

GRAMMATICAL CASE IN THE TEXT OF  
REVELATION 4 AND 5S.J.P.K. Riekert<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

It is generally assumed that the Greek case system does not function in the usual way in the book of Revelation. Using the distinction between abstract Case and morpho-phonological case one can reconsider the use of case in Revelation in the light of the development in case markings, including new morpho-phonological realisations of certain participles.

The Greek grammar of Revelation is generally considered as very remarkable, peculiar and foreign to the language system itself (cf. Swete [1908] 1968: cxxv; Charles 1915:79; Thompson 1985:2-7, 106-108; Dougherty 1992:1-33 and Musser 1992:1). The use of cases is typical of this remarkable language usage (cf. Bousset [1906] 1966:159, 163; Swete [1908] 1968:cxxiii; Charles 1915:83-4, 86, 89-90; [1920] 1971:clii-iv; Mussies 1980:167; Dougherty 1992:7, 10).

If the so-called “foreign” usage of morphological case in Revelation were considered in the framework of the Case sub-theory of the Government-Binding (GB) Theory of Chomsky, one would have a better mechanism whereby to decide whether the “foreign” usage is truly “foreign”. The Government-Binding Theory propagates the view that the totality of the formulated rules and principles regarding language comprises the grammar of a language (Chomsky 1991:417). The grammar as an interdependent system of rules and principles provides the basis for the grammatical sentences of a language. One should therefore be able to distinguish between sentences and non-sentences, as well as between well-constructed sentences and non-well-constructed sentences. One should therefore be able to obtain an observationally adequate description (Radford 1981:25,26; 1988:27-30, cf. Botha 1982:26-7; Haegeman 1991:5). There is, however, one aspect that restricts our search for a descriptive adequate formulation, namely the lack of mother-tongue intuitions that could give us guidance regarding the grammaticality and acceptability of constructions in the Greek text (cf. Riekert 1985:26; Haegeman 1991:6-8).

1 Prof. S.P.J.K. Riekert, Head: Department of Biblical and Religious Studies, Faculty of Theology, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Musser (1992:1) indicates a number of proposals made in the past to describe the unique grammatical usage of Revelation. Riekert (1996) proceeds from the hypothesis that the morphological cases in Revelation 4 and 5 can be adequately described and explained within the framework of the Case sub-theory of the Government-Binding Theory. He analyses the two chapters relating to the abstract Case assignment and the morphological realisations in terms of proposals made within the Government-Binding Theory, and the application of these proposals to New Testament Greek (cf. Riekert 1985; 1996).

Riekert's study (1996) shows that in terms of abstract Case assignment no irregularities could be found. Nevertheless, we may comment on the following developments.

### 1. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND CASE REALISATION OF κύκλω

It is remarkable that κύκλω which realises genitive case to its NP may be explained within the framework of the Case sub-theory in two ways (cf. Riekert 1996:75-77; 113-114): (i) κύκλω may be described as an auto-thematic Case assignment realised as dative which in its turn governs another NP, and assigns to it genitive Case and case as in (1), or (ii) κύκλω may be considered a petrified noun in the dative which functions as a preposition, and assigns oblique Case which is realised as genitive, as in (2):

(1) Revelation 5:11

[NP [NP	κύκλω]	[NP	τοῦ θρόνου
	surrounding(-space)		the throne
	dative		genitive
	AUTO-THEMATIC		STRUCTURAL
καὶ τῶν ζώων		καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων]	
and the living creatures		and the elders	
... genitive .....		..... genitive	
... STRUCTURAL .....		..... STRUCTURAL	

The description of κύκλω can potentially be different. κύκλω may be described as dative (Rienecker 1966:616) and then as noun which governs the following, NP τοῦ θρόνου ..... πρεσβυτέρων and assigns to it structural genitive Case as in (1) (cf. Mounce 1980:149, n. 28). On its own it is a free adjunct to the VP ἤκουσα ..... πολλῶν and the receiver of auto-thematic Case. Otherwise we may describe κύκλω as a petrified noun in the

dative which functions as a preposition, and therefore assign oblique Case in the genitive case as in (2) (cf. Mounce 1980:149, n. 28; Dougherty 1992:147, 383):

(2) Revelation 5:11

[PP [P	κύκλῳ]	[NP	τοῦ θρόνου
	around		the throne
	petrified N as P		genitive...
			OBLIQUE...
καὶ τῶν ζώων		καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων]]	
and the living creatures		and the elders	
... genitive .....		..... genitive	
... OBLIQUE .....		..... OBLIQUE	

## 2. CASE ASSIGNMENT BY ἰδοῦ

Similarly, ἰδοῦ as an interjection fails to assign Case (cf. Riekert 1996:66-67), whereas as an expletive element it assigns nominative Case and case as in (3) (cf. Riekert 1996:61-64, 67):

(3) Revelation 4:1

[IP [VP[V	(ἰδοῦ)]	[NP	ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ]]]
	(look there is)		a voice, the first
			nominative
			STRUCTURAL

The case of Case assignment is the nominative after ἰδοῦ. Rienecker (1966:615) explains it merely as an Hebraism. Blass *et al.* (1961:80) mention that the nominative could best be explained by accepting ἰδοῦ as a petrified imperative particle — as in Attic Greek — with the loss of the characteristics of the imperative form. Blass *et al.* (1961:71; cf. Beyer 1968: 57-8) draw attention to the fact that in following the Semitic pattern the present, future, imperfect and aorist of (παρ)εἶναι and (παρα)γενέσθαι may be omitted after ἰδοῦ. Beyer (1968:57-8; cf. Charles [1920] 1971: cxxv, 106-7; Dougherty 1992:90, n. 19, 539-40) illustrates the five constructions of the Hebrew וַיִּהְיֶה and its renderings in the Septuagint. Accordingly, it is clear that the renderings of וַיִּהְיֶה in Greek take place as an expletive element. καὶ ἰδοῦ is therefore not only an exclamation, but also an expletive element in the sense of *there is/are* (cf. Czepluch 1988:282, 304n.14; Lasnik 1993:8-21). The nominative is assigned by co-indexation to the

subject element of the expletive ἰδοῦ, which is also co-indexed to the NP ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ..... λέγων. (Cf. sentence 6).

### 3. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND CASE REALISATION BY ἀκούω

Revelation 4-5 confirms the preference for objective Case assignment by ἀκούω throughout the book (Riekert 1996:64; cf. Dougherty 1992:127 which draws attention to the fact that the accusative realises the governed noun of ἀκούω 29 times in Revelation, whereas the genitive realises it 11 times). According to Liddell *et al.* (1968:54-4), the verb governs the noun in both the accusative and the genitive, but with a preference for the genitive which would be inherent Case assignment. Consequently Revelation reflects a shift to the objective Case assignment as in (4), (5) and (6).

(4) Revelation 5:11

καὶ	{IP {VP {V	ἤκουσα}	{NP {NP	φωνήν}
and		I heard		(a) sound
				accusative
				OBJECTIVE
	{NP ἀγγέλων	πολλῶν}}]		
	(of) angels	many		
	genitive			
	STRUCTURAL			

The verb ἤκουσα governs the NP φωνήν ..... πολλῶν and assigns to the head φωνήν objective Case realised as accusative case.

The above analysis accepts that the NP φωνήν governs the NP ἀγγέλων πολλῶν and assigns to it structural genitive Case. There is a remote possibility that ἀγγέλων πολλῶν is indirectly governed by the verb ἤκουσα and in this case the genitive is then inherent Case assignment, traditionally described as the genitive of the source of the sound. In this instance it would make no difference in the semantic context of the sentence.

(5) Revelation 5:13

καὶ	{IP {NP <sub>1</sub> {NP	πᾶν κτίσμα}	[CP COMP <sub>e</sub>
and		every creature	
		accusative	
		OBJECTIVE	

[IP [NP	ὅ]	([INFL 3 sg. praes.])		
	which			
	nominative			
	STRUCTURAL			
[VP ([V	ἐστὶ < εἰμι])	{PP [PP [P	ἐν	
	(is)		in	
[NP τῶ οὐρανῶ]	καὶ	{PP [P	ἐπὶ]	[NP
the heaven and		on		τῆς γῆς]] καὶ
dative				the earth and
OBLIQUE				genitive
				OBLIQUE
[PP [P	ὑποκάτω]	[NP	τῆς γῆς]] καὶ	[PP [P
underneath		the earth and		ἐπὶ]
		genitive		on
		OBLIQUE		
[NP	τῆς θαλάσσης]]]]]]]] καὶ	[NP [DET τὰ]		[PP [P
the sea	and	the (things)		ἐν]
genitive		accusative		
OBLIQUE		OBJECTIVE		
[NP	αὐτοῖς]]][AP	πάντα]	[VP [V	ἤκουσα]
them	all		I heard	
dative	accusative			
OBLIQUE	OBJECTIVE			
NP <sub>τ<sub>1</sub></sub>	[IP [A	λέγοντας]]]		
	saying			
	accusative			
	OBJECTIVE			

Because of the length of the NP *πάν ..... αὐτοῖς πάντα* which moved in front of the verb to take the topicalisation position, the construction of the sentence is not so obvious.

The verb *ἤκουσα* governs the NP-construction above and assigns to the heads of the recursive composed NP, viz. to *πάν κτίσμα* and *τὰ* objective Case realised as accusative case (cf. Riekert 1996:64; Dougherty 1992:127-8).

The DET τὰ is made more precise by means of the PP ἐν which governs the NP αὐτοῖς and assigns to it dative case as realisation of the oblique Case. Lohmeyer (1953:57) is of the opinion that τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς resumes the last three nouns together, thus a resumption of the detailed description of πᾶν κτίσμα, now from the viewpoint of a totality, or as Bratcher (1984: 53) formulated it “the whole universe”, according to Bousset ([1906] 1966: 262, cf. Charles [1920] 1971:150) in terms of a quatio partition. The fact that the whole is meant seems confirmed by the use of πάντα as a adjective to strenghten the resumption. Charles ([1920] 1971:136) shows that πάντα follows its noun only in two other instances in Revelation. Dougherty (1992:220, 225) considers πάντα as a substantive adjective. In this case we have a different construction and AP with πάντα changes to NP. It is also part of the chain with (πᾶν κτίσμα) τὰ and λέγοντας, and it has the Case assignment in common with the rest.

The verb ἀκούω is sub-categorised to take the participle together with the object and in this case λέγοντας which then like πᾶν κτίσμα and τὰ has accusative case as realisation of the objective Case which is also a *constructio ad sensum* (cf. Charles [1920] 1971:cxliv; Dougherty 1992:343). The agreement with regard to number and case and Case is therefore unproblematic. There is, however, a problem with respect to grammatical gender, as it becomes obvious from the text critical apparatus which reflects attempts to change λέγοντας to neuter plural in agreement with τὰ (cf. Dougherty 1992:332, 341-2).

## (6) Revelation 4:1

COMP <sub>e</sub> [IP [NP	ἧν <sub>2</sub> ]	[VP [V ἤκουσα] NP <sub>t2</sub>	
	Which	I heard	
	accusative		
	OBJECTIVE		
[ADVP [ADV ὡς]	[NP NP <sub>e</sub> [NP	σάλπιγγος λαλούσης]	
like		(of) a trumpet talking	
		genitive	
		STRUCTURAL	
[PP [P μετ’]	[NP	ἐμοῦ]]]]	[IP PRO <sub>1</sub> [A
to	me	which says	λέγων <sub>1</sub> ...] ]
	genitive	nominative	
	OBLIQUE	STRUCTURAL	

In sentence (6) we have the relative clause ἦν ἤκουσα with WH-movement, the Case objective being assigned to the relative pronoun and realised as accusative in the structural position before movement according to the rules. In Revelation, we find, however, alternation of the case after ἀκούω. In this case it is objective Case realised as accusative. In other cases it is inherent Case assignment realised as genitive case (cf. Dougherty 1992:127, 159). In the phrase ὡς σάλπιγγος λαλούσης the assignment is realised in the genitive case, probably as auto-thematic Case, called a genitive absolute in the traditional Greek grammatical description (cf. Dougherty 1992:131 which states that we do not find a genitive absolute in Revelation). Charles ([1920] 1971:35) rightly calls the construction in this instance “a pregnant one”. The construction reflects the following deep structure.

ὡς	φωνή	σάλπιγγος
like	(a) voice	(of)(a) trumpet

Charles ([1920] 1971:35) also indicates that ὡς leaves the Case assignment unaltered.

The case of λαλούσης may be explained as a case of agreement with σάλπιγγος, the second NP which receives structural genitive Case as a NP which is governed by another NP. The agreement should rather be with the governing NP and therefore we should rather expect λαλούσης in agreement with φωνή (cf. Charles [1920] 1971:24). The Case assignment of the PP μετ' ἐμοῦ described in detail in Riekert (1996:64-65) has no bearing on this problem.

#### 4. PHENOMENA REFLECTING DEVIATIONS IN LANGUAGE USAGE CONNECTED WITH CASE

Phenomena connected with case which reflect deviations in the language usage in Revelation compared to the language usage in other books of the New Testament, deserve discussion. There are new morpho-phonological formations of the participles which realise the cases, viz. λέγων and ἔχων.

##### 4.1 New morpho-phonological realisations of the participle

###### λέγων

4.1.1 λέγων in (7) shows deviations from the rest of the nominative phrase with regard to the grammatical gender. When it is regarded as a petrification and thus indeclinable or it functions as a *constructio ad sensum*,

then there is no problem with regard to Case and case. It is at the most a problem concerning the agreement of grammatical gender (cf. Riekert 1996:130).

(7) Revelation 4:1

[IP [VP [(V (ἰδοῦ)]	{NP <sub>1</sub>	ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη]	[CP
(look there is)		a voice, the first	
		nominative	
		STRUCTURAL	
COMP <sub>e</sub> [IP [NP	ἣν <sub>2</sub> ]	{VP [V ἤκουσα]	NP <sub>t2</sub>
	which	I heard	
	accusative		
	OBJECTIVE		
[ADVP [ADV ὡς]	{NP NP <sub>e</sub> [NP	σάλπιγγος λαλούσης]	
like		(of) a trumpet talking	
		genitive	
		STRUCTURAL	
[PP [P μετ']	{NP	ἐμοῦ]]]]	{IP PRO <sub>1</sub> [A λέγων <sub>1</sub> ...]]]]
to	me	which says	
	genitive	nominative	
	OBLIQUE	STRUCTURAL	

As far as Case is concerned, there is no problem with λέγων, but the grammatical gender of λέγων is not in agreement with the rest of the nominative phrase. Therefore we also find corrections to λέγουσα (cf. Zahn [1924-26] 1986:137). This is not necessary. According to Bousset ([1906] 1966:243) and Lohmeyer (1953:45; cf. Swete [1908] 1968:67; Charles 1915:85; [1920] 1971:108; Thompson 1985:69, 70; Dougherty 1992:106, 106N8,N9, 331,342, 344), it is either a *constructio ad sensum* or a rendering of the Hebrew לְאָמַר. In the latter case it most probably reflects a petrification of the participle λέγων to introduce direct speech. According to Blass *et al.* (1961:76), it is indeclinable.

4.1.2 λέγοντας in (8) deserves attention. The basic problem is agreement of grammatical gender and is most probably a *constructio ad sensum*. There is no problem concerning the agreement with regard to number, Case and case.

## (8) Revelation 5:13

καὶ	[IP [NP <sub>1</sub> [NP	πάν κτίσμα]	[CP COMP <sub>e</sub>
and		every creature	
		accusative	
		OBJECTIVE	
[IP [NP	ὅ]		(({INFL 3 sg. praes.})
	which		
	nominative		
	STRUCTURAL		
[VP {V	(ἐστὶ < εἰμι)]	[PP[PP[P	ἐν]
(is)			in
[NP τῷ οὐρανῷ]]	καὶ	[PP [P ἐπὶ]	[NP τῆς γῆς]] καὶ
the heaven	and	on	the earth and
dative			genitive
OBLIQUE			OBLIQUE
[PP [P	ὑποκάτω]	[NP τῆς γῆς]] καὶ	[PP [P ἐπὶ]
	underneath	the earth and	on
		genitive	
		OBLIQUE	
[NP τῆς θαλάσσης]]]]]]]] καὶ		[NP [DET τὰ]	[PP [P ἐν]
the sea	and	the (things)	in
genitive		accusative	
OBLIQUE		OBJECTIVE	
[NP αὐτοῖς]]][AP	πάντα]	[VP [V ἤκουσα]	
them	all	I heard	
dative	accusative		
OBLIQUE	OBJECTIVE		
NP <sub>t1</sub> [IP [A	λέγοντας]....]]]		
	saying		
	accusative		
	OBJECTIVE		

Because much of (8) was discussed in (5), the discussion here is limited to what we have observed thus far concerning λέγοντας.

We have noted the attempts to correct the grammatical gender to λέγοντα, neuter plural in agreement with τὰ. It is clearly an instance where άκουω takes the participle together with the object.

4.1.3 λέγοντες in (9) should also be discussed.

(9) Revelation 5:11 and 12

καὶ	{IP NP <sub>t<sub>1</sub></sub> [INFL 3 sg. impf.]		{VP [V ἦν < εἶμι] [NP <sub>1</sub>
and			to be
[NP ὁ	ἀριθμὸς]	[NP αὐτῶν <sub>2</sub> ]	
the	number (of)	them	
nominative		genitive	
STRUCTURAL	STRUCTURAL		
[NP [NP [NP	μυριάδες]		
	ten thousands		
	nominative		
	STRUCTURAL		
[NP μυριάδων]]	καὶ	[NP [NP χιλιάδες]	
(of) ten thousands	and	thousands	
genitive		nominative	
STRUCTURAL		STRUCTURAL	
[NP χιλιάδων ]]]]	{IP PRO <sub>2</sub> [INFL (3) pl. praes.]		
(of) thousands			
genitive			
STRUCTURAL			
[AP [A	λέγοντες <sub>2</sub> ]	[NP φωνῆ μεγάλης]...]]]]]	
saying		(a) voice loud	
nominative		dative	
STRUCTURAL		AUTO-THEMATIC	

The NP ὁ ἀριθμὸς (αὐτῶν) is co-indexed with the AGR-element of INFL as subject of the copulative verb ἦν and receives structural nominative Case. The NP's μυριάδες and χιλιάδες also receive structural nominative Case as part of the predicate and therefore co-indexed with ὁ ἀριθμὸς. The NP's αὐτῶν, μυριάδων and χιλιάδων are governed by the NP's ὁ ἀριθμὸς, μυριάδες and χιλιάδες, respectively, and consequently receive genitive case and Case. Although μυριάδες μυριάδων and χιλιάδες χιλιάδων are Hebraisms as far as the rendering is concerned (Blass *et al.* 1961:90, cf.

Riekert 1996:89, 90; Dougherty 1992:124-5), the Case assignment and case realisations are in agreement with the peculiarity of the Greek language. The participle λέγοντες is co-indexed with PRO in its own IP. As far as the number is concerned λέγοντες is co-indexed with αὐτῶν and as far as the case is concerned, with the head of αὐτῶν; therefore, with ὁ ἀριθμὸς, with which it functions as a chain together with μυριάδες and χιλιάδες. This results in a structural nominative Case assignment. Charles ([1920] 1971:148-9) correctly draws attention to the fact that μυριάδες and χιλιάδες figure in an unusual order. Nevertheless, one should consider the possibility that ὁ ἀριθμὸς..... χιλιάδων is a parenthetic clause to sentence (6) and that λέγοντες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ is part of that clause. In this case λέγοντες is indeclinable (cf. Riekert 1996:63; Charles 1915:85; [1920] 1971:136; Blass *et al.* 1961:76; Dougherty 1992:341,343), and we could rather expect λέγουσαν to be in agreement with φωνῆν or λέγοντων to be in agreement with ἀγγέλων πολλῶν. The NP φωνῇ μεγάλῃ is a free adjunct to λέγοντες and has been assigned autothematic Case which is realised as dative according to Dougherty (1992:150) as a description of manner.

#### 4.2 New morpho-phonological realisations of the participle

##### ἔχων

4.2.1 ἔχων in (10) and (11) is either a *constructio ad sensum* or masculine and neuter. In any other instance it would not be in agreement in terms of grammatical gender. It is, however, unproblematic with regard to the Case assignment and case realisation.

(10) Revelation 4:7

καὶ	{IP [NP	τὸ τρίτον ζῶον]	
and		the third living creature	
		nominative	
		STRUCTURAL	
	{[INFL impf. 3 sg. akk.] [VP ([V	(ἦν <	εἶμι)
			to be
[AP [A	ἔχων]	{NP [NP τὸ πρόσωπον]	
	possessing	the face	
	nominative	accusative	
	STRUCTURAL	OBJECTIVE	

{[ADV                    ὡς]}    {[NP    ἄνθρωπου]]}]}

(of) a human being  
genitive  
STRUCTURAL

The assignment of structural nominative Case and case to the NP τὸ τρίτον ζῶον is by co-indexation with INFL imperfect 3 singular (cf. Riekert 1996:79). The participle ἔχων as A, without the article, is predicative and by co-indexation nominative, although the form is masculine and therefore incongruent with ζῶον (neuter) (cf. Dougherty 1992:224, 322-3, 335-8). It is possible to explain it as an *ad sensum* stylistic adaptation or ἔχων is accepted as masculine and neuter (cf. Riekert 1996:82-3, 104-105). Dougherty (1992:105) describes this instance as one where

a personified neuter subject has a masculine predicate adjective, even though the same neuter subject may take a neuter predicate or attribute in the same or similar context.

Charles ([1920] 1971:124) states that ἔχων replaces a *verbum finitum*, in agreement with the Hebrew or Aramaic idiom. The participle as verb governs the NP τὸ πρόσωπον and assigns to it objective Case (obviously realised as accusative) (cf. Dougherty 1992:160). At the same time πρόσωπον governs the NP (ὡς) ἄνθρωπου to which it assigns structural genitive Case and case. ὡς is an adverb which is text critically not without problems, but that does not affect Case assignment.

(11) Revelation 4:8

καὶ	{[IP [NP [NP	τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα]			
and		the four living creatures			
		nominative			
		STRUCTURAL			
[NP [NP	ἓν]	{[PP [P	καθ’	[NP [NP	ἓν]
	one	for		one	
	nominative			accusative	
	STRUCTURAL			OBLIQUE	
[NP	αὐτῶν]]]}([INFL impf. 3 sg.])	[VP ([V	(ἦν <	εἶμι)]	
(of) them		(to be)			
genitive					
STRUCTURAL					

[AP [A	ἔχων]	{ADV	ἀνά}	{NP	πτέρυγας ἕξι}]
	possessing		each		wings six
	nominative				accusative
	STRUCTURAL				OBJECTIVE

The NP τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα displays nominative case and Case in the SPEC- or subject position of INFL and is linked by means of the apposition to the NP ἔν which is also nominative by antecedent government. The preposition καθ' which expresses distributive meaning, assigns to ἔν oblique Case which is realised as accusative (cf. Charles [1920] 1971:124; Dougherty 1992:174). This NP ἔν in its turn governs the NP αὐτῶν and assigns to it structural genitive Case and case. The participle ἔχων as A is by co-indexation with the first ἔν nominative, according to Bousset ([1906] 1966:250; Swete [1908] 1968:cclin 1,72) a brilliant *constructio ad sensum*, although the form should be in agreement regarding the grammatical gender (cf. Riekert 1996: 80). Charles ([1920] 1971:cxliv) indicates that the *ad sensum* construction continues until Revelation 4:9 with γέμουσιν, ἔχουσιν and λέγοντες, which are all *constructiones ad sensum*. Remarkable is the stylistic numerical co-indexation with ἔν and not with τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα. Dougherty (1992:336-8) describes it as a "circumstantial participle". As verb ἔχων assigns to the NP πτέρυγας ἕξι objective Case, which is obviously realised as accusative (cf. Dougherty 1992:160). Dougherty (1992: 364, 529; cf. Charles [1920] 1971:124; Arndt & Gingrich 1952:49) takes ἀνά as distributive adverb. Dana & Mantey (1957:99), on the other hand, wrongly take ἀνά as preposition which assigns the accusative case as realisation of the oblique Case in terms of the study of Riekert (1996). On first impression the [AP ἔχων ἀνά πτέρυγας ἕξι] could be analysed as in (12).

(12)	[AP [A	ἔχων]	{PP [P	ἀνά}	{ NP	πτέρυγας ἕξι}]
		possessing		to		wings six
		nominative				accusative
		STRUCTURAL				OBLIQUE

In this case a NP to fill the *theta* role grid of ἔχων is lacking whereas the above analysis clearly gives it. The insertion of an adverb, and in particular ἀνά, causes no problem at all to the structuring of the AP.

4.2.2 ἔχων in (13) is most probably an uncommon morphological realisation, but the Case assignment and case realisation agree with the theory.

## (13) Revelation 5:6

	Καὶ	{IP {VP {V	εἶδον}	NP <sub>t<sub>1</sub></sub>	
	and		I saw		
{PP {P	ἐν}	{NP {NP	μέσῳ}		
	in		(the) middle		
			dative		
			OBLIQUE		
{NP	τοῦ θρόνου	καὶ	τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων}}		
	(of) the throne	and	the four living creatures		
	genitive				
	STRUCTURAL				
	καὶ	{PP {P	ἐν}	{NP	
	and		in		
{NP	μέσῳ}	{NP	τῶν πρεσβυτέρων}}		
	(the) middle		(of) the elders		
	dative		genitive		
	OBLIQUE		STRUCTURAL		
{NP1 {N	ἀρνίον}	{AP	ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον}	{AP	
	a lamb		standing like (one)slaughtered		
	accusative		accusative		
	OBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE		
{A	ἔχων}	{NP	κέρατα ἑπτὰ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς	ἑπτὰ}}}	
	having		horns seven and eyes	seven	
	accusative		accusative		
	OBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE		
{CP COMP <sub>e</sub> {NP	οἳ}	{INFL 3 pl. praes}			
	they who				
	nominative				
	STRUCTURAL				
{VP {V	εἰσιν < εἰμι}				
	are				



and forms with it and with τὰ [ἐπτὰ] πνεύματα a chain and therefore offers a realisation of nominative case and Case (cf. Dougherty 1992:85 who mentions “predicate adjective”). Dougherty (1992:85n11) indicates that the phrase has two predicates, viz. τὰ [ἐπτὰ] πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ and ἀπεσταλμένοι εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. The latter, as participle, is considered a circumstantial or supplementary participle. Mounce (1980:146, n. 17, cf. Charles [1920] 1971:142) correctly draws attention to the fact that ἀπεσταλμένοι (and οἱ) agrees with ὀφθαλμοῦς in gender, whereas in fact it is the πνεύματα which is sent out. The οἱ is thus attracted to the antecedent (cf. Blass *et al.* 1961:73, cf. also Du Toit 1987) with ἀπεσταλμένοι, a *constructio ad sensum*. As participle it has a verbal nature which requires a *theta* role in the form of a PP; the preposition εἰ governs the NP πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν and assigns to it accusative case which realises the oblique Case.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARNDT W F & GINGRICH F W

1952. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BEYER K

1968. *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. Band I Satzlehre Teil 1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 7.)

BLASS F, DEBRUNNER A & FUNK RW

1961. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Cambridge: University Press.

BOTHA R P

1982. 'n Roete deur die wêreld van Chomsky. In: Botha R.P. & Sinclair M. (reds.), *Chomsky in die jare tagtig*, 1-47. Stellenbosch: Die Universiteit van Stellenbosch. Departement Algemene Taalwetenskap. (Spil plus nr. 7.)

BOUSSET W

[1906] 1966. *Die Offenbarung Jobannis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

**BRATCHER R G**

1984. *A translator's guide to the Revelation of John*. London, New York, Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

**CHARLES R H**

1915. *Studies in the Apocalypse being lectures delivered before the University of London*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

[1920] 1971. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Revelation of St. John*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. (The International Critical Commentary.)

**CHOMSKY N**

1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In: Freidin R. (ed.), *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, 415-454. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT.

**CZEPLUCH H**

1988. Kasusmorphologie und Kasusrelationen: Überlegungen zur Kasustheorie am Beispiel des Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte* 116:275-310.

**DANA H E & MANTEY J R**

1957. *A manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Macmillan.

**DOUGHERTY E C A**

1992. *The syntax of the Apocalypse*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Dissertation Information Service.

**DU TOIT H C**

1987. Stylistic rules in Greek within the framework of the theory of 'Government and binding'. *S.A. Tydskrif vir Taalkunde* 5 (4):20-36.

**HAEGEMAN L**

1991. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

**LASNIK H**

1993. *Lectures on Minimalist Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT. (University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics. Occasional Papers. Issue 1.)

**LIDDELL H G, SCOTT R, JONES H S & MCKENZIE E R**

1968. *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon.

**LOHMEYER E**

1953. *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 16.)

**MOUNCE R H**

1980. *The Book of Revelation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans. (The New International Commentary on the New Testament.)

**MUSSER R E**

[1990] 1992. *Grammar in the Apocalypse. A Forschungsgeschichte*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Dissertation Information Service.

Riekert Grammatical case in Revelation 4 and 5

MUSSIES G

1980. The Greek of the Book of Revelation. In: Lambrecht J. (ed.), *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. 167-177. Gembloux: Duculot. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium LIII.)

RADFORD A

1981. *Transformational syntax. A student's guide to Chomsky's Extended Standard Theory*. Cambridge: University Press.

1988. *Transformational grammar. A first course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

RIEKERT S J P K

1985. Die GB-Teorie en kasustoeëning in Nuwe-Testamentiese Grieks. *Acta Academica* B-reeks 2:23-63.

1996. Die beskrywing van kasustoeëning in Openbaring vier en vyf volgens die GB-teorie as alternatief vir die tradisionele beskrywing van die sintaksis van die naamvalle. Bloemfontein: Universiteit van die Oranje-Vrystaat. (MA-verhandeling.)

RIENECKER F

1966. *Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*. Giessen: Brunnen-Verlag.

SWETE H B

[1908] 1968. *The Apocalypse of St. John. The Greek Text with introduction, notes and indices*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

THOMPSON S

1985. *The Apocalypse and Semitic Syntax*. Cambridge: University Press. (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 52.)

ZAHN T

[1924-26] 1986. *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*. Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

*Keywords*

New Testament Grammar

Grammatical case

Revelation 4-5

*Trefwoorde*

Nuwe-Testamentiese grammatika

Kasus

Openbaring 4-5