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In the first paper of this volume, Thomas proposes a method for developing exhaustive grammatical paradigms. Paradigms of this sort may be used as the base from which a large number of correct utterances may be generated in a language. The Telugu paradigms included here illustrate a start toward developing complete Telugu paradigms. The formulas are correct for the examples given, however, they have not been checked with other base words. Similarly it has not been possible to integrate some of what are obviously similar formulas because time for checking was not available. Because of this the paradigms are incomplete, and they are somewhat redundant. It is felt, however, that even in this rough and tentative form, the paradigms provide keys to powerful Telugu structures.

There are five paradigms: 1) Compound sentence, 2) Transitive, 3) Intransitive, 4) Stative, 5) Pron-Adjective. Each paradigm is to a certain extent self-contained, with its own list of symbols and morphemes. Those morphemes which appear to be phonologically bound are written with hyphens, however, this is a very arbitrary distinction and is actually irrelevant for the purposes of this presentation.

1. Compound Sentence Paradigm. This set of constructions illustrates eleven ways in which two simple clauses may be combined into a single sentence in Telugu. These are minimal examples of contrastive but related structural types. The order of items in the examples is fixed. Two intransitive clauses form the base from which the paradigm proceeds:

(Pronoun) Verb 1 'I came'
(Pronoun) Verb 2 'I sat down'

The symbols used are: V = verb; VS = verb stem; C = connective; ( ) = optional occurrence.
In the formulas the actual forms of small class morphemes are included. Those found in this paradigm are:
-na = meaning and function unknown
-elaga = 'anyway'
-ku = purpose
-te = 'if'
 (-na) = tense: -na 'past', -ta 'present', -da 'future'
-cunda = progressive

-na = past
-na = present
-ta = infinitive derivative suffix
-em = reason
-emo = reason
-ga = 'while'
-kada = doubt
Class $C_1$ consists of taruvaata 'after' and ventane 'soon after'
Class $C_2$ consists of kanuka 'since' and ani 'so'.

1.1 SEQUENTIAL
vaci kucunanu I came and sat down.
$V_{S_1} V_2$

1.2 SUBORDINATE I
vaci -na taruvaata kucunanu After coming, I sat down.
$V_{S_1} -na C_1 V_2$

1.3 SUBORDINATE II
elaga vaci -na -ni kucunanu Anyway, having come I sat down.
$elaga V_{S_1} -na -ni V_2$

1.4 SUBORDINATE III
vaci -na -na -ni kucunanu Having come, I sat down.
$V_{S_1} (<-na) -na -ni V_2$

1.5 COORDINATE I
vacinanu kanuka kucunanu Since I had come, I sat down.
$V_1 C_2 V_2$

1.6 COORDINATE II
(elaga) vacinanu -ni kucunanu (Anyway), having come, I sat down.
(elaga) $V_1 -ni V_2$

1.7 DOUBT
vacinanu -ni kada ani kucunanu Inasmuch as I had come, I sat down.
$V_1 -ni kada C_2 V_2$

1.8 PURPOSE
vacu -ta -ku kucunanu I sat down to come
$V_{S_1} -ta -ku V_2$

1.9 REASON (different persons must be marked in the two clauses)
vastard -emo ani kucunanu Because he came, I sat down.
$V_1 -emo C_2 V_2$
1.10 CONDITIONAL (tense of second verb must be future)

\[ \text{vas} - \text{te} \quad \text{kucuntanu} \quad \text{If I come, I will sit down.} \]

\[ \text{VS}_1 - \text{te} \quad \text{V}_2 \]

1.11 SIMULTANEOUS

\[ \text{vacu} - \text{cunda} - \text{ga} \quad \text{kucunanu} \quad \text{While coming, I sat down.} \]

\[ \text{VS}_1 - \text{cunda} - \text{ga} \quad \text{V}_2 \]

2. Transitive Paradigm. This Telugu paradigm shows the words manisyi 'man', ammu 'sell', and biyyamu 'uncooked rice' in eleven transitive constructions. In this and all other paradigms involving verbs, allomorphic alternation of verb stems will be noted. No attempt has been made to explain this, since it seems complex. The symbols used in this paradigm are: \( N = \) noun; \( \text{VS} = \) verb stem; \( \text{Inf} = \) inflectional affixation; \( \text{Inton} = \) a range of intonation contours different from those of other constructions; ( ) = optional occurrence.

Below is a list of the small-class morphemes which are important in these transitive constructions.

- \( a = \) 'that'
- \( -ceta = \) 'by (agentive)'
- \( -badu = \) passive marker
- \( \text{leedu} = \) negative
- \( -a = \) yes-no interrogative
- \( -ki = \) object marker
- \( -lani = \) desiderative
- \( -e = \) meaning and function unknown
- \( \text{ee-} = \) question marker
- \( \text{vun-} = \) 'is'

The \(<-\text{rdu}>\) class of morphemes is shown in Chart A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-vu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>-rdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>fem-ntr -di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Inf class of morphemes is: \( -\text{bovu} = \) 'about to', \( -\text{nts} = \) 'must', \( \text{cun} = \) progressive. The morpheme \( -\text{gala} = \) 'can' may also prove to be a member of this class.

Morphemes in the class listed as \(<-\text{vacu}>\) are: \( -\text{vacu} = \) 'may', \( -\text{leedu} = \) negative. The morpheme \( -\text{li} = \) 'should' may also prove to be a member of this class.
In these formulas it has not been possible to determine the full extent of optional affixation (Inf) in each case. Thus there may be restrictions on certain types which are as yet undiscovered.

2.1 DECLARATIVE

\[
a \text{ manisyi biyyamu ammi -na -rdu} \quad \text{The man sold the rice.}
\]
\[
a \quad N_1 \quad N_2 \quad \text{VS (Inf)} \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle \quad \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle
\]

2.2 DECLARATIVE POSSIBILITY

\[
a \text{ manisyi biyyamu amma -vacu} \quad \text{The man may sell the rice.}
\]
\[
a \quad N_1 \quad N_2 \quad \text{VS (Inf)} \quad \langle\text{-vacu}\rangle
\]

2.3 PASSIVE

\[
\text{biyyamu manisyi -ceta amma -badi -na -di} \quad \text{The rice was sold by the man.}
\]
\[
N_2 \quad N_1 \quad \text{-ceta (Inf)} \quad \text{-badi} \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle
\]

2.4. PASSIVE POSSIBILITY

\[
\text{biyyamu manisyi -ceta amma -badi -vacu} \quad \text{The rice may be sold by the man}
\]
\[
N_2 \quad N_1 \quad \text{-ceta VS (Inf)} \quad \text{-badi} \quad \langle\text{-vacu}\rangle
\]

2.5 NEGATIVE

\[
a \text{ manisyi biyyamu amma -rdu} \quad \text{The man doesn't sell the rice}
\]
\[
a \quad N_1 \quad N_2 \quad \text{VS} \quad \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle
\]

2.6 IMPERATIVE

\[
\text{biyyemu ammu} \quad \text{Sell the rice!}
\]
\[
N_2 \quad \text{VS} \quad \text{Irton}
\]

2.7 INTERROGATIVE I

\[
a \text{ manisyi ee- biyyamu ammi -na -rdu} \quad \text{What rice did the man sell?}
\]
\[
a \quad N_1 \quad ee- \quad N_2 \quad \text{VS (Inf)} \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle \quad \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle
\]

2.8 INTERROGATIVE II

\[
a \text{ manisyi biyyamu ammi -na -rda -a} \quad \text{Does the man sell the rice?}
\]
\[
a \quad N_1 \quad N_2 \quad \text{VS} \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle \quad \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle \quad \text{-a}
\]
2.9 DESIDERATIVE

(a) biyyamu manisyi -ki amma -lani vun -na -di The man desires the rice.
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N}_2 & \quad \text{N}_1 & \quad \text{VS} & \quad -\text{lani} & \quad \text{vun} & \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle & \quad \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle
\end{align*}
\]

(b) biyyamu manisyi -ki amma -lani leedu The man does not desire the rice
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N}_2 & \quad \text{N}_1 & \quad \text{VS} & \quad -\text{lani} & \quad \text{leedu}
\end{align*}
\]

2.10 RELATIVE I

a. biyyemu amm -e manisyi The man who sells rice...
\[
\text{a} \quad \text{N}_2 \quad \text{VS} \quad -e \quad \text{N}_1
\]

2.11 RELATIVE II

(a) a biyyemu ammi -na manisyi The man who sold the rice...
\[
\text{a} \quad \text{N}_2 \quad \text{VS} \quad \langle\text{Inf}\rangle & \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle & \quad \text{N}_1
\]

(b) a manisy1 ammi -na biyyemu The rice sold by the man...
\[
\text{a} \quad \text{N}_1 \quad \text{VS} \quad \langle\text{Inf}\rangle & \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle & \quad \text{N}_2
\]

3. Intransitive Paradigm. This paradigm shows the Telugu words paksyi 'bird', and eguru 'fly' in nine intransitive constructions. Practically all of these constructions are very closely related to their transitive counterparts shown in the preceding paradigm. Notice that passives are missing in this paradigm, and that the Relative II construction in this case requires a location to be expressed.

The symbols and small-class morphemes used in this paradigm are the same as those used in the transitive paradigm (see p. 62) with the addition of akardaku 'there'.

3.1 DECLARATIVE

paksyi egiri -na -di The bird flew.
\[
\text{N} \quad \text{VS} \quad \langle\text{Inf}\rangle & \quad \langle\text{-na}\rangle & \quad \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle
\]

3.2 POSSIBILITY

paksyi egara -vacu The bird may fly.
\[
\text{N} \quad \text{VS} \quad \langle\text{Inf}\rangle & \quad \langle\text{-vacu}\rangle
\]

3.3 NEGATIVE

paksyi egara -du The bird doesn't fly.
\[
\text{N} \quad \text{VS} \quad \langle\text{-rdu}\rangle
\]
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3.4 IMPERATIVE

eguru Fly

VS Inton

3.5 INTERROGATIVE I

ee- paksyi egiri -na -di Which bird flew.

ee- N VS (Inf) ⟨-na⟩ ⟨-rdu⟩

3.6 INTERROGATIVE II

paksyi egiri -na -da -a Did the bird fly?

N VS (Inf) ⟨-na⟩ ⟨-rdu⟩ -a Inton

3.7 DESIDERATIVE

a) paksyi -ki egara -lani vun -na -di The bird wants to fly.

N -ki VS -lani vun ⟨-na⟩ ⟨-rdu⟩

b) paksyi -ki egara -lani leedu The bird doesn't want to fly.

N -ki VS -lani leedu

3.8 RELATIVE I

egir -e paksyi The bird that flies...

VS -e N

3.9 RELATIVE II

akardaku egiri -na paksyi The bird that flew there...

Loc VS ⟨-na⟩ N

4. Stative Paradigm. This paradigm shows the Telugu words phalamu 'fruit', ammayi 'girl', and irstamu 'like' in six constructions. This paradigm is very different from the preceding two. The symbols used are: N = noun; V = verb; ( ) = optional occurrence. The small-class morphemes used in this paradigm are:

-ki = objective case leedu = 'no, not'

-layandu -andu = 'in' vun = 'is'

-lante = 'of, for' -gala = 'can'

⟨-na⟩ = (see p. 62) ⟨-rdu⟩ = (see p. 62)

kaladu = 'have' -na = meaning and function unknown
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It will be noticed in these constructions that the word which in the English translation comes out as subject, in the Telugu is marked as objective case. Also, it is somewhat anomalous to give irstamu 'like' as a verb, since it does not take verb affixation. How large a class it represents is not known. In constructions 1 - 4 the two nouns may be interchanged in position.

4.1 INDICATIVE

a ammayi -ki phalamu irstamu The girl likes fruit.
\( a N_1 -ki N_2 V \)

4.2NEGATIVE

a ammayi -ki phalamu irstamu leedu The girl does not like fruit.
\( a N_1 -ki N_2 V \langle -\text{vācu} \rangle \)

4.3 EQUATIVE I

a ammayi -ki phalamu irstamu vun -na -di The girl is liking fruit.
\( a N_1 -ki N_2 V \langle -\text{na} \rangle \langle -\text{rdu} \rangle \)

4.4 EQUATIVE II

a ammayi -ki phalamu -layandu irstamu kaladu The girl has a liking in fruit.
\( a N_1 -ki N_2 -\text{layandu} V \text{kaladu} \)

4.5 RELATIVE I

phalamu -lante irstamu -gala ammayi The girl who likes fruit...
\( N_2 \langle -\text{lante} \rangle V -\text{gala} N_1 \)

4.6 RELATIVE II

phalamulu -andu irstamu vun -na ammayi The girl who has a liking in fruit...
\( N_2 -\text{andu} V \text{vun} -\text{na} N_1 \)

5. Noun-Adjective Paradigm; Three ways in which Telugu nouns and adjectives occur together are given in this paradigm. These may be structurally either equative clauses, relative clauses, or noun phrases. In type 2 (equative), agreement between gender of subject and of a pronoun suffix is maintained (thus examples are given in masculine and feminine-neuter genders). The base words of this paradigm are: manci 'good', manisyi 'man', laavu 'fat', ammayi 'girl'. The small class morphemes are:

- \( a = \text{'that'} \)
- \( -\text{vadu} = \text{'he'} \)
- \( -\text{di} = \text{'she, it'} \)
- \( -\text{aina} = \text{'like'} \)
vun = 'is'  
 ga = 'while'  
 -na = meaning and function unknown

5.1 ATTRIBUTIVE

(a) a manci -aina manisyi the good man

(a) A (-aina) N

5.2 EQUATIVE

(a) a manisyi manci -vadu That man is good.

A N A -vadu (masculine)

(b) a ammayi laavu -di The girl is fat.

A N A -di (feminine-neuter)

5.3 RELATIVE

manci -ga vun -na manisyi The man who is good...

A -ga vun -na N