CHAPTER-4 Preliminaries to the Argument Structure of Telugu Verbs

4.1. Introduction:

4.1.1. Arguments and argument structure

The concept of argument structure is borrowed from logic. It generally concerns with relations between predicate and a set of arguments. A quick review of the basic concepts about the nature of the arguments and argument structure and related aspects with respect to Telugu will be presented in the following. The crucial element of a sentence in Telugu is Predicate, which is usually a Verb or a Noun. The discussion will be limited to verbal predicates only. The predicate determines the presence or absence of other crucial elements in a sentence. In the following examples all sentences have an NP in the nominative, showing agreement with the predicate and is considered as the subject of the sentence and Predicate. Some sentences have only a subject and some have subject and object. Let us take the sentence in (1b). We may see the elements or constituents like Subject rAju, Adverb ninna, Object annaM and Verb winnAdu. Among these some elements are obligatory and others are optional.

4.1.1.1. Predicates and Arguments

1.a. pApa eduswoMxi

Baby {3nm.sg.nom} is crying {3nm.sg}
b. \textit{rAju ninna annaM winnAdu}
\begin{quote}
Raju \{m.sg.nom\} ate \{3m.sg\} food yesterday
\end{quote}

c. \textit{rAju pulini caMpAdu}
\begin{quote}
Raju \{3m.sg.nom\} killed \{3m.sg\} a \textit{tiger} \{3nm.sg.acc\}
\end{quote}

2. a. \textit{ninna annaM winnAdu} (Explicit Subject is missing)
\begin{quote}
yesterday \ (he) ate \ food
\end{quote}

b*. \textit{rAju ninna annaM}. (Verb is missing)
\begin{quote}
Raju \ yesterday \ food
\end{quote}

c. \textit{rAju ninna winnAdu}. (Object is missing)
\begin{quote}
Raju \ yesterday \ ate
(Raju ate yesterday)
\end{quote}

d. \textit{rAju annaM winnAdu}. (Adverb is missing)
\begin{quote}
Raju \ food \ ate
(Raju ate food)
\end{quote}

Among the sentences in example (2) only the sentence (2b) is ungrammatical and all others are grammatical. With this example we can show that only the verb in the sentence (1b) is obligatory and other elements are optional. Whether an element is optional or obligatory is dependent upon the semantico-syntactic property of the predicate. By this statement we mean that the obligatory element is that which holds maximum amount of information in that sentence. It is the verb in
Telugu (and in many languages) that carries the maximum amount of information by way of semantic-syntactic properties it is endowed with. In the sentence (1b) the verb *winu ‘eat’* requires two elements, subject and object. The elements, which are required by the predicate, may be called Arguments. As the verb *eduvu ‘cry’* supports only one argument, it is called one-place argument, the verb *winu ‘eat’* which supports two arguments is called two-place predicate, and the verb *ivvu ‘give’* which supports three arguments, subject, object and indirect object is called three-place predicate.

In Telugu, as mentioned earlier, we can say that only the lexical categories like Nouns and Verbs can be predicates. A subject in Telugu is usually a noun in nominative and shows agreement with the main verb of the clause. By way of agreement, the verb carries the information with regard to the subject of the clause. There are various proposals in recent years about the existence of, non-nominative subjects in Telugu (Subbarao, 2001; Usha Devi, 2001; Vijayanarayana, 2002), Nominal predicates usually occur in sentences with equative constructions.

Every predicate has its own set of arguments defined by its semantic properties. The syntactic structure of the sentence or the clause of which the predicate is the head is determined by the semantic property and its argument structure.
4.1.1.2. Arguments and Thematic roles

Various elements in a sentence exhibit distinct relationships with each other. Particularly, the verbs of the predicate occupy a salient position in the sentence differing relationships such as who is doing the action and who or what is being affected by the action denoted by the verb as in the sentence:

3. abbAyi annaM winnAdu. ‘The boy ate the food’

In the above sentence abbAyi ‘boy’ functions as the agent of the action denoted by the verb and the annaM ‘food’ as the object affected. Such relations are generally known in the literature as thematic relations in the western tradition and as karaka relations in the Indian tradition. These relations are semantic relations and are different from the kind of relations we see in the surface structure (or S-Structure) of the languages often known as syntactic or grammatical functions like subject of the verb and the object of the verb. Within the Principles and Parameters of language Theory, these kinds of relations that are discussed here are generally treated under θ–Theory (Theta theory). θ–Theory describes such relationships by bringing forth these as part of the specifications of a lexical entry. Every lexical entry for a verb must specify a set of θ–role that occur with it. The relationship between the θ–roles and predicate is captured by the logical expression as in the following:

4. winu (abbAyi, annaM) ‘eat(boy, food)’

abbAyi annaM winnAdu ‘Boy ate food’
which indicates that the two arguments *AbbAy*, ‘boy’, *AnnaM* ‘food’ are related by the predicate's semantic property. The number of arguments is dependent on the semantic property of the predicate as in (5) one place predicate, and (4) a two place predicate (6) a three place predicate.

5. *Uduku* (*AnnaM*) ‘boil (rice)’
   
   *AnnaM udikiMxi*. ‘Rice has boiled’

6. *Ivvu* (*AbbAy*, *AnnAy*, *PuswakaM*) ‘give (boy, girl, book)’
   
   *AbbAy* *AnnAy* *ikiyiky* *PuswakaM iccAdu*. The boy gave the book to 
   
   girl/The boy gave the girl a book’

The predicate argument relationships as represented here are part of formal logic which when represented in natural languages by various mechanisms acquire specific morpho-syntactic notation.

The well-known distinction of verbs into transitives and intransitives is based on the argument structure of the predicate. If a verb takes one argument it is called an intransitive verb and there is no provision for object. Whereas if the verb takes two or more arguments then it forms a transitive construction where the subject and object are provided. It is said that arguments contain semantic information that is specific and relevant for the predicate. In other words, predicates characteristically determine pattern of arguments they qualify in a sentence. For example, the English verb *pay* supports three arguments, *payer, payee* and the paid-thing. With this we know that the predicate itself
does not contain any semantic information explicitly about the arguments but is considered to be a placeholder. It is argued that arguments may contain semantic information, which is determined by the predicate. Semantic patterns of arguments are captured through thematic roles. In the following, a list of thematic roles, is discussed, which is assigned to each argument. The theta roles like agent, patient, theme, experiencer, locative, instrumentaly goal, and source are assigned to each argument. And their definitions and examples are as follows:

(1) **Agent** The entity, which intentionally instigates the event or an action described by the predicate.

7. a. *teCarn paATaM ceVppiMxi*  
   Teacher taught the lesson

   b. *amma nAku annaM peVttiMxi*  
   Mother served me food

(2) **Patient:** The entity, which undergoes the effect of or affected by the event or an action described by the predicate.

8. a. *aVdu paMduVlicAdu*  
   He peeled the fruit

   b. *ravi raAyini peleAdu*  
   Ravi blasted the stone
c. *ravi annaM vaMdAdu*
   Ravi cooked the food

(3) **Theme:** The entity, which is moved in the event or an action described by the predicate.

9. a. *vAlYluviorahAnni swApiMcAru*
   They erected the statue

   b. *caMxu bAlunu visirAdu*
   Chandu threw the ball

(4) **Experiencer:** The entity, which experiences some psychosomatic state described by the predicate.

10. a. *pidugupAtuki pilla BayapadiMxi*
    The thunder frightened the baby

   b. *nenu vAdini saMwoRapeVttAnu*
    I made him happy

   c. *vAdiki jvaraMgAuMxi*
    He has a fever.

(5) **Instrument.** The entity, which is used to realize the action or the event or an action described by the predicate.
11. a. *nenu paMdunu ka*nwiwo koSAnu
    I cut the fruit with a knife

    b. *awanu gunapaMwo raYini eVwAdu
    He lifted the stone with a crowbar

(6) **Locative:** The place in which the event or an action described by the predicate takes place.

12. a. *e Vskimolu grInAMdulo uMtAru
    Eskimos live in Greenland

    b. *bukku tekukpEnapeVttAnu
    I kept the book on the table

(7) **Goal:** Entity toward which something moves in the event or an action described by the predicate. In some *classifications* Goal is distinguished from Beneficiary or Recipient.

13. a. *Ramudu mohanku o puswakaM iccAdu
    Ram gave a book to Mohan

    b. *pn Vside VMtu pollIsuku pawakAnni babukariMcAru
    President presented the award to the police

(8) **Source:** Entity from which some thing moves in the event or an action described by the predicate-
14. a. *aSoku keVnadAnuMdi vaccaAdu*

Ashok came from Canada

b. *koVliminuMdi seVgalu vaswAyi.*

Fumes comes from the kiln

Table shows the correspondences of the thematic roles and the semantic properties of the nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Thematic properties</th>
<th>Animacy</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Affected (change)</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Psychosomatic state</th>
<th>Goal (destination)</th>
<th>Source (Place)</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Experiencer</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

If only with reference to the verbs of motion, defines the property that really moves the arguments of Theme, then the distinction is not inherent to the theme here and one may combine both under the *theme*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Roles</th>
<th>Experiencer</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semantic Event</strong></td>
<td>Psycho-somatic</td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>Affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition feature</strong></td>
<td>[+ani]&lt;Ag&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;N&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;N&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 5

There are certain thematic roles used by other linguists which are not mentioned in the above list. In certain cases, it is very difficult to identify one from the other.

15. a. *nenu vAłyvAlyu maMcivAlyu am anuko VMtAnu.*

I think they are good people.

b. *koVduku waMdrinipoBunnAdu*

Son resembles father

Singh (1972) observes that “Panini seems to have been motivated to set up the karaka categories to account for facts of grammar at various levels. For instance, at the syntactic level, transformations of a sentence structure into another, and nominalization of a sentence in embedded constructions is stated in terms of karakas”. In the Indian grammatical tradition, Panini's ashtadhyayi provides a detailed account of thematic roles in the name of karaka relations, viz. karta, karma, karana, sampradana, apadana and adhikarana. Panini describes these karakas in the order of a hierarchy, karta, karma, *adhikarana*, karana, sampradana, and apadhana.
The below mentioned table shows the rough correspondence between the theta roles of the modern western languages and the Indian karakas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karaka</th>
<th>Theta Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karta</td>
<td>Agent, Experiencer, Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karma</td>
<td>Theme, Patient, Content, Result, Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karana</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sampradaana</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apaadaana</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhikarana</td>
<td>Time, Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 6

4.1.1.3. Types of Arguments

It is generally considered that there are three different types of arguments as given below from the point of syntax.

16. a. External argument and internal argument
   b. Direct argument and indirect argument
   c. Implicit argument and Semantic argument

The argument, which is associated with the position outside the maximal projection of the predicate, is called the external argument, whereas the argument to be associated with the position which is inside
the maximal projection of the predicate is called internal argument (Williams 1981).

17. ciMtu annaM winnAdu ‘Chintu ate food’

\[ S \]
\[ NP \]
\[ V \]
\[ ciMtu \]
\[ annaM \]
\[ winnAdu \]
\[ ARG1 \]
\[ ARG2 \]
\[ PRED \]

The argument (ARG1), which is outside VP, is called external argument and the argument (ARG2), which is inside the VP, is called internal argument

In English the external argument is always associated with the subject. Further if a verb does not have an external argument, an internal argument of the verb should move to the subject position since the subject position should be filled obligatorily. If a verb has an external argument then the construction does not need any movement. Only the verb with an external argument can assign accusative case. In Telugu the external argument is defined not as ‘external’ to VP* or directly dominated by ‘S’ rather than VP. But, the NP in nominative is external and moves out of VP to be singled out (on ontological hierarchy) to which the verb would show the agreement inflection. In Telugu, however, the external argument will be defined so that NP which is nominative and the verb shows agreement with it.
In other than external arguments if an argument is realized with a post-position it is called indirect argument. However in English the direct argument is realized without a preposition unlike in Telugu.

18. a. *glwa slwaku puswakaM icciMxi.* ‘Gita gave the book to Sita’

   ARG   ARG   ARG   PRED
   InDO   DO

   b. *slwa pillavAdiki annaM peVitiMxi.* ‘Sita served the food to the Kid’

   DO   InDO

All other internal arguments are realized with relevant post-position endings except the direct argument in case it is inanimate, and other with certain exceptions (adverbs of time and place names).

Structurally, arguments that we conceptualize are realized overtly i.e. the arguments are pronounced in our speech or they surface in our written language. However, there are arguments, which are not overt or not pronounced in speech. This covert argument is called the implicit argument. The external argument is suppressed in the passive sentences. The suppression indicates the loss of the argument status (Where it receives a post position). Suppressed argument may not appear in the argument position. This suppressed argument is called implicit argument. It does not play any role in overt syntax.
4.1.1.4. Argument, Adjunct and Complement

It is defined that Argument is required by the predicate as a participant in the event or situation described by the predicate and thus its presence is usually obligatory. Whereas adjunct is not required by the predicate and its presence is optional.

Ex:
   Rama gave the book to Ravi yesterday.

   The predicate iccu (gave) supports three arguments, Amudu (Ramudu), puswakaM (book) and ravi (Ravi). For the sentence to be grammatical, the adverb ninna (yesterday) is not required by the verb and its presence is optional. The number of arguments of a predicate is fixed, but the number of adjuncts is not fixed. If possible adjuncts can be added semantically.

Ex.
20. svapna pallVlo oVkanavalanu cAlArginlagA nixAnaMeArAswoMxi.
   Swapna is writing a novel in the village very slowly over many days.

   While Argument is based on semantic requirements of the predicates, complement is based on syntax. Complement appears on a sister node of a head. Complements are words or phrases that complete the sentence. Without the complement, the sentence is not complete.
Adjunct is an optional constituent in a clause and is typically a spatio temporal noun or a manner adverb in which an event takes place.

21. vAIAY/Yu pillavAdini cAlAnIcaMgA cUsmAru. “They treat the boy badly”

The following is the comparative table illustrating the difference between arguments, adjuncts and complements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Complements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grammatical function feature</td>
<td>Semantic property of predicate</td>
<td>Syntactic property.</td>
<td>Semantico-Syntactic property (of its head).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Syntactico-Semantic relevance</td>
<td>Naturally obligatory</td>
<td>Optional.</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Valence coding of verb</td>
<td>Number is fixed</td>
<td>Number is not fixed</td>
<td>Functional Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lexical representation</td>
<td>Lexical predicate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Saves referential function</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
4.1.1.5. Argument position and Theta-position

The syntactic positions which can be associated with arguments are called \textit{A(rgument)-positions}, whereas those \textit{which} are not are called \textit{A^(A-bar)-positions}. Thus subject and object positions (Complements of verb) are A-positions, whereas the adjunct positions are \textit{A`-positions}. That is, arguments appear in A-positions, but adjuncts may not.

The position very similar to but different from A-position is Theta-position. A Theta-position is a position occupied by an argument, which is assigned a Theta-role. The complement positions of the transitive verbs are theta-positions since the verbs \textit{will} assign theta-roles to these positions. All theta-positions are A-positions, but all A-positions are not theta-positions.

4.1.1.6. Argument and Case

Arguments are closely related to Case. Case is assigned to NP. But an NP, which is not an argument, is not an assigned case. Only \textit{finite} verb can assign case. Case filter applies to argument NP only. An NP with a case can be assigned a \textit{theta-role}. That is, Case renders an NP argument visible to theta-role assignment. When a verb assigns a theta-role to its subject, it can assign an accusative case, or when a verb assigns an accusative case, it assigns a theta-role to its subject. A passive verb cannot assign an accusative case to its complement since its external argument is suppressed.
An interesting phenomenon observed about these thematic roles is that there is a hierarchy among the roles. A well-known universal phenomenon is that Agent of an active is associated with the subject position. This indirectly indicates that this agent is higher than theme since the subject position is higher than the object position in the syntactic structure. The hierarchy of thematic roles is called Thematic Hierarchy. Jackendoff (1972) observed that in the passive sentence the thematic role of the NP in the ‘by’ phrase should be higher than that of the surface subject in the thematic hierarchy. There are several versions of Thematic Hierarchy proposed by several linguists:

**Thematic Hierarchy:**

a) \(<\text{Agent}, \text{Location/source/goal}, \text{Theme}>\) (Jackendoff 1972)
b) \(<\text{Agent}, \text{Theme}, \text{goal}, \text{Oblique}>\) (Larson 1988)
c) \(<\text{Agent}, \text{Theme}, \text{Goal/Benefactive/Location}>\) (M. Baker 1989)
d) \(<\text{Agent}, \text{Benefactive}, \text{Experiencer/Recipient}, \text{Instrument, Theme/Patient Location}>\) (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989)
e) \(<\text{Agent}, \text{Experiencer}, \text{Location/Source/Goal, Theme}>\) (Grimshaw 1990)
Among the hierarchies mentioned above, Agent is higher than Location (or Source or Goal) and the Experiencer is higher than theme. Although there are variations in the versions above, one common hierarchy is the following:

< Agent, Experiencer, Theme, Location>

The reason for variation in hierarchy is due to the difference in the realization of theta roles of different languages or due to the default or universal treatment of animate object over inanimate object in theta-role assignment and syntactic treatment. One of the consequences of the hierarchy of thematic roles is the syntactic hierarchy to which the thematic roles are linked. For instance, Agent is linked to the subject position, and theme to the object position. The subject position is higher than the object position and thus we can say that Agent is higher than Theme. Experiencer is higher than Theme since Experiencer is linked to Subject and Theme to Object.

23. **ravi cinnapillani BayapeVttAdu.**
    Ag    Ex
    Ravi frightened the kid.

24. **kamalaki mAmidipalYlu iRtaM**
    Ex    Th
    Kamala likes mangoes
Among these alternate proposals on hierarchies, thematic roles do not have one to one correspondence except Agent and Locatives. In all other thematic roles they occur under combined cover terms or split into more than one. Therefore it is difficult to compare. For example, Jackendoff has Locative, Source and Goal into one unit and includes Experiencer, Patient and Benefactory, which includes animate human objects and theme as an inanimate object hence the hierarchy. Whereas in the case of Larson, Theme may include Experiencer, Patient, Benefactory, so next in the hierarchy to Agent, so similar is Bakers. In case of Bresnan and Kanerva, Benefactive Recepient/Experiencer are higher in the hierarchy and next to Agent and followed by Theme and Patient because these three may include animate/human objects, whereas theme is not So is the case in Grimshaw (1990).

On the whole, in the hierarchy above mentioned, Agent is higher than the Location (or Source or Goal) and the Location is higher than the Theme. Although there are variations in the versions above, and a hierarchy common to most languages can be presented as in

<Agent, Experiencer, Theme>

The hierarchy serves to order the arguments in a predicate argument structure in terms of a semantically determined prominence.
scale. Some linguists avoid using thematic roles because of their unclear definitions. They proposed variables such as X, Y & Z. The variables represent arguments but they keep the hierarchy.

26. John fixed his computer.

   \text{Fix: } \text{x} < \text{y} >

   In the above sentence we can see that the predicate ‘fix’ takes two arguments ‘x’ and ‘y’, where V is higher than ‘y’ in the hierarchy. Here we can see the hierarchy or structure among arguments. This is similar to a thematic hierarchy. Argument structure is a general term for argument hierarchy or structured arguments.

   "The number of thematic roles embraced by various theories varies considerably. Some people use half-dozen thematic roles. Others use three or four times as many. The exact number does not matter much as long as there are enough to expose natural constraints on how verbs and thematic role instances form sentences."— Winston (1984, p.314) (rf. Sylvie Ratte 1994).

4.2. Argument Structure and Telugu Verbs

   In Telugu, intransitive verbs do not form a homogenous group. We can have distinct subtypes based on their semantic features. For example, we can broadly divide the intransitives into unergatives and
unaccusatives. Again cutting them across the above distinction, we may have +sudden change of state verbs and −sudden change of state verbs. Relevant features identified in morphosyntactic alternations involving these verbs.

4.2.1. Unergative verbs

They form a special group of intransitive verbs. Semantically, Unergative verbs have a subject perceived as actively initiating or actively responsible for the action expressed by the verb. Thematically, these verbs take an Agent, which is an external argument. The following are the unergative verbs identified in Telugu (ref. Uma Maheshwar Rao, 2001).

..contd..
Ex:

Adu 'to play'
Agu 'to stop'
aluvu be tired'
aluvu to grumble*
Anu ‘to rest on'
amTu ‘to touch'
aracu 'to shout'
axuku ‘to stick'
awuku ‘to stick'
imudu ‘to fit'
lxu ‘to swim'
uruku ‘to jump'
yyy ‘to spit'
Uru 'to become fat'
evKku ‘to rise'
evGuru ‘to fly'
evNnu ‘to count'
ftafoy ‘to cry'
edcu ‘to cry'
egu ‘to go'
oVluvu ‘to be peeled off
uMDu ‘to be'
kAcu 'to boil/wait/guard'
kuxulu 'to move'
kuxuru ‘to be settled'
kakku* ‘to vomit'
kuMtU ‘to limp'
kuLu ‘to move gracefully’
kUdu ‘to be associated with’
goVNu ‘to murmer’
gevMtU* ‘to push'
gevMn ‘to jump'
ciku ‘to suck'
jadu ‘to be scared'
jaru ‘to slip’
xadu ‘to tremble/shiver with fear'
xagg ‘to cough'
xAgU ‘to hide'
xig ‘to go down'
wadiy ‘to become wet'
wagl ‘to become in contact with*
wapp ‘to move'
warg ‘to cut'
wara ‘to move'
wummu ‘to sneeze'
welu ‘to float/result'
wocu ‘to be sensed'
wAku ‘to touch'
wirugu  'to turn/rotate'
weVMcu  'to pluck/cut'
wUlu  'to stagger'
\text{\textit{xumuku}}  'to jump'
\text{nAnu}  'to become wet*
\text{\textit{naduvu}}  'to walk'
navvu  'to laugh'
nakku  'to hide'
nadacu  'to walk'
nasugu  'to murmur/hesitate'
nigudu  'to stretch'
nilulu  'to stand'
nilugu*  'to stretch'
\text{\textit{paluku}}*  'to respond'
pAdu  to sing'
pAku  'to crawl'
pUnu*  'to undertake'
bawuku  'to live'
marulu  'to turn'
mAru  'to be changed'
mUgu  'to swarm'
mukku  'to moan'
munugu  'to drown'
murryu  'to be pleased'
muruwu  'to be delighted'

\text{\textit{musuru}}  'to collect'
meVlugu  'to behave'
meVxalu  'to stir'
meVxulu  'to move'
meāpu  'to graze cattle'
meōu  'to graze'
moVrugu  'to bark'
moVlacu  'to sprout'
moVluwu  'to sprout'
rAyu  'to write'
reVccu 'to be stirred up'
le  to rise/get up'
/\textit{ecu}' to rise/get up'
loVMgu  'to surrender'
vaMgu  'to bend'
vaccu  'to come'
vAdu  'to use'
vAlu  'to lean'
vidu  'to separate'
vIcu  'to blow'
vaxulu  'to leave'
re\textit{vIYlu}  'to go'
vetu*  to pray'
vegu  'to be fried'
4.2.2. Unaccusative verbs

There exists a group of intransitive verbs, characterized semantically, where the subject does not actively initiate or is not actively responsible for the action of the verb, rather it has properties which it shares with the direct object of a transitive verb (or better, with the grammatical subject of its passive counterpart). Thematically, these verbs take Theme, which is an internal argument in terms of argument structure. (rf. UmaMaheshwar Rao, 2001).

Ex.

`avvu` to become'  
`anugu` to be pressed'  
`axaru` to shake/tremble'  
`axuru` to shake/tremble'  
`amaru` to fit into'  
`arugu` be abraded'  
`Aru` to dry'  
`iMku` be obsorbed'  
`(guru` to dry up'  
`inuku` be obsorbed'  
`ubbu` to wsell'  
`uduku` 'to boil'  
`urumu` 'to thunder'  
`Ugu` 'to swing'  
`U du` 'toslip/be lost'  
`eV/Mdu` 'to dry'  
`eV/xugu` 'to grow'  

`oVrugu` 'to lean'  
`kaMxu` 'be inflamed'  
`karugu` 'to melt'  
`kalug` 'to happen/occur'  
`kAgu` 'to boil'  
`kAru` 'to leak'  
`kuMgu` 'to stoop/shrink'  
`kuruvu` 'to rain/to fall'  
`kUlu` 'to collapse'  
`kuLYu` 'to decay'  
`gaduvu` 'to pass/elapse'  
`gaduvu` 'to pass'  
`cAvu` 'to die'  
`caccu` 'to die'  
`cikku` 'be caught up'  
`anugu` 'to be torn'  
`cirugu` 'to be torn'
ceru 'to reach'
celu 'to split/crack
ceVdu 'to cry'
ceVxuru 'be scattered
ceVllu 'to settle'
xoVllu 'to roll'
rf<?/^ 'to vomit'
waggu 'bereduced'
wunugu 'to cut'
wUgu 'to weigh'
weVgu 'to be cut'
weVMulu to stir/start'
woVNaku 'to gleam'
wulYlu 'to frisk'
xakku 'be obtained'
xoVrlu 'to roll'
zoVruku 'to be found'
niMdu 'to be filled'
meVruu 'to learn'
pagulu 'to break'
padu 'to fall'
paMdu 'to ripe'
pAru 'to flow'
pgulu 'to break'
puVyi 'to flower/apply'
peVrugu 'to grow'
pelu 'to explode'
poVkku 'come to light'
poVMgu 'to boil over'
poVrlu 'to over flow'
puccu 'to rot/take'
puuru 'to ferment'
fea&w* 'to become stout'
beVxuru 'to be frightened'
biguu 'to tight'
maggu 'to go mouldy'
marugu 'to boil'
maAgu 'to ripe'
maMdu 'to burn/blaze'
masulu 'to boil/mix'
maN 'be cured'
maAr 'to change'
maAyi 'become dirty'
migulu 'be left over'
marugu 'to rot/decay'
muxuru 'to coarsen'
mUdu 'to end'
meVruu 'to flash'
moVgu 'to lean'
rugulu 'to be kindled'
regu 'to be aroused'
vaNuku 'to shiver'
vACu 'to swell'
vicu 'to swell'
visugu to get irritated' veVlugu ‘to shine'  
viruku ‘to break' sAgu ‘to stretch’  
viruvu ‘to break'  
veVluvu ‘to come into existence’

However, it is difficult to draw a clear distinction between the two groups of the intransitives in some cases. The two types of verbs are represented differently in the argument structure and in the syntactic structure as in the following:

Unergative: x < >

Unaccusative: <x>