



TURKOPHONE

Türkçe Konuşurların Akademik Dergisi

www.turkophone.net

ISSN: 2148-6808

The Influence of Greek and Latin Studies of Albanian on the Diathesis and Problems Arising from it

Albana DEDA (NDOJA)

PhD., Lecturer at the Faculty of History and Philology, University of Tirana

ABSTRACT

This paper will consider the theoretical background, where scholars of Albanian have been based on, especially authors of different Albanian grammars, in the voice (diathesis) approach. It is already known that the voice is perceived generally as a formal cover to the verb phrases of Albanian by most of these approaches. In Grammar I of the Academy of Sciences, 2002, the theoretical approach is broader, but the reasoning is practical, and it is still in limited ends. Besides the fact that in this Grammar it is foreseen the semantic criterion, as well as the formal-syntactical one, mainly in the given divisions there are provided examples, which do not reflect general sustainable thoughts in cases of Albanian. This happens particularly in the semantic criterion, which is very limited (the classical case is the so-called active voice, including others as well). In this context we are discussing with real illustrations many cases that are debatable and cannot be interpreted based on our current ways of approach (considering even that of Gramatika I). We aim at arguing that the voice cannot be perceived anymore as a morphological category, but as a wider process, which includes some levels of linguistic study. It shall be seen in the framework of verb valency models. We consider that this context reflects clearly the relations of different verbs, not only with the subject, as one of the complements of the verb, but also with other complements that are obligatory to it, in the frameworks of different valency models, where they are projected.

Keywords: Valence, diathesis, transitivity, active, passive

1. INTRODUCTION

We believe that the verb, the paradigm and its traditional function have been among the most studied cases from linguists since ancient times. This is because the verb, like the noun have been part of the traditional speech (discourse), which have been distinguished in the beginning, and, on the other hand, it is already known the role they play, especially the verb, in the organization of linguistic structure. It is said that Plato (427 – 347 BC) was one of the first ones to distinguish the nominal part from the verb. Aristotle (384 – 322 BC) followed the same difference and added some other discourse units.

Stoics, on the other hand, - Zen of Citium (334 BC – 262 BC), Diogenes Laertius (300 BC), Seneca (4 BC – 65 AD), Marcus Aurelius (121 AD – 180 AD), etc, showed a great interest for a great number of types of predicates¹, by introducing also their groupings into categories. Based on these groupings, they also planned a theory of the sentence, which remained on different kinds of predicates (Robins, 2007: 38). So, following the same methods in the other grammars, the verb was not lacking and it had a central role in it. Its description, mostly in the early ancient times was of a morphological level. According to Robins (2007), in the western ancient countries the scheme of the grammatical description was “word and paradigm (Robins, 2007: 52)”. Of course, that in the beginning it was mostly talked about the formal part of the paradigm and not for the components of the system. In these first efforts we find also the notion of the voice (it is implied that its treatment in the time was far from the one we have today in traditional studies).

We shall have in mind that in the antiquity scientific disciplines were not separated. Most of them were perceived under the umbrella of philosophy. According to Ivan Evrard (2005) the term voice is seen firstly in the medicine of Hippocrates (V-IV centuries BC) and in the philosophy of Antiphon (Evrard, 2005: 2) (sophist, V century BC).

In Plato, (precisely Philébe 11d e 32e), the discussion for this concept is related to the *disposition* of the spirit and the body, which is put in front of “*habitus*” (habit) in a broader sense. Plato saw this notion, also in a phonetic perspective of a letter (Cratili 412 c) or in the meaning of letters and syllables (Hippias maior 285 d).

Even according to Ludger Jansen (n.d.), the term *diathesis* at Aristotle corresponds to the Latin term *disposition*. This term, actually, refers to our field of interest. It is related to a certain of orderly arrangement, being that for things, discourse or for the soldiers in the

¹The term Predicate here refers to the verb predikate and it is a traditional use.

military (Jansen, n.d.: 3). Jansen (n.d.), also notices that the latter is in fact related to a kind of power (casual power), which in the studies of Aristotle was seen in relation to the three other elements, such as *dinamis* (capacity), *physis* (nature) and *hexis* (habit). *Dinamis*, as a term, is found in other previous works, even at Homer. Generally, “*dinamis*” is seen as “an active power” and Aristotle defines it in this way: *Dinamis implies a type of source (or principle) of the movement or change, which happens in something else or in the thing itself, as something else.*” (Metaphysics V 12) (Jansen, n.d.: 5).

By source or principle, Aristotle implies the beginning of the movement and change, whereas by movement and change, according to Jansen (n.d.), Aristotle sees two possibilities of transformation of active power. We shall add here that most of the reasoning in the work of Aristotle regarding *diposition* is not of a linguistic ground, because it is also known the debate of the time was mostly based on philosophical grounds.

Stoics, which we know mostly with the theory of Doigenes Laertius (3rd century BC), generally introduced in their work the contraposition of the form and content of the introduction. Regarding the verb, they distinguished three types of predicates: the direct (droit, term of Evrard, 2005), the reverse (renvérses) and neutron (neuters (Laerc, n.d.: 64-65), maybe better that neutral).

We think that the effort for a morphological categorization and somehow semantic (already oriented to a single linguistic level) of these predicates of Laertius, is what we believe as a broaden point of view on the perceiving of the verb, predicates and their types.

According to Laertius, certain predicates are related to cases, such as indirect case, the complement of prepositif doer, etc. This discussion is found in the case of reflexive predicates or reverse ones. (The concept of diathesis is found in the Stoics as a part of hexis (Sambursky, 1987: 85). Hexis for Stoics, as it seems, was represented by a variety of states. In this context diathesis was its most extreme display).

From what we discussed above, we can see that not only for naming, but also for the ways of projecting predicates, even though not broadened or complete, we are given a more accurate information and of a syntactical level.

Besides this, the concept of diathesis was given again in the philosophical background (as can be seen in the explanation of Laertius). However, we have to say that even the divisions of

different types of predicates, are signs that now the linguistic ground could not be perceived just in illustrative aspects of philosophical topics, but it had also attracted a greater attention.

Dionisius Thrax (1995) (170 – 90 BC) in his grammar gives the method in a more complete order. It is defined the word firstly, then it passes to parts of speech and in the end their grammatical categories. In this work, *rhēma* (the verb) is perceived as a word and it is understood according to tense, persons, number and expresses an action or an activity which is acted or passed on the doer. (Robins, 2007: 68).

According to Lucio Melazzo, the dialectical term in the narrow linguistic context (thus disconnected from philosophy) was first used by Dionysus Thrax (Melazzo: 1) (obviously, the influences from the philosophical contemplations of Aristotle and the forerunners of the disposition are obvious). For Thracian dialects, these three divisions are defined: *ἐαυέργεια*, *παθός*, *μεσότης* (energy, pathos and mesotis²).

Thrace says that the semantic feature of the verbs was action and affinity, which were reflected in the verbs, respectively of the active form and mediophrastic form. It provides the abundance for these two, but does not define a clear group for the so called meshed (*μεσότης*).

According to Andersen, diathesis at this time was one of the seven morphological categories of verb. The verb was treated merely formally, generally describing the survival of verbal groups. These endings were seen in the function of the subject to show themselves, the number also the diathesis predisposition (Andersen, 1994).

Regardless of the above statement, it should be added that, unlike the tradition of the past, the verb was seen not only clothed with formal morphological indicators such as number and diathesis, but characterized, to some extent, semantically with the attributes of activity and affection. Rightfully Melazzo sees this kind of relationship similar to the verb and the thematic roles that it selects (Melazzo, n.d.).

Apollonius Diskole (2nd century AD) and his work appears to be far more complex than the ancestors' treatments, as he sees diathesis through relations between noun and verb. In his work, the relations between the case form, the person, the verb mode and the diathesis are treated. (Evrard, 2005: 4)

²It must be said that the analysis of Robins emphasizes the fact that until now, thus the time of Thrax, in Latin it was noticed the active and passive diathesis, whereas in the old Greek these two classes were added also with the middle (*mésos*), which expresses some meanings which contained a kind of reflexiveness (for example *egrápsamen*-I have written about myself; *lousamai* – I will wash myself).

In this context, he tried to give a syntax to the old Greek, describing the *relations between the words with a concise noun in conjunction with the three groups of verbs that he distinguished.*

The verbal groups we find in his work are: active, passive, and neutral. According to Robins (2007), with active, Diskole means transitive verbs, while with neutral, reflexive verbs (Robins, 2007: 74). It is noticed that a group that until then was not named, namely neutrals, and, on the other hand, the concept of transitivity associated with these groups also appears in this treatment. We have, therefore, an expanding perspective from formal to somewhat semantic precedents, in syntax (albeit very pale), whether referring to the transitivity (discussed in conjunction with distinguished verbal groups) that analyzes wider relationships than simply a word and its paradigm, as was the methodology followed up to that time.

Concerning active verbs, Diskole says that they show an action "going to something else or someone else" (Discolo, 1997: 277). Rightly Robins (2007) says that here can be seen the origins of *verbum transitivum* definition of Latin and the definition of transitive verbs. On the other hand, he sees in these definitions also the strands of distinction between the subject and the predicate, as well as further concepts such as reaction and dependence (Robins, 2007: 74).

Evrard (2005) sees the verb and the related name "through a deictic connection" (Evrard, 2005: 4), which makes you realize that we are dealing with relationships beyond its word and paradigm, even with the effort to describe the structural pattern of the groups of the verbs distinguished by Diskole.

Roman civilization and authors dealing with language issues did not fundamentally bring about inherent changes in the linguistic definitions made by the Greeks in general. Thus, in their works, they again rejected the debate on analogy and anomaly, which were the main theses of the Aristotelians and the Stoics (Saussure is thought to have had much influence from these debates, especially from the Stoics.)

Studies conducted by these researchers are seen in two phases. In the first phase, extending from the 1st century. I BC – 2nd century AD, we have a period, which represents a stage of preparation, recognition of the Greek tradition. It relates to the names of such authors as Varron, Quintilian (Quintilian is an author who took a lot of rhetoric.), Plin, etc., who were generally treated with the treatments made by Greek scholars, especially to translate and to know them.

During this time there were numerous translations of Greek works and, of course, the influence of those was considerable. According to Evrard (2005), at first the Latin researchers had not translated the Greek term *diathesis* properly. This was noted in the treatments, to some extent lead to this process.

Thus, Varron as a representative of the first period of the development of Latin studies, he distinguished four types of verbs. He spoke of *active, passive, neutron and deponent* verbs. (Evrard, 2005: 7) In differentiating these divisions, the morphological criteria were generally used and these were mostly formally described. Connecting to diathesis we do by naming divisions in accordance with today's traditional diathesis treatments, not that Varron intended to treat this phenomenon as a separate phenomenon. The clusters themselves, despite the denominations, were mostly described by the paradigm. This compared to Greek tradition, especially its latest authors, was a step back in the treatment.

Even at Prischian (n.d.) it is notable the obvious influence of the Greek tradition, as it gives the same lectures and the definition of the verb is the same. According to him, "verb (vĕrbum) is a part of speech and is its own indication of an action or the underlying of an action. It has the forms of tense and mode, but it is not according to the case" (Prisciani, n.d.: 43). (It is clearly seen the similarity with the treatment done by Apollonius Discolo.).

Yet Prischian had another merit, to be noted by other scholars: He deepened to some extent in the semantics of the words. Even the examples given in this regard relate specifically to verbal and semantic analysis.

Prischian defined the verbs as "active or passive," he noted that if this definition is deeper, he requires further clarification, such as the verb "audire" (hear), which is formally acting, but it has a passive meaning. (Robins, 2007: 103)" According to us, this kind of conclusion has nothing to do with the semantics of the particular verb, but also with its distribution. Otherwise, there was no way to come to the conclusion he gave.

The same way of conception is noted also in relation to the clusters that came to the verb. They were the same as those of Greeks, namely Apollonius [active transitive verbs, passive verbs, and neutral (non-transitive) verbs]. However, besides them, he also saw the "deponent" verbs, which were literally formally and functionally meaningful. (Priscian: 59)

According to Evrard (2005: 80), Prischian, once recaptured the concept of Diskolo, focusing more specifically on the concept of transcendence and its expression in the structures that

require the predicative, restricted the further handling of the matter by the equivalence of forms from the active to the passive and vice versa.

It can be noticed that we have in essence no major change of treatment from the Greek tradition. The difference can be seen in the deepening of the possible transformations of the structures of a part of the verbs from the active to the inactive (from the active to the passive). However, this fact was illustrated by limited examples.

2. THE CONCEPT IN MEDIEVAL AGES

If you read the main manuals of the history of world civilization, it is noticed that most authors claim the same thing about arts, linguistics and philosophy (but not only): The Middle Ages (especially its first part) is seen as a full support in the works of classical Greek-Roman antiquity, despite the political and religious limitations of the time. That is why during this time there were many translations of the ancient tradition.

Modists turned their attention to the *syntax*. In these works, it was discussed also for the rection (*reginem*) (Villadei, n.d.) and the construction of the noun-verb became the object of these studies. Concerning the noun and verb, they used terms such as *supositium* and *apositium* (respectively, the subject and the predicate), whose definitions were entirely referenced to the syntax level.

In contrast to the forerunners, attention here began to focus not only on the names of the above units and the description of the respective paradigm, but also in the coverage of the relationship between the different classes already defined, that is syntactic. Thus, Thomas Erfurt (n.d.), a representative of this period, states that "one part of a building is either dependent on one another or adds dependence on the other". The concept ranged from word-to-speech relationships to sentence relationships. In this context, the *transitive* and *non-transitive* term is a category of syntactic constructs.³

According to Robins (2007), the distinction between transitive and intransitive constructions in Modist's works "*relies on the fact that intransitive constructions need a single limit in their category, while transitive ones necessarily require more than one (nouns and pronouns).*" (Robins, 2007: 137)" Despite the fact that transitivity/intransitivity was more limited in the

³ We regate continuously the diathesis with transitivity/intransitivity, because not only in the latest traditional studies, but even before, anytime it is spoken about the transitivity, the treatment is related to classical diathesis.

formal aspect of relations between certain classes of words and was not linked to the semantic side of the relationship, it had its own importance because, compared to the ancient period, the concept of diathesis is merely a formal morphological feature of verbal clusters (with a semantic element in miniature), here passed on a syntax plane.

On the other hand, the concept of direction, governance, dependence in this period is found in relations between such classes as *dependes* (apositionum), where the verb, adjective, noun, adverbs as unit and *terminalis* were represented by the subordinate units from the other group. Thus, the verb depended on the noun in subjective (suppositium) or the noun on the objective. (Socrates runs, reads a book, are the Erfurt examples of the verb) (Robins, 2007: 136).

These kinds of explanations confirm the fact that the transition from studies to the limits of the paradigm had begun to those of the structure in which these components of the paradigm are found.

During the latter period of the Middle Ages there were no major changes regarding the concept of dialectics and transitivity. Even at this time there was a tendency of conceptualization of the linguistic aspect again in the frame of philosophy. Even in those cases when it was not perceived in this context, the linguistic study generally focused on "*the sentence with its own changes*". (De Courtrai, n.d.: 1)

3. TERMINOLOGY ENCOUNTERED IN THE FOLLOWING PERIOD

We will dwell briefly on the treatments made by the scholars regarding markers and markings of diathesis about the end of the Middle Ages and beyond (we refer to a part of the Middle Ages, respectively 17th – 18th centuries).

According to Roberta Maneghel (2014), at this time we note the use of the *vox* (referring to the diathesis) naming more than the other denominations used up to that time referring to this process (Maneghel, 2014: 226) (today we still find it as *voce*- Italian, *voice*-English, *vox*-French.) As stated above, the diathesis mark in antiquity did not come up with this marker, but often and under the markers such as *genus*, *significatio* and *affectus* (Maneghel, 2014: 221).

Both in Italian and French and English the use of terms *voce*, *voix* and *voice* was related to the phonetic aspect of certain characters, which played the role of morphemes in active and passive verbal forms. So, there were sounds that were distinguished in the paradigms of verbs of active value, active, or inactive passive. (Maneghel, 2014: 228) This is emphasized by Beauzée in Enciklopédie, who argues that the name *voix* is a Greek-Latin term, referring to

the verbal flexion of the Latin verb "amare". With this denomination (voice-variant of vox) is first encountered in English grammar around the thirteenth and fourteenth century and likewise in French and Italian grammar.

In modern times, the classic conception changes, as it does not refer to the morphological layer, but emerges in a broader context referring to both the syntax and the semantics. This is also apparent from "*The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*" (Asher et al., 1994).

According to Shibatan (Shibatani: 1994, 4938), the use of a single term, *voce*, *vox*, *voice*, referring to some of the linguistic layers creates a great confusion, especially to compare coincidences by different levels in different languages. For this reason, the clarification of the marking should be made, which refers to each author in relation to this mark.

The researchers claim that the Latin *significatio* / *vox* pair was resized in *diathesis* / *vox*, considering the semantic side with diathesis and predicate-subject relation with *vox* (Maneghel, 2014). Roberta Meneghel (Maneghel, 2014: 231) thinks that voice should refer to the morphological component, while diathesis refers to a specific mark, which links semantic composition and grammatical functions.

The thoughts of the most modern linguists link the diathesis treatment today with the valency as *vox* refers to the subject-predicate relationship, whereas *diathesis* treats the formal morphological side (Duhoux: 103).

Even Russian schools refer to this process as a valence process, even in the broader approach of this concept. Thus, Kulikov states: *Diathesis is defined as a pattern of designing semantic arguments in syntactic functions, while "voice" is simply seen as the verbal morphological nature accompanying this process* (Kulikov: 370).

We will follow the last attitude in this study. According to us, diathesis cannot be discussed as a formal morphological category, as it is actually a process involving several linguistic study arrays, respectively semantics, syntax and morphology. We have noticed such a thing before we come into contact with the Theory of Valence, as the traditional discussions did not explain a good part of the cases with the more formal morphological and somewhat syntactic criteria provided by it (We refer to Grammar I as a reference text yet even today.).

In this context, we will continue to be familiar with some of our traditional approaches to diathesis, and then we will clarify a part of Valence Theory which, in our view, more accurately reflects this phenomenon.

4. DIATHESIS IN ALBANIAN LANGUAGE

The beginnings of dialectic treatments in Albanian language are of an early time. Of course, the main literature to be consulted remain the first grammars. We have considered some of them to see how this process was conceived from one author to the next to Grammar I of the Academy of Sciences as a reference text even currently.⁴

Costandin Kristoforidhi (1826-1892) (1882) in his grammar does not give any definitions for diathesis, but the terminology related to this phenomenon is found here in the classification of verbs according to the types of conjugation. So, he speaks of active, inactive and middle conjugation.

"Passive Diathesis" is identified with non-hybrid conjugation. As it can be seen, we are dealing with a formal characterization and there is no semantic and structural clarification. Even the treatment is classic, similar to what we saw in the early and later antiquity authors, who viewed diathesis as a purely formal part of verbal clusters, i.e. paradigms.

Sami Frashëri (1850-1904) states that transitional verbs are divided into: active(*punëtore*), passive(*pësore*), reflexive, and middle (*mesore*) (Frashëri, 1886). Formally, he gives the inflections that inactive verbs take. At first glance it seems that the process is again seen as a formal mechanism (we consider the denominations, and the fact that it is not yet conceived as a separate process).

According to us, the variety of divisions given to us with terms that reflect semantic and structural relationships at the same time, being that it is given in the context of transitivity / non-transitivity, constitutes a broader perspective than ancestors and a part of contemporaries, if we consider the time Frashëri's (1886) work was written. He already does not use the direct term *diathesis*, but he has passed from its conception only to the paradigm limits, as these verbs are seen in the structure, in the context of transitive and non-transitive verbs. The denominations also have semantic elements in the background and are more detailed than the forerunners.

On the other hand, such a combination of these two notions, transitivity and diathesis in this paper, though mostly remained in the formal boundaries of the analysis and failed to analyze the structures or rather to see these processes in the first place as the semantic and syntax

⁴ We have considered these authors, because we think we have the same concepts or are less considered in ther authors.

attribute, again remains more specific than the ancestors for the somewhat semantic handling effort as mentioned above.

Ilia Dilo Sheperi (1872-1945) (Sheperi, 1929: 144) gives us an interesting treatment of the problem. In the part of the morphology he describes the paradigm of active and passive verbs on their own. In the second group he introduces all verbs that in Grammar I are the paradigm of non-hypothetical forms. Diathesis is not mentioned at the morphology.

In the section of the syntax Sheperi (1929) distinguishes the following verbs: active, passive, reflexive and neutral.

He says: "Active verbs indicate that the subject acts (work, write).

The passive verbs indicate that the subject is undergoing an action (the field is worked; the design is written).

Reflective verbs indicate that the subject acts and undergoes the action (lahem, krihem – wash my face, comb my hair).

The neutral verbs show that the subject does not act, nor does it undergo an action (I am, I sleep, I stay). "(Sheperi, 1929: 144)

So, we notice that here there is an attempt at semantic characterization, though quite superficial and not inclusive, given the different structural patterns in which the same verb can be found. Interestingly, the concept is that non-transitive verbs create a separate diathesis (neutral).

Sheperi (1929) also states that passive verbs are taken over by the actor or the cause, etc. We have analytical efforts in the distributive level, which, of course, have been dictated also by the semantic specification made above but, however, it expands the justification even at the syntax level. This is seen in the fact that these divisions are discussed in the Syntax section, as well as in clarifying the examples, in which, besides the principle, the fundamental role has also counterparts, or other elements of the verbal distribution that create semantic nuances, which distinguish these groups from each other. Obviously, today, problems are especially evident in the analysis of the semantic layer of interpretation, but the time when it is published is a serious treatment.

Osman Myderrizi (1891-1973) (1944) in his grammar speaks of transitive verbs. According to him, these have three forms: active, passive and reflexive. Speaking of the grammatical

meaning of each one, he notes an interesting fact: "In Albanian we have some verbs that, although they have the passive form and the reflexive one, are not such, but are non-transitive active verbs: to repent, to try (*me u pendue, me u përpykë*). These verbs, as they lie in the middle of passive-reflexive verbs, are called middle. Middle verbs are either directly non-transitive active verbs like appear, cough, or come from transitive verbs like: think, obey. "⁵

The foregoing argument draws attention to the assertion of the use of such verbs as transitive and sometimes as non-transitive, as well as the possibility of using these verbs in different diathesis. We notice how the representative form of this group is given infinitive in an inactive way.

On the other hand, there are attempts also for a semantic characterization, whether referring to designated denominations and groupings, although it fails to provide criteria to allow for generalizations (the separation necessarily requires such an analysis, since the formal morphological criterion is no longer redundant, according to perception given.). It should be said that this characterization is very absurd and does not really give any proper semantic analysis to make a clear semantic difference between the groups. This is noticed with the way the middle verbs are positioned, but not only.

It is noticed that the formal opposition between the two groups of verbs (both transitive and non-transitive) is not distinguished, since in both of them is shown the u part (Albanian) in the passive, although the verbs of the first group, as Myderrizi (1944) says, are expressed as non-transitive active verbs.

In this argument, he argues that middle (mesor) verbs can be derived from non-transitive verbs (*mbetem* from *mbes*). These statements do not make a clear explanation of the contradictions that create the distinctive features of one diathesis from the other. However, it is quite interesting to differentiate such verbs as indirectly lets you understand different syntax design of these verbs.

Myderrizi (1944) also sees non-transitive verbs as carriers of the diathesis process. The two above statements again show that no precise definition is given as semantic and formal between middle verbs and non-transitive. However, it should be said that from the aforementioned authors, the treatment of Myderriz (1944), although it does not provide cut criteria to make a definite distinction between groupings, constitutes an attempt to include and

⁵ In fact, the forms given as illustrations are in pasive infinitive

clarify also many cases encountered in practice and could not find solution from template examples, almost of the same verbs found in the earliest grammars. If we consider the time when the semantic developments were written at that time, we could discern the author's intuitive language intuition, despite the absence of its formation at the level of semantic analysis. The latter, as we have said, is conditioned by the contemporary tradition, still not very developed semantic studies before 1944 (it is known that semantics and a series of new disciplines took off in the second half of the twentieth century and in the continuation of our century).

Kostaq Cipo (1892-1952) (Cipo, 1949: 108) in his work “Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe” (Grammar of the Albanian Language) distinguishes the diathesis as a separate category, naming it separately as such, thus as a grammatical category of the verb (not as seen by predecessors as an element of the conjugation of the verb, ie its paradigm or syntax level like Sheperi, but without renaming this noun and the latter.)

He gives this definition of diathesis: “*It is called by this name the direction from which the verbal action is intended.*”(Cipo, 1949: 108) In essence, such a definition is closer to the traditional reaction than to the diathesis. However, the explanation given to the examples, regardless of the definition, passes a purely structural approach. Thus, Cipo (1949) admits that there are verbs that may have more than one diathesis. In dealing with this issue, Cipo (1949) distinguishes three groups: active passive and reflexive.

According to him, active diathesis has transitive and non-transitive verbs. The latter are not used in any other diathesis. In reflexive diathesis, the self-reciprocal verbs (*zihem- fight, kacafytem- quarrel*) and reflexive-intransitive verbs (vers like: *përgjërohem-beg, pendohem-repent*, represent intransitive reflexive verbs⁶).

On the other hand, Cipo (1949) recognizes that there are verbs that can be transitive and intransitive, which allows them to have more than one diathesis (*shpëtoj-get rid of, qaj-cry*, etc.). Cipo also speaks of transitions of transitive intransitive verbs, such as the “*veroj*” (pass the summer) case, in which the inner object appears (Cipo, 1944: 109).

From this perception we can see that non-transitive verbs are seen as an active actor in this process. On the other hand, semantic characterization is almost lacking. Likewise, it appears

⁶Apparently, the semantic similarity, in other words the lack of juxtaposition in semantic level led to this division.

quite absurd the treatment of direction, which is predicted as the essential element of diathesis in Cipo's (1949) definition. Had it been done exactly, then it would have been expanding and of course some kind of semantic characterization would be conditioned by the specific distribution of each group.

However, the difference in the use of a verb sometimes as non-transitive and sometimes as transitive expands from a structural point of view the viewpoint of analysis. The bad thing is that this remains only a case-by-case distinction and is not followed by the clarification of its structure and elements that are different from one use to another.

Shaban Demiraj (1920-2014) (Demiraj, 1976: 162-174) discusses in his work the diathesis category as part of Chapter XXII, in the context of conjugation (non-active conjugation).

The treatment distinguishes four diathesis groups, respectively active, passive, middle and reflexive, and the formal indications of these verbs (generally the actions of the active and the inactive). All the partial synchronous analysis (given only a part of the formal Albanian means, there are missing the forms of Geg, Cam, etc), is accompanied by a reflection and the possible diachronic developments of these tools. The semantic side draws very little, which is noticed and the exclusion of non-transitive verbs from this process.

Demiraj (1976) thus defines the diathesis in this way: "*With term diathesis of the verb we understand the expression of the relation between the subject and the object of action named by the verb by morphological means.*"

If carefully noted here, there is a small circle of participants to be analyzed in relation to this process (the subject, the object and the verb), but on the other hand, the problem is confined to their concrete realization, with only morphological means. He also notes that diathesis have only transitive verbs. These can be used in active, passive and reflexive diathesis.

Following, Demiraj (1976) gives the grammatical meaning of each diathesis (Demiraj, 1976: 165). According to him, in the group of reflexives there is a set of verbs, which resemble non-transitive verbs, because the action performed by the subject remains the same. These verbs are called middle-reflexive. They differ from non-transitive verbs only by form.

Demiraj (1976) does not see the verbs disconnected from the context in which they are used. He emphasizes: "To determine diathesis we must rely on the concrete meaning with which that verb is used in the sentence, because there are cases where the same verb in different contexts expresses different nuances." (Demiraj, 1976: 166)

The ascertainment given above is very fair, but little is taken into account in practice. Finally, we can add that, despite the receipt of middle cases, the problem remained in the context of purely formal conception. The semantic level is very limited and, with regard to the syntax level, it is represented by a verb usage pattern, avoiding other patterns where it can be found, according to which the meaning has changed.

Gramatika I, the publication of the Academy of Sciences of Albania (2002) is the reference text not only for the university level, but also for scholars. Also, it is the text on the basis of which writers of the programs of the Albanian language course at the pre-university level are based. From this data, its impact on language studies cannot be discussed, and it is assumed that accuracy and scientific correctness must be on a credible level. Precisely for these reasons, we have taken into consideration the concept of diathesis treated in this text and the fact that at exactly the time we have ascertained the problems that showed the difference of the different verb cases in the predicted groupings, the text with it which we worked on was exactly this grammar.

It should be recalled also a fact mentioned above, which is related to the authorship of the part related to diathesis here. As we have noted above, the verb's part has the authorship of prof. Shaban Demiraj (1976). Not least, we looked at his work in 1976 to see how the treatment was developed.

The definition of diathesis in *Gramatika I* is: "*Diathesis is that grammatical category, through which the relation between the action labeled by the verb and the subject is expressed.*" (Gramatika, 2002: 270)

If we make a comparison with the definition given by Demiraj (1976) in its previous treatment, we note that the latter have a limit on the number of participants in the process (the object is eliminated), and on the other hand, we do not have an accurate definition of formal fulfillment of it. We also note that we are talking about a true morphological category according to this author, while in the definition we have more structural characterization of it.

The treatment in *Gramatika I* determines the fact that diathesis have transitive verbs, whereas non-transitives are not, since the latter cannot be used in an inactive form (Gramatika, 2002: 270) (despite the fact that it has verbs that can be transitive and intransitive).

However, the last statement is almost ignored in the divisions given for diathesis. This is due to the fact that they are mostly formally characterized (active and inactive diathesis: passive, reflexive, middle diathesis). Their semantic and distributive description is incomplete.

The last statement is easily distinguishable from the characterization of transitive and non-transitive verbs, a distinction indispensable with regard to diathesis, given the fact that Gramatika I determine that only transitive verbs have diathesis. According to it, non-transitive verbs "name actions that remain to the one who performs it. They can show states, movement, and so on." (Gramatika, 2002: 264). Such verbs are: see, sleep, slumber, go, walk, run, etc.

However, states and movements can also show verbal dialects. Thus, their semantic definition is such: *The verb is middle diathesis ..., when it names an action that the subject itself carries out.*

Here, the verbs are grouped in verbs that name motion (I jump, cling, go back, lean, curl, try, rotate, etc.), verbs that name psycho-physiological actions (mostly in shape): *dëshpërohem, hidhërohem, mërzitem, gëzohem* (I get bored, I get sad, I become happy), verbs that show changes in the physical, physiological, psychological state of the subject *bëhem, dobësohem, egërsohet* (become, weaken, become wild, etc.).

If we make a simple traditional semantics analysis of these verbs, it can be distinguished that non-transitive verbs name in some cases an action that remains to the one who performs it, but it is also someone who performs it, just like in the case of middle verbs.

On the other hand, there are many structures where the verbs of these groups stay, in which action, state, movement are perceived mostly as such without the need for emphasis on the doer, which is known.

So we do not see any real difference in the examples taken in the structures of these verbs, except that the definition of non-transitive verbs emphasizes that action remains the subject, whereas in the middle it is the subject to carry out the action. The characteristic that opposes these verbs remains only the formal (active for the transitive verbs and the inactive form for the middle), although Gramatika I (2002) itself and later the Albanian Language Dictionary give occasions when non-transitive verbs can be used in two forms.

In the sentence as follows we see the verb *jump*, which according to Gramatika I (2002), is perceived as a verb in the middle diathesis, whereas the Albanian Language Dictionary sees that as reflexive. I will jump, together with my child, from the abyss.

(Do hidhem bashkë me fëmijën në humnerë) (Albanian corpus)

In this sentence the action which is expected to be performed by the verb is firstly perceived as a voluntary action, it has even well-defined not only the main doer, but also his companion (with the child). In this context, the above verb does not differ much from non-transitive verbs as it indicates motion (a semantic element emphasized by this grammar for non-transitive verbs) and action is also performed by the subject. Starting from these data, we do not believe there is any semantic or structural change with the sentence: They left together with the others. (Ata ikën bashkë me të tjerët.)

The change is completely formal, that is, the active and inactive form of the verb. However, according to this grammar, diathesis should be seen as a relationship between the parts of speech and not just as a formal connotation.

From the given analysis it can be noticed that semantically there is no difference with the non-transitive verbs of the movement (go, leave, come). The change with verbs of middle diathesis is formal, as the latter are in the form of a passive one. It should also be said that the semantic definition given by Gramatika (2002) that the action is performed by the subject in middle verbs in most of the structures where these verbs are found is not a distinct feature, since the relevant meanings of these verbs are perceived as a state, a movement in itself (being closer to the semantics of non-transitive verbs).

The middle diathesis does not create semantic contradictions, at least according to the conception of Gramatika I (2002), and with the active diathesis, as the definition of the latter is the same as that of the middle (The verbs of the active diathesis are the actions performed by the subject). The difference with the middle is again formal. Despite this determination, we think there is a lack of a precise characterization of the verb.

Thus, according to Gramatika I (2002), if a verb that is transitive and in the form of active also that verb is an action that is performed by the subject, then that verb is in active diathesis. This is the definition of Gramatika (2002) for verbs of active diathesis. From this definition we can affirm some facts:

- Firstly, we do not have fixed groups of transitive and non-transitive verbs, since here is overestimated the distribution criterion (existence of the complement, without entering into any other semantic or formal analysis). In this context, no explicit

semantic and distributive criteria are provided, which make it possible to make clear distinctions of a used verb as transitive and sometimes non-transitive.

Shkoj në shtëpinë e tij./ I shkoj në shtëpi. (I go to his house. I pay a visit to him.)

Ai punon me kujdes në torno./ Ai e punon me kujdes drurin në torno⁷. (He works carefully in the lathe. He works the wood carefully in the lathe.)

In both these examples, verb is an action and, according to Gramatika I (2002), the difference is that in the first sentence we have no object, and the second one has an object. Yet semantically we do not notice any difference in the action labeled by the verb itself. According to us, the change has to do with the actors who enter the scene in its siege. The latter are not only related to what the nouns mean, but also to the objects, even in certain cases with modifiers, for certain verbs.

- • Secondly, is it possible for all transitive verbs in the active form to name only actions, as it is expressed in Gramatika I (2002)?

We think that no, because there are transitive verbs that can express the condition (bother someone, make happy, etc.), processes (Continue work, process material, etc.). We are talking again with traditional semantic terminology. Nor can we speak of a correct semantic definition of the verbs that enter this group. Of course, this is also due to the lack of studies on the semantic classification of verbs in groups, which we do not even have today.

We are taking a very meaningful case, the verb *undergo*. The Dictionary of Albanian Language defines it in this way:

PËSOJ kal. UNDERGO, transitive.

1. An action of something out of me happens to me, I feel the consequence of an action, I succumb to the action of someone or something; a disaster happens to me, I suffer. He underwent a stroke. They underwent a disaster. They suffered badly. He underwent a loss. idiom. He who does, he undergoes all.

(Bie mbi mua veprimi i diçkaje të jashtme, ndiej pasojën e një veprimi; i nënshtrohem një veprimi të dikujt a të diçkaje; më bie një fatkeqësi a një e keqe tjetër; heq një të keqe. Pësoi një goditje. Pësuan një fatkeqësi. E pësuan keq (rëndë). Pësoi një humbje. Koka bën, koka pëson. fj. u. Kush e bën, kush e pëson!)

⁷ See cases given in the Dictionary of Albanian Language regarding the verb work.

2. reflex. III person. It is an object of the action expressed by the verb. It is the subject which undergoes it.

(vet. veta III gjuh. Është objekti i një veprimi të shprehur nga folja. E pëson kryefjala.

In either of these two explained meanings, the passive and reflexive meaning is clear. However, the Dictionary sees it as transitive and as such in its uses in the form of action it will be taken as a verb in the active diathesis, which demonstrates that the semantic determination of this diathesis does not really relate to its true semantics in the active uses (having in mind that in the passive it comes out rarely).

• Third, is it the only fact that the subject in active verbs is performing an action? (Remember that the verbs of active diathesis name an action that is performed by the subject). We do not think that, even if we take them away from such verbs, but with them, we can find many instances when the authorship of action, especially in cases of interrogative and negative structures, it is not perceived as an important element of the main message that will convey the structure (Do you see anything? -I do not see anything.).

From the above analysis we can affirm that the less determined semantically and distributional diathesis is exactly the active one. In this context, the same definition of middle diathesis is quite evasive and does not create any difference. Even in this case, there remains the formal distinctive criterion (active / passive middles), as no overarching definition has been given semantically and structurally.

In the course of this analysis we can add that there are cases even when, despite the fact that the verb is transitive and active, it is perceived as reflexive-passive especially when accompanied by self-reflexive pronouns.

-Ai vrau veten. (He killed himself.)

-Ai u plagos vetë. (He injured himself.)

-Vetë e preu të shkretën? (Did he really cut himself?)

In the sentences above, of course, the action has been done by the subject, but we believe that in certain structures, especially when it comes without the subject, the emphasis is on the undergoing as a state after an action obtained by its author.

If the student were to ask what the diathesis is the verb in the sentence above, he would without a hesitation say at first, we have transitive verbs and then active forms and active

diathesis. So, the formal criterion on the active diathesis does not allow to discuss other elements that come from the ratio of this verb to its distribution, which is not just the subject matter. The presence of “*self*” transforms the complete semantics of the message (compare: He killed the bear.).

On the other hand, it is known that the formal criterion differentiates the diathesis from passive, middle, and reflexive, but this criterion is of no value to three passive diatheses. In this context, it should be the semantic and distributive criterion, which should distinguish these groups with one another.

Above we gave the definition of the middle diathesis and discussed also the groups of verbs which were in the Gramatika I (2002).

Regarding the reflexive diathesis Gramatika I (2002) says it this way: *The verb in the reflexive diathesis, when it has a passive form and names an action which the subject does and undergoes at the same time.* As reflexive verbs there are cases as: wash, com, dress, etc. Also, there are also the mutual reflexives which name mutual actions of two persons, such as: get engaged, get married, hug, etc.

Let us make a comparison among verb defined in Gramatika I (2002) as middle and as reflexive. We are giving the examples of Albanian Corpus, regardin the verb *wash*:

-Gjithmonë kur *lahem* e humb nocionin e kohës. (Always, when I wash myself, I forget about the time)

-Po, po, dua *të lahem*, thashë, dua. (Yes, I said I want to wash myself, I said yes.)

-Dua të shkoj *të lahem* në dush. (I want to have a shower.)

-Aq sa ende sot më tingëllojnë në vesh fjalët e gjyshes tek më përbente që as të mos u afrohem e lëre më *të lahem* me fëmijët e mëhallës në atë hurdhën e madhe te Shpella e Zhajes, ku gati të gjithë fëmijët e mëhallës kemi mësuar notin dhe freskoheshim ditëve të verës. (Even today I hear my grandma’s voice in my head, which made me not even come close, or even think to swim (stay in the water) with the children of the neighbourhood in the big pond of the Zhaje Cave, where nearly all the kids of the hood learned how to swim and freshened during summer days.

-Moabi është legeni ku unë *lahem*; mbi Edomin do të hedh sandalen time, mbi Filisti do të dërgoj britma triumfi ». (Moabi is the tub I wash in; on the Edomin I put my sandal, on Filisti I will send echoes of triumph.)

-Ai para ca kohësh i kishte kritikuar këto këngë, por origjina e fshatit e thirri tek piu raki dhe ia turbulloi mendimin kritik... — E... bukur, ë? — tha shoku Zylo për këngën duke u përkulur përsëri në tryezë. — Ashtu është, — tha kryetari. — Dhe unë, o krye... kryetar, nesër bashkë me këtë ndihmësin tim, — dhe më ra shpatullave, — do të shkoj e *do të lahem* në banjat e fshatit. (Sometimes ago he had criticized these songs, but the origin from the country called him back while drinking raki and troubled the critical thinking... “Beautiful, isn’t it?”, comrade Zylo said for the song by bending on the table. “It is indeed”, said the chairman, “even me, chair... chairman, tomorrow with my assistant”, and he patted on the shoulders, “I will go and have a swim (wash) on the bathes of the country.)

If structurally and semantically analyzes these examples (which are only a part of the Albanian structures), we believe that the verb *wash* (have a bath/swim) is perceived as a process, without the fact that this process is performing and undergoes (this very term is very controversial, what is going on with someone who is bathed) the same person. The human speaking community, not only of the Albanian code, has certain standards of psycho-motor development of the human being. Thus, for a normal psycho-motorist human being, it would be emphasized that he is doing several actions (better processes) until a well-defined age (5-6 years old, even depending on what kind of wash) we have no illusory spell of giving this fact beyond this age.

Such self-reflexive uses come to the fore when they associate themselves with the self (I wash myself, mum.). In other cases, they are perceived simply as processes. Such a thing becomes more apparent in the example given below:

-Ata u lanë, u veshën, u përshëndetën dhe u larguan me lot në sy. (They washed themselves, got dressed, saluted each-other and left in tears.)

According to Gramatika I (2002), the first three verbs should be taken as reflexive, and the latter as a middle. If we see all four verbs are perceived as processes, even as actions in the process. We do not believe that the recipient perceives that the first three verbs are actions that he performs and are subjected to the subject itself, while the last (departed) is an action performed by the subject (the semantic definition of Gramatika I (2002)). So, in this case, the semantic contradiction falls, that the formal one does not exist, since they are all in a passive form and in the same distribution, with homogeneous bonds between them.

In lesser nuances, the semantic contradiction falls between some uses of passive verbs, which in specific distributions can be perceived to be of a middle nuance, besides reflexive when viewed as repetitive actions.

-Ai vritet vazhdimisht, kur luan. (He is hurt many times while playing.)

-Sa herë ka qënë në luftime, është plagosur diku. (Anytime he was in the war, he was hurt.)

-Pritet çdo herë që mundohet të gatujë diçka. (He cuts himself anytime he wants to cook.)

-Nuk gërvishtet asnjëherë. (He never gets hurt.)

In the examples above the semantic nuances the verbs of these sentences have mixed semantic nuances (passive, middle, reflexive), and cannot be given a definite definition for them.

The analysis we have outlined above with controversial cases is only a small part of what is presented in common use in the structure of the Albanian system. Of course, if any verbs were to be discussed in relation to most of the structural patterns, where it stays, the examples would be more numerous. Such a statement confirms the fact that the traditional definition given by Gramatika I (2002) in relation to diathesis as a morphological category (with its formal, semantic, and distributive definitions) is not fair to us and does not allow the correct definition of different verbs.

It is mostly perceived as a formal category with a very lacking semantic characterization, while comparing distribution patterns, especially the same verbs, is mostly absent. The definitions rely more on a usage model and are not compared with other models.

The above issues are easily recognizable in the Albanian Language Dictionary. The verbs that Gramatika I (2002) takes on middle diathesis, in this vocabulary come out as reflexive, etc. (This Dictionary often reflects the verbal form of the same paradigm as two separate units (eg injured / hurt). Such a fact is an indication of the lack of semantic and structural deepening to see these forms as the same verb in different usage patterns.).

But could there be a more detailed study of the structure of each verb for determining its diathesis? We think that the definition of diathesis just as a morphological category has limited the possibility of wider conception of it. It is impossible to achieve a fair distinction of traditional diathesis simply by relying on the formal element, regardless of the different structures and semantic nuances that differ even for the same verb (despite the fact that those criteria are mentioned in divisions given).

In this context we think that traditional diathesis can no longer be seen in this way. It requires a more accurate definition of level (or levels), where it should be conceived, which according to us is not only morphological, but much wider, as it requires coordination of the semantic, syntax and morphological levels. It is not possible to analyze a verb just by discussing its relationship with the subject, but all its specific sieges, in different patterns with which it appears.

Semantically verbs do not name only *actions*, the term by which traditional grammar semantically characterizes this morphological category (the latest grammars conceive it and the other parts of the discourse as a lexical category. See Pollum.)

The concept of its distribution in a wider context and not just about the formal, but semantic, would correctly and clearly reflect true verbal relationships with other actors, which surround it.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, P. (1994). Remarks on Dionysios Thrax's concept of Diathesis, *Historiografia Linguistica*, 21(1), 1-37.
- Cipo K. (1949). *Gramatika Shqipe*, 1949.
- De Courtrai, S. (n.d.). *Summa modorum significandi*, 1320.
- Demiraj, Sh. (1976). *Morfologjia e gjuhës shqipe*, Tiranë.
- Evrard, I. (2005). L'intermédiaire diathétique dans les grammaires anciennes: de l'exception au principe? *Faits de langues*, 25, 79-84.
- Frashëri, S. (1186). *Shkronjëto*.
- Gramatika I. (2002). Akademia e Shkencave, Tiranë.
- Jansen L. (n.d.) *Aristotle's Theory of Dispositions*, http://www.academia.edu/537228/Aristotles_Theory_of_Dispositions
- Kristoforidhi, K. (1882). *Gramatika*.
- Laerc, D. (n.d.). *Vies VII*, 64-65.
- Maneghel. R. (2014). *Dall latino vox all ingleze voice. Alla ricerca della diatesi, Metalinguaggio. Storia e statuto dei costrutti della linguistica*, Roma.
- Myderrizi, O. (1944). *Gramatika e re e gjuhës shqipe*, 1944.
- Melazzo, (n.d.). *L. The origin of diathesis in linguistics*, <http://linguistica.sns.it/Chronos11/Abstract/95.pdf>
- Prisciani. (n.d.). *Institutiones Grammaticae, rreth viteve 500 e.s.*

Robins, R. (2007). *Historia e gjuhësisë*, Dituria.

Sambursky, S. (1987). *Physics of Stoics*, Princeton of University Press. Thrax, D. (1995).
Téchnē Grammatikē, Münster.

Sheperi, I. D. (1929). *Gramatika dhe sindaksa e gjuhës shqipe*, Vlorë.

Villadei, A. (n.d.) *Doctrinale*, 1175-1250.

Von Erfurt, Th. (n.d.). *De modis significandi*, 1310