

Danove, Paul. *A Grammatical and Exegetical Study of New Testament Verbs of Transference*.  
Library of New Testament Studies 329. Studies in New Testament Greek 13. Edinburgh:  
T. & T. Clark, 2009.

Many thanks for Continuum/T & T Clark for a review copy.

### **Introduction: Chapters 1-2:**

Chapters 1-2 of this impressive book provide a general introduction to Danove's methodology & presuppositions.

In his words, "Case frame analysis is concerned with the description of 'predicators', defined as words that license the presence of other elements in a phrase" (1). While his book focuses on verbs, Danove rightly recognizes that a much larger number of elements can be termed predicators (e.g. prepositions, nouns, and other lexical items that require/permit adjuncts & arguments within their constituent). Verbs are the most clear representative of this with their requirement of at least a Subject constituent (intransitive clauses).

In terms of representation of arguments & adjuncts, Case frame analysis uses a form a valence descriptions, which contain between one and three columns, one for each potential argument, representing intransitive, monotransitive, and ditransitive clauses, respectively. The descriptions also contain three rows: the first is for the number of arguments required by a predicator, the middle for marking the syntactic & semantic functions as well as the lexical realization of each argument, and the third for clarifying, "features that describe the conceptualization of the event designated by a verb" (3). An example is provided below (adapted from Danove, 6):

παραφέρω

1	2	3
Agent	Theme	Source
[N] <sup>1</sup>	N	P/ἀπό

Take this cup from me (Mk 14.36)

παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ

### **Semantic Features**

In addition to the basic valence descriptions provided by Danove, the analyses of the 104 verbs themselves are distinguished in usage by means of semantic features. These are semantic features distinct from semantic roles such as *Agent* and *Theme*. While semantic roles define the semantics of the arguments required by the verb, Danove's semantic features define the predicators themselves.

He defines the following semantic features for verbal predicators:

---

<sup>1</sup> The brackets denote that the Agent of this imperative clause is null, as is common with imperatives.

### *Subject Affectedness:*

Danove rightly bases his description of active, middle, & passive voice alternations on the recent work of Rutgar Allan's *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek: A Study in Polysemy* (ASCP 11; Amsterdam: Gieben, 2003), where the fundamental semantic feature involved in *Subject Affectedness*. Unfortunately, I was disappointed that Danove did not follow Allan's position that the passive is a sub-function of the Middle Voice.

Danove marks Active usages as –Subject Affectedness and Middle & Passive usages as +Subject Affectedness (like Allan, Danove acknowledges that unmarked usages *can potentially* have an affected subject).

### *Impetus:*

In transference verbs, the Agent of a clause can either provide, “an initial discrete impetus,” where the theme is set in motion, or “a continuous impetus” that not only sets the Theme in motion, but also maintains that motion all the way to its goal through the whole transference event (24). Thus, for Danove, βάλλω in Matt 13:50 is marked by discrete impetus: “They will cast them into the furnace of fire.” Here the Agent initiates the motion of the Theme “them” into the fire, but has no influence over the Theme after that initial causation. Likewise, ἄγω, in Luke 4:9, is marked by continuous impetus: “He led them to Jerusalem.” In this case, the Agent not only initiates the motion of the Theme, but also sustains its motion through to the end of the event *to Jerusalem*.

Danove marks Discrete Impetus as –Impetus and Continuous Impetus as +Impetus (24-25).

### *Perspective:*

The *Transference Event* requires four entities: Source, Agent, Theme, and Goal. But the limits of both Greek verbs, as well as English verbs for marking participants and their relationships in a clause is limited to three entities. The result of this is that often with verbs of transference there are usages where the Source = Agent or where the Goal = Agent. Thus in Mark 8:26, “[Jesus] sent him [from Jesus] to his house,” The Agent of the motion (Jesus) also functions as the Source of motion. Likewise, in Mark 14:36, “[You] take this cup from me [to yourself],” the Agent of the motion (You/God) also functions as the Goal where the motion will end (to yourself/God).

Danove marks Source = Agent perspectives with S=A and Goal = Agent with G=A (25). Where one of these semantic entities (Source, Goal, or Agent) is merely implied by context, they are placed in brackets [ ] (25-27).

### *Focus:*

For Danove, *Focus* is not dealing directly with the information structure and pragmatics, though there is a relationship between his *Focus* in valence description and *Focus* in the sense that a speaker uses Danove's *Focus* as one way for structuring the information of a given clause. In valence description, *Focus* deals with the conceptualization of the event and the overt status of

required arguments. That is, in some cases, all four entities of the Transference Event (Source, Agent, Theme Goal) are explicitly marked in a clause, as in Luke 7:20, “John the Baptist sent us to you.” This, Danove defines as the Primary Focus Usage because it permits direct retrieval of all four entities. Conversely, in John 1:6, “a human being, sent from God,” it is impossible for the audience to directly retrieve the Goal from the clause only. Danove defines this usage where an element cannot be directly retrieved from a clause the Secondary Focus Usage. In both these examples, the verb has the same *Perspective* (in this case Source = Agent), but they differ in that the Goal cannot be retrieved directly.

“Valence descriptions note secondary usages by placing the unrealized and irretrievable entity in parentheses, ( ), and primary usages by placing the unrealized but retrievable entity in brackets, [ ]” (28).

Thus ἀποστέλλω has two distinct valence descriptions depending on which prepositions is used. The first parallels the valence of Luke 7:20 with the Goal is explicitly expressed by πρός and the Source is retrievable from the Agent. The second parallels John 1:6, where the Goal in brackets is both unrealized and irretrievable from the verb and its arguments.

ἀποστέλλω AΘ[S]G [S=A]

1	2	3
Agent	Theme	Goal
N	N	P/πρός

ἀποστέλλω AΘS(G) S=A

1	2	3
Agent	Theme	Source
N	N	P/παρά

(Danove, 27-30).

*Functionality:*

Danove defines *Functionality* as the feature where one semantic role functions as another semantic role. This is similar to Luraghi’s use of metaphorical transfer for semantic roles (*On the Meaning Prepositions and Cases: Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek* [Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004]). It essentially is a cover term for a variety of metaphors for explaining semantic role usage. For example, in Matt 26:46, “Get up, let’s go!” has the *Functionality* of Theme → Agent on the basis of the metaphor: Themes that initial transference are Agents.

The feature of *Functionality*, Danove also notes, is the only thing that distinguishes two usages of τίθημι:

ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημεῖον. Acts 13:29

They placed [Jesus] into a tomb.

ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ἐν μνημείῳ. Mark 6:29  
They placed him [John] in a tomb.

Danove's valence descriptions mark the change of *Functionality* here of Goal --> Location, where the metaphor is Goals are Locations (30-32).

### **Event Features:**

The main proposal of the final section of chapter 2 examines the events expressed by verbs of transference and their derivatives. Danove's main argument here is there are parallels between the default transference usages of his 104 verbs and their secondary senses which do not necessarily express transference. These include the "continuing applicability of impetus and the rules linking active/middle/passive base." Such parallels suggest that all other events expressed by Danove's 104 verbs should be viewed and treated as derivatives of transference even though the four logical entities of transference (Source, Agent, Theme, Goal) are not necessarily present. These derivative event features include Exclusion, Augmentation, and Substitution. In the current review, these will be dealt with on a more *ad hoc* basis than the semantic features above.

### **+/-Animate:**

Danove proposes that the distinction between πρὸς constituents, N+Dative constituents, and εἰς constituents can be defined along the lines of animacy. Across his corpus of transference, the first two constituent types are consistently +animate, while the third, εἰς constituents are consistently –animate.

### **Observations for Chapters 1-2:**

If Danove has successfully distinguished the semantics of usage for his corpus of 104 verbs based on the features delineated above and from my reading he has, then he is to be commended. The amount of effort and analysis he has invested into this endeavor is impressive and his semantic proposals are quite theoretically convincing for the lexical semantics of these verbs. My only disappointment is the lack of the feature of Aktionsart/Situation Aspect, which would have enriched his semantic description even more for describing verbs in terms of the features *State*, *Achievement*, *Accomplishment*, *Activity*, & *Semelfactive*.

### **Survey of Chapters 3-10:**

The following chapters of Danove's book, specifically chapters 3-6, focus on semantically similar usages & verbs. The central emphasis in these chapters is the fact that verbs of motion and transference can fundamentally be treated as a semantic system where each verb and its senses can be differentiated from others based on its semantic features (see above). Thus, chapter 3 examines usages that specifically denote transference verbs in the Active voice which require three constituents. Danove divides these transference verbs into nine distinct usages each of which varies in its semantic features. These include usages which involve transference explicitly to a goal, from a source, or terminate in a locative constituent. These are then divided up based on other semantic features such as impetus (again, see above).

In the same vein, chapter 4 examines those same usages for the Middle voice and Chapter 5 for the Passive voice. But chapter 5 is also unique in that passive voice usages are not all inherently transference, since the passive voice lends itself to creating motion semantics rather than transference. Passive transference verbs as well as passive motion verbs, according to Danove, maintain a close enough semantic relationship that they can be treated together.

Chapter 6 focuses on active voice motion and relative motion usages. The verbs include προάγω, ἄγω, ἐπιβάλλω, αἶρω, βάλλω, and παραδίδωμι (to get a sense of what kind of verbs fit in this category). They are unified by two central features: First, all of these verbs are semantically marked for the Theme (that which is moved/transferred) also functioning as the Agent (that which moves/transfers) Secondly, these verbs consistently reflect the perspective that the Theme is also functionally the Source. Other semantic & usage features such as impetus & focus vary for these verbs. Such features make it possible to distinguish them from one another.

Chapter 7 examines verbs which grammaticalize an event/situation which Danove terms effect. Effect usage verbs are verbs which in their more basic sense express transference, but by the exclusion of both Source and Goal participant/entities have grammaticalized a situation where, “the conceptualization of the event highlights the effect of the Agent’s action on the Theme; and the Theme functions as an internally affected Patient ( $\Theta \rightarrow P$ )” (124-25). A good example of an effect verbal usage is the secondary sense of δίδωμι: to produce. For example in Mark 4:8, “Others fall onto the good ground and **produced** fruit...” (33) In the basic sense of δίδωμι, the verb requires an Agent/Source (who gives), a Theme (which is given) and Goal/Recipient (which receives). In this derived sense of the verb, the Source & the Goal are removed from the equation. Danove’s central argument here is that for transference/motion verbs which have secondary non-transference/motion senses, those secondary senses are:

1. derived from the transference senses, but also
2. adopt the very same semantic & event features as typical transference verbs.

The total result of this claim is this: Danove holds that both the basic transference/motion usages and also the derived usages can be explained as functioning as part of the exact same semantic system. And if I may say so, the results are quite impressive.

Chapter 8 takes a look at eight transference verbs which also have secondary derived usages which he terms: delegation (e.g. δίδωμι, ‘to appoint’), addition (e.g. προστίθημι, ‘to add’), disposition (e.g. δίδωμι, ‘to make/dispose one to’ [ethical benefaction]), commission (e.g. ἀποστέλλω, ‘to send +inf’), and decision (e.g. τίθημι, ‘to decide’). Likewise, the same theoretical claims mentioned above for chapter 7 apply equally here.

Chapter 9 presents some implications, applications & conclusions. Danove’s major suggested implication with regard to his proposed usage features is that the model could potentially be used to describe any group of verbs, provided that they, “grammaticalize the same events” (164). Perhaps just as significant is Danove’s proposed implication for the semantic feature *Animacy* with relation to Goal & Locative: all +animate *Goal* complements take πρὸς and all +animate *Locative* complements take εἰς. Likewise all –animate *Goal* complements take εἰς and all –

animate *Locative* complements take *πρός*. Danove argues this distribution holds with Hebrew 5.7 as the only exception in his corpus. More investigation of the benefit of the semantic feature of *Animacy* in relation to prepositional usage would prove to be a highly beneficial procedure.

But of chapter 9, probably the most interesting discussion for NT scholars is Danove's critique of BAGD's<sup>2</sup> lexical descriptions and division of senses, using *δίδωμι* as representative. The following chart is adapted from Danove, 168 & his own lexical entry on page 185ff.:<sup>3</sup>

### Danove's Proposed Usages for *δίδωμι*

1. (a) Transference, Active, Ditransitive (Agent, Theme, Goal+dat), *give*  
(b) Transference, Active, Ditransitive (Agent, Theme, Locative+P), *give/put*
2. Effect, Active, Transitive (Agent, Patient), *give forth, produce*
3. Delegation, Active, ditransitive (Agent, Event+ἵνα, Goal) *give, delegate*
4. Disposition, Active, Ditransitive (Agent, Patient, Event) *make, dispose*

### BAGD's Divisions in relation to Danove's Proposals

1. a. Danove's Sense #1a.  
b. Danove's Sense #2 (give forth in the sense of *bestow, impart, grant*)
2. Danove's Sense #1a.
3. Danove's Sense #1a.
4. Danove's Sense #2 (give forth in the sense of *give back, yield, produce*).
5. Danove's Sense #1b.
6. Danove's Sense #2 +Benefactive Adjunct (*give up/sacrifice*)
7. Usage #45 [sic, see below] (Decision, Middle, Continuous Impetus).

As it can easily be seen, BDAG's divisions are significantly varied compared to Danove's, who is worth quoting at length on this issue:

“The entry from Bauer, *Lexicon*, separates the discussion of the usages of transference to a Goal (#1 [Sense 1a) and effect (#31 [Sense 2]) into three segments, offers no comment on the usage of delegation (#39 [Sense 3]), and considers only the difficult occurrence of the usage of disposition (#42 [Sense 4]) in Lk. 23.58 (ἐργασίαν δίδωμι: see chapter 8, section 5d)” (168).

It appears that BAGD's sense #7, which Danove lists as Usage #45 is a typo that should be Usage #42 (Active, Continuous Impetus). With that in mind, for a sense that BAGD & BDAG consider a Latinism, Danove proposes that the semantic-syntactic structure of the clause actually

<sup>2</sup> It is not entirely clear why the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (BAGD, 1979) is used rather than the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (BDAG, 2000). BDAG does not even appear in the bibliography or abbreviations list. With that said, BDAG's entry for *δίδωμι* is expanded from 7 senses to 17, which in of itself is suspect. This might be the reason behind this odd choice: dealing with the 17 so-called "senses" proposed by BDAG compared to the 7 of BAGD could have very well been a much more frustrating endeavor. It would be a beneficial procedure to compare Danove's syntactic-semantic claims about *δίδωμι* to the current edition of Bauer to see how its significantly multiplied senses compare.

<sup>3</sup> In order to make the significance of the chart more clear in this review, I have expanded the simple list of usages provided in both columns in such a way that the different senses of *δίδωμι* are more recognizable.

fits better the licensing of  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  in the sense of *make, dispose* rather than the Latin idiom typically followed.

This discussion of Danove's case frame lexicon also functions as a helpful summary of chapter 10, which consists of the Case Frame Lexicon & Parsing Guide. Danove's lexical entries are more concise, convey the very same information in a manner that better fits the semantic-syntactic properties of Greek verbs, and provides a greater wealth of grammatical information about each verb than either BAGD or BDAG. The only current limits of Danove's work are the lack of extra-biblical material and a comprehensive study of all Greek verbs.

### **Conclusions:**

Danove's new book examining Greek verbs of transference & motion in the New Testament is a revolutionary volume that deserves to have a major impact on Greek lexicography, syntax, & translation. His framework is rigorous and thorough in a manner that previous lexicons & discussions of verbs, cases, & prepositions are not. Danove has quite successfully distinguished the meaning and usages of his 104 verb sample. As far as his own discussion shows, all the verbs are distinguished in meaning and function from the others — including near synonyms.

Unfortunately, this level of accuracy has come at the price of simplicity. While granting that examining the interface between syntax & semantics is never simple, I fear that the majority of Danove's work will never be fully appreciated because of the amount of mental effort required to work through this highly complex system.

Until we are provided with a basic, more accessible *introduction* to case frame analysis and argument structure, there will be no advance in the application of what I consider to be a very beneficial methodology for understanding Greek verbs and their clauses. While this is a very successful system & method, which excels at understanding Greek verbs on their own terms rather than on English, it is not a system that can currently be helpfully or easily conveyed to students, whether beginning or advanced. In fact, even most scholars themselves will struggle with its complexities before fully comprehending its full usefulness.

For Danove's work here to be implemented on a large scale by Greek scholars & students, either the teaching of Greek grammar will need to be drastically changed or his model will need to be simplified. Or perhaps both will need to happen. This is not, as a whole, a criticism of Danove's work. Indeed, the detailed and rigorous work ought to be done as a grounding & basis before more accessible follows. I hope that such an introduction will be forthcoming from Danove's pen, so that a larger audience will be able to enjoy the richness of his methodology & work in Greek syntax.

In any case, for those who are willing to put in the effort to work through this book, they will not be able to help but be impressed with the level of detailed analysis provided here, which deserves to be read widely.