sciendo

Comparative analysis of oral descriptions of events in Swahili and Polish.
A semantic and morphosyntactic perspective

Agnieszka Schönhof-Wilkans

Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
agawilkans@gmail.com

Abstract: Agnieszka Schönhof-Wilkans. *Comparative analysis of oral descriptions of events in Swahili and Polish. A semantic and morphosyntactic perspective*. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of Arts and Sciences, PL ISSN 0079-4740, pp. 123-139

The aim of this paper is to give a preferably brief overview of research undertaken in the project *Comparative analysis of oral descriptions of events in Swahili and Polish. A semantic and morphosyntactic perspective* funded by the Polish National Science Centre within *Preludium 4* funding scheme (grant no. 2012/07/N/HS2/00963). The project includes applying the conceptual apparatus that enables comparison of genetically and typologically diverse languages within the scope of one of the most complex linguistic categories, that of diathesis. The material for analysis was collected by means of interviews with Polish and Swahili native speakers by use of audiovisual prompts. The collected material was then subjected to comparative analysis with respect to diathesis. The analysis makes use of the concepts of Jerzy Bańczerowski's general theory of diathesis and concentrates mainly upon semantic and morpho-syntactic schemata for the diathetic meanings of transitivity and transmittivity. The semantic schemata proposed below are conceived to be universal in our theory. The lingual material reveals some morpho-syntactic schemata which are intertwined with the semantic schemata in each of the two languages under description.

Keywords: Swahili, Polish, diathesis, voice, transitivity, transmittivity, causativity

1. Introduction

The present paper is a modest attempt towards comparison of two genetically distant languages, Polish and Swahili, in terms of diathesis. The analysis makes use of the concepts of Jerzy Bańczerowski's general theory of diathesis, which has hitherto been applied to several languages – Japanese (Bańczerowski 2006), Korean (Bańczerowski 2001), Chinese (Kordek 2000), Finnish and Estonian (Bielecki 2005), and Hindi (Stroński 2011) – although it has not yet been applied to African languages. The present project is a continuation of research already undertaken for a doctoral thesis (Schönhof-Wilkans 2015). In combination with the thesis, it represents the first attempt to apply that theory in re-

search on the syntax of Swahili and above all extends that work to include a contrastive aspect. The article mainly focuses on transitivity and transmittivity. These two diathetic meanings are to be described both generally and specifically, that is from the perspective of each of the two languages, Polish and Swahili. The specific descriptions of the categories in question are far from being complete as we operate on a limited data, that is spoken material, obtained during fieldwork in 2014. From this kind of data, we can only formulate hypotheses about language users' preferences for some construction types over the others, or observe certain tendencies in a language. The lingual material certainly does not exhaust all possible constructions for a given diathetic meaning in any of the two languages.

2. Method

The material for analysis was collected by means of interviews. The research sample consisted of 30 native speakers of each of the two languages, Polish and Swahili. Both men and women participated in the experiment, their ages ranged from 20 to 60. Interviews were conducted using audiovisual prompts (15-18 short videos[1]). As the author's intention was eliciting a set of event descriptions which were diversified in terms of the number of diathetic meanings, the parameters of video excerption referred to specific diathetic meanings (e.g. transitivity, transmittivity, causativity, stativity, among others). For example, in order to elicit a description of a transmittive event (a situation in which an agent participant causes an object to pass into the possession of an animate receiver), a video was chosen in which a man is giving a bag to a homeless person. After having watched a video, a respondent was encouraged to give a short description of what happened in the video. All interviews were conducted individually and most of the interviews (all of the interviews with Tanzanians) were audio-recorded. Data processing involved extracting sentences from interviewees' utterances and assigning them a morpho-syntactic description.

3. Preliminary remarks on diathesis and voice

The theoretical problems of diathesis still raise many controversies in linguistics, although research in this domain had already begun in antiquity. The complexity of the matter makes it difficult for the researcher to avoid inconsistencies or even ambiguities while trying to embrace the totality of diathetic phenomena in a language. That is probably why the distinction between diathesis and voice is sometimes blurred, even to the extent that the two notions are treated interchangeably. One of the earliest documented

---

[1] As for the source of the videos, they were taken as 30-second fragments of existing films present on YouTube, which, at the time of conducting research, was permissible under the Right of Quotation (Art. 34 of the Law of February 4, 1994 on Copyright and Related Rights, Art. Act of February 4, 1994 on Copyright and Related Rights, Art. 29 § 3 of the Act of 4 February 1994 on Copyright and Related Rights).

studies into diathesis and voice was conducted by Pāṇini who "described the distinctions of inflectional paradigms and of meanings associated with the opposition of active and middle in the Sanskrit verb" (Klaiman 1991: 1). The very term διάθεσις 'disposition, arrangement' was apparently first used by Dionysius Thrax with reference to passive, active and medium constructions of Classical Greek (Andersen 1991: 30ff). Latin grammarians adopted the concept of diathesis for the opposition between active and passive verbal forms under the notion of *genera verbi*. Medieval Latin grammarians used the term *vox* for roughly the same concept, which, in turn, underlies the French *voix* and the English *voice* used in the modern linguistic approaches (Kulikov 2010: 368). Xolodovič & Mel'čuk (1970) define diathesis (Russian *diateza*) in terms of correspondence between two levels of representation: the level of semantic arguments or semantic roles and the level of grammatical relations or syntactic functions. Voice (Russian *zalog*), on the other hand, is described as the systematic encoding of diathesis in the morphology of the verb. Therefore, according to Babby (1998: 4), "a verb's various voices constitute a subset of the full diathetic paradigm". Laskowski claims that the notion of diathesis is solely applicable to predicates taking more than one argument. By *diathesis* he understands the relation between the set of arguments governed by the predicate and the way of encoding each of these arguments in the surface syntactic structure (Laskowski 1984: 136). Diathesis is therefore conceived as the totality of formal, structural-syntactic and morphological means that serve to signal the differences in the hierarchization of the predicate arguments, whereas voice is the grammatical category that serves to signal the differences in diathesis (Laskowski 1984: 137). In Kulikov's words (2010: 369-370), "diathesis is determined as a pattern of mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions (grammatical relations). The notion of diathesis is closely related to that of verbal valency/valence, which is inherently associated with the set of arguments governed by the verb in question". A distinction is often made between marked and unmarked diathesis. By marked diathesis Górski (2008: 9) understands the deagentization expressed by formal means (both morphological and syntactic). Unmarked diathesis is nothing else but a natural hierarchization of arguments. The marked diathesis in Polish, according to Górski (*ibid*.), encompasses passivum, impersonal passive constructions, and pseudoreflexivum. In all three types of constructions the agent undergoes degradation to a non-subject position or is completely excluded from the sentence. He concludes that in Polish the degradation of the agent, rather than the promotion of the patient, is the main function of the marked diathesis.

4. Theoretical foundations of the theory of diathesis

At the foundation of our considerations lies the assumption that language and reality are intertwined together. This kind of dependence reminds us of a feedback mechanism – through language we apprehend events in the real world, but the linguistic structures that we use with reference to the world are imposed by the events themselves. Both sentences and events belong to the key concepts of the present investigation. Every natural language can be understood as a stream of sentences in analogy to reality conceived

of as a stream of events. Events compose of participants and relations binding those participants. Within each event we distinguish at least one participant and at least one interparticipant relation. Event participants and interparticipant relations are represented by proper units in sentences. Constituents of sentences (predicates and their arguments) refer to extra-lingual entities and mirror relations occurring between those entities. Thus, sentences designate events and signify some of their properties.

As one of the broadest lingual categories, diathesis covers considerable areas of semantics, syntax, and morpho-syntax. Here, in order to draw a clear terminological distinction between a linguistic discipline and its subject matter, it should be mentioned that Bańczerowski introduced two terms: diathetology and diathesis. The former could be viewed as a discipline dealing with sentences and desentential syntagms, with regard to how they reflect the structure of events or states-of-affairs being designated by them, the latter, diathesis, is treated as the domain of diathetology (Bańczerowski 2006: 5). The categories of voice and case interact within diathesis. While diathesis is concerned with sentences and desentential syntagms, voice is conceived of as a flexion of verbs with regard to diathesis. Case, on its part, is the category concerned with arguments.

Languages display differences in the coding of information concerning the same events. Those differences occur both inter- and intralingually. Various theoretical models are applied in order to enable cross-linguistic grammatical comparison. Therefore, diathetology as a class of linguistic theories can be divided into general and particular diathetology. Theories constructed within general diathetology are universal, applicable to all languages. Particular diathetological theories are limited to an individual language or a group of languages (Bańczerowki, *ibid.*). In diathetological research certain types of interaction between the participants of events are of interest. Diathetically relevant properties of events are conceived of as diathetic-significata or diathetic meanings. These include the following, among the others:

(i)   Transitivity,
(ii)   Intransitivity,
(iii)   Transmittivity,
(iv)   Stativity,
(v)   Causativity,
(vi)   Reciprocity,
(vii) Reflexivity,
(viii) Possessivity.

Each diathetic meaning is complex and will be viewed as *suprasignificatum* with regard to its *subsignificata* (cf. Bańczerowski 2001, 2006). For instance, transitivity is comprised of agentivity, patientivity and transitificatory. The diathetic meaning of transitivity refers to a transitive event, which is usually defined as a dynamic event that involves two distinct participants – an intentionally acting agent, and a patient who is directly affected as a result of the transfer of energy from the agent.

For the sake of diathetic research, Bańczerowski and his students have proposed a few sets of primitive terms and formulated a few sets of axioms (postulates). Since space is limited here, I deliberately resign from presenting the list of primitive terms and postulates

for diathesis (for reference see Schönhof-Wilkans 2015). Nevertheless, an intuitive introduction to some concepts is indispensable for further reading.

The notions of **symptosis** and **concasion** are crucial to the theory of diathesis. The symptosis of a given sentive[2] reflects the syntactic organization of semantic categories in this sentive. Symptoses are therefore categorial semantic schemata which are determined by diathetic meanings. The concasion of a given sentive reflects the syntactic organization of morphological categories of case and voice within this sentive. Concasions are thus categorial morpho-syntactic schemata determined by diathetic meanings. The diathetic meaning of the sentence *Mary ate a cake* is transitive. Table 1 presents the sentence structure, its symptosis and concasion.

Table 1: Symptosis and concasion of the sentence *Mary ate a cake*

	Mary	*ate*	*a cake*
Sentence structure	subject	predicate	object
Symptosis	agent	transitificator	patient
Concasion	nominative	active verb	accusative

The sentential agentive symptosis is represented by the following scheme: ({AGT, PAT, TSF}, {(AGT, TSF), (TSF, PAT)}). This symptosis is realized by concasion represented by the scheme ({Nom., Acc., Act.V},{(Nom., Act.V), (Act.V., Acc.)}).

Voice and case are categories which a grammar of a given language usually has at its disposal (Bańczerowski 2006: 11). Hence, morpho-syntactic schemata (concasions) are considered to be language-specific, whereas categorial semantic schemata (symptoses) are more universal in our theory. In this respect, the comparison of two genetically and typologically distant languages, namely Polish and Swahili, seems to be an interesting undertaking. It was assumed that the above mentioned differences between the two languages would occur primarily at the level of representation of the category of voice and case. It shall also be noted here that Bantu languages differ considerably to Indo-European languages in terms of coding those two categories. Swahili does not have any overt case marking, however its cross-referencing system of agreement and the word order operate in an accusative system (cf. Blake 1994: 120). The information about case in Swahili is encoded linearly and also within the verb. As far as the category of voice is concerned, Swahili predicates may incorporate morphemes that signify particular verbal voices (e.g. reflexive, reciprocal, passive, etc.).

Diathesis in Swahili is still waiting for a comprehensive approach although considerable research on some fragments of the category in question (e.g. transitivity, passive constructions) has already been undertaken (e.g. Whiteley 1968; Vitale 1981; Abdulaziz 1996; Amidu 2001; Mkude 2005). However, none of these scholars actually used the term 'diathesis'. Those studies predominantly focused upon transitivity by using such methodologies as systemic functional grammar (e.g. Whiteley 1968; Abdulaziz 1996),

---

[2] This notion refers to either a sentence or a desentential syntagm (syntagm derived from a sentence).

linguistic empirical grammar (e.g. Amidu 2006) or various generative approaches (e.g. Vitale 1981).

5. Transitivity

A transitive event is a dynamic event which involves two distinct participants – an intentionally acting agent, and a patient who is directly affected as a result of the transfer of energy from the agent. Within the theory of diathesis, the diathetic meaning of transitivity comprises of the following diathetic submeanings: agentivity (AGT), patientivity (PAT) and transitificatory (TSF). Table 2 shows which syntactic categories are occupied by which semantic categories within the diathetic meaning of transitivity in sentences and desentential syntagms.

Table 2: Syntactic organistion of symptoses for transitivity (cf. Schönhof-Wilkans 2015: 125)

Symptoses for transitivity	Syntactic categories		
	Subject or subject-like category	Predicate	Oblique syntactic categories (direct object, indirect object, circumstantial (adverbial), attribute)
Sentential agentive symptosis	agent	agentive transitificator	patient
Sentential patientive symptosis	patient	patientive transitificator	agent
Desentential agentive symptosis	agent	–	patient (oblique), transitificator (attribute to the agent)
Desentential patientive symptosis	patient	–	agent (oblique), transitificator (attribute to the patient)
Desentential agentificatorial symptosis	agentive transitificator	–	agent, patient
Desentential patientificatorial symptosis	patientive transitificator	–	agent, patient

In order to elicit a set of sentences referring to the diathetic meaning of transitivity a video stimulus was selected showing a lumberjack cutting down the tree with a machine. There was also an alternative video showing a tree falling down in severe weather conditions with no person involved in the process. The sentential agentive symptosis

({AGT, PAT, TSF}, {(AGT, TSF), (TSF, PAT)}) was the most common in both Tanzanian and Polish utterances:

(1)   *mtu a-na-kat-a mti*   Swahili
       Nom. Act.V Acc.
       man 3sg-PRES-cut-ind tree
       'the man is cutting the tree'

(2)   *mężczyzna ścina drzewo*   Polish
       Nom. Act.V Acc.
       man cut tree
       'the man is cutting the tree'

In both languages the symptosis ({AGT, PAT, TSF}, {(AGT, TSF), (TSF, PAT)}) is realized by concasion ({Nom., Acc., Act.V}, {(Nom., Act.V), (Act.V, Acc.)}), but, unlike Polish, Swahili has no morphologically overt case marking. The sentential patientive symptosis ({AGT, PAT, TSF}, {(PAT, TSF), (TSF, AGT)}), in which the patient serves as subject never appeared spontaneously in interviews, but only if a speaker was asked to start a sentence with the noun 'tree':

(3)   *mti u-me-kat-w-a na mwanaume*   Swahili
       Nom. Pass.V. NA-case
       tree CL3-PERF-cut-PASS-ind by man
       'the tree has been cut down by the man'

(4)   *drzewo zostało ścięte przez mężczyznę*   Polish
       Nom. Pass.V. Acc.
       tree be cut by man
       'the tree has been cut down by the man'

Tanzanians' responses to the video revealed another aspect of the situation, namely its causative reading:

(5)   *a-na-angu-sh-a mti kwa kutumia mashine*
       3sg-PRES-fall-CAUS-ind tree by use machine
       '(he) is cutting down the tree [causing the tree to fall down] by use of machine'

The transitive verb *angusha* 'cause to fall' derives from the intransitive *anguka* 'fall' by addition of causative morpheme *–sh-*. Therefore, sentence (5) might be interpreted as synsymptosic, that is realizing more than one, in this case, two symptoses:
   (i) ({AGT, PAT, TSF}, {(AGT, TSF), (TSF, PAT)}) – transitve reading
   (ii) ({CSR, EFR, CSFR}, {(CSR, CSFR), (CSFR, EFR)}) – causative reading.

Both symptoses presented above are realized by one concasion in Swahili:

   (i) ({Nom., Acc., Act.CSV}, {(Nom., Act.CSV), (Act.CSV, Acc.)}).

There was a strong tendency among Swahili speakers to use causative verbs, both active and passive, in the description of the video showing a tree falling down in a storm:

(6)   *kuna upepo mkali na mti u-me-angu-sh-w-a na upepo*
            (there)is wind strong and tree Sbj.CL9-PERF-fall-CAUS-PASS-ind by wind
            'there is strong wind and the tree has been fallen down by the wind'

(7)   *kimbunga ki-me-angu-sh-a mti*
            storm Sbj.CL7-PERF-fall-CAUS-ind tree
            'the storm has fallen down the tree'

An intersting observation was made concerning the perception of the video. When the tune was off, two Swahili speakers came up with intransitive verbs *-anguka* 'fall' and *-vunjika* 'get broken' (derived from *vunja* 'break' by addition of the stative morpheme -k-):

(8)   *mti u-me-anguk-a mwenyewe*
            tree Sbj.CL3-PERF-fall-ind by itself
            'the tree has fallen down by itself'

(9)   *mti u-me-vunj-ik-a*
            tree Sbj.CL3-PERF-break-STAT-ind
            'the tree broke'

However, after watching the video again but with the tune on (sound of a storm), they preferred causative verbs over stative ones:

(10)   *Aaa! [mti] u-me-angu-sh-w-a na upepo mkali*
            (exclamation) [tree] Sbj.CL9-PERF-fall-CAUS-PASS-ind by wind strong
            'Oh! It has been fallen down by the strong wind'

(11)   *ni-me-sem-a kwamba ni upepo ki-na-cho-sabab-ish-a mti kuanguka*
            1sg-PERF-tell-ind that is wind CL7-PRES-CL7.REL-reason-CAUS-ind tree fall down
            'I told it is the wind that is causing the tree to fall down'

Some of the descriptions included stative verbs accompanied by the noun denoting the cause of the event:

(12)   *ni-me-on-a mti u-me-dondok-a kwa sababu ya kimbunga*
            1sg-PERF-see-ind tree Sbj.CL3-PERF-fall-ind by reason of storm
            'I saw (that) the tree has fallen down because of the storm'

(13)   *mti u-me-anguk-a kwa upepo mkali*
            tree Sbj.CL3-PERF-fall-ind by wind strong
            'the tree has fallen down because of strong wing'

Some Polish speakers used similar constructions while describing the cause of the event, however they expressed the change of state by use of reflexive particle 'się':

(14)   *drzewo przewróciło się od wiatru*
            tree fell down REFL from wind
            'the tree fell down itself because of the wind'

The cause of the situation is introduced here by prepositional expression 'od wiatru'. Although 'wiatru' is genitive of 'wiatr', the whole expression with the preposition *od*, expressing the direction of a motion from an object, reminds us of *ablativus causae*. Another Polish speaker used the preposition *przez* 'by' which, together with the passive voice, presupposes 'wind' as agent:

(15)   *drzewo zostało powalone przez wichurę*
            tree be (PAST) fallen down by wind
            'the tree has been fallen down by the wind'

While describing the video, the vast majority of Polish speakers interpreted 'wind' as the agent, and 'tree' as the patient of the situation by choice of an active clause:

(16)   *wiatr powalił drzewo*
            wind fell down tree
            'the wind fell the tree down'

(17)   *wichura wyrwała drzewo z korzeniami*
            wind pulled out tree with roots
            'the wind pulled out the tree with its roots'

Thus, the sentential agentive symptosis ({AGT, PAT, TSF}, {(AGT, TSF), (TSF, PAT)}) realized by concasion ({Nom., Acc., Act.V}, {(Nom., Act.V), (Act.V, Acc.) }) prevailed in Polish descriptions of the video. The analogical concasion is Swahili ({Nom., Acc., Act.CSV}, {(Nom., Act.CSV), (Act.CSV, Acc.)}) appears to be synsymptosis between ({AGT, PAT, TSF}, {(AGT, TSF), (TSF, PAT)}) and ({CSR, EFR, CSFR}, {(CSR, CSFR), (CSFR, EFR)}).

6. Transmittivity

In linguistics a transmittive event is often described in terms of a 'ditransitive construction'. As defined by Malchukov, Haspelmath & Comrie (2010), a ditransitive construction consists of a (ditransitive) verb, an agent argument, a recipient-like argument, and a theme argument. The construction refers to a situation in which an agent participant causes an object to pass into the possession of an animate receiver (=recipient). Such constructions simply convey the diathetic meaning of transmittivity. Since the notions of agent and patient are reserved for transitivity in our theoretical model, I propose the following notions for the diathetic meaning of transmittivity:

(i)   emittor – the entity transmitting/transferring something,
(ii)   recipient – the entity receiving something,
(iii)   emissive – the entity being transmitted/transferred from the emittor to the recipient.

These correspond to the notions used by Malchukov et al. (2010), namely to agent, recipient and theme respectively. Transmittivity can be pure (atomic) or extended (proper). In the former it is the act of transmission itself that is passed from the emittor to the recipient:

(18)   *askari a-na-hudum-i-a nchi*   Swahili
         soldier SBJ.1sg-PRES-serve-APPL-ind country
         'the soldier serves the country'

Table 3 shows possible symptoses for atomic transmittivity within the syntactic organization of sentences and desentential syntagms.

Table 3: Syntactic organization of symptoses for atomic transmittivity (cf. Schönhof-Wilkans 2015: 143)

Symptoses for atomic transmittivity	Syntactic categories		
	Subject or subject-like category	Predicate	Oblique syntactic categories (indirect object, circumstantial (adverbial), attribute)
Sentential emittorial symptosis	emittor	emittorial transmittificator	recipient
Sentential recipientive symptosis	recipient	recipientive transmittificator	emittor
Desentential emittorial symptosis	emittor	–	recipient (oblique), transmittificator (attribute to the emittor)
Desentential recipientive symptosis	recipient	–	emittor (oblique), transmittificator (attribute to the recipient)
Desentential emittorificatorial symptosis	emittorial transmittificator	–	emittor, recipient
Desentential recipientificatorial symptosis	recipientive transmittificator	–	emittor, recipient

The diathetic meaning of (extended) transmittivity is formed by the following sub-meanings: emittority, recipientivity, emissivity and transmittificatory.

Table 4: Syntactic organization of symptoses for extended transmittivity (cf. Schönhof-Wilkans 2015: 145)

Symptoses for transmittivity	Syntactic categories			
	Subject or subject-like category	Predicate	Oblique syntactic categories (direct object, indirect object, circumstantial (adverbial), attribute)	
Sentential emittorial symptosis	emittor	emittorial transmittificator	emissive	recipient
Sentential recipientive symptosis	recipient	recipientive transmittificator	emittor	emissive
Sentential emissive symptosis	emissive	emissive transmittificator	recipient	emittor
Desentential emittorial symptosis	emittor	–	emissive, recipient, transmittificator	
Desentential recipientive symptosis	recipient	–	emittor, emissive, transmittificator	
Desentential emissive symptosis	emissive	–	emittor, recipient, transmittificator	
Desentential emittorificatorial symptosis	emittorial transmittificator	–	emittor, emissive, recipient	
Desentential recipientificatorial symptosis	recipientive transmittificator	–	emittor, emissive, recipient	
Desentential emissificatorial symptosis	emissive transmittificator	–	emittor, emissive, recipient	

The schemata determined above can be viewed as universal semanto-syntactic patterns enabling us to code lingually events of extralingual reality. A language may prefer some schemata over the others, which means that it imposes certain restrictions upon the occurrences of particular schemata. Or, some of the categorial semantic schemata from the range of a given diathetic meaning might not operate in a given language at all.

Let us now proceed to the results of research within the diathetic meaning of (extended) transmittivity in Polish and Swahili. As mentioned earlier, one of the videos presented a homeless person lying on the floor and receiving a gift (a full plastic bag) from a man coming by. What was foreseeable, the descriptions varied. In order to describe the situation, Swahili speakers utilized the following verbs among the others: *-p-*‘give’, *-hudhumia* ‘serve for’, *-toa msaada* ‘give help’, *-saidia* ‘help’, *-bebia* ‘carry for’, *-pata* ‘receive’, *-patia* ‘give to’, *-saidiwa* ‘be helped’, *-pewa* ‘be given’, *-pelekewa* ‘be delivered something’. In most cases the emittor (being an agent at the same time) was realised as subject category:

(19)   *mtu a-na-m-hudhum-i-a mzee*
       man SBJ.3sg-PRES-OBJ.3sg-serve-APPL-ind old man
       'the man is serving the old man'

(20)   *mtu a-na-to-a msaada kwa mtu ambaye ni mwhitaji*
       man' SBJ.3sg-PRES-give away-ind help for man that is man in need
       'the man is giving away help for the man who is in need'

(21)   *huyo a-na-m-said-i-a mzee ambaye a-na-hitaji*
       (man) in question SBJ.3sg-PRES-OBJ.sg-help-APPL-ind old man who SBJ.3sg-
       PRES-need
       'the man (in question) is helping the old man who needs (help)'

(22)   *a-na-m-pa msaada*
       SBJ.3sg-PRES-OBJ.3sg-give-ind help
       '(he) is giving him help'

(23)   *mtu a-na-beb-i-a mwenzake mizigo zake*
       man SBJ.3sg-carry-APPL-ind his fellow stuff his
       'the man is carrying stuff for his fellow'

(24)   *mtu a-na-omb-a msaada, mwengine a-na-m-said-i-a chakula*
       man SBJ.3sg-PRES-ask-ind help the other (man) SBJ.3sg-PRES-OBJ.sg-help-
       APPL-ind food
       'the man is asking for help, the other one is helping him (with/by) food'

(25)   *nimeona kijana a-ki-m-pat-i-a mzee kifurushi*
       SBJ.1sg-PERF-see-ind   young   man   SBJ.3sg-HIPOTAXIS-OBJ.3sg-get-APPL-ind
       old man parcel
       'I have seen the young man giving the old man a parcel'

In some cases, it was the recipient who was realized as subject, and as a consequence – the passive voice was used:

(26)   *mzee anahitaji chakula [...] kwa hivyo a-me-said-i-w-a kitu chakula*
       old man SBJ.3sg-PRES-need food that is why SBJ.3sg-PERF-help-APPL-PASS-ind
       something food
       'the old man needs food (…) that is why he has been helped with some food'

(27)   *huyu baba ni mtu ambaye ha-ji-wez-i sasa a-me-pelek-e-w-a zawadi*
       this grandad is man who NEG-REFL-be able to-ind so/ now SBJ.3sg-PERF-deliver-AP
       PL-PASS gift
       'this grandad is a man who is not able to help himself so he has been delivered a gift'

(28)   *mzee a-na-p-ew-a msaada na huyo kijana*
       old man SBJ.3sg-PRES-give-PASS-ind help by this young man
       'this old man is being given help by the young man'

30 predicates have been extracted from Swahili utterances referring to the video. They can be grouped as follows:

(i)   active applicative verb with the object marker (occurrence 40%), e.g. *anamsaidia, akampatia, anamhudhumia*

(ii)   active three-argument verb without the applicative morpheme and with object marking (occurrence 20%), e.g. *anampa*

(iii)   passive verb without the applicative morpheme (occurrence 13.3%), e.g. *anapewa*

(iv)   complex predicate *-toa msaada* 'give help', no applicative morpheme, no object marking (occurrence 13.3%)

(v)   active applicative verb without object marking (occurrence 6.6%), e.g. *anasaidia, anabebia*

(vi)   applicative passive verb (occurrence 6.6%), e.g. *anahudhumiwa*

As far as symptoses for transmittivity are concerned, Swahili results embraced two out of nine theoretically possible symptoses, namely:

(i)   the sentential emittorial symptosis:
        ({EMR, RCP, TSMF}, {(EMR, TSMF), (TSMF, RCP)}) – for atomic transmittivity
        ({EMR, RCP, EMS, TSMF}, {(EMR., TSMF), (TSMF, RCP), (TSMF, EMS)}) – for extended transmittivity

(ii)   the sentential recipientive symptosis:
        ({EMR, RCP, TSMF}, {(RCP, TSMF), (TSMF, EMR)}) – for atomic transmittivity
        ({EMR, RCP, EMS, TSMF}, {(RCP., TSMF), (TSMF, EMR), (TSMF, EMS)}) – for extended transmittivity

As shown in Table 4, the sentential emittorial symptosis requires an emittor for subject category, both a recipient and emissive for oblique syntactic categories and an emittorial transmittificator for predicate. The sentential recipientive symptosis has the structure in which a recipient appears as subject, an emittor and emissive function as oblique syntactic categories, and a recipientive transmittificator functions as predicate. Those symptoses can be realized by a number of concasions in Swahili. In Tanzanians' utterances, the sentential emittorial symptosis has been realized by the following concasions:

(i)   ({Nom., Dat., Act.APV}, {(Nom., Act.APV), (Act.APV, Dat.)})

(ii)   ({Nom., Acc., Act.APV}, {(Nom., Act.APV), (Act.APV, Acc.)})

(iii)   ({Nom., Dat., Acc., Act.APV}, {(Nom, Act.APV), (Act.APV, Dat.), (Act.APV, Acc.)})

(iv)   ({Nom., NA-case, Obl., Pass.APV},{(Nom., Pass.APV), (Pass.APV, NA-case), (Pass.APV, Obl.)})

In Tanzanian's utterances obtained by help of video elicitation stimuli, the sentential recipientive symptosis has been realized by the following concasions:

(i)   ({Nom., Acc., Act.APV}, {(Nom., Act.APV), (Act.APV, Acc.)})

(ii)   ({Nom., Dat./Abl., Act.APV}, {(Nom., ActAPV), (Act.APV, Dat./Abl.)})

(iii)   ({Nom., Obl., Pass.APV}, {(Nom., Pass.APV), (Pass.APV, Obl.)})

(iv)   ({Nom., Dat./Abl., Acc., Act.APV}, {(Nom., Act.APV), (Act.APV, Dat./Abl.), (Act.APV, Acc.)})

(v)   ({Nom., NA-case, Obl., Pass.APV},{(Nom., Pass.APV), (Pass.APV, NA-case), (Pass.APV, Obl.)})

Polish respondents utilized the same symptoses for transmittivity as Swahili speakers. Though, the concasions for transmittivity were different.

(29)   *człowiek niesie pomoc bezdomnym*
       man carry help the homeless
       'the man is offering help homeless people'

(30)   *mężczyzna daje leżącemu człowiekowi siatkę*
       man gives lying man bag
       'the man is giving bag to the lying man'

(31)   *on mu daje jedzenie*
       he him gives food
       'he is giving him food'

(32)   *mężczyzna dzieli się jedzeniem z bezdomnym*
       man share REFL food with homeless person
       'the man is sharing food with a homeless person'

The sentential emittorial symptosis has been realized by the following concasions in Polish:
(i)   ({Nom., Dat., Act.V}, {(Nom., Act.V), (Act.V, Dat.)})
(ii)   ({Nom., Dat., Acc., Act.V}, {(Nom., Act.V), (Act.V, Dat.), (Act.V, Acc.)})
(iii)   ({Nom., Instr., Instr., Act.Refl.V}, {(Nom., Act.Refl.V), (Act.Refl.V, Instr.), (Act.Refl.V, Instr.)})

As far as transmittivity is concerned, Polish and Swahili differ from each other not only by case-related issues, but also in terms of the lack of applicative marker on the verb in the former language and the presence of thereof in the latter.

While the act of giving is expressed by *verbum emittendi*, the act of receiving is expressed either by passivzed *verbum emittendi* or by *verbum recipiendi* as shown below:

(33)   *bezdomny uzyskuje pomoc od innego człowieka*   Polish
       homeless person get help from another man
       'the homless mani s getting help from another man'

The sentential recipientive symptosis in Polish has been realized by the following concasions:
(i)   ({Nom., Acc., Act.V}, {(Nom., Act.V), (Act.V, Acc.)})
(ii)   ({Nom., Acc., Gen., Act.V}, {(Nom., Act.V), (Act.V, Acc.), (Acc., Gen.)}).

7. Conclusions

The article discussed some general theoretical issues concerned with diathesis. It particularly focused on two diathetic meanings, namely transitivity and transmittivity based on the framework of the general theory of diathesis developed by Bańczerowski (1980, 1993, 2001, 2006) and continued by his students. The present analysis was by no means intended to be exhaustive. I do claim, however, it has several advantages as a framework for further cross-linguistic investigation over diathetological issues. I hope that the frame-

work adopted for the purposes of the present investigation will result in a systematic description of linguistic phenomena concerning transitivity, transmittivity and other diathetic meanings in Swahili and Polish, or, at least, will constitute a different proposal to those available so far. As previously assumed, Polish and Swahili differ considerably as far as the categories of voice and case are concerned. Although data was limited to a spoken language, it revealed relevant differences in morpho-syntactic coding of events under description.

Abbreviations

Abl. – ablative; Acc. – accusative; Act. – active (voice); Act.V – active verb; APPL – applicative; APV – applicative verb; CAUS – causative; CL – nominal class; CSFR – causatificator, CSR – causer; CSV – causative verb; Dat. – dative; EFR – effector; EMR – emittor; EMS – emissive; FUT – future; Gen. – genitive; ind – indicative; Nom. – nominative; OBJ – object; Obl. – oblique; PERF – perfect; PRES – present; Pass. – passive (voice); PASS – passive; PAST – past; pl – plural; RCP – Recipient; REC – reciprocal; REF – referential; REFL – reflexive; REL – relative; SBJ – subject; sg – singular; TSF – Transitificator; TSMF – Transmittificator.

References

Abdulaziz, Mohamed H. 1996. *Transitivity in Swahili*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
Amidu, Assibi A. 2001. *Argument and Predicate Relations in Kiswahili. A New Analysis of Transitiveness in Bantu*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
Amidu, Assibi A. 2012. PP Arguments in Kiswahili Bantu and their Implications for Transitivity Theory. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 20(1). 1-30.
Andersen, Paul K. 1991. *A new look at the passive*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris: Peter Lang.
Babby, Leonard H. 1998. *Voice and diathesis in Slavic*. Presented at Conference on Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax, Bloomington. http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/babby.pdf (21.03.2011).
Bańczerowski, Jerzy. 1980. *Systems of semantics and syntax. A determinational theory of language*. Warszawa, Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
Bańczerowski, Jerzy. 1993. Some theoretical aspects of diathesis. In Darski, Józef et al. (eds.), *Sprache – Kommunikation – Informatik*, Vol. 1, 17-23. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Bańczerowski, Jerzy. 2001. Some aspects of the category of diathesis in Korean. In: Cheong, Byung-Kwon & Pak, Cheong-Wu (eds.), *Je 8 hwe jeonggi haksul daehwe. Haksul Daehwe Nonmunjip*. Seoul: Hanguk Dong Yureop Balkan Hakhwe, Hanguk Wegugeo Daehakkyo, Dong Yureop Balkan Yeonguso.
Bańczerowski, Jerzy. 2006. A contribution to a theory of transitivity in Japanese. *Scripta Neophilologica Posnaniensia* VIII. 3-24.
Bańczerowski, Jerzy & Lê Đình Tu'. 2012. Phonetic and Morphological Coding of Minimal Syntactic Units in Isolating Languages (A tentative draft with insights from Chinese and Vietnamese). *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* LXV(1). 7-23.
Bańczerowski, Jerzy & Pogonowski, Jerzy & Zgółka, Tadeusz. 1982. *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*. Poznań: UAM.
Beaudoin-Lietz, Ch.A. 1999. *Formatives of Tense, Aspect, Mood and Negation in the Verbal Construction of Standard Swahili*. Memorial University of Newfoundland. (PhD dissertation.)
Bielecki, Robert. 2005. *Kategoria tranzytywności w języku fińskim i estońskim*. Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. (Unpublished doctoral thesis.)
Bresnan, Joan & Moshi, Lioba. 1990. Object Asymmetries in Comparative Bantu Syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21(2). 147-185.
Comrie, Bernard & Polinsky, Maria (eds.). 1993. *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Deen, Kamil Ud. 2002. *The Acquisition of Nairobi Swahili: The Morphosyntax of Inflectional Prefixes and Subjects*. UCLA. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation.)

Dixon, Robert M.W. & Aikhenvald, Alexandra (eds.). 2000. *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.). 2011. The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. http://wals.info (Accessed 2012-11-30).

Farrell, Patrick. 2005. *Grammatical Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fillmore, Charles. 1968. The Case for Case. In Bach, Emmon & Harms, Robert (eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hagège, Claude. 2010. *Adpositions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyman, Larry M. & Duranti, A. 1982. On the Object Relation in Bantu. In Hopper, P. & Thompson, S. (eds.), *Studies in Transitivity, Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 15, 217-239. New York: Academic Press.

Iggesen, Oliver A. 2011. Number of Cases. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 49. http://wals.info/chapter/49 (Accessed 2012-12-03).

Kempf, Zdzisław. 1978. *Próba teorii przypadków. Część 1*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Kempf, Zdzisław. 2007. *Próba teorii przypadków. Część 2*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.

Kiango, J. G. 2003a. Syntactic classification of Swahili verbal expressions. *Africa &Asia: Göteborg working papers on Asian and African languages and literatures 3*. 20-40.

Kiango, J. G. 2003b. Syntactic analysis of Swahili verbal expressions. *Africa &Asia: Göteborg working papers on Asian and African languages and literatures 3*. 64-90.

Klaiman, M. 2005 (first published 1991). *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kordek, N. 2000. *Kategoria diatezy w języku chińskim*. Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. (Unpublished doctoral thesis.)

Kulikov, Leonid I. 1998. Causative constructions in Tuvinian: towards a typology of transitivity. In Johanson, Lars et al. (eds), *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3-6, 1994*. (Turcologica; Bd. 32), 258-264. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kulikov, Leonid I. 2010. Voice typology. In Song, Jae J. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, 368-398. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lodhi, A.Y. 2002. Verbal extensions in Bantu (the case of Swahili and Nyamwezi). *Africa&Asia* 2. 4-26.

Malchukov, Andrej & Spencer, Andrew (eds.). 2008. *The Oxford handbook of case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malchukov, Andrej. 2008. Animacy and asymmetries in differential case marking. *Lingua* 118. 203-221.

Malchukov, Andrej & Haspelmath, Martin & Comrie, Bernard. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: A typological overview. In Malchukov, Andrej & Haspelmath, Martin & Comrie, Bernard (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook*, 1-64. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Maw, Joan. 1969. *Sentences in Swahili: A Study of Their Internal Relationships*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Mel'čuk, I. A. & Xolodovič, Aleksandr A. 1970. K teorii grammatičeskogo zaloga. *Narody Azii i Afriki* 4. 111-124.

Mkude, Daniel J. 1995. *Towards a Semantic Typology of the Swahili Language*. Tokyo: ILCAA.

Mkude, Daniel J. 2005. *The Passive Construction in Swahili*. Tokyo: ILCAA.

Ngonyani, Deo. 1995. *Towards a Typology of Applicatives in Bantu*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference on African Linguistics, 26th, Los Angeles, CA, March 24-26 1995.

Ngonyani, Deo. 1998. Properties of applied objects in Kiswahili and Kindendeule. *Studies in African Linguistics* 27(1). 67-95.

Ohly, Rajmund & Kraska-Szlenk, Iwona & Podobińska, Zofia. 1998. *Język suahili*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.

Pawlak, Nina. 2010. *Języki afrykańskie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Polański, Kazimierz (red.). 1999. *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Polomé, Edgar C. 1967. *Swahili Language Handbook*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Port, Robert F. 1981. The applied suffix in Swahili. *Studies in African Linguistics* 12(1). 71-82.

Reynolds, Karl H. & Eastman, Carol M. 1989. Morphologically Based Agreement in Swahili. *Studies in African Linguistics* 20(1). 63-78.

Saloni, Zygmunt & Świdziński, Marek. 1985. *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

Schadeberg, Thilo C. 1996. Uo mmoja hautiwi panga mbili. Aina za yambwa na maana zake. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 47*, *Swahili Forum* III. 63-71.

Schönhof-Wilkans, Agnieszka. 2012. On the Question of Transitive and Intransitive Verbs in Swahili. In *Lingua Posnaniensis* LIV(1). 89-97.

Schönhof-Wilkans, Agnieszka. 2015. *The Category of Diathesis in Swahili. Transitivity, Transmittivity, Causativity*. Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. (Unpublished doctoral thesis.)

Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The passive: A comparative linguistic analysis*. London: Croom Helm.

Stroński, Krzysztof. 2011. *Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects of Ergativity in Indo Aryan*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

TUKI. 2001. *Kamusi ya Kiswahili-Kiingereza. Swahili-English Dictionary. Toleo la Kwanza*. Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili (TUKI): Chuo Kikuu cha Dar es Salaam.

TUKI. 2004. *Kamusi ya Kiswahili Sanifu. Toleo la Pili*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Vitale, Anthony J. 1981. *Swahili Syntax*. Dordrecht, Cinnaminson, NJ: Foris Publications.

Wesana-Chomi, E. 1973. Towards the Syntax of Complex Sentences in Swahili. *Kiswahili* 43(2). 30-51.

Whiteley, Wilfrey H. 1968. *Some Problems of Transitivity in Swahili,* London: School of Oriental and African Studies.