Abstract:

Levinsohn (2003) claims that the near and far demonstratives (ὁὗτος and ἐκεῖνος respectively) can be used non-deictically to encode relative thematic saliency of discourse referents, with ὁὗτος 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 ὁὗτος 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 ὁὗτος and ἐκεῖνος,” he claims that the near demonstrative ὁὗτος 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 ὁὗτος 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 ὁὗτος 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 ὁὗτος 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). 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 formal 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). 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 Greek

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

---

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 ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον 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. οὗτοι, then οὗτοι 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 δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὀδόν*, ‘These are the ones along the path’. By default, οὗτοι as a pronominal element would be expected to immediately follow the verb. 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 πετρώδη 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. 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 ἕκεινος 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 ἑσπαρμένον 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 ρίζαν 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 at 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.
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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: σπείρει ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον. (variation of Mark 4:14a)
   Marked: ὁ σπείρων σπείρει τὸν λόγον.

c) Preposing certain prepositional phrases for a new spatial point of departure:
   Default: καὶ ἔπεσεν ἄλλο ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ὅπου οὐκ ἔχεν γῆν πολλήν (variation of Mark 4:5)
   Marked: καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ἔπεσεν ἄλλο ὅπου οὐκ ἔχεν γῆν πολλήν

d) Preposing conditional clauses for an explicit conditional point of departure:
   Default: τίνα γὰρ μισθὸν ἔχετε ἐὰν ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας υἱὸς; (variation of Matt 5:46)
   Marked: ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας υἱὸς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε;
Appendix 2: Synoptic Accounts of the Explanation of the Parable of the Sower

Matthew 13:19-23
19 ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἑσπαρμένων ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὁ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς.
20 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρείς, ὁ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσας καὶ ἀπαίτη τοῦ πλούτου συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον καὶ ἀκραπος γίνεται.

Mark 4:14-20
14 ὁ σπόρος τὸν λόγον σπείρει.
15 ὁ δὲ ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὁμοίως ἐσπαρμένος, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ ἀνέφερε τὸν λόγον τὸν ἑσπαρμένων εἰς αὐτούς.
16 καὶ ὁ δὲ ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς, ὁ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσας καὶ ἀπαίτη τοῦ πλούτου συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται.

Luke 8:11-15
11 ὃς δὲ περασὺτε ἕστιν τὸν λόγον τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐκείνης, ὃς δὲ ἐστιν αὐτὴ ἡ παραβολῆ ἡ ὁμογενής.
Information structure analysis of each Gospel:

Matthew 13:19-23

19a παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος

19b ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς

19c καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

19d οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς.

20a ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς.

20b οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων.

21a οὐκ ἔχει ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρείς,

21b ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστιν,

21c γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται.

22a ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρείς,

22b οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων.

23a οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων.

23b καὶ ποιεῖ ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.
Mark 4:14-20

14a ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει.
15a οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος ὃς ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.
15b καὶ οὗτοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν ὃς σπείρεται ὁ λόγος λαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν,
15c καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀκούσωσιν εὐθὺς ἐρχεῖται ἐπὶ αὐτούς.
16a οἵ εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπείρομεν,
16b καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐπί τὸν λόγον αἴρεται εἰς αὐτούς.
17a καὶ οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ περὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· ἀλλὰ παραδέχονται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἑν τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν ἡμερῶν ἑν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἑν ἑκατόν ἑκατόν.
Luke 8:11-15

11a Ἐστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή·
11b Ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.
12a οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,
12b εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος
12c καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν,
12d ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.
13a οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας
13b οἵ τινες ἀκούσαντες μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον,
13c καὶ αὐτοὶ ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν,
13d οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν.
14a τὸ δὲ ἐις τὰς ἀκάνθας
14b οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,
14c καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται
14d καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν.
15a τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ
15b οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ 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.