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Abstract
In order to describe the government by prepositions in the book of Revelation in terms of the Government and Binding Theory, it is imperative that the sub-theory of Case assignment be considered. With the latter as point of departure one may describe, i) the shifts from autothematic and structural Case to oblique Case, ii) the use of prepositions with oblique Case instead of the structural genitive Case, and, iii) the peculiarities of the Case and case assignment of the preposition επί as found in Revelation 4 and 5.

1. INTRODUCTION
The use of cases with regard to the government by prepositions forms an integral part of the remarkable and peculiar Greek featuring as the language of Revelation (cf Bousset [1906] 1966:164-8; Charles 1915:86; Mussies 1980:167; Dougherty 1992:10; Riekert 1996; 2003).

Musser (1992:1) mentions a number of suggestions advanced in the past to describe the peculiar grammatical usage of Revelation. Riekert (1996) departs 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. Therefore he presents an analysis of those two chapters regarding 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; 2003). This study of Riekert (1996) shows that in terms of abstract Case assignment no irregularities could be found, at all.
When the so-called “foreign” usage of morphological case in Revelation is considered within the framework of the Case sub-theory of the Government-Binding (GB) Theory of Chomsky, one should be in a better position to decide whether the “foreign” usage is quite so “foreign”.

Bearing in mind the developments in the realisations of the morphophonological cases from the usual in the rest of the New Testament to those in the book of Revelation (cf Charles [1920] 1971: xxxviii-cxi), one should realise that the deviations reflect only change and development within the Greek language which can easily be explained within the framework of the Case sub-theory of the Government-Binding theory (cf Riekert 1996). Nevertheless we may comment on the following developments.

2. SHIFTS FROM AUTOTHEMATIC AND STRUCTURAL CASE TO OBLIQUE CASE

We may take them together as shifts from autothematic and structural Case to oblique Case. The use of prepositions in this regard calls for a more detailed discussion.

2.1 Autothematic Case and prepositions with oblique Case

Riekert (1996:128) states with clarity that instrument and manner may be expressed by means of the so-called dative of instrument and dative of manner, but also by means of a preposition and its governed NP. It is remarkable that ἐν ἰματίοις λευκοῖς (cf Riekert 1996:71), in Revelation 4:4, is used as a prepositional phrase expressing instrument. In (1) we have the following analysis:

(1) Rev 4:4

καὶ [IP [PP [ἐπὶ] on [NP τούς θρόνους]]

[VP (ἐίδον)]

(I saw)

[NP ἐκκοσα τέσσαρας πρεσβυτέρους] [AP [καθημένους]

sitting accusative OBJECTIVE
For the analysis of the ἐπί-phrase, see (4)(a). The omitted verb έιδον assigned to the object ἐίκοσι ... περιβεβλημένους objective Case, of course realised as accusative. The participle περιβεβλημένους – described by Dougherty (1992:330) as a "circumstantial participle" – governs a PP in which P ἐν assigns oblique Case to ἰματίοις λευκοῖς, realised as dative, according to Dougherty (1992:150) as a description of manner.

Charles ([1920] 1971: cxxxix) follows a reading which has the dative ἰματίοις λευκοῖς without the ἐν and comments that the dative of instrument "is mostly replaced in our author by ἐν".

In contrast to σφραγίσων ἐπτα (Rev 5:1) and φωνή μεγάλη (Rev 5:12) (Riekert 1996:93-95, 115-116) we find ἐν τῷ ἰματίῳ (Rev 5:9) and ἐν φωνή μεγάλῃ (Rev 5:2) (Riekert 1996:95, 110-113) with identical functions in the sentence or expressing the same thematic relationship. It is clearly an illustration of the fact that the use of prepositions to express manner and instrument is augmented and that we have a concomitant shift from autothematic Case to oblique Case (cf Dougherty 1992:352), as in (2).

(2) (a) Revelation 5:2
καὶ [IP [VP [V έιδον] and I saw
[NP [N ἁγγελόν] an angel
accusative
OBJECTIVE
[AP [A ἰσχυρόν]] [AP strong
accusative
OBJECTIVE
[PP [P ἐν] in
[NP φωνή μεγάλη] A voice
OBLIQUE
proclaiming
accusative
OBJECTIVE

The head N ἁγγελόν with its head A's of the adjectival determinations, viz. ἰσχυρόν and κηρύσσοντα, is accusative as realisation of the objective Case. The verb έιδον governs the NP ἁγγελόν... μεγάλη. Dougherty (1992:333) describes κηρύσσοντα as a "supplementary participle" after έιδον. The preposition ἐν (as part of the AP κηρύσσοντα) governs the NP φωνή μεγάλη realised as dative.
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(2) (b) Revelation 5:1

[AGramme, non ADVP ἐσωθεὶν καὶ ὑποθεὶν] [AP
written
accusative
OBJECTIVE

[A kateparrakisménon] [NP ὁφραγίσιν ἑπτά] [AP
sealed
accusative
OBJECTIVE

The A’s γεγραμένον and κατεσφραγισμένον receive by indexation with βιβλίον accusative case which realises objective Case. The participle κατεσφραγισμένον as verb has a free adjunct ὁφραγίσιν ἑπτά which receives dative case as realisation of autotematic Case, in terms of the traditional grammar as instrument (cf Dougherty 1992:149). Correctly the translation uses a preposition (with) which theta-governs ὁφραγίσιν ἑπτά and assigns a theta role to it. The NP ὁφραγίσιν ἑπτά reflects the theta role of instrument. The traditional grammar (cf Dana & Mantey 1957:84; Riekert 1996:131) ascribes the theta role to the dative case or rather to the phenomenon that the case of instrument at one stage is embodied in the dative.

(2) (c) Revelation 5:9 and 10

[CP [COMP καὶ] [IP [VP ἔσφαγες]]
because and

[IP [VP [V ἡγορᾶσαι] [NP₃ [NP τῷ θεῷ] [NP τῷ αἵματί]
you have bought (for) {the} God

[PP [P ἐν] [NP [NP τῷ αἵματί] [NP [σου]]]]
with the blood (of) you

There are however less convincing readings which supply ἡμῶς (us) accusative. Nevertheless it would seem best to accept a trace here (cf Brütsch 1970:264). We assume that after ἡγορᾶσαι there is an NP-trace which may be recovered after deletion, according to Rienecker (1966:616) as object from the subsequent passage. The NP τῷ θεῷ shows in the analysis a theta role, governed by the verb, and the dative case is a realisation of inherent Case (cf Dougherty 1992:143,145-6, 156). The preposition ἐν governs the NP τῷ αἵματι and assigns to it dative case as realisation of the oblique Case.
That ἐν governs an NP here which receives a theta role of instrument or of price (cf respectively Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1961:118; Charles [1920] 1971:147), does not affect Case assignment, however the latter NP governs in its turn again the NP σοῦ and assigns to it structural genitive Case.

2.2 Structural genitive Case and prepositions with oblique Case
Another confirmation of the prevalence of the use of prepositions is seen in (3). The circumscription ἐκ τῶν πρεσβύτερων (Rev 5:5, cf Riekert 1996:99-100) is an equivalent for a (partitive) genitive, or ἐκ could be considered as a kind of marker of the genitive (cf Charles [1920] 1971:cxxix; Dougherty 1992:360). It represents a shift towards oblique Case assignment, away from structural Case assignment.

(3) Revelation 5:5.

καὶ [IP [NP [NP ἐι] and ] [PP [P ἐκ] [NP τῶν πρεσβύτερων]]

alar nominative STRUCTURAL

[INFL 3 sg. pres. act.] [VP [V λέγει] say ] [NP μοι ] ......]]

The NP ἐι is the head of the NP-phrase which serves as subject of the verb λέγει and which is coindexed with the INFL element of the verb. Therefore ἐι receives nominative case and Case (cf Dougherty 1992:74,266 who draws attention to the fact that ἐι is semantically equivalent to an indefinite pronoun). The preposition ἐκ governs the NP τῶν πρεσβύτερων and assigns therefore genitive case which realises Oblique Case. The verb λέγει governs the pronoun μοι which fills a theta role position (cf Dougherty 1992:140, 155) and assigns dative case to it as realisation of the inherent Case.

3. THE PREPOSITION EVPI, WITH SHIFTS OF CASES IN THE REALISATION OF OBLIQUE CASE
Charles ([1920] 1971:cxlii) quotes Moulton who refers to "uncertain use of cases" in Revelations. One such instance is the government of the preposition ἐπί. This preposition is used with different cases and all of them indicate the place where. In Revelation 4 and 5 it is conspicuous that ἐπί governs all three cases of the oblique Case in the sense of on, at (positionally in a place). Even more conspicuous is the use of ἐπί with forms of θρόνος (=throne) as
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(4)  (a)  (i)  Rev 4:4

καὶ  [IP  [PP  [P  ἐπὶ]  [NP  τοὺς  θρόνους]]  
and  on  the  thrones  accusative  OBLIQUE

[VP  ([V  εἶδον])]  
(I saw)

[NP  εἴκοσι  τέσσαρας  πρεσβυτέρους]  [AP  [A  καθημένους]]
twenty  four  elders  sitting  accusative  OBJECTIVE

[AP  [A  περιβεβλημένους]  [PP  [P  ἐν]  [NP  ἰματίοις  λευκοῖς]]]
clothed  in  clothes  white  accusative  OBJECTIVE

The preposition ἐπὶ governs its NP τοὺς θρόνους and assigns to it oblique Case realised as accusative, as a free adjunct to the omitted verb εἶδον (cf Riekert 1996:70). For the analysis of the object εἴκοσι τέσσαρας πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους περιβεβλημένους ἐν ἰματίοις λευκοῖς – objective Case assignment – etc, see (1).

(4)  (a)  (ii)  Rev 4:4, two elements selected in the original order.

ἐπὶ  τοὺς  θρόνους  καθημένους
on  the  thrones  sitting  accusative  accusative, participle

(4)  (a)  (iii)  Rev 4:4, two elements rearranged for comparison.

καθημένους  ἐπὶ  τοὺς  θρόνους
sitting  on  the  throne  accusative, participle  accusative

(4)  (b)  (i)  Revelation 4:2

καὶ  [IP  [VP  ([V  ἰδοῦ])]  
and  (look there is)  on  

[NP  τὸν  θρόνον]]  [NP1  (ὁνθρωπός)  καθήμενος,]]
the  throne  (a man)  sitting  nominative  OBLIQUE  STRUCTURAL
The expletive element ἵδος should be considered as omitted and the functioning is as in Riekert (1996:61-65). The NP (ἀνθρωπος) καθήμενος, has moved for the sake of emphasis with deletion of ἀνθρωπος, or it may be a substantiated participle without the article (cf Dougherty 1992:76). The Case assignment to the NP is with co-indexation to the expletive element. The realisation of the case of PP ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον draws the attention; the Case assignment is oblique, but the realisation as accusative deviates from that of classical Greek (cf Swete [1908] 1968:67; Charles [1920] 1971:112-3). Stylistically the PP is detached from a possible structuring with the NP as an adjectival phrase (cf Dougherty 1992:398) by reason of the NP movement and without any doubt made part of the VP as predicate or in the predicate position.

(4) (b) (ii) Rev 4:4, two elements selected in the original order.

ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος,
on the throne sitting
accusative nominative, participle

(4) (b) (iii) Rev 4:4, the two elements rearranged for comparison.

καθήμενος ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον
sitting on the throne
nominative, participle accusative

(4) (c) (i) (α) Revelation 4:9-10

Καὶ [CP [COMP ὅταν] [IP NPt1] and whenever

[INFL 3 pl. fut. act.] [VP [V δώσουσι] give

[NP τὰ ζωὰς]
the living creatures nominative
STRUCTURAL

[NP δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν] [NP glory and honour and thanksgiving accusative
OBJECTIVE

[NP τῷ καθήμενῳ] [PP [P ἐπὶ] [NP τῷ θρόνῳ]] (to) the One sitting on the throne dative dative
INHERENT OBLIQUE
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\[
\begin{align*}
[NP \ [NP \ \tau\phi \ \zeta\omega\nu\tau_i2] \ [PP \ [P \ eic]]] \\
\text{(to) the One living in to dative INHERENT}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[NP \ [NP \ \tau\omicron\zeta\iota\varsigma \ \alpha\iota\iota\nu\varsigma\varsigma \zeta] \ [NP \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \alpha\iota\iota\nu\varsigma\varsigma, \ ]][]][]]
\text{the eternities accusative genitive OBLIQUE STRUCTURAL}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[IP \ NP_{t3} \ [INFL \ 3 \ pl. \ fut. \ mid. \ dep.]]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[VP \ [V \ \pi\varepsilon\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\iota]] \\
\text{fall (down)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[NP_{t3} \ \iota \ \epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\sigmai \ \tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma \ \pi\nu\rho\varepsilon\nu\tau\omicron\tau\iota\omicron\iota] \\
\text{the twenty four elders nominative STRUCTURAL}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[PP \ [P \ \epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\pi\omicron\nu]] \ [NP \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \kappa\alpha\theta\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\nu]]]
\text{before the One sitting on genitive OBLIQUE}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[PP \ [P \ \epsilon\pi]] \ [NP \ [P \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \theta\rho\omicron\nu\omega]]][]]
\text{on the throne genitive OBLIQUE}
\end{align*}
\]

The NPs τά ζώα and οἱ εἰκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι are generated in the SPEC- or subject position of INFL. These NPs are coindexed with INFL and therefore receive structural nominative Case and case; they are at a later stage moved to a position to the right of the verb (cf Dougherty 1992:392). We may note here that INFL is marked plural where Attic Greek would prefer singular (cf Riekert 1996:84; Dougherty 1992:102). Otherwise it can be accepted with Thompson (1985:88) that they have been generated under the influence of the Hebrew syntactic rules in that position, without any influence on Case assignment. The recursive composed NP δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν is generated by the verb δώσουσιν (from δίδωμι) and it assigns to it objective Case which is realised as accusative (cf Dougherty 1992:187). The NP τῷ καθημένῳ is also governed by the verb δώσουσιν which assigns inherent Case, realised as dative in a theta-grid position (cf Dougherty 1992:140,156,179). The NP τῷ ζώντει is in apposition with the NP τῷ καθημένῳ and it is antecedent-governed by it and receives the same Case and case by coindexation. As substantiated participles the NP’s τῷ καθημένῳ and τῷ ζώντει have the possibility to take free adjuncts in the form of prepositional phrases (cf Dougherty 1992:396). The preposition ἐπὶ governs in the first instance the NP τῷ θρόνῳ and in the second instance the NP τοῦ
θρόνου; both NP's are affected by oblique Case assignment, but the two assignments are respectively realised as dative and genitive. The preposition ἐπί which realised its oblique Case as accusative in sentences (6) and (10) also features in this sentence. In this instance the assignment of oblique Case is problematic. The presupposition by oblique Case as inherent Case is that the assignment would be dependent on the inherent characteristics of the Case assigner. In all these instances ἐπί has the same meaning. We have therefore no justification for more than one case realisation to be found, cf Riekert 1996:132-146. The prepositions εἶς and ἐνώπιον also assign oblique Case, respectively realised as accusative (τοῦ ἁιώνας) and genitive (τοῦ καθημένου), according to the inherent characteristics of the Case assigners. The NP τοῦ ἁιώνας also governs the NP τῶν ἁιώνων, and assigns to it structural genitive Case and case, all according to the principles of Greek Case assignment, (cf Dougherty 1992:124-5) even if the expression reflects a Hebrew and Aramaic superlative construction.

(4) (c) (i) (β) Revelation 5:1

Kaí [IP PPT₁* [VP [V εἶδον] [PP₁ [P ἐπὶ [NP τῆν δεξιὰν]] [NP τοῦ καθημένου]] [PP (One) sitting genitive STRUCTURAL

[PP ἐπὶ [NP τοῦ θρόνου]]]] [NP [N καθημένου] [PP têν δεξιὰν] the right hand accusative OBLIQUE

[P ἐπὶ [NP τοῦ θρόνου] on the throne genitive OBLIQUE

[N bibliōn] a book accusative OBJECTIVE

The PP ἐπὶ... τοῦ θρόνου could move from any one of the two trace positions [PPT] marked by an asterisk. It does not affect, however in any way the Case assignment regardless from which trace position it would move. The move however eclipses to a degree the observation of the objective Case of bibliōn... κατεσφραγισμένον... when the PP₁ moves to a position between εἶδον and its NP with objective Case realised as accusative. The preposition ἐπὶ governs firstly τῆν δεξιὰν and secondly τοῦ θρόνου and assigns to them oblique Case, respectively realised as accusative and genitive case, but with the same meaning (cf Brütsch 1970:244). This difference indicates a clash with the oblique Case as an inherent Case assignment (cf Riekert 1996:132-146). The NP τῆν δεξιὰν governs the NP τοῦ καθημένου and assigns to it genitive case and Case.
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(4) (c) (i) (γ) Revelation 5:7

καὶ [IP [VP [ἐλθεῖν]]] he took [PP [ἐκ] [NP from]

[NP τῆς δεξιᾶς] the right hand genitive OBLIQUE

[NP τοῦ καθημένου] (of) the (one) sitting genitive STRUCTURAL

[PP [ἐπὶ] on [NP τοῦ θρόνου]] the throne genitive OBLIQUE

The PP ἐκ ..... θρόνου receives a theta role from the verb ἔφθασεν. The P ἐκ assigns genitive case as realisation of the oblique Case to τῆς δεξιᾶς which in turn governs the NP τοῦ καθημένου and assigns to it structural genitive Case. As a participle καθημένου has a theta role which has been filled by the PP ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου where P ἐπὶ with genitive case offers a realisation of the oblique Case assignment.

(4) (c) (ii) (α) Rev 4:9; 5:13, two elements selected in the original order.

τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ
the one sitting on the throne dative, participle dative

touro kaqhme,nou evpi tou qro,nou
the One sitting on the throne genitive, participle genitive

(4) (c) (ii) (β) Rev 4:10; 5:1; 5:7, two elements selected in the original order.

touro kaqhme,nou ἐπὶ του θρόνου
the One sitting on the throne genitive, participle genitive

(4) (c) (iii) Rev 4:9; 5:13, variant readings of (4)(c)(ii)(α).

τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου
the One sitting on the throne genitive, participle genitive

dative, participle genitive

In (4) (a) (i), (4) (b) (i), (4) (c) (i) (α) and (4) (c) (i) (β) present instances where ἐπὶ is used with an alternation between accusative, genitive and dative without any difference in meaning. When one rearranges the word order of (4)(a)(i) and (4) (b) (i) to have all of them uniform, (as in respectively (4) (a) (iii) and (4) (b) (iii)), then they correspond with (4) (c) (ii) (α), (4) (c) (ii) (β) and (4) (c) (iii) in structure and the following pattern (5) which Bousset [1906] 1966:165-6, cf Charles [1920] 1971:113; Lohmeyer 1953:45) has already indicated, becomes obvious.
Only the variant reading according to (4) (c) (iii) disturbs the pattern: in this case \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\) governs a NP in the genitive case following a dative participle.

It seems that we have here assimilation, or rather assonance, of the case governed by \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\) to the case of the participle of \(\kappa\alpha\theta\varepsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\lambda\iota\). Nevertheless, the assimilation is limited, for the nominative participle preceding \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\), fails to bring about that the case following \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\) be nominative, but indeed accusative. That should be ascribed to the rules regulating Case assignment. Nominative case cannot realise an oblique Case assignment (cf Riekert 1993:70). Assimilation-assonance however cannot completely explain the use of different case of the word \(\theta\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\zeta\).

The Case theory determines that the preposition \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\) just like all the other prepositions assigns oblique Case. The question is now how would it be realised in terms of cases. All three of those cases which realise oblique and inherent Cases, could be considered in principle. The fact that the nominative participle has a different case following \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\) and breaks the pattern of correspondence between the case of the participle and the case of the NP following \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\), confirms that the Case assignment rules are obeyed here. Riekert (1996:136-141) analyses combinations of \(\kappa\alpha\theta\varepsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\lambda\iota\) as well as other verbs with \(\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\) where the formulation of (5) is not valid.

The instances in (6) come into consideration.

(6) (a) (i) Revelation 4:4

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\kappa\alpha\iota \quad [\text{IP}] \quad [\text{PP}] \quad [\text{P}] \quad [\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota] \quad [\text{NP}] \quad [\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma] \quad [\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma] \quad [\text{NP}] \quad [\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu] \quad [\text{of them}] \quad [\text{genitive}] \quad [\text{structural}] \\
\text{and} \quad \text{on} \quad \text{the heads} \quad \text{accusative} \quad \text{OBLIQUE} \\
[V(P) \quad [\epsilon\iota\delta\omega\nu]] \quad [\text{NP}] \quad [\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha} \nu\omega\varsigma] \quad [\chi\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\zeta] \\
\text{(I saw) crowns golden OBJECTIVE} \\
\end{array}
\]

(6) (a) (ii) Rev 4:4

\[
\begin{array}{l}
[\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota] \quad [\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma] \quad [\text{on}] \quad [\text{the heads}] \quad [\text{accusative}] \\
\end{array}
\]
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The preposition ἐπί governs its NP τὰς κεφαλὰς and assigns to it oblique Case realised as accusative; the NP τὰς κεφαλὰς in its turn the NP αὐτῶν and assigns to it structural genitive Case and case. The omitted verb ἔδωκεν realises as accusative the assigned objective Case of its object στεφάνιος χρυσοῦς (cf Riekert 1996:71, 72), with the PP ἐπι ..... αὐτῶν as a free adjunct to the omitted verb.

(6) (b) (i) (α) Revelation 5:3

καὶ [IP [NP [NP οὐδείς]] [INFL 3 sg. impf.]]
and nobody nominative STRUCTURAL

[VP [V1 {AUX} ἐδώκετο ] [PP [P ἐν]]
is able in

[NP τῶν οὐρανῶν]] [NP οὐδείς] [PP [P ἐπὶ] [NP τῆς γῆς]]
the heaven dative genitive OBLIQUE

[PP [P υποκάτω] [NP τῆς γῆς]]
and (not) underneath the earth genitive OBLIQUE

The NP οὐδείς has nominative case and Case as subject which is coindexed with INFL of ἐδώκετο which is directly next to οὐδείς (vgl Dougherty 1992:72, 387, 389). The preposition ἐπί governs the NP τῶν οὐρανῶν and assigns to it dative case which realises the oblique Case (cf also Riekert 1996:96-98, 113, 118-121). The Ps ἐπί and υποκάτω govern the NP τῆς γῆς and assign to it genitive case which realises the oblique Case.
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(6)  (b)  (i) (β)  Revelation 5:10

καὶ  [IP [VP [V βασιλεύσουσιν]]  [PP [P ἐπὶ]]  [NP τῆς γῆς]]]
and  they shall rule  on  the earth

(6)  (b)  (ii)  Rev 5:3, 10, 13

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
on  the  earth

generic

(6)  (c)  (i)  Revelation 5:13

καὶ  [IP [NP1 [NP πᾶν κτίσμα]] [CP COMPe]
and  every creature

[IP [NP ὃ]]
which

([INFL 3 sg. praes.])

[VP (〚V ἐστιν < εἰμι〛)]
in

[NP τῷ οὐρανῷ]]  καὶ  [PP [P ἐπὶ]]  [NP τῆς γῆς]]  καὶ
the heaven  and  on  the earth

dative  genitive

[PP [P ὑποκάτω]]  [NP τῆς γῆς]]  καὶ  [PP [P ἐπὶ]]
underneath  the earth  and  on

[PP [P ὑποκάτω]]  [NP τῆς γῆς]]  καὶ  [PP [P ἐπὶ]]
underneath  the earth  and  on

[NP τῆς θαλάσσης]]]]
the sea

genitive

[NP [DET τὰ]]  [PP [P ἐπὶ]]
the (things)  in

[AP αὐτῶν]]]  [VP [V ήκούσακα]]  [VP [V λέγοντας]]
them  all  I heard

dative  accusative

NPt1  [IP [A λέγοντας] ..... ]]]
saying

accusative

OBJECTIVE
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Because of the length of the NP πᾶν ἀυτοίς πάντα which moved in front of the verb to take the topicalisation position, the construction of the sentence is not so obvious.

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

The DET τά is accentuated by means of the PP ἐν which governs the NP ἀυτοίς and assigns to it dative case as realisation of the oblique Case. Lohmeyer (1953: 57) is of the opinion that τά ἐν ἀυτοίς 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) formulates it “the whole universe”, according to Bousset ([1906] 1966: 262, cf Charles [1920] 1971: 150) in terms of a quatro-partition. The fact that the whole is meant seems to be confirmed by the use of πάντα as an adjective to strengthen 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) τά and λέγονταις and it has the Case assignment in common with the rest.

The verb ἀκοῦω is sub-categorised to take the participle together with the object and in this case λέγονταις which then like πᾶν κτίσμα and τά have accusative case as realisation of the objective Case which is also a *constructio ad sensum* (cf Charles [1920] 1971: cxlii; Dougherty 1992: 343). Consequently the agreement with regard to number and case and Case is uncomplicated (cf Dougherty 1992: 332, 341-2), however with regard to grammatical gender there is a problem, which becomes obvious from the text critical apparatus reflecting attempts to change λέγονταις to neuter plural in agreement with τά.

(6) (c) (ii) Rev 5:13

ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης
on the sea genitive

The preposition governs τῆς γῆς and assigns to it genitive case which is a realisation of the oblique Case. Blass, Debrunner & Funk
(1961:96) correctly assume that the PP ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is not a substitute for a direct object – it is in fact a free adjunct.

All the principles of case realisations which are gleaned from (4)(a)(i) to (4)(c)(iii), seem to be valid here. The explanation of the assimilation of the cases of θρόνος (=throne) would rather be sought in the rhetorical situation. The word θρόνος with the participal construction of καθήσθαι ἐπὶ serves as an indication of God being the One who holds sway over everything. Therefore Lohmeyer (1953:45) explains the pattern in the use of ἐπὶ with different cases as follows: "Das ist grammatisch gekünstelt, hat aber, zieht Man die damit verbundene Vermeidung des Gottesname in Betracht, den eindeutige Sinn Thron und Gott zu einen Begriff gleicher Art und gleichen Wesens zu verbinden, dass auch durch Deklination diese gleichschwebende Einheit nicht gestört wird". The assimilation respects the principles for Case assignment.

In all the instances supplied in (4) ἐπὶ has the meaning of on, at in the meaning of place where something rests, be positionally. From the perspective of language economy it is problematic to have three cases to serve one function. Charles ([1920] 1971:112-3; cf Swete [1908] 1968:67; Riekert 1996:67) draws attention to the efforts made to find different meanings in the usage of three cases, regrettably with scant success, should we ignore the mere listing of cases.

The definition of Liddell e a (1968:621-2) of the meaning of ἐπὶ and usage, to express locality, may be expressed as in (7).

(7)  
(a) ἐπὶ with genitive: locality with verbs of resting, or with verbs of movement where the subject is resting on something (like on a horse or wagon): on, with at. A number of idiomatic expressions are only used with the genitive.
(b) ἐπὶ with dative: locality, similar in meaning to (a).
(c) ἐπὶ with accusative: locality, with verbs of movement, unto an object or place, or to a higher object, place or in hostile sense: to; unto; against.

The conclusion (8) may now be drawn:

(8)  
(a) ἐπὶ in the sense of on, at might take in classical Greek its case in either genitive or dative to realise the oblique Case, and in this regard there was always the freedom of stylistic choice between genitive and dative.
(b) ἐπὶ with its NP in accusative case in the sense of on, at shows a shift in the case realisation which should be investigated in more detail.
Reconsidering prepositions

According to Browning (1983:82) all prepositions in late medieval Greek govern the accusative. Where the genitive still appears, Browning (1983:83) ascribes it to the aftermath of literary Greek. The classical distinctions in meaning between prepositions with different cases then fall away.

Riekert (1996:142-144) gives the following examples from Revelation where ἐπί with accusative is used in the classical meaning of (7)(c).


εβαλεν τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
he threw the sickle of him on the earth accusative

(b) Revelation 6:16, cf 2:24; 18:19

Πέσετε ἐφ’ (=epi) ἡμᾶς
fall on us accusative

(c) Revelation 1:17, cf 22:18 (twice)

ἠθηκεν τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ἐμὲ
he placed the right hand (of) him on me accusative

(d) Revelation 7:17

δοθησεὶ αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ .... πηγὰς
he will guide them to .... springs accusative

(e) Revelation 3:12, cf 2:17; 17:5, 8; 19:16

γράψω ἐπ’ αὐτῶν τὸ ὄνομα
I will write on him the name accusative

(f) Revelation 16:8, cf 16:10, 12, 17.

ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ἥλιον,
he poured out the bowl of him on the sun accusative

(g) Rev 16:21

καταβαίνει τὸν ἀνθρώπους, it descends .... onto the people accusative
In (9)(a) to (j) it becomes conspicuous that ἐπὶ with the accusative functions in the classical meaning. It would appear that ἐπὶ with the genitive never functions in this sense. The only possible instances are in (10)

(10) Revelation 7:1

(10) (a) πνεύμα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
blow on the earth genitive

(10) (b) (πνεύμα) ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης
(blow) on the sea genitive

(10) (c) (πνεύμα) ἐπὶ πάν τὴν δέντραν.
(blow) on every tree accusative

Charles ([1920] 1971:191) would like to read the phrase (10) (a) to (c) in the same way when he says: "We should expect either accusatives throughout or genitives". He attributes the alteration to the fact that the author uses certain characteristic phrases. It is possible, but this instance may serve as tangible proof that the distinction between ἐπὶ with accusative is still maintained (cf Mounce 1977:165-6; 166N3; Riekert 1993:73). The translations supplied, present such an understanding for (10)(c) for which we have a parallel in (11).
Reconsidering prepositions

(11) Rev 3:3

\[ \text{ἐπὶ \ ἡς ὁς} \quad \text{ἐπὶ} \quad \text{σου} \\]

I will come against you

accusative

Riekert (1996:144-5) discusses the uses of \(\varepsilon \pi'\), + genitive and accusative in Rev 7:1 and Rev 3:3. Which leads to the conclusion:

Therefore we may assume that the author offers us a subtle distinction here: the wind will blow on the earth and on the sea but against the trees. In this case: (10)(a) to (c) presents a demonstration that the distinction between \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with accusative and \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with the genitive still exist for the author of Revelation. Please note that the change goes in one direction only: the accusative gain usage and assumes usage from the genitive.

4. CONCLUSION

The question arises as to how we should account for the facts in (4) to (11) with the Case theory. In the classical period there it is settled that Case assignment by prepositions was oblique. This oblique Case was potentially realised in three different cases and these cases were inevitably determined by the meaning which should be expressed. The instances in (4) to (9) in contrast with (10) demonstrates that as far as it concerns \(\varepsilon \pi'\), the distinction between \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with accusative and \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with genitive or dative was on the wane. Furthermore, this indicates that the accusative acquires greater use and it reflects a development similar to the usage of prepositions in English which prevails upon Chomsky (1981:49, 50, 292-3) to conclude that English has the marked characteristic that a P assigns structural objective Case.

Should one assume that Case in Revelation is still assigned obliquely after prepositions, then it follows that an N can be taken from the lexicon in either accusative, genitive or dative case. The Case control filter is indeed functional, but it passes any one of the three forms as realisation of the oblique Case, because of the developments discussed above. In the phase preceding Revelation, the filter has prevented the accusative with \(\varepsilon \pi'\) in the sense of on, at (positional in a place). When the genitive and dative in a subsequent development, were in the process of becoming obsolete, then only would the Case control filter start to prevent them. \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with accusative was already gaining usage at the expense of \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with genitive or dative. The distinction in meaning between \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with accusative and \(\varepsilon \pi'\) with genitive or dative was already disappearing in Revelation.
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