

DOUBLE CASE CONSTRUCTIONS IN KOINE GREEK

Martin M. Culy

Briercrest College and Seminary, Caronport, SK, Canada

1. *Introduction*

It has long been recognized that the Greek language makes use of double case constructions—at least the double accusative variety. Although only certain verbs allow for such constructions,¹ they are nevertheless commonly encountered by readers of the New Testament and other Greek literature. Drawing on basic notions from Transformational Grammar and Relational Grammar in particular, this article will (1) demonstrate that the other cases of Koine Greek, with the sole exception of the vocative,² also occur in double case constructions; (2) explain the linguistic phenomena that produce such constructions; (3) highlight how other linguistic phenomena may lead to pseudo-double accusative constructions; and (4) briefly highlight some of the exegetical implications of the proposed analysis.

Wallace points out that in double accusative constructions³ ‘one accusative substantive is the direct object of the verb and the other accusative (either noun, adjective, participle or infinitive) complements

1. Daniel B. Wallace lists more than fifty such verbs that occur in the New Testament. See ‘The Semantics and Exegetical Significance of the Object–Complement Construction in the New Testament’, *GTJ* 6 (1985), pp. 91-112 (96 n. 23).

2. The vocative does occasionally appear in object–complement constructions with a verb of identification. In such instances, it replaces whatever case would have been expected in the complement. For example, in Jn 1.38 we find ‘Ραββί, ὃ λέγεται μεθερμηνεύμενον, Διδάσκαλε (‘Rabbi, which means when it is translated, Teacher’). In this text, Διδάσκαλε serves as a complement to the relative pronoun ὃ, forming what would normally be a subject–complement double nominative construction. The complement, however, is vocative rather than nominative. For more on subject–complement constructions, see below.

3. In the analysis of double accusative constructions that follows, the discussion is limited to object–complement constructions. The reason for this will become evident below.

the object in that it predicates something about it'.⁴ Thus, in Jn 15.15 (οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους—'I no longer call you slaves'), for example, the accusative ὑμᾶς serves as the direct object of the verb λέγω, and the accusative δούλους serves as the complement. In his early work on this phenomenon, Wallace attempted to answer three key questions: (1) How can we recognize object–complement constructions? (2) How can we distinguish the object from the complement, since they both bear the same case? and (3) What is the semantic significance of the object–complement construction.⁵ This article will focus primarily on attempting to answer Wallace's first question more fully and broadening the discussion to include all double case constructions that occur in Koine Greek.⁶ In the final section, the semantic significance of some of the linguistic phenomena we have examined will be explored briefly.

2. *Passivization and Double Nominative Constructions*

To understand one of the syntactic motivations for non-accusative double case constructions, we must first recognize the nature of passivization in Greek and other languages. Following insights from classical Transformational Grammar,⁷ any given active sentence, such as (1)

4. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), p. 182. In Wallace's earlier formulation, he did not include infinitives as possible complements, but rather had raised the question of whether infinitives functioned as complements in a number of cases. See Wallace, 'Semantics and Exegetical Significance', p. 93. In the final section of this article, I will argue that the examples with infinitives involve subordinate infinitival clauses rather than complements. Infinitives are thus best left out of the definition of double accusative constructions; cf. A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), p. 480.

5. Wallace, 'Semantics and Exegetical Significance', p. 94.

6. Readers interested in a thorough introduction to double accusative constructions are encouraged to consult Wallace, 'Semantics and Exegetical Significance'; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, pp. 181-89; and Robertson, *Grammar*, pp. 479-84.

7. See, e.g., Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton, 1957); Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965); Andrew Radford, *Transformational Syntax* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Andrew Radford, *Transformational Grammar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

below, can be ‘transformed’ into a passive sentence (2) through a simple process:

(1) The boy hit the ball.

(2) The ball was hit by the boy.

Active sentence (1) has been passivized to form sentence (2) by (a) moving the direct object ‘the ball’ into the subject position, (b) moving the agent (the one performing the action) from the subject position to follow the verb as part of a prepositional phrase headed by the preposition ‘by’, and (c) changing the verb form from active to passive. Theoretically, any transitive clause in English could be transformed into a passive clause using this process.

An analogous process is used to derive passive constructions in Koine Greek:

(3) ἐξέβαλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ὄχλον (‘Jesus sent away the crowd’)

(4) ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (‘the crowd was sent away by Jesus’)

As was the case in the English example above, the process of passivization in Koine Greek is straightforward.⁸ The direct object of the active clause (τὸν ὄχλον) becomes the subject of the passive clause (ὁ ὄχλος). In Relational Grammar terms, the direct object has ‘advanced’ to subject.⁹ The semantic agent of the verb, ὁ Ἰησοῦς in (3), also takes on a new syntactic role,¹⁰ a role marked in English by the preposition ‘by’ and in Greek by the preposition ὑπό. In Relational Grammar, this role is known as a *chômeur*¹¹ (‘unemployed one’) or

8. See David M. Perlmutter and Paul M. Postal, ‘Toward a Universal Characterization of Passivization’, in D.M. Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in Relational Grammar* 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 3-29. The labels ‘subject’, ‘direct object’ and ‘indirect object’, which are not used in Relational Grammar, are used here for convenience.

9. Proponents of Relational Grammar maintain that grammatical relations are ranked on a hierarchy in the order of subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique. Most languages allow for some sort of advancement up the hierarchy from one status to the next. Passivization represents advancement from direct object to subject status.

10. See David M. Perlmutter and Paul M. Postal, ‘The Relational Succession Law’, in *Studies in Relational Grammar* 1, pp. 30-80.

11. On the notion of *chômeur*, see esp. Perlmutter and Postal, ‘Universal Characterization of Passivization’, pp. 20-23.

being *en chômage* ('unemployed' or 'jobless'). We will return to this important concept below.

For the present, it is important to recognize that any transitive clause in Greek can potentially be transformed into a passive clause, including transitive clauses that contain a double accusative construction. When a transitive clause is passivized, the accusative direct object of the transitive clause becomes a nominative subject in the passive construction. When that accusative direct object is part of a double accusative construction, the result will always be a double nominative construction, since the object and complement function as a syntactic unit; that is, complements in such constructions will always bear the same case as the nominal they 'complement'.

Double accusative and double nominative constructions are both common with the verb καλέω:

(5) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν (Mt. 1.25—'and he called his name Jesus')

(6) σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς (Jn 1.42—'you will be called Cephas')

In sentence (5), τὸ ὄνομα serves as the accusative direct object of the active verb ἐκάλεσεν, with the accusative Ἰησοῦν functioning as its complement in a double accusative construction. Sentence (6) is derived, in transformational terms, from the active sentence: τις καλέσει σε Κηφᾶν ('Someone will call you Cephas'). When passivized, the direct object σε not only becomes the subject, and thus bears nominative case marking (σύ), but its complement obligatorily also takes on the nominative case (Κηφᾶς). The result is technically a *subject-complement double nominative* construction.

In Greek, double nominatives are frequently masked by the fact that Greek clauses do not require an overt subject. Where the subject is only marked on the verb, as in the examples below, the double nominative construction is not as readily apparent.

(7) κληθήσεται Ἰωάννης (Lk. 1.60—'he will be called John')

(8) κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος (Rom. 9.26—'they will be called sons of the living God')

(9) φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη (Jas 2.23—'he was called friend of God')

(10) ἵνα τέκνα θεοῦ κληθῶμεν (1 Jn 3.1—'that we should be called children of God')

While each of these sentences lacks an explicit subject (the one who is called something), the nominative constituent nevertheless serves as a complement of that unexpressed subject. In (7), the subject is the third singular ‘he’ and Ἰωάννης is the nominative complement; in (8), the subject is the third plural ‘they’ and υἱοί is the nominative complement; in (9), the subject is the third singular ‘he’ and φίλος is the nominative complement; and in (10) the subject is the first plural ‘we’ and τέκνα is the nominative complement.

Although such constructions are quite common throughout the New Testament and in Greek literature in general, they have sometimes been mishandled in the standard reference works. Young, for example, describes the nominative Ἰησοῦς in the clause ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς (Lk. 2.21—‘his name was called Jesus’) as a ‘nominative of appellation’.¹² Other scholars, however, have appropriately noted that when verbs that take a double accusative appear in the passive, the direct object and its complement change case.¹³ In such instances, the nominative complement is sometimes labeled a ‘predicate nominative’.¹⁴ We will return to the question of whether such a label is appropriate below.

The important point here is that once the link between active and passive constructions is recognized, the presence of double nominative constructions becomes a predictable feature of Greek grammar. Simply examining the passive indicative occurrences of a single verb that takes double accusative constructions (καλέω) we find 24 examples of double nominative constructions in the New Testament: Mt. 2.23; 5.9, 19, 19; 21.13; 23.8, 10; 27.8; Mk 11.17; Lk. 1.32, 35, 60, 76; 2.4, 21, 23; Jn 1.42; Acts 28.1; Rom. 9.26; 1 Cor. 7.21; Jas 2.23; 1 Jn 3.1; Rev. 11.8; 19.13.

12. Richard A. Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), p. 13; cf. H.E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1957), p. 70. Young also cites 1 Jn 3.1 as an example of the nominative of appellation, though it too represents a double nominative construction.

13. See as examples Robertson, *Grammar*, pp. 480, 485; Robert W. Funk, *A Beginning–Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek. II. Syntax* (Missoula, MT: SBL, 1973), p. 389; Wallace, ‘Semantics and Exegetical Significance’, p. 102. For other grammarians who have noted this phenomenon, see Wallace, ‘Semantics and Exegetical Significance’, p. 103 n. 53.

14. Cf. Wallace, ‘Semantics and Exegetical Significance’, pp. 102-103.

(11) αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται (Mt. 5.9—‘they will be called sons of God’)

(12) Μελίτη ἡ νῆσος καλεῖται (Acts 28.1—‘the island is called Malta’)

(13) δοῦλος ἐκλήθης; (1 Cor. 7.21—‘were you called a slave?’)

(14) ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον ληστῶν (Mt. 21.13—‘my house will be called a house of prayer, but you have made it a den of thieves’)

The clause in (11), for example, is derived from the active (double accusative) construction: τις καλέσει αὐτοὺς υἱοὺς θεοῦ (‘someone will call them sons of God’). Similarly, the clause in (12) is derived from the active τις καλεῖ τὴν νῆσον Μελίτην (‘someone calls the island Malta’); and the clause in (13) is derived from the active τις ἐκάλεσέν σε δοῦλον; (‘Did someone call you a slave?’). Clause (14) provides an example where both a double nominative (ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται) and double accusative construction (ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον ληστῶν) occur in the same verse.

3. *Double Genitive and Double Dative Constructions*

Although a number of reference grammars allude to the presence of double nominative constructions in Greek, I am not aware of any that discuss the phenomena of double genitives or double datives. To understand how these constructions are derived, we must first recognize how participles work in double case constructions. The standard grammars typically acknowledge that participles can occur in double case constructions.¹⁵ They do not, however, tend to highlight how common such constructions are, perhaps because of the tendency to place them in different categories.

While there are a number of verbs that take double accusative constructions and occasionally appear with a participle serving as the complement (15-17), more frequently we find verbs of perception with an accusative direct object that is accompanied by a participial accusative complement indicating what the subject of the main verb ‘saw’ or ‘heard’ the direct object doing (18-23):

15. See, e.g., Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 480; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, p. 182.

- (15) παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα (Acts 1.3—‘he presented himself alive’)
- (16) ὁ Φῆλιξ κατέλιπε τὸν Παῦλον δεδεμένον (Acts 24.27—‘Felix left Paul bound’)
- (17) ἤγαγον δὲ τὸν παῖδα ζῶντα (Acts 20.12—‘they brought the child [home] alive’)
- (18) ἀκούσας δὲ Ἰακώβ ὄντα σιτία εἰς Αἴγυπτον (Acts 7.12—‘when Jacob heard that there was grain in Egypt’)
- (19) πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν (1 Jn 4.2—‘every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God’)
- (20) τὸ δεσμωτήριον εὔρομεν κεκλεισμένον ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ (Acts 5.23—‘we found the prison securely locked’)
- (21) ἐθεάσασθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (Acts 1.11—‘you saw him going into the sky’)
- (22) εἶδεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα καὶ αἰνοῦντα τὸν θεόν (Acts 3.9—‘all the people saw him walking and praising God’)
- (23) εἶδεν... Ἰησοῦν ἐστῶτα¹⁶ ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 7.55—‘he saw... Jesus standing at the right hand of God’)

Since the latter constructions frequently involve a verb related to speech or hearing, such as ἀκούω (18) or ὁμολογέω (19), these participles are often labeled ‘indirect discourse’.¹⁷ Such an analysis, however, masks the fact that we are dealing with syntax that is structurally an object–complement construction.¹⁸ The fact that these constructions frequently involve verbs of seeing (20-23) rather than verbs of hearing also makes the label ‘indirect discourse’ less than ideal.

16. As I have suggested elsewhere, understanding the participle ἐστῶτα as an accusative complement rather than an attributive modifier of Ἰησοῦν ‘places the emphasis not on the person who is seen, but on what that person is doing’. See Martin M. Culy and Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2003), p. 145.

17. See, e.g., Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, pp. 645-46; Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 1123; Young, *Intermediate Greek*, p. 149; Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2nd edn, 1994), p. 274.

18. Texts like Acts 24.5, εὐρόντες γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον λοιμὸν καὶ κινουῦντα στάσεις, support this analysis. Here, the complement in the double accusative construction is made up of a noun (λοιμὸν) conjoined with a participle (κινουῦντα), making it clear that both of these elements serve as a complement.

Given the fact that verbs of perception often appear with ‘double objects’, it is not surprising that double genitive constructions frequently occur, since some verbs of perception (like ἀκούω) take their object in the genitive case.

(24) ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τούτου (Mk 14.58—‘we heard him saying, “I will destroy this temple”’)

(25) ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ ὄχλου γογγύζοντος (Jn 7.32—‘the Pharisees heard the crowd grumbling’)

(26) ἀκηκόαμεν αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ῥήματα βλάσφημα εἰς Μωϋσῆν καὶ τὸν θεόν (Acts 6.11—‘we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God’)

In (24), αὐτοῦ serves as the genitive direct object of ἠκούσαμεν, while the participle λέγοντος serves as a genitive complement in an object–complement double genitive construction. In (25), the noun phrase τοῦ ὄχλου serves as the genitive direct object of ἤκουσαν, while the participle γογγύζοντος serves as the genitive complement. In (26), αὐτοῦ serves as the genitive direct object of ἀκηκόαμεν, while λαλοῦντος serves as the genitive complement. Double genitive constructions of this nature are very common in Koine Greek.

Such constructions, however, do not occur only with verbs that take a genitive direct object. Indeed, double case constructions of all varieties, except the vocative, also frequently occur when a verb that takes a double accusative construction is used as an attributive participle. When such verbs are used to form an attributive participial modifier of a genitive noun, the complement of the noun will appear in the genitive case, thus forming a double genitive construction. Such constructions only occur with passive participles and thus represent subject–complement relationships:

(27) καὶ ἐκβαλόντες ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἐλιθοβόλουν. καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας νεανίου καλουμένου Σαύλου (Acts 7.58—‘and when they had thrown him out of the city, they began to stone him. And the witnesses took off their outer garments [and left them] at the feet of a young man named Saul’)

In (27), the genitive noun νεανίου is modified by an attributive participle (καλουμένου), which therefore must also bear genitive case marking. Although participles typically take their direct objects in the accusative case like finite verbs, where passive participial forms of

verbs that can take a double accusative construction are used as attributive modifiers, the complement will bear the same case as the participle. Presumably, since the logical subject of the participle (the noun that the participle modifies) is genitive, the complement must share the case of that genitive ‘subject’.¹⁹ This type of subject–complement²⁰ construction is common in Greek and may result in double nominative, double genitive,²¹ double dative or double accusative constructions:

19. We might perhaps posit an unexpressed subject of the passive participle that is co-referential with the noun that the attributive participle modifies. This unexpressed constituent would then determine case agreement for the complement. Given the fact that we have instances of complements occurring within infinitival clauses, where the subject of the infinitive is unexpressed and the case of the complement agrees with the case of the co-referential subject in the main clause, it seems preferable to state the agreement rule as I have done above. As an example of this phenomenon with a passive infinitive, consider 1 Cor. 15.9: ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος (‘for I am the least of the apostles, who is not adequate to be called an apostle’). The infinitival clause derives from an underlying ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς ἵνα τις καλῆ με ἀπόστολον (‘who is not adequate that someone should call me an apostle’). When the subordinate clause is placed in infinitival form, the agent (τις) is omitted and the accusative direct object pronoun (με) is left implied as the subject of the passive infinitive. Normally, the complement as we find it in 1 Cor. 15.9 (ἀπόστολος) would then bear accusative case marking, since it complements what would be an accusative subject of the passive infinitive (καλεῖσθαι με ἀπόστολον). In this instance, however, presumably since the infinitival subject remains unexpressed, the complement takes its case from the nominative subject of the main clause (ὅς) with which it is co-referential. This same phenomenon occurs in Lk. 15.19, 21, though there it is complicated by the fact that there is no overt nominative subject in the main clause either. The only explicit nominative element is the predicate nominative ἄξιος.

I should also note that, at times, case is assigned through reference to an unexpressed constituent, i.e., the ‘head’ of a substantival participial clause. Thus, in the clause ἦκεν ἄγων εἰς τὴν καλουμένην Πέτραν (Josephus, *Ant.* 14.16—‘he came and brought [him] to [the city] called Petra’), since the substantival participle is accusative as part of a prepositional phrase headed by εἰς, the complement will also be accusative in agreement with the unexpressed subject of the participle.

20. Such constructions do not occur with active participles, i.e., as object–complement constructions, since active participles take their complement in the accusative case.

21. For other examples of double genitive subject–complement constructions, see, e.g., Acts 7.58; 10.1; 12.12; Rom. 1.4.

(28) ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφηῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι ὃ τε Βαρναβᾶς καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ (Acts 13.1—‘now there were many²² prophets and teachers in the local church at Antioch, including Barnabas and Simeon called Niger’)

(29) ἐγένομην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ (Rev. 1.9—‘I was on the island called Patmos’)

(30) καὶ ἔστησαν δύο, Ἰωσήφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰουῆτος, καὶ Μαθθίαν (Acts 1.23—‘so, they put forward two men, Joseph called Barsabbas, who was [also] called Justus, and Matthias’)

In (28), we have the nominative noun Συμεὼν (which is part of a noun phrase that stands in apposition to the nominative προφηῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι) modified by an attributive participle. The participial phrase in (28) is derived from the active clause, τις καλεῖ Συμεὼν Νίγερ (‘someone calls Simeon Niger’). Since the participle is passive, and since it is an attributive modifier of a nominative noun, both the participle (καλούμενος) and the complement (Νίγερ) appear in the nominative case, with the latter being part of a subject–complement double nominative construction.²³

In (29), we have an analogous example. In this case, however, the noun phrase that the participial phrase modifies is in the dative case (τῇ νήσῳ). The attributive passive participle (τῇ καλουμένῃ) and the complement (Πάτμῳ) must therefore also be in the dative case. The participial phrase in (29) is derived from the underlying clause, τις καλεῖ τὴν νήσον Πάτμον (‘someone calls the island Patmos’). Πάτμῳ thus functions as a dative complement in a subject–complement double dative construction.²⁴

Finally, we see from (30) that double accusatives may also occur in this type of syntactic environment.²⁵ The participle τὸν καλούμενον agrees with the accusative noun it modifies (the indeclinable Ἰωσήφ),

22. On the translation, see the note on κατὰ in Culy and Parsons, *Acts*, p. 243.

23. For other examples of double nominative constructions derived in this manner, see, e.g., Acts 4.36; 8.10; 10.18; 27.14.

24. For other examples of subject–complement double dative constructions, see, e.g., Lk. 1.36; Josephus, *Apion* 1.241; *Ant.* 9.98.

25. Notice that we also have an example of a double nominative construction in (30), with ὃς serving as the nominative subject of the relative clause and Ἰουῆτος serving as the nominative complement in a subject–complement double nominative construction.

and Βαρσαββᾶν also bears accusative case as the complement of the logical subject of καλούμενον (i.e. Ἰωσήφ). In this case, then, we are dealing with a subject–complement double accusative construction.²⁶

We should note, at this point, that double accusative constructions may also occur in instances where καλέω or another verb that can take a double accusative is used in an infinitival clause:

(31) ἐνένευον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτό
(Lk. 1.62—‘they motioned to his father about what he wanted him to be called’)

In (31), the passive infinitive καλεῖσθαι appears with an accusative subject (αὐτό) and an accusative complement (τί), thus forming a subject–complement double accusative construction. The infinitival clause is derived from the underlying active clause, τις καλεῖ αὐτὸ τί (‘someone calls him what?’).

4. Pseudo-Double Accusatives

Having established that double case constructions are more common in Greek than has typically been recognized, or at least explicitly stated, we turn now to instances where standard reference grammars have grouped other syntactic phenomena under the label ‘double accusative’. While such phenomena generate texts that contain two accusative elements, the syntax and function of these texts differ from the object–complement double accusative construction. Acts 21.21, for instance, is sometimes cited as an example of a double accusative construction:²⁷

(32) ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως τοὺς κατὰ ἔθνη
πάντας Ἰουδαίους (Acts 21.21—‘you teach all the Jews throughout
the nations rebellion against Moses’)

As with the English verb ‘teach’, the Greek verb διδάσκω can take an animate object (‘I teach *someone*’) or an inanimate object (‘I teach

26. For other examples of subject–complement double accusative constructions, see Lk. 6.15; 7.11; 9.10; 19.29; 21.37; 22.3; 23.33; Acts 3.2; 9.11; 11.13; 12.25; 15.22, 37; 27.8, 16; Rev. 16.16. The accusative constituent in such constructions should not be treated as a ‘predicate accusative’; contra, e.g., Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, p. 191, who analyzes Acts 9.11 in this manner. See further below.

27. So, e.g., N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. III. *Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 246; Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 482.

something'). In English, when the verb 'teach' has both an animate and inanimate object, the sentence may be constructed with a direct object and indirect object ('I teach Greek to my students') or in an alternative form ('I teach my students Greek'). In the latter construction, the sentence *appears* to contain two direct objects (a 'double accusative' construction), a common phenomenon in both English and Greek.²⁸ In reality, the sentence represents an instance where the indirect object has 'advanced' to the direct object position,²⁹ thus displacing the direct object.³⁰ The semantic patient (former direct object) now has a different

28. In the linguistic literature, this phenomenon is often referred to as 'dative alternation'.

29. The language of 'advancement' is typically associated with Relational Grammar, though that framework uses the numbers 1, 2 and 3 to refer to the nominal arguments typically associated with semantic agents, patients and recipients.

30. In my analysis of what I have called pseudo-double accusatives, I am following scholars who see a derivational relationship between the direct object plus indirect object construction and the double object construction. Linguists, however, continue to debate whether double object constructions in English and other languages derive from an underlying construction that includes an accusative and a dative constituent or have different underlying structures altogether, and are thus not related by transformation. For the former, see, e.g., Charles Fillmore, *Indirect Object Constructions in English and the Ordering of Transformations* (The Hague: Mouton, 1965); Joseph Emonds, 'Evidence that Indirect Object Movement is a Structure-Preserving Rule', *Foundations of Language* 8 (1972), pp. 546-61; Richard K. Larson, 'On the Double Object Construction', *Linguistic Inquiry* 19 (1988), pp. 335-91; Richard K. Larson, 'Double Objects Revisited: Reply to Jackendoff', *Linguistic Inquiry* 21 (1990), pp. 333-78; Mark C. Baker, *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988). For the latter, see, e.g., Richard Oehrle, 'The Grammatical Status of the English Dative Alternation' (Ph.D. diss., MIT, 1976); David Dowty, 'Governed Transformations as Lexical Rules in a Montague Grammar', *Linguistic Inquiry* 9 (1978), pp. 393-426; Ray Jackendoff, 'On Larson's Treatment of the Doubled Object Construction', *Linguistic Inquiry* 21 (1990), pp. 427-56; David Pesetsky, *Zero Syntax: Experiencers in Cascades* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995). Even among those who take a transformational, or multi-stratal approach to the syntax of these constructions, some maintain that the construction with two accusative constituents represents the underlying form from which accusative plus dative constructions are derived; see, e.g., J. Bowers, *The Theory of Grammatical Relations* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981); M. Dryer, 'On Primary Object, Secondary Objects, and Antidative', *Language* 62 (1987), pp. 808-45; J. Aoun and Y.-H.A. Li, 'Scope and Constituency', *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (1989), pp. 141-72.

syntactic status altogether, that is, it is now a *chômeur*. While *chômeurs* generated through passivization are ‘flagged’ by the preposition ὑπό in Greek, *chômeurs* generated through advancement to direct object are marked with the accusative case. This effectively results in constructions that contain two accusative constituents (a direct object and a *chômeur*), but not two ‘objects’ or an object and a complement. Such constructions should, therefore, be distinguished from typical double object constructions.

While indirect object to direct object advancement is optional in English, in Greek it appears to be obligatory, for example, with the verb διδάσκω. In other words, when this verb has both an animate and inanimate object, the animate object (semantic recipient) will not occur in the syntax as a dative indirect object. Instead, it will always advance to direct object status, thus taking on accusative case marking, as in (32), where the semantic recipient τοὺς...’λουδαίους appears in the accusative case. The same phenomenon occurs in (33), where the semantic recipient has advanced to direct object status, thus taking on accusative case marking (αὐτούς) and displacing the semantic patient, which now bears accusative case marking as a *chômeur* (πολλά).³¹

(33) καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτούς πολλά (Mk 6.34—‘and he began to teach them many things’)

The same general rule holds true when the semantic patient is a clausal complement, such as a ὅτι clause or infinitival clause.³² Thus

31. See also Jn 14.26 (ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα—‘he will teach you all things’) and Heb. 5.12 (πάλιν χρεῖαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ—‘you need someone to teach you the basic beginning principles of the oracles of God’).

32. I am only aware of one counter-example in the New Testament to what otherwise appears to be an obligatory ‘rule’. In Rev. 2.14, διδάσκω has an infinitival complement and superficially has a semantic recipient appearing as a dative indirect object: Βαλαάμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλάκ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ (‘Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before the children of Israel’). G.K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), p. 250, suggests that the dative functions either instrumentally (thus, presumably, ‘Balaam, who taught the placing of a stumbling block before the children of Israel through Balak’) or as a dative of advantage (thus, presumably, ‘Balaam, who taught the placing of a stumbling block before the children of Israel for Balak’). It is probably better, though, to follow Thomas, who builds on the earlier work of Hort, Swete and Charles, and recognize that the verb may optionally be used with a dative indirect

where διδάσκω is modified by a clausal complement and a semantic recipient, the recipient will appear in the accusative case, as in (34) and (36). In contrast, where the verb λέγω appears with analogous modifiers, the semantic recipient will appear as a dative indirect object, with no advancement occurring, as in (35) and (37):

(34) ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν (Mk 8.31—‘he began to teach them that it was necessary for the Son of Man to suffer many things’)

(35) ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων (Mk 9.31—‘he was saying to them, “The Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of men”’)

(36) κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι (Lk. 11.1—‘Lord, teach us to pray’)

(37) ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ (Mt. 5.39—‘but I say to you, “Do not resist an evil man”’)

The examples with διδάσκω (32, 33, 34 and 36), then, represent cases of indirect object to direct object advancement, a phenomenon that is distinct from genuine double accusative constructions. In order to account for texts that have been generated through indirect object to direct object advancement most scholars have posited ‘thing-object’ constructions (or something of this nature) as a sub-category of double accusatives.³³ Given the cross-linguistically common phenomenon of indirect object to direct object advancement, however, and the fact that ‘thing-object’ double accusative constructions cannot optionally include an equative infinitive (such as εἶναι) between the two accusative elements, it is better to recognize that we are dealing with a different

object when it has two objects. See Robert L. Thomas, *Revelation 1–7: An Exegetical Commentary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1992), pp. 203-204. The fact that such a usage occurs in Plutarch and later writers may suggest that, at the time Revelation was written, at least some dialects of Koine Greek were no longer requiring indirect object to direct object advancement when διδάσκω was used with both an animate and inanimate object. That we are dealing with a case of dialectal variation is further supported by the textual variants here. While the UBS4 reading is supported by A C syr^s, the phrase τῷ Βαλάκ is omitted altogether by \aleph^* ; it appears in the accusative (τὸν Βαλάκ) in \aleph^1 , the Byzantine tradition, and a variety of other manuscripts; while in the TR the text reads ἐν τῷ Βαλαὰμ τὸν Βαλάκ. For fuller manuscript citations, see David E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5* (WBC, 52a; Dallas: Word, 1997), p. 178.

33. See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, pp. 181-82.

syntactic phenomenon altogether. Indeed, upon careful inspection, examples of thing-object double accusative constructions all appear to be instances of either indirect object to direct object advancement or oblique to direct object advancement. I include below a brief sampling of the examples cited by Wallace:

(38) ἐκείνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα (Jn 14.26—‘he will teach you all things’)

(39) ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμύδα (Mt. 27.31—‘they stripped his clothes from him’)

(40) ἔχρισέν σε ὁ θεός...ἔλαιον (Heb. 1.9—‘God anointed you...with oil’)

In (38), we have another example of indirect object to direct object advancement; in (39) we have an example of source to direct object advancement; and in (40) we have an example of instrument to direct object advancement. As far as I can tell, other examples of thing-object double accusatives can also be accounted for through reference to either indirect object to direct object advancement or oblique to direct object advancement.³⁴

5. *Accusative of Retained Object?*

Failure to recognize the phenomenon of indirect object to direct object advancement can also lead to misunderstanding constructions where the semantic recipient (logical indirect object) has become the subject of the clause.³⁵ Galatians 2.7 provides an example of this phenomenon:

(41) πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Gal. 2.7—‘I have been entrusted with the gospel’)

34. Oblique to direct object advancement in Greek appears always to be optional. In the expression, δῆσατε αὐτὰ εἰς δέσμας (Mt. 13.30—‘bind them into bundles’), for example, the oblique εἰς δέσμας can optionally advance to direct object status, leaving αὐτὰ as an accusative *chômeur*: δῆσατε αὐτὰ δέσμας (L Δ f¹ 700 1241 1424 *al*). Oblique to direct object advancement is likely the syntactic process behind certain cognate accusative constructions, such as ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην (Mt. 2.10—‘rejoice with great joy’).

35. See, e.g., Turner, *Syntax*, p. 247; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, p. 197; Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 485.

Here, the underlying clause (42) has undergone indirect object to direct object advancement resulting in (43). This process is then followed by passivization resulting in the text as we find it in Gal. 2.7 (lit. ‘I have been entrusted the gospel’). The semantic patient (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) has been placed *en chômage*. It, therefore, bears accusative case marking as a *chômeur* rather than as a ‘retained’ direct object.³⁶

(42) ΤΙΣ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΕΝ Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιόν μοι (‘someone has entrusted the gospel to me’)

(43) ΤΙΣ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΕΝ ΜΕ Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον (‘someone has entrusted me the gospel’)

The long list of other examples cited by Robertson can be explained through reference to various types of advancement strategies. In (44), for example, the semantic recipient (‘this man’) has advanced from indirect object (τούτῳ in 45) to direct object (τούτον in 46), leaving the semantic patient, or logical direct object (τὴν ὁδόν), in the accusative case as a *chômeur* (46). This process is then followed by passivization (i.e., direct object to subject advancement), resulting in passive verb morphology (in this case as part of a periphrastic construction) and the shift from accusative τούτον to nominative οὗτος in (44).

(44) Οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου (Acts 18.25—‘this man had been taught the way of the Lord’)

(45) ΤΙΣ ΚΑΤΗΧΗΣΕΝ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου τούτῳ (‘someone taught the way of the Lord to this man.’)

(46) ΤΙΣ ΚΑΤΗΧΗΣΕΝ τούτον τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου (‘someone taught this man the way of the Lord.’)

The next example cited by Robertson is more complex:

(47) Κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε (2 Thess. 2.15—‘hold to the traditions which you were taught’)

To understand what is taking place in (47), we must go back to the underlying form of the relative clause (48). I have substituted the antecedent of the relative pronoun ἃς (τὰς παραδόσεις) in the underlying clause to make the discussion easier to follow.

36. This reflects the language used in the standard grammars. See, e.g., Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 485; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, p. 197.

(48) τις ἐδίδαξεν τὰς παραδόσεις ὑμῖν ('someone taught the traditions to you')

(49) τις ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς τὰς παραδόσεις ('someone taught you the traditions')

In the relative clause, as we find it in (47), two syntactic processes have again taken place. First, the recipient, or indirect object (ὑμῖν) of the underlying construction (48), has advanced to direct object status, resulting in (49), where the second plural pronoun has taken on accusative case marking (ὑμᾶς) as the new direct object, and the former direct object has become a *chômeur* and thus also appears in the accusative case (τὰς παραδόσεις). From there, the second plural pronoun advances to subject status through passivization and is now simply expressed morphologically with a suffix on the verb (ἐδιδάχθητε). This process is accompanied by relativization,³⁷ which leaves us with the text as it appears in (47). Technically, then, the accusative ᾶς does not *retain* its accusative case, as if it were still the direct object of a passive verb, but rather it has taken on accusative case marking in light of its status as a *chômeur*.

For the sake of space, we will look at just one further example of the so-called 'accusative of retained object'.³⁸ In (50), the constituent bearing accusative case marking (καρπὸν) once again bears that case as a result of advancement.

(50) πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης (Phil. 1.11—'having been filled with the fruit of righteousness')

(51) πεπληρωμένοι καρποῦ δικαιοσύνης ('having been filled with the fruit of righteousness')

37. I should note that an alternative analysis is possible. Since relative clauses in Greek involve what is known as Wh-movement, which obligatorily moves the relative pronoun to the beginning of the relative clause (the same phenomenon occurs in English), we could simply say that Wh-movement has occurred prior to the indirect object advancing first to direct object status and then to subject status. In this analysis, it would be fair to say that the relative pronoun has retained its accusative case marking by getting out of town before it was rendered 'unemployed'!

38. Here, I am using Wallace's label (see, *Greek Grammar*, p. 197), though both he and Robertson (*Grammar*, p. 485) cite Phil. 1.11 as an example of this phenomenon.

The verb πληρόω takes an accusative direct object. The thing that the direct object is filled with appears in the genitive³⁹ or the dative case.⁴⁰ When the verb occurs in a passive construction, the direct object advances to the subject role and the thing with which the subject is filled remains in the dative or genitive case, as in (51) where the subject is unexpressed. In (50), one additional process has occurred subsequent to passivization. The oblique (καρπού) has advanced to fill the vacant direct object role, and therefore bears accusative case marking (καρπόν). Thus, strictly speaking, (50) represents an example of oblique to direct object advancement rather than retention of an accusative object.

6. 'Complements' or 'Predicates'?

Given the variation in terminology used to describe double case constructions, it is appropriate to address this issue briefly here in light of the above analysis. Wallace has provided strong arguments for viewing object–complement constructions as semantically equivalent to subject–predicate constructions.⁴¹ In light of his analysis, it would appear to be appropriate to refer to what he labels accusative 'complements' in object–complement constructions as 'predicate accusatives',⁴² and to refer to what I am calling 'nominative complements' as 'predicate nominatives'. After all, as Robertson notes, in some cases where εἶναι (or another stative verb) is used before the predicate accusative, 'the sense is not greatly altered by its absence or presence'.⁴³ As an example of this phenomenon, he cites Mk 1.17 and Mt. 4.19:

(52) ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων (Mk 1.17—'I will cause you to become fishers of men')

(53) ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων (Mt. 4.19—'I will make you fishers of men')

39. See, e.g., Acts 2.28; 5.28; 13.52; Rom. 15.13, 14; 2 Tim. 1.4.

40. See, e.g., Rom. 1.29; 2 Cor. 7.4.

41. See Wallace, 'Semantics and Exegetical Significance', pp. 101-105; cf. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, pp. 184-85. I will return to the question of the semantic equivalence of these two constructions below.

42. So, e.g., Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 480; William D. Chamberlain, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), p. 37; Funk, *Beginning–Intermediate Grammar*, pp. 388-89.

43. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 481.

Other verbs display a comparable degree of semantic similarity between the two constructions. It is unlikely that there is a great deal of semantic difference between (54) and (55):

(54) οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους (Jn 15.15—‘I no longer call you slaves’)

(55) οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς εἶναι δούλους (‘I no longer say that you are slaves’)

Perhaps the most striking example of the apparent interchangeability of the two constructions, however, occurs in Phil. 3.7-8 (56). In v. 7, Paul uses a double accusative construction with the verb ἡγέομαι (ἡγημαί), with ταῦτα serving as the accusative direct object and ζημίαν serving as the accusative complement. Then, in the next clause, Paul uses the same verb (ἡγοῦμαι), this time with πάντα and ζημίαν, but with the two accusatives serving as the subject and predicate of the infinitive εἶναι:

(56) ταῦτα ἡγημαί διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ζημίαν. ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι διὰ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου μου (Phil. 3.7-8—‘I have come to consider these things loss because of Christ. More than that, I also consider all things to be loss because of the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord’)

The same apparent interchangeability of these two constructions is seen in the textual history of certain passages. In some instances, where the critical editions of the New Testament have an infinitival complement with εἶναι plus an accusative subject and accusative predicate, the passage appears in textual variants without the infinitive, that is, as a double accusative construction. For example, Rom. 6.11 appears in some manuscripts (⌘ B C *al*) as (57) and in others (P^{46vid} A D F G *pc*) as (58):

(57) λογίξεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (‘consider yourselves to be dead to sin’)

(58) λογίξεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (‘consider yourselves dead to sin’)

All of this suggests that it is not unreasonable to label what Wallace has called the ‘complement’ in double accusative constructions as

‘predicate accusatives’.⁴⁴ If this is the case, it would also be appropriate to label such predicate constituents that are part of a passive construction ‘predicate nominatives’. The most important thing would be to be consistent;⁴⁵ one should not use the label ‘complement’ with a double accusative construction and then turn around and label the ‘complement’ of a double nominative construction ‘predicate nominative’. To do so would be to mask the fact that we are dealing with related phenomena. Moreover, if one adopts the ‘predicate’ labels, it is critical that the other element of double accusative constructions be analyzed in light of this label. Consider Jn 15.15 once more:

(59) οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους (‘I no longer call you slaves’)

Following Wallace’s approach, I would describe ὑμᾶς as the accusative direct object of λέγω, and δούλους as the accusative complement in an object–complement double accusative construction. If we adopt predicate terminology and label δούλους a ‘predicate accusative’, however, we must recognize that we are viewing it as the predicate of an implied infinitive: οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς (εἶναι) δούλους. In such an analysis, ὑμᾶς can no longer be the accusative direct object of λέγω, but rather must serve as the ‘accusative subject’ of the implied infinitive.⁴⁶

I would suggest, however, that it is preferable to reserve the label ‘predicate’ for cases where we are clearly dealing with a clause involving an equative verb (either explicit or implicit). Thus, ‘predicate nominative’ would be used to refer to the predicate component of an equative clause containing a finite verb, such as θεός in (60). The label ‘predicate accusative’, on the other hand, would be reserved for instances where the predicate occurs with an infinitival equative verb, as is the case with τινα in (61).

(60) θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (Jn 1.1—‘the Word was God’)

44. Wallace does not himself adopt such terminology.

45. One of the few reference grammars to show such consistency is that of G.B. Winer, who refers to the accusative elements in double accusative constructions as an accusative of subject and accusative of predicate, assuming an implicit equative infinitive. See G.B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (trans. and rev. by W.F. Moulton; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 3rd edn, 1882), p. 285.

46. For a discussion of the appropriateness of the label, ‘accusative subject of the infinitive’, see Culy and Parsons, *Acts*, p. 4.

(61) ἀνέστη Θευδάς, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν (Acts 5.36—‘Theudas came along claiming that he was someone [important]’)

There are, in fact, a number of reasons for using distinct terminology for the second element in double case constructions. One reason is illustrated by double accusative constructions containing a participial ‘complement’:

(62) ἑθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (Jn 1.14—‘we have seen his glory’)

(63) ἑθεάσασθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (Acts 1.11—‘you saw him go into the sky’)

Clauses (62) and (63) illustrate the fact that the verb θεάομαι can take either a simple accusative direct object (τὴν δόξαν), as in (62), or a double accusative construction (αὐτὸν πορευόμενον), as in (63). In both clauses, the accusative elements tell what was seen. In the latter case, however, a participial complement occurs, specifying what the accusative object was seen doing. As far as I can tell, such participial complements never occur with an equative infinitive, such as εἶναί. This calls into question the appropriateness of treating the accusative participle as a ‘predicate accusative’. Ultimately, however, the most significant problem with using the ‘predicate’ label in this type of construction stems from the likelihood that the pragmatic status of an infinitival construction differs from that of an object–complement construction that is part of a finite clause. This brings us to the question of what bearing our syntactic analysis has on the interpretation of the biblical text.

7. The Interpretive Implications of Some Double Case Constructions

If certain phenomena have historically been overlooked or incorrectly analyzed, are there implications for how we understand the texts in which these phenomena occur? To understand the implications of certain double case constructions, we must first understand the function of passivization and other ‘advancement’ strategies. In a passive clause, the topicality/referentiality of the agent is significantly downgraded, while the topicality/referentiality of the patient is significantly upgraded.⁴⁷ Or, put another way, a passive clause inverts the topicality of the

47. T. Givón, *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, II (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990), p. 909.

subject and direct object of its transitive counterpart. Thus, in examples (64) and (65), topicality shifts from the boy (64) to the ball (65).

(64) The boy hit the ball.

(65) The ball was hit by the boy.

As we have seen, it is not only syntactic direct objects that can ‘advance’ (as in passivization); a similar process can occur with indirect objects. Thus, example (66) can be re-expressed as (67), with the indirect object assuming the role of the direct object. In this case, the topicality of the patient (‘the ball’) is downgraded as it becomes a *chômeur* in (67), while the topicality of the recipient (‘the boy’) is upgraded as it becomes the direct object.

(66) I gave the ball to the boy.

(67) I gave the boy the ball.

Of particular interest for evaluating the implications of passive and other advancement strategies in Greek is the relationship between grammatical relations and relative topicality. Givón and others have argued that the syntactic subject correlates with the ‘main topic’, the syntactic direct object with the ‘secondary topic’, and all other case roles, including indirect object, represent ‘non-topics’.⁴⁸ Discourse level topicality, of course, can only be determined through reference to both the referential accessibility⁴⁹ and thematic importance⁵⁰ of the constituent. One can look at both topic persistence (i.e., the number of times the referent persists as an argument in the following clauses) and overall frequency (i.e. ‘the total number of times the same referent appears as clausal argument in the discourse’).⁵¹ By utilizing advancement strategies, writers effectively increase the relative topicality of a given referent.

If Givón and others are correct in concluding that topicality is largely measured with reference to syntactic subjects and syntactic direct objects, then it becomes particularly important to recognize where a putative double accusative construction actually represents either

48. See Givón, *Syntax*, pp. 900-911.

49. Referential accessibility refers to the degree to which the referent connects with the preceding (‘anaphoric’) discourse context. See Givón, *Syntax*, p. 902.

50. Thematic importance is measured in terms of the referent’s occurrence in subsequent (‘cataphoric’) discourse context. See Givón, *Syntax*, p. 903.

51. Givón, *Syntax*, p. 908.

indirect object to direct object advancement or oblique to direct object advancement. In such cases, the underlying indirect object or oblique takes on the status of ‘secondary topic’ by virtue of assuming the role of direct object. The former direct object (i.e. the semantic patient), on the other hand, now bears the status of *chômeur* and thus is a ‘non-topic’, which only coincidentally bears accusative case marking (as a *chômeur*).

Finally, the discussion of syntactic advancement and topicality brings us back to the question of whether there is any semantic or pragmatic distinction between object–complement constructions and subject–predicate constructions, and the related question of whether ‘predicate’ terminology is appropriate for double case constructions. Wallace has done an admirable job of establishing the strong relationship between the semantics of object–complement constructions and subject–predicate constructions. I would like to suggest, however, that the syntactic distinction between the two constructions actually points to an important pragmatic difference between them. Consider again the textual variants for Rom. 6.11:

(68) λογίξεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ (‘consider yourselves to be dead to sin’)

(69) λογίξεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ (‘consider yourselves dead to sin’)

Clause (68) consists of a main verb (λογίξεσθε) modified by an infinitival clausal complement (ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ). Within that complement, ἑαυτοὺς serves as the accusative subject of εἶναι and νεκροὺς as a predicate accusative. What is important for our purposes is the fact that the two accusative elements function as constituents of a *subordinate* clause. In clause (69), on the other hand, the two elements function as constituents of the main (and only) clause, with ἑαυτοὺς being the accusative direct object and νεκροὺς the accusative complement. It is quite likely that at least some double accusative constructions derive syntactically from equative infinitival complements. In linguistic terms, the difference between (68) and (69), then, would be that in (69) the subject of the infinitival clause in (68) has been ‘raised’ to direct object status in finite clause (69).⁵² While

52. For more background on the discussion that follows, see Givón, *Syntax*, pp. 767-75.

raising⁵³ was traditionally assumed to be a mere stylistic variant of the construction involving a subordinate clause, Givón makes a strong case for treating raising as a foregrounding device.⁵⁴ In other words, ‘raising a referent from a dependent clause to a grammatical argument role in the main clause has the similar pragmatic effect as the one noted for other promotion rules—dative shift [indirect object to direct object advancement] and passivization’.⁵⁵ As with the advancement strategies discussed above, ‘Raised referents are more topical than their unraised counterparts.’⁵⁶ In light of the difference in topicality, then, it is important to distinguish object–complement constructions from subject–predicate constructions and to use appropriate terminology to describe them.⁵⁷ Both advancement and raising affect the relative topicality of a constituent, ultimately affecting the way readers evaluate the importance of particular themes within the discourse.

8. Conclusion

This article has argued that double case constructions in Koine Greek have at times either been overlooked in standard reference works or misconstrued. All of us who study the Greek language are interested in formulating analyses that are as precise and accurate as possible. It is hoped that this article will make a small contribution to achieving those goals.

We have seen that in addition to the double accusative construction that so commonly occurs in Greek, subject–complement double

53. On the phenomenon of raising, see esp. Paul M. Postal, *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and its Theoretical Implications* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974); see also Stephen A. Marlett, ‘Copy-Raising in Koine Greek’ (MA thesis, University of North Dakota, 1976); Stephen A. Marlett, ‘Evidence for Raising in Koine Greek’, in Richard A. Rhodes (ed.), *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session, XIX* (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1975), pp. 1-21.

54. This is an issue that needs further attention. The apparent interchangeability of the two constructions at points in the textual history of the New Testament suggests that at least some later scribes may not have perceived such a pragmatic distinction.

55. Givón, *Syntax*, p. 771.

56. Givón, *Syntax*, p. 771.

57. Here, Wallace’s advocacy for ‘object–complement’ terminology has been particularly helpful.

nominative constructions occur when verbs taking an accusative direct object and an accusative complement appear in the passive voice. Double genitives, on the other hand, occur when a verb like ἀκούω takes both an object and a participial complement. In instances where a verb that takes a double case construction is used as an attributive participial modifier, the result will be a double nominative, double genitive, double dative or double accusative construction, depending on the case of the noun that the participle modifies. Such constructions only occur with passive participles and thus always represent subject–complement double case constructions.

We have also seen that many texts typically associated with double accusative constructions actually involve processes known as advancements. Advancements from indirect object to direct object or oblique to direct object will result in two accusative constituents. The semantic patient in such constructions, however, will represent a *chômeur*, rather than an accusative retained object.

Finally, we have seen that clarifying the syntactic structure of such constructions has implications for the interpretation of the texts in which they occur. Like passivization, other advancement strategies serve to increase the topicality of the advanced constituent and downgrade the topicality of those constituents that are displaced, or placed *en chômage*. Rightly understanding the syntax of such constructions, then, has some bearing on how we evaluate the relative importance of discourse themes. For this reason, it is inappropriate to draw a one-to-one correlation between the semantics of double case constructions and subject–predicate constructions that are part of an infinitival clause. Just as advancement within a clause affects the relative topicality of those constituents affected, so raising the subject of an infinitival clause to direct object status in the main clause—the difference between expressing the same general thought as an infinitive clause or in a double accusative construction—likewise serves to upgrade the topicality of the raised constituent.