

**COMPOSITIONALITY AND PREDICATION OF
PROPERTY CONCEPT (PC)-EXPRESSIONS IN
TELANGANA TELUGU**

THIRUKOVELA NIKHILESH



**DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
JULY 2023**

**© INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, NEW DELHI, 2023
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

**Compositionality and Predication of Property Concept (PC)-expressions in
Telangana Telugu**

Dissertation submitted by

Thirukovela Nikhilesh

(2017 HUZ 8148)

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Under the Supervision of

Dr. Paroma Sanyal

*In fulfillment of the requirements for the degree **Doctor of Philosophy** to the*



Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
Hauz Khas, New Delhi – 110016, India

July 2023

To,

*My parents, **Krishnaveni and Hariprasad**, who have given me unconditional love
and absolute freedom to do anything I wish in my life.*

Everything that I am today is because of you.

Thank you.

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis - **“Compositionality and Predication of Property Concept (PC)-expressions in Telangana Telugu”** - submitted by Thirukovela Nikhilesh to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IIT Delhi) for the award of the degree of **“Doctor of Philosophy”** is a record of bona fide research work carried out by her under my supervision and guidance, and it is in conformity with the rules and regulations of IIT Delhi.

He has fulfilled all the requirements for the submission of this thesis which has, in my opinion, reached the standard of fulfilling the requirements for the degree.

To the best of my knowledge, the material contained in this thesis has not been submitted, in part or in full, to any other University or Institute for the award of any other degree or diploma.

Dr. Paroma Sanyal
Associate Professor
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
New Delhi
India

Date: 11 July 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Five years ago, I embarked on a journey that began in the scorching summer of Delhi. After having just completed my masters, I was determined to pursue a PhD from one of the leading institutes in the country. When I was offered the opportunity at IIT-Delhi, I was overjoyed. In hindsight, I was naive in thinking that it wouldn't be too difficult, but boy was I wrong! This PhD has been the most challenging and fulfilling experience of my life. Looking back, I now realize I had no clue what I was getting into with a PhD in linguistics at IIT-Delhi back then. Thankfully, I now have a slightly better understanding. Lot of this knowledge and clarity I owe to the faculty members at the linguistics unit of IITD and their meticulously crafted coursework curriculum. Their lectures were my first step towards understanding linguistics as I do it today.

First and foremost, I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Paroma Sanyal, for her unwavering support and guidance throughout my journey. It is an understatement to say that, without her, this thesis would not have come to fruition. I appreciate her faith in me and her encouragement to approach my research with critical thinking. Her wisdom that any topic can be explored if the right questions are asked and its implications are understood has stayed with me. She is not only a renowned scholar but also a remarkable person. Her way of discussing research inspired confidence in me and I am fortunate to have had such a supportive supervisor. Thank you for being so kind and patient with me.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to my external committee member, Professor R Amritavalli. She has been a singular source of, perhaps the most important and informative insights

of this thesis. Her suggestions and comments have shaped most parts of this thesis. I am also grateful to my research committee members, Professor Angelie Multani and Dr. Ashwini Vaidya, for their support and helpful feedback during my synopsis and other presentations over the past five years. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the faculty members from the linguistics unit at IIT-Delhi - Professor Pritha Chandra for her insightful syntax lessons and Dr. Samar Husain for our inspiring academic discussions. Outside of IIT, I would like to thank Dr. Rahul Balusu, Professor KA Jayaseelan, Professor KV Subbarao, Dr. Ishani Guha, and Dr. Sindhu Herur for their patience and help in answering my questions at various points during my research. I extend my sincere gratitude to the external reviewers, Professor Ayesha Kidwai and Dr. Mythili Menon for their thorough comments and insights. Lastly, I cannot end without mentioning Dr. Gracious Mary Temsen, who introduced me to syntax and is responsible for my ongoing interest in generative syntax. Thank you, Grace, for everything. Although my trees may not be beautiful, I hope they won't attract flying dusters anymore !

Last but not least, I would like to thank my friends from the unit - Preeti, Tanuj, Krishna, Vyom, Ankita, Reena, Wasim, Apurv and Chandini who have not only been my go-to people to discuss all things linguistics but also been good friends and support system throughout this journey. I cannot forget my Wind-T gang- Urooj, Jyotirmay, Sneha, Simran and the Sear Sapata group- Sumallya, Akhil, Avantika and Mudafia. Our Food walks, Chai-breaks and Cooking sessions are one of my most memorable experiences from Delhi. I cannot imagine this journey without you all. Outside IIT, I thank my friends, Medha, Harish, Nandini, Varsha and Josh for always being there and my family members Raja, Bharath, Sunny and all the cousins, ammama, thathayya and all pinnis and babais for supporting me throughout this journey. Finally, I would like to thank my

wife, Jyoshna - although you entered into my life almost as I was concluding this project, you have been my strongest supporter. Thank you.

This research was supported by the institute fellowship grant by IIT Delhi. All errors are my own.

Thirukovela Nikhilesh

July 2023

New Delhi

ABSTRACT

Property Concept (PC)-expressions are semantic notions that are consistently lexicalized as adjectives in languages with lexical adjectives (Dixon, 2004). The central question this thesis aims to explore is “How are the semantic notions of PC-expressions (PCs) expressed in Syntax?”. To achieve this goal, the thesis utilizes the theoretical framework of Distributed Morphology, as proposed by Halle and Marantz (1993), Harley and Noyer (1999), and Embick (2015). The thesis specifically focuses on the idea that PC roots are incorporated into syntax without being assigned a syntactic category, and categorization occurs within syntax through functional categorizers, as stated in the Categorization Assumption (Embick and Marantz, 2008: 6).

Languages can be broadly categorized into two groups with regards to their adjective formation. The first group, referred to as (α)-type languages, primarily use the adjectival categorizer (a-cat) as the base-merge to form adjectives for most of their PC-roots. Only a small number of PC-roots from these languages use nominal or verbal categorizers (n-cat or v-cat) as the base-merge to build modification structures. Conversely, (β)-type languages predominantly use these complex compositional structures for the majority of their PCs, while only a limited number of PCs are constructed through direct a-categorization. These languages have been described in literature as lacking the "adjective" as a lexical category, with examples including Chichewa, Hausa, Mohawk (Baker 2003), Japanese (Miyagawa, 1987), Korean (Haspelmath, 2001), Kannada and Malayalam of the Dravidian language family (Amritavalli and Jayaseelan, 2003). This thesis, therefore, investigates Telangana Telugu, a regional variant of Telugu of the Dravidian language family, in order to understand the syntactic composition of PC-expressions in (β)-type languages.

First, focusing on the attributive modification structures, this thesis establishes Telangana Telugu (TT) as (β)-type language. As such, it is found that most PCs in TT adopt the n-cat as the base merge and employ the relativization strategy to form modification structures. However, not all PC-nouns are formed in the same relative clause (RC) modification structures. There are two main forms of RC modification structures in TT: (1) CoS RCPCs that utilize the copula -avu “become” and (2) equative RCPCs that employ a null equative copula. Both these structures show further restrictions and variations within them. Specifically, equative RCPCs have three optional markers: the accusative case marker -ni, the oblique case marker -ti, and the possessive nominalizer -pu, in addition to the RC structure. Additionally, the -ni marker seems to appear in two different positions within the structure. This thesis seeks to resolve these puzzles by examining the information structure resolution within the RCPCs.

Next, this thesis delves into the area of modification semantics with the purpose of addressing the inquiry as to how adjectives convey their semantics onto the nouns they modify in (β)-type languages such as TT. The study demonstrates that PC-adjectives are intersective context-dependent adjectives, while Equative RCPCs exhibit true-subjective characteristics. However, the interpretation of CoS RCPCs remains ambiguous, displaying both intersective and subjective meanings. This ambiguity is resolved through the application of the GEN morpheme semantics (Larson, 1999). Lastly, the modification structure of each type of PCs is analyzed within the framework of typed lambda(λ)-calculus.

Finally, this thesis also contributes to the understanding of the predication of PC-expressions by examining the predicative structures of the Psych-PCs in TT. A major finding is that Psych PCs in TT can also be predicted using ‘-*gaa*’, a [+eventive] Pred⁰ along with the usual dative ‘-*ki*’ marker in Dravidian. This allows psych-PCs to appear in nominative subject predicates with expressive and dynamic semantics rather than the experiencer stative semantics. This difference finds its locus in the sub-evental semantics within the First Phase Syntax (FPS) paradigm (Ramchand, 2008). Furthermore, a comprehensive list of vocabulary items that encompasses all variations of the Psych-PC predicates in TT is provided. In this way, this thesis highlights the significance of representational theories such as Distributed Morphology, where late insertion allows to explain the variation found in the data, adhering to Borer-Chomsky conjecture.

सारांश

प्रॉपर्टी कॉन्सेप्ट (पीसी) -एक्सप्रेसिंस सिमेंटिक धारणाएं हैं जो लेक्सिकल विशेषण (डिक्सन, 2004) वाली भाषाओं में विशेषण के रूप में लगातार लेक्सिकलाइज़ की जाती हैं। केंद्रीय प्रश्न इस थीसिस का पता लगाने का लक्ष्य है "सिंटेक्स में पीसी-एक्सप्रेसिंस (पीसी) की सिमेंटिक धारणाएं कैसे व्यक्त की जाती हैं?" यह थीसिस डिस्ट्रीब्यूटेड मॉर्फोलॉजी (हाले और मारेंटज़, 1993; हार्ले और नोयर, 1999; एम्बिक, 2015) के सैद्धांतिक ढांचे को नियोजित करती है, विशेष रूप से यह विचार कि पीसी जड़ों को सिंटेक्टिक श्रेणी के बिना सिंटेक्स में पेश किया जाता है और सभी वर्गीकरण सिंटेक्स के माध्यम से होता है। कार्यात्मक वर्गीकरणकर्ता (वर्गीकरण धारणा; एम्बिक और मारेंटज़ 2008: 6)।

क्रॉस-भाषाई रूप से, भाषाओं को इस संबंध में दो प्रकारों में विभाजित किया जा सकता है। सबसे पहले (α)-प्रकार की भाषाएं हैं जो अपने अधिकांश पीसी-रूटों के लिए विशेषण बनाने के लिए बेस मर्ज के रूप में विशेषण श्रेणीकारक (a-cat) का उपयोग करती हैं। उनके पीसी-रूट्स में से केवल कुछ ही बेस मर्ज के रूप में नाममात्र या मौखिक श्रेणीकरण (एन-कैट या वी-कैट) का उपयोग करते हैं और संशोधन संरचनाओं के निर्माण के लिए जटिल संरचनागत संरचनाओं को नियोजित करते हैं। दूसरी ओर, (β)-प्रकार की भाषाएं अपने अधिकांश पीसी के लिए इन रचनात्मक संरचनाओं का उपयोग करती हैं, जबकि केवल मुट्टी भर पीसी सीधे ए-वर्गीकरण के माध्यम से रचे जाते हैं। इन भाषाओं को कभी-कभी साहित्य में एक व्याख्यात्मक श्रेणी के रूप में 'विशेषण' की कमी के रूप में वर्णित किया जाता है। उदाहरण के लिए, चिचेवा, हौसा, मोहॉक (बेकर

2003), जापानी (मियागावा, 1987), कोरियाई (हसपेलमठ, 2001), द्रविड़ भाषा परिवार के कन्नड़ और मलयालम (अमृतवल्ली और जयसीलन, 2004)। इस कारण से, यह थीसिस तेलंगाना तेलुगु को देखती है, द्रविड़ भाषा परिवार के तेलुगु के एक क्षेत्रीय संस्करण को समझने के लिए कि कैसे पीसी-अभिव्यक्ति वाक्यात्मक रूप से (β)-प्रकार की भाषाओं में रची जाती है।

सबसे पहले, गुणकारी संशोधन संरचनाओं पर ध्यान केंद्रित करते हुए, यह थीसिस तेलंगाना तेलुगु (टीटी) को (β)-प्रकार की भाषा के रूप में स्थापित करती है। जैसे, टीटी में अधिकांश पीसी एन-कैट को बेस मर्ज के रूप में लेते हैं और सापेक्षीकरण रणनीति का उपयोग करके संशोधन संरचना बनाते हैं। हालांकि, सभी पीसी-संज्ञाएं एक ही सापेक्ष खंड (आरसी) संशोधन संरचनाओं में नहीं बनती हैं। टीटी में (आरसी) संशोधन संरचना बनाने के दो मुख्य तरीके हैं। ये हैं:- अ. CoS RCPCs जो CoS कोपुला -avu 'बन' और b का उपयोग करते हैं। इकेटिव आरसीपीसी जो एक अशक्त इकेटिव कोपुला का उपयोग करते हैं। दोनों संरचनाएं अपने भीतर और अधिक प्रतिबंध और भिन्नता दिखाती हैं। विशेष रूप से, समतुल्य RCPCs 3 वैकल्पिक मार्करों के साथ दिखाई देते हैं: - अभियोगात्मक मामला मार्कर -ni, तिरछा मामला मार्कर -ti और स्वामित्व नाममात्र -pu RC संरचना के ऊपर और ऊपर। इसके अलावा, -ni मार्कर भी संरचना में 2 अलग-अलग जगहों पर दिखाई देता है। थीसिस आरसीपीसी के भीतर सूचना संरचना संकल्प का हवाला देकर इन पहेलियों को हल करती है।

इसके बाद, यह थीसिस प्रश्न का उत्तर देने के उद्देश्य से संशोधन शब्दार्थ के क्षेत्र में अंतर्दृष्टि प्रदान करती है: - "विशेषण (β) - प्रकार की भाषाओं में संशोधित संज्ञा पर अपने शब्दार्थ को कैसे लागू करता है?"। यह स्थापित करता है कि पीसी-विशेषण प्रतिच्छेदन प्रासंगिक रूप से निर्भर विशेषण हैं और इकेटिव आरसीपीसी सच्चे-उप-विशेषण विशेषण हैं। हालांकि, सीओएस आरसीपीसी अस्पष्ट व्याख्याएं देते हैं और इंटरसेक्टिव और सबसेक्टिव दोनों अर्थ देते हैं। यह GEN morpheme (लार्सन, 1999) के शब्दार्थ का उपयोग करके हल किया

गया है। अंत में, टाइप किए गए लैम्बडा (λ) -कलकुलस के सिद्धांत के भीतर प्रत्येक प्रकार के पीसी की संशोधन संरचना प्रदान की जाती है।

अंत में, यह थीसिस टीटी में साइक-पीसी की विधेय संरचनाओं को देखकर पीसी-भावों की प्रवृत्ति की समझ में भी योगदान देती है। एक प्रमुख खोज यह है कि टीटी में साइक पीसी को द्रविड़ियन में '-गा', एक [+eventive] Pred⁰ के साथ-साथ सामान्य डाइवेटिव '-की' मार्कर का उपयोग करके भी प्रवृत्ति की जा सकती है। यह साइक-पीसी को अनुभवकर्ता स्थिर शब्दार्थ के बजाय अभिव्यंजक और गतिशील शब्दार्थ के साथ नाममात्र विषय में प्रकट होने की अनुमति देता है। यह अंतर प्रथम चरण सिंटेक्स (FPS) प्रतिमान (रामचंद्र, 2008) के भीतर उप-घटक शब्दार्थ में अपना ठिकाना पाता है। अंत में, शब्दावली आइटम का एक पूरा सेट जो टीटी में साइक-पीसी विधेय के भीतर सभी भिन्नता उत्पन्न करता है, प्रदान किया जाता है। इस तरह, यह थीसिस प्रतिनिधित्वात्मक सिद्धांतों के महत्व को भी दर्शाती है जैसे वितरित आकृति विज्ञान जहां देर से सम्मिलन बोरर-चॉम्स्की अनुमान का पालन करने वाले डेटा में पाई गई भिन्नता की व्याख्या करने की अनुमति देता है।

CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	i
Abstract	iv
Contents	x
Chapter 1: Introduction	1-44
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Property Concept (PC)-expressions	2
1.3. Modification function of PC-expressions	4
1.3.1. Attributive modification using PC-expressions	5
1.3.1.1. Attributive modification in (α)-type languages	5
1.3.1.2. Attributive modification in (β)-type languages	10
1.3.1.3 Summary	13
1.3.2. Economy of Derivation	14
1.3.2.1. Emergence of the lexical category ‘Adjective’	19
1.4. Syntactic categories and lexical insertion: A Brief History	21
1.5. Adjectives in syntax: Defining Adjectives	30
1.5.1. Summary	39
1.6. Structure of the dissertation	43
Chapter 2: Data and Classification	45-152
2.1. PC-expressions in Telangana Telugu (TT)	45
2.2. Data and classification	48
2.2.1: List of PC-modification expressions in TT	53

2.2.2. Attributive position	53
2.2.2.1. Null PCs	53
2.2.2.2. ‘-ayina’ PCs	54
2.2.2.3. ‘-ti/ni/pu’ PCs	54
2.2.3. Predicative position	55
2.2.3.1. Nominative case	55
2.2.3.2. PCs with ‘-gaa’ marker	58
2.2.3.3. Dative case	59
2.2.4. Data classification: Attributive position	59
2.2.5. PC classes in TT	61
2.2.5.1. Null PCs	61
2.2.5.2. ‘-ayina’ PCs	63
2.2.5.2.1. Deconstruction of ‘-ayina’ marker	64
2.2.5.2.2. The CoS copula <i>-avu</i> ‘become’	64
2.2.5.2.3. The past tense marker [+PST] ‘-in’	65
2.2.5.2.4. The Relative clause marker ‘-a’:	66
2.2.5.3. ‘-ti/ni/pu’ PCs	67
2.3. Syntactic word classes	70
2.3.1. Dixon’s (2004) semantic types classification of PCs	70
2.3.2. Syntactic diagnostic tests	74
2.3.2.1. Attributive modification position	75
2.3.2.2. Head of NP	77
2.3.2.3. Case markers	78

2.3.2.4. Plural marker	82
2.4: Syntactic tests applied on semantic categories	83
2.4.1. Semantic class 1: Dimension	83
2.4.1.1. Optional RC PCs: Scalar Semantics.....	95
2.4.1.2. Dual categorization approach	99
2.4.2. Semantic class 2: Age	100
2.4.3. Semantic class 3: Value	104
2.4.4. Semantic class 4: Color	111
2.4.5. Semantic class 5: Physical Property	114
2.4.5.1. Issue with equative RC PCs	131
2.4.6. Semantic class 6: Human Propensity	133
2.4.7. Semantic class 7: Speed	138
2.4.8. Semantic class 8: Cardinal numbers	140
2.5. Status of PC-expressions in terms of both PC-class and syntactic categories	143
2.5.1. Revised classification and syntactic category chart of PCs in TT	151
Chapter 3: Syntactic Compositionality	153-213
3.1. Introduction: Distributed morphology	153
3.1.1. Syntactic Categorization in DM	156
3.1.1.1. Vocabulary insertion	158
3.1.1.2. Allomorphy and Syncretism	160
3.2. Compositional structures of PC-expressions in TT	162
3.2.1. Null PCs	164
3.2.2. RC modification	165

3.2.2.1. Relative clause (RC) marker ‘-a’ and Relativization strategy.....	167
3.2.2.2. Relative Clause modification structure in Dravidian.....	170
3.3. Relative Clauses as Adjectives	181
3.3.1. CoS RCPCs	182
3.3.1.1. Variation within CoS RCPCs	187
3.3.2. Equative RCPCs	190
3.3.2.1. Variation within equative RC PCs	196
3.3.2.2. -ni marker	198
3.3.2.2.1. Variation in the -ni marker structures	200
3.3.2.3. -ti marker	204
3.3.2.4. -pu marker	206
3.3.3. TT case marking RCPCs w.r.t. information structure	212
Chapter 4: Modification Semantics	214-255
4.1. Introduction: Semantics	214
4.1.1. Compositionality	215
4.1.2. Lambda(λ)- calculus	217
4.1.2.1. Lambda (λ)-abstraction and application	218
4.1.3. Type theory	221
4.1.4. Compositionality in typed lambda(λ)-calculus	224
4.1.5. Type-mismatch	226
4.2. Compositionality of Adjectives	227
4.2.1. Modification semantics (Morzyki, 2016)	227
4.2.2. Adjective Type Heterogeneity vs. Homogeneity Hypothesis	234

4.2.3. Diagnostic test: Intersective vs. non-intersective adjectives	242
4.3. Compositional Semantics of PC-expressions in TT	245
4.3.1. Null PCs	245
4.3.2. Relative clause (RC) PCs	248
4.3.2.1. CoS RCPCs	249
4.3.2.2. Equative RCPCs	252
4.4. Summary	255
Chapter 5. Predication	256-302
5.1. Predicate adjectives in TT: overview	256
5.2. Data	258
5.2.1. PC-adjectives	258
5.2.2. PC-nouns (RCPCs)	259
5.2.2.1. Equative copulas	260
5.2.2.2. CoS copulas	261
5.3. Psych Predicates	263
5.3.1. Psych PC-predicates in Dravidian	265
5.3.2. -gaa particle in Telugu	269
5.3.3. Role of -gaa particle in the semantic mismatch puzzle	274
5.3.3.1. Evidence that -unn is an existential copula	274
5.3.3.2. Evidence that the psych-PC predicates in TT are SLPs	276
5.3.3.3. Semantic mismatch puzzle	278
5.4. ‘-ki’ and ‘-gaa’ markers in Telugu and TT	282
5.4.1. Dative -ki as initP	283

5.4.2. Pred ⁰ '-gaa' as ProcP	286
5.4.3. Syntax and Semantics of 'ki' and '-gaa'	291
5.4.4. Sub-evental variation in Telugu and TT	293
5.4.5. The Experiencer-CoS with both -ki and -gaa	297
5.4.6. The Expressive resultatives in TT	299
5.5. Summary	302
Chapter 6. Conclusion	303-319
6.1. Conclusion	303
6.2. Residual questions	308
6.2.1. DIS and CoS RCPCs	311
6.2.1.1 Visibility Conditions	314
6.2.2. DIS and <i>goppa</i> -class equative RCPCs	317
References