GRAMMATICAL CASE IN THE TEXT OF REVELATION 4 AND 5

S.J.P.K. Riekert

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.


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).
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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 \( \text{kύκλως} \)

It is remarkable that \( \text{kύκλως} \) 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) \( \text{kύκλως} \) may be described as an aut 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) \( \text{kύκλως} \) 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

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[NP [NP } \\
\text{kύκλως]} \\
\text{surrounding(-space)} \\
\text{dative} \\
\text{AUTO-THEMATIC} \\
\text{καὶ τῶν ζῴων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων]} \\
\text{and the living creatures and the elders} \\
\text{... genitive .....} \\
\text{... STRUCTURAL} \\
\text{the throne} \\
\text{genitive} \\
\text{STRUCTURAL}
\end{array}
\]

The description of \( \text{kύκλως} \) can potentially be different. \( \text{kύκλως} \) may be described as dative (Rienecker 1966:616) and then as noun which governs the following, NP \( \text{τοῦ θρόνου} \) \( \text{πρεσβυτέρων} \) 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 \( \text{ἐξομολογούμενον} \) \( \text{πολλῶν} \) and the receiver of aut thematic Case. Otherwise we may describe \( \text{kύκλως} \) 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 | genitive… |
| petrified N as P | OBLIQUE… |
| καὶ τῶν ζώων | καὶ τῶν πρεσβύτερων |
| and the living creatures | and the elders |
| … genitive … | … genitive |
| … OBLIQUE … | … OBLIQUE |

2. CASE ASSIGNMENT BY ἴδοὺ

Similarly, ἴδοὺ 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 | (ἴδοὺ) | NP ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ]]
| (look there is) | nominative |
| | STRUCTURAL |

The case of Case assignment is the nominative after ἴδοumont. Rienecker (1966:615) explains it merely as an Hebraism. Blass et al. (1961:80) mention that the nominative could best be explained by accepting ἴδοumont 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’κιναι and (παρ’γινέσθαι may be omitted after ἴδοumont. Beyer (1968:57-8; cf. Charles [1920] 1971: cxxx, 106-7; Dougherty 1992:90, n. 19, 539-40) illustrates the five constructions of the Hebrew 727 and its renderings in the Septuagint. Accordingly, it is clear that the renderings of 727 in Greek take place as an expletive element. καὶ ἴδοumont 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 ἐδού, which is also co-indexed to the NP ἐ ὑφων ἐ 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 [NP [V ἠκούσα] [NP [NP ὑφων] [NP ὑφων] [NP ὑφων] [NP ὑφων] [NP ὑφων]]]]
and I heard (a) sound
accusative
STRUCTURAL

The verb ἠκούσα governs the NP φωνην and assigns to the head φωνην objective Case realised as accusative case.

The above analysis accepts that the NP φωνην 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 ἠκούσα 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, [NP [NP πᾶν κτίσμα] [NP πᾶν κτίσμα] [CP COMP e]]]]
and every creature
accusative
OBJECTIVE
Because of the length of the NP \(\pi\alpha\nu\ldots\;\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\) which moved in front of the verb to take the topicalisation position, the construction of the sentence is not so obvious.

The verb \(\eta\kappa\omicron\sigma\alpha\) governs the NP-construction above and assigns to the heads of the recursive composed NP, viz. to \(\pi\alpha\nu\;\kappa\tau\acute{i}\sigma\mu\alpha\) and \(\tau\alpha\) 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 ἀυτοῖς and assigns to it dative case as realisation of the oblique
Case. Lohmeyer (1953:57) is of the opinion that τὰ ἐν ἀυτοῖς 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]
that the whole is meant seems confirmed by the use of πᾶντα as a adjec-
tive to strengthen the resumption. Charles ([1920] 1971:136) shows that
πᾶντα follows its noun only in two other instances in Revelation. Dougherty
(1992:220, 225) considers πᾶντα as a substantive adjective. In this case we
have a different construction and AP with πᾶντα changes to NP. It is also
part of the chain with (πᾶν κτίσμα) τὰ and ἔγοντας, and it has the Case
assignment in common with the rest.

The verb ἀκοίησα is sub-categorised to take the participle together with
the object and in this case ἔγοντας which then like πᾶν κτίσμα and τὰ
has accusative case as realisation of the objective Case which is also a con-
agreement with regard to number and case and Case is therefore unproble-
matic. There is, however, a problem with respect to grammatical gender, as
it becomes obvious from the text critical apparatus which reflects attempts
to change ἔγοντας to neuter plural in agreement with τὰ (cf. Dougherty

(6) Revelation 4:1

| PP [P =τ'] | [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP [P =τ'] | [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
| [NP | ἐμοὶ|] | [IP [PRō | [A | λέγωσιν...]]] | me which says
| OBJIQUE | genitive | nominative |
In sentence (6) we have the relative clause ἵν ἔχεισα 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 ἔχεισα. 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 ὃς 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.

\[ \text{ὁς} \quad \text{φωνή} \quad \text{σάλπιγγος} \]
like (a) voice (a) trumpet

Charles ([1920] 1971:35) also indicates that ὃς 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’ ἑμοῦ 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 (ίδοὺ)] [NP1 ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρῶτη] [CP a voice, the first nominative STRUCTURAL

COMP2 [IP [NP ἦτε,] [VP [V ἤκουσα] [NP2 which I heard accusative OBJECTIVE

[ADVP [ADV ἦς] [NP NP2 [NP σὰλπιγγος λαλούσης] like (of) a trumpet talking genitive STRUCTURAL

[PP [P πρητ'] [NP ἐμοί] [IP PRO1 [A λέγων] 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 1913:85; [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 יָנָא. 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 λέγουσας 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.
Because much of (8) was discussed in (5), the discussion here is limited to what we have observed thus far concerning λέγοντας.
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We have noted the attempts to correct the grammatical gender to λέγοντα, neuter plural in agreement with τά. It is clearly an instance where ἀκούω takes the participle together with the object.

4.1.3 λέγοντάς in (9) should also be discussed.

(9) Revelation 5:11 and 12

καὶ [IP NPt1 [INFL 3 sg. impf.]] [VP [V ἔσ- < εἰμι]] [NP1]
and to be

[NP ὁ ἀριθμὸς] [NP αὐτῶν]
the number (of) them
nominative genitive

STRUCTURAL STRUCTURAL

[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 PROj [INFL (3) pl. praes.]]
(of thousands
genitive

STRUCTURAL

[AP [A λέγοντας]] [NP φωνῆ μεγάλην]]][][]
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 ἔσ- 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. 192
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 *λέγωντες* is co-indexed with PRO in its own IP. As far as the number is concerned *λέγωντες* is co-indexed with *αὐτῶν* and as far as the case is concerned, with the head of *αὐτῶν*; therefore, with ὁ ἄρθρομος, 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 ἄρθρομος..... *χιλιάδων* is a parenthetic clause to sentence (6) and that *λέγωντες* ὑφή μεγάλη is part of that clause. In this case *λέγωντες* 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 ὑφήν or *λέγοντων* to be in agreement with ἀγγέλων πολλῶν. The NP ὑφήν μεγάλη is a free adjunct to *λέγωντες* 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

4.2.1 *ἐχων* 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 ζῶν] and the third living creature nominative

structural

(INFL impf. 3 sg. akk.) [VP (ἥ < ἔμι) to be

[AP [A *ἐχων*] possessing the face nominative accusative

structural objective
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{[ADV ως]} [NP ἄνθρωπος)]
(o) a human being

genitive

STRUCTURAL

The assignment of structural nominative Case and case to the NP τὸ πρὸτον ζῷον 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 ζῷον (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 πρόδοτον and assigns to it objective Case (obviously realised as accusative) (cf. Dougherty 1992:160). At the same time πρόδοτον governs the NP (ως) ἄνθρωπος to which it assigns structural genitive Case and case. ως 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 tepóssara ωςa] the four living creatures
and
nominative

STRUCTURAL

[NP [NP [P [P καὶ [NP [NP eν] one
[INFL impf. 3 sg.]]] one
for

nominative

oblique

STRUCTURAL

[NP [INFL impf. 3 sg.]]] (of) them
[VP (V (ἐἶμι < υπ) (to be))

genitive

STRUCTURAL
The NP τὰ τέσσαρα ζω'α displays nominative case and Case in the SPEC- or subject position of INFL and is linked by means of the apposition to the NP ἕν which is also nominative by antecedent government. The preposition καθ' which expresses distributive meaning, assigns to ἕν oblique Case which is realised as accusative (cf. Charles [1920] 1971:124; Dougherty 1992:174). This NP ἕν in its turn governs the NP αὖτωνν and assigns to it structural genitive Case and case. The participle ἔχων as A is by co-indexation with the first ἕν nominative, according to Bousset ([1906] 1966:250; Swete [1908] 1968:cxlin 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:cxlii) indicates that the ad sensum construction continues until Revelation 4:9 with γεμουσιν, ἔχωνν and λέγοντες, which are all constructiones ad sensum. Remarkable is the stylistic numerical co-indexation with ἕν and not with τὰ τέσσαρα ζω'α. Dougherty (1992:336-8) describes it as a "circumstantial participle". As verb ἔχων assigns to the NP πτερυγιας ἕξ 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 ἀνάνεω as distributive adverb. Dana & Mantey (1957:99), on the other hand, wrongly take ἀνάνεω 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 ἀνάνεω πτερυγιας ἕξ] could be analysed as in (12).

(12)

[AP [A ἔχων] [PP [P ἀνάνεω] [ NP πτερυγιας ἕξ]]]

possessing to wings six

nominative accusative

In this case a NP to fill the θeta role grid of ἔχων is lacking whereas the above analysis clearly gives it. The insertion of an adverb, and in particular ἀνάνεω, 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

Kαὶ [IP [VP [V ἐίδον] NP₁]
and
[PP [P ἐν] [NP [NP μέσῳ] (the) middle
dative
OBLIQUE
[VP [V ἐν] [NP (of) the throne and the four living creatures
dative genitive
STRUCTURAL
καὶ [PP [P ἐν] [NP and in
[NP μέσῳ] [NP τῶν πρεσβυτέρων]] (of) the elders
dative genitive
OBLIQUE STRUCTURAL
[VP [V ἐν] [NP (of) the throne and the four living creatures
dative genitive
καὶ [PP [P ἐν] [NP and in
[NP μέσῳ] [NP τῶν πρεσβυτέρων]] (of) the elders
dative genitive
OBLIQUE STRUCTURAL

[AP [ći] [AP [ći] [ći] a lamb standing like (one)slaughtered
accusative accusative
OBJECTIVE OBJECTIVE
[AP [ći] [ći] [ći] having horns seven and eyes seven
accusative accusative
OBJECTIVE OBJECTIVE
[CP COMP [NP [ći] [INFL 3 pl. praes] they who
nominative
STRUCTURAL
[VP [V < εἰμι] are
The P ἐν assigns to both the NP’s μέσων oblique Case which is realised as dative case and this NP in turn governs two NPs and assigns to them structural genitive Case, realised also as genitive case, viz. to (i): τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων which forms a NP with a recursive build up, and (ii): τῶν πρεσβύτερων, μέσων could be considered to be merely implied before τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων. The above analysis accepts that the phrase τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων reflects a single concept of space. Lohmeyer (1953:54; cf. Bousset [1906] 1966:257; Swete [1908] 1968:78; Charles [1920] 1971:136,140) expresses the opinion that the double ἐν μέσων is an Hebraism and therefore indicates the two boundaries of one space: the Lamb is standing in this case between the throne with the circle of living creatures on the one side and the elders on the other. Swete ([1908] 1968:78; cf. Charles [1920] 1971:140) prefers to understand it in the sense “the middle of all” — the Lamb as the focus of the entire scene. The verb ἐδόν governs the NP ἄρνου, although the PPs discussed above moved in between ἐδόν and ἄρνου, which realised the accusative case as objective Case assignment. The AP ἐστίν καὶ ἐσφάγμενον is an adjustment to and consequently forms a chain with ἄρνου and the Case assignment is objective, realised as accusative like the A ἔχον (which as in Riekkert 1996:79-80, is an uncommon morphological realisation; cf. Dougherty 1992:331, 336-8), but it is nevertheless accusative in agreement with ἄρνου. In its turn ἔχον as participle (cf. Dougherty 1992:334,336 who classifies it as both a circumstantial and a supplementary participle) is also verbal in nature; it governs κέρατα ἐπτὰ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπτὰ and realises accusative case as objective Case assignment, also a NP with recursive build up (cf. Dougherty 1992:160, 186). The NP οἱ relative pronoun in a relative clause, receives nominative case and Case by means of co-indexation with INFL and the NP τὰ [ἐπτὰ] πνεύματα by means of co-indexation with οἱ also structural nominative Case (cf. Dougherty 1992:71, 83). The latter NP in turn governs the NP τοῦ θεοῦ and assigns to it genitive case and Case. The participle ἀπεσταλμένοι as adjective is co-indexed with οἱ.
and forms with it and with τὰ [ἐπὶ τὰ] πνεῦματα 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 [ἐπὶ τὰ] πνεῦματα 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 ὁι) agrees with ὁμίλον; in gender, whereas in fact it is the πνεῦματα which is sent out. The ὁ 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 to the NP πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν and assigns to it accusative Case which realises the oblique Case.
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