



Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(Special Issue 2),965-978; 2021

Morpho-syntactic and semantic properties of finiteness in Telugu relative clauses

Suman Kothakonda^{al} 

Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, India

APA Citation:

Kothakonda, S. (2021). Morpho-syntactic and semantic properties of finiteness in Telugu relative clauses. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 2),965-978

Submission Date: 26/12/2020

Acceptance Date:21/01/2020

Abstract

One of the most challenging and interesting notions in descriptive and theoretical linguistics is finiteness. Telugu is one of the major Dravidian languages of Southern part of India which is widely spoken in states of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana. In Telugu language, finiteness does not contribute towards direct analysis and is a complicated phenomenon. This paper explores how different grammatical theories represent the finiteness; the nature of the finiteness in relation to Telugu relative clauses; and how morpho-syntactic and semantic properties decide whether a clause is finite or non-finite. It also investigates the notion of finiteness and formulates criteria to decide it in Telugu. It further explains two types of relative clauses namely Dravidian (Dr) type and Indo-Aryan (IA) type and takes up the Indigenous Dr type first and sees to what extent it meets the criteria for finiteness. Second, the IA type that Telugu and Dr Languages borrowed from Sanskrit is in some ways different from the original IA correlative although it is modelled on that pattern. Dr correlative is always pre-nominal and it uses an interrogative pronoun unlike the correlatives in Hindi and other IA languages which use relative pronouns. However, based on theoretical and empirical evidence, this paper provides a description of both these Telugu relative clauses and explores how finiteness is realized in terms of formal and functional perspectives.

© 2021 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: relative clauses; finiteness; morpho-syntactic properties; semantic properties; Telugu

1. Introduction

This paper offers some crucial investigations of finiteness in Telugu and the phenomenon in this language, is understudied in empirical and theoretical perspectives. Though Telugu is morphologically rich language in comparison with other Dravidian languages, it lacks some properties in some root and embedded constructions. Eventually, this leads to several difficulties in developing the criteria for finiteness in Telugu. Initially, scholars assumed the notion of finiteness is related to morphological property. But, recent investigations on finiteness reveal that one should examine several factors to determine finiteness in respective language/languages. In fact, it is a challenging task to define finiteness in terms of morpho-syntactic and semantic perspectives in Telugu. It has been already

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: sumanvennala@gmail.com

noticed that there is no common criterion which decides finiteness across all world languages (see Nikolaeva, 2007). In fact, huge variation is found across languages. Since finiteness is, in Telugu, a complex phenomenon we need to take several factors into consideration across the languages to develop criteria for finiteness. Therefore, this paper first discusses finiteness in several languages and second it attempts to develop criteria to decide finiteness in Telugu.

1.1. Theoretical background

There is no single definition for finiteness which satisfies/applies to all the languages in the world. In fact, languages considerably may vary in terms of properties on pronouns and verbs. So, there is a need to develop criteria for finiteness depending on respective language(s). In some languages this is a complex phenomenon and it is more in Telugu. Initially, the verb which inflects for tense and/or agreement has been considered the defining criterion of finiteness. According to Noonan (1992), there is cross-linguistic evidence to show that neither tense nor agreement can be considered as universal categories. Languages like Japanese that lack agreement lack finiteness altogether, when agreement is considered as the relevant category, where verbs inflect for tense but not for agreement. The finite/non-finite opposition is not found in languages such as Lango, where verbs don't inflect for tense, in case the tense is considered to be a decisive feature (see Noonan 1992). Chinese, which is an isolating language, lacks inflectional morphology altogether. We observe that at least one of them is not present in many languages. So, presence of agreement and tense inflection alone cannot be the sole criterion for finite status. According to Nikolaeva (2007, 2010), no fixed definition for finiteness was offered. She also states that the morphological properties of the verb, person, number, agreement along with tense were paid attention by the Greek tradition which was considered as the original notion of finiteness. Finiteness is merely considered as syntactic property on the basis of Traditional approaches of both generative and formal. According to Cowper (2002) Cowper & Hall (1999), the assignment of nominative case and agreement are necessary for the structural configuration of a finite clause. On the other hand, Huddleston (1988) and Hogg (1992) mention that person, number and tense mark a finite clause or verb.

Finiteness has been described as a scalar phenomenon through functional approaches. It should be defined as clusters of parameters but not as individual universal morphological property or parameter from the aspect of functional-typological findings (Cristofaro, 2007). Such parameters create the foundation towards setting up a scale for developing separate patterns of how the finiteness is being realized in individual language(s) (Givón 1990: Dik 1997a: Hengeveld 1998: Cristofaro). Scalar analysis is not possible as the focus of formal approaches are on syntactic effects of properties or features. These features are distinct and incorporated into a binary system that decides if a particular effect occurs or not. An extensive study on finiteness in terms of scalar phenomenon is presented by Givón (1990: 852-91). According to his view, finiteness in terms of property of the clause is considered as a syntactic reflection of the degree with which a clause is incorporated with 'its immediate clausal environment'. This is a part of clausal dependency that is finally a subject of discourse coherence (Irina Nikolaeva, 2007). According to Givón (1990), the properties of finiteness are: 1. Clausal domain 2. Complexity and scalarity 3. Coding function 4. Scope of dependency.

According to Madelyn Kissock (2014) traditional definitions relating to tense and agreement morphology should be rejected and the properties of the subject should be concerned to better abstract one with regard to anchoring as well as the potential for independence. Kissock proposes that PRO in its lexicon and Control structures is absent in Telugu. All null subjects are accounted for by Pro in its place. Sandhya Sundaresan (2014) focuses on the proposal of Kissock that in Telugu, all the instances of null subject are pro instead of Obligatory Control PRO. She argues that such claim should be assessed again with a consideration that (OC) PRO and pro are not primitives: Both of them seem to

be calm, but the main difference is, while the former is always a bound-variable anaphor, the latter is referred deictically. So, the claim saying OC PRO is not there in language leads to a question of whether obligatorily bound variables have the ability to remain calm or not. Eventually, she contends that the language might have controlled PRO at least in some clause types. In the view of K.A. Jayaseelan (2014), clausal categories that are in complementary distribution in Dravidian start with some observations especially, when the verb has subject agreement, it disappears in the presence of a modal or in the case of negated clause. Simultaneously, the general marker of negation is incompatible with the modals. In addition, clauses cannot be conjoined or revitalized that bear any one of these markers which means conjoined clauses and relative clauses should be non-finite. This group of properties evidently differentiate Dravidian languages with the most known languages, where agreement, negation and modality freely join. In addition to that, clauses bearing certain combination of the relevant markings are coordinated and also relativized (see McFadden, T., & Sundaresan, S. (2014)). It is observed that tense and agreement markers are found on the verbal inflection in a finite clause especially in the major Dravidian languages like Telugu, Kannada and Tamil. However, the finite verb inflects only for tense in case of Malayalam. Now, the second part of the study examines Telugu relative clauses in order to develop criteria to decide finiteness in Telugu.

2. Finiteness in Telugu

In Telugu, the verb shows rich inflectional morphology. But, while agreement is present in many constructions, tense is not always present overtly. Some negatives, modals and embedded clauses lack agreement inflection. Interestingly, aspectual morphology is present in all finite clauses. To begin with, we try to account root clauses in relation to finiteness in Telugu and we move on to find out which features make relative clauses as finite based on the properties which are found in Telugu root clauses. Now, we provide an explanation to develop criteria to define finiteness in Telugu. Telugu separates 3 grammatical persons (first, second & third), 2 numbers (singular, plural), and only one gender (masculine).

(1) a.	ne:nu	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta:-nu.	‘I sing songs’
b.	me:mu	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta:-mu.	‘We sing songs’
c.	manamu	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta:-mu.	‘We (PL) sing songs’
d.	ne:vu	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta:-vu.	‘You sing songs’
e.	mi:ru	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta:-ru.	‘You (PL) sing songs’
f.	ataɖu/va:ɖu	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta:-ɖu.	‘He sings songs’
g.	a:me/adi	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta-di.	‘She sings songs’
h.	adi	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta-di.	‘It sings songs’
i.	va:ru	pa:ʈa-lu	pa:du-ta:-ru.	‘They sing songs’

Telugu finite verbs inflect for tense and agreement as shown in the examples. Non-past is marked by the suffix *-ta:* in these sentences. To analyse the pronouns and the verbs in (1) starting with features of person-number would be better. If we observe the above examples, to represent the specified pronoun, some part of the pronouns is spelt as an affix on the verbal inflection. First person pronoun singular is *ne:nu* ‘I’ and the bit of pronoun *-nu* spelt as a suffix on the verbal inflection as shown in (1a). First person pronoun plurals are (inclusive) *me:mu* and (exclusive) *manamu* ‘we’ and the bit of pronoun *-mu* spelt as a suffix on the verbal inflection as shown in (1b&c). Second person pronoun singular is *ne:vu* ‘you’ and the part of pronoun *-vu* spells out as a suffix on the verbal inflection (1d). Second person pronoun plural is *mi:ru* ‘you’ and the bit of pronoun *-ru* spelt as a suffix on the verbal

inflection (1e). Third person singulars are *ataḍu/va:ḍu* ‘he’, *a:me/adi* ‘she/it’ and *adi* ‘it’ and the part of pronoun *-ḍu*, *-di* and *-di* spell out as affixes on the verbal inflection respectively as shown in (1f-h). *va:ḍu* and *adi* is generally used to refer to informal and rude manner as in (1f-g). Third person pronoun plural is *va:ru* ‘they’ and the bit of pronoun *-ru* spelt as a suffix on the verbal inflection as shown in (1i). All the sentences can stand alone which means they are independent clauses. So, it is hard to find out the more accountable feature for finiteness. Now, we examine some more examples.

- (2) a. *ne:nu/me:mu/ne:vu/ataḍu/a:me/adi/va:ru/pro* *pe||i-ki* *ra:-|e:-du.*
 I/we/you/he/she/it/they/pro-NOM marriage-DAT come-NEG-DEF AGR
 ‘I/we/you/he/she/it/they didn’t come to marriage’
- b. *ne:nu/me:mu/ne:vu/ataḍu/a:me/adi/va:ru/pro* *pe||i-ki* *ra:-vaḥfu.*
 I/we/you/he/she/it/they/pro-NOM marriage-DAT come-may
 ‘I/we/you/he/she/it/they may come to marriage’
- c. *ne:nu/me:mu/ne:vu/ataḍu/a:me/adi/va:ru/pro* *pe||i-ki* *ra:-va:li.*
 I/we/you/he/she/it/they/pro-NOM marriage-DAT come-have to
 ‘I/we/you/he/she/it/they have to/has to come to marriage’

In the above examples, finite verbs inflect for negative marker *|e:* ‘not’, modal verb *vaḥfu* ‘may’ and *va:li* ‘have to’ which have inherent tense feature respectively. Example (2a) ‘*le:du*’ occurs only in past event but not in non-past. So, we can say, it has past time reference. Anyway, the finite verb doesn’t inflect for either tense or agreement overtly. Since, Telugu is a pro-drop language, 1st and 2nd pronouns can be freely dropped in casual speech. However, when it comes to 3rd person pronouns, there should be an appropriate and rich context. As the above clauses can stand independently they are considered as finite clause. These clauses have a nominative subject. So, we assume that nominative case is assigned by abstract tense to the subjects. Besides, these clauses are propositional in that they make a statement. In Telugu, adverbs play an important role about time reference. Consider the following examples:

- (3) a. *ne:vu* *ipuḍu* *da:nimmarasam* *ti:suko:ni-vunḍa(va)las-in-di.*
 you-NOM now pomegranate juice take-should have-PST-DEF AGR
 ‘You should have taken pomegranate juice now’
- b. *ne:vu* *ninna* *da:nimmarasam* *ti:suko:ni-vunḍa(va)las-in-di.*
 you-NOM yesterday pomegranate juice take-should have-PST-DEF AGR
 ‘You should have taken pomegranate juice yesterday’
- c. **ne:vu* *re:pu* *da:nimmarasam* *ti:suko:ni-vunḍa(va)las-in-di.*
 you-NOM tomorrow pomegranate juice take-should have-PST-DEF AGR
 *‘You should have taken pomegranate juice tomorrow’

As we have noted, adverb plays an important role in indicating time. There are restrictions as to which adverb has to be used with which verb. For instance the *unḍa(va)lisi* ‘should have’ is used with past and present time adverbs but not with future time adverbs, as shown in the ungrammatical example in (3c). In these examples, the finite verb doesn’t inflect for full agreement but inflects for default agreement. Default agreement cannot be taken as agreement, since it does not match with phi-features of the nominative subject. It seems both tense and agreement play a significant role for finiteness. In all these root clauses, we have examined the presence of tense/aspect, agreement, nominative NP, auxiliary, modal, etc. In addition to these, the clauses are independent and propositional. Lack of

agreement is found in some constructions. Sudharsan (2014) states that all finite clauses are tensed and only tensed clauses have agreement in Kannada. This suggests that specification of tense is mandatory in finite clauses. Agreement does not occur in all finite clauses. The (declarative) affirmative root clauses, and subordinate clauses *endu-*, *emba-* and *embudu* clauses are all tensed and they carry agreement also. But we know that negatives and modals lack agreement. Although negatives are devoid of agreement, they are specified for tense, since tense has to be present in a finite clause to assign nominative case (see Sudharsan, 2014). However, tense/aspect plays a primary role and agreement plays secondary role in Telugu.

3. Finiteness in Telugu Relative Clauses

A relative clause usually does modify a noun or noun phrase and it is another name for an adjective clause. In a construction, it functions as an adjective. Generally, it is observed that a relative clause will qualify a head NP in which it gets embedded. The term ‘relative clause’ has been defined in various ways by the scholars. According to Riemsdijk (2006), relative clause is that which modifies a phrasal constituent, usually a noun phrase and the noun phrase modified in such terms is considered as the head of the relative clause. Andrews (2009) states that the relative clauses are subordinate clauses which help to delimit the potential reference of an NP. Krishnamurthi and Gwynn (1985:237) states that there are no relative pronouns in Telugu and their part is played by verbal adjectives. They further say that verbal adjectives come under the classification of derived adjectives, since they are derived from verbs. There are four verbal adjectives and they correspond to the past, future-habitual, durative and negative tenses of the finite verb (see Krishnamurthi and Gwynn (1985). Since there are no relative pronouns in Telugu, their roles are played by verbal adjectives in the Dravidian type of relative clauses and in borrowed, interrogative pronouns are used. Relative clauses are found in world languages and some languages widely vary in their constructions as well as in their morpho-syntactic and semantic properties (see Dixon, R. M. W. (1972), Underhill, R. (1972), Kuno, S. (1973), Platero, P. R. (1974). Creider, C. (1978), Wachtel, T. (1979). Klumpp, J., & Burquest, D. A. (1983), Yimam, Bai, B. L. (1985), B. (1987), Sharvit, Y. (1999), De Vries, M. (2002), Alexopoulou, T. (2006). Subbārão, K. V. (2012), Josephs, L. S. (2019) and others. Following are the two kinds of relative clauses found in Telugu and other Dravidian languages (see Suman, 2015):

- i. Dravidian (Dr) type.
- ii. Indo-Aryan (IA) type.

If we examine these two types in Dravidian languages, they vary some properties on the relativized verbs according to respective language(s). So, the findings, in one or two Dravidian languages, can't be generalised to all the Dravidian languages. I personally observed that all Dravidian languages are not similar with respect to tense, aspect and agreement. Languages should be individually analysed to bring out the facts to define finiteness in respective language(s). Finiteness is not an easy task in Telugu in which verbal properties vary in each type of sentence within root clauses. However, each type has to be clearly examined for better understanding of finiteness in such language(s) as shown in Telugu root clauses. We examine these two types with respect to finiteness in Telugu. Dravidian type has an inflectional phrase (IP) structure. We have already seen that some root clauses lack agreement. In a similar manner, Dravidian type relative clause also lacks agreement. The relativized verb, in this type, does inflect for aspect in Telugu and for both aspect and tense. Though relativized verb lacks agreement, it can have a nominative subject. In this type, there is one more important characteristic feature which is pronominal all the time. In this case, it occurs before the noun which it relativizes. Consider the following example.

have a relative particle-*a*, which is suffixed to the verb stem to relativize the clause. Klumpp, J., & Burquest, D. A. (1983) says that a few relativized verbs seem like main verbs and are differentiated from them only through additional relative affixes in Piapoco. Telugu vocalic suffix *-a* is a relativizer used only for past tense verbs. This relativizer goes with the past tense marker *-in*. In this way, the relative clause indicates past action, event, etc, by the combination of *-in* and *-a*. So, we assume that tense/time is expressed overtly which means that a clause has its own time reference distinct from that of the matrix. Example (5b) is ungrammatical because *-in* (past tense marker) is used for future reading. In the examples (5c-d) contain subordinate relative clauses *a:me fadava-bo:y-e:*, *a:me fadiv-e:*, the verbs are marked for aspect/tense but not for agreement features. Instead they have a relative particle-*e:*, which is suffixed to the verb stem to relativize the clause. This vocalic suffix *-e:* is a relativizer used only in case of non-past tense verbs where the relativizer goes with the marker of non-past tense as shown in (5c) and it also has such feature within itself as in (5d). This way the relative clause indicates non-past action, event, etc. So, we assume that tense/time is expressed in some constructions overtly or covertly which means that the clause has its own time reference distinct from that of the matrix.

Consider the examples given below in which the relative clause refers to non-past event, action indicated by the vocalic suffix *-e:* and this vocalic suffix is used in only non-past event. These clauses have temporal independence, in the sense; they can have time distinct from that of main clause as shown in (6a). Sentence (6b) is ungrammatical because the non-past verb is used with past adverb in the relative clause.

- (6) a. [ataḍu ipuḍu pa:ḍ-e:] pa:ṭa ne:nu ninna ra:s-in-di.
 [he-NOM now singing-NPST-REL] song I-NOM yesterday write-PST-DEF AGR
 ‘The song he is singing now which I wrote yesterday’
- b. * [ataḍu ninna pa:ḍ-e:] pa:ṭa ne:nu ra:s-in-di.
 [he-NOM yesterday sing-NPST-REL] song I-NOM write-PST-DEF AGR
 *‘He sings the song yesterday which I wrote’
- c. [ataḍu pa:ḍ-galig-e:] pa:ṭa ne:nu ra:s-in-di.
 [he-NOM sing-NPST-REL] song I-NOM write-PST-DEF AGR
 ‘He can sing the song which I wrote’

In these examples, the relativized clauses are finite as they have nominative subjects and *-e:* is suffixed to the verb to relativize the clause, which is used for non-past. The ungrammaticality is shown in the example (6b), if we use *-e:* with the past. Because, *-e:* can be used only for non-past event. This relative clause licences nominative subject. It is noticed that there is an abstract tense which renders this embedded clause finite. It is also observed that relativized verb can inflect for modal *gala* ‘can’ as shown in (6c). Also, the verb carries different aspectual inflections, as shown in the following examples.

- (7) a. a:me ninna kaṭṭ-in-a fī:ra na:-di.
 she-NOM yesterday wear-PST-REL sari mine-3.SG
 ‘The sari that she wore yesterday is mine’
- b. a:me ipuḍu/re:pu kaṭṭ-e: fī:ra na:-di.
 she-NOM now/tomorrow wear-NPST-REL sari mine-3.SG
 ‘The sari that she wears now/tomorrow is mine’

c. a:me ipuḍu kaṭṭu-tunn-a ḥi:ra na:-di.
 she-NOM now wear-PROG-REL sari mine-3.SG

‘The sari that she is wearing now is mine’

d. a:me kaṭṭa-bo:je: ḥi:ra na:-di.
 she-NOM wear-NPST sari mine-3.SG

‘The sari that she is going to wear is mine’

These examples of relative clauses in which the verb inflects for different aspects show that they are not dependent upon the matrix for temporal reference. We noted earlier that modals are always finite in English and Telugu, in that they can never occur in non-finite clauses. In the examples below, the subordinate relative clauses contain modal verbs which give supporting evidence for their finite status.

(8) a. [va:ru ti:sukuravalas-in-a] pustakamu ataḍu ti:sukuvaf-æ:-ḍu.
 [They-NOM bring-should have-PST-REL] book he-NOM bring-PST-3.SG.M

‘He brought the book which they should have brought’

b. [a:me ḥe:jaavalas-in-a] pani va:ru ḥe:ś-æ:-ru
 [she-NOM do-should have-PST-REL] work they-NOM do-PST-3.PL

‘They did the work which she should have done’

In (8 a-b), the tense and agreement are inflected by matrix verb as shown in the root clauses and embedded one does inflect for modal, aspect and relativizer. The presence of modals gives evidence to show that these clauses are finite. As we all know, modals generally occur in only finite clauses. They have nominative subjects as well. However, this type of relative clause has all the properties which we find in root clauses except propositional independence. Now, we turn our attention to IA type relative clauses.

3.2. Indo-Aryan Type of Relative Clauses

The IA type that Telugu and Dravidian Languages borrowed from Sanskrit is in some ways different from the original Indo-Aryan correlative although it is modelled on that pattern. To begin with the Dravidian Correlative is always pre-nominal. Secondly, it uses an interrogative pronoun such as *evāru*, ‘who’ *emi*, ‘what’ *ekāḍa*, ‘where’, etc., unlike the correlatives in Hindi and other Indo-Aryan languages which use relative pronouns. In Indo-Aryan languages the correlatives can be pre- or post-nominal. As for verbal morphology is concerned, we have already noted that the verb inflects for aspect/tense and agreement also. It licenses nominative, etc. It is a CP structure, since it has an interrogative pronoun. However it is a non-indicative clause. Another characteristic of this clause is that the interrogative pronouns need not always occur in the beginning of the clause; can come within the relative clause as shown in the (9a). But these features are not directly relevant to the issue regarding finiteness.

(9) a. [evāriṇi ne:vu koṭṭ[-ina:-v-o:] va:ri daggara a: kalamu un-di.
 [whom-ACC you-NOM beat-PST-2.SG-REL] they-DAT near the pen is-3.SG

‘The pen is with them whom you beat’

b. [ninna evārajte: vaf-æ:-r-o:] va:re: ipuḍu vaf-æ:-ru.
 [yesterday who-if came-PST-3.SG-REL] they-EMP now come-PST-3.PL

‘The persons who came yesterday came now’

In (9a-b), subordinate relative clauses have tense/aspect and agreement and they license nominative subjects. Besides, these embedded clauses are characterized by independence of temporal reference. In this pattern, the embedded clause has verbal predicate which contain all relevant verbal morphology exactly like root clauses except the complementizer.

c. [evərini ne:vu ko[tʃa-bo:tu-na:vo:] atani daggara a: tupaki un-di.
[whom-ACC you-NOM beat-LV.NPST-2-SG-REL] he-DAT near the gun is-3.SG
‘The person whom you want to beat has gun with him’

d. [evərini ne:vu ko[tʃa-gala-vo:] atade: po:tʃi-lo una:-ru.
[whom-ACC you-NOM beat-NPST(can)-2-SG-REL] he-EMP competition-LOC are-3.SG
‘The person whom you can beat is in the competition’

In (9c-d) the presence of modal verb in embedding indicates clue to say it is finite. The presence of modals can indicate that they are finite. Generally, modals don’t occur in finite clause. The verbal embedding has all the morphological properties of a root clause. The predicate has the full array of tense/aspect, modal and agreement. Moreover, the subject is in the nominative form as in root clauses. Since they are subordinate clauses, they lack propositional independence. Telugu has several kinds of non-finite clauses, like conjunctive participle clause, infinitival clause, etc. Let us analyse some of them. Consider the following examples:

(10) a. a:me_(i) [PRO_(i) pa:tʃa pa:du-tu:] vanʃa tʃes-in-di.
she-NOM [song sing-PRS.PTCP] cooking do-PST-3.SG
‘While singing song she did cooking’

b. a:me_(i) [PRO_(i) pa:tʃa pa:du-*gala-tu:] vanʃa tʃes-in-di.
she-NOM [song sing-can-PRS.PTCP] cooking do-PST-3.SG
‘While singing song she did cooking’

c. ne:nu_(i) [PRO_(i) /*ataɖu/*a:me/*va:ru sinima: tʃu:s-tu:] annamu tinn-a:-nu.
I-NOM [e/I/he/she/they movie watch-PRS.PTCP] rice eat-PST-1.SG
‘While watching movie I ate food’

In the progressive participle subordinate clause, the verb has the progressive suffix *-tu*; but it lacks the auxiliary verb *un*, ‘be’ which occurs in all finite progressive tenses. This means that aspect is expressed only partially without the finite auxiliary *un*. And another important characteristic of this clause is that it has a PRO subject; in other words, the subordinate clause cannot have its own overt subject. The matrix subject controls the PRO subject. Basically, the construction was a subject-controlled structure. That is the PRO subject cannot be controlled by any other NP in the matrix. If we use any modal in this progressive participle clause it is unacceptable as shown in (10b). This is an evidence to show that modals don’t occur in non-finite clauses. The example (10c) shows that the embedded PRO subject is co-referential with the matrix subject. The sentence also shows that if PRO is replaced by any overt subject, it renders the sentence ungrammatical. Another important characteristic we need to note about these participial clauses is its subject can serve as co-referential only with the matrix subject, but not with any other NP in the matrix as shown in example (10c). Besides, these clauses lack propositional independence and temporal independence.

According to EriKurniawan and William D. Davies (2015), there are environments in which overt pronouns are disallowed, where their occurrence results in ungrammaticality. They further state that control in this structure is obligatory. Consider the example below taken from Sundanese:

- (11) Barudak₁ nyoba-nyoba [PRO_{1/*2}rékjarual-an sapatu di pasar].
 Children AV.try-RED FUT sell.PL-IT shoes in market
 ‘The children tried to sell shoes in the (traditional) market’
 (EriKurniawan AND William D. Davies, 2015)
- (12) a. pilalu_(i) [PRO_(i) puvu-lu amm-a] ikkaḍi-ki vaṭṭa:ru.
 children-NOM [flower-s sell-INF] here-DAT come-PST-3.S.M
 ‘Children came here to sell the flowers’
- b. pilalu_(i) [PRO_{(i)/*j} puvu-lu amm-a] ikkaḍi-ki vaṭṭa:ru.
 children-NOM [flower-s sell-INF] here-DAT come-PST-3.S.M
 ‘Children came here to sell the flowers’

It is noticed that Telugu infinitives don’t allow any kind of overt subjects as shown in the above examples (12a-b). They can have only PRO subject which is controlled by the subject of matrix clause. If there is any overt subject in such clauses, it is ungrammatical as shown in (12b). However, these clauses are totally devoid of any aspectual inflection and they cannot take any adverb either. Tense, aspect, agreement, temporal auxiliaries, modals, etc can’t occur in these clauses. Subject control is mandatory in these clauses. Besides, these clauses lack propositional independence. Therefore, we can say these are purely non-finite clauses.

Now, we summarize the main characteristics of the relative clauses Dravidian type (IP clause) and Indo-Aryan type (CP clause) that we have examined so far. The following are their morphosyntactic characteristics: Dravidian type relative clauses lack an independent functional head C and agreement. They inflect for aspect/tense and allow nominative subject. Moreover, they contain the auxiliary *un* or modal verbs and they can also license a pro subject or the reflexive subject *ta:nu*. As for their semantic or non-formal characteristics, they have the following properties: Telugu relative clauses lack propositional independence or completeness. But, they all exhibit temporal independence since they do inflect for aspect. In Telugu, agreement is present in both affirmative and negative indicative clauses, although not consistently in all negative clauses. Sudharsan(2014) proposes clausal force, which is also used as one of the parameters, which seems to decide verbal morphology in Kannada. She argues agreement exclusively occurs in affirmative, declarative clauses and the clauses which are not affirmative lack agreement in Kannada. This is the case in Telugu also. However, in Telugu, agreement is present in both affirmative and negative indicative clauses, although not consistently in all negative clauses. In sum, following Sudharsan (2014), we can say that agreement is a feature of indicative force in Telugu and Kannada, whereas the non-indicative force is signalled by the absence of agreement. Dravidian type IP clauses are all non-indicative in force and the only non-indicative clause which is a CP structure is the IA type of relative clause.

4. Conclusions

This paper offered a comprehensive account of the verbal morphology and explored Telugu relative clauses in relation to finiteness. It has been found that relative clauses are of two kinds in Telugu namely Dravidian Type & Indo-Aryan type. It is noticed that there is no single satisfactory/straightforward definition for finiteness in Telugu. But, a set of criteria can be useful to define finiteness in Telugu as shown in this paper. Apparently, we tried to find out the different properties of both CP and IP relative clauses and examined how far those properties contributed to draw conclusions in developing criteria for finiteness. As a result, on the bases of theoretical and empirical research, we argued that finiteness is a cluster of morpho-syntactic and semantic properties.

This paper also examined some of non-finite clauses, such as conjunctive participle clause, infinitival clauses and showed what properties they lack and have to be considered as non-finite in Telugu. However, the morpho-syntactic properties can be categorized as formal features whereas the semantic properties as functional features.

5. Ethics Committee Approval

The author(s) confirm(s) that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country (Date of Confirmation: 21.01.2021).

Acknowledgments

An early version of this paper was presented at ICOLSI-41 in India, 2019. The author is thankful to Prof. Anuradha Sudharsan for her insights and encouragement and he extends his thanks to K. Vindhya Pratyusha for proof reading the earlier version of this article. The author is also thanks to the anonymous reviewer(s) and editor for their constructive comments and feedback which helped him to improve this work. Finally, he thanks Delara Publication for proof reading the final version.

References

- Alexopoulou, T. (2006). Resumption in relative clauses. *Natural language & linguistic theory*, 24(1), 57-111.
- Andrews, A. D. (2007a). Relative clauses. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 2, 206–236.
- Bai, B. L. (1985). Some notes on correlative constructions in Dravidian. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications*, (20), 181-190.
- Chamoreau, C., & Estrada-Fernández, Z. (Eds.). (2016). *Finiteness and Nominalization* (Vol. 113). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cowper, E., & Hall, D. C. (1999). *Semantic composition and syntactic structure: English inflection*. Canadian Linguistic Association, Université de Sherbrooke.
- Cowper, E. (2002). *Finiteness*. Manuscript. University of Toronto.
- Creider, C. (1978). The syntax of relative clauses in Inuktitut. *Etudes/Inuit/Studies*, 95-110.
- De Vries, M. (2002). *The syntax of relativization*. Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics. Netherlands.
- Dik, S. C. (1997). *The theory of functional grammar: the structure of the clause*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1972). *The Dyirbal language of north Queensland*, (Vol. 9). CUP Archive.
- George, Leland M and Jaklin Kornfilt. (1981). *Finiteness and Boundedness in Turkish*. In Binding and Filtering. Frank Heny., ed. London: Croom Helm.
- Givon, T. (1990). Voice and De-transitivization. *Syntax: a functional typological introduction*, 2, 563-644.
- Hengeveld, K. (1998). Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe. *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, 335-420.
- Hogg, R. (1992). *The Cambridge history of the English language*. Volume I: The beginnings 1066.
- Huddleston, R. (1988). *English grammar: An outline*. Cambridge University Press.

- Jayaseelan, K. A. (2014). Coordination, relativization and finiteness in Dravidian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 32(1), 191-211.
- Josephs, L. S. (2019). *Palauan reference grammar*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Julien, M. (2000). *Syntactic heads and word formation: A study of verbal inflection*. University of Tromsø.
- Irina Nikolaeva, (2007). *Finiteness Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Irina Nikolaeva, (2010). Typology of finiteness. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(12), 1176-1189.
- Kissock, M. J. (2014). Evidence for ‘finiteness’ in Telugu. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 32(1), 29-58.
- Klumpp, J., & Burquest, D. A. (1983). Relative clauses in Piapoco. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 49(4), 388-399.
- Krishnamurti, B., & Gwynn, J. P. L. (1985). *A grammar of modern Telugu*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Krishnamurti, B. (2003). *The Dravidian languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kuno, S. (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kurniawan, E., & Davies, W. D. (2015). Finiteness in Sundanese. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 1-16.
- McFadden, T., & Sundaresan, S. (2014). Finiteness in South Asian languages: an introduction. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 32(1), 1-27.
- Noonan, M. (1992). *A Grammar of Lango*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Platero, P. R. (1974). The Navajo relative clause. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 40(3), 202-246.
- Shanmugam, S. V. (1972). *Gender-number sub-categorization in Dravidian*. Agesthalingom, S. and Shanmugam, SV (eds.). 1972. In *Proceedings of the Seminar on Dravidian Linguistics* (pp. 23-58). Hyderabad.
- Sharvit, Y. (1999). Functional relative clauses. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 447-478.
- Subbārāo, K. V. (2012). *South Asian languages: A syntactic typology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sudharsan, A. (2014). Tense, Aspect and Agreement in Kannada. *Indian Linguistics (a journal of the Linguistic Society of India)*, Vol. 75, Pune.
- Sudharsan, A. (2014). Subordination in Kannada: Evidence against finiteness constraint. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 19 (4), 17-22.
- Suman, K. (2015). *Finiteness in Telugu Formal and Functional Perspectives*. Ph. D dissertation, EFL University.
- Sundaresan, S. (2014). Making sense of silence: Finiteness and the (OC) PRO vs. pro distinction. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 32(1), 59-85.
- Van Riemsdijk, H. C. (2006). Free relatives. *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, 338-382.
- Underhill, R. (1972). Turkish participles. *Linguistic inquiry*, 3(1), 87-99.
- Wachtel, T. (1979). Nouns, Relative Clauses, and Pragmatic Control. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 511-514.
- Yimam, B. (1987). Relative clauses in Oromo. *Journal of Ethiopian studies*, 20, 60-74.

Appendix A.

List of Abbreviations:

1	First Person
2	Second Person
3	Third Person
ACC	Accusative
CP	ComplementizerPhrase
DAT	Dative
Dr	Dravidian
DEF AGR	Default Agreement
EMPH	Emphasis
F	Feminine
IA	Indo-Aryan
IP	Inflectional Phrase
LV	Light Verb
M	Masculine
NOM	Nominative
NPST	Non-PastTense
PL	Plural
PROG	Progressive
PRS.PTCP	PresentParticiple
PST	Past Tense
REL	Relativizer
SG	Singular

Telugu sıfat cümleciklerinde sonluluğun biçim-sözdizimsel ve anlambilimsel özellikleri

Özet

Tanımlayıcı ve teorik dilbilimdeki en zorlu ve ilginç kavramlardan biri sonluluktur. Telugu, Andhra Pradesh ve Telangana eyaletlerinde yaygın olarak konuşulan, Hindistan'ın güney kesiminin en önemli Dravid dillerinden biridir. Telugu dilinde, sonluluk doğrudan analize katkıda bulunmaz ve karmaşık bir olgudur. Bu makale, farklı gramer teorilerinin sonluluğu nasıl temsil ettiğini araştırıyor; Telugu bağlı cümleciklerine göre sonluluğun doğası ve morfo-sözdizimsel ve anlamsal özelliklerin bir cümlenin sonlu olup olmadığına nasıl karar verdiğini. Ayrıca, sonluluk kavramını araştırır ve buna karar vermek için kriterleri Telugu'da formüle eder. Ayrıca, Dravidian (Dr) türü ve Hint-Aryan (IA) türü olmak üzere iki tür ilgili cümleyi açıklar ve ilk olarak Yerli Dr

türünü ele alır ve sonluluk kriterlerini ne ölçüde karşıladığını görür. İkinci olarak, Telugu ve Dr Languages'ın Sanskritçe'den ödünç aldıkları IA türü, bu model üzerinde modellenmiş olmasına rağmen, orijinal IA bağıntısından bazı yönlerden farklıdır. Dr korelatif her zaman nominalden öncedir ve Hintçe ve sıfat cümlecığı zamirlerini kullanan diğer IA dillerindeki korelasyonların aksine bir soru zamiri kullanır. Bununla birlikte, teorik ve ampirik kanıtlara dayalı olarak, bu makale hem bu Telugu göreceli cümleciklerinin bir tanımını sağlamakta hem de sonluluğun biçimsel ve işlevsel perspektifler açısından nasıl gerçekleştiğini araştırmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: : sıfat cümlecikleri; sonluluk; biçim-sözdizimsel özellikler; anlambilim özellikler; Telugu

AUTHOR BIODATA

Kothakonda Suman is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Linguistics and Contrastive Study of Tribal Languages in the Faculty of Tribal Studies at Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, India. Prior to this position, he worked as an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at KL University. He did his PGDTE, M.Phil and Ph.D from The English and Foreign Languages University. He qualified UGC-NET (Ling), AP SET (Ling) and AP SET (Eng). His research interests are Language Teaching, Language Acquisition and Learning, and Theoretical Linguistics.