

YUNING SHEN (2018a), *TRANSITIVITÄT UND VERBVALENZ IM SWAHILI*
[TRANSITIVITY AND VERB VALENCY IN SWAHILI]
COLOGNE: RUEDIGER KOEPPE VERLAG
ISBN 978-3-89645-712-7

A REVIEW

Introduction

Shen (2018a) is about transitivity and verb valency in Swahili or Kiswahili. It is not the first nor will it be the last work on the subject matter. Shen (2018a) comes exactly 20 years after Whiteley's (1968) ground-breaking study into transitivity in Kiswahili. In Kiswahili, as in other languages, the debate has raged since 1850 as to which verbs deserve to be called 'transitive verbs' exclusively and without exception and which verbs deserve to be called 'intransitive verbs' exclusively and without exception. Several modern scholars, including this writer, have pointed out that verbs are neither *transitive* nor *intransitive* by themselves. Verbs rather function in transitive and/or intransitive clauses (see Fowler 1971, Chomsky 1995, Amidu 2001, 2013, Croft 2001). As a result, the same verb may function in a transitive clause and in an intransitive clause respectively.

In African language and linguistic studies, the influence of oversimplified pedagogic grammar books, papers, and dictionaries either inherited from the colonial period of Africa or modelled on colonial descriptive grammatical originals has led many scholars and students to adopt what we have called the "dogma of inherent intransitivity" (Amidu 2013: 10). We wish to call it, for short, the 'fiat of dogma position'. The fiat of dogma position holds that there are inherent exclusive and without exception 'intransitive verbs' in African languages. For example, in Kiswahili, verbs like *-simama* 'stand', *-enda* 'go', *-mea* 'sprout', *-enea* 'spread, be spread', *-vimba* 'swell, be swollen', to name a few, are still regularly described as intransitive verbs absolutely and without exception in modern books, articles, in dictionaries (see TUKI 2004), and in computer generated grammar and corpuses. It is difficult to say why so many grammarians, linguists, and computation programmers of African languages still use old outdated pedagogical descriptions of transitivity to this day.

Shen (2018a) follows the old Eurocentric tradition and attempts, at the same time, to clarify the Africanist's dilemma about intransitivity. Unfortunately, he fails in his attempt because he adopts a narrowly oversimplified hypothesis in which intransitivity is determined by WHOLE-PART and PART-WHOLE relationships and his "situated internalisation" of postverbal NPs.

2.0 Shen's (2018a) approach to transitivity and verb valency in Kiswahili

Firstly, Shen (2018a) adopts "The Helsinki Corpus of Swahili" (HCS) of Hurskainen (2016), as downloaded on 25.09.2017, as a central aspect of his study for the retrieval of his verbs and statistical calculations. Shen (2018a: 111) writes confidently about his use of the HCS in his English summary as follows:

"This study focuses distinctively on the language data provided by Helsinki Corpus of Swahili 2.0 and raises the question whether previous classifications of verbs properly mapped the language performance of Swahili speakers. Two tests are designed to profile the following features generally suggested as qualifying objecthood of certain NPs: 1) the likelihood of attracting a noun in the syntactic position following the verb form (referred to as noun affinity in this study); 2) the distribution of verb forms between those which occupied an object prefix and those which did not (referred to as the ability of object prefixation in this study)."

Observe that Shen (2018a) places a lot of faith in the efficacy of the HCS to the extent that he does not appear to cross-check his data against detailed native speaker usage. He seems unaware that any computer-generated corpus of a language is like the Oracle of Thebes. It may not get all its facts and predictions right. This is because the material generated and retrieved from a computer is dependent for its reliability and accuracy on the language and grammar programmed into it. If it is programmed to generate Ancient Egyptian, or Ancient Greek, or old grammatical results, it will generate Ancient Egyptian, or Ancient Greek, or old grammatical results which, although exciting for a historical linguists, are of little use to Modern Egyptian, or Modern Greek, or modern and current grammatical results.

Secondly, Shen (2018a) spells out his methodology clearly in chapter 5 of his book. For example, on page 51 (or p. 59 of the pdf version) of his book, he writes in German about what he means by R1 position as "unmittelbar postverbale[r] Position (R1)". He gives a list of nouns that occupy his R1 position immediately after the verb or "postverbalen position" in his "Tabelle 13: Nomen in R1-Position für den Verbstamm -vimba "schwellen". His criterion of R1 ignores the principle of flexible word order in postverbal position in Kiswahili to which Ashton (1947: 301-302) refers. The book contains lots of statistical and percentage calculations of occurrence of his verbs, again oblivious that it has been pointed out by others, e.g. Amidu (2001: 13-20), that distinctions like 'major' versus 'minor' patterns and statistical percentages do not determine whether or not a verb functions as intransitive or transitive in clauses. In his English Summary, Shen (2018a: 111-112) spells out his hypothesis more fully.

"Two tests are designed to profile the following features generally suggested as qualifying objecthood of certain NPs: 1) the likelihood of attracting a noun in the syntactic position following the verb form (referred to as noun affinity in this study); 2) the distribution of verb forms between those which occupied an object prefix and those which did not (referred to as the ability of object prefixation in this study). The results conflicted with previous classifications in many ways and some of these are discussed intensively in this work. [...]

In group C, through a method testing the possibility of permutation of some lexical items as Whiteley (1968) classified with his entailment model, the verb *-vimba* "(to) swell" exhibits extraordinarily higher noun affinity comparing to other members in this group. A qualitative analysis from this study suggests a rather widespread feature of intransitive verb: the allowance of the nominal coded ascription in the postverbal position which cannot be marked through object prefix in finite verb form. This nominal coded ascription or argument is conceptually very close to the subject noun through a PART WHOLE relationship. The wide spectrum of this PART WHOLE relationship made the author of the study call it "situational internalization (SitIn)". Moreover, evidence shows that the object prefix certainly could be used with this intransitive verb. The condition has to be met that the object prefix can only be used for marking the argument which represent the concept of WHOLE, and additionally, the argument involved should always be signalled, contradicting the entailment represented by Whiteley (1968), in previous text."

The core of Shen's (2018a) hypothesis with regard to intransitivity centres on two concepts: i) the concept of WHOLE-PART relationship (W/P-R) and/or PART-WHOLE relationship (P/W-R) between a subject NP, which encodes a WHOLE object, and a postverbal nominal, which encodes the PART object of the WHOLE object in the subject NP, and ii) the concept of postverbal nominal phrase which encodes the PART object of the WHOLE object, which is the subject NP, as the "situated internalisation" (SIP-N). The SIP-N obligatory follows its verb.

3.0 Whiteley (1968), Abdulaziz (1996), and Olejarnik (2005)

In chapter 3 of his book, Shen (2018a) refers in particular to Whiteley (1968), Abdulaziz (1996), and Olejarnik (2005), but he is particularly critical of Whiteley (1968). His criticism of Whiteley (1968) is bold and will no doubt generate some debate and discussion.

'Transitivity' for Whiteley (1968) means 'transitive' as opposed to 'intransitivity' or 'intransitive'. In this respect, Whiteley (1968: 10) adopts an "operation of 'entailment' and the sentences involved in such an operation [...] as constituting an 'affiliation-set'." He also indicates that some of his patterns do not yield entailments at all, others give rise to passive entailment, while others do not do so. Later in his book, Whiteley (1968) refers to the stative and other patterns, too, e.g. on pp. 35-36. In his chapters 4-5, Shen (2018a) refers to many of Whiteley's (1968) patterns. Shen (2018a) refers to his data (19-20a, b) about *-vimba* 'swell' taken from Whiteley (1968: 35-36) to illustrate, in his view, the failure of Whiteley's transitivity project. Other examples which involve *-vimba* are numbered (21-22) in his book.

Shen (2018a) leads readers to expect him to demonstrate and illustrate three things: i) that he has found evidence that the sentence-patterns of Whiteley (1968) are untenable as patterns of transitivity, ii) that he has found sentences in Whiteley (1968) that do not fit into any of the patterns and/or entailments he proposes, and iii) that only Shen's (2018a) alternative hypothesis is a sound, verifiable, motivated, and inductive substitute for Whiteley (1968), Abdulaziz (1996), and Olejarnik (2005).

4.0 Evaluation of the concepts of Shen (2018a) and their results

Firstly, Ashton (1947: 299-303) was the first to propose the concept of "situated internalisation" of postverbal NP. She called it "THE NOMINAL CONSTRUCTION". Thus, Shen (2018a) simply rechristens Ashton's "THE NOMINAL CONSTRUCTION" as a "situated internalisation" of postverbal "NOMINAL ASCRIPTION". He then formalizes his "R1 position" as "unmittelbar postverbale[r] Position (R1)" in Shen (2018a: 51, or p. 59 of the pdf) linked to the concept of PART-WHOLE relationship in Shen (2018a), alternatively called WHOLE-PART relationship. All these relationships are implied in parts of Ashton's (1947) "the nominal construction". Shen (2018a) applies his formalization exclusively and without exception to what he calls intransitive verbs or intransitive verb forms. In short, his relationships, elaborated in his book, he claims, allegedly explain, detect, and identify intransitive verbs in Kiswahili. Recall that Shen (2018a) says that,

"A qualitative analysis from this study suggests a rather widespread feature of intransitive verb: the allowance of the nominal coded ascription in the postverbal position which cannot be marked through object prefix in finite verb form. This nominal coded ascription or argument is conceptually very close to the subject noun through a PART WHOLE relationship. The wide spectrum of this PART WHOLE relationship made the author of the study call it "situational internalization (SitIn)"." (Shen 2018a: 111-112)

Observe, therefore, that Shen's (2018a) nominal ascription must be "in the postverbal position which cannot be marked through object prefix in finite verb form." The postverbal nominal ascription must also stand immediately after its verb (see also Ashton 1947: 299-300, for a similar assertion). The problem, as we see it, may be divided into three parts as follows:

- a. Shen's (2018a) approach is dependent on the reader agreeing with him without question that his claim that there are intransitive verbs out there is irrefutable and only need confirmation from his concepts above. As soon as Kiswahili internal evidence refutes his *a priori* fiat of dogma position, Shen's (2018a) claim loses its traction.
- b. Shen's (2018a) approach is dependent on the irrefutability of his claim that only a postverbal nominal "which cannot be marked through object prefix in finite verb form" is a "situated internalisation" of NP (SIP-N). It occurs only after intransitive verbs. A SIP-N is a PART object that relates with a subject NP that is its WHOLE object. Thus, if we find a postverbal NP that assigns allomorphs of object prefixes or object markers into the so-called intransitive verbs of Shen (2018a), then Shen's hypothesis fails its own tests. Finally, if a so-called intransitive verb has double object NPs, with or without allomorphs

of object prefixes or object markers that agree with the non-situated internalized NP, the hypothesis of Shen (2018a) fails and becomes untenable and false. If postverbal double NPs further display word order variation, they further refute his hypothesis. In addition, all deviations from Shen's prescriptions would turn his so-called intransitive verbs into transitive verbs either by default or a flaw in his hypothesis and reveal it as an instance of Quine and Ullian's (1978: 73) "cynical doctrine of selective leniency".

- c. Shen's (2018a) approach is further dependent on an elaboration of his claim in Shen (2018b: 12), to the effect that, strictly speaking, "WHOLE-PART-relationship is common for many intransitive verbs or intransitive verb forms, ranges from anatomical terminology (as for -vimba X, attributive descriptions (as for -komaa X) inalienable possession (as for -ibiwa X "be stolen X") to adhoc strong affiliation (as for -funguliwa X "be opened for X")." Ironically, note that Shen states that, "WHOLE-PART-relationship is **common for many intransitive verbs** or **intransitive verb forms** [...]" (our bold) In short, his hypothesis does not predict many other intransitive verbs at all. What is the use of a hypothesis that the author admits is incapable of accounting for all intransitive verbs as a verb class? Despite this obvious weakness, Shen (2018a) appears to imply that if Kiswahili internal evidence discovers a postverbal NP of his so-called intransitive verbs that is not a PART object of the subject NP, the reader must, nevertheless, accept without question the verbs as intransitives *via* Shen's fiat of dogma position. Note that Shen's SIP-N is never a WHOLE object. Thus, a WHOLE object in postverbal position violates his hypothesis unless it adheres to the condition of object marking its V. This point is worth stressing.

As Hempel (1966: 64) has observed, any hypothesis may be refuted by a single counterexample. As he says, "[...] a hypothesis of strictly universal form, such as 'All swans are white', can be refuted, in virtue of the *modus tollens* argument, by reference to one counter-instance, such as a black swan." (see also Amidu (2011: 3, footnote 1; see also p. 36, rules 1-2 and footnote 4). As Quine and Ullian (1978: 102) remark, "Any hypothesis, indeed any statement at all, that implies a falsehood is itself false."

Secondly, it is well known that Tsunoda (1978) and Austin (1982) refer to intransitive verbs with postverbal NPs or nominal phrases in Australian languages. Austin (1982: 42-43) refers to Tsunoda as recognizing "intransitive direct object". Thus, Shen's (2018a) position is again not new or original. Amidu (2013: 3-17), has criticized the claims of Tsunoda (1978) and Austin (1982) on the grounds that, by definition, an intransitive verb lacks a postverbal NP or nominal phrase, whether called "situated internalisation" or not, that forms a VP-dominated NP syntax in the sense of Fowler (1971: 50). It follows that any postverbal nominal phrase, whether it has a WHOLE-PART relationship with a subject NP or not, either forms a phrase with V and is a VP-dominated NP in the sense of Fowler (1971: 50) or it is not part of VP and is an adjunct. We know that it is syntactically impossible for an adjunct to generate a subject marker or prefix (SM/SP) or an object marker or prefix (OM/OP) into its verb. As a result, the assertion by Shen (2018a) to the effect that his verbs are intransitives that take OMs/OPs is self-contradictory as well as false in Bantu syntax. The simple matter of fact is that if Shen's (2018a) postverbal nominal phrase involving a WHOLE-PART relationship with a subject NP does not collocate with V and, hence, is not a VP-dominated NP, and is also not an adjunct, then, it is probably a discontinuous or gapped appositional subject unit (see Amidu 2009, on matrix NPs).

Thirdly, Shen (2018a: 112) writes in his English Summary cited above that,

"Moreover, evidence shows that the object prefix certainly could be used with this intransitive verb. The condition has to be met that the object prefix can only be used for marking the argument which represent the concept of WHOLE, and additionally, the argument involved should always be signalled, contradicting the entailment represented by Whiteley (1968), in previous text."

Recall that since the NP standing for the WHOLE object is not a SIP-N, its presence in postverbal position is only justified by Shen's (2018a) condition of having an OM in its V. Note, however, that it is a self-contradiction to say that an intransitive verb can take an object prefix/marker, in principle. Thus, the OM condition of Shen (2018a: 112) above reflects either a lack of familiarity with Bantu grammatical terminology or a cynical attempt at using a red herring to get out of a dilemma in his analysis. Whiteley (1968: 9) has rightly pointed out that,

"In the standard grammar and dictionaries very little specific attention is paid to the question of transitivity, though Ashton touches on the matter obliquely in her discussion of 'adverbial subject' and the 'nominal construction' and Polomé considers the structure of the verbal clause in some detail. Neither, however, gives attention to the question whether the patterns they exemplify are specific to certain verbs or not, so that the learner/reader has no way of knowing how general is the phenomenon under discussion. **This is particularly true with respect to the prefix known as the 'object prefix', the optional pre-radical element which formally marks an object relationship.**" (bold inserted by us)

Thus, in Bantu grammatical descriptions and theory, the 'object prefix/marker' (OP/OM) as well as its 'object relative prefix/marker' (ORP/ORM) are used exclusively to signal object relationships (see Amidu 2001: 11-13, 2013: chs. 2-3). To say of the term OP/OM and/or ORP/ORM that it marks non-object relationship in intransitive verbs qualifies for what Firth (1957: 21) calls "bogus philosophizing in linguistics." This is because, no constituent that is not an object or object complement, or complement object takes an OM/OP or ORM/ORP, or both, in Bantu syntax as the term transparently implies. In principle, by definitional implication, OM/OP or ORM/ORP, or both, falsifies Shen's (2018a) claims and analyses.

5.0 Yuning Shen's (2018a) WHOLE-PART relationship concept based on his Concept of Situated Internalisation for intransitive verbs

We reject Shen's (2018a) use of the term 'object prefix', also called 'object marker', to imply non-object relationship because a) his use contradicts standard principles of intransitivity, and b) his use is not the established usage in Bantu linguistic and grammatical descriptions and discourse.

According to Shen (2018a), a verb like *-vimba* 'swell, be swollen' is an intransitive verb. Our question is this: How does he know that a verb like *-vimba* is intransitive without first undertaking a syntactic analysis of comparable sentence patterns of the verb? Shen's (2018a) intransitive declaration about a verb like *-vimba* 'swell, be swollen' suggests to us that he believes indeed in an *a priori* fiat of dogma that says that there are absolute and without exception 'intransitive' verbs in Kiswahili. A number of problems arise from any belief in absolute and without exception intransitive verbs.

First of all, if the verb *-vimba* is intransitive *a priori* and absolutely and without exception, then Shen's (2018a) study is still born at its birth because it is unnecessary and useless. This is because it is self-evident that, confronted with an *a priori* conjecture as a universal truth, we are no longer dealing with analysis and description but with a decree and dogma. Within such a framework, the concepts of WHOLE-PART or PART/WHOLE relationship (W/P-R) or (P/W-R) and SIP-Ns are irrelevant for testing syntactic intransitivity versus transitivity. This is because, whether or not the subject NP and a postverbal nominal NP of verbs like *-vimba* are in a W/P-R or not, they would not change the verb's intransitivity as decreed by the fiat of dogma position. Thus, the assertion to the effect that W/P-Rs based on situated "postverbal nominal ascriptions" demonstrate that his verbs are intransitive is a conclusion that adds nothing to the fiat of dogma position that already says verbs like *-vimba* 'swell' are intransitives without exception, with and without W/P or P/W relationships and "situated internalisation" of "postnominal ascriptions".

Second of all, a further major drawback of the W/P-R or P/W-R concept of Shen (2018a) is that the relationship between WHOLE and PART is always bidirectional, namely $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A \rightarrow B$

ad infinitum. However, a WHOLE-WHOLE relationship (W/W-R) is also bidirectional, namely $A = B$ and $B = A$ *ad infinitum*. A W/W-R does not qualify as a PART-WHOLE relationship (P/W-R) or W/P-R at all. Thus, evidence of W/W-R would falsify Shen's (2018a) hypothesis of intransitivity. All the bidirectional relationships mentioned above are 'circular derivations'. They lead to 'chicken and egg' argumentations and to *argumentum ad absurdum*.

Third of all, Shen (2018a) does not factor into his hypothesis the fact, mentioned in Amidu (2001:193), that locative and locative like NPs, e.g. *nchini mwake* 'in his country', *nchi yake* '(in) his country', temporal locative/locative like NPs, e.g. *wakati* 'time', *siku* 'day/s', *asubuhi* 'morning', MAHALI NP, e.g. *mahali* 'place', manner/way NPs, e.g. *jinsi* 'way, manner', *namna* 'manner, way', to name just a few, occur in postverbal positions in many constructions and undergo object relative operations. These NPs easily falsify any *a priori* fiat of dogma assertion to the effect that "a verb X is intransitive" absolutely and without exception in Kiswahili.

Shen (2018a) could counterargue that it is his WHOLE-PART or PART-WHOLE relationship based on "Situating Internalisation" of postverbal nominal ascription, which has a special relationship to the subject noun, that makes and demonstrates the intransitivity of his verbs, for example, *-vimba* 'swell, be swollen'. This assertion would not, in itself, answer the critical syntactic question as to how he knows that his postverbal nominal phrase is not part of VP, namely it is not a VP-dominated NP which signals automatically an object relationship with V. This is especially the case when he has not undertaken a comparison of sentence/clause patterns of his verbs prior to asserting that they are intransitive verbs *a priori*. In short, we do not know how he identified and isolated a situated internalisation of a postverbal nominal phrase or nominal ascription. We are left to assume that he arrives at his fiat *via a priori* conjecture after consulting an Oracle of Thebes, probably, in the form of HCS.

5.1 Kiswahili data and their implications

- 1a. *Kuku wangu alivimba mguu mmoja.*
'One leg of my chicken was swollen, lit. my chicken was swollen one leg.'
- 1b. *Kuku wangu alivimba mguu mmoja mahali pale/siku ile/wakati ule/jinsi hii.*
'One leg of my chicken was swollen at that place/on that day/at that time/in this way, lit. my chicken was swollen one leg that place/that day/that time/this way.'

Firstly, Shen (2018a) argues that, given an example like (1a), which is similar to his example (20a) in his § 5.2 of his book (2018a) and taken from Whiteley (1968: 36), the verb *alivimba* 'it was swollen' is intransitive because the subject NP *kuku wangu* 'my chicken' refers to a WHOLE object and the postverbal NP *mguu mmoja* 'one leg' is a PART of the WHOLE object. In addition, the postverbal NP does not assign an OM to its verb. Thus, by his concepts, *mguu mmoja* is a postverbal "situated internalisation" of a nominal ascription and the verb is, therefore, intransitive absolutely and without exception. Our (1b), however, reveals, that if (1a) is, indeed, intransitive absolutely and without exception, as he claims, then it is strange that the verb *alivimba* 'she was swollen' takes an additional postverbal NP to form a double postverbal NP clause. The second postverbal NP does not define a W/P-R or P/W-R with its V at all. Shen (2018a) provides no answers to this paradox in his book. We are compelled by (1b) to conclude that Shen's (2018a) claim that the verb *-vimba* is intransitive *a priori* per his fiat of dogma, W/P-R or P/W-R *cum* SIP-N alone, is untenable and false. Let us test Shen's (2018a) hypothesis about (1a) with i) object relative syntax, and ii) ergative syntax.

- 1c. *Mguu mmoja ali-o-vimba kuku wangu umekatwa.*
'The one leg of my chicken which was swollen has been cut off.'
- 1d. *Mguu mmoja ulivimba.*
'One leg was swollen.'

In spite of Shen's (2018a) hypothesis, we observe that a class marked object relative marker (ORM), also called an object relative prefix (ORP), namely class 3 {o}, is generated and assigned by the postverbal NP *mguu mmoja* 'one leg' to its V. (1d) further reveals that the postverbal nominal phrase *mguu mmoja* 'one leg' in (1a, b) can function as the subject of its verb because it is derived from the DO of its VP in (1a). Observe that the SM/SP {u} in V of (1d) demonstrates the noun-verb relationship between subject NP and its V. No adjunct can function as a subject NP in Kiswahili. Only object NPs and object type NPs can do so. A datum like (1d) is found in Whiteley (1968: 35) and is recorded as datum (19) in Shen (2018a). Consider also (1e-h).

- 1e. *Mahali pale kuku wangu ali-po-vimba mguu mmoja panateleza sana.*
'The place where my chicken was swollen in one leg is very slippery.'
- 1f. *Siku ile kuku wangu ali-po-vimba/ali-yo-vimba mguu mmoja ilikuwa siku mbaya.*
'That day when/on which my chicken was swollen in one leg was a bad day.'
- 1g. *Wakati ule kuku wangu ali-po-vimba/ali-o-vimba mguu mmoja ulikuwa mchana.*
'That time when my chicken was swollen in one leg was noon.'
- 1h. *Jinsi hii kuku wangu ali-vyo-vimba/ali-yo-vimba mguu mmoja ilitushangaza sote.*
'This manner by/in which my chicken was swollen in one leg surprised all of us.'

Once more, in spite of Shen's relationships and hypothesis, we observe that a class marked ORM/ORP, namely locative or locative like class 16 {po}, or class 9 {yo}, or class 11 {o}, or class 8 {vyo}, respectively, is located in (1e-h) 'lit. which/when/how she was swollen'. (1e-h) are good grammatical constructions of Kiswahili. The explicit presence of each ORM in its V in (1c) and (1e-h) falsifies Shen's (2018a) claim to the effect that the verb in (1a, b) is intransitive absolutely and without exception. The problem for Shen (2018a) is that, as Chomsky (1995: 31) has observed and we have referred to him in Amidu (2013: 169), if a V cannot take a complement/object, it will not take one at all. Likewise, no postverbal NP will undergo an object relative operation, as the term implies, to be moved to the preverbal position behind that of the subject NP if it does not have an object relationship or object type relationship with its V in Kiswahili. ORM is, therefore, a *bona fide* allomorph of OM and its presence confirms directly and incontestably the objecthood of a VP-dominated NP in Kiswahili and Bantu syntax. If Shen (2018a) were to argue that he does not recognize the 2nd postverbal NPs in (1b) as NPs but rather as adverbs and adverbial phrases because in Indo-European grammars and/or Chinese they would be translated by means of adverb/adverbial phrases, he would be declaring in the same breath that he is not familiar with Bantu syntax and grammar, where noun phrases belongs in the noun class system and are not adverb phrases and/or adverbial phrases. In short, Kiswahili is not an Indo-European language or Chinese language. Thus, as observed in Amidu (2001, 2013) and noted above, a *bona fide* Bantuist and Kiswahilist will not call a marker 'object relative marker'/'object relative prefix' unless he or she understands and accepts the term as referring to a marker/prefix of an NP with object function derived from a noun class, and the NP has an object relationship with its V. Given (1a-h), the postverbal NP *mguu wangu* as well as all other postverbal NPs are object NPs or object complement NPs, whether or not any of them is a PART entity that refers to a WHOLE entity which is the subject NP of the clause. (1a-h) refute Shen's (2018a) intransitivity hypothesis and exposes it as an *ad hoc* hypothesis. As Quine and Ullian (1978: 78) have observed,

"The vice of an ad hoc hypothesis admits of degrees. The extreme case is where the hypothesis covers only the observations it was invented to account for, so that it is totally useless in prediction. Then also it is unsusceptible to confirmation, which would come of our verifying its predictions."

Note that besides the NP1 and DO *mguu mmoja*, an NP2 and IO in (1b) does not form an ergative syntax. What matters is that, syntactically, no postverbal NP that is not an element to which the term 'object' or 'complement' can apply can undergo an ergative operation to function as the subject NP of its ergative intransitive clause. Recall that adjuncts have no realized or potential agreement with S, V, or O (see Maw 1969: 42).

Secondly, consider (2a-f).

- 2a. *Mguu mmoja uli-m-vimba kuku wangu.*
'One leg of my chicken was swollen, lit. one leg swelled my chicken.'
- 2b. *Mguu mmoja uli-m-vimba kuku wangu mahali pale/siku ile/wakati ule/jinsi hii.*
'One leg of my chicken was broken at that place/on that day/at that time/in this way, lit. one leg swelled my chicken that place/day/time/way.'
- 2c. *Mahali pale mguu mmoja uli-po-m-vimba kuku wangu panateleza sana.*
'The place where one leg of my chicken was swollen is very slippery, lit. that place where one leg swelled my chicken is very slippery.'
- 2d. *Siku ile mguu mmoja uli-po-m-vimba kuku wangu ilikuwa siku mbaya.*
'That day when/on which one leg of my chicken was swollen was a bad day, lit. that day when/which one leg swelled my chicken was a bad day.'
- 2e. *Wakati ule mguu mmoja uli-po-m-vimba kuku wangu ulikuwa mchana.*
'That time when one leg of my chicken was swollen was noon, lit. that time when one leg swelled my chicken was noon.'
- 2f. *Jinsi hii mguu mmoja uli-vyo-m-vimba kuku wangu ilitushangaza sote.*
'This manner by/in which one leg of my chicken was swollen surprised all of us, lit. this manner which one leg swelled my chicken surprised all of us.'

(2a) is derived by a principle of entailment from (1a) (see Whiteley 1968: 10, 36). According to Whiteley (1968), a datum like (2a) is transitive. Shen (2018a) also has a datum like (2a) as his datum (20b) but describes its verb as intransitive. In (2a), the verb is *ulimvimba* 'it was swollen for her'. The subject NP is *mguu mmoja*. It refers to a PART object of a WHOLE object, and the postverbal nominal phrase *kuku wangu* is the WHOLE object. The demoted WHOLE object generates an OM and assigns it to its verb *ulimvimba* 'it swelled him'. The OM is {m} of noun class 1 in the verbs of (2a-f). Recall that, in Bantu grammatical theory, the OM {m} in the verb in (2a-f) falsifies Shen's (2018a) claim that the function of a verb like *-vimba* is always absolutely intransitive. Shen (2018a) disagrees, but his hypothesis is unable to explain patterns like (2b-f). In (2b), V *ulimvimba* takes a postverbal NP2 as its indirect object (IO). (2c-f), reveal that each choice of NP2 or IO in (2b) undergoes an object relative operation and assigns its ORM/ORP to its V. Thus, each V has two object markers, namely OM/OP for DO and ORM/ORP for IO. The patterns do not support Shen's (2018a: 112) *ad hoc* use of the term 'object prefix'/'object marker', including its allomorph ORM/ORP, to designate intransitive verbs. *Bona fide* intransitive verbs do not have DO and IO. Shen's claim that he has refuted Whiteley's (1968) transitivity hypothesis is, therefore, exposed by (2b-f) as a mere red herring.

Thirdly, let us consider also (3-4).

3. *Kuku wangu alijivimba sana.*
'My chicken was very arrogant/boastful, lit. my chicken became very self-swollen.'
- 4a. *Kuku wangu alivimba mwili wote.*
'My chicken was swollen all over her body, lit. my chicken was swollen whole body.'
- 4b. *Mwili wote uli-m-vimba kuku wangu.*
'The whole body of my chicken was swollen, lit. whole body was swollen my chicken.'
- 4c. *Mwili wote ulivimba.*
'The whole body was swollen.'

An example like (4c) appears on in Shen (2018a) as datum (21). The reflexivized form *-jivimba* 'be arrogant, be boastful, lit. swell oneself' in (3) is recorded in Sacleux (1939: 997) and used in Kingwana. In (3), *kuku wangu* 'my chicken' is the subject NP and the postverbal NP in the form of the reflexive anaphor NP {ji} 'self' is grammaticalized as or like an object marker and located inside the verb in the slot for object marker. In traditional Kiswahili grammar, the reflexive {ji} is called an 'object prefix'/'object marker'. This is stated explicitly in Ashton (1947: 43). **First of all**, the object marker or object prefix is inserted into the verb in (3) and violates the condition for intransitivity proposed by Shen (2018a: 112, for English Summary). The reflexive OM {ji} represents a counter-instance of his generalization about intransitive verbs and, therefore, falsifies

his hypothesis. At the very least, the verb *-vimba* is not intransitive in (3). **Second of all**, as any syntactician knows, a reflexive anaphor is generally coreferential with the subject NP of its containing clause. This means that {ji} 'self' implies the WHOLE object rather than a PART object separate from the WHOLE object, which is the subject NP *kuku wangu* 'my chicken'. **Third of all**, (4a) has *kuku wangu* 'my chicken' as subject NP and the postverbal NP *mwili wote* 'whole body'. The NPs are obligatorily coterminal and imply each other. As a result, the subject NP *kuku wangu* 'my chicken' and postverbal NP *mwili wote* 'whole body' are coreferential entities. That is, in (3) and (4a), my chicken implies herself or her whole body and, vice-versa, her whole body or herself implies my chicken. This is known in semantics as the **supernymic-hyponymic relationship and meaning**. Thus, if one identifies a whole person, one simultaneously identifies his/her self or whole body, too. Likewise, when one identifies a whole body or a self, one simultaneously identifies the whole person to whom the whole object/self belongs. Given that the NPs in (3) and (4a) are involved in a W/W-R and imply each other, the verb *-vimba* 'swell' cannot, *a fortiori*, be intransitive per Shen's (2018a) hypothesis because there is no W/P-R or P/W-R in (3) and (4a). (4b) is entailed from (4a) and has no W/P-R or P/W-R at all. Shen's (2018a) hypothesis of intransitivity is again revealed as unable to predict the intransitivity of the verb in (3-4) without his fiat of dogma. (4c) is an ergative intransitive derived from (4a) and confirms that the verb in (4a) is not intransitive. Shen's (2018a) W/P-R and P/W-R concepts also acquire the unfortunate accolade of turning his own *a priori* intransitive verbs like *-vimba* into transitive verbs by default in (3) and (4a, b). Shen (2018a) could argue that his hypothesis only covers cases "common for many intransitive verbs or intransitive verb forms" (Shen 2018b: 12). That is the nature of *ad hoc* hypotheses. They operate a "cynical doctrine of selective leniency" (Quine and Ullian 1978: 73).

Shen's (2018a) concepts and general hypothesis also assume that if one finds a WHOLE object, one will find its PART object, and if one finds a PART object, one will find a WHOLE object. In Macmillan (1950: 81), a story tells us that *Imam Saleh bin Omari* was caught by a leopard (*chui*), taken away, and eaten. As the story goes,

"Wakalala hata asubuhi. Asubuhi wakafuata wee wakakuta maiti imebaki kichwa tu, wakakichukua wakaja nacho mjini, wakakizika". This translates as 'They slept until morning. In the morning they followed the trail for a long time and found the dead/deceased person had been left with his head/the head, and they took it, returned to town with it, and buried it'.

- 5a. "Maiti imebaki kichwa tu." (Macmillan 1950: 81)
 'The dead/deceased person has been left with only a head/his head, i.e. only the head of the dead/deceased person remained.'
- 5b. *Imam Saleh bin Omari amebaki kichwa tu.* (our construction)
 'Imam Saleh bin Omari has been left with only a head/his head, i.e. only the head of Imam Saleh bin Omari remained.'

(5a) is from the story and (5b) is our addition. From (5a, b), we know that *chui* 'leopard' ate and left behind only the head of *Imam Saleh bin Omari*. The subject NP is *maiti* 'deceased/dead person, corpse' in (5a) and *Imam Saleh bin Omari* in (5b). The postverbal NP is still *kichwa* 'head, his head', The verb final adjunct *tu* 'only' follows the postverbal NP. If we are to take the WHOLE-PART relationships of Shen (2018a) seriously in (5a, b), it will presumably mean that the verb stem *-baki* 'be left over, remain' is also an intransitive verb. However, where is the WHOLE object in (5a, b) even by Shen's (2018a) standard? Do we have to resort to idealization here? Is such an idealization allowed only if employed by the author himself but misleading when employed by Whiteley (1968)? The truth of the matter is that without the help of idealization, the presence of a WHOLE deceased person/corpse/Imam required to successfully define a W/P-R per Shen (2018a) fails its own test because we only have *kichwa* 'head' and no other body PART to form a relationship in (5a, b). In fact, we do not have 3/4 of the entity. The 3/4 PART has also long been digested and passed out as manure. Even a DNA test and use of the name *maiti* 'deceased' and/or *Imam Saleh bin Omari* cannot help to restore a semblance of a WHOLE object. As the account

goes, only the head was buried. (5) reveals that the WHOLE-PART relationship and "situated internalisation" of postverbal nominal phrase that will be required for us to treat (5a, b) as having an intransitive verb fails because there is no anatomical WHOLE object in subject position but an idealized entity. In the end, the paradox in (5a, b) reveals that a WHOLE-PART relation is a logical postulate that, even with idealization, fails to predict intransitivity in Kiswahili. Let us look at (6-9) below.

- 6a. *Yule mwanafunzi amevimba kichwa siku hizi.*
'The apprentice/student is arrogant/conceited/proud these days, lit. apprentice/student is swollen head these days.'
- 6b. *Kichwa **kime-m-vimba** yule mwanafunzi siku hizi.*
'The apprentice/student is arrogant/conceited/proud these days, lit. head has swelled the apprentice/student these days.'
- 7a. *Yule mwanafunzi amepanda kichwa siku hizi.*
'The apprentice/student is arrogant/conceited/proud these days, lit. apprentice/student has grown a head these days.'
- 7b. *Kichwa **kime-m-panda** yule mwanafunzi siku hizi.*
'The apprentice/student is arrogant/conceited/proud these days, lit. head has grown apprentice/student these days.'
- 8a. *Yule mwanafunzi ana kichwa kikubwa siku hizi.*
'The apprentice/student is very arrogant/conceited/proud these days, lit. apprentice/student has a big head/swelled head these days.'
- 8b. *Kichwa kikubwa kina yule mwanafunzi siku hizi.*
'The apprentice/student is very arrogant/conceited/proud these days, lit. big head has the apprentice/student these days.'
- 9a. "Hata yule mwanafunzi akafanya kichwa kikubwa, akafanya kiwanda chake, na fundi wake asimjue." (Macmillan 1950: 113-114)
'And so, the apprentice/student became very arrogant/conceited/proud, and started his own workshop, and ignored his master craftsman.'
- 9b. *Yule mwanafunzi akafanya kichwa kikubwa.*
'And the apprentice/student became arrogant/conceited/proud, lit. the apprentice made/created/did/cultivated a big head.'
- 9c. *Yule mwanafunzi akafanya kiwanda chake.*
'And the apprentice/student made/created/started his (own) workshop.'

An example like (6b) also appears in Shen (2018a) as his datum (22). Shen's (2018a) WHOLE-PART and "situated internalisation" concepts are unable to predict and account for the transitivity of V + NP collocations, as in (6-8) and (9b). Observe that (6a) entails as (6b), (7a) entails as (7b), (8a) entails as (8b). (9b, c) have no entailed patterns. The subject NP is *yule mwanafunzi* 'the apprentice/student' in (6a, 7a, 8a, 9b). The postverbal NP is *kichwa* 'head' in (6a, 7a), or its variant *kichwa kikubwa* 'big head' in (8a, 9b). The relationship is that of WHOLE-PART. Where entailment is possible, we get (6b, 7b, 8b). The relationship is, then, PART-WHOLE. According Shen (2018a), (6a, b) involve an intransitive verb *-vimba* 'swell'. This means that the verbs *-panda* 'grow, rise, climb', copula *-na* 'have, be with', and *-fanya* 'do, make, create, cause' are not intransitive verbs. And yet, all the clauses in (6-8) and (9b) have the same syntactic constituents, the same meaning, convey the same communication intention, and the verbs in (6a, 7a, 8a, 9b) do not normally take an OM. A conclusion in which only (6a, b) have an intransitive verb and SIP-N, while (7-8) and (9b) with the same syntactic patterns have transitive verbs without SIP-N is difficult to buy as valid. The paradox makes Shen's (2018a) hypothesis a clear instance of Firth's (1957: 21) "bogus philosophizing in linguistics." The "bogus" tag arises from the fact that the hypothesis produces different transitivity results for the same functions, patterns, and meaning.

The issue here is that although Shen's (2018a: § 5.3, and p. 112 of pdf) hypothesis refers to 'idiom', he does not take into account the syntactic implications of V + NP collocations, whether or not they have W/P or P/W constituents, as in (6-8) and (9b). V + NP collocations are also called

phrasal verbs, V-NP complex, or V + NP contextual specialisation, e.g. *piga simu* 'make a phone call'. Maw (1969: 46-47) considered whether these alleged 'idioms', e.g. *-piga simu*, *-pamba moto*, were R_P but decided against the idea on her page 47. In V + NP collocations, the postverbal NP, whether called a PART object or whatever, is obligatorily closely bound to V than to any subject NP, whether it refers to a WHOLE object or not. This does not prevent the NP from undergoing object relative operation in Kiswahili, as demonstrated in Amidu (2013). This is why the V + NP collocation in (6-8) and (9b) is founded on the premise of the existence a V + object/complement relationship. As a result, any V + NP collocation, in fact, defeats a W/P, or P/W, or W/W concept in determining the intransitivity of verbs. Furthermore, in (6-8) and (9b), the postverbal NP is obligatorily part of the construction of the meaning of the VP, and is obligatorily an object/complement, whether or not it is also related to the subject NP. Note that (9a) has two clauses, given as (9b) and (9c). (9b, c) are exactly comparable in syntactic pattern, arrangement, and have the same verb, but only (9b) has a postverbal NP that forms a contextually specialized phrase with its V. (9c) has normal SVO pattern and ordinary usage. Syntactically, therefore, (6-9) are all transitive clauses without exception because they have "VP-dominated NP" syntax (see Fowler 1971: 50) and have comparable syntactic patterns. These patterns are referred to by other linguists as 'semi-idioms'. If Shen (2018a) says that *-na* 'have', *-panda* 'grow, rise', and *-fanya* 'do, make' are intransitive verb stems on analogy with his description of the verb stem *-vimba* in (6a), many linguists will be surprized. This is because V + NP collocation involving V + WHOLE or PART NP, or cognate NP, or other NP refutes a claim about absolute intransitive verbs. It follows that the verb *-vimba* functions as a transitive verb in (6) like the verbs in (7-9).

Shen (2018a: 29, 45 or 37, 53 of pdf version) also describes a verb like *-simama* 'stand' as intransitive. His datum (2) of (2019: 3) clarifies what he means as follows: "(simama: kitenzi kisoelekezi)", i.e. '(simama: intransitive verb)'. We renumber his datum (2) as (10) below.

10. *John alisimama.*
'John stood.'

It is true that, in (10), the verb *alisimama* 'he stood' functions in an intransitive clause, namely the clause does not require a postverbal NP to complete its syntax. Does that suffice to make the verb *-simama* 'stand, rise, erect' an absolute and without exception intransitive verb? We also find a variant assertion in Ashton (1947: 300). We number her datum as (11).

11. "Watoto, simameni **msimamo wa kiaskari**
Children, stand like soldiers."

Ashton (1947: 299-300) says (11) is an example of her "Nominal Construction" where an intransitive verb is followed by an NP. She says *-simama* 'stand' is intransitive because in English it would require a PP which, however, is not the case in (11). She assumed, thereby, that Kiswahili grammar must be analyzed as an extension of English grammar. Her postverbal NP *msimamo wa kiaskari* 'soldiery standing, lit. standing of soldier's way' is headed by the noun *msimamo* 'standing' of class 3. The postverbal NP is also not one of Shen's (2018a, 2019) SIP-N (see also (20a, b) below). The NP in (11) is, in fact, a **cognate direct object NP** generated by the verb itself. Thus, the verb of (11) is not intransitive as asserted by Ashton (1947: 300) and Shen (2018a: 29, 45 or 37, 53 of pdf, 2019: 3). This is clear when we compare (12a) with (12b) below.

- 12a. *Mtoto alisimama msimamo wa kiaskari.*
'The child stood like a soldier, lit. child stood the standing of a soldier.'
12b. *Msimamo wa kiaskari aliosimama mtoto ulimfurahisha mwalimu mwake.*
'The standing of like a soldier which the child stood gladdened his teacher.'

(12b) reveals that the postverbal NP in (12a) can be object relativized and signalled by an ORM {o} of its class 3 in the verb. (12b) syntactically refutes the claim by Ashton (1947) and Shen

(2018a, 2019) that the verb *-simama* is absolutely an intransitive verb. Next, consider (13a, b, c) verified by Sh. Abdulaziz Y. Lodhi of Uppsala University, Sweden, on 28 Sept 2006.

- 13a. *Yule askari kanzu alisimama masharubu kama mende.*
 'The plain clothes policeman sported a moustache like a cockroach, lit. the plain clothes policeman has stood/raised a moustache like a cockroach.'
- 13b. *Yule askari kanzu ali-ya-simama masharubu kama mende.*
 'The plain clothes policeman sported a moustache like a cockroach, lit. the plain clothes policeman stood/raised a moustache like a cockroach.'
- 13c. *Masharubu yali-m-simama yule askari kanzu kama mende.*
 'A moustache stood/rose on the plain clothes policeman like a cockroach.'

The original on which (13) is based comes from Shafi's (1999: 70) datum "Masharubu yalimsimama kama mende". It translates as, 'A moustache stood/rose on him like a cockroach' in reference to *yule askari kanzu* 'plain clothes policeman'. Observe that the postverbal NP *masharubu* 'moustache' in (13a) is a PART object related to the subject NP *yule askari kanzu* 'the plain clothes policeman', who is also the WHOLE object. Shen's (2018a) hypothesis appears to apply to (13). On closer examination of (13b), we discover that the postverbal NP and PART object assigns its OM or OP {ya} of its class 6 to its verb. According to Shen (2018a: 111) his situated internalized postverbal NP cannot assign any OM/OP into a verb. As a result, (13b) falsifies Shen's and Ashton's assertions to the effect that the verb *-simama* is an intransitive verb absolutely and without exception. It is a transitive verb in (13a, b). Furthermore, despite this, (13a, b) can be entailed as (13c) with an OM {m} in the verb referring to the demoted erstwhile subject NP *yule askari kanzu*, which remains the WHOLE object. (13b) can take two object NPs, as in (13d), and signal in the process object relationships with ORM {vyo} for NP *jinsi* 'way, manner' and OM {m} for NP *yule askari kanzu* 'the plain clothes policeman' simultaneously.

- 13d. *Jinsi masharubu yali-vyo-m-simama yule askari kanzu ilitutisha.*
 'The way (in) which a moustache stood/rose on the plain clothes policeman scared us.'

Given that (13a, b) are transitive clauses irrespective of any W/P-R, it is self-evident that (13c, d) are also transitive clauses in themselves rather than as a result of a SIP-N PART object being entailed as a subject NP and being bound to its WHOLE object in the postverbal position in (13c, d). Given that the grammatical (13c, d) are transitive even though (13a, b) violate Shen's (2018a) hypothesis, it is, *a fortiori*, the case that (2a), (4b), (6b) and (7b) above and all other examples with the same pattern do not have intransitive verb stems at all. Recall, further, that (3) from Kingwana confirms and underpins our conclusion that OM functions only in transitive clauses. This is motivated, well-founded, and grounded in traditional and modern Kiswahili descriptions.

Shen's (2018a) hypothesis is also unable to account for data such as (14-15).

- *14a. *Saleh alikwenda shindo roho yake.*
 'Saleh missed/felt a beat/bang in his heart/being, lit. Saleh went a shock/beat/bang his heart/being.'
- 14b. *Roho yake ili-mw-enda shindo Saleh.* (based on Abdulla 1973: 33)
 'His heart/being missed/felt a beat/bang in Saleh.'
- *15a. *Chuki kila mmoja anachemka.* (non-neutral word order)
 'hatred each one is boiling.'
- *15b. *Kila mmoja anachemka chuki.* (neutral word order of (15a))
 'Each one is boiling hatred.'
- 15c. "[...] kila mmoja chuki inamchemka." (non-neutral word order of Shafi 2003: 236)
 '[...] each one hatred is boiling in him, lit. each one hatred is boiling him.'
- 15d. *Chuki inamchemka kila mmoja.* (neutral word order of (15c))
 'Hatred is boiling in each one.'

In (14a), *Saleh* is the subject NP, the verb is *alikwenda* 'lit. he went, galloped', which has the verb stem *-enda* 'go, move, gallop' found in Shen (2018a: 30, or 38 of the pdf). In (14a), a first postverbal NP1 is *shindo* 'bang, shock, jolt, trot' of class 5. It forms a close collocation with V. The second postverbal NP2 is the so-called SIP-N *roho yake* 'his heart/being' of class 9, but it is not closest to V. (14a) has double postverbal NPs despite the claim or decree to the effect that the verb *-enda* 'go, move' is an intransitive verb. It is strange, indeed, that a so-called intransitive verb of the fiat of dogma has double postverbal NPs at all. The subject NP *Saleh* is the WHOLE object and the postverbal NP2 *roho yake* 'his heart/being' is the PART object. Observe that the postverbal object NP1 *shindo* 'bang, beat, shock, jolt' is not a PART object, and yet, it follows immediately after the verb. Observe, furthermore, that (14a) is not grammatical, because Kiswahili does not have such a clausal relation of W/P-R for the verb *-enda* 'go'. In short, there is no grammatical SIP-N, which is a PART object of the subject NP in (14a), that can become the subject NP of an entailed clause, as proposed by Shen's (2018a) hypothesis and require its verb to take an OM of its WHOLE object to preserve its intransitivity. In (14b), the subject NP is *roho yake* 'his heart/being', a PART object, and the postverbal NP2 is *Saleh*, the WHOLE object. The postverbal NP1 *shindo* 'bang, beat, shock, jolt' remains *in situ*. Thus, (14b) has a double postverbal NP. Significantly, since there is no (14a) from which (14b) is entailed, Shen's (2018a) hypothesis does not apply to (14b). In short, the hypothesis does not predict patterns like (14b) that are not entailed from and do not owe their grammaticality to any SIP-N in (14a). Shen (2018a: 112) says "[...] evidence shows that the object prefix certainly could be used with this intransitive verb. The condition has to be met that the object prefix can only be used for marking the argument which represent the concept of WHOLE, [...]" This statement is inaccurate for (14b). (14b) refutes Shen's (2018a) hypothesis because there is no grammatical clause with SIP-N in (14a) that could be entailed as a subject NP and be bound to a demoted WHOLE object *via* an OM {m} in the verb to preserve intransitivity in (14b). This point is crucial. Recall that a WHOLE object is not a SIP-N, and it cannot function in postverbal position after being entailed from a grammatical clause like (14a), unless it assigns an OM to its verb (see Shen 2018a: 112). Thus, Shen's (2018a) hypothesis is saddled with i) a condition of SIP-N which cannot be met to derive (14b), and ii) a condition of a demoted WHOLE object with OM in V for validating his intransitive verbs, which is useless for (14b). In addition, the verb in (14b) has two postverbal NPs, one of which is not a PART or WHOLE object of its clause at all (see also (1b), (1e-h), (2b-f) and (13d) *supra*).

(15a) has a subject NP *kila mmoja* 'each one' referring to a WHOLE object. The verb is *anachemka* 'he is boiling'. Observe that an NP *chuki* 'hatred, animosity' is located before the subject NP as a topicalized object NP. The topicalized object NP is derived from the postverbal position where it would allegedly be a SIP-N. It is an emotive PART object of the subject NP *kila mmoja* 'each one'. The word order in (15a) is non-neutral because it has a topicalized object NP that precedes the subject NP and, therefore, does not appear in the postverbal position. Word order variation of this type is not factored into Shen's (2018a: 51 or p. 59 of pdf) "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)". As a result, (15a) falsifies the "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)" condition because even a potential SIP-N need not appear in the "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)". The neutral word order appears in (15b). (15a, b) are ungrammatical because Kiswahili does not have a clause with a W/P-R with the verb *anachemka* 'he is boiling'. In short, there is no grammatical SIP-N, which is a PART object of the subject NP, that can become the subject NP of an entailed clause, as proposed by Shen's (2018a) hypothesis and also require its verb to take an OM of its WHOLE object to preserve its intransitivity. (15c) also has non-neutral word order. The subject NP is *chuki* 'hatred, animosity' of class 9. The verb is *inamchemka* 'it is boiling him'. Observe that an NP *kila mmoja* 'each one' is located before the subject NP as a topicalized object NP. The topicalized object NP is derived from the postverbal position where it would allegedly be the WHOLE object. It is not in the "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)". Yet, although the WHOLE object *kila mmoja* 'each one' appears before the subject NP, it still assigns its verb its OM {m}. The evidence reveals that a WHOLE object need not appear in the "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)" under entailment to generate its OM at all. (15c), therefore, also falsifies the "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)" condition of Shen (2018a). The neutral word order appears in (15d). Once again, given that there is no (15a, b) from which (15c, d) are

derived, Shen's (2018a) hypothesis collapses under its own weight because the patterns in (15c, d) are not derived from and do not owe their grammaticality to any SIP-N that is entailed as a subject NP and whose WHOLE object must generate an OM {m} for its verb to preserve the intransitivity of its verb. Thus, flexible word order in clauses arising from topicalization torpedoes Shen's (2018a) condition to the effect that a demoted WHOLE object must be in the postverbal position in order to derive its OM to signal the intransitivity of his verbs. Shen's (2018a) hypothesis is unable to explain clausal word order variations and topicalization. It fails in (14b) and (15c) as a hypothesis because it is unable to meet his condition of intransitivity. Let us consider (16-17).

- 16a. *Imam Saleh bin Omari alitapakaa damu yake mwenyewe alipokuwa akiliwa na chui.*
'Imam Saleh bin Omari became scattered/covered with his own blood when he was being eaten by the leopard.'
- 16b. *Damu yake mwenyewe ili-m-tapakaa Imam Saleh bin Omari alipokuwa akiliwa na chui.*
'His own blood became scattered onto *Imam Saleh bin Omari* when he was being eaten by the leopard.'
- 17a. *Imam Saleh bin Omari alitapakaa damu ya chui aliyeuawa.*
'Imam Saleh bin Omari became scattered with the blood of the leopard which was killed.'
- 17b. *Damu ya chui aliyeuawa ili-m-tapakaa Imam Saleh bin Omari.*
'The blood of the leopard which was killed became scattered on *Imam Saleh bin Omari*.'

Observe that the subject NP in (16a) is *Imam Saleh bin Omari*, the WHOLE object and the postverbal NP is *damu yake mwenyewe* 'his own blood', the PART object and SIP-N. Note that the verb *alitapaka* 'he became scattered/covered with' does not take an OM at all. According to Shen (2018a), this pattern is proof that the verb stem *-tapakaa* 'be scattered with, be spread with, be covered with/in' is an intransitive verb (see also TUKI 2004: 396). The so-called intransitive nature of the verb *-tapakaa* is, according to Shen's (2018a) hypothesis, confirmed by (16b), which is an entailed pattern derived from (16a). Consequently, the OM {m} is obligatorily inserted in the verb by its postverbal NP *Imam Saleh bin Omari*, which is the WHOLE object, to preserve the verb's so-called intransitive status and to bind the WHOLE object to its erstwhile SIP-N *damu yake mwenyewe* 'his own blood', which is the PART object and the subject NP of (16b).

When we turn to (17a), we discover that the subject NP is still *Imam Saleh bin Omari*, but it is not a WHOLE object of the immediate postverbal NP *damu ya chui aliyeuawa* 'the blood of the leopard which was killed', which is, therefore, not a PART object and is not a SIP-N. The verb is still *alitapaka* 'he became scattered with' in (17a). It does not take the OM of its non-SIP-N. In spite of this, the construction is grammatical. Paradoxically, the verb cannot be intransitive *a fortiori* because its clause lacks a W/P-R between its NPs per Shen's hypothesis. (17a) entails as (17b). It has the subject NP *damu ya chui aliyeuawa* 'the blood of the leopard which was killed', a non-PART object. The verb is *ilimtapaka* 'it became scattered on him' in (17b), exactly as in (16b). The postverbal NP is *Imam Saleh bin Omari*, which is a non-WHOLE object in relation the subject NP. Paradoxically, it assigns an OM {m} of class 1 to its verb. The verb, therefore, has the same OM {m} as in (16b) inserted into it even though, amazingly, it does not mark the intransitive status of the verb at all because there is no P/W-R at all in (17b). (17a, b) are just like (16a, b) syntactically. Strangely, Shen's (2018a) hypothesis would obligatorily make the verb stem *-takapaa* in the verb of (17a, b) a non-intransitive verb, on the one hand, while he insists that the same verb in (16a, b) is intransitive without exception, on the other hand. These differential outcomes arising from Shen's (2018a) hypothesis expose it to be defective syntactically because it cannot account for comparable syntactic patterns in the same way in Kiswahili.

In Shafi (2003: 41), we find the construction, "Alimwagiwa ndoo nzima ya maji usoni, yakamtapakaa uso mzima, [...]" It translates into English as follows: 'A full bucket of water was poured on his face, and it scattered on/covered his entire face.' The account is about the ordeal of *Hamza* in prison at the hands of soldiers. From Shafi's (2003) text, we get two clauses as follows:

- 18a. *Hamza akatapakaa maji uso mzima.* (our construction inspired by (18b))
'And Hamza became covered/scattered with water on the entire face, lit. and Hamza became scattered/covered water entire face.'
- 18b. *Maji yakamtakapaa Hamza uso mzima.* (based on Shafi's text)
'And water covered/scattered on Hamza on the entire face, lit. and water became scattered/covered Hamza entire face.'

(18a) is like (17a) except that it has a double NP in postverbal position. In (18a), the subject NP is *Hamza*, but it is not a WHOLE object of the immediate postverbal NP1 *maji* 'water'. As a result, the postverbal NP1 *maji* 'water' is not a PART object of the subject NP, even though it follows immediately its V due to V + NP collocation. The postverbal NP2 is *uso mzima* 'entire face'. It is the PART object of the WHOLE object, which is the subject NP. Note, however, that N *uso* 'face' in the postverbal NP2 *uso mzima* 'entire face' is modified by an adjective *mzima* 'entire, whole'. This might also explain why it does not stand immediately next to its V. This rule is stated in Ashton (1947: 301-302). In principle, a sequence NP2 *uso mzima* + NP1 *maji* is also allowed. What matters in (18a) is that *uso mzima*, the PART object, is not in the SIP-N position as required by Shen's (2018a) hypothesis. Observe further that the verb *akatapaka* 'and he became covered/scattered with' does not take an OM of its immediate postverbal NP1 *maji* 'water' at all. It does not also take the OM of the PART object, which is the postverbal NP2 *uso mzima* 'entire face'. Given that (18a) has no SIP-N in "unmittelbar postverbale[r] Position (R1)" of its V as obligatorily required by Shen (2018a), by logical extrapolation, its verb cannot, per Shen's own hypothesis, be intransitive. It follows, *a fortiori*, that the verb in (18a) must be transitive either inherently or through a default in the hypothesis of Shen (2018a). (18b) is an entailed pattern derived from (18a). Its subject NP is *maji* 'water', but it is not a PART object of the postverbal NP1 *Hamza*. The postverbal NP1 *Hamza*, which is in the postverbal position is, as a result, not a WHOLE object of the subject NP *maji* 'water'. Observe, interestingly, that the postverbal NP1 *Hamza* still assigns its verb *yakamtakapaa* 'and it became scattered on him' its OM {m}, even though it is not a WHOLE object of the subject NP. A further paradox is that the postverbal NP1 is rather the WHOLE object of the PART object which still functions as the postverbal NP2 *uso mzima* 'entire face'. The evidence reveals starkly that both the WHOLE object *Hamza* and its PART object *uso mzima* 'entire face' are in the postverbal position. As a result, although they have a W/P-R, they fail to save the intransitive hypothesis of Shen (2018a), revealing it, once more, as severely flawed because the WHOLE object has an OM {m} in its verb despite the fact that its PART object follows it in the same postverbal position. Thus, by self-evident implication of Shen's (2018a) hypothesis, the verb *yakamtakapaa* in (18b) cannot be intransitive. Given that the verb is transitive in (18a, b), it follows that the claim that it is intransitive absolutely and without exception found in dictionaries like TUKI (2004) must be misleading. (18a, b) reveal that syntactic intransitivity in Kiswahili is not determined by W/P-R and/or P/W-R plus SIP-N.

In Farsy (1960: 48), we find the following construction "Macho yalimjaa machozi, [...]" It translates into English as '(His) eyes became full of tears, lit. his eyes were full him tears.' From Farsy's example, we have constructed the maximal (19a, b).

- 19a. *Faki alijaa machozi macho.*
'Faki became full of tears in/from his eyes, lit. Faki became full tears eyes.'
- 19b. *Macho yalimjaa machozi Faki.*
'His eyes became full of tears, lit. eyes became full tears Faki.'

The stem *-jaa* 'be full' is found in Shen (2018a: 40 or 48 of pdf) as an intransitive verb stem. (19a) has *Faki* as the subject NP. The verb is *alijaa* 'he became full/filled with'. There are two postverbal NPs. The postverbal NP1 *machozi* 'tears' collocates with its V. The postverbal NP2 *macho* 'eyes' follows NP1. Observe that the postverbal NP1 *machozi* 'tears' does not assign an OM to its verb *alijaa* 'he became full'. Likewise, the postverbal NP2 *macho* 'eyes' does not assign an OM to the verb *alijaa* 'he became full/filled with.' (19a) is very interesting because the subject NP *Faki* is a WHOLE object to the postverbal NP2 *macho* 'eyes', which is its PART object. At the same time,

the postverbal NP1 *machosi* 'tears', which immediately follows the verb, is a PART object of a WHOLE object *macho* 'eyes', which is the postverbal NP2. The NP2 *macho* 'eyes', in turn, is a PART object to the subject NP *Faki*. Postverbal NP2 *macho* is, therefore, a WHOLE object and also a PART object. Because the postverbal NP1 *machosi* 'tears' is not a PART object of the subject NP *Faki* but rather of the postverbal NP2 *macho* 'eyes', Shen's (2018a) hypothesis fails, again, its own test of intransitivity. (19a) entails as (19b). (19b) has *macho* 'eyes' as the subject NP. The verb is *yalimjaa* 'they became full of him'. There are two postverbal NPs, namely NP1 *machosi* 'tears' and NP2 *Faki*. Observe that the postverbal NP2 *Faki* assigns an OM {m} to its verb *yalimjaa* 'they became full of him', while the immediate postverbal NP1 *machosi* 'tears' does not assign an OM to the verb *yalimjaa*. (19b) is even more interesting than (18b) because the subject NP *macho* 'his eyes' is still a PART object to postverbal NP2 *Faki*, and simultaneously, it is the WHOLE object of the postverbal NP1 *machosi* 'tears'. This intricate relationship is allowed even though the simultaneous PART *cum* WHOLE object subject NP *macho* 'eyes' was not in a SIP-N position in (19a). At the same time, the postverbal NP1 *machosi* 'tears' in (19a) stands next to its V in (19b) and remains a PART object of its WHOLE object, i.e. the subject NP *macho* 'eyes'. Simultaneously, *macho* 'his eyes' is a PART object to the postverbal NP2 *Faki* which is its WHOLE object. Despite these intricate relationships of PART *cum* WHOLE and WHOLE *cum* PART function/s of the subject NP *macho* 'eyes', the syntax allows it to function as the PART object of its WHOLE object, i.e. NP2 *Faki*, which generates the OM {m} in (19b). Shen's (2018a) hypothesis fails its intransitivity test in (19a, b), too, because the subject NP *macho* 'eyes' in (19b) was not a SIP-N in "unmittelbar postverbale[r] Position (R1)" of (19a) before it became a subject. Shen (2018a) could argue that, per Ashton (1947: 301-302), the postverbal NPs in (19a) could be subject to postverbal word order variation, as in (19c).

19c. *Faki alijaa macho machosi.*

'Faki became filled in his eyes with tears, lit. Faki became full/filled eyes tears.'

He could point to data such as "Hebu toka huko ndani upesi uje uyatie macho yako nuru." in Shafi (1999: 213) as support for his case. Shafi's construction translates as 'I say, come out of the interior so you may get to see/ behold with your eyes a spectacle, lit. come out of the interior so that you may get to put into your eyes some light'. Others might consider (19c) awkward. We assume that (19c) is good grammatical clause with the same or nearly the same meaning as (19a). Even so, it would still not save Shen's (2018a) hypothesis. This is because, even though in (19c) the "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)" has NP1 *macho* 'his eyes' and it is the PART object of the subject NP *Faki*, which is a WHOLE object, the patterns (19a, c) taken together reveal that Shen's hypothesis, in fact, does not take into account postverbal word order variation between two or more postverbal NPs that could display flexible word order patterns. The paradox of flexible word order of NPs is that the postverbal NP that is the PART object that directly relates to the WHOLE object denoted by the subject NP need not be in "unmittelbar postverbale[r] Position (R1)", at all, as in (19a). Shen's (2018a) dogma of intransitive is refuted wherever postverbal word order variation is allowed. For example, word order variation is allowed in (14b) *shindo Saleh* → *Saleh shindo*, (18a) *maji uso mzima* → *uso mzima maji*, (19b) *machosi Faki* → *Faki machosi* and (19a) *machosi macho* → (19c) *macho machosi* without changing meaning. Then, there is also the anomaly of Shen's (2018a) intransitive verbs which have two or more postverbal NPs just like transitive verbs, which his intransitivity hypothesis is unable to explain.

Finally, Shen's (2018a) hypothesis does not take into account patterns such as those found in the following two clauses, "Yasmin amesimama mlangoni, uso wake umejaa tabasamu." (Shafi 1999: 120). Shafi's text translates into English as follows, 'Yasmin is standing by the door, her face is full of smiles/her face is beaming with smiles.' (20a) is the 1st clause in Shafi's text.

20a. *Yasmin amesimama mlangoni.* → (20b)

'Yasmin is standing at the door.'

- 20b. *Mlangoni pamesimama Yasmin.* (our construction)
'By the door is/there is standing Yasmin.'

In (20a), *Yasmin* is the subject NP. The verb is *amesimama* 'she is standing'. The postverbal NP is *mlangoni* 'in/by/at door'. As a word, *mlangoni* 'at/by/in the door', belongs in the locative noun class. Observe that there is no W/P-R between the NPs in (20a). Per Shen's (2018a) hypothesis, the verb stem *-simama* 'stand' in (20a) is not intransitive like in (10), unless he resorts to his dogma of intransitivity. (20a) also reveals that Shen's hypothesis is not relevant for it. The postverbal NP *mlangoni* can be object relativized. It can also undergo ergative syntax. (20a) entails as (20b). Observe that there is no P/W-R between the NPs in (20b). As a result, the verb *-simama* 'stand' in (20b) is probably not intransitive. Shen's (2018a) hypothesis is not relevant for (20b), too, revealing that it has very limited predictable power. In short, (20a, b) do not support the claim that the verb stem *-simama* in (12) and (20) is intransitive. (21a) is the 2nd clause in Shafi's text.

- 21a. *Uso wake umejaa tabasamu.* → (21b)
'Her face is full of smiles/her face is beaming with smiles.'
21b. *Tabasamu zimejaa uso wake.* (our construction)
'Smiles have filled her face/smiles have beamed up her face.'

In (21a), *uso wake* 'her face' of class 11 is the subject NP. The verb is *umejaa* 'it is full of/beaming with'. The postverbal NP is *tabasamu* 'smile/s' of classes 9/10. There is a W/P-R between the NPs in (21a). Consequently, per Shen's (2018a) hypothesis, the NP *tabasamu* is a SIP-N of its verb. In view of this, given Shen (2018a), we expect the verb stem *-jaa* 'be full' to be intransitive. (21a) entails as (21b). This time, the relationship is that of P/W-R between the NPs. Per Shen's (2018a) hypothesis, the verb *-jaa* 'be full' in (21b) ought to be intransitive. Surprisingly, it is not intransitive because the verb fails to take the OM {u} of the postverbal NP and WHOLE object *uso wake* 'her face'. Recall Shen's (2018a) OM condition. We repeat it below.

"Moreover, evidence shows that the object prefix certainly could be used with this intransitive verb. The condition has to be met that the object prefix can only be used for marking the argument which represent the concept of WHOLE, and additionally, the argument involved should always be signalled, contradicting the entailment represented by Whiteley (1968), in previous text." (Shen 2018a: 112)

In (21b), we have a postverbal NP, which is the WHOLE object related to the subject NP, which is the PART object, and yet, intransitivity fails because the OM condition in Shen (2018a: 112) is irrelevant for it. (21a, b) falsify Shen's intransitive hypothesis, revealing, once again, that intransitivity is not determined by WHOLE versus PART relationships whose entailed patterns allow a demoted erstwhile WHOLE object from the subject position to be the postverbal NP, subject to the condition that it generates an OM into its V to legitimize the intransitive status of its verb. In fact, Shen's (2018a) OM condition is irrelevant for many patterns with W/P-R and P/W-R like (21b). His OM condition is also irrelevant in (17b) and (18b). The OM occurs in (7b) even though it has W/P-R and P/W-R NPs and its verb is not intransitive at all. These counterinstances weaken the claims of the book, revealing that OM does not occur in verbs because of intransitivity. The source of this singular failure of Shen's (2018a) hypothesis and OM condition comes from the fact he fails to take into account the **animacy criterion** or **animacy hypothesis** of agreement marking in Kiswahili grammar (see Ashton 1947: 43-45, 54-63, Amidu 1997: 3-5, 113-117, 192-207, 414). According to the animacy criterion, proper names and personal pronouns referring to humans, on the one hand, and other animate and animate denoting nouns, both human and non-human, often when modified by possessive, demonstrative, and interrogative modifiers, on the other hand, automatically generate the OM {m} of class 1 or the OM {wa} of class 2, according to number, and assign it to their verb to mark definiteness, or emphasis, or precedence over other object NPs usually those that imply [-animate, -human] denoting entities. It follows that it is the animacy criterion that motivates the insertion of class 1 OM or class 2 OM in verbs of transitive but not intransitive clauses. Thus, Shen's (2018a) verbs with OM {m} of class 1 or the OM {wa} of class 2 merely satisfy the requirement of animacy and they are not intransitive

verbs. In view of this, all the OMs in the examples (2), (3), (4b), (6b), (7b), (13c, d), (14b), (15b), (16b), (17b), (18b) and (19b) do not mark intransitivity at all. Whiteley (1968), therefore, correctly analyzed his patterns with OM as transitive clauses. Shen's (2018a) confusion of the animacy hypothesis and its requirement for OM marking in transitive clauses with intransitive clauses that do not require OM reflects a lack of familiarity with Bantu animacy rules. For a book about intransitivity, the repeated non-relevance of Shen's (2018a: 112) OM condition is not surprising.

6.0 Conclusion

The *a priori* fiat of dogma of intransitivity of Shen (2018a) for verbs like *-vimba* 'swell', *-tapakaa* 'be scattered', *-jaa* 'become full', *-enda* 'go', *-simama* 'stand', and so on, is easily shown to be false by several data above. The evidence reveals, **first of all**, that the intransitivity of verbs in Kiswahili is not determined by W/P-R and/or P/W-R combined with an *a priori* dogma because, **second of all**, the SIP-N in "unmittelbar postverbale[r] Position (R1)" requirement fails its own test in many clauses. Namely, **third of all**, clausal and postverbal word order variations refute the "unmittelbar postverbale[n] Position (R1)" condition, as in (14-18). Double or multiple postverbal NPs falsify the intransitivity hypothesis. WHOLE objects can also occur as postverbal NPs without generating OM into V, as in (21b). **Fourth of all**, the animacy criterion/hypothesis which tells us that an animate denoting OM of class 1 or class 2 appears only in transitive verbs but not in intransitive verbs which, by definition, do not have postverbal NPs at all, falsifies Shen's (2018a) hypothesis. **Fifth of all**, in our view, Shen (2018a) makes no new contribution to existing knowledge about transitivity in Kiswahili. In short, his book lacks usability for the study of transitivity. This is because his hypothesis lacks plausibility due to the fact that its claims are easily refuted and, thus, cannot be verified and confirmed as explanatory relevant for Kiswahili.

We have not said that any of the verbs above cannot function in intransitive clauses. All verbs can be used intransitively, too. In response to a question, *Yule mwanafunzi ana kichwa kikubwa?* 'Is the apprentice/student arrogant/proud?' One can answer simply, *Hana* 'he is not, lit. he does not have'. Thus, many Kiswahili verbs or verb stems can have dual transitivity or 'bitransitivity' (see Amidu 2001, 2013). That is why to say any Kiswahili verb is intransitive absolutely is, generally, unwise. Note that the English verbs *stand*, *swell*, *sprout*, *go*, etc. also have intransitive and transitive functions in clauses, e.g. *he stood his ground*, *music swelled his heart with joy*, *he sprouted a moustache*, *he went a mile down the canal in a boat*, and so on (see Allen 1990).

The principal problem with Shen (2018a) is not 'traditional' versus 'modern' approach or methodology. The problem is that the author relies on *ad hoc* hypotheses, an uncritical faith in HCS, and a simplified set of patterns. He also fails to take account of counter-instances/black swans, ignores flexible word order, and overlooks basic grammatical rules. These shortcomings diminish the quality of his book for the study of intransitivity versus transitivity. Ultimately, the object lesson is that one cannot decide syntactic structures in Kiswahili without a broad range of native speaker data and corroboration. And so, in the end, Shen's (2018a) inherent dogma of intransitive verbs and his hypotheses let him down just when he needed them most.

NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

ASSIBI A. AMIDU

List of Abbreviations

DO	direct object
HCS	Helsinki Corpus of Swahili
IO	indirect object
N	noun, nominal
NP	noun phrase, nominal phrase

O	object
OM	object marker (see also OP)
OP	object prefix (see also OM)
ORM	object relative marker (see also ORP)
ORP	object relative prefix (see also ORM)
P/W	PART-WHOLE
P/W-R	PART-WHOLE relationship
S	subject
SIP-N	situated internalization of NP
SM	subject marker (see also SP)
SP	subject prefix (see also SM)
V	verb, predicate verb, verbal
VP	verb phrase, verbal phrase
W/P	WHOLE-PART
W/P-R	WHOLE-PART relationship
W/W	WHOLE-WHOLE
W/W-R	WHOLE-WHOLE relationship

Bibliography

- Abdulaziz, M. H. 1996.
Transitivity in Swahili. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Abdulla, M. S. 1973.
Duniani Kuna Watu. Dar es Salaam: East African Publishing House.
- Adam, H. 2004.
Masimulizi Kamilifu ya Alfu Lela u Lela au Siku Elfu Moja na Moja. Kitabu cha Kwanza.
 Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Allen, R. E. (ed). 1990.
The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amidu, A. A. 1997.
Classes in Kiswahili: A Study of their Forms and Implications. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag
- Amidu, A. A. 2001.
Argument and Predicate Relationships in Kiswahili. A New Analysis of Transitivity in Bantu. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Amidu, A. A. 2009.
Matrix Nominal Phrases in Kiswahili Bantu. A Study of their Effects on Argument Syntax.
 Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Amidu, A. A. 2010.
 'Motivation and Transitivity: The Problem of the Intransitive in Kiswahili Bantu.' *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 18(4): 1-26.
- Amidu, A. A. 2011.
Reflexive and Reciprocal Syntax Revisited. Apologia for Internal Evidence in Kiswahili.
 Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Amidu, A. A. 2012.
 'PP Arguments in Kiswahili Bantu and their Implications for Transitivity Theory.' *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 20(1): 1-30.
- Amidu, A. A. 2013.
Objects and Complements in Kiswahili Clauses. A Study of their Mechanisms and Patterns. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag
- Ashton, E. O. 1947.
Swahili Grammar. 2nd edition. London: Longman Group.

- Austin, P. 1982.
'Transitivity and Cognate Objects in Australian Languages.' In, *Syntax and Semantics 15: Studies in Transitivity*, Hopper, P. J. and Thompson, S. A. (eds.), pp. 37-47. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1995.
The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Croft, W. 2001.
Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farsy, M. S. 1960.
Kurwa na Doto. Dar es Salaam: East African Literature Bureau.
- Firth, J. R. 1957.
'A Synopsis of Linguistics Theory, 1930-1955.' In, *Studies in Linguistic Analysis*, pp. 1-32. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fowler, R. 1971.
An Introduction to Transformational Syntax. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hempel, C. G. 1966.
Philosophy of Natural Science. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Hurskainen, A. 2016.
Helsinki Corpus of Swahili 2.0. (Not Annotated Version). Retrieved 24/09/2017 from world wide web, <https://korp.esc.fi/download/HCS>.
- Lyons, J. 1968.
An Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Macmillan and Co. 1950(1935).
Hekaya za Abunuwas na Hadithi Nyingine. Revised edition. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Maw, J. E. M. 1969.
Sentences in Swahili: A Study of their Internal Relationships. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Olejarnik, M. 2005.
'Transitivity Continuum in Swahili.' *Studies of the Department of Languages and Cultures, Warsaw University* 38: 31-54.
- Polomé, E. C. 1967.
Swahili Language Handbook. Washington, D. C. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Quine, W. V. O and Ullian, J. S. 1978(1970).
The Web of Belief. New York: Random House.
- Sacleux, Le P. Ch. C.S.SP. 1939.
Dictionnaire Swahili-Français. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie.
- Shafi, A. S. 1999.
Vuta N'Kuvute. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Shafi, A. S. 2003.
Haini. Nairobi: Longhorn Publishers (Kenya).
- Shen, Yuning. 2018a.
Transitivität und Verbvalenz im Swahili. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Shen, Yuning. 2018b.
'A Corpus-Based Analysis of Transitivity in Swahili and the Concept of "Situating Internalisation".' PPT Presentation at Leiden August 2018. Uploaded by Yuning Shen on 29 September 2018 on ResearchGate.net, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327954481>.
- Shen, Yuning. 2019.
'Uchambuzi wa baadhi ya vitenzi visioelekezi viambatanavyo na nomino kwenye kongoo ya Kiswahili.' PPT Presentation at Nairobi August 2019. Uploaded by Yuning Shen on 01 April 2021 on ResearchGate.net, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350565479>.

- Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili (TUKI). 2004.
Kamusi ya Kiswahili Sanifu. 2nd edition. Dar es Salaam and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsunoda, T. 1978.
The Djaru Language of Kimberly Western Australia. Ph.D. Thesis. Melbourne: Monash University.
- TUKI. 2004. (see Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili)
- Whiteley, W. H. 1968.
Some Problems of Transitivity in Swahili. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Whiteley, W. H. 1974.
'Contextual Specialization and Idiomaticity: A Case Study from Swahili.' *African Language Studies*, 15: 1-13.