bruce Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15* (Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, 2004).

Maybe I am a bit eccentric. A few years ago, I cut down and brought home a very symmetrical Christmas tree for our living room, a gorgeous concolor fir. I had done that many times before. I decided to add a visual lesson about asymmetry to our small home group meeting. That tree was trimmed to illustrate the extra, absence, transposition, and variation.

After that tree was set on its stand, I used loppers to create a large hole on the lower right side of the tree. After the people arrived, I explained the extra and then pointed to that good-sized hole. I asked, “Why is that there?” One lady who understood the teaching touched an ornament on the tree's opposite side. The ornament had a picture of a newborn baby. She said, “Jesus.”

The extra is a rather odd literary device that is not well documented (previously described in Section 4.5.1, *Extra*). It is not happenstance nor the mistake by some scribe—it is an intentional redirection of our attention to the corresponding element. The extra says, “Look, there is something special to see.”

An extra can be found in chiasms and parallel symmetries. When one element is missing, its conjugate pair is often an emphatic extra.

At the time of this writing, there are roughly two hundred and fifty (250) instances of an extra in the Pattern Analysis database. All contribute a persuasive if not an emphatic flair to their literary unit.¹²² For example, in [1 John 4:7–19](#), there is no text in the position of the *D* element between vv. 13,14. The *D'* element is its conjugate pair, v. 16A, which reads, “We have come to know and have believed the love which God has for us. God is love.” Most would probably agree that *D'* is particularly emphatic with the strong statement that God is love (also repeated in v. 8).

When the demon stated, “I will return to my house from which I came” in [Luke 11:14–26](#), that is an extra. Those words are in the *b'* element, v. 24B, part of the closing summary. There is also an extra in v. 16 of that same structure, for some in the crowd were testing Jesus. Both of these are emphatic to me.

Also consider the words of Thomas in [John 20:19–29](#) after Jesus told him to place his finger on His hands. Thomas stated, “My Lord and my God!” which is an extra in the *F'* position in verse 28—another emphatic statement.

122. Two hundred and forty-nine is twenty-two percent (22%) of every pericope currently in the Pattern Analysis database.

A last example of an extra is v. 7 of [Revelation 10:1–11](#). The paired *A*, *C*, and *D* elements show good symmetry. The first/last *A* elements describe the little book in the hands of a strong angel with an imperative command to hand the book to an angel. The two *C* corresponding elements indicate that this angel placed one foot on the sea and the other on the land, which is not an overly persuasive statement. The two *D* center point elements present the seven peals of thunder, an exclamatory metaphor, where a voice from heaven said to seal the thing up. Going back to the *B'* element in v. 7, the extra is the voice of the seventh angel which announced the mystery of God is about to be finished. This is another emphatic announcement.

[4.4.2. Absence](#)

Regarding that Christmas tree, I told our small home group that it made sense if that same hole had been made in the concolor fir on Resurrection Sunday. The absence would seem appropriate in that circumstance: He was not there, He had risen.

An absence appears only in a chiasm or parallel symmetry. It occurs when a special meaning is associated with an element's intentional omission.

One of the joys of Pattern Analysis is the discernment during questionable situations. Such is the case with an absence. When one of the corresponding elements does not have a conjugate pair, is it an extra or an absence? Both have text on one side but no text on the other. In such situations, the extra is much more common than an absence; however, both should be checked.

The answer in Section 4.4.1, *Extra*, was evident in [John 20:19–29](#) where Thomas exclaimed, “My Lord and my God!” That *F'* element is undoubtedly an emphatic extra. The absence of the *F* element is similar to making this statement, “I don’t believe.”

In [Psalm 62:1–12](#) (Section 4.5.2, *Absence*), the absence of text in *A* “was much more subtle. The question, “Why do you think the *A*” element is blank?” added a profound meaning to the silent waiting in the first two *A* elements.

There is a certain amount of obscurity when an absence appears. The text does not state the meaning of the absence, and its omission does not infer it has rhetorical significance. This allows the Holy Spirit to speak individually. In [Joshua 3:12; 4:1–9, 19 – 5:1](#), the *C'* element has no text. The *C* and *C''* elements have a typical last/last/last emphasis: carry the stones. There is no particular

importance to the *C'* element—it exists but the rhetorical value is not apparent. That scenario is very uncommon but does exist.

Another example is in [Deuteronomy 30:15–20](#) where there are three *A* elements. The *A'* element has not been stated. The *A* and *A''* elements present two consequential choices: life and death. What is the significance of the missing *A'* element? This was rendered as an absence with good rhetorical significance. The context of the entire pericope provides that answer: there are not two choices.

[4.4.3. Transposition](#)

As I describe transpositions to others, my speech gets faster and much less monotone. I am excited to tell them about this literary device, yet I conclude with a sincere question, “What do you think? Can this be?”

I begin with a picture of two sets of stairs with four steps: *blue-green-yellow-red* and then *blue-green-yellow-red*. That is a typical arrangement in the Bible.¹²³ A transposition, which is in fourteen percent (14%) of the structures, might have the second set reorganized as *blue-green-red-yellow*. This seems to suggest the transposition is part of the Holy Spirit’s handiwork, His personal word to us.

A transposition can exist in either a chiasm or a parallel symmetry. It occurs when an element is re-arranged to another location. A transposition fits Walsh’s statement that an asymmetric element represents a “disruption of pattern” in the storyline.¹²⁴

There are three scenarios concerning rhetoric for transpositions: switch the position of two adjacent elements, relocate an element to a nearby position, and reorganize several elements. Also, transpositions seem to have a unique artistic significance within a few pericopes. In these artistic situations, the literary structure appears to paint a conceptual picture of the scenario. The switch of Abel before Cain (Section 4.5.3, *Transposition*) is one such example—the picture of the two brothers changed.

Those learning about transpositions for the first time can understandably be skeptical. This author was also initially skeptical, which contributed to this lengthy Bible research that began in

123. As described in Section 3.5.3, *Transposition*, chiasms can have similar transpositions.

124. Walsh, *1 Kings*, xv.

2016. The purpose of transpositions was unclear. Walsh does not discuss their expected effect—he states that each must be evaluated on its own merit.¹²⁵ Some insight can be provided through this research of more than one hundred and fifty (150) transpositions. One or more of the following six examples are used when presenting transpositions.

The first example is when two adjacent elements are switched in position. This is the most common form of transposition. In [Psalm 30:1–12](#), the *C'* element appears before the *B'* element, resulting in a corresponding change in emphasis. The exegete should ask, “Which is particularly persuasive, *B'*, *C'*, or both?” The answer in this case is both. The *C* element stresses joy over weeping, and the *B'* responds with praise and thankfulness. Both transposed elements strongly reinforce the message that this psalm expresses.

There is also an artistic significance to this psalm. The normal organization for Psalm 30 would have been a *SUM-A-B-C-X-A'-B'-C'* structure. But in this psalm, where is that *C'* element? Has it danced to a new position before *B'*, that is *SUM-A-B-C-X-A'-C'-B'*? Has the mourning turned to dancing? While many transpositions do not present such a pictorial representation, this one does so.

The second example is when an element is relocated to a distant position. For example, [Lamentations 1:1–9](#) expresses overall sorrow because the lovely city of Jerusalem now sits alone. This literary unit is an imperfect chiasm with an *A-B-C-A'-X-C'-B'-SUM* structure. The *A'* element has been moved up four positions. The question is, “Which is particularly persuasive, *A'*, *B'*, both, or somewhere else?” The closing summary (vv. 8,9A) and the X center point are the most significant emphases. The other lettered elements support those two.

Concerning the transposed *A'* element in v. 4, the gates are desolate. The transposed *A'* element sits alone, placed before the *X* element, out of place from its natural order—a picture of the dysfunctional Jerusalem. Others certainly may view this differently. Could that be intentional?

Another example appears in [Ezekiel 6:1–14](#) where the transposition is within the substructure for the *A* element. The *c'* is relocated to the middle of the *a-b-c-c'-x-a'-b'-sum* structure, not the expected *a-b-c-x-a'-b'-c'-sum*. Where then is the emphasis? Everything seems emphatic: the

125. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 102.

first/first *a* elements, the two corresponding *b* elements, the two *c* elements that would typically be in the last/last position, the *x* center point, and the substructure summary.

Then why the relocated *c'* element? The normal location of the *c'* element would be at the end between vv. 6B and 7. It is reminiscent of a statue made with many blocks. What happens when the bottom block is removed? That statue is ruined! Is this irregularity a picture of the ruin where the *c'* element has been removed and relocated? It emphasizes that idols and altars collapse. With this imagery, the transposition made this warning more alarming. Is this the Holy Spirit's anger?

The fourth example is what was deemed an irregular transposition in Section 3.5.3, *Transposition*. There are few irregular literary units, so the following is simply conjecture. This example, based on Ezra 5:7–6:11, is presented in Figure 15.

Figure 15: Schema for Ezra 5:7 – 6:11 (Excerpt)

PARALLEL SYMMETRY SUBSTRUCTURE: ... correspondence between the governor and King Darius ...

SUB-UNIT MARKER:		A change of voice: A letter to the king	v5:7
a		Tattenai and colleagues have seen the rebuilding of the temple	v5:8
b		Questioned the elders about their authority	v5:9,10
c	EXTRA:	We are from Judah but were exiled to Babylon	v5:11,12
d		King Cyrus issued a decree to rebuild	v5:13
e		Cyrus returned to us the gold and silver utensils	v5:14,15
f		The rebuilding has started, but it is not complete	v5:16
g		Please perform a search to see if this is correct	v5:17
g'	TRANSPOSITION:	A search was conducted	v6:1
SUB-UNIT MARKER:		A change of location: A scroll was found in Ecbatana	v6:2
d'		The decree to rebuild with details of the size and the means of payment	v6:3,4
e'		The decree to return the gold and silver utensils	v6:5
a'		Tattenai and colleagues must stop visiting the temple	v6:6
b'		The governor and elders have the authority to rebuild	v6:7
c'			no text
f'		The rebuilding shall continue; Tattenai / Shethar-bozenai must pay for it	v6:8–10
sum		The penalty for violating the decree	v6:11

The above structure is the *X* center point of a larger structure from vv. 4:24 to 6:22. The first challenge with this substructure was determining whether it was a chiasm or a parallel symmetry.

We don't know with certainty—it is so irregular. The two *a* elements were rendered with a first/first emphasis because Tattenai and their friends must stop harassing the workers. The extra *c* element in v. 5:11,12 suggests they belong in Judah. The order to conduct the search in *g* and its completion in *g'* constitute the turning point in the center. The relocated *f'* element has a strong last/last emphasis because that is the culmination of Darius's investigation. A penalty for disobedience is stated in the substructure summary, v. 6:11.

In the rhetorical documentation, here is what was written about this irregularity:

The TRANSPOSITION of many elements, beginning with verse 6:1, points to the irregularity of the parallel symmetry substructure. This is my conjecture only, but rather than attempting to straighten the confusion, maybe it is better to call it *applause!* God's joyous celebration!! The work continues. King Darius added financial support to these Jews in response to their order to stop work.

This substructure is another example of an emotional God.

The fifth example, depicting what seems to be an emotional side of God, appears in Esther 2:1-23. For example, could the irregular pattern be due to the Holy Spirit's joy? It is a *FRAME-A-B-C-D-E-X-A'-B'-FRAME-D'-C'-SUM* structure. In v. 17, we read that King Ahasuerus loved Esther more than any of the other women. Could the Holy Spirit become so excited during His inspiration that His joy is shown in the disorganization? It is hard to say, but it is part of these rhetorical musings.

Turning to the book of Numbers for the sixth example, could it be that the Holy Spirit's anger caused the unusual pattern in Numbers 14:25-45? The structure is *FRAME-A-B-C-D-B'-D'-A'-C'-SUM-FRAME* which is immediately after the rebellious ten spies and fellow Israelites begged their return to Egypt. Is that structure a literary representation of God's complete frustration, which prevented that generation from entering the promised land? We will never know on this side of heaven.

4.4.4. Variation

A variation identifies there are different themes for otherwise corresponding elements. If a Christmas tree is decorated with all white lights except a red one, that red tree light is a variation. Variations can be relatively minor or a significant part of the story.

A variation can appear in a chiasm or parallel symmetry and occasionally in a list. It is a comparative device that distinguishes an element from the related elements.

In Section 3.5.4, *Variation*, mention was given to v. 62 of [Luke 9:51–62](#) where Jesus boldly stated some that are not fit for the kingdom of God. Most likely agree there is emphatic value to that variation.

When preparing the rhetorical documentation, the student writes what is particularly persuasive in the literary unit. Some variations are particularly strong and very much worthy of that written description. The case study in Chapter Six, *Final Case Study*, presents two such surprising variations in [Exodus 19:1–20:26](#).

4.5. Non-lettered Devices

Four non-lettered devices—summarization, preliminary, frame, and parenthesis—are commonly taught in writing courses. A summarization can appear at the end of a written article or less frequently at the beginning; the preliminary statements are typically background information; a frame thematically restates an initially strong beginning statement with a corresponding end; and a parenthetical note can be added for increased understanding within an article. What is less common is to consider how those three non-lettered devices can add persuasion for a reader.

[4.5.1. Summarization](#)

Summarizations are natural starting places when instructing others about the rhetorical model. The presentation of the letters *SUM* or *sum* in a structure indicates it is a summarization. Sometimes we consider two nursery rhymes: “Now I know my ABCs, next time won’t you sing with me.” Or the final lyrics in *Hush Little Baby*, “And if that horse and cart fall down, you’ll still be the sweetest little baby in town!” These are summarizations.

The opening summary, closing summary, and substructure summary are powerful rhetorical devices in biblical literature.

The first example is from [Lamentations 1:1–9](#) which has a strong closing statement that explains Jerusalem’s fundamental problem:

SUM Jerusalem sinned greatly, therefore she has become an unclean thing. All who honored her despise her because they have seen her nakedness; even she herself groans and turns away. Her uncleanness was in her skirts; she

CLOSING SUMMARY:
Jerusalem has
greatly sinned and

did not consider her future. Therefore she has fallen astonishingly; she has [here are the effects](#) no comforter. (v. 8,9A)

Eighty percent (80%) of the structures have either an opening summarization or a much more common closing summarization. Similar results are seen in chiasm, parallel symmetry, immediate repetition, and list organizations. Many times, the literary unit drives towards the closing summary. All summarizations were found to be emphatic.

A summarization may be a single element as in the example above, an element with a substructure, or a substructure without any text in the position of the basic element. It may be one of three scenarios: *SUM* (some text), *SUM* (some text) *a-b-x-a'-b'*, or *SUM a-b-x-a'-b'*. There is a substructure in the second and third scenarios. In [Revelation 10:1–11](#), the words “So I went to the angel, telling him to give me the little book” in v. 9A are rendered as the second scenario. Verse 9A is placed on the same line as the *SUM* so the reader can better understand the emphasis in vv. 9B–11.

In the fourth example, the substructure is the entire summarization. An example is in [Acts 1:1–12](#) where a sub-unit marker in v. 9A separates the lettered structure from the summarization. While all the verses from 9 to 12 are essential, as would be expected with a closing summary, vv. 9B and 10 are Christ’s ascension, even more important.

[4.5.2. Preliminary](#)

Unlike summarizations, preliminary elements are not emphatic. There are no instances in the Pattern Analysis database where the preliminary element has emphatic value. Preliminaries typically contain background information needed for the remainder of the pericope—they are often facts. However, when a substructure is a subset of the preliminary, the normal locations for emphasis should be checked. If the preliminary’s substructure contains some form of persuasive influence for the pericope, it can be documented in the rhetoric.

For example, consider [1 Corinthians 6:12–20](#). The topic of the pericope is our bodies as a temple of the Holy Spirit. The preliminary is based on the sense that vv. 12 to 14 are necessary to understand that temple position within us. After two amplifications, the substructure summary assures that we will be raised just like Jesus.

[4.5.3. Frames](#)

A frame is a repetition of a theme or its antithesis, but not necessarily with the same words (Section 3.6.3, *Frames*).

Whether frames apply to a basic literary device or a substructure, they are sometimes emphatic.

The frame in [Luke 9:51–62](#) uses similar thoughts in vv. 51B and 56B which record movement, but they are not emphatic. Roughly eighty percent (80%) of the frames in the Pattern Analysis repository are emphatic. The analyst is encouraged to decide whether or not there is strong persuasive value in each frame.

An emphatic frame appears in [1 John 4:7–19](#) which surrounds a teaching about love. Both elements, vv. 11B and 19, recognize God’s love for us. Therefore, as He loves us, we ought to love one another.

Another emphatic frame is found in [Jeremiah 28:1–17](#). Normally the frame surrounds all the lettered elements, either a basic structure or a substructure. In this pericope, the two frame elements surround just the *A-B-C* sequence. In that way, Hananiah’s prophecy cannot be confused with that given through Jeremiah. This terse false prophecy states that Hananiah foresaw that the LORD had broken and would break Nebuchadnezzar’s yoke.

[4.5.4. Parenthesis](#)

There are few parentheses in the Pattern Analysis repository, and only a few seem emphatic. One that stands out is found in [1 John 4:7–19](#). The words in v. 18, “There is no fear in love; but perfect love casts out fear, because fear involves punishment, and the one who fears is not perfected in love,” are particularly strong. It is parenthetical because the discussion of fear is unlike the pericope’s other encouraging words about love.

4.6. Grammatical Devices

Four grammatical devices—imperative, question, interjection, and repetition—can supplement the analysis of a pericope. The Pattern Analysis Software checks during the validation process for three of these devices: imperatives (based on New Testament Greek only), questions (based on the appearance of a question mark), and interjections (based on the word “behold”). Many other figures of speech such as a simile or metaphor could have been added to Pattern Analysis,

giving an added understanding of the text. However, they were not included, and they might be better addressed during the full exegetical and hermeneutic processes.

[4.6.1. Imperative](#)

In Section 3.6.4, *Imperative*, a distinction was made between an *imperative device* and an *imperative element*. Both have emphatic value: an imperative device can, in some ways, be similar to a summarization, and an imperative element appears in the lettered devices with a letter such as *a*, *c'*, or *X* before the biblical text. Explaining their value in the rhetoric is more important than correctly distinguishing between them. An imperative device can add a strong overarching value to a literary unit, appearing outside the lettered devices.

An imperative device contains imperative verbs whereas a summarization normally does not. It can be identified if an element is imperative and a summarization. An imperative element appears in the lettered devices and contains an imperative command. An imperative element may or may not be considered emphatic depending on the student's sense of the situation.

Sometimes a basic structure or a substructure contains two summarization-like elements. Both of these elements may be strong statements that act as a takeaway for the reader. On closer inspection, one may be found to be an imperative command. An example of this scenario is found in vv. 10 and 18–27 of [Proverbs 4:10–27](#). The words “hear” and “accept” in v.10 are an *IMPERATIVE*: “Hear, my son, and accept my saying.” This verse applies to the entire literary unit as the words for the son to obey. In contrast, the closing summary *SUM* in vv. 18–27 contains directions to fulfill the path of righteousness.

In [Proverbs 4:10–27](#), eight elements are flagged with the word *IMPERATIVE*. All are stern directives to the son regarding wicked and righteous behaviors. In these imperative commands, the Holy Spirit can guide and direct the student willing to listen. With that many imperative verbs in eighteen verses, including them in the rhetorical documentation would seem appropriate.

On the other hand, it is not necessary or even appropriate to identify all imperative elements. For example in verse 59B of [Luke 9:51–62](#), the command, “permit me first to bury my father” is imperative but not appropriate for hopefully obvious reasons. The student decides if an imperative element is personally emphatic or not in the rhetoric.

[4.6.2. Question](#)

Questions are commonplace in all writings, biblical or not. They can be rhetorical, ones where the speaker knows the answer and looks to persuade the audience to that answer for themselves. They can also be for clarification, requests for action, or a whole host of different scenarios.

The way we read questions in the Bible, either passive or active, will impact the text's full meaning. In a passive way, the so-called author asks a question which we then read like any children's story or non-fiction work. In an active manner, the Holy Spirit's inspired questions are read with His wisdom, authority, and persuasion. Those questions take on a much more personal and emphatic tone when viewed as part of the Holy Spirit's inspired themes.

Regarding questions in the minor prophetic books, Wendland wrote, "Questions of any type also perform the general rhetorical function of attracting the attention of the current listening audience (or readership), of drawing them experientially into the prophetic message, and of encouraging them to answer these same interrogatives for themselves, whether overtly during a public preaching of the text or when reading it silently to oneself."¹²⁶ Questions can have personal value well beyond the current storyline.

Jesus asked, "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?" ([Matthew 16:13](#)). A passive approach to the Bible, possibly due to a quick reading of the text, might view the reader as an innocent bystander observing an inquiry to Peter. Pattern Analysis looks for a slower reading of the text. That question is an attempt to actively engage the reader in God's dialog: *Who do I say Jesus is?* In this way, biblical questions can have strong rhetorical value.

But there is more. A question asked by a character in a story can also have persuasive value: "How can a man be born when he is old?" (John 3:4). If Nicodemus was asking this question for clarification, our posture as readers could again be passive. If the man John, the one who penned the book of John, challenged his listening audience to respond, that could be relevant 2000 years ago but not today. Or the questions David asked the LORD in [Psalm 30:1–12](#) should be considered part of the persuasive dialog. However, if the One who inspired the Bible is that individual who speaks to the reader thematically through John, should it then have relevant persuasive value?

¹²⁶. Wendland, *Prophetic Rhetoric*, 195.

The Holy Spirit's use of emphasis through questions in the Bible can motivate us. As one reads a question, is the Holy Spirit leading in some manner that is not obvious? The value of biblical questions is their persuasive ability to engage that person actively with God through the text.

When Abimelech asked Abraham regarding Sarah, "How have I sinned against you, that you have brought on me and on my kingdom a great sin?" (Genesis 20:9), is our reading passive or active? Is the writer retelling this story for some audience, or is there a greater message for those with an ear to hear? Is the Bible simply good literature, or is it a text that can penetrate hearts?

How does a question stir us? There are twenty-five hundred (2,500) verses in the NASB 95 that ask one or more questions. Pattern Analysis suggests that the Holy Spirit can use questions to move a person from a passive to an active participant. A question can challenge us to provide a relevant answer. We can take a more active role if we recognize that the One behind the text may be asking that question personally. The Holy Spirit wants us to slow down, ponder the text for His answer, gain a fresh understanding or application, and then respond. If we accept the premise that the Holy Spirit somehow inspired the Bible's themes, we can become more actively engaged with God through those questions.

While questions may be a way that we are persuaded somehow, it is a mistake to say that most questions are persuasive or emphatic. Some questions may move the reader, but not all. Whether a question is emphatic or not is situational. Does that question in some way elicit a deeper understanding and response?

[4.6.3. Interjection](#)

Interjections are generally restricted to the use of either the word "behold" or less seldom the word "woe." They indicate that the subsequent words are particularly noteworthy. Nearly twelve hundred (1,200) verses in the NASB 95 have the word "behold." That word should be rendered as a flag, indicating persuasive words follow.

"Behold" in verse 10B of [Acts 1:1-12](#) alerts the reader that something important follows:

Figure 16: Schema for Acts 1:9-12

SUM CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE: ... the ascension of Jesus ...

sub-unit marker: A change of time: Afterwards

v9A

sum	Jesus was lifted into a cloud	v9B,10A
a	Behold , two men in white clothing appeared	v10B
b	Why are you perplexed by Jesus's leaving?	v11A
b'	Jesus will return	v11B
a'	The men returned	v12

Following that word *behold*, two men in white interpret the disappearance of Jesus by stating He was just taken up to heaven.

In analysis, one should flag “behold” as an interjection if it is particularly persuasive. That means some will render a behold statement as an interjection, and some will not. To that extent, the grammatical devices of the rhetorical model can be subjective. For example, the words “I am a dry tree” following “Behold” in v. 3 of [Isaiah 56:1–7](#) may not be particularly strong, but some might disagree.

4.6.4. Repetition

Nida lamented in 1983 that rhetorical analyses too often dwelt upon the micro-level of the text, thereby deemphasizing the rhetorical structures associated with parallel organizations. Rather than focus on the many rhetorical devices documented over the years, he refocused on rhetorical features such as repetition: sounds, grammar, lexical units, and propositions.¹²⁷ Wendland, a student of Nida, looked at recursion from many different angles associated with a literary-rhetorical approach to the Bible.¹²⁸ Much could be written about repetition that is too detailed to present here.

Two types of repetition have already been discussed: immediate repetition (Section 3.4.3, *Immediate Repetition*) where themes are successively repeated, and a repeated phrase, a demarcation identifier (Section 2.2.1, *Identification of Markers*). Any two corresponding elements such as frames, first/last, or *B* elements, are also examples of repetition. Repetition within Pattern Analysis focuses on the recursive value of repeated themes within a pericope. Repetitions that cross pericopes are not included in this methodology.

Within the context of the rhetorical model, repetition refers to a significant repetition of themes within a literary unit.

¹²⁷. Eugene A. Nida, *Style and Discourse*, (Baltimore: Amer Bible Society, 1983), 22-32.

¹²⁸. Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture*, 126,145-6.

A repetition is seen in list substructures where a word or phrase begins each element. There are two such lists in [Psalm 146:1–10](#). In vv. 6A to 7B, four elements begin with “Who.” Similarly in vv. 7C to 10A, “The LORD” appears at the beginning of six of the eight elements, and “He” is substituted for the other two. Similarly, “they will know that I am the LORD” appears in three elements of [Ezekiel 6:1–14](#), vv. 7,10,14. Separating each repetition into unique elements within these lists makes the rhetorical significance stand out more clearly.

The challenge during Pattern Analysis’s rhetorical documentation is to ask if or how this repetition is significant. The words “just as the LORD had commanded Moses” are repeated many times in Exodus 39 and 40. Similarly, the words “‘Yet you have not returned to Me,’ declares the LORD” are repeated five times in [Amos 4:1–13](#). The question of significance is somewhat subjective—can we take those words and apply them somehow?

4.7. Comparative Devices

The four comparative tools are comparison, contrast, intensification, and amplification. The comparison and contrast are based on one’s interaction with the text, whereas the intensification and amplification describe the emphatic flow within the structure. One person may be terse, whereas the next person may be much wordier; one might use these comparative devices more sparingly than others. The advantage of these four devices is that they can adapt to one’s personal view of the Scriptures. By thinking through each analysis, students should receive a better understanding of the text.

[4.7.1. Comparison and Contrast](#)

From the very beginning of the Bible, there are contrasts and comparisons. Eve is compared to Adam; they were created like God but did not behave that way; the tree presents a contrast between right and wrong; they were free but then punished; and they were banned from where they once dwelt with God. The serpent tempted but God established a rule. As familiar as that story may be, it uses contrasts and comparisons to develop rich meaning.

The Bible is replete with comparisons and contrasts. They should be added to one’s rhetorical documentation as appropriate. No two people should be expected to respond in precisely the same way.

In [Matthew 16:13–28](#), there are both contrasts and comparisons. Jesus is not John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the other prophets—He is the Messiah. To put this contrast more plainly, He is unlike any other man. Then a second contrast appears when Peter is told, “Get behind Me, Satan!” Peter seemed so close when he identified Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of the living God. That contrast seems so startling, possibly so these two views may be remembered. A comparison is seen in the two *C* corresponding elements: the church begins with Peter and his statement of faith, and the church is built by those who deny themselves, take up their cross, and follow Jesus. Finally, in the closing summary there is a contrast related to one’s deeds—some will taste death whereas others will not.

In the Bible, comparisons and contrasts persuade the listener/reader. The church at Laodicea is set up as a contrast, for it is neither cold nor hot. The similarity of a comparison and dissimilarity of a contrast does not have a place somewhere between. Figuratively speaking, they are thrown in the cold bucket (Revelation 3:14–16).

There are many more contrasts than comparisons in the Bible. For example, [Deuteronomy 30:15–20](#) contrasts loving/worshipping/obeying the LORD and worshipping/serving other gods. Comparisons and contrasts are typically a pair of corresponding elements or a correlation of sequences (Section 4.3.5, *Correlation of Sequences*).

[4.7.2. Intensification](#)

Stories often move towards a climax, a high point in a forward march toward a key place in the dialog. That forward movement is called *intensification*. Wendland uses the term *progression*, a purposely forward-moving and goal-oriented development in a literary discourse.¹²⁹

An intensification is a literary device found in many writing styles where a high point is reached in the dialog.

Some literary units in the Bible use intensification; many others do not. Each of the four structure types develops the intensification differently. Intensifications appear in all four structure types.¹³⁰

129. Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture*, 125.

130. Walsh limits intensifications to parallel symmetries without asymmetry and immediate repetitions. Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 37–40,97.

Chiasm Intensification—The intensification in a chiasm typically moves from the two first/last positions to the center point. If there is a closing summary, it generally adds intensity. A case in point is [Mark 2:1–12](#) where certain scribes became the focus of Jesus’s attention. The closing summary records the amazement of many.

Parallel Symmetry Intensification—Walsh stated that the emphasis for a parallel symmetry appears in two types of progression: the *succession* from *A* to *B* and then to *C*, and the *intensification* from *A-B-C* to *A'-B'-C'*. To him, the progression is the main dynamic such as $A \rightarrow D$ and $A' \rightarrow D'$.¹³¹

If there is intensification in a parallel symmetry, it builds from the first/first to the last/last elements. A closing summary often adds to that emphasis. For example, the progression in [Judges 2:16–23](#) from *A* to *C* (the LORD raised up judges but they ignored and disobeyed Him) and *A'* to *C'* (the LORD was the judge but they followed other gods and would not obey Him) is directional. The end point of the intensification is the closing summary where the LORD’s anger burned against the people. Many parallel symmetries behave similarly.

Immediate Repetition Intensification—Some immediate repetitions have an intensification, but that is not overly common. When it occurs, the correlation of sequences reveals that intensity: first the *A* elements, then the *B* elements, etc. In the case of [1 Corinthians 6:1–11](#), the first two *A* elements present certain Corinthians who were defrauding their brothers. This list grows much larger in the *B* elements, noting that the list of additional unrighteous deeds disqualifies them from inheriting the kingdom of heaven. The closing summary is the end of that intensification.

List Intensification—While lists generally do not have an intensification, list substructures more often have a forward progression. In [Amos 4:1–13](#), the LORD identifies five stages that He used to try to return the people to Him: famine, alternating rain and drought, wind and mildew, a plague, and rescue. In the end, He warned them they would meet His wrath. Another example is the *gradation* in Romans 8:29,30 (a substructure) where the end goal is glorification: He foreknew → predestined → called → justified → glorified.

131. Ibid, 35-45.

[4.7.3. Amplification](#)

Unlike the chiasm and parallel symmetry which have rhetorical significance in the first and last positions, an immediate repetition does not have first and last elements. For that reason, Walsh stated there is no particular place where emphasis regularly appears in an immediate repetition.¹³² Weber suggests that *amplification* is a literary tool that persuades through the escalation of a thought or theme.¹³³ Amplification of adjacent pairs, such as when *B* is explained and expanded in *B'*, is a particularly persuasive tool. Kugel coined the term “A, what’s more B” to explain amplification within a verse(s).¹³⁴

An amplification embellishes upon the theme in the second element—in contrast, a variation modifies that second element in some way (Section 4.4.4, *Variation*). An amplification appears most often in immediate repetitions.

An amplification is emphatic when the second element in a pair, in some strong way, expands or explains the first element. It is more than mere repetition of thought.

In [1 Corinthians 6:1–11](#), the *B'* element (vv. 9B,10) is an amplification of the more general statement in *B* (v. 9A). That is, the ten examples of the unrighteous provide clarification of those who will not inherit the kingdom of God. However, the *A'* element is not an amplification over the *A* element.

[Psalm 146:1–10](#) is somewhat similar: the amplification is limited to the *B* and *B'* elements. In that example, *B'* amplifies *B* by stating four attributes of the LORD.

Amplification is not limited to immediate repetitions. Generally speaking, substructures can amplify their parent element by providing details that would not have been otherwise apparent. In the [Revelation 10:1–11](#) chiasm, the second center point element amplifies the first by dedicating the seven peals of thunder for some special purpose.

132. Ibid., 35.

133. Beat Webber, *Toward a Theory of the Poetry of the Hebrew Bible: The Poetry of the Psalms as a Test Case*. (Bulletin for Biblical Research, 22.2, 2012), 177-9.

134. James L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1981). 8.

4.8. Link

Intertextuality is a broad topic that, in its fullness, is far beyond the scope of this manuscript. Two examples are typological comparisons such as the Abraham/Isaac sacrifice story as a picture of the sacrifice of Jesus and then the study of how Old Testament prophecies have been fulfilled. A link is just a small part of that larger study.

A link brings at least one emphasis from an Old Testament pericope into a literary unit in the New Testament.

Links are a Pattern Analysis innovation. They bring an emphasis from an Old Testament pericope into that literary unit in the New Testament. Just as the words of Jesus in Matthew 27:46, *ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI*, is to the entire Psalm 22, a link uses the emphasis from the Old to add meaning to the New. In most cases, at least one of the emphatic portions of the Old's literary unit applies directly to the literary unit in the New Testament.

Some New Testament citations from the Old Testament can be perplexing. The parable of the tares, [Matthew 13:24–30,36–43](#), is one such example. At the end of that pericope are these words in verse 43, “the righteous will shine forth as the sun.” That reference to Proverbs 4:18 was one of those peculiarities. Those words in Proverbs v. 18 state, “But the path of the righteous is like the light of dawn, that shines brighter and brighter until the full day.” How did Proverbs 4:18 relate to Matthew 13:43? Did it equate righteousness to the kingdom of heaven, the sower, the wheat, or something else? How did it pertain to the parable of the tares as a whole?

To see the emphasis as a LINK to the Old, one should click on the blue capitalized and underlined words in the New Testament. The pericope from the Old then appears. For example, try clicking on the words [THE RIGHTEOUS WILL SHINE FORTH AS THE SUN](#) in v. 43. Assuming there is an internet connection, [Proverbs 4:10–27](#) should appear. There are several potential locations where the emphasis may be found: the various imperative statements, the first/first *A* elements, the corresponding *B* elements, and the last/last *C* elements; the contrast in the correlation of sequences between the righteous in *A-B-C* and the wicked in *A'-B'-C'*; and the closing summary with its immediate repetition substructure and the substructure summary. Any or all of these might lend an increased understanding of the righteous, the wheat, and the tares.

The peculiarity of Matthew 13:43 seems to be resolved in the closing summary of Proverbs 4:10–27. That closing summary reads, “But the path of the *righteous* is like the light of dawn, that shines brighter and brighter until the full day. The way of the *wicked* is like darkness; they do not know over what they stumble” (v. 4:18,19, italics added). That closing summary is a contrast between the righteous and the wicked. Therefore, the righteous may be equated with the wheat and the wicked with the tares.

Someone once said, “Do not add to the text what is not there.” That points to a tension within the Bible: does the Old help clarify the New? The question is not how Proverbs 4:18 is connected to Matthew 13:43. More correctly, if [Proverbs 4:10–27](#) is connected to [Matthew 13:24–30,36–43](#), how? The words of Proverbs 4:18,19 seem to add understanding to this parable.

A second example is [Matthew 16:13–28](#) which has a link to [Psalm 62:1–12](#). The closing summary in Matthew 6:27, “For the Son of Man ... **WILL REPAY EVERY MAN ACCORDING TO HIS DEEDS**”, is a reference to v. 12 of Psalm 62:12, also a closing summary. One of the emphases in Psalm 62 is a last/last/last contrast of the *C* elements: David’s trust in God versus man’s trust in worldly ways such as power and wealth. Could it be that Jesus’s trust in God is in contrast with Peter’s horror at the thought of Christ’s suffering and death? Is the statement in Matthew 16:27 that Jesus “will then repay every man according to his deeds” a way of stating that Christ will judge everyone’s worldly ways?

A third example draws on the strong angel with a little book in [Revelation 10:1–11](#). Note the capitalization of v. 10:6 which states, **WHO CREATED HEAVEN AND THE THINGS IN IT, AND THE EARTH AND THE THINGS IN IT, AND THE SEA AND THE THINGS IN IT, ...** . In [Psalm 146:1–10](#), the above words are nearly identical to vv. 6,7. How is Psalm 146 related to the angel with a little book? Could it be that the closing summary, vv. 146:7C–10A, is related to the contents of that little book?

As stated in Section 3.7.3, *Link*, there are three hundred and thirty-five (335) links to the Old Testament from the New. All links to the Old Testament add a persuasive value for the New Testament literary unit. The Old Testament literary unit may be the referenced verse itself and not one in another portion of the pericope. For example, [1 Corinthians 6:12–20](#) refers to v. 24 of [Genesis 2:18–25](#). Those words, **THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH**, from Genesis 2:24 apply directly to that 1 Corinthians passage. The suggestion is that while most links bring added meaning from other parts of the Old Testament pericope, the emphatic meaning does not require that added search.

As Pattern Analysis was developing, there were times when a New Testament element should be broken into two parts. The second part of that element is termed a *continuation*. An example of a continuation appears in vv. 5 and 6 of [Revelation 10:1–11](#). The part with the text approximates its conjugate pair, and the other part is a link to an Old Testament literary unit. The reason for separating them is for the sake of clarity. In this case, the commonality of themes for *C* and *C'* can be more readily seen.

4.9. Consistency of the Rhetorical Model

Martin recognizes two aspects of biblical analysis: reasoning and emotional reactions. He contended that once the rational argument is presented, the audience's emotional reaction must be considered: anger, insult, compassion, etc.¹³⁵ In this regard, the rational argument is the evaluation of the literary structure (Chapter Four, *The Structural Model*). The rhetoric in Pattern Analysis is one's response to the Holy Spirit's structured themes, similar to Martin's emotional considerations.

Hermeneutics is the application of one's exegesis. Fee states that while the goal of exegesis is understanding the biblical author's content and context, there is something beyond the exegesis—interpretation—which is hermeneutics. That is, the end product is today's application for the student.¹³⁶ The rhetoric in Pattern Analysis is the interpretation of the structural analysis, similar to Fee's hermeneutic. For both Martin and Fee, the rhetorical model in Pattern Analysis looks for the Holy Spirit's message and the personal response by the reader/listener.

The results of the frequency analyses for the rhetorical model are similar to those in the previous chapters. The statistical mean for each literary device is listed under "Mean: All Genres"—the variation from the mean is the observed fluctuation under each genre.

Twenty-four (24) literary devices are listed for the rhetorical model, of which ten (10) were previously identified in Chapter Four, *The Structural Model*. For those ten, the structural frequencies in the frame, parenthesis, and variation are greater than those in the rhetorical devices chart because some structural devices are not always emphatic.¹³⁷

135. Lee Roy Martin, "Rhetorical Criticism", 340-3.

136. Fee, *New Testament Exegesis*, 1,2.

137. Those ten are the absence, closing summary, extra, frame, link, opening summary, parenthesis, substructure summary, transposition, and variation.

Rhetorical Lettered Devices –Each of the six (6) rhetorical lettered devices hover fairly well around the mean, as shown in the [Frequencies for Lettered Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#). There is no genre which is prominent when compared to the others.

These six rhetorical devices include both basic structures and substructures, most of which are chiasms and parallel symmetries. When that chart is compared to the [Frequencies of Lettered Devices \(Structural\)](#), it can be seen that there is a difference between potential rhetoric locations and actual rhetoric locations. For example, there are over nine hundred (900) parallel symmetries and associated substructures, each with first/first and last/last locations. Two-thirds of those last/last locations are rendered as emphatic, and one-third of the first/first locations as emphatic. While there is a potential for those locations to be emphatic, the student must analyze each location to see if it is persuasive.

Rhetorical Asymmetric Devices—Except for the variation in literary devices, there seems to be good coherence to the mean for each genre. The numbers in the [Frequencies for Asymmetric Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#) chart are the same as those shown in [Frequencies for Asymmetric Devices \(Structural\)](#). As of the date of this writing, all asymmetric devices have emphatic value.

Rhetorical Non-lettered Devices—There are five (5) rhetorical devices in the [Frequencies for Non-Lettered Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#), which is in contrast to the seven (7) structural devices in the [Frequencies of Non-Lettered Devices \(Structural\)](#). There are no instances in the database repository where the preliminary literary device is persuasive. The imperative is discussed with the other rhetorical grammatical devices.

Over four hundred frames are identified in the frequencies chart (structural), but roughly three hundred frames are in the frequencies chart (rhetorical). This is an example of a literary device that is sometimes emphatic and sometimes not. The structural chart states that these frames physically exist, whereas the rhetorical chart identifies how often they contribute to the persuasion.

As might be expected, all of the closing summary, opening summary, and substructure summary elements have clear emphatic value. The frame, as mentioned above, is sometimes

emphatic and sometimes not. Very few of the parentheses are emphatic. Except for the substructure summary, the variance from the mean is low.

Rhetorical Grammatical Devices—Of the different categories within the rhetorical model, the grammatical devices are more subjective than structural ones. The frequency of the four (4) metrics—imperative, interjection, question, and repetition—is seen in [Frequencies for Grammatical Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#). They have no structural basis, for they are based on how one receives and interprets certain words. There are many more imperative verbs in the Bible than the ones identified in these analyses, many more interjections, many more questions, and many more repetitions. What one considers to be persuasive might be unnoticed by another. That subjectiveness is seen somewhat in the grammatical frequency analysis—it may be better seen by simply opening one’s Bible.

Rhetorical Comparative Devices—Four (4) rhetorical devices are used for comparative purposes: amplification, comparison, contrast, and intensification. See the [Frequencies for Comparative Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#). Like the rhetorical grammatical devices, these too are subjective because they are not based on structure, and therefore related to how one receives and interprets the text.

Rhetorical Links—Of the twenty-four (24) rhetorical literary devices, one stands out as inconsistent across all genres: the *link*. That is because the link appears only in the New Testament as a connection to the Old. As described in Section 4.8, *Link*, there is rhetorical persuasion from every Old Testament pericope as applied to the New. The distribution across the genres is shown in [Frequencies for Structure Combinations \(Rhetorical\)](#), but it is not overly meaningful regarding consistency.

5. Final Case Study

One can identify the demarcations of a pericope, develop an analysis of its structure, and prepare a perspective of its unique persuasion, but the full impact and power of the literary unit may best be seen through a case study.

5.0. Overview of Exodus 19 and 20

I consider myself a good driver. My car insurance company would most likely agree. Normally I do the driving and am seldom a passenger. Continually I look forward a long distance to see what may be developing, I am aware of the cars near me, and am regularly checking my mirrors. I try to be attentive to all that is around. What I can miss are the details of my surroundings. I may not recognize the type of dog walking on the sidewalk, the new chartreuse shutters on a house in my community, or a fresh bouquet of yellow and white flowers that just opened as the seasons change. I can enjoy more of these wonderful details when in the passenger's seat, but then I can't see out the rear-view mirror because I'm not driving.

Analogously, Pattern Analysis allows the reader to be both the driver and the passenger by looking at the big picture and details that might be missed.

The driver's picture in a literary unit investigates how the discourse moves from start to finish. The study of related elements (Chapters Four and Five, *The Structural Model* and *The Rhetorical Model*) is akin to the passenger's view where details within a basic structure can be more easily seen. The following case study from [Exodus 19:1 – 20:26](#) exemplifies the synergy between drivers and passengers.

5.1. Pericope Demarcations

The pericope demarcation is akin to the car's journey. Journeys have a starting and ending place, and often have stoplights and signs indicating a halt or a change of direction. With that in mind, there are multiple reasons why this pericope begins in Exodus 19:1.

BEGINNING MARKER: In the third month after the sons of Israel had gone out of the land of Egypt, on that very day they came into the wilderness of Sinai. (v19:1) **a change of time**

The phrase “in the third month” is a change of time, “into the wilderness of Sinai” is a change of location, and the transition from Exodus 18 is a change of topic. I selected the one that appears first.

Regarding the journey’s end, Exodus 21 introduces a change of genre, transitioning from the preceding narrative arrangement to a presentation of the Hebraic law. Therefore, the end of this case study pericope is v. 20:26 and the pericope extends from vv.19:1 to 20:26. Within those boundaries are eight sub-unit markers—each introduces a change of some type:

Figure 17: Markers in Exodus 19,20

Beginning of a substructure	Moses went up to God (v19:3A)	a change of location
Separation of two parts of a substructure	Moses went to the people (v19:7A)	a change of location
Start of a lettered sequence	The LORD also said to Moses (v19:10A)	a divine oracle
Separation of two parts of a basic structure	So Moses went down from the mountain (v19:14A)	a change of location
Start of a new element	So it came about on the third day, when it was morning, (v19:16A)	a change of time
Beginning of a substructure	Now Mount Sinai was all in smoke (v19:18A)	a change of flow
Beginning of a literary unit	Then God spoke all these words (v20:1)	a change of genre
Beginning of a substructure	So the people stood at a distance, while Moses approached the thick cloud where God was. (v20:21)	a change of location

Sub-unit markers can help readers visualize a new setting, just as a car may turn onto another road.

5.2. Basic Structure

Exodus 19 and 20 are two of the most pivotal chapters in the Old Testament. The following is the driver’s view of these two chapters before this Pattern Analysis was performed: God set before Moses a covenant that called for obedience to His voice; He gave Moses a plan to bring the people to the mountain; the people trembled in fear from the base of the mountain; the LORD warned Moses not to let the people touch the mountain; the Decalogue (Ten Commandments) was given; and the people instructed Moses to tell them what God says.

This driver's view misses some important details because the passenger's view, identified in Sections 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6, had not been taken. The basic structure of these two chapters is a parallel symmetry. There is a frame that surrounds the lettered elements (*A* to *E*) and a closing summary immediately precedes the second frame element. The basic structure is:

FRAME-A-B-C-D-E-A'-B'-C'-D'-E'-SUM-FRAME

Both frame elements have a substructure, and the closing summary also has a substructure. There also is an intriguing break in the substructure within the closing summary, the Decalogue.

Figure 18 is an overview of the basic structure, the driver's perspective:

Figure 18: Schema for Exodus 19,20

PARALLEL SYMMETRY

... the LORD appeared on Mount Sinai ...

BEGINNING MARKER	A change of time: third month	v19:1
PRELIMINARY	Israel camped in front of the mountain	v19:2
FRAME with a SUBSTRUCTURE	Listen and obey God's voice so you will be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation; the people agreed	v19:3-9
A-B-C-D-E	Instructions to Moses for the people to approach the mountain	v19:10-13
A'-B'-C'-D'-E'	What Moses did; the appearance of thunder, lightning, thick cloud, and loud trumpet	v19:14-17
SUM with a SUBSTRUCTURE	The LORD dealt with Moses; the Decalogue	v19:18 - 20:18
FRAME with a SUBSTRUCTURE	The people refused to listen to God's voice	v20:19-26

This pericope has much to be discovered, but the most important is found in the A-B-C-D-E-A'-B'-C'-D'-E' structure, vv. 19:10-17. The description begins in Section 5.3, *Parallel Symmetry and Variation*, and then comes returns to the FRAME in vv. 19:3-9.

5.3. Parallel Symmetry and Variation

The following example from Exodus 19:10-17 shows the strength of the variation. As mentioned in Section 3.5.4, *Variation*, a variation occurs when a pair of elements are substantially different from each other, *A-B-C-D-A'-B'-Y'-D'*. That non-correspondence of the *Y'* element is considered a variation.

In Figure 19, two instructions are provided so that the passenger’s perspective may be seen:

A challenge to each reader: compare the *C* and *C'* elements

The challenge for each reader is to open [Exodus 19:1 – 20:26](#) and read first the two *A* elements and then the two *B* elements. Note how closely they correspond with each other. Then read the two *C* elements, vv. 19:12,13A and 19:15B. The *C* element should be compared with *C'*. What does that mean?

A second challenge for each reader: compare the *D* and *D'* elements

Again the challenge for each reader is to open [Exodus 19:1 – 20:26](#) and read the two *D* elements, vv. 19:13B and 19:16B. The *D* element should be compared with *D'*; and then the *E* with the *E'* elements. What does that mean?

Figure 19: Schema for Exodus 19:10–17

SUB-UNIT MARKER	A divine oracle: the LORD also said to Moses	v19:10A
A	Consecrate the people; garments are to be washed	v19:10B
B	Be ready for the third day	v19:11
C	Instructions: do not touch the mountain, else they will not live	v19:12–13A
D	A long trumpet-like sound	v19:13B
E	They shall go to the mountain	v19:13C
SUB-UNIT MARKER	A change of location: Moses went down the mountain	v19:14A
A'	The people were consecrated; garments were washed	v19:14B
B'	Be ready for the third day	v19:15A
C'	VARIATION: Analyst, compare <i>C</i> with <i>C'</i>	v19:15B
SUB-UNIT MARKER	A change of time: the third day arrived	v19:16A
D'	VARIATION: Analyst, compare <i>D</i> with <i>D'</i>	v19:16B
E'	They stood at the mountain	v19:17

The *A* matches *A'*, *B* matches *B'*, and *E* matches *E'*. But does *C* match *C'*? Certainly the call of a long trumpet-like sound in *D* does not match what actually happened in *D'*. The effect in *D'* seems to be related to *C'*. Why did Moses proceed as he did? What might have happened if Moses had listened to the voice of God and obeyed it? Moses never became a priest (v. 19:6).

Is it possible that God manifested His anger because Moses did not follow the LORD's instructions?

Regarding the rhetorical emphasis, neither the first/first (*A* and *A*) or last/last (*E* and *E*) positions are particularly persuasive. Instead, the two variations carry the rhetorical emphasis:

2) The VARIATION in *C'* is very different from the LORD's instructions in *C*. The LORD had stated in verses 19:12 and 13A that the people were to be instructed not to go up the mountain or to touch it, else they die. In *C'*, Moses instead instructed them not to go near a woman! Abstaining from women was not the order that the LORD had specified. This is a classical variation of a theme.

3) The VARIATION of the *D'* element is also much different than *D*. Rather than a long trumpet-like blast, there was thunder, lightning, a thick cloud, and a very loud trumpet blast. Because the people were given the wrong instruction, the LORD was very upset with Moses. Is it possible that God manifested His anger because Moses did not follow the LORD's instructions?

5.4. Frame (First Element)

Much has been written about the covenant and the calling of the people in vv. 19:3–9. The purpose of this analysis is to simply present the parallelism and how it persuades in some way:

Figure 20: Schema for Exodus 19:3–9

FRAME CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE: ... listen and obey God's voice so you will be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation ...

sub-unit marker:	a change of location: Moses went up to God	v19:3A
a:	tell these words of Mine to the sons of Israel	v19:3B
b:	I brought these people to Me	v19:4
c:	if you obey Me and My covenant, you will be Mine	v19:5
x:	then you shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation	v19:6
sub-unit marker:	a change of location: Moses went to the people	v19:7A
c':	the people all together agreed	v19:7B,8
b':	I will bring My words to these people so they may believe	v19:9A
a':	Moses told the words of Israel to the LORD	v19:9B

The rhetoric identifies all locations of emphasis. The first entry about rhetoric reads:

1) Of the two FRAME elements, the first contains the LORD's command for the people. The two *c* CORRESPONDING ELEMENTS include the covenantal requirement to obey His voice and commands (verse 19:5), and the people's agreement to do so (verse 19:7,8). At the CENTER POINT, verse 19:6, the LORD promised they *shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation*.

5.5. Closing Summary and Decalogue

Following the lettered elements of the parallel symmetry is a closing summary:

Figure 21: Schema for [Exodus 19:18 – 20:18](#)

SUM	CHIASM SUBSTRUCTURE: ... the LORD corrected the instructions of Moses ...	
sub-unit marker:	A change of flow: smoke over Mount Sinai	v19:18A
a:	manifestations: fire, smoke, and earthquakes	v19:18B
b:	God spoke with trumpets and thunder against Moses	v19:19
c:	the LORD came down and Moses went up the mountain to meet	v19:20
d:	do not let them break through to see Me, else many will perish	v19:21
e:	the priests are to consecrate themselves, else God will break them	v19:22
e':	Moses repeated the instructions: set bounds and consecrate it	v19:23
d':	do not let them break through, else God will break upon them	v19:24
c':	Moses went down, met the people, and told them	v19:25
b' link:	THE DECALOGUE (TEN COMMANDMENTS)	v20:1-17
a':	manifestations: thunder, lightning, trumpet sound, and smoke	v20:18A
sum	the people trembled at God's manifestations	v20:18B

It seems ironic that Moses knew the LORD's instructions—"obey My voice and keep My covenant" (v. 19:5)—but He did not. God's agenda seems to be that He would speak the Decalogue once the people were lined up at the mountain's base. Obedience to the Decalogue was to be the path to becoming a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (vv. 19:5–8).

Section 4.4.3, *Transposition*, states that God can show strong emotions. The exploding mountain strongly suggests those emotions.

If the exploding mountain with thunder, lightning, loud sounds, and earthquakes was God's reaction to the misdirected words by Moses, that would seem to substantiate the thought that He is a very emotional God!!

The exploding mountain is described in the first/last elements, *a* and *a'*, part of the rhetoric. The LORD was in the fire (v19:19B)—smoke rose to heaven with violent earthquakes, thunder, lightning, and very loud trumpet sounds. When the people saw all this, the substructure summary identifies how the people trembled. This too was an emotive response.

The LORD had to deal with the misinformation of Moses because the people must not see Him (vv. 19:21–24). The *e* and *e'* center point corrects the “do not go near a woman” directive in v. 19:15. The mountain was holy and must be set apart.

Regarding the Decalogue in [Exodus 20:1–17](#), the first of the two corresponding *b* elements, v. 19:19, describes the LORD’s voice spoken to Moses as thunder. In the second *b* element, v. 20:18A, “All the people perceived the thunder.” The delivery of the Decalogue, vv. 20:1–17, was heard by all! The Decalogue is rendered as a separate literary unit because it is referenced many times in the New Testament.

The statement of rhetoric for this closing summary reads:

4) The CLOSING SUMMARY (verses 19:18–25 and 20:18) is a chiasm substructure that describes what happened when Moses brought the people to the foot of the violently erupting mountain. The LORD had thundered at Moses for his error. The two *a* elements are the FIRST/LAST, verses 19:18 and 20:18, which identify how the LORD’s anger manifested at Moses through the smoke, thunder, lightning, and so on. The two *e* CENTER POINT elements correct the instructions by Moses, that the mountain is holy and He must not be seen. The two *b* CORRESPONDING ELEMENTS pair the LORD’s loud voice in verse 19:19 against the Decalogue, an intriguing LINK to Exodus 20:1–17. Then the SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY of verse 20:18B reveals that the people fearfully trembled at the manifestations by the LORD.

5.6. Frame (Second Element)

Again, the rhetoric describes one’s understanding of the text. In this case, the second frame element is compared with the first frame element, vv. 19:3–8. The people had agreed to obey the LORD’s voice and His covenant—they would belong to Him and be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. The Hebrew word for obey in v. 19:5 is “shema” which means to both listen and obey. The people had agreed to listen to His voice and obey it.

The people were terrified when the mountain exploded with God’s manifestations of thunder, lightning, fire, smoke, etc. In fear of death, they rejected the opportunity to hear God’s voice by demanding that Moses inform them of what God stated (vv. 20:19,20). As a consequence, they lost their position as a kingdom of priests. The Levites eventually were given that priesthood when the golden calf was destroyed.

Unfortunately, one cannot obey a voice that is not first heard. They lost their position as a kingdom of priests by rejecting God’s voice.

Figure22: Schema for *Exodus 20:19–26*

FRAME	the people refused to listen to God's voice	v20:19,20
IMMEDIATE REPETITION SUBSTRUCTURE: ... a repetition of the second commandment ...		
sub-unit marker:	A change of location: Moses approached God in the cloud	v20:21
sum	the LORD spoke to all from heaven	v20:22
a:	no other gods besides Me (second commandment)	v20:23
a':	sacrifice your burnt and peace offerings to Me	v20:24A
x:	then you will be a blessed	v20:24B
b:	My altars must use uncut stones	v20:25
b':	do not climb the steps to My altar	v20:26

The description of the rhetoric states:

5) In the second of the two frame elements, verses 20:19–26, the people rejected the LORD's covenant. Whereas they agreed to it in the first frame (verse 19:8), the CONTRAST here is they refused to listen. As a result, the people lost their position as a kingdom of priests. That position was eventually given to the Levites who stood up for God against those who created the golden calf. The LORD emphasized the first and second commandments within the immediate repetition substructure: worship God only and have no idols (verses 20:23,24). The *b'* element is an AMPLIFICATION of *b* by describing what they should do: worship God alone. Because these are the only commandments mentioned of the ten, they are the most important. The SUBSTRUCTURE SUMMARY in verse 20:22 is a remembrance of what God has done. The *x* CENTER POINT is conditional—the blessings are related to that obedience.

5.7. Application

The rejection of the LORD's voice in v. 20:19 is possibly the saddest account in the Bible. At Massah, the people's rebellion had caused the LORD's wrath to be provoked (Exodus 17:7 and Deuteronomy 9:22). The suggestion is that it was Moses' disobedience to the LORD's command that led to the mountain exploding (see the variation in Section 5.3, *Parallel Symmetry and Variation*). The LORD had called the people to listen and obey His voice, and Moses behaved like the Israelites: he disobeyed. The explosive actions on the mountain demonstrated the LORD's anger with Moses. As a result, the people trembled in fear and stated they wanted Moses to do the listening. In time, their hearts became insensitive, their ears dull, and their eyes dim (Isaiah 6:10) because they were no longer attentive to His voice.

The application is the student's last words about the pericope. It answers the question, "So what?" In Pattern Analysis, after the rhetoric is written, further documentation of the application is optional—some instructors may require it, some not.

Does that problem exist today? Have our people listened and obeyed the LORD's commands? Do some tremble and live in fear of the LORD who loves them? Has today's church allowed learned scholars and pastors to do their listening for them? This author suggests today's people need to listen individually to the LORD and then follow His commands. Hopefully some people will find Pattern Analysis is helpful with that process.

The application statement reads:

APPLICATION: The rejection of God's voice in verse 20:19 is possibly the saddest account in the Bible. I suggest Moses' disobedience to the LORD's command led to the mountain exploding. God had called the people to listen and obey His voice, and Moses did otherwise. The explosive actions on the mountain demonstrated the LORD's anger with Moses. As a result, the people trembled in fear and stated they wanted Moses to do the listening. As Isaiah 6:10 states, their hearts became insensitive, their ears dull, and their eyes dim—because they no longer heard His voice.

That problem seems to exist today. Our people have not consistently listened to and obeyed God's commands. Some live in fear of the LORD who loves them. Further, today's church has often allowed learned scholars and pastors to do their listening for them. I suggest today's people need to listen and obey the voice of God, and our church leaders need to teach them how to respond to God's love with love itself.

The completed analysis of Exodus 19 and 20, including the application, may be viewed in [Exodus 19:1 – 20:26](#).

6. Concluding Thoughts

As seen in the preceding chapters, Pattern Analysis takes an innovative approach to biblical hermeneutics. Some of that innovation is seen through the Pattern Analysis Software, briefly described in the Appendix. Other parts of the innovation is seen in the three models described in Chapters 2, 3, and 4. Perhaps the most bold of these innovations may be statements about the Holy Spirit's involvement in the composition of the Bible.

6.0. Overview of Pattern Analysis's Innovation

This methodology is more than a presentation about literary units of the Bible, where they begin, how they are structurally organized, and how they persuade the student, all of which are identified in this manuscript. It is genuinely hoped some people will engage in that effort, especially those in an academic setting. Another hope is that an organization will convert the Pattern Analysis Software to an internet platform so that others may enjoy this same analysis of pericopes. But the most significant hope is that the Holy Spirit's strong messages will be more readily understood and applied.

If the book of Acts is just Luke's story, the Psalms just prayers of David and others, the gospels just different and sometimes contradictory records by four different men, and the prophetic books just some record of ways the LORD spoke to various people, we would have a wooden manuscript. Instead, is it possible that the consistent evidence provided through this methodology clarifies how the Holy Spirit arranged His thoughts to various so-called authors?

6.1. Consistency of Methodology

Pattern Analysis began by asking if Jerome T. Walsh's methodology applies to every verse in the Bible or if modifications are necessary. In particular, are his statements about emphatic locations reasonable?¹³⁸ I wondered if Walsh's statements about emphasis present a means to discern the Holy

138. Walsh, *Style and Structure*. 8,11,14,26,37,52,57,72,73,101-3,107,110-4,145.

Spirit's voice in the Bible. The initial purpose was to see if a consistent methodology could be developed from his teachings. I was not disappointed.

The initial inquiry asked if Walsh's statements about emphasis could lead to a consistent means for discerning the Holy Spirit's voice. I was not disappointed.

Numerous modifications became necessary for Walsh's methodology. As the three models and associated software were developed, adjustments were made so that all emphatic locations would be identified. The demarcation model was significantly expanded; portions of Walsh's structural model were not used while other additions were included; and certain emphatic locations were added to the rhetorical model, all of which accounted for additional areas of importance. The works of others were considered in these changes.

As a result, wonderful nuggets were gleaned from this revised methodology. The process forces the reader to slow down, deal with what the text says, and grasp new understandings. Pattern Analysis provides evidence that basically every pericope, every book, and every genre follow the same uniform approach. Human authors would have created significant inconsistencies while in reality there are very few. That evidence is summarized as follows:

Completeness of the demarcation model—Every pericope starts with the same demarcation approach (Section 2.2.2, *Location of Markers*, and Section 2.2.3, *First-element Frames*). Rather than being randomly placed, ninety-two percent (92%) have a beginning marker and the remaining eight percent (8%) have a first-element frame. They are very consistent throughout the nine genres. See [Frequencies of Demarcation Devices](#). At the same time, sub-unit markers are not as consistent and ending markers are not very consistent.

Completeness of the structural model—Of the roughly 21,000 verses analyzed, every verse fits this methodology. No verses are unexplained. Where exegetes today can be deterred as they discover an inconsistency within a potential chiasm, Pattern Analysis offers a methodology that works uniformly. For example, frames can surround a parallel symmetry, an extra does not have a matching pair, a summarization may be located at the beginning or end, a substructure can continue a thought but with a different pattern, or two thoughts may be transposed from the pattern established by the corresponding sequence.

Completeness of the rhetorical model—Not only does every structure work but students should expect the emphases in the Bible to be placed in predictable locations. Unlike traditional approaches, most pericopes have multiple locations for emphasis. Many potential locations for rhetoric are presented which allows exegetes to choose and explain their understandings of that unit.

Marker identifiers—As described in Section 2.2.1, *Identification of Markers*, there are twenty (20) identifiers that potentially mark a pericope. All demarcation identifiers, whether beginning markers, sub-unit markers, or ending markers, are explained by this demarcation scheme. See [Marker Identifiers for the Demarcation Model](#).

Cohesiveness—Individual themes of lettered elements are consistently joined with their conjugate pair (Section 2.3.2, *Cohesive Themes*). Rather than using a word-based approach to identify pairs, the paraphrased documentation of themes opens a broad understanding of the pair and the pericope as a whole.

Contiguous—The pericopes are contiguous (Section 2.3.4, *Continuity*). There are no holes between one pericope and another. When one pericope ends, another starts in the next verse without a gap (hole) between them. That is best seen in those books that have been completed. See [Books Analyzed by Pattern Analysis](#).

Substructures—Basic structures regularly interact with substructures (Section 2.2, *Basic Structures and Substructures*). Whereas most approaches to literary structure do not include substructures, that difficulty is removed by recognizing every basic element throughout the Bible can have a substructure. Every substructure adds details about its parent element. Each substructure is either a chiasm, parallel symmetry, immediate repetition, or a list, without exception.

Lettered devices—The lettered devices—the basic structures, substructures, and asymmetric structures which include the chiasm, parallel symmetry, immediate repetition, and list—fully explain each of the analyzed pericopes (Section 3.4, *Lettered Devices*). There is no need to incorporate other devices into the methodology. These lettered devices show very good consistency across all genres. See [Frequencies for Lettered Devices \(Structural\)](#).

Arrangements of basic chiasms—The frequency analyses for the most common basic chiasms indicate that *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'-SUM* and *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'-SUM* and *A-B-X-B'-A'-SUM* arrangements are regularly dispersed throughout each genre with very little exception. As the number of total literary devices decreases, the consistency becomes more diverse. See [Frequencies for Basic Structures with Chiasms](#).

Arrangements of basic parallel symmetries—Likewise, for the most common basic parallel symmetries, these lettered organizations are reasonably uniform across all genres. For example, note how the *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'-SUM* and *A-B-C-X-A'-B'-C'-SUM* arrangements are distributed reasonably well across each genre. See [Frequencies for Basic Structures with Parallel Symmetries](#).

Arrangements of basic immediate repetitions and lists—Despite the strong consistency of the chiasmic and parallel symmetry arrangements, the frequencies for the immediate repetitions and lists do not show similar consistencies. See [Frequencies for Basic Structures with Immediate Repetitions](#). Scholars have done much to reveal those parallelisms, particularly in the poetic and prophetic portions of the Old Testament. It is not surprising they consider immediate repetitions to be inconsistent.

Asymmetry—The asymmetric literary devices—extra, absence, transposition, and variation—are a unique writing style (Section 3.5, *Asymmetric Devices*). The frequency analysis is reasonably consistent across each genre. See [Frequencies for Asymmetric Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#). Each of those four devices has the potential to speak persuasively to an astute reader (Section 4.4, *Asymmetric Devices*).

Non-lettered devices—The non-lettered devices consistently allow the structural analysis to extend to the pericope edges (Section 3.6, *Non-Lettered Devices*). Summarizations, preliminary, frames, preliminary, and parenthesis fully explain that portion of the pericope before and after the lettered elements. These frequency analyses are again reasonably consistent. See [Frequencies for Non-Lettered Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#). A frame always has two elements and never three or more (Section 3.6.3, *Frames*, and Section 4.5.3, *Frames*). The

basic preliminary elements are never emphatic, although some substructures within a preliminary are identified as emphatic (Section 4.5.2, *Preliminary*).

Summarizations—There is uniqueness to the summarization statements in a unit (Section 3.6.1, *Summarization*). For a basic structure, there is only one opening summary, one closing summary, or neither. Never a second one. For a substructure, if a substructure summary exists, there is only one at the beginning or end.

Links—Three of the four structure combinations (composite, drill, and structure split) should not be expected to have good consistency for various reasons. However, the link is strongly consistent when comparing New Testament citations with their linked Old Testament connection. There are three-hundred and thirty-five (335) structural links in the Pattern Analysis repository. Each of these add rhetorical and emphatic value from the Old Testament pericope to its counterpart pericope in the New Testament.

Other devices—Some of the rhetorical devices are more subjective than their structural counterpart. Four areas are presented. First are the comparative devices, [Frequencies of Comparative Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#): while amplification and intensification are based on structural organization and therefore have good adherence to the mean, the comparison and contrast do not have that basis and therefore are much more dispersed. The second is the variation, [Frequencies for Asymmetric Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#): unlike the absence, extra, and transposition which are also based on structural organization, the variation is more subjective and shows similar deviation from the mean. Third of those with higher subjectivity are the four grammatical devices, [Frequencies for Grammatical Devices \(Rhetorical\)](#), which have some significant deviation from the mean.

The above analysis presents compelling evidence: the demarcation, structural, and rhetorical portions, with few exceptions, identify a very consistent methodology. This strong evidence seems to clarify how the Holy Spirit communicated His thoughts to various so-called authors.

The very consistent methodology presented in Pattern Analysis clarifies how the Holy Spirit communicated His thoughts to various so-called authors.

6.2. Implications of Pattern Analysis

Based on this overwhelming evidence about structure and rhetorical emphasis, some implications seem appropriate:

New approach to reading the Bible—When we were children, most of us were taught to normally find a summarization at the beginning and/or end of a story. We would then read the story from top to bottom. The Bible offers a different approach for what is important: the first/first, last/last, and first/last elements; those center points in chiasms, parallel symmetries, immediate repetitions, or lists; and the corresponding pairs with common themes. Summarizations add emphatic clarity to the text and substructures add detail to their parent element. Imperatives, interjections, and questions add flavor. These additional devices and others have emphatic value which add meaning to the text—they help hear the voice of God. These are opportunities to encounter God, stir up a love response, and freshly express reverence to Him.

Exegetical analyses—For those who want to perform exegetical and hermeneutic analyses of the Bible, Pattern Analysis may be incorporated into those methods. It will allow the student to gather a big-picture view of the Holy Spirit's persuasive emphasis before going into in-depth word studies. The student may then continue with the exegesis and hermeneutics as deemed appropriate. In that way, the understanding of the emphasis would help with the hermeneutic interpretation of the text. Those exegetical and hermeneutic approaches are not part of the Pattern Analysis methodology.

Effect on the church—The emphasis on Pattern Analysis should help the worldwide church focus more clearly on what the text says to each person individually. The Word of God should be found to be living and alive, sharper than any two-edged sword. It is hoped that the church will search the Bible for greater clarity, potentially correcting misunderstandings they may have formed.

Translation teams—Pattern Analysis should help with translating the biblical text. As the Holy Spirit laid down these forms of logical presentation, these pericope-level structures should be considered when performing either a dynamic or more literal translation to the target

language. Or, to put it another way, the translation should not relocate the parallelism seen in Pattern Analysis.

Pattern Analysis offers a tool that allows a less-trained person to struggle with the text, to make mistakes, to dialog with others, to hear the corrective voice of the Holy Spirit, and to encounter God afresh. Analysts will want to dig into the text, parse it in various ways, and struggle with what it states. May their perspective be that it is God's story. May their search be for the heart of God. May they too hear and understand His voice.

The overwhelming evidence suggests that the Holy Spirit's emphatic voice can be discerned by looking at the rhetorical analysis for each pericope. These demarcation, structural, and rhetorical models are like looking at the signature of God. They are the voice of the Holy Spirit.

6.3. Further Investigation

Some areas of further investigation are:

Critique the methodology—The Pattern Analysis methodology has not had a critical scholarly review. It began its development outside an academic setting due to certain health-related issues. Using this current manuscript as a basis, that review seems imperative now that those health issues are resolved.

Review of current analyses—An organization should perform an independent review of some or all portions already analyzed. Due to copyright limitations, the HTML web pages would be provided on an as-needed basis. Only a portion of the analyses have undergone independent editing and review.

Further analysis—There is an opportunity for an organization to attempt the remaining thirty percent (30%) of the Bible. Certain software changes would be necessary to make Pattern Analysis available to a limited set of people. No one else can create new analyses on the laptop version.

Exegetical process—In the thought of incorporating Pattern Analysis into the exegetical process, it would be interesting to test the melding of those two approaches. Potentially the

demarcation, structural, and rhetorical phases would be completed by the student before detailed word studies of an exegetical analysis.

6.4. Application

Once the Pattern Analysis methodology has been deemed viable, the hope is for Bible students anywhere to prepare their own analyses using a commercialized version of the Pattern Analysis Software. The existing software would be re-written for an internet-based environment. While there is some temptation to release all completed analyses for review purposes, there is a much greater value to instead allow others to use Pattern Analysis themselves. That is, there should be joy as students grasp greater meaning and glean more of the Holy Spirit's emphasis in the Bible.

I attribute the decay in our Western society today on the fallen status of the Bible. As we turn from a culture that previously based morality on scriptural principles, we now establish our own rules. That seems to be a thought in our culture—throw away what is established and rethink everything. We could attribute it to the devil, of course, but humanity also has a responsibility. We could blame it on the media, politics, or many different things. Whatever the cause, we have been losing the battle of biblical relevance.

God is certainly not asleep during this moral plummet. The Holy Spirit has been impressing upon me what I consider the epitome of today's decay: human trafficking. These victims are modern-day slaves to a master and to a culture that seems powerless in combatting this affront to civilization. I believe God is calling me through Pattern Analysis to help do something about it—that I might have some small part to play in God's restoration plan.

When the existing Pattern Analysis Software is ported to an internet environment, an annual subscription model would be used whereby all profit would be targeted towards agencies that combat sex trafficking. Access to the Pattern Analysis software would then be granted. Students would download their preferred translation or the original language for a literary unit, parse the text, identify the themes, and document their understanding of the Holy Spirit's emphasis (the rhetoric). The software would perform validations similar to the existing system and then produce a dynamic HTML web page with the results. This manuscript, *Pattern Analysis Methodology*, would be incorporated into a robust help system.

I am not looking for revenue but to do my part in God's restoration of society and the Bible's relevance/reliability. Funding is necessary to go beyond those groups that concentrate on freeing victims. Lawyers are needed to change laws, investigators to track the criminals, case workers and workplaces to teach needed skills, shelters to live safely, computer workers to combat pornography, and marketing campaigns to bring a heart change of our people.

We must break this enslavement of children and women and men into human trafficking. The cost to resolve this issue is enormous, but we must not let it go. These could be our neighbor's daughter or son, or our own.

6.5. A Love Response

Pattern Analysis focuses the exegete on each pericope: what seems to be the Holy Spirit's emphasis. Compared with other approaches about literary structure, Pattern Analysis moves the reasoning of literary structural analysis toward the heart. God's goal appears not to be the precise analysis of facts but the changed hearts of His people.

God's greater purpose is intimacy—for us to find Him, to know Him, to understand His heart, and to love Him. That intimacy comes not from presenting facts but from grasping the Holy Spirit's messages. For the person who focuses on a linear reading from top to bottom, they can miss portions of the Holy Spirit's voice. The messages revealed in the emphasis can change how we view Him. In this way, the documentation of rhetoric in Pattern Analysis helps us receive the Holy Spirit's emphasis.

We have allowed pastors and teachers to do our digging for us. We have put them on a very tall and demanding pedestal. Instead, each of us should be struggling with how the Bible, through the Holy Spirit, is teaching us to forgive, to know Jesus, to distinguish good from evil, to understand the consequences of our actions, to have hope, to know God loves us, and to respond in love. By allowing the Holy Spirit to be the One who corrects our misunderstandings, we can grow in our Christian faith.

Many modern songs focus on how much God loves us and how He sacrificed His Son's life for us. That is so essential to our faith walk. But Pattern Analysis suggests we fall short if we stop there. God is earnestly seeking our song response: do we genuinely love Him in return? Can we confess from deep within our hearts that God has somehow profoundly moved us? A heart cry of

passion and adoration. I yearn for a day when there is a rich and abundant proclamation of that love to God through songs. Even more, the Bible.

Documentation is the key. Somehow, by annotating the textual themes with paraphrases and composing the rhetorical documentation, the Holy Spirit seems to add fresh understanding to the text. Writing seems to engage the heart, whereas a structural analysis can engage reasoning in the mind. Both are important—please don't be misled—but our response to His love is what He seeks. Pattern Analysis has the potential to better touch one's heart.

O Come, Let Us Adore Him

Appendix:

The Pattern Analysis Software

It amazes me how in 1906, Francis Brown with help from S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs prepared what is commonly known as the *BDB Lexicon* without the aid of a computer.¹³⁹ Or how Orville Nave produced his first version of the *Nave's Topical Bible* in 1896.¹⁴⁰ The same is true for many other manuscripts from the pre-computer era. Incredible.

The Pattern Analysis Software was prepared to develop and refine the analyses, to ensure specific rules about literary structure and rhetoric are enforced, to record its many literary structures, and to present the results dynamically. The effort be overwhelming without this software, and the rigor of consistent analysis, rapid search, and easy reorganization seems practically impossible.

The Pattern Analysis Software works effectively on my home computer but is not designed for public use. It currently is a database with front-end software in a Windows environment. Copyright infringement of Lockman Foundation's NASB 95 translation is among the many issues.¹⁴¹ If the application's software seems worthwhile, it should be considered a working prototype for an established organization to convert to another platform for public use. Similar to the donation mentioned in Section 6.3, *Further Investigation*, a generous contribution to combat the human trafficking crisis should be considered. The hope is we can collectively help combat that hideous epidemic that has invaded our society.

This software was developed with three goals in mind: to create a way to easily enter analyses (*PARL*), to improve the rigor of structural analyses (validation), and to develop a means for

139. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, (Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers Marketing LLC, 2012).

140. Orville J. Nave, *Nave's Topical Bible: A Digest of the Holy Scriptures*, (Nashville, The Southwestern Company, 1896, editions in 1897, 1921, and 1962).

141. The Lockman Foundation allows up to five hundred (500) verses of their NASB 95 may be quoted without express written permission. A special agreement with Lockman would be required for use of their entire Bible translation.

consistent presentation of each analysis (dynamic web pages). The result is a consistent and reliable approach for learning the Bible and understanding subtleties that may not be readily discerned.

The software includes:

PARL—An acronym for the *Pattern Analysis Research Language*. This simple method is offered as a public domain format for the entry of each structural and rhetorical analysis into a computer. No licensing is needed to use the PARL format. The analyst surrounds the biblical text with PARL operators which instruct the software to present the basic structures, substructures, and other literary content presented in this methodology. See [Pattern Analysis Research Language \(PARL\) for Acts 2:1–13](#).

Conceptually there are four parts of each line within the PARL: the element’s label such as *A* or *SUB-UNIT MARKER*; the biblical text; the verse reference numbers such as (v9-11A); and a thematic paraphrase of the biblical text. One or more of those four parts may be omitted allowing various portions of the analysis to shift left as necessary. A blank line is used to terminate substructures. These variables are stored in the software’s database along with other variables needed to make the system work.

The four-part format of PARL is:

Label ➔ Biblical text ➔ Verse reference numbers ➔ Thematic paraphrase

A sample of the PARL format from Acts 2:7 is:

a question: They were amazed and astonished, saying, “Why, are not all these who are speaking Galileans? (v7) /* asked why in amazement */

After validation, the Pattern Analysis Software converts the PARL-formatted input to:

- a They were amazed and astonished, saying, “Why, are not all these who are speaking Galileans? (v7) QUESTION: asked why in amazement

Validation—Once the student believes the structural PARL analysis has been adequately identified, multiple checks are made to ensure compliance with specific fundamental rules. The model checks that every verse within the pericope has been presented, the basic structure and substructure(s) have been properly laid out, and each element has a brief paraphrase of its

meaning.¹⁴² When the validation button is clicked, the logic of the PARL structure is checked. Many diagnostics are provided: various hard errors stop the process, and some soft checks suggest improvement.

Dynamic Web pages—After the structure and rhetoric pass the validation test, an HTML web page is produced which indents each element, adds coloration for conjugate pairs, allows cursor movement to indicate pairs, and permits substructures to be hidden or shown. The software allows the student to generate a web page with either the potential locations where emphases may be located or a completed analysis with the rhetoric.¹⁴³ That web page may be forwarded to others or printed. For example, see [Acts 2:1–13](#).

Spelling—A *spell checker* is incorporated to improve the quality of the created PARL structures and the rhetorical analyses.

Literary Unit Searches—The literary unit search is the first of the three types of searches in the Pattern Analysis Software. It is also the most commonly used—a search based on various parameters, literary devices, rhetorical devices, and words/phrases. The capability of this search is essential when locating analyzed literary units.

Scripture Searches—This innovative search through various Bible translations is more than a simple word search. It allows both “*and*” and “*or*” searches using relevant book(s), chapter(s), words/phrases, and translations. Shown are both the matching verses and the context for each selected verse.

Strong’s Number Searches—This search leverages the KJV with Strong’s numbers. For each New or Old Testament Strong’s number, a frequency list shows how often each word appears in the Bible. A word search is also included. The matching verses are shown as well as the context for each selected verse.

142. The validation check is a feature of the pattern analysis software. It attempts to identify many of the common mistakes such as labeling a chiasm as an A-B-B-X-C'-B'-A' structure, lack of demarcation, or failure to enter a paraphrase of an element. It does not attempt to validate the text of individual pairings of elements by using some mechanism such as artificial intelligence.

143. When the list of potential locations is selected, some items on that list may not apply and others may not. This list of potential locations becomes the starting point for the emphasis documentation.

Ad Hoc Queries—The various frequency analyses are examples of the ad hoc ability to investigate the data behind the software. Software development skills are necessary for their use.

For more information, contact Tom@ThomasBClarke.com.

Glossary of Terms

Absence—An element was intentionally removed from one of the two parts: e.g. *A-B-C-D-D'-B'-A'* where the *C'* is not provided. The absence only applies to imperfect chiasmic and imperfect parallel symmetry structures. The absence emphasizes something is intentionally missing.

Alternating repetition—See parallel symmetry.

Amplification—A clarification of an element or a sequence of elements where the second part in some way removes the obfuscation that may be found in the first. An amplification can be a large increase such as the multiplication of believers in the book of Acts; the additional detail provided by its conjugate pair, seen especially when a substructure provides data that is not in the first; or in an immediate repetition where the second part adds more than just the antithesis to the first such as Kugel's *A what's more B* teaching.¹⁴⁴

Anaphora—A repetition that occurs when successive verses begin with the same word or phrase.

Asymmetric—Not symmetric. A spruce tree ready for Christmas cutting is considered symmetric, whereas a similar tree with a large hole on one side would be considered asymmetric.

Asyndeton—A collection of similar words, whether they are people, places, things, or actions, without the word “and” separating each. See also Polysyndeton.

Basic structure—In contrast to a substructure, a basic structure is the major structural organization of a pericope. Those *A*, *B* and *C* elements are capitalized in Pattern Analysis, along with other elements such as *SUM* and *PRELIMINARY*.

Beginning marker—Marks the beginning of a new pericope. Beginning markers are very useful because they can instruct the analyst where to begin. They are sometimes called unit

144. James L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry*, 8.

boundaries. In Pattern Analysis, there are twenty marker identifiers. Four of those identifiers are considered potentially emphatic: an imperative, an interjection, a question, and a repeated phrase.

Center point—An emphasis or turning point that is at the logical center of a structure. In Pattern Analysis, an *X* in the middle of a list, immediate repetition, parallel symmetry, or chiasm is a center point. If two elements appear at the center of a structure rather than an *X*, those two elements are the center point. For example, *A-B-C-X-A'-B'-C'* or *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'*.

Chiasm—An *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'* or *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'* type of structure. It is a repetition of similar themes in the reverse sequence. Other names for chiasms include chiasmus, concentric symmetry, introversion, inverted parallelism, reverse symmetry, and ring construction. The most common emphatic locations are found in the center point and the first/last elements.

Chiasm (imperfect)—The imperfect form of the chiasm is a powerful literary device that uses an asymmetric imbalance to bring emphasis on a portion of the structure. An imperfect chiasm is seen when an extra or absence is presented (such as *A-C-D-D'-C'-B'-A'*), or a transposition (*A-B-C-X-C'-A'-B'*) is detected. The place of imperfection is normally emphatic.

Chiasm substructure—A structure shaped as a chiasm but positioned as a sub-unit within another structure. For example, an *A-B-A'-(a-b-c-x-c'-b'-a')-B'* structure. The same rules for chiasms and imperfect chiasms apply to the substructures.

Closing summary—A summarization that concludes a basic structure which is designated with the letters *SUM*. For example, *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'-SUM*. A closing summary is also known as a concluding epitome, final unit, and an epilogue. It serves two functions: to summarize and to motivate. It is always emphatic and should be easily detected.

Comparison—The likeness of two or more themes within a pericope. This could be the comparison of a conjugate pair if that is particularly emphatic. Otherwise, it should be restricted to an emphatic similarity of two element clusters: *A-B-C* when compared to *A'-B'-C'*.

Composite—Two or more basic structures: chiasm, immediate repetition, list, or parallel symmetry. For example, *A-B-X-B'-A'* followed by *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'*. With a composite, one basic structure ends and the next begins. The basic structures are needed to develop the entire emphatic picture. The composite discusses one topic.

Concentric chiasm—An *A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'* type of chiasm where there is an *X* center point.

Contrast—While contrasts appear throughout the Bible (Saul tried to destroy the early church, Paul helped build the early church), the context here is those opposing themes within a pericope. That is, Peter said Jesus is the Messiah and then he urged Jesus not to submit Himself to suffering and death.

Correlation of sequences—In a chiasm or parallel symmetry, this is an emphasis where the first part is compared or contrasted with the second part. For a chiasm, it correlates $A-B-C$ as a group with the group of $C'-B'-A'$ elements. Likewise for a parallel symmetry, it is a correlation of $A-B-C$ with $A'-B'-C'$.

Corresponding elements—Also known as conjugate pairs. It is any two elements that are paired with each other. In some cases, the pair may be emphatic even though they are not in a position of emphasis such as first/first or first/last. For example, in a chiasmic $A-B-C-X-C'-B'-A'$ structure, the two B elements might add considerable conviction to the reader or listener.

Demarcation model—The first step of the Pattern Analysis methodology that separates one pericope from another, as well certain locations within the pericope.

Drill—A reference to another pericope that augments or somehow complements the current structure. It is used as a table of contents to dynamically drill to the associated pericope. The structure of that table of contents may be a list, immediate repetition, parallel symmetry, chiasm, and it may have substructures.

Dynamic web page—Unlike a static web page that does not change, a dynamic web page adjusts what is displayed based on usage by the individual. For Pattern Analysis, it includes the ability to hide and/or show certain content, and to change coloration based on cursor movements.

Element—Similar in some ways to a verse, an element is a combination of the biblical words and the exegete's analysis. The theme of one element is often paired with the theme of another element within a pericope. The element consists of four parts: an element label, the scriptural text, the element reference, and a paraphrased theme.

Element label—Element labels are presented to the left of the scriptural text within an element. They have identifiers such as B or C' or *PRELIMINARY*, or with lowercase letters such as b or c' or *sum*.

Element reference—The verse number or numbers of the element. The format is (v12:5,6A) where the chapter number is needed if there is more than one chapter. Opening and closing parentheses with the letter “v” are required.

Ellipsis—The intentional omission of a word or words in a sentence which eliminates superfluous wordings.

Ending marker—Marks the end of a structure or substructure. Ending markers are rarely emphatic.

Epiphora—A repetition that occurs when successive verses end with the same word or phrase.

Extra—An element was intentionally inserted from one of the two parts. For example, the *C* element in *A-B-C-D-D'-B'-A'* does not have a corresponding *C'* element, which means *C* is an extra. This anomaly only applies to chiasmic and parallel symmetry structures. The extra is a place of rhetorical importance, whereas the corresponding element is missing.

First/first—In a parallel symmetry, these are the two *A* elements, *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'*. Sometimes these are a place of emphasis.

First/last—In a chiasm, these are the two *A* elements: *A-B-C-C'-B'-A'*. Oftentimes an emphasis may be found in these locations.

First-element frame—A specific type of frame where the first of the two elements is the first appearing element of a literary unit.

Forward symmetry—See parallel symmetry.

Frame—A frame is the repetition of a theme near the beginning and end of a structure or substructure. The surrounding layer of a frame encapsulates an inner portion. Scholars often mention a similar concept called an *inclusio* or *inclusion* where the repetition may be confined to a literary unit or it may span multiple literary units. Both portions of the frame are required. The two frame elements often do not have the same words—instead, they have the same general theme and sometimes they are antithetical. Other related names for frames are bookends, brackets, and envelopes. Oftentimes the frame contains an emphatic statement.

Gradation—A progression of words; an example of intensification. In a gradation, a word is stated in one element and then repeated in the second element. The next word is introduced in the

second element and then repeated in the third element. This repetition often continues for several more elements, each with increasing intensity.

Hole—During the analysis of an entire book, a hole is any verse or verses that have not yet been accounted for. Those verses may be between two pericopes, or they may be within a pericope. If chapters 5, 6 and 7 of some book have not yet been analyzed, that is a three-chapter hole. If vv. 22 and 23 do not seem to fit within any pericope, that too would be a hole.

Immediate repetition—Most commonly it is an $A-A'-B-B'$ arrangement. It can also be an $A-A'-B-B'-C-C'$ or occasionally with a larger number of repeated elements such as an $A-A'-A''-A'''-B-B'-B''-B'''$ structure. In an immediate repetition, a theme is repeated then a second theme with its repetition, a third theme with its repetition, and so on. As few as two elements may have been used, $A-A'$. Usually the emphasis, if there is one, is found in the X center point or in a summarization. Sometimes the second element augments the first with greater meaning, B and what's more B' .

Immediate repetition substructure—An immediate repetition sub-unit within another structure. For example, an $A-B-C-A'-B'-(a-a'-b-b'-c-c')-C'$ structure.

Imperative—A strongly worded directive or command that conveys the importance of doing something. In English, Hebrew and Greek, the imperative is a verb. In Greek, the spelling of the word indicates it is imperative. In English, imperatives are usually the first word in a sentence or phrase. For example, the phrase in Deuteronomy 30:19C which states, “Choose life in order that you may live, you and your descendants,” is an imperative. Context is important in determining if an imperative statement is emphatic.

Imperative device—Similar to a summarization, the imperative verb also carries concluding attributes to its message.

Imperative element—A theme-based portion of a structure that carries the format of a lettered element such as X *IMPERATIVE*.

Imperative marker—A beginning marker or a sub-unit marker that has an imperative verb.

Imperfect chiasm—See Chiasm (imperfect).

Imperfect parallel symmetry—See Parallel symmetry (imperfect).

Inclusio—See frame. A word, phrase, sentence, or even a paragraph that is repeated at the location within the book. Also known as a simple inclusion.

Intensification—An escalation of themes from the beginning to the end, or in the case of a chiasm, from the outside towards the middle. A purposely forward-moving and goal-oriented development in a discourse.

Interjection—A sudden statement which often appears near the beginning of a sentence that draws emphasis to the statement. The emphasis is to be found in the words that immediately follow the interjection.

Intertextuality—Those situations where the text from one book of the Bible makes reference to the text in another book. With respect to Pattern Analysis, it is the relationship between the pericopes of the Old Testament as found in New Testament pericopes.

Irregular structure—A rather uncommon form of an asymmetry, similar to a contortion. The irregularity seems to somehow represent an emotive scenario.

Last/last—In a parallel symmetry, this is oftentimes a place of emphasis. For example, in an *A-B-C-D-A'-B'-C'-D'* structure, the two *D* elements are in the last/last position.

Link—A connection of one pericope to another, typically an Old Testament pericope that is emphatically related to one in the New. A link is not a reference of common words from the Old into the New. A link is also not a prophetic foreshadowing of something in the New such as Christ. A link connects the Old to the New by adding emphasis from the Old into the New, thereby adding additional meaning.

List—An A-B-C-D-E or 1-2-3-4-5 type of sequence. The exegete may use either letters or numbers. At least three elements must be present to be considered a list. All elements in a list must be about the same topic. Lists are also known as enumerations and linear patterns. The order of list items does not relate to importance unless the Bible tells us differently. Sometimes there is intensification in a list.

List substructure—A list substructure within another structure. For example, an *A-B-C-X-A'-B'-(1-2-3-4-5)-C'* structure.

Literary device—Literary devices reveal the tools in Pattern Analysis toolbox. There are thirty (30) structural literary devices in Pattern Analysis, and twenty-four (24) rhetorical literary devices.

These literary devices reveal the schematic scope of a literary unit's structure, and the methods of persuasion for a literary unit's rhetoric.

Literary structure—Normally, biblical literary structure refers to the organization of a portion of the Bible.

Literary unit—See pericope.

Macro-level analysis—An arrangement of text within a discourse, including a structural analysis.

Marker—Either a beginning marker, sub-unit marker, or ending marker. They identify certain changes of flow either where a pericope begins or other locations within a pericope.

Marker identifier—A word or a set of words that identify a change of flow in a pericope.

Micro-level analysis—A look at smaller portions of the text than a pericope-level approach. Cola and bi-cola constructions as well as semantic nuances of the text are often considered in a micro-level analysis.

Non-correspondence—See variation.

Opening summary—A summarization that appears near the beginning portion of a structure. For example, *SUM-A-B-C-A'-B'-C'*. It is similar to a closing summary which is also represented by a SUM. The opening summary should be considered emphatic.

Parallel Symmetry—A step-like symmetry such as *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'* or *A-B-C-X-A'-B'-C'* structure where the themes are repeated in the same direction. A continuing structure is also possible such as *A-B-C-A'-B'-C'-A''-B''-C'''* (consider the ten plagues of Moses). Other names for this device are extended alternation, forward symmetry, panel construction, step parallelism, and in certain contexts simply named “parallelism.” The most common locations for emphasis are in the last/last position, an *X* center point, and less often in the first/first position.

Parallel symmetry (imperfect)—Like the imperfect chiasmic structures, imperfect parallel symmetries can also have a high impact upon a reader. When an element has been inserted, omitted, transposed to another location, or substantially varied, that then is an imperfect parallel symmetry. This makes the structure look less than totally symmetric. An additional emphasis should be found in an imperfect parallel symmetry at the place of asymmetry.

Parallel symmetry substructure—A parallel symmetry substructure within another structure. For example, an $A-B-C-D-(a-b-c-a'-b'-c')-D'-C'-B'-A'$ structure. The rules for identifying emphasis in the substructures are the same as those for the parent.

Parallelism—Parallelism exists when one element is found to correspond to another nearby element with a similar theme. The pair of elements may be antithetical. In structural analysis, the parallelism generally appears in clusters such as $A-B-C-C'-B'-A'$ or $A-B-C-A'-B'-C''$ or $A-A'-B-B'-C-C'$.

Paraphrased theme—A theme is a conceptual attempt to describe the content of an element. In the preparation of a structural analysis, the theme for each element is documented as a paraphrase of the scriptural text. In Pattern Analysis, it is located to the right of the scripture.

Paradiastole—Similar to a polysyndeton in a list except the separating words are “neither” or “nor” or “either” or “or.”

Parenthesis—A parenthetical expression or a minor change of flow which afterwards returns to the previous discussion. Scholars often refer to this anomaly as an intercalation or an aside. That is, an outer text that surrounds an inner text. Parentheses can interrupt for the sake of emphasis.

Pattern Analysis Research Language (PARL)—A software language developed specifically for Pattern Analysis that allows an analyst to mark-up the biblical text of a literary unit so that, after validation, it may be converted to a dynamic web page using the HTML 5 protocol for presentation.

Pattern Analysis Software—Computer software that will hopefully be a prototype of a publicly accessible application. The vision is to apply the Pattern Analysis methodology for one’s individual analysis of pericopes.

Pericope—A unit of literature, having a distinct beginning and sometimes a distinct ending about a common topic. Also known as a literary unit. A pericope is roughly equivalent to a paragraph or so, as seen in many modern translations. A pericope consists of multiple elements. In the narrative portions, it is typically a story. While a pericope normally contains just one basic structure, there can be two or maybe even more basic structures (see Composite).

Pericope-level analysis—A review of the structural and rhetorical literary devices that extend from the beginning to end of a pericope. It includes basic and substructure devices, and the associated rhetorical analysis.

Polysyndeton—A collection of similar words, whether they are people, places, things, or actions, that have the word “and” separating each. See also Asyndeton and Paradiastole.

Postscript—An informational ending piece that is not a conclusion or a summarization, most usually an ending marker. Besides the final words of a book, postscripts are not overly common, and they are not emphatic. The closing summary should be used instead if there is a sense that the element has persuasive value.

Preliminary—Provides background information to a literary unit. Normally the preliminary portion follows the beginning marker. A preliminary helps the reader understand the right historical and/or spiritual perspective for what is to follow. An element that is marked preliminary is helpful to know but it is not itself judgmental or corrective. When a preliminary has a substructure, there may be a persuasive portion within it. An alternative name that scholars sometimes use is the word *prelude*.

Progression—See intensification.

Question—Some questions seem designed to ask the reader to pause and reflect on his or her own answer. In those cases, the text is intended to slow the reader down and cause them to read the context, listen to what the Spirit is nudging them, gain a fresh understanding, and then respond. Questions are many times emphatic, but it is a mistake to say that most questions are emphatic. Whether any one question is emphatic or not can be subjective.

Repetition—Stating the same or nearly the same words multiple times. Repetitions are normally emphatic.

Reverse symmetry—See chiasm.

Rhetoric—One’s personal view of what motivates and persuades them in the text. There is also recognition that yesterday’s understanding may not be the same today.

Rhetorical device—A mechanism that persuades or somehow influences an understanding of what is stated. Examples are an imperative verb, a summarization, and a first/last element.

Rhetorical model—The third and final step of the Pattern Analysis methodology. It considers how the student is persuaded by the text based on the pericope’s literary structure.

Structural model—The second step of the Pattern Analysis methodology which determines how pericopes are organized.

Structure split—Occurs when one part of the pericope is continued at a later point and the portion separating the two parts is not relevant. That is, if a structure has a first and second part with an unrelated separation in between, it is to be considered a structure split. Splitting a structure has no effect on its emphasis.

Substructure—A substructure clarifies an element in a basic structure by adding detail. The shape of a substructure is either a list, immediate repetition, parallel symmetry, or chiasm. The elements of a substructure are presented as lowercase letters. For example, if detail is provided for a *B* element, that part of the structure could be represented as *B-a-b- a'-b'*.

Substructure summary—An opening or closing summarization that appears within a substructure. The schematic representation is the lowercase letters *sum*. This summarization may appear at the end of a substructure, *a-b-x-a'-b'-sum*, or at the beginning, *sum-a-b-c-d*. All the substructure summaries are emphatic.

Subtopic—As a topic is to a pericope, so a sub-topic is to a substructure. A subtopic is the main thought of the substructure.

Sub-unit marker—A change in a structure that is neither at the beginning or ending of the pericope. Two common examples are at the beginning of a substructure, e.g. *A-B-B'-SubunitMkr-a-b-c-a'-b'-c'-A'*, and at the center of a basic structure, e.g. *A-B-C-SubunitMkr-A'-B'-C'*. They are identified by the same twenty (20) types of markers that are used for beginning and ending markers.

Summarization—An emphatic literary device that stresses a main point or conclusion of a literary unit. Summarizations may be a closing summary, opening summary, or a substructure summary.

Superscription—The opening words of some books or psalms that include the name of the person attributed to its writing. Other information can be included in the superscription such as the time, the location, occasion, and/or recipient. In Pattern Analysis, these opening words are an example of a beginning marker called “a title.”

Thematic inclusion—An alternative name for a frame, a term not used in Pattern Analysis. It is a frame where the themes of the two bookends are similar but the wording can be considerably different.

Theme—A theme is a conceptual attempt to describe the content of an element. The theme of one element is often paired with the theme of another element within a pericope.

Topic—In the sense of pericopes in Pattern Analysis, a topic is the analyst's understanding of the pericope's central and unifying thought. Each theme within the pericope should somehow be related to that main topic.

Transposition—The expected elements have been re-arranged, e.g. $A-B-C-X-B'-C'-A'$. When a transposition appears, the location of one element is interchanged with another; an intentional relocation. Transpositions appear in imperfect chiasms and parallel symmetries. The emphasis appears either in the element that is transposed or in the one which has been dislocated. That is, in an $A-B-C-X-B'-C'-A'$ structure, either the B' or C' elements would be emphatic.

Validation—A software process that evaluates the content of a pericope against a set of rules. The intent is to certify that the annotated text conforms to criteria of the Pattern Analysis Research Language (PARL). Once the pericope passes the validation, its dynamic web page is created.

Variance—A statistical term that measures the amount of variation of a measurement when compared to the mean. If a tall building is newly constructed in a neighborhood of single floor homes, that new building would change the neighborhood from low variance to much higher variance.

Variation—The themes of two corresponding elements are somewhat different from one another in content. It is an unexpected change in the pattern. Normally just one of the pair is emphatic. In $A-B-C-D-A'-B'-Y'D'$, the emphasis would be found in either C or more likely Y' .

Bibliography

Works cited:

- Aristotle. *Aristotle's "Art" of Rhetoric*. Translated by Robert C. Bartlett. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011.
- . *Poet and Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: Combined Edition, 1983.
- Bauer, David R. and Robert A. Traina. *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Boys, Thomas. *A Key to the Book of Psalms*. London: L. B. Seeley and Son, 1825. Accessed April 16, 2023, Academia.edu.
- Bratcher, Robert G. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies: 1961, 1984.
- Brenton, Sir Lancelot C.L. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: English and Greek*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851; Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, 2014.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers Marketing LLC, 2012.
- Brown, Jeannine K. *Scripture as Communication: Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bullinger, E. W. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1898; Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968.
- . *How to Enjoy the Bible*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1916; Reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Classics, 1990.
- Clarke, Thomas B. *Joshua's Spiritual Warfare: Understanding the Chiasms of Joshua*. Syracuse: Bible Discernments, 2008.
- Decker, Rodney J. "Verbal-Plenary Inspiration and Translation." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 11 (2006): 27,8. Accessed April 13, 2018, Academia.edu.
- Dorsey, David A. *The Literary Structure of the Old Testament: A Commentary on Genesis-Malachi*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999.
- Ellis, Peter F. *Seven Pauline Letters*. Collegetown, MN: Order of St. Benedict, 1982.

- Fee, Gordon D. *New Testament Exegesis, Third Edition, A Handbook for Students and Pastors*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Fee, Gordon D. and Douglas Stuart. *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- Fokkelman, J. P. *Reading Biblical Poetry, An Introductory Guide*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Goh, Samuel T. S. *The Basics of Hebrew Poetry: Theory and Practice*. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2017.
- Hahn, Scott and Wiker, Benjamin. *The Decline and Fall of Sacred Scripture: How the Bible Became a Secular Book*. Steubenville, OH: Emmaus Road Publishing, 2021.
- Hill, Gary. *The Discovery Bible: New Testament*. La Habra, CA: The Lockman Foundation, 1987.
- Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Kugel, James L. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Long, Fredrick J. *II Corinthians: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015.
- . *Koine Greek Grammar: A Beginning-Intermediate Greek Exegetical and Pragmatic Handbook*. Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse, 2015.
- Lowth, Robert. *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, London, T. Tegg and Son, 1753.
- Lund, Nils W. *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in the Form and Function of Chiasmic Structures*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.
- Martin, Lee Roy. "Rhetorical Criticism and the Affective Dimension of the Biblical Text." *Journal for Semitics* 23/2i (2014). Accessed December 5, 2022, Academia.edu.
- Muilenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88, 1969. Accessed May 15, 2022, Academia.edu.
- Nave, Orville J. *Nave's Topical Bible: A Digest of the Holy Scriptures*. Nashville, The Southwestern Company, 1896, editions in 1897, 1921, and 1962.
- Nida, Eugene A. *Style and Discourse*. Baltimore: Amer Bible Society, 1983.
- Osborne, Grant R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2006.
- Rotherham, Joseph Bryant. *Rotherham Emphasized Bible: A Translation Designed to Set Forth the Exact Meaning, the Proper Terminology, and the Graphic Style of the Sacred Original*. Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 1902; Reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1959.
- Ryken, Leland. *A Complete Handbook of Literary Forms in the Bible*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2014.
- . *How to Read the Bible as Literature*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Scacewater, Todd A. *Discourse Analysis of the New Testament Writings*. Dallas: Fontes Press, 2020. Edited by Todd A. Scacewater.

- Stuart, Douglas. *Old Testament Exegesis, Fourth Edition, A Handbook for Students and Pastors*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press. 2009.
- Walsh, Jerome T. *1 Kings*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- . *Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.
- . *Style and Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Waltke, Bruce K. *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2004.
- Webber, Beat. *Toward a Theory of the Poetry of the Hebrew Bible: The Poetry of the Psalms as a Test Case*: Bulletin for Biblical Research, 22.2, 2012.
- Wendland, Ernst R. *Analyzing and Translating Hebrew Poetry, with Special Reference to Prophecy and the Book of Haggai*. Lusaka: Lusaka Lutheran Press, 2021.
- . *The Discourse Analysis of Hebrew Prophetic Literature: Determining the Larger Textual Units of Hosea and Joel*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995. Accessed March 23, 2018, Academia.edu.
- . *Disjunctive Parallelism in the Psalter*. Lusaka. Accessed October 5, 2018, Academia.edu.
- . *Prophetic Rhetoric: Case Studies in Text Analysis and Translation*. Dallas: SIL International, 2014.
- . *Translating the Literature of Scripture*. Dallas: SIL International, 2004.
- Wilt, Timothy and Wendland, Ernst *Scripture Frames and Framing: A workbook for Bible translators*, Stellenbosch, South Africa, African Sun Media, 2008. Accessed September 12, 2017, Academia.edu

Scripture Index

Genesis 2:18–25	4.3.3. First/First and Last/Last
Genesis 4:1–5	4.8. Link
Genesis 5:32 – 9:29	3.5.3. Transposition
Genesis 20:9	3.7.4. Drill
Genesis 41:1,32	4.6.2. Question
Exodus 19:1 – 20:26	2.2.3. First-element Frames
Exodus 19:1,3A,7A,10A, 14A,16A,18A; 20:1,21	4.4.4. Variation
Exodus 19:3–9	5.0. Final Case Study
Exodus 19:10–17	5.2. Basic Structure
Exodus 19:18 – 20:18	5.7. Completed Analysis
Exodus 20:1–17	5.1. Pericope Demarcations
Exodus 20:19–26	5.4. Frame (First Element)
Exodus 25:1–40	5.3. Parallel Symmetry and Variation
Exodus 39:1 – 40:32	5.5. Closing Summary and Decalogue
Leviticus 9:23–10:3	5.5. Closing Summary and Decalogue
Numbers 14:25–45	5.6. Frame (Second Element)
Deuteronomy 30:15–20	3.4.5. Consistency of Lettered Devices
	4.6.4 Repetition
	2.2.2. Location of Markers
	2.4.4. Nadab and Abihu Case Study
	3.0. The Structural Model
	3.2. Basic Structures and Substructures
	3.4.2. Parallel Symmetry
	3.6.2. Preliminary
	4.4.3. Transposition
	3.1. My Structural Process
	4.3.1. Center Point

	4.4.2. Absence
	4.7.1. Comparison and Contrast
Deuteronomy 33:1–29	3.5.4. Variation
Joshua 2:24	3.0. The Structural Model
Joshua 3:12; 4:1–9,19 – 5:1	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.5.2. Absence
	3.6.4. Imperative
	3.7.2. Structure Split
	4.4.2. Absence
Judges 2:16–23	3.4.2. Parallel Symmetry
	4.7.2. Intensification
2 Samuel 3:1–22	6.1. Consistency of Methodology
2 Chronicles 5:2–14	2.0. The Demarcation Model
	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.4.3. Immediate Repetition
	3.6.1. Summarization
	4.3.1. Center Point
	4.3.2. First/Last
Ezra 2:1–70	3.4.5. Consistency of Lettered Devices
Ezra 5:1–17	3.5.3. Transposition
	4.4.3. Transposition
Esther 2:1–23	4.4.3. Transposition
Job 4:1 – 5:27	2.3.1. Well Documented Themes
Psalms 22:1	3.7.3. Link
Psalms 22:1–31	3.7.3. Link
	4.8. Link
Psalm 30:1–12	3.1. My Structural Process
	3.5.3. Transposition
	4.3.1. Center Point
	4.4.3. Transposition
	4.6.2. Question
Psalm 62:1–12	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.5.2. Absence
	3.6.1. Summarization

	4.4.2. Absence
	4.8. Link
Psalm 100	4.3.5. Correlation of Sequences
Psalm 146:1–10	2.0. The Demarcation Model
	2.2.3. First-element Frames
	3.4.4. List
	4.6.4. Repetition
	4.7.3. Amplification
	4.8. Link
Proverbs 4:10–27	2.0. The Demarcation Model
	3.4.3. Immediate Repetition
	4.3.5. Correlation of Sequences
	4.6.1. Imperative
	4.8. Link
Proverbs 4:14,15	3.6.4. Imperative
Proverbs 10:1 – 22:16	3.4.4. List
Proverbs 10:1 – 29:27	4.4. Asymmetric Devices
Song of Solomon	4.6.4. Repetition
Isaiah 6:8–13	4.3.5. Correlation of Sequences
Isaiah 6:10	Chapter 1: What is Pattern Analysis?
	5.7. Completed Analysis
Isaiah 42:1–9	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.1. My Structural Process
	3.6.1. Summarization
Isaiah 56:1–7	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.4.1. Chiasm
	3.6.4. Imperative
	4.3.3. First/First and Last/Last
	4.6.3. Interjection
Jeremiah 28:1–17	2.0. The Demarcation Model
	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	2.2.2. Location of Markers
	3.6.2. Preliminary
	4.5.3. Frames
Jeremiah 31:27–40	3.6.3. Frames

Lamentations 1:1–9	3.5.3. Transposition 4.4.3. Transposition 4.5.1. Summarization
Ezekiel 6:1–14	3.4.4. List 3.5. Asymmetric Devices 3.6.4. Imperative 3.5.3. Transposition 4.3.4. Corresponding Elements 4.4.3. Transposition 4.6.4. Repetition
Daniel 5:1–30	2.2.1. Identification of Markers 2.2.2. Location of Markers 2.4.2. Belshazzar Case Study 3.5.1. Extra 3.6.1. Summarization 3.6.3. Frames 3.6.4. Imperative
Amos 4:1–13	2.2.1. Identification of Markers 2.2.3. First-element Frames 3.4.4. List 3.6.3. Frames 4.7.2. Intensification
Matthew 1:1,18	2.1. Background of the Demarcation Model
Matthew 13:24–30,36–43	2.2.1. Identification of Markers 3.2. Basic Structures and Substructures 3.7.2. Structure Split 4.3.4. Corresponding Elements 4.8. Link
Matthew 16:13	4.6.2. Question
Matthew 16:13–28	3.6.3. Frames 4.3.4. Corresponding Elements 4.7.1. Comparison and Contrast 4.8. Link
Matthew 27:46	3.7.3. Link 4.8. Link

Mark 2:1–12	3.1. My Structural Process 3.4.1. Chiasm 3.5.1. Extra 3.6.2. Preliminary 4.3.2. First/Last 4.7.2. Intensification
Luke 9:51–62	3.1. My Structural Process 3.4.2. Parallel Symmetry 3.5.4. Variation 3.6.3. Frames 3.6.4. Imperative 4.4.4. Variation 4.5.3. Frames 4.6.1. Imperative
Luke 11:1–13	2.2.2. Location of Markers 3.4.3. Immediate Repetition
Luke 11:14–26	2.2.1. Identification of Markers 2.2.2. Location of Markers 4.3.1. Center Point 4.4.1. Extra
John 3:4	4.6.2. Question
John 20:19–29	2.2.1. Identification of Markers 3.7.1. Composite 4.4.1. Extra 4.4.2. Absence
Acts 1:1–12	4.3.4. Corresponding Elements 4.5.1. Summarization 4.6.3. Interjection
Acts 2:1	2.2.2. Location of Markers
Acts 2:1–13	2.2.1. Identification of Markers 3.1. My Structural Process 3.3. Structural Case Study 3.4.2. Parallel Symmetry 3.5.1. Extra 4.2. Rhetorical Case Study 4.3. Lettered Devices

Acts 3:2–8, 4:22	3.6.5. Parenthesis
Acts 9:32–43	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	2.2.2. Location of Markers
	2.5.1. Peter Called Two to be Raised Case Study
	3.4.2. Parallel Symmetry
Romans 8:29,30	4.7.2. Intensification
Romans 10:14,15	3.4.5. Consistency of Lettered Devices
Romans 13:1–10	3.5.3. Transposition
1 Corinthians 6:1–11	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.4.3. Immediate Repetition
	3.4.4. List
	3.6.2. Preliminary
	4.3.1. Center Point
	4.7.2. Intensification
	4.7.3. Amplification
1 Corinthians 6:12–20	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.2. Basic Structures and Substructures
	3.4.1. Chiasm
	3.6.1. Summarization
	4.5.2. Preliminary
	4.8. Link
1 Corinthians 13:13	3.4.4. List
Galatians 5:22,23	3.4.4. List
1 Thessalonians 5:14–22	3.4.4. List
2 Timothy 1:1,2; 4:9–22	2.2.1. Identification of Markers
	3.4.5. Consistency of Lettered Devices
	3.7.2. Structure Split
	4.3.1. Center Point
Hebrews 4:12	4.1. My Rhetorical Analysis
Hebrews 8:7–13	3.6.3 Frames
1 Peter 2:1	2.3.2. Cohesive Themes
1 John 4:7–19	How to Use This Manuscript
	1.0. What is Pattern Analysis
	1.2. Method
	2.2.1. Identification of Markers

	2.3.2. Cohesive Themes
	2.4.3. Love One Another Case Study
	3.2. Basic Structures and Substructures
	3.6.1. Summarization
	3.6.5. Parenthesis
	4.0. The Rhetorical Model
	4.1. My Rhetorical Process
	4.4.1. Extra
	4.5.3. Frames
	4.5.4. Parenthesis
1 John 4:20–5:12	2.5.3. Love One Another Case Study
	3.6.1. Summarization
Revelation 1:9 – 3:22	3.5. Asymmetric Devices
Revelation 3:14–16	4.7.1. Comparison and Contrast
Revelation 10:1–11	3.5.1. Extra
	3.7.3. Link
	4.4.1. Extra
	4.5.1. Summarization
	4.7.3. Amplification
	4.8. Link

Back Cover

Pattern Analysis Methodology **An Innovative Approach to Literary Structures**

Pattern Analysis is a fresh approach to the Bible that opens one's understanding of the text. It reveals one consistent thought process that the Holy Spirit used for the sake of persuasion from Genesis to Revelation. This verse-by-verse approach is a study tool to help locate His emphatic voice.

Academics and non-academics alike have similar problems. Bible scholars, in their search through the fine details of their study, can lose touch with the bigger picture. Pastors in their message preparation can get caught in the minutia, thereby compromising their time management. Students can feel like they are on a forced march through their course work. Lesser-trained people can be overwhelmed with information about the text.

Pattern Analysis addresses that tedium by directing us to what the Holy Spirit seems to be saying in the text. This methodology begins with an analysis of the literary structure. The structural organization leads into what is emphatic. Through the matching of related themes and then the documentation of their persuasive meaning, one can encounter God afresh.

Therefore, the end result with this toolbox of tools is the rhetoric, one's persuasion by the text. Nuances in Scripture can be exposed which might otherwise be missed. The goal is to hear what the Holy Spirit is saying, the many ways He emphasizes certain points within the text. A love letter from God.

This consistent Pattern Analysis methodology gives clarity to the Holy Spirit's thought process as He communicated to various so-called authors.

Thomas B. Clarke (Tom) is a retired software developer. He devoted more than seven years developing the Pattern Analysis methodology and related computer software.

www.ThomasBClarke.com