

Vol. 8, Issue-III (June 2017)

ISSN: 0976-8165

The Criterion

An International Journal in English

Bi-monthly, Refereed & Indexed Open Access eJournal



The Criterion

UGC Approved Journal [Arts and Humanities, Jr. No. 768]

Editor-In-Chief - Dr. Vishwanath Bite

www.the-criterion.com

About Us: <http://www.the-criterion.com/about/>

Archive: <http://www.the-criterion.com/archive/>

Contact Us: <http://www.the-criterion.com/contact/>

Editorial Board: <http://www.the-criterion.com/editorial-board/>

Submission: <http://www.the-criterion.com/submission/>

FAQ: <http://www.the-criterion.com/fa/>



Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

Bi-Monthly Refereed and Indexed Open Access eJournal

www.galaxyimrj.com

ISSN 2278-9529

A Comparative study of Syntactic and Semantic Aspectual Character Verbs of Motion in Telugu and English

Veerababu Modhala

Ph.D. Scholar

The English and Foreign Languages University Lucknow Campus
India

Article History: Submitted-26/05/2017, Revised-29/06/2017, Accepted-01/07/2017, Published-05/07/2017.

Abstract:

The present work is an attempt at a semantic and syntactic analysis of a set of verbs of motion in English and Telugu. Characterizing the semantic organization of the motion situation these verbs operate in, an attempt has been made to show how the syntactic structure relates to semantic structure and how semantic relations determine and account for syntactic behaviour and forms the introduction to the approach adopted in the present study, to the assumptions underlying such an approach and to its advantages as well as disadvantages. Verbs of motion characterize a motion situation in which an entity moves from a source position to a goal position. In this analysis concerned mainly with the semantic characterization of the motion situation which involves the semantic functions, Theme, Source, Goal, path and state of motion. The function 'agent', also participates in the motion situation if the situation is of a causative type, the situation is brought into existence as a result of the intention of a volitional entity. Mainly in this paper has an investigation into the aspectual character of the verbs of motion. The problems arising from the aspectual character of the verbs such as the compatibility of the verbs with the progressive and the co-occurrence of punctual and durative time-adverbials have been explored into. The semantic causation types in which these verbs are seen to operate determine and explain, to a great extent, the aspectual phenomena for it is not the lexical specification of the verb alone but the information contributed by the theme, source and goal that makes up the aspectual character of the verb.

Keywords: Lexical Semantics, Syntax, theoretical Linguistics, Thematic Roles, Aspectual Character, verbs of Motion, Telugu Verbs and English Verbs, Semantics Functions

Introduction

The present work is a study of a syntactic and semantic analysis of a set of verbs of motion in English and Telugu. The purpose here is to explore the semantic structures underlying the verbs of motion and see how they relate to syntactic structures. Verbs of motion which form part of the language are interpreted as a system meanings accompanied by forms through which meanings can be realized. One need not be apologetic about a syntactic study that chooses a semantic base to explain syntactic phenomena. For in linguistics we have long since 'stopped playing ostrich about semantics'. A controversy over methodological issues

still persists with regard to the place of semantics in a grammar of a language which is set up as a characterization of the linguistic knowledge that each speaker of a language has, as native speaker, to generate and understand an infinite number of sentences in his language. The semantics is crucial and plays main role in the study of language. The present study is not merely an exercise in contrastive analysis; rather the concern is to explore how different languages (English and Telugu in the present study) conceptualize a motion situation and how they exhibit differences or similarities in realizing it at the syntactic level of sentence structure. We look at language from a semantic perspective; inter sentential constraints play a role that is problems more important than under other views of language for a number of limitations which cross sentence boundaries are clearly semantic in nature. A situation that can be considered to consist of, one object moving or located with respect to another object will be termed a motion situation and symbolized (*Talmy, 1975:181*). Talmy conceives of the motion situation to consist of four components, figure, ground, path and the state- of- motion. Figure refers to the moving object, ground to the located object. Path refers to the particular course followed or site occupied by the figure with respect to the ground and the state of motion can be either moving or stationary. Outside the motion/ location event proper the figure can concurrently be in some independent activity or state, bearing the relation manner to the first event. In terms of generative underlying structure, a motion/ location event will be represented by a four –constituent phrase-marker, the figure object by the subject nominal, the ground object by the (oblique) object nominal; the path by an ad position and the state-of-motion by the verb; in particular by either of the two deep verbs represent able as MOVE and BE-LOCATED (*Talmy: 1978:641-642*).

The Importance of Verbs

We shall begin our study by comparing the points of view of various linguistics as regards the primacy of verbs. In traditional linguistics, the grammatical unit ‘sentence’ has been postulated to account for the syntactic relation obtaining among different constituents. The sentence nucleus has been analysed in two parts: a nominal subject and a verbal predicate, the distinction being intrinsically linked with the difference between reference and predication. There is an alternative analysis of the structure of the proposition that is formalized in the first order calculus predicate. According to this formalization, the predicate is an operator with one or more arguments; the predicate is represented by a verbal element and arguments by nominal. An intransitive verb is termed a one-place operator which relates one nominal to another and so on. According to this conception of constituent structure of sentences, the verbal element appears to be ‘the pivot of the sentence nucleus’ (*Lyons, 1977; 434; 5*). The pivotal status of the verb correlates with several more syntactic phenomena accounting for the dependencies between constituents called ‘concord’ and ‘government’ as traditionally understood do not figure in all languages (Russian and Indonesian for example) yet in many related languages, the verb must agree, that is, be in ‘concord’ with either the subject or the object in number, person, gender, etc.) And govern’ its object in terms of case or the selection of a particular preposition. One way of considering the verbs pivotal is by considering what modifies what in a sentence. In Peter sold the bike to Michael; It is part of the European grammatical tradition to say that the phrases the bike and to say that the phrases the bike and to Michael modify ‘sold’. It is mentioned by themselves in his principles de grammier

generate that early mediaeval theory also held the subject noun to be a modifier of the verb but this notion became submerged in later grammatical theory (*Miller, 1978, 253*). In Sanskrit grammatical tradition, too, the verb is considered to occupy the central place, for the only portion of syntax treated separately in Sanskrit grammars is the ‘karak prakarana’ or the chapter on ‘government’ ‘karak’. Incidentally is defined as a relation between a noun and a verb in a sentence. *Fillmore (1968)* has extended the notion of government in his theory of case relation to provide a universal framework for syntactic analysis. In Fillmore’s theory, the subject noun in a sentence may enjoy special status in descriptions of theme-rhyme system but it has no significance in constituent structure that the deep syntax level. The deep structure of a sentence is regarded as consisting of predicate that in the verb and a number of roles or the cases associated with it. There is no direct correspondence between deep cases and their surface relation as subject, object or various pre phrases. According to *Chafe (1970-96)* every acceptable sentence is built arranged a predicative element is accompanied by one, or more nominal elements. For example, in the sentence, the floor is clean, there is a predicative element meaning be clean and it is accompanied by the nominal element the floor. In the sentence “Harriet sang”, “There is a predicative element sang accompanied by the nominal element Harriet. We shall refer to predicative elements as verbs and nominal elements as nouns. *Chafe (1970: 96)* dichotomizes the total human conceptual universe into two major areas; one, the area of the verb, embraces states (conditions, qualities) and event, the other, the area of the noun embraces ‘things’ both physical projects and refined abstractions of these, Two, the verb will be assumed to be central and the noun peripheral ...in every language a verb is present semantically in all but a few marginal utterances as in ‘oh!’. ‘Ouch’ etc.

A verb is always present, though it may, in some instances be deleted before a surface structure is reached. the nature of the verb determines what the rest of the sentence will be like; in particular, it determines what noun will accompany it, what the relation of these nouns to it will be, semantically specified for example suppose the verb is specified as an action, as we shall see is true of the verb in the men laughed. Such a verb dictates that it be accompanied by a noun, that the noun be specified as animate perhaps also as human. Thus according to Chafe; it is the verb which dictates the presence and character of the noun, rather than vice-versa. If we are confronted with a surface such as the chairlaughed and forced to give it meaning of some kind, what we do is to interpret chair as if it is abnormally animate, as dictated by the verb. What we do not do is to interpret laugh in an abnormal way as if it were a different kind of activity, performed by inanimate objects. This is because the semantic influence of the verb is dominant, extending itself over the subservient accompanying nouns.

Motion Verbs

By the verbs of motion, we mean the verbs that involve concrete physical movements in perceptual space. *Gruber (1965)* in ‘studies in lexical relations’ studies the verbs of motion and the thematic functions they involve. But his interest is not in the analysis of the structure of motion –verbs per se but in more general notions which are probably derived from concrete concepts of physical motion. The main characteristic feature of his analysis is that

all verbs of a language fall into movement and no movement verbs and that all sentences are characterized by certain semantic functions which form the thematic kernel pattern of ‘theme’, ‘source’, and ‘Goal’. The notion ‘theme’ pertains to an entity which is conceived of as moving, the notion ‘source’ pertains to the location from where the movement originates. *Jackendoff (1972)* incorporates the thematic analysis of Gruber into his interpretive semantic approach. His lexical entry for verbs contains a so-called functional structure which is in fact, a prepositional function whose arguments fulfil specific semantic functions. *Verkuyl (1976)* analyses the semantic functions theme, source and goal in terms of a CHANGE-of state PREDICATION, consisting of a two –place predicate CHANGE and two arguments, namely a source-preposition and a goal-proposition.

The domain chosen for our purpose is that of motion *event*, because motion is one of the primary experiential domains in human life and therefore bound to be lexicalized in all languages. A number of approaches has been suggested for dealing with issues related to lexicalization patterns in motion expressions, most of which have concentrated on the meaning of verbs or V+PPS. There is no doubt that verb meaning is central to any account of motion lexicalization in languages. Our primary aim in this study is to analyze the semantic organization of the motion situation as it is realized in surface structure at the syntactic level in English and Telugu. Gruber’s main aim is to propose a pre-lexical level of representation which will be relevant to semantic as to syntactic interpretation and ‘will be derivationally prior to the attachment of lexical items to the base structure, which event constitutes the syntactic interpretation’ (*Gruber, 1975:2*). His approach is to investigate the lexical relationships among verbs, verbs that refer to relatively concrete situations, such as position, motion, possession, identification, etc. and the syntax of particular verbs will be established by means of the lexical entry of the verbs in terms of the prelexical categorical structure. We will concentrate our attention on.

We have selected a group of twelve verbs of motion in English and their translation equivalents in Telugu. The verbs are the following;

English Telugu

‘fall’	padu
‘bounce’	ganthu
‘roll’	dorlu
‘tumble’	dorilinccu
‘sink’	munugu
‘push’(causative)	nettu
‘swim’ (non-causative)	iidu
‘float’	teluta

Syntactic and Semantic aspects of Motion Verbs

A semantic and syntactic analysis is proposed here, for we find that mere constituent structure analysis as proposed in transformational grammar is not adequate to the characterization of the semantic representations underlying sentences. Consider the following sentences.

1. John pushed Mary into the room.
2. John pulled Mary into the room.

Syntactically these sentences can be given the same pre-terminal underlying structure in terms of the (extended) standard theory, but they do not have the same relational network. Our problems are: how do we account for the fact that John in (1) stays out of the room while in (2) John is in the room? Again, how do we explain that in (1) the causing event stops after the beginning point whereas in (2) the causation of the movement lasts throughout the situation? In order to account for these differences, syntactic analysis is obviously not enough. Our theory should focus on the verbs primarily rather than on the surrounding prep-phrases, these being the same in the cases.

Let us see how Chomsky handles location phrases in his model of grammar.

Chomsky (1965:102) proposes the following base rules:

1. S-----□□NP –predicate phrase
2. Predicate phrase-----□□Aux_VP (place), (time)
3. VP-----□ be predicate

(NP) (Prep-phrase) (Manner)

V---- Adj. S

(Like) predicate-nominal

4. Prep-phrase-----□ Direction

Duration

Place Frequency, etc.

In terms of rule (2) a location phrase occurs as verb-phrase complement and according to rules (3)-(4) it can occur as verbal complement. Manner adverbials too are treated as verbal complements. But if we take the test proposed by Vestergaard as our conclusive evidence, we cannot treat manner adverbials as verbal compliments. As the following examples show, the manner adverbials do not have the same status as directional and goal phrases. A verb without verbal compliments may not be the focus of a 'do' / 'happen what' sentence (vestergaard, 1977:16)

3. What did John do in consternation? - He jumped from the roof.

4. * What did John do from the roof? – He jumped in consternation.
5. What John did with pleasure was roll down the hill.
6. * What John did down the hill was roll with pleasure.

As sentences (3)–(6) indicate, the verbs of motion ‘jump’ and ‘roll’ cannot be the focus of a cleft sentence unless they are combined with a goal –phrase. Again if the verbs of motion appear with manner –adverbials, they do not become the focus of a cleft sentence. The unacceptability of (4) and (6) indicates this. This constraint can be explained by semantic facts; viz. motion-verbs have and require a reference to location, whereas manner is extraneous to their specification. The test also points to the fact that of all the location can be considered to be verbal complements whereas adverbial phrases of manner cannot. Moreover, from among locative phrases, goal phrases exhibit greater cohesion with the verb than the location phrases. Consider the following sentence:

7. John jumped off (of) the train in New York.

Both; off (of the train ‘and ‘in New York’ are locative phrases. Still, the fit between ‘jumped’ and ‘off (of) the train’ is tighter than that between ‘jumped’ and ‘in New York’. This has its analogue in syntactic behaviour. ‘In New York’ exits greater freedom of movement than ‘off (of) the train’. We can propose the location phrase, ‘in New York’ with a Slight shift in focus whereas we cannot propose the goal phrase ‘off (of) the train’. Consider the following:

8. In New York, John jumped off (of) the train.
9. *Off (of) the train, John jumped in New York.

The above example (23) is acceptable whereas (24) is not.

It may be difficult to explain such semantic and syntactic distinctions in terms of Chomsky’s two-tier constituency grammar. We have not made any attempt here to present the facts of Telugu and English in the framework of a highly formalized system. Our focus has been on describing semantically significant syntactic relations. Our approach has been eclectic: We have drawn on the studies of Gruber (1976), Verkuyl (1978), Talmy (1975, 1976, 1978), Fillmore (1968, 1971, 1977) and Nilsen (1972). We have made an extensive reference to semantic relationships such as Para -phrase, entailment and presuppositions and semantic deviances of various kinds including contradictions. We have also made an attempt to show how the syntactic structure relates to semantic structure and how semantic relations determine syntactic behaviour.

The present study provides an insight into the material used for this study and investigates some of the research that has been carried out within the domain of motion events and its lexicalization in Telugu and English. The present work, though not meant primarily to be of to language teachers and learners is the process of learning how meaning relates to form use and form to meaning. the comparison of English and Telugu verbs of motion may be of use to second –language learners it can sharpen their awareness of the complexity of language structure (the same semantic situation can be realized differently at the level of syntax; for

example, in English, ‘*drop*’ may be neutral to ‘*intention*’ on the part of the agent-subject but in Telugu, its translation –equivalent ‘*padipovu*’ is not. It is difficult for a Telugu speaker to interpret ‘he dropped the book’ in any but an intentional reading. Moreover, there are lexical gaps in a language, for example, whereas Telugu has ‘*jaripovu*’/’*padipovu*’ non-causative-causative pair, English causative form ‘*fell*’ for the non-causative verb ‘*fall*’ has a severe selectional restrictions on the choice of the cause. ‘*Fell*’ is restricted to situations on the choice of the cause. ‘*Fell*’ is restricted to situations where a tree or a large animal is involved as the cause. However, a linguistic study can have a limited though indirect relevance to the language teaching situation.

In our analysis, most of the English examples have been taken from ‘the advanced learner’s dictionary of current English ‘and ‘lexical structures in syntax and semantics’ *Gruber: 1976*). The basic meanings treated in the study are given in appendix 1. Telugu translation-equivalents by two native speakers have been given in appendix 2.

ANALYSIS INTRODUCTION

The present study is a contribution to the analysis of the principled connections between verbal meanings and syntactic configurations. It offers analysis of Telugu and English motion verbs. Verbs of motion form an important subset of dynamic verbs which describe in their semantic structure a motion situation which can be partitioned into the following components:

1. The object moving with respect to another object or location which serves as the reference-point for the change-of –location of the first object. The moving object will be termed the theme.
2. The object (or location) which sets the limit of the movement of the theme is termed the goal.
3. The location which serves as the reference –point (either implicit or explicit) and characterizes the beginning-point of the movement of the theme is termed the source.
4. The path along which the theme travels from the source –position to the goal position is characterized by an ordered pair of spatio-temporal positions covered by the theme. The different phases that go into its structure may be homogeneous or non-homogeneous considering the specification of the motion –state.
5. The moving state that the theme is considered to be in with respect to the goal is the motion –state.
6. The motion situation may be characterized by a manner component which adds specific information to the general meaning of movement.
7. Apart from the above semantic components which specify the semantic organization of the motion situation, there can be a volitional entity called agent who is the energy source and cause of the motion event. The agent may

stand apart from the components theme, goal and source or coincide with one of them.

Consider the following examples:

10. John threw the ball into the ditch.
11. John rolled down the hill.
12. John pulled the table into the room.
13. John rolled the table into the room.

In the example (10), the agent coincides with the source phrase, specifying the source position where the theme i.e. 'the ball' is positioned at the beginning. In (11), the agent coincides with the theme for the direction of the movement of the theme is towards the goal. In the sentence (13), the agent has a semantic function that does not coincide with any of the components.

We can postulate the following formula to draw all verbs of locomotion in our analysis. The formulation is based on *Verkuyl (1978)*. t_b indicates time of beginning and, t_E the end of time. P_s indicates place of source and p_g place of goal. Any entity X changes location in a period Y if there are two times t_b and t_E in T , and X is AT position p_G at t_E (where t_b precedes t_E and p_s is not the same as p_G). The path of X expressed by the movement of the verb has positions in perceptual space spanned by p_s and p_G and their counterparts in time.

Verkuyl (1978) analyzes the motion situation in terms of a CHANGE-predication, consisting of a two-place predicate CHANGE and two arguments, namely a source proposition and a goal –proposition. Both propositions are structurally similar AT predications, where AT is taken as a two –place predicate whose first argument pertains to the theme. The second argument of AT in both source and Goal – propositions consists of an ordered pair of times and spatial positions. During the course of our analysis we will draw on these insights, which have an explanatory value, in exploring the semantic and syntactic structures of the motion situation. The motion situation embeds in it two propositions representing a sequence of events which may be linked by a causal chain if the agent participates in the situation, however, even if the agent is not located in the situation, there is a weak causal link between the two propositions. Compare the following sentences:

14. The box rolled off the table.
15. The box lay on the table.

Though syntactically similar in their surface structure, sentences (14-15) represent two different situations. Whereas (14) has two propositions in its underlying structure, (15) has only one proposition. Example (14) specifies two events:

- a The box rolled
- b (As a result) it moved away from the surface of the table.

While (15) only specifies the location of the box on the surface of the table, if we have an agent participating in the situation, as in (16).

16. John rolled the box off the table.

We have a three –event sequence which can be represented as the following:

- a John Acted upon the box.

- b (As a result) the box rolled.
- c (As a result) the box moved away from the surface of the table.

Looked at from this view- point, the motion situation presents another interesting phenomenon. The agent 'John' causes a motion event but at the same time he is also the source of movement. The theme, i.e. 'the box; is the affected entity in the proposition 1) but it is also the goal of the movement. In 2), however, the theme moves and in 3) there is a change in its location, brought about by the agent's act, from the source –position to the goal-position. This point to the fact, that there is a natural connection between agent, source, and cause on the one hand and effect and goal of movement on the other. '**John**' combines in his agentive role both the causal link and the source of movement, for 'the ball' is with 'John' and 'john' directs his action at 'the ball' and 'the ball' is also affected by his act. This also accounts for the use of the term 'transitive ', for transitivity is associated with goal-directed activity. The entity that is referred to by means of the expression that functions as the direct object is both the patient, i.e. the affected object, and also the goal of movement.

Analysis:

Aspectual Character

The present section attempts an investigation into the aspectual character of the verbs of motion the various semantic causation types in which these verbs are seen to operate under study as it relates to and is to a great extent determined .Aspect, a non-deictic term of temporal reference, originally used to denote the opposition between perfective and imperfective grammatical categories in the Slavonic languages has been extended in its present use to refer to a variety of oppositions based upon the notions of duration , initiation, frequency, instantaneity, frequency, completion, etc., and in Hackett's words deals with 'temporal distribution or contour of action expressed by verbs. As the general definition of aspect, we may take the formulation that aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation '
(Comrie: 1976:52)

The distinction between dynamic and static situations is relevant to the analysis of aspect since the grammatical category of aspect presents a view of or comment on the situation described by an utterance of a sentence. A static situation is one that is conceived of as existing rather than happening and as being homogenous, continuous and unchanging throughout its duration. A dynamic situation, on the other hand, is a process: if it is momentary or it is extended in time, it is a process; if it is momentary or viewed as an unanalyzable whole it is an event. Finally, a process that is under the control of an agent is an act (Lyons: 1977). Comrie (1976) however does not conceive of an event in terms of its time span. He maintains that whereas 'process' refers to the internal structure of a single complete whole. in the characterization of situations, therefore, the parameters of time , internal structure and a subjective view of the situation play an important role. The opposition between 'have' on the one hand and 'get' on the other. this has its grammatical relevance in that 'have' indicating a state is incompatible with progressivity for the main semantic function of the progressive aspect in English is that of representing a situation not simply as existing but as happening or developing through time . in Telugu, however,

the opposition is not lexicalized but grammaticalised, e.g. Telugu ‘*agu*’ (be/become) can occur in the progressive when indicating a dynamic situation (atadupoduguauthunnadu=he is becoming tall) and is incompatible with the progressive when predicating a state (atadumanchivadu=he is good).

However, in English *‘he is being tall’ is ungrammatical since ‘be’ can represent a state which is more or less permanent, unchanging and unchangeable with all the temporal phases in it being homogeneous in their structure. According to *Sapir (1921:108)*, ‘aspect is expressed in English by all kinds of idiomatic terms rather than by a consistently worked out set of grammatical forms’, while *Ota (1963)* considers the progressive as the English aspect form for it indicates the process of action, being closest to perfective/imperfective distinction. Telugu grammaticalises the distinction between an act in progress and completion the distinction between an act in progress and completion. This aspectual distinction combines with every tense form. The aspectual character of a verb or more simply its character will be that part of its meaning whereby it (normally) denotes one kind of situation rather than another (*Lyons:1977:706*).

Accomplishments are process which take time and are completed in time, instead of going on in time indefinitely. From within the subclass of accomplishments, another subset is distinguished which consists of events which do involve the notion of a goal without specifying the activity that leads up to it. This subset is termed achievements and since its nature is punctual, it is incompatible with both durative aspect and period-of-time adverbials. whereas ‘how long did it take?’ is an appropriate question with regard to accomplishments, ‘when did happen?’ is proper for achievements. For example it makes sense to say ‘it took John one hour to write the letter’ or ‘John wrote in one hour’. ‘write’ is an activity that goes on without a specified goal while ‘write a letter’ has a specified goal towards which the activity proceeds. We will draw upon these insights during our discussion of aspectual character of the verbs and related problems and take Vendler’s classification of the propositions expressed by the verbs as our point of departure. Dynamic situations as opposed to states are represented in the verbs of motion but they differ in regard to their aspectual properties inherent to their lexical specification which either prohibit certain combinations of time adverbials which serve as secondary points of aspectual reference or restrict their semantic specification. Consider the following sentences:

17a. John swam the channel in ten minutes.

* b. John swam the channel for ten minutes.

18*a. John pushed the cart in ten minutes.

c. John pushed the cart for ten minutes.

19? a. John sank the boat in ten minutes.

?b. John sank the boat for ten minutes.

The verb refers to the expression class, not lexeme class (*Lyons: 1977*).

Sentence (17.a-b) expresses “accomplishments” proposition. Sentences (18.a-b) specify an “activity” proposition, while sentences (19.a- b) specify an “achievement”. Sentence (17.a) is acceptable for it makes the assertion that a certain goal was achieved after John’s striving towards it for 10 minutes. The adverbial phrase “in 10 minutes” sentence (17.b) is incompatible with the accomplishment predication, and therefore sentence (17.b) is an unacceptable sentence.

Sentence (18.a) is unacceptable whereas sentence (18.b) is acceptable for “push the cart” describes a process going on in time without progressing towards a terminal point. Hence the “in ten minutes” adverbial phrase violates the occurrence restriction. The adverbial of duration “for ten minutes”, on the other hand, is compatible with the specification of the verb “push the cart” for it makes sense to enquire in the case of activities, “how long did it last?” Moreover, John can stop pushing the cart at any point of time and it will still be true that he has pushed the cart. The situation described here has no terminal point which has to be reached if the proposition asserted has to be true; it can be protracted indefinitely or broken off at any point. Sentence (19.a) in the achievement reading is unacceptable for the achievement specifies an event that is viewed as punctual, making assertion about the terminal point without specifying the process that preceded it. Sentence (19.a) will be a well-formed sentence. Sentence (19.b), in the achievement reading, can be acceptable if interpreted as indicating an event going on repetitiously. In the accomplishment reading, however, (19.b) is unacceptable.

In Telugu, however, a distinction is maintained between activity and accomplishment verbs at the semantic and syntactic level. Consider the following sentences:

20.?a. jonaabanthi-nipadinimisamu-lo tos-aa-du.

John -nom the ball-acctenminutes-within throw-past-PNG

b. jonaabanthi-nipadinimisamu-lutos-aa-du.

John -nom the ball-acctenminutes-for throw-past-PNG

21a.jonpadinimisamu-lo aakalava-nu id-aa-du.

John -nom tenminutes-within the channel-acc swim-past-PNG

b. jonpadinimisamu-luaakalava-nu id-aa-du.

John -nom tenminutes-from the channel-acc swim-PNG

22? a. jonaapadava-nu padinimisamu-lo munch-aa-du.

John -nom the boat-acctenminutes-within sink-past-PNG

? b. jonaapadava -nu padinimisamu-lu munch-aa-du.

John -nom the boat-acctenminute-for sink-past-PNG

Sentence (20.a) seems doubtful in acceptability unless the context makes it clear that John had a certain stint to do in a certain stretch of time. And he could do it in 10 minutes. (20.b) is compatible with a durative adverbial for in (20.b) the verb denotes an activity. In (21.a), the verb '*iduta*' is incompatible with the accomplishment reading. We can use '*iduta*' only in the activity reading. The following sentences are acceptable.

23. jonpadinimisamul-lo kalava-nu iidukuntudat-aa-du
 John -nom ten minutes-within channel-acc swim-prog cross-past-PNG
 John crossed the channel by swimming in 10 minutes.

(21.b) is also unacceptable for we can use the locative complement as a locative adverbial not as a direct object. The following sentence is acceptable as we have already used in (21.a) which is repeated below. .

21. a) jonpadinimisamu-lukalava-lo id-aa-du.
 John -nom tenminutes-for channel-in swim-past-PNG
 John swam in the channel for ten minutes.

Sentence (22.a) is acceptable in the accomplishment reading whereas sentence (22.b) is unacceptable. If at all it is possible to interpret sentence (22.b) as indicating a repetition of events of sinking the boat which went on for 10 minutes, Telugu puts constraints on the verbal form. sentence (22.a- b) in Telugu and English points to the fact that there is a vague and ill-defined distinction between accomplishments and achievements. The above discussion confronts us with the following problems. For the incompatibility of time adverbials how do we account that like "in 10 minutes", "for 10 minutes" etc. With the verbs under study? ; how do we account for the semantic relationships of entailment between the following:

- i. 'John sank the boat for 10 minutes' indicates a repetition of an event?
- ii. 'John pushing the cart' entails 'John pushed the cart'
- iii. 'John was sinking the boat' does not entail 'John sank the boat';
- iv. 'John sank the boat for 10 minutes' indicates a repetition of an event?

Let v-ing be the progressive participle of a transitive verb v and v-ed the perfect participle of the same verb. Let A, B be common nouns. Then, if the sentence "an a was v-ing a, B" entails "an A *v-ed* a B," v is an activity verb, if not, an accomplishment. (Hoepelman, 1978:122).

We will apply to these verbs the test proposed by Hoepelman to distinguish between activity verbs and accomplishment verbs.

V-ing form	entails	v-ed form
John was throwing the ball.		John threw the ball.
John was sinking the boat	John sank the boat	
John was floating the log		John floated the log
John was rolling the boll.	John rolled the boll.	

John was pushing the cart.	John pushed the cart.
John was bouncing the ball.	John bounced the ball.
John was pulling the cart.	John pulled the cart.
John was jumping.	John jumped.
John was swimming	John swam.
John was falling	John fell.
The boat was sinking.	The boat sank.
The log was floating.	The log floated.
John was tumbling.	John tumble
John was rolling.	John rolled
John was bouncing	John bounced.

According to the entailment relations shown above we can classify the verbs into two categories.

Activity verbs: roll, push, float, pull, bounce, swim (intransitive)

Accomplishment tumble, sink, fall, through, float (transitive)

Verbs: Indicates that entailment relation does not follow when we say 'John was throwing the ball', the sentence cannot assert that the transition in the position of the ball from its source to the goal took place. So the sentence does not 'John threw the ball' . but when we say , 'john was rolling the ball'.

The implicit reference is to the activity of rolling the ball which comprises many single acts of rolling the ball. If the reference is only to a single act of John's , the entailment relation does not hold. In 'John was pushing /pulling the cart', the reference is to an activity with no specific goal and therefore the entailment relation holds. 'jump' and 'bounce' are such acts that by their nature the /act of jumping and bouncing involves one single complete event. Verbs do not co-occur with an adverbial phrase "in 10 minutes". The following are unacceptable.

24.* John threw the ball in 10 minutes.

25.*John tumbled out of the bed in 10 minutes.

26.* John fell from the cliff in 10 minutes.

The above verbs are not the durative and the activity indicated by them is viewed as occurring at a single point without a beginning , a middle and an end. They are closer to achievements in their specification .Aspectual phenomena are not restricted to the specification of the verbs alone; rather they are compositional in nature , with the theme , source and goal contributing their information to their composition.

Consider the following sentences:

27. John swam across the channel.
a. in 10 minutes.
b. *for 10 minutes.
28. John pulled the cart into the yard.
a. in 10 minutes.
b. *for 10 minutes.
29. John rolled the barrel into the yard
a. in 10 minutes.
b. *for 10 minutes.
30. John pushed the cart to London.
a. in 10 minutes.
b. *for 10 minutes.
31. John jumped over the fence.
a. in 10 minutes.
b. *for 10 minutes.
32. John bounced the ball to the other side.
a. *in 10 minutes .
b. For 10 minutes. (*verkuyl: 1976.*)

Above sentences (27-32) belong to the agentive causation type with the goal of the motion specified in each case. Yet we find that only sentences (27-30) are acceptable with a phrases while sentences (31-32) are not compatible with the adverbial phrases of time. This confronts us with a problem: how do we account for this anomaly? We may look for the answer in the fact that sentences (27 -30) specify extent - durational causation is co- extensive with the caused event . this means that the causation process is durative and we can talk of an action completed within a certain period of time.

Sentence (27-30) are unacceptable if combined with then b) phrases of time reference, since durative adverbials cannot occur when the sentences specify a process which proceeds towards a terminal point . so, these verbs of activity are compatible with durative adverbials if they occur in goal-unoriented causation type, i.e. without specification of the goal of the motion. sentences (31-32), however , can be acceptable with 'for 10 minutes' phrases in the reading that the event took place not once but more than once.

Now we will sum up our discussion about time-adverbs and entailment

relations:

- 1) However, the iterative interpretation will depend on the semantic specification of the verb, activity verbs when accompanied by a goal phrase behave like accomplishment verbs and hence show incompatibility with adverbs of duration unless they are interpreted in the iterative sense. The nature of activity and the extent of time indicated.
- 2) Activity verbs like 'roll', 'bounce', 'push', 'pull', 'swim', 'float', when not occurring in agentive causation type, i.e. without a goal phrase, can occur with adverbials of duration and hence are compatible with the progressive aspect both in English and Telugu. Since they refer to an activity that is not bound by time. When the causation is co-extensive with the caused event; not when the causation stops after the beginning-point. Activity verbs used with a goal phrase can occur with "in 10 minutes" time adverbials.

Verbs like 'fall', 'tumble', 'through', this kind of verbs cannot occur with adverbials of duration for the activity indicated by them specifies the resulting event too. A single event without internal structure, they are viewed as indicating. However, they can have an iterative reading with durative adverbials. 'Sink' can however be used in the accomplishment reading and can occur with "in ten minutes adverbial phrase, indicating progress of an activity towards a goal in a stretch of time

Conclusion:

The theoretical background for this research was eclectic by choice and we critically positioned ourselves towards major frameworks and relevant approaches to meaning without siding completely with any particular one. We demonstrated that our data driven approach has advantages over a theory-driven one. Our network of spatial and temporal parameters was a great help in achieving our goals. It enables us to detect language features that are relevant in the lexicalization of the experimental domain of motion and explain how they find their way into lexicalization patterns. Different interactions of language-specific systems of lexical semantics, syntax and morphology may compel speakers of a particular language to refer to some aspects of events more often than speakers of the languages. Based on a close investigation of the syntactic and semantic properties of the various subclasses of motion verbs in English and Telugu and their ability to express directed motion/goal of motion, I have shown that verbs of inherently directed motion. In this research we have looked at polysemous verb lexemes in Telugu and we have focused on Telugu motion verbs since they constitute a good example of the problem area. Within this particular semantic domain we have established a set of relevant frame elements as well as a set of relevant aspectual types. On the basis of these features, a taxonomy of verbs has been established which enables us to identify which subgroups of verbs are sensitive to which meaning changes. In short direction verbs proved to be rigid in meaning.

We also believe that the methodology proposed can be extended to other semantic domains. The taxonomical approach where each semantic domain –on the basis of data is examined both from the syntactic and from the semantic point of view leads to a more detailed and

fruitful analysis than that seen in more general approaches to semantic roles and aspectual types. In other words, we assume that each semantic domain contains its own critical divergences between languages and that these can best be captured by a domain-oriented analysis (see also palmer and Wu (1995) for a comparison of English and Chinese change of state verbs. Differences in the ways English and Telugu express motion and direction are not accounted for by lexicalization patterns or sectional restrictions of verb pairs such as *dorlu/roll*, *parigettu/run*, *nadaccu/walk*, *cheru/arrive* lexicalize essentially the same elements of movement, manner, transition. Most of the verbs of motion being studied here belong to the class of lexical causatives which present the view of a causative motion situation as a single temporally extended situation on the surface. Since causality is an important factor in understanding the motion situation, I have shown that the semantic structure of the verbs of motion according as they operate in agentive and non-agentive causal (non-causal) situations. An analysis of location phrases and an exploration into the concurrence restriction with the motion verbs has been made in this research.

Works Cited:

- Chomsky, N.(1965) . Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, mass: MIT press.
- Chomsky, N. (1972). Studies on semantics in generative grammar. The Hague: Mouton.
- Clark, Herbert H. (1976). Semantics and Comprehension. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cruse, D. A (1973). 'Some thoughts on agentivity'. Journal of linguistics 9. 11-23.
- Dowty, D. R (1972 b). 'On the Syntax and Semantics of the atomic predicate cause'. In perantean, Levi, and phares (eds.) papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of The Chicago Linguistic Circle. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Circle. 62-74.
- Fodor, J. D. (1977). Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar. New Yourk : Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Gruber, J. 1976. Lexical structures in syntax and semantics. Amsterdam: NorthHolland.
- Holliday, M. A. K. (1970). 'Language structure and Language Function '. In Lyons (ed.) New Horizons in Linguistics (1970-140-65).
- Indira,V. (1977). A Syntactic and Semantic Analysis of the Emotive predicates in English and Telugu. Ph. D Dissertation, Andhra University. 1977. 86
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1972). Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge, mass; MIT Press.
- Krishnamurti, Bh. (1961). Telugu verbal bases: a comparative and descriptive study. Berkeley: University of California prass.
- Krishnamurti, Bh. (1975). 'Verbs of cognition in Telugu'. Osmania papers in Linguistics 1. 1-15.
- Kachru, Yamuna (1976). 'On the Semantics of the Causative Construction in Hindi – Urdu '. In shibatani (ed.) Syntax and Semantics, Vol 6 (1976:353-369).
- Lyons, John. 1968. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Linakvist Karl-Gunnar (1976). A Comprehensive Study of Conceptions of Locality in which English preposition occurs. Stockholm Sweden: Almquist and wiskell Internatuaraal.
- Leech, G.N. (1971). Meaning and the English verb. London: Longman.
- McCawley, J. D (1976). 'Remarks on what can cause what'. In shibatani (ed.) Syntax and Semantics, Volume 6. (1976:126-129).
- Michotte, A. (1976). 'The perception of Causality, London: Methnem.

- Rajendran, S. 1978. *Syntax and Semantics of Tamil verbs*. Ph. D. Thesis. Poona: Deccan College.
- Shibatani, M. (1976). 'Causativization'. In shibatani (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 5: Japanese Generative Grammar* (1976:239-293).
- Sinha, A. K. (1972). 'On the deictic use of 'Coming' and 'going 'inHindi, papers from the English Regional meeting, Chicaago Linguistic society April 14-16 (351358). 87
- Talmy, L. (1975) 'Semantics and Syntax of motion '. In Kimball (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 4* (1975: 181-238). Talmy, L. (1978). *Figure and Ground in Complex Sentences*'. In Greenberg (ed.) *university of Human Language, Volume 4* (1978: 627-649).
- Verkuyl. (1978). *Thematic Relations and the semantic representation of verbs expressing change*'.