

Relative Saliency and Information Structure in Mark's Parable of the Sower

Steven E. Runge
Scholar-in-Residence
Logos Bible Software

Abstract:

Levinsohn (2003) claims that the near and far demonstratives (οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος respectively) can be used non-deictically to encode relative thematic saliency of discourse referents, with οὗτος being used to mark the more salient constituent. In applying this concept to the Markan explanation of the Parable of the Sower, Levinsohn's claim would indicate that the descriptions of the three unfruitful scatterings of seed are *more salient* to the writer than the productive scattering that bears fruit. The other synoptic accounts do not seem to make such a distinction in salience, using the near demonstrative οὗτος for both the unfruitful *and* fruitful plantings alike. Are there *other* means of analysis to either corroborate or overturn the view that the unfruitful plantings are more thematically salient in Mark's account?

This study applies the cognitive model of Chafe (1976, 1987) and Givón (1992), and the information-structure model of Lambrecht (1994) as applied by Levinsohn (2000) to the Markan explanation of the Parable of the Sower (4:14-20). The primary objective is to identify and analyze other linguistic devices, besides demonstratives, which might clarify the apparent prominence given to the unfruitful scatterings in Mark's account. This study provides the necessary framework for comparing Mark's pragmatic weighting of saliency to that found in the other synoptic accounts in order to determine whether Mark's version is consistent or divergent with the other traditions.

1. Relative saliency and non-deictic demonstratives

In Levinsohn's (2003) SBL paper "Towards a Unified Linguistic Description of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος," he claims that the near demonstrative οὗτος is prototypically used in narrative anaphorically to encode **thematic** or 'central' participants, especially if the referent temporarily displaces a more globally thematic participant, e.g., Simeon displacing Joseph, Mary and Jesus in Luke 2:25. On the other hand, the far demonstrative ἐκεῖνος is used in similar contexts to encode **athematic** or 'non-central' participants, as in Mark 16:10-11 to refer to 'that one/those ones' as athematic while Jesus remains thematic. Levinsohn also demonstrates that these demonstratives are used to contrast competing participants, using the near demonstrative οὗτος for the more salient or important of the two (cf. Mt 9:26; 12:45; Lu 18:14; Jo 1:33; 5:19, 38; 6:29; 10:6; 21:23; 1 Co 10:6, 11, 28; 1 Jo 3:3).

Let us now consider the use of demonstratives in Mark 4:14-20.¹ The near demonstrative οὗτος is used in vv. 15, 16 and 18 to encode the seed scattered along the path, on the rocky ground, and among the thorns, respectively. On the other hand, the far demonstrative ἐκεῖνος is used to encode the seed scattered on good soil. Is Levinsohn's claim applicable here, viz. that the unfruitful scatterings of

¹ It should not be ruled out that writer/editor intended these terms to be understood deictically, as though Jesus were literally pointing at the kind of ground in question. Even granting this point, the fact still remains that a distinction between the two groups has been made using the prototypically thematic οὗτος and the prototypically athematic ἐκεῖνος.

seed are more thematically salient to the writer/editor? This paper will consider other linguistic devices used in this pericope to evaluate whether a thematic/athematic distinction exists as suggested by the contrasting use of demonstrative pronouns. I will begin with an overview of information structure by looking at how hearers process and categorize information. This will provide the necessary background for understanding how and why speakers structure their utterances.

2. Mental Representations and Information Status

As people read a text, they form a *mental representation* of the information communicated in the discourse, which has been likened to filing the information into cognitive files (Lambrecht 1994:43). Givón states that discourse is made up of a combination of *new* and *old* information. We shall refer to the new information as *focal*, and the old information as *presupposed* or *topical*. *Presupposed, topical* information is “assumed by the speaker to be accessible to the hearer” either from the preceding text, or from a general knowledge of the world; *focal* information is “assumed by the speaker to be inaccessible to the hearer” (1992:8). *Presupposed* information serves as the “grounding point” or framework within which the *focal* information is processed (1992:8).² By definition, the focal information is the most important part of the utterance, with the presupposed information grounding it to the context.

According to the cross-linguistic principle of ‘natural information flow’ (cf. Comrie 1989:127-128; Givón 2001:257), utterances are prototypically structured to move from what is *most* known to what is *least* known. Stated another way, *presupposed* or *topical information* is most naturally placed before *focal* information, as much as the syntactic typology of the language allows. Consider the following example. The bolded constituents are the **focal** information, the plain italics are *presupposed*.

1) Default flow of information

- a) Once upon a time there was **a handsome prince**.
- b) *The prince* **lived in a large, ornate castle, which was surrounded by a moat.**
- c) *The prince* **wanted to see the world...**

² A simple old/new dichotomy is admittedly insufficient to differentiate focal information from what is presupposed in some cases, but it provides a heuristic starting point. Lambrecht states, “the information conveyed by a proposition cannot be factored out and matched with individual sentence constituents. In particular, the difference between ‘old information’ and ‘new information’ cannot be equated with the difference between ‘old’ and ‘new’ referents” (1994:49). What makes information ‘new’ is the relation between the *presupposition* and the *assertion*. Lambrecht defines focus as “The semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition” (1994:213). Focus is not formally distinguished on the basis of a constituent being textually or situationally ‘new’. It is pragmatically and cognitively established based upon the difference between what is presupposed in a hearer’s mental presentation and what is asserted by a speaker in a given context.

The story begins by predicating the existence of a *handsome prince*, and only makes a *comment* about him after his activation. The second line introduces a *large, ornate castle*, and makes a comment about it using a relative clause. In the reader's mental representation, a file has figuratively been created for the prince, and the information about his dwelling and his aspirations are filed inside it.

3. Information Structure

3.1 Markedness

Andrew's (1990:9-29) account of markedness proposes an asymmetrical set of oppositions where members of the set are either *marked* or *unmarked* for a particular feature. Use of a '*marked*' form explicitly signals the presence of a particular feature in the context. Use of the '*unmarked*' member of a set does not specify whether or not the feature is present. It is *unmarked* for the feature. From a methodological standpoint, we will describe the unmarked member of the opposition set as the *default*, the '*most basic*' member of the set. The default becomes the canon against which *marked* forms are identified and described.

The principle of natural information flow represents the default ordering of constituents when a speaker has *no particular reason* to use a marked order or structure (Levinson 1987).³ When speakers use a marked order, it means that they have pragmatically chosen to signal the presence of a particular feature, such as discontinuity or added prominence. To summarize, use of a *marked* order, *by definition*, signals the presence of a particular feature in the context. If speakers use a *default* order, they have pragmatically chosen *not* to signal the presence of the feature. It *may* or *may not* be present, but the default form is unmarked for it. Thus, a default expression does not inherently mean the *opposite* of a marked expression; it simply implies that the expression is unmarked for the feature in question.

3.2 'Points of departure' (PoDs)

Speakers have a certain degree of flexibility in *how* they structure an utterance, based on the conventions and constraints of the particular language. Utterances can be pragmatically structured to create certain effects, prototypically signaling that a constituent is marked for a particular feature by moving it to an initial position in the clause, which I will refer to as *preposing*. Preposing a constituent has one of two pragmatic effects, depending on whether the constituent is *presupposed* or *focal*.

Lambrecht (1994) has found that preposing topical information pragmatically creates a *new frame of reference* for the following clause, with several effects. While the writer/speaker could have

³ Cf. Stephen C. Levinson's neo-Gricean pragmatic implicature expressed in his M-principle, which states that a speaker should not use a marked expression unless he or she intends some meaning other than that signaled by a default expression.

communicated the same information by placing the constituent in its default position, preposing a noun phrase (NP) or an adverbial expression of place, time, or situation, creates a disruption or *discontinuity* in the flow of the text by signaling a non-default switch in the context. A second effect is that this preposed topical constituent becomes the primary basis of relating the discourse that precedes the constituent with the discourse that follows it (Levinsohn 2000:8; Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:68-69). I will refer to clause-initial presupposed constituents as *points of departure* or *PoDs*, following Levinsohn (2000:8), and identify them graphically by underlining. While preposing the presupposed information does add prominence to it, it does not make it more salient than the focal information. By definition, the focal information is the most important part of the utterance, regardless of its location. I now turn to the pragmatic effect of preposing focal information.

3.3 Preposed Focal Constituents (PFCs)

When both topical and focal information are preposed, Dik (1978) has found that languages place the topical information before focal information, as expected based on the principle of natural information flow (cf. Lambrecht 1994). The default position for focal constituents is as close to the end of the clause as the typology of the language allows. Preposing the focal constituent pragmatically gives it *marked prominence* it would not have naturally received in its default position. It reflects the writer's choice to add extra prominence to what is already relatively most salient in the context. The pragmatic effect of preposing focal constituents has long been recognized, but is usually referred to as placing 'emphasis' on the constituent (cf. BDF §472(2)). I will refer to *preposed focal constituents* using the abbreviation *PFCs*, and identify them graphically using **bolding**.

This study considers the following constituent order to be the most basic and unmarked order in NT Greek when all constituents are present, as informed by the principles of natural information flow and of language typology (cf. Lehmann 1978, 1989).

2) Proposed unmarked constituent orders of nuclear clauses in NT Greek⁴

PoD—PFC—Verb—Pronoun(s)—Subject—Complement(s)—Adjuncts

If one or more clause constituents is preposed before the verb, I will construe this as being pragmatically motivated. Compare the pragmatic effects of changing the structures found in **Appendix 1**.

A constituent's discourse context determines whether it should be construed as presupposed or focal. Consider the pragmatic change to the word *yesterday* depending upon the context it occurs in.

3) Presupposed versus focal: the importance of discourse context

⁴ For a fuller treatment of constituent ordering principles, cf. Levinsohn (2000:1-62), on which my explanation is based.

- a) *What did you do yesterday?*
*Yesterday, I **arrived**. (Today, I am **going fishing**.)*
- b) *When did you arrive?*
***Yesterday** I arrived. (as opposed to some other day).*

Both (3a) and (3b) contain the exact same clause, but *yesterday* plays a different pragmatic role in each, based on the change in context. In (3a), *yesterday* functions as a PoD to establish a specific temporal frame of reference for the clause that follows. *Today* in the following clause serves the same purpose, with the pragmatic effect of sharpening the contrast between *yesterday* and *today*. In the case of (3b), *yesterday* provides the missing element of the question, filling in the gap between what is presupposed and what is asserted, making it focal. Preposing it adds extra prominence, hence a PFC. For more examples illustrating these information structure concepts in both English and Greek, see Appendix 1.

4. Analysis of information structure in Mark 4:14-20

There are several factors that serve to separate the unfruitful plantings from the fruitful:⁵

- changes in the utilization of marked constituent order,
- lexical changes in the use of demonstratives, and
- changes in verbal aspect.

Each of these issues will be discussed below. Their overall contribution to the pericope's interpretation will be presented in the final section.

4.1 The Structuring of the Account⁶

Mark's explanation of the parable begins in v. 14 by explaining *what* the seed symbolizes using a very tidy marked clause $\delta \sigma\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\nu \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\nu$ σπείρει 'The sower the word sows'. The sower is reactivated from the original parable using a PoD to indicate a new topic, and the explanation of what he sows is preposed for marked focus, highlighting the identification of 'the seed' as 'the word'. The preposed focal information fills in the blank between what was presupposed (the sower sowed *something*) and the new information that is being asserted. Mark's explanation makes regular use of such marked structures.

⁵ Gould notes these factors, but does not draw any specific conclusions from them. He states, "We have three different pronouns, or adjectives, used in pointing out the various classes of hearers. οὔτοι, then οὔτοι ὁμοίως, indicating a general resemblance; then ἄλλοι, denoting a specific difference; and finally ἐκεῖνοι, denoting contrast with all that precede. οἱ σπαρέντες—that were sown. The part. in the other cases has been present, denoting the general fact about seed sown in such places. The aor. here confines it to the particular case of the parable" (1922:76).

⁶ In reading this next section, it may be helpful to make reference to the complete analysis of the information structure of the different synoptic versions provided in Appendix 2.

First, Mark's account uses non-default constituent order to *structure* the pericope, viz. the repeated use of preposed demonstrative pronouns to begin each new segment of the explanation (cf. vv. 15a, 16a, 18a, 20a). But while the Matthean and Lukan accounts use the demonstratives in referential PoDs to signal the transition to a new segment, Mark uses the pronouns *cataphorically* as PFCs, 'pointing ahead' to highlight an referent which *follows* the pronoun. For instance, in v. 15 he writes οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, 'These are the ones along the path'. By default, οὗτοι as a pronominal element would be expected to immediately follow the verb.⁷ Mark's strategy has the same type of effect as the other accounts, but is achieved via a different path by *cataphorically* highlighting the referent before introducing it. This strategy has the effect of drawing extra attention to the referent before it is introduced.

Mark's account also uses non-default structures to *highlight* salient ideas, like the location of the scatterings. In vv. 15a, 16a, 18a, and 20a, each demonstrative is followed by a NP specifying the location of the scattering. Verse 15a uses a relative clause to grammaticalize the scattering, ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος, 'where the word was scattered'. The choice of the relative clause affords the writer/editor another opportunity to reinforce the correlation of 'the seed' to 'the word'. Each of the following segments grammaticalizes the scattering using a participial phrase, e.g., οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη σπειρόμενοι 'the ones **on the rocky place** scattered' in v. 16a. Preposing the focal information within the participial clause adds prominence to *where* the seed fell, but the scope of the prominence is limited to the participial clause.

Second, while each segment of Mark's explanation utilizes nearly parallel structures to introduce the scatterings, distinctions between the fruitful and unfruitful scatterings are made using other devices. The unfruitful scatterings each use present tense/imperfective aspect to grammaticalize the act of scattering.⁸ This stands in contrast to the aorist tense/perfective aspect found describing the fruitful scattering in v. 20a. Perfective aspect is the most unmarked, portraying the action as an undifferentiated whole; imperfective aspect marks the action as ongoing or incomplete, allowing attention to be given to some facet within the action (Porter 1992:21ff.). The choice to grammaticalize the first three scatterings using imperfective aspect opens the door for more attention to be given to

⁷ Cf. Mt 20:21; 25:46; Jn 6:5. The vast majority of occurrences using οὗτοι are marked, either points of departure or preposed focal constituents. This is where the asymmetrical view of markedness is crucial, in that I do not take the most *frequently* occurring form or position to be default. Instead, the most *basic* form is selected as default, and forms the canon against which marked forms are described.

One should not be surprised that demonstratives are utilized so frequently for marked constructions since demonstratives are virtually the only pronominal option for anaphorically referring to entire propositions, cf. Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski (2004).

⁸ Though v. 15a does not use a participle, the verb in the subordinate relative clause, functionally parallel to the participles in vv. 16a and 18a, is nonetheless present passive.

the actions or results. In contrast, the final scattering in Mark is viewed as a complete, undifferentiated whole. These differences in verbal aspect match the differences in the amount of description that the results of each scattering receives (see below).

Third, the scatterings are differentiated by lexical changes in the use of demonstratives. As noted above, οὗτος is used to refer to the three unfruitful scatterings, while ἐκεῖνος is used to refer to the fruitful one. An important clarification must be made though. In the explanation of the seed falling among the thorns in v. 18a, the cataphoric pronoun is *not* οὗτος, but ἄλλος ‘other’, a correlative pronoun. Correlatives are prototypically used to link non-initial members of a correlated set. The correlative ἄλλος can be used for each non-initial member of the set, explicitly linking each to the other (e.g., Mt 13:4-8; 13:24, 31, 33). This is the strategy the writer/editor uses in the parable itself (cf. Mk 4:5, 7, 8).

There is no exact parallel in Mark to the usage of ἄλλος with only the final member of the set, as found here in 4:18a. However, Mark does create a similar effect by using ἄλλος for all but the final item, where the writer/editor creates a distinction between the correlated set and the final item (cf. Mk 6:15-16; 8:28-29; 12:3-6). The effect created in the explanation of the Sower parable is to *separate* the scattering in the good soil from the other scatterings, corroborating the apparent distinction between groups created by varying the use of demonstratives and the use of verbal aspect mentioned above. Though the correlative pronoun is used cataphorically in v. 18a, the demonstrative οὗτος is used in v. 18b as a PoD to reassert the preceding topic, and thus links with the other scatterings introduced by οὗτοι by virtue of the repetition.

4.2 Highlighting within the Account

Mention has already been made of how PFCs are used to give added prominence to focal information (viz., preposing the prepositional phrases in vv. 16a, 18a and 20a). Mark also makes use of marked orders to highlight certain aspects of the results of the scatterings. The relative clauses of v. 15b and 16b share a similar structure. Both begin by establishing an explicit cognitive frame of reference for the clause that follows using a temporal PoD, ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν...⁹ ‘when they would hear...’ The default position for subordinate adverbial adjuncts, according to this framework, is clause-final. Preposing it establishes a specific temporal frame of reference for the clause that follows, indicating that the primary basis for relating what follows to the preceding discourse is as a switch from the one *sowing* to the ones *hearing*, concentrating specifically on what happened *when* they heard.

⁹ The noun phrase τὸν λόγον is likely elided in v. 15b is due to the presence of in the preceding relative clause. Verse 16 does not contain such an occurrence; hence the explicit object noun phrase in 16b.

Both relative clauses also prepose adverbial constituents to highlight the *manner* in which the following action takes place. In v. 15b, εὐθὺς ‘*immediately*’ is preposed to highlight how quickly ‘Satan comes and takes the word *which was sown in them*’.¹⁰ In v. 16b, a second adverb is preposed, highlighting that the hearers not only responded *quickly*, but *with joy*. Verse 17b describes these hearers using the preposed focal constituent πρόσκαιροί or *short-lived*, an implicit consequence of not having roots.¹¹

Verse 17c elaborates on the circumstances contributing to the plants’ fleeting existence. The verse begins with two temporal frames: *then*, to indicate that what follows is closely linked chronologically to what precedes (viz., immediately and with great joy receiving the word), and the second outlining the circumstances that lead to their demise, grammaticalized using a genitive absolute circumstantial clause. Thus 17c could be translated “**Then**, when affliction and persecution come about on account of the word, **immediately** they turn away.” The adverb εὐθὺς is preposed before the nuclear verb to highlight that just as quickly as they received the word, these hearers fall away.

In addition to the cataphoric use of the correlative ἄλλοι discussed in the previous section, it is also important to note the preposing of focal information in vv. 19a and 19b. Based on the parable told in 4:1-9, the reader presupposes that *something* chokes out the seed, allegorized as weeds. While the *manner* was highlighted describing seed scattered along the path and on the rocky place, the *instrument* is highlighted in the description of the weeds. The term ἄκαρπος or *unfruitful* is also preposed, clearly highlighting the poor *results* of this scattering. Note that Matthew preposes both the instruments and the result (cf. 13:22c), while Luke only preposes the instruments (cf. 8:14c).

Finally, and in stark contrast to the unfruitful scatterings, the description of the seed scattered upon the good soil makes no use of marked constructions other than the initial description of the location (i.e., οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες ‘*the ones on the good soil scattered*’). One would think that if this portion were the most salient of the four, the ‘*thirty-, sixty- and hundred-fold*’ return on the seed would be given more prominence by preposing or by some other linguistic device. Interestingly enough, the other synoptic traditions (with a minor exception in Luke¹²) do not use marked devices either. With the analysis complete, we are now able to draw some conclusions regarding the relative salience of the different scatterings, as indicated by information structure and other linguistic devices.

¹⁰ The appositional modifier τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς is semantically redundant, and likely functions to sharpen the contrast that what had only just been sown is now being taken away. Cf. Porter (1982:39-41) for the significance of using the perfect tense in such a context.

¹¹ The preposing of ῥίζαν in Luke’s version (8:13c) gives more prominence to the factor leading to their being short-lived than in Mark’s version.

¹² Cf. use of ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ to describe the *manner* in which the ‘good soil’ hears the word. The crop produced is not highlighted at all.

5. Conclusions

I have presented a number of linguistic devices that help to grammaticalize how the writer/editor conceptualized the explanation of the Parable of the Sower. I demonstrated the ways that marked constituent order was used above the clause level to organize the pericope, breaking the explanation into four distinct segments. Such structures were also shown to be used at the clause level for establishing PoDs, which created new cognitive frames of reference for the clause that followed, and provided links back to the preceding discourse. I also pointed out the preposing of focal constituents, reinforcing the fact that these clause elements were relatively more salient than the other constituents in the clause. The description of the scatterings along the path and on the rocky place used PFCs to highlight the *manner*. In the scattering among the thorns, a PFC highlighted the *instrument* that made the scattering unfruitful. In the description of the fruitful scattering, on the other hand, the writer/editor gave no marked prominence to any constituent after the introduction in v. 20a. It is as though the seed scattered on good soil produced the expected result, whereas the other scatterings produced seemingly *unexpected* results. There are two options here.

The first option is that Mark was simply trusting that the natural prominence of mentioning the fruitful scattering last was sufficient to indicate that it was most salient to him. But in light of the contrasting use of marked structures, combined with the apparent distinction made between the unfruitful and fruitful scatterings using the near and far demonstratives, this is an unlikely option.

The interpretation I would advocate in light of these linguistic data is that Mark pragmatically structured his explanation of the parable to highlight the various ‘roadblocks to a bountiful spiritual harvest’ as being more salient than ‘good soil bearing a good crop’. The hearer of the parable might well have expected poor results based on the description of the first three scatterings. There are few marked constituents in the actual parable (with the exception of vv. 6b and 7d), creating the impression that each scattering is equally salient. However, the *spiritual factors* contributing to the unfruitfulness of the scatterings, as disclosed in the explanation, would *not* have been expected. For this reason, it is more reasonable to conclude that Mark uses these linguistic devices to focus his readers’ attention on the pitfalls to spiritual growth that should be avoided.¹³

Such an interpretation is reasonable in light of current research. Gundry (1993:206) comments on the linguistic devices which serve to separate the unfruitful scatterings from the fruitful, but he draws no conclusion regarding salience. France (2002:207) notes that the final group receives little

¹³ Williamson suggests something along these lines, saying “The thrust of this explanation is not encouragement but exhortation. The reader is led to ask, ‘What kind of soil am I?’” (1983:94).

interpretation compared to the others, without mentioning the conventions used to delineate the groups. Finally, Mann (1986:267-68) states, “The end of the explanation of the parable is an anti-climax. So intent are all three versions in the synoptic gospels on the failures and shortcomings of the previous types that the triumph of the word in the fully converted is almost omitted. Certainly the harvest is left to explain itself.” Geulich makes a similar claim, stating that “the interpretation explains the parable as a warning against ‘hearing’ in the first three categories of respondents and an admonition for all ‘hearers’ to be like the fourth category that ‘bears fruit’” (2002:223).

Though the other synoptic traditions do not make a comparable distinction between the fruitful and unfruitful scatterings using *demonstratives*, this preliminary survey points toward a comparable weighting of the unfruitful scatterings *using other devices*, but is beyond the scope of this study.

Works cited:

- Andrews, E.
 1990 *Markedness Theory: The Union of Asymmetry and Semiosis in Language*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Chafe, Wallace L.
 1987 “Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow.” In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, edited by Russel S. Tomlin. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 21-51.
 1976 “Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View.” In *Subject and Topic*, edited by Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press, pp. 25-56.
- Dik, Simon
 1978 *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press.
- Dooley, Robert A. and Stephen H. Levinsohn
 2001 *Analyzing discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts*. Dallas: SIL International.
- France, R. T.
 2002 *The Gospel of Mark*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Guelich, Robert A.
 2002 *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 34A. Dallas: Word, Inc.
- Givón, Talmy.
 1992 “The Grammar of Referential Coherence as Mental Processing Instructions.” *Linguistics* 30:5-55.
- Gould, Ezra Palmer.
 1922 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*. International Critical Commentary. New York: T&T Clark.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg and Ron Zacharski
 2004 “Demonstrative Pronouns in Natural Discourse.” Paper presented at DAARC-2004 (the Fifth Discourse Anaphora and Anaphora Resolution Colloquium), São Miguel, Portugal, Sept. 23-24, 2004.
- Gundry, Robert H.
 1993 *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lambrecht, Knud
 1996 *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, Winfred P.
 1973 “A Structural Principle of Language and its Implication.” *Language* 49:47-66.

- 1978 "Conclusion: Toward an Understanding of the Profound Unity Underlying Languages." In *Syntactic Typology*, edited by Winfred P. Lehmann. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 663-80).
- Levinsohn, Stephen H.
 2003 "Towards a Unified Linguistic Description of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος." Paper presented at Biblical Greek and Linguistics Section of the SBL Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA.
 2000 *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd edition. Dallas: SIL International.
- Levinson, Stephen C.
 1987 "Pragmatics and the Grammar of Anaphora: a Partial Pragmatic Reduction of Binding and Control Phenomena." *Journal of Linguistics* 23:379-434.
- Li, Charles N.
 1997 "On Zero Anaphora." In *Essays on Language Function and Language Type: Dedicated to T. Givón*, edited by Joan Bybee, John Haiman, and Sandra A. Thompson. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 275-300.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson
 1976 "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language." In *Subject and Topic*, edited by Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press, pp. 459-489.
- Linde, Charlotte
 1979 "Focus of Attention and the Choice of Pronouns in Discourse." In *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, edited by Talmy Givón. New York: Academic Press, pp. 337-354.
- Mann, C. S.
 1986 *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday and Co.
- Porter, Stanley E.
 1992 *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Biblical Languages: Greek 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Prince, Ellen F.
 1981. Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information. In *Radical Pragmatics*, edited by Peter Cole. New York: Academic Press, pp. 223-255.
- Lamar Williamson.
 1983 *Mark* (Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching). Atlanta: J. Knox Press.
- Wolde, Ellen van
 2002 "Linguistic Motivation and Biblical Exegesis." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*, edited by Ellen van Wolde. Leiden: Brill, pp. 21-50.

Appendix 1: The pragmatic effects of preposing various kinds of constituents

1) Illustration of *default* versus *marked* ordering in English

a) *Preposing temporal expressions for a new temporal point of departure:*

Default: John went outside after dinner. OR John ate dinner and went outside.

Marked: After dinner, John went outside. OR John ate dinner, then he went outside.

b) *Preposing nominal constituents for a new referential point of departure*

Default: John went outside after dinner.

Marked: As for John, he went outside after dinner.

c) *Preposing certain prepositional phrases for a new spatial point of departure:*

Default: John finished eating dinner in the kitchen and went outside.

Marked: In the kitchen, John finished eating dinner and then went outside.

d) *Preposing conditional clauses for an explicit conditional point of departure:*

Default: John will not go outside if he doesn't finish eating dinner.

Marked: If John doesn't finish eating dinner, he will not go outside.

e) *Preposing 'new' information for marked focus (PFC):*

i) What were you working on?

Default: I was working on my **paper**.

Marked: It was my **paper** (I was working on).

ii) When did you arrive?

Default: I arrived **yesterday**.

Marked: **Yesterday** I arrived.

2) Illustration of *default* versus *marked* ordering in Koine Greek

a) *Preposing temporal expressions for a new temporal point of departure:*

Default: καὶ εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν. (variation of Mark 4:15b)

Marked: καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς.

b) *Preposing nominal constituents for a new referential point of departure:*

Default: σπεῖρει ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον. (variation of Mark 4:14a)

Marked: ὁ σπείρων σπεῖρει τὸν λόγον.

c) *Preposing certain prepositional phrases for a new spatial point of departure:*

Default: καὶ ἔπεσεν ἄλλο ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν (variation of Mark 4:5)

Marked: καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ἔπεσεν ἄλλο ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν

d) *Preposing conditional clauses for an explicit conditional point of departure:*

Default: τίνα γὰρ μισθὸν ἔχετε ἐὰν ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς; (variation of Matt 5:46)

Marked: ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε;

Appendix 2: Synoptic Accounts of the Explanation of the Parable of the Sower

Matthew 13:19-23

19 παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ **παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν** σπαρεῖς.
20 ὁ δὲ **ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη** σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ **τὸν λόγον** ἀκούων καὶ **εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς** λαμβάνων αὐτόν,
21 οὐκ ἔχει δὲ **ρίζαν** ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀλλὰ **πρόσκαιρός** ἐστιν, γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ **διὰ τὸν λόγον** **εὐθὺς** σκανδαλίζεται.

22 ὁ δὲ **εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας** σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ **τὸν λόγον** ἀκούων, καὶ ἡ **μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος** καὶ ἡ **ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου** συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον καὶ **ἄκαρπος** γίνεται.

23 ὁ δὲ **ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν** σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ **τὸν λόγον** ἀκούων καὶ συνιείς, ὃς δὴ καρποφορεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.

Mark 4:14-20

14 ὁ **σπεύρων τὸν λόγον** σπεῖρει.
15 οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ **παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν**· ὅπου σπεῖρεται ὁ λόγος καὶ **ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς** ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.

16 καὶ οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ **ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη** σπειρόμενοι, οἱ **ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον** **εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς** λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν,
17 καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν **ρίζαν** ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ **πρόσκαιροί** εἰσιν, **εἴτα** γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ **διὰ τὸν λόγον** **εὐθὺς** σκανδαλίζονται.

18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσιν οἱ **εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας** σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ **τὸν λόγον** ἀκούσαντες,
19 καὶ αἱ **μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος** καὶ ἡ **ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου** καὶ αἱ **περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι** εἰσπορευόμεναι συμπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ **ἄκαρπος** γίνεται.
20 καὶ **ἐκεῖνοί** εἰσιν οἱ **ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν** σπαρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν.

Luke 8:11-15

11 Ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή· Ὁ σπόρος

ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

12 οἱ δὲ **παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν** εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, **εἴτα** ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.

13 οἱ δὲ **ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας** οἱ **ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν μετὰ χαρᾶς** δέχονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὗτοι **ρίζαν** οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οἱ **πρὸς καιρὸν** πιστεύουσιν καὶ **ἐν καιρῷ** πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται.

14 τὸ δὲ **εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας** πεσόν, οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ **ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου** πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν.

15 τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῆ, οὗτοι εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν **καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ** ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

Information structure analysis of each Gospel:

Matthew 13:19-23

- 19a παντός ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος¹⁴
19b ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς
19c καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ,
19d οὗτός¹⁵ ἐστὶν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν¹⁶ σπαρεῖς,
20a ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη¹⁷ σπαρεῖς,¹⁸
20b οὗτός¹⁹ ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων
20c καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς¹⁹ λαμβάνων αὐτόν,
21a οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ρίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ
21b ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός²⁰ ἐστὶν,
21c γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον²¹ εὐθὺς²² σκανδαλίζεται.
22a ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας²³ σπαρεῖς,²⁴
22b οὗτός²⁵ ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον²⁵ ἀκούων,
22c καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου²⁶ συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον
22d καὶ ἄκαρπος²⁷ γίνεται.
23a ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν²⁸ σπαρεῖς,²⁹
23b οὗτός³⁰ ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον³⁰ ἀκούων
23c καὶ συνιείς,
23d ὃς δὴ καρποφορεῖ
23e καὶ ποιεῖ ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.³¹

¹⁴ Underlined clause is a left-dislocated phrase—syntactically independent from the following main clauses—to activate a new topic. This dislocated phrase establishes the framework within which the following predications hold (cf. Li and Thompson (1976); Chafe (1976)). Verse 19a is coreferent with οὗτός in 19d.

¹⁵ Referential point of departure resumes topic established in 19a.

¹⁶ Marked focal constituent within the point of departure highlights the place where the seed is sown.

¹⁷ Marked focal constituent within the point of departure highlights the place where the seed is sown.

¹⁸ Underlined clause is left-dislocated with respect to v. 20b to establish a new topic, resumed by οὗτός.

¹⁹ Marked focal constituents highlight the manner in which the word is received, *immediately* and *with joy*.

²⁰ Marked focal constituent highlights the duration of the plants existence.

²¹ Initial clause establishes a temporal point of departure as the basis for relating what follows to what precedes.

²² Marked focal constituent highlights the manner in which the person falls away, *immediately*.

²³ Marked focal constituent within the point of departure highlights the place where the seed is sown.

²⁴ Underlined clause is left-dislocated with respect to v. 22b to establish a new topic, resumed by οὗτός.

²⁵ Marked focal constituent within the participial phrase highlights what was heard. Contrast with Mt. 13:19a, Mk 4:20b.

²⁶ The parable presupposes that *something* chokes the growth of the seeds (cf. v. 7), and the marked focal constituent highlights the means of choking.

²⁷ Marked focal constituent highlights the resulting state of the seed, *unfruitful*.

²⁸ Marked focal constituent within the point of departure highlights the place where the seed is sown.

²⁹ Underlined clause is left-dislocated with respect to v. 23b to establish a new topic, resumed by οὗτός.

³⁰ Marked focal constituent within the participial phrase highlights what was heard. Contrast with Mt 13:19a, Mk 4:20b.

³¹ Verse 23d is a continuative relative clause which provides further description of the left-dislocated topic of v. 23a.

Mark 4:14-20

- 14a ὁ σπείρων³² τὸν λόγον³³ σπείρει.
15a οὗτοι³⁴ δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν· ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος
15b καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν³⁵, εὐθὺς³⁶ ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς
15c καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.
16a καὶ οὗτοι³⁷ εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη³⁸ σπειρόμενοι,
16b οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον³⁹ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς⁴⁰ λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν,
17a καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
17b ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί⁴¹ εἰσιν,
17c εἴτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς⁴² σκανδαλίζονται.
18a καὶ ἄλλοι⁴³ εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας⁴⁴ σπειρόμενοι·
18b οὗτοι⁴⁵ εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον⁴⁵ ἀκούσαντες,
19a καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλοῦτου καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι⁴⁶ εἰσπορευόμεναι
συμπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον
19b καὶ ἄκαρπος⁴⁷ γίνεται.
20a καὶ ἐκεῖνοί⁴⁸ εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν⁴⁹ σπαρέντες,
20b οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν λόγον
20c καὶ παραδέχονται
20d καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἕν τριάκοντα καὶ ἕν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἕν ἑκατόν.

³² Referential point of departure for a marked to switch to a different topic.

³³ Marked focal constituent highlights the new information of the clause.

³⁴ Marked focal constituent cataphorically highlights the new topic οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν by preposing the demonstrative pronoun.

³⁵ Temporal point of departure to establish the temporal frame of reference for what follows.

³⁶ Marked focal constituent highlights the manner in which the enemy comes.

³⁷ Marked focal constituent cataphorically highlights the new topic οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι by preposing the demonstrative pronoun.

³⁸ Marked focal constituent within the participial phrase highlights the place where the seeds were sown.

³⁹ Temporal point of departure to establish the temporal frame of the continuative relative clause which it begins.

⁴⁰ Marked focal constituents highlight the manner in which the word is received, *immediately* and *with joy*.

⁴¹ Marked focal constituent highlights the duration of the plants existence.

⁴² Marked focal constituent highlights the manner in which the person falls away, *immediately*.

⁴³ Marked focal constituent cataphorically highlights the new topic οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι by preposing the correlative pronoun. Use of correlative—instead of the proximate demonstrative οὗτοι—indicates the end of correlated entities. Compare to Mt 13:4, 5, 7, 8; 13:1, 24, 31, 33; 20:1, 3, 6; and Mk. 4:4, 5, 7, 8; where correlative pronouns are used for each non-initial entity of the correlated set, including the last. Contrast with Mk 12:3, 4, 5, 6 where the final related member of the set is contrasted with the other members of the set. Similar usages are found in Mk 6:14, 15, 16; 8:28, 29.

⁴⁴ Marked focal constituent within the participial phrase highlights the place where the seeds were sown.

⁴⁵ Marked focal constituent within the participial phrase highlights what was heard. Contrast with Mark 4:20b.

⁴⁶ The parable presupposes that *something* chokes the growth of the seeds (cf. v. 7), and the marked focal constituents highlight the *means* of the choking.

⁴⁷ Marked focal constituent highlights the resulting state of the seed, *unfruitful*.

⁴⁸ Marked focal constituent cataphorically highlights the new topic οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες by preposing the demonstrative.

⁴⁹ Marked focal constituent within the participial phrase highlights the place where the seeds were sown.

Luke 8:11-15

11a Ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή·

11b Ὁ σπόρος⁵⁰ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

12a οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν⁵¹ εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,

12b εἶτα⁵² ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος

12c καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν,

12d ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.

13a οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας⁵³

13b οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν⁵⁴ μετὰ χαρᾶς⁵⁵ δέχονται τὸν λόγον,

13c καὶ οὗτοι ῥίζαν⁵⁶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν,

13d οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν⁵⁷ πιστεύουσιν

13e καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ⁵⁸ ἀφίστανται.

14a τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας⁵⁹ πεσόν,⁶⁰

14b οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,

14c καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου⁶¹ πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται

14d καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν.

15a τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῆ,⁶²

15b οὗτοι εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ⁶³ ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν

15c καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

⁵⁰ Referential point of departure for a marked to switch to a different topic.

⁵¹ Referential point of departure for a marked to switch to a different topic.

⁵² Temporal point of departure to establish the temporal frame for the clause which it begins.

⁵³ Left dislocated referential point of departure for a marked switch to a different topic for the continuative relative clause in v. 13b, resumed by οὗτοι in v. 13c.

⁵⁴ Temporal point of departure to establish the temporal frame for the continuative relative clause which it begins.

⁵⁵ Marked focal constituent highlights the manner in which the word is received, *with joy*.

⁵⁶ Marked focal constituent highlights what these plants are missing, *roots*.

⁵⁷ Marked focal constituent highlights the duration for which the word is believed, *for a time*.

⁵⁸ Temporal point of departure to establish the temporal frame for the clause which it begins.

⁵⁹ Marked focal constituent within the point of departure highlights the place where the seed is sown.

⁶⁰ Left dislocated referential point of departure for a marked to switch to a different topic, resumed by οὗτοι in the following clause.

⁶¹ The parable presupposes that *something* chokes the growth of the seeds (cf. v. 7), and the marked focal constituent highlights the means of choking.

⁶² Left dislocated referential point of departure for a marked to switch to a different topic, resumed by οὗτοι in the following clause.

⁶³ Marked focal constituent highlights the inner qualities of some who hear the word and respond favorably.