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Abstract
The paper aims at explaining causative morphemes/verbs in Telugu based on the features of distinctive causativization. This only covers the usual instances of causativization and explains how different types of Telugu verbs, transitives and intransitives, have different types of causative forms. Primarily, the causative typology of Telugu and the aspect of verb incorporation based on Baker’s theory are discussed. An attempt to find the restrictions on the morphophonemic processes involved in causativization is dealt with. The significance of morphological and periphrastic causatives and on productivity of the same is focussed as it involves the interaction between phonology, morphology and syntax.

Introduction
Languages, in general, express the idea of causing someone to carry out a certain action. Causatives fall into three major categories based on their morpho-syntax: lexical, morphological and syntactic. Lexical causatives are those in which the effect of causativization is found at the lexical level. These are the verbs which can be paraphrased in the way in which we construct a causative sentence. There is no external causativization is required in this case.

Many languages form their causatives either morphologically i.e. using specific causative morpheme of the verb or periphrastically, i.e. using a specific verb of causation. If the causativization is grammatical rather than periphrastic, the causative device changes the grammatical status of the arguments in the predication. It has the effect of adding another participant or object to the sentence structure. Causative suffix may demote an agent to a patient or a recipient and add a new grammatical role for the causer (the new agent).

On the surface, structures with morphological causatives are believed to be monoclusal and those with periphrastic causatives appear to be bicausal. Causatives in Telugu are either morphological or periphrastic. Some verbs make use of adjuncts too, to give the causative meaning. This paper mainly looks at the morphological and periphrastic causatives.

Morphological causatives are formed by the suffix –inc, which attaches to the transitive verb stem, with the causee marked with ‘ceeta’ (= by means of, INST).

\[
\begin{align*}
g &:\ 1. \text{ama-\ Nom} & \text{ama\-Ta} & \text{ama}\-\text{D-\ indi} \\
&:\ \text{ama sang a song.} \\
&:\ \text{ravi} & \text{ma-\ ceeta} & \text{ama\-Ta} & \text{ama}\-\text{D- inc - aaDu} \\
&:\ \text{avi-\Nom} & \text{ama-\INST} & \text{ama\-\text{D-\past-agr}} \\
&:\ \text{avi made Rama sing a song.}
\end{align*}
\]

Periphrastic causatives are formed with the help of the free-standing lexical verb cees (=make), which takes an infinitival complement (ending in -impa, the infinitival suffix). The object of the infinitive is ACC–marked.

\[
\begin{align*}
g &:\ 2. \text{child-\Nom} & \text{ustakamu\-nu} & \text{aduvu\-nu} \\
&:\ \text{he child reads the book.}
\end{align*}
\]
b. amma paapa pustakamu nu cadiv ces
Mother makes the child read the book.

Syntactic structures can also be formed periphrastically by making use of adjuncts such as eela (=like) to give the causative meaning. It is observed that the clitic -eela (derived from the adverbial ‘alaaga’ (=like that)) is attached to the lower verb stem

g; 3 a. paapa ɯstakamu-nu uduvu-nu
child-Nom ɦok-Acc ad-agr
he child reads the book.

In general, it may be observed from the list of verbs below that the lexical verb cees attaches to the non-finite form of verb and the causative morpheme ‘-inc’ to the bare/transitive stem of the verb. The classes of verbs are as given in Krishnamurthy (1961).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>/erb + impa + ceeyu</th>
<th>/erb + incu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lass 1 Eg: todugu ‘to wear’</td>
<td>dɪg-impa-ceeyu</td>
<td>dɪg-incu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lass 2 Eg: pilucu ‘to call’</td>
<td>lɪp-impa-ceeyu</td>
<td>lɪp-incu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lass 3 Eg: caccu ‘to die’</td>
<td>ɪmp-impa-ceeyu</td>
<td>ɪmp-incu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teliyu ‘to know’</td>
<td>liya ceeyu / teli-impa-ceeyu</td>
<td>eli-incu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lass 4 Eg: kuTTu ‘to sew’</td>
<td>iTT-impa-ceeyu</td>
<td>iTT-incu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lass 5 Eg: tinu ‘to eat’</td>
<td>nip-impa-ceeyu</td>
<td>nip-incu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lass 6 Eg: iccu ‘to give’</td>
<td>ɪp-impa-ceeyu</td>
<td>ɪp-incu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the causatives formed from nouns are observed, it is observed that -inc, -ela and –ees occur together and in that order. But, -inc here acts as a verbaliser rather than a causative.

Causative Typology
Causative sentences are generally categorized into type 1 and type 2 causatives. The variation between these two constructions is said to be parametric that differs from language to language. In fact, Gibson (1980) argued for type 1 and type 2 for causativisation based on the embedded clause, the case marking properties and the passivization.

According to Gibson’s typology, Telugu falls under type 1 category in which the subject of the embedded clause (in D-structure) takes an Oblique case (in the S-structure) while the object of the embedded clause (in D-structure) becomes a direct object (in S-structure). In type 2 causatives, unlike type 1 causatives, it is the subject of the lower clause which surfaces as the object of the causative sentence and the whole causative clause does not function as a single binding domain.
To be precise, Telugu morphological causatives fall into type 1 causatives for the following reasons (cf. Amritavalli 1997).
- the object of the lower clause retains its status.
- the causee is optional.
- the whole clause functions as a single binding domain.

Baker (1988), in accordance with Gibson (1980), describes the typology of causativization on the basis of the functions of ‘case and causativization’. Instead of two, Baker (1988) proposed four types and the focus of his typology is mainly on the properties of case of the NP of the lower clause. But as per Baker’s typology, Telugu falls under the third category with no double objects.

Morphological causatives are considered to be a part of a general phenomenon called ‘Verb Incorporation’, which is an instance of ‘move-alpha’ applying between D-structure and S-structure leaving a trace. In Telugu, like in Chichewa (Baker 1985) and in Malayalam (Mohanan 1983), a single morphologically complex verb stands for two separate predicates. According to Baker (1988), morphologically complex verbs are syntactically derived from two independent verbs by movement and that the process of causativisation too is an example of verb incorporation, which is governed by certain syntactic principles causing a change in grammatical function.

**Mono-transitive verbs:**

The following tree structures give the process of verb incorporation that is applicable to suffixal causativization of mono-transitive verbs in Telugu. Here, the suffix of the verb of higher clause should be attached to the lower verb to obey the rule of *Stray Affix Filter* (Baker 1988).

```
g. neenu mmudi - to taram raay – inc - aau
I-Nom other - Inst tter-Acc write – caus -past-agr
made my brother write a letter.
```

The higher verb with the causative morpheme ’-inc’ has to satisfy the latter’s morphological subcategorization properties, which stipulates that it must attach to a verb in order to pass the stray affix filter.
In order to incorporate into the higher verb, the lower verb has to move within the embedded clause to a position that is governed by the higher verb.

As there is no inherent case in Telugu, V-Comp movement is considered ungrammatical, where the verb trace cannot assign case to the object of embedded clause. Here, the lower verb that has left its NP will not be assigned any case as it violates the case filter thus, leading to ungrammaticality. However, VP-Comp movement is possible where the entire VP (V along with NP) moves into the specifier position of CP. Before incorporation, the lower verb governs the object of the embedded clause. But after incorporation, the complex verb assigns accusative case to the object. In Telugu, case is assigned to one NP only and the verb cannot assign case to the other NP (for instance, ‘tammudu = brother’ in given example). Here the case insertion rule applies. A post position is added to the NP, which takes an oblique case on the surface structure, to satisfy the case filter.

Di-transitive verbs:
Causativization of di-transitive verbs is similar to mono-transitive verbs except that an additional NP is occurs. Here too V-Comp movement is ungrammatical and VP-Comp movement occurs to satisfy the case filter.

\[\text{g., neenu mmudi – to } \text{ume-ku} \quad \text{ttaram} \quad \text{raay – inc - aanu} \]
\[\text{I-Nom } \text{'other – Inst} \quad \text{er- Dat} \quad \text{tte-Acc} \quad \text{rite – caus -past-agr} \]

I made my brother write a letter.

Like in mono-transitive verbs, the lower verb moves. The entire VP moves instead of V. The matrix verb assigns accusative case to the first NP (‘uttaram’ = letter) and oblique case to the second NP (‘tammudu’ = brother). The third NP (‘aame’ = her) is inherently marked with dative case. It moves along with its case intact. The case insertion rule applies here too.

\[\text{g., neenu mmudi - to } \text{ume-ku} \quad \text{ttaram} \quad \text{raay – inc - aanu} \]
\[\text{I-Nom } \text{'other - Inst} \quad \text{er- Dat} \quad \text{letter-Acc} \quad \text{write – caus -past-agr} \]

made my brother write a letter.

**VP-Comp movement**
Intransitive verbs:
Intransitive verbs are the verbs with single argument that can be further divided into two categories: unaccusatives and unergatives. Transitive verbs have language specific case marking properties and so have to account for whether the movement is V-Comp or VP-COMP. However, verb incorporation of intransitive verbs does not show any typological (cross-linguistic) variation or issues regarding case assignment due to the absence of NP in the embedded clause.

Unaccusatives
An unaccusative verb is a verb with an underlying internal argument that originates at the object position but surfaces as the subject of the sentence. These verbs do not assign agent theta role and can have transitive counterparts. In Telugu, two morphemes -imp and -inc are attached to the base verb stem in order to transitivize the unaccusative verb stems.

In transitive form of the unaccusative ~ transitive pairs, V-Comp movement is ungrammatical and so VP-Comp movement takes place before the incorporation of the verb.

V-Comp movement is ungrammatical as there is no case assigned to the NP of the lower clause, either structurally or inherently, thus affecting the case-filter. Whereas in the other case, the entire VP (maximal projection) moves into the specifier position of CP. Due to adjacency of NP with the matrix verb, the lower NP gets accusative case from the matrix verb. Here too, a case insertion rule is applied to assign oblique case to the causee. A post position (E.g. ‘ceeta’= by) is inserted next to the NP (E.g. ‘atanu’= He). As per Baker (1988), these verbs are similar to mono-transitive verbs, which are accounted for causativization without applying an explicit rule of causativization.

Verb Incorporation of unaccusative verbs
I made him stop the bus.

Case 1: Some unaccusative verbs allow both the morphemes, -imp and -inc, to transitivize unaccusative verbs. The morphemes -imp and -inc are actually transitivizers but function as causativizers as well.

\[ \text{g. digu ‘to get down’} \quad (g) + \text{imp} = \text{dimp} \quad (g) + \text{inc} = \text{dinc} \]
\[ \text{gu ‘to cut’} \quad (g) + \text{imp} = \text{temp} \quad (g) + \text{inc} = \text{tenc} \]

The -imp suffixation to an unaccusative verb stem feeds further affixation of causative -inc at the second level of causativization. An instrumental NP appears with this construction.

Case 2: Some unaccusative verbs are listed, with which only -imp or -inc suffixation possible but not both.
If a verb stem takes the transitive morpheme -inc, a morphophonemic process takes place at the second level causativization, which converts the ending c sound either with p or y.

Case 3: Some unaccusative verb stems are transitivized by suffixing few morphemes such as koTT (=beat), peTT (=put) and ves (=put). These morphemes are, in fact, separate lexical verbs in the language. It can be said that they form a kind of serial verb construction where the causative morpheme -inc is suffixed to the final verb in the series at the second level causativization.

Unergatives

Unergative verbs assign an agent theta role to the argument which is external even at the deep structure. In Telugu, transitive counterparts to these verbs are possible but only one level of causativization, i.e. –inc suffixation but not –imp, is allowed.

According to Baker (1988), unergative verbs across languages take either V-Comp movement or VP-CP movement without any difference. Only one NP occurs in the sentence in the subject position of the embedded clause. After the verb is incorporated into the matrix verb, the matrix verb governs the subject of embedded clause and then either the GTC(Government Transparancy Corollary) rule (Baker 1988a) applies or the complementizer deletion (C-deletion) happens. After C-deletion, as it has no head distinction from verb, the lower clause will be transparent for government.

Verb Incorporation in unergative verbs
Case 1: Some unergative verbs are listed, with which inc/imp suffixation is not possible. However, all these verbs can be causativized using a bi-clausal construction.

\[
g. \text{vaccu} \ 'to \ come' \quad \text{vacc} + \text{imp} \quad \text{vacc} + \text{inc} \\
g. \text{giccu} \ 'to \ prick' \quad \text{gicc} + \text{imp} \quad \text{gicc} + \text{inc}
\]

Case 2: The morpheme -inc can be suffixed to noun stems, derived from Sanskrit, functions as a verbalizer. The verb stems thus formed do not allow for causativization.

\[
g. \text{sparsa} \ 'touch' \quad \text{parsa} + \text{inc} \quad \text{parsinc} \quad \text{parsinc} + \text{inc} \\
g. \text{raksha} \ 'protection' \quad \text{ksh} + \text{inc} \quad \text{akshinc} \quad \text{akshinc} + \text{inc}
\]

Case 3: Some morphemes like pad (=fall) and av (=happen) also carry out a verbalizing function. They are added to noun stems, derived from Dravidian, to turn them into verbs. For these resultant verbs, transitive counterparts are possible and in which case a transitive morpheme peTT (= to put) is suffixed to the base stem. So it can be said that the second level causativization is possible with these transitive verb stems by sufffixing -inc.

\[
g. \text{kasTam} \ 'suffering' \quad \text{kasTam} + \text{paDu} \quad \text{kasTa-peTTu} \quad \text{kasTa-peTT} + \text{inc} \\
g. \text{kharcu} \ 'spending' \quad \text{kharc} + \text{avu} \quad \text{kharc-peTTu} \quad \text{kharc-peTT} + \text{inc}
\]

Iteration of the infinitive clause:
It is interesting to note that in Telugu, the infinitive clause seems to iterate any number of times without any restriction. The by-clause generally takes a post position and will be embedded in the clause.

\[
\text{ddam [pagilindi]} \\
\text{Mirror \ broke} \\
\text{neenu 1[addam [pagala-goTT -aanu]]} \\
\text{I \ mirror \ break \ -agr}
\]
Periphrastic causativization is not an instance of Verb Incorporation both in case of transitive and intransitive verbs. But Baker’s theory does not account for this kind of causativization. Unlike English, in which verb incorporation is possible, Telugu does not allow this process. The process of causativization based on ‘Verb Incorporation’ leaves some issues unsolved due to the inadequacy of syntactic properties of these causatives.

So a morpho-syntactic account of Telugu causative formation based on Julien’s (2000) analysis of word formation is presented here. If two or more morphemes, syntactically represented as heads, are realized as constituents of one single word, the heads in question must be adjacent in some sense. Based on the analysis of Baker (1985, 1988a), it is understood that causative constructions are a result of syntactic head movement operations. In case of head movement, it is always the next head down that will be attracted to any given head, according to the Head Movement Constraint of Travis (1984). Head movement, as per Julien (2000), is driven by a strong feature of the host that induces the host to incorporate the head of its complement. Head movement operations, according to Koopman (1994), can either be overt or covert.

Thus, in case of morphological causatives, the strong features of T˚ and I˚ trigger an overt movement of V˚ so that these strong features can be checked off before the derivation reaches PF. The overt inflectional markers, according to Julien, must be seen as reflexes of the features of the inflectional heads and not of the features of the verb itself. Whereas in case of periphrastic causatives, the relevant features are weak so the verb stays in VP. In these constructions, the features of non-finite main verb seem to be incompatible with the morphological selection properties of T˚ and so a finite verb is inserted. Julien argues that these constructions are bclual, with a finite verb as the V˚ of the matrix clause and a non-finite main verb as the V˚ of the embedded clause. Thus, it can be concluded that in case of Telugu causatives, in order to incorporate the causativized verb into V-caus and form the verbal complex, the head movement is either overt or covert. That is to say, in morphological causatives, the verb incorporates into V-caus by overt head movement while in periphrastic causatives, the incorporation is covert.

A note on Productivity:
Processes of word formation that can be used by native speakers to form new words are called productive. Productivity is a question of how productive an affix is when attached to words of a particular morphological class (Aronoff 1976). An example of Telugu causative sentence with borrowed (English) word and a few observations are listed below.

|---|---|---|---|---|

Periphrastic causativization of biclausal construction:

At the first level, -inc is never attached to a borrowed (for instance, an English) word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>borrowed words</th>
<th>oun/Verb + ceeyu</th>
<th>oun/Verb + incu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbs post</td>
<td>oot ceeyu</td>
<td>oot incu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>ork ceeyu</td>
<td>work incu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

950
In the causative form, cees performs the role of a verbaliser while –inc acts as the causative.

Verbs: apply ceeyu
ready ceeyu

Nouns: poster ceeyu
workshop ceeyu

Causative form

verbs: apply ceeyu
ready ceeyu

Nouns: poster ceeyu
workshop ceeyu

Conclusion
Telugu morphological causatives fall into type 1 causatives because the object of the lower clause retains its status, the causee is optional and the whole clause functions as a single binding domain. In general, most of the causatives in Telugu are either morphological (-inc) or periphrastic (cees). Some verbs neither take cees nor –inc to form the causative, but use an adjunct. As a rule, the causative verb ‘ceeds’ attaches to the infinitive form of the verb and ‘-inc’ to the bare/transitive stem of the verb. The causatives formed from nouns have -inc, -eela and –cees together and in that order. In these cases, -inc acts as a verbaliser and –cees as the causative. In terms of productivity, -inc is never attached to a borrowed word at the first level of causativization while at the second level, ‘ceeds’ acts as a verbaliser and –inc as a causative. Also in Telugu, the infinite clause seems to iterate any number of times without any restriction.
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