CHAPTER 4

Assessment and Implications

This is a chapter where the questions of research meet the findings. There was a five-fold statement of the problem and we will here seek to give a straightforward or one to one answer in light of the analysis contained in Chapters 2 and especially 3. A series of implications will be finally put forward for the domains that are at the crossroads of the morphology and syntax of the book of Revelation, namely, NT grammar, exegesis, and theology.

The Degree to Which John’s Language is Solecistic

There were five questions of research addressed in the Statement of the Problem. The first four will be addressed under this heading. The reason for approaching them in the same section is that each one of the four inquiries is ultimately reduced to quantity and intensity.

The Number of Grammatical Departures in Revelation

The view that the Johannine Apocalypse is imbued with solecisms has been perpetuated throughout NT Introductions, commentaries on Revelation, grammars, and other various related works or articles. However, a definite number or comprehensive statistical data on the solecisms in the book of Revelation does not exist.

It must be said that one hindrance that there has been in this work, is the lack of analysis that needed to be done before numerical values could be introduced into the equation. The said analysis is a prerequisite because two types of quantitative information are expected: the total number of morpho-syntactical irregularities noted in the literature and the number of words or constructions that remain irregular after critical observation and examination. With this distinction in mind, it is possible to provide the following quantitative information.

First, eleven barbarisms were discussed in the beginning of the third chapter, but none of them seemed to be real. In contrast with this small amount, the total number of solecisms is 221. During the synthesis and evaluation of each category I divided the solecisms into three classes: alleged, explicable, and actual. The first label was clear enough as it pointed to the syntactical arrangements that had nothing wrong with them. The explicable solecisms were in the
majority and referred to those constructions that were not called into question without reason, but whose assessment disassociated them from the last category. The actual solecisms are those without linguistic explanation.

This last group consisted of 45 cases, a much smaller number than the total number of solecisms found in the literature. These 45 cases represent 19 percent of the total of 232 presupposed blunders. More than that, the number 45 does not refer to 45 different types of irregularities. For example, 9 of these are nominatives appended to oblique cases, 8 are the masculine for the neuter gender, 8 are participles in place of finite verbs, and 9 are Semitic resumptive pronouns, so all these 34 cases are in fact four types of irregular Greek syntax. The whole number 45 represents 9 types of solecisms, 5 of these being committed only one to three times. Therefore, misleading phrases like “Revelation teems with ‘deviations,’”

The Classification of the Morpho-Syntactical Irregularities

This is another area of confusion and disparity. The authors who dealt in any depth with the grammar of the Apocalypse arranged the solecisms in varied or differing manners. Some used a heterogeneous taxonomy (Bousset, Allo, Swete, Aune, Beale, BDF, and Turner), others arranged the solecisms according to their explanation (R.H. Charles), or according to the fault (Winer), or according to the grammatical category involved (Ewald, Lücke, S. Davidson, Cowden, Robertson, and Dougherty).

These four types of arrangements may have served their purpose well enough in the works of which they were a part. However, they were all lacking when it came to a specialized study on uneven morphology and syntax.
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