# Categorial Participant of Slovak Semantic Sentence Structure. Sentences of Existence

Peter Gregorík

University of St. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, Slovakia

peter.gregorik@ucm.sk

**Abstract**: We focus on semantic participants of Slovak Language. These participants are known also as thematic roles, semantic roles or theta roles. In every sentence there are some participants needed for correct syntactic meaning. Our hypothesis is based on premise that one of these participants is categorial and this participant opens the position or positions for other participants. In our opinion categorial participant is fundamental semantic element within specific language micro-situations (existence, possession, information transfer, moving etc.) and every micro-situation has only one such participant. Non-categorial (general) participants can occur within more micro-situations. The paper describes methods for specifying categorial participants. As a model structure we describe elementary sentence structure of existence.

**Key words:** linguistics, syntax, semantic structure, thematic role, participant, existence

## Introduction

Our premise is that sentence as a basic unit of communication is a realization of conventional semantic and syntactic scheme. This scheme is correlative to units, or participants, of specified language micro-situation. For example, micro-situation when *somebody informs someone about something* needs these participants: somebody who informs (agent); somebody who receives information (recipient); and information. Of course, language is not able to describe the whole micro-situation based on extra-linguistic context. It describes it selectively. The central position by creating any sentence within a micro-situation has a predicator. It is a mediator which correlates particular participants of specific micro-situation. The ability of predicator to open functional positions we call intentional ability, and the configuration of participants - the aggregate of functional positions of a predicator – we call intention field. We use this terms as Grepl and Karlík have it (1998). In our conception participant is a functional position of predicator. As Grepl and Karlík (1998) say participants of semantic sentence structure may be characterized as a specific positions that correspond to "members" or relevant "circumstances" of standardized situations. The roles of participants are for example agent, patient, recipient, initiator, possessor, locus, direction etc. The number of these roles vary from one linguist to another. Ch. Fillmore (1969) has eight "deep cases": agent, counter-agent, object, result, instrument, source, goal and experiencer. W. L. Chafe (1970) has only two roles: agent a patient. E. Tibenská (1996) has these subject participants: processor, actor, initiator, causator and realisator. She writes also about object participants (1998): patient, result, recipient, relant, sociative and inherent. Grepl and Karlík (1998) divide participants into two groups: 1. substantial – that are divided into physical objects (agent, causator, processor, carrier, possessor, expirient, recipient, beneficient, patient, stimulus, instrument and vehicle), and locus participants (locus, directiv and origative); and 2. situational participants (information, instruction, impulse and purpose). J. Nižníková (2001) writes about 64 semantic participants.

This brief survey into problematics of semantic roles shows that there are different approaches and methods used for describing them. Our conception is based on needs and requirements of specific language micro-situations in which we assume some standardized syntactic and semantic participants. The most important is semantic function of them, e.g. the semantic role they have within elementary sentence structures. The conception of Czech linguists P. Karlík and M. Grepl (1998) is the methodological base for our research. We modify this conception in the way that of used methods. We use methods of verb specific description and method of semantic (or thematic) roles. The first one is used for defining of basic situational scheme within a particular language micro-situation. For example we use it for abstracting of general extra-linguistic meanings in the sentences with verba dicendi and we got structures like *somebody says something* or *somebody speaks with someone*. In the next step we abstract semantic roles *source, theme, information* or *sociativ.*

On one hand the language is a complicated phenomenon but on the other hand no special skill is needed for using it. Language – in its systemic complexity – changes into easy tool of communication. Interconnection between extra-linguistic complexity and linguistic abstraction is the base for analyses of semantic structure of Slovak sentences.

In the past structure of Slovak sentences was described mostly as a formal structure based on morphological attributes of words. For example typical Slovak sentence structure with subject in nominative case, verbum finitum as a predicate and object in accusative case has the formalized structure (N means noun):

$$N_N - VF - N_A$$

There are many examples for this type: *Otec číta noviny. Peter spozoroval včely. Žofia zbožňuje palacinky. Voda obsahuje kyslík. On nenávidí mňa. (Father reads a newspaper. Peter beholds bees. Žofia likes pancakes. Water contains oxygen. He hates me*.) In all of these sentences the grammar structure is the same but their semantic structure is clearly different – there is an action, a perception, a description, an emotion. We think that only a description of grammar structure of sentence is not enough for typology of sentences. The same grammar structure may correspond to different semantic structures. On the other different grammar structures may have the same semantic structure. As an example there is a passivization of sentences. By this process object from active sentence becomes subject in passive sentence, and subject from active sentence is not present in passive sentence or it changes into an adverbial:

Active sentence: *Zahraniční robotníci stavajú dom. (Foreign workers build this house.)*

Passive sentence where subject from active sentence changes into adverbial*: Dom je stavaný robotníkmi zo zahraničia. (The house is built by foreign workers.)*

Passive sentence where subject from active sentence is not present: *Dom sa stavia. (The house is built.).*

In these sentences there is a change in grammar positions of its parts but these parts keep its semantic positions – *house* is still generated substance and *workers* are still the agent of the action. Of course, sometimes it is not necessary to express the agent in the surface structure of the sentence and it can be omitted. Grammar position and semantic positions are two independent structures. As Grepl and Karlík (1998) have it: syntactic (grammar) positions and their forms in grammar structure do not uniquely correspond to any semantic roles (functions).

In this paper we used semantic sentence structure as the basis for sentence description. Language micro-situations are the base for our semantic-role model. In our conception language micro-situations are abstractions based on defining basic semantic participants within elementary sentence structures. Grepl and Karlík (1998) have nine elementary sentence structures: identity, existence, possession, location, quantity, correlation and process. J. Nižníková (2001) has eleven model groups based on the lexical meaning of corresponding verbs. We define elementary sentence structures as the most general categories that are transferred for extra-linguistic reality into language. They can be imagined as topics abstracted from common language use. Within elementary sentence structures we define particular language micro-situations that are less general and within one elementary sentence structure there can be more language micro-situations. Micro-situations can be identified by specific configuration of semantic roles. Within one elementary sentence structure there is always one or more categorial participant(s) that cannot occur within other elementary sentence structure. We can say that language micro-situations are modifications of the same basic elementary sentence structure. This modifications are made by non-categorial participants that can occur in more elementary sentence structures. Within particular language micro-situations we define their semantic and grammatical structure, and its lexical or stylistic varieties. We allocated eight basic elementary sentence structures: existence, state, characteristic, location, possession, attitude, information and action. In this paper we describe elementary sentence structure ***existence***.

Process of communication is bordered within non-linguistic reality. Elementary sentence structures and language micro-situation as their specifications are only segments of this reality. Of course, this segment is always simplified and reduced – language is no table to describe all details and relations of depicted reality. For that reason it is necessary to abstract semantic and grammatical elements when describing sentence structures.

If we want to define elementary sentence structure ***information transfer***, it is necessary to asbtract which semantic elements can occur within this structure and which must occur. Elements that must occur are categorial, other participants are non-categorial. In this elementary sentence structure the participant ***information*** must be always present, even if there is not subject as in this Slovak single-element sentence:

*Hovorí sa, že každý raz nájde svoje šťastie. (It is said that once everyone will find his happiness.)*

Other participants that can occur are non-cathegorial; e. g. ***agens***:

***Ľudia*** *hovoria, že každý raz nájde svoje šťastie. (**People** say that once everyone will find his happiness.)*

Sentence can be completed also with non-categorial participant ***recipient***:

*Peter hovorí **Pavlovi**, že každý raz nájde svoje šťastie. (Peter talks to **Pavol** that once everyone will find his happiness.)*

Also non-categorial participant ***aspect*** can occur in some sentences:

*Peter hovorí Pavlovi **o ich spoločnej kamarátke Katke**, že si raz určite nájde svoje šťastie. (Peter talks to Pavol **about their friend Katka** that once she will find his happiness.)*

Complex semantic structure has the form:

$$\text{agens} - \text{predicator} - \text{information} - \text{recipient} - \text{theme}$$

Not only semantic structures but also their grammatical realization are important. For language praxis it is important to know which grammar forms are used for realizations of particular semantic participant. For example, agent in this kind of structures can be realized by morphologically different but semantic equal forms: ***Vrátnik** nás informoval/**na vrátnici** nás informovali/**od vrátnika** sme dostali informáciu. (**The gate-keeper** informed us/**at the gate** we were informed/we got information **from the gate-keeper**).*

## Elementary sentence structure *existence*

The meaning of the word existence is probably intuitively clear to everyone but i tis not so easy to define it. In the most general meaning we can say that existence is being, presence within some time and space dimension. Existence refers not only to human beings, animals or things but also to abstract nouns. For expression of existence there is relatively only small group of predicators because it is specific type of language micro-situation with quite a stabile structure. As the predicator the most frequent is the verb *byť* (to be). Other verbs are for example *existovať (to exist), jestvovať (to exist), uskutočniť sa (to take place), prebehnúť (to take place), vyskytnúť sa (to appear)*. The intention field of these predicators is also limited. They need one categorial participant – nositeľ existencie (existence experiencer) which can be completed by one non-categorial participant.

The basic scheme of this elementary sentence structure is:

**somebody/something – exist/does not exist/arises/vanishes**

Semantic structure has the form:

**Experiencer$_{\text{existence}}$ – existence – (benefactor/tempus/locus/aspect/causation)**

Grammatical structure has the form:

$$N_{N/A/G} - VF - (N_D/pre\ N_A\ /ADV_{loc/temp/asp/cauz}/prepN$$

**Characteristics of particular participants:**

**a) Experiencer$_{\text{existence}}$ (Exp$_{\text{exi}}$)** is the categorical participant of this elementary structure. It is not an active participant. It is expressed by non-fiction and fiction persons, animals, material things but also abstract terms. They have in common that in sentence is shown that they exist/do not exist/arise/vanishes. Formally they can be expressed by:

- nominative case: ***Yeti** je a **Lochneská príšera** nie je? Musia byť aj iné **svety** podobné Zemi.(Yeti exists and Loch Ness monster does not exist. There must be also other worlds like Earth.)*
- partitive genitive case: *Veľa **nádeje** už nám nezostalo. **Ľudí** je ako maku. (There is not much hope left. There are so many people.)*
- accusative case: *Máš **známky**, ktoré si nikdy nekúpiš. Máte **otázky**, na ktoré nikdy nenájdete odpoveď. (There are stamps that you will never buy. There are questions that you will never answer.)*

**b) Experiencer$_{\text{existence/change}}$ (Exp$_{\text{exi}}$)** is a participant that occurs in sentence that express arising or vanishing of something. Like **Experiencer$_{\text{existence}}$** it is semantic passive participant but there is a difference. There is a mutative change by **Experiencer$_{\text{existence/change}}$**. It starts or discontinues existing. Formally it can be expressed by:

- **nominative case**: *Susedovi vykapali všetky **sliepky**. **Zem** vznikla približne pred 4,5 miliardou rokov. Vzplanul spravodlivý **hnev** utláčaných. (All neighbour´s **chickens** have died. **Earth** arose approximately 4.5 billion years ago. Righteous **anger** of oppressed people has arisen.)*
- **partitive genitive**: *Rodí sa viac **dievčat** ako chlapcov. Postupne sa vytvorilo niekoľko **koncepcií**. (More **girls** than boys are being born. Several **conceptions** were created progressively.*

**c) Benefactor (be)** is, in Eva Tibenská´s terminology (2012), third-plan participant. As she says, benefactor can occur in sentence to make its meaning complex, and to change sentence perspective from objective to subjective. Its use is not a stylistic device. Benefactor expresses the aspect, e.g. in regard of who/what the expressed existence applies. It can be expressed by:

- dative case: *Veľa nádeje už **Ivanovi** nezostalo. Možností **vám** existuje habadej. (There is not much hope left for **Ivan**. There exist a lot of possibilities **for you**.)*
- nominative case: ***Ivan** nemá veľa nádeje na úspech. (Vy) Máte habadej možností. (**Ivan** has not many chances to success. **You** have a lot of possibilities.*

- accusative case + preposition *pre (for)*: *Veľa nádeje už **pre nás** neexistuje. Jestvuje **pre Vás** habadej možností.* (There is not much hope **for us**. there exist a lot of possibilities **for you**.)

In intention field grammar form $N_N$ corresponds to **Experiencer$_{existence}$**. Predicator is mostly expressed by the verb byť (to be) in its existence meaning. The verb byť can have several meanings in Slovak language and can be found in three different language micro-situation:
 (1) Existence: *Strašidlá **sú**. (Monsters **exist**.)*
 (2) Location: *Strašidlá **sú** v sklade.(Monsters **are** in the deposit.)*
 (3) Characteristics or state: *Strašidlá **sú** hrôzostrašné, deti **sú** vystrašené. (Monsters **are** creepy, and children **are** scared.)*
In the third meaning there is not the autosemantic form of the verb byť. It is only a copula verb. Predicator with this verb consists of the form of the verb byť and autosemantic form of a noun, adjective, pronoun or numeral.
(1) Verb byť (to be) in the meaning: to exist from ontological point of view. In this function the verb byť expresses existence regardless of any external circumstances. It can be identified as something or someone that simply exist or does not exist. From the lexical point of view i tis an autosemantic verb that can be replaced by synonymic verbs like existovať, jestvovať (both mean to exist). From syntactic point of view it is autosyntagmatic word that fulfills role typical for autosyntagmatic verbs in the sentence – the role of predicate.
Examples: *Mimozemšťania **nie sú**. Musia **byť** i iné svety. Myslím, teda **som**. Niečo **je** a niečo **nie je**. (Extra-terrestrials **does not exist**. There must **be** also other worlds. I think, therefore I **am**. Something **exists** and something **does not**.)*
(2) Verb byť expressing location: to occur in or to have origin in. In this function there is nota n ontological aspect. The necessary component of this meaning is adverbial of place. Of course there is no rection between the verb and adverbial, despite of this adverbial is obligatory component of sentence. From lexical point of view i tis an autosemantic word that can be replaced by synonymous verbs like nachádzať sa (to occur), žiť (to live somewhere), vyskytovať sa (to occur)... From syntactic point of view it is an autosyntagmatic word. Predicator byť (to be) together with adverbial of time (tempus) expresses existence – but not ontological but located somewhere.
*Syn **je/žije** už dvadsať rokov **v USA**. Mama **je/nachádza sa v záhrade**. Komáre **sú/sa vyskytujú** najmä **pri vode**. Kniha **je/nachádza sa na stole**. Štefan **je/pochádza z Novohradu**. (My son **has been/lived in USA** for twenty years. Mother **is in the garden**. Mosquitoes **occur** mostly **by the water**. The book **is on the table**. Štefan **comes from Novohrad**.)*
(3) The verb to be as synsemantic word. It is a copula that serves only as a carrier of grammatical categories. Its meaning must be completed be autosemantic word – noun, adjective, pronoun, numeral, participle or adverb. From lexical point of view i tis a synsemantic word without any lexical meaning. From syntactic point of view i tis a synsyntagmatic word that is never an independent constituent of sentence but always occurs together with autosemantic constituent.
Examples: *Žofia **je učiteľka**. Peter **bol nervózny**. Starí ľudia **sú** už **takí**. Alonso **bude prvý**. (Žofia **is a teacher**. Peter **was nervous**. Old people **are like that**. Alonso **will be the first**.)*

We take existence similar to M. Grepl and P. Karlík (1998) who distinguish three possible states of existence: something/someone exists/does not exists, something/someone arises, and something/someone causes that something/someone arises/vanishes. In our conception their third state of existence belongs to other elementary sentence structure because it is an action that causes something. J. Nižníková (2001) divides sentence models with verbs of existence into three groups: verbs of existence, verbs of arising, and verbs of vanishing.

1.   **Language microsituation "somebody/something exists/does not exists"**

From semantic point of view there are two components in this microsituation: ***Exp$_{exi}$*** and predicator of existence. ***Exp$_{exi}$*** can be expressed by anything that exists in factual or abstract meaning, in fiction or non-fiction world. As the participant there can be human beings, animals, things or abstract terms.

Existence can be expressed in two ways:
**a)** as **absolute existence**, i. e. generally without reference to any circumstances:
*Vlkolaci **nie sú**. Duša **je**. Veľký tresk možno prebehol. (Werewolves **does not exist**. Soul **exists**. Big Bang maybe really was.)*
In this way it is only a statement without an adverbial. It expresses only existence or non-existence of some entity. For this reason there is only one participant Exp$_{exi}$, and this participant is categorical. Predicator does not open any other obligatory position for more semantic participants.

Semantic structure has the form: **Exp$_{exi}$ - existence**
J. Nižníková (2001) more closely specifies the participant as processual existence experiencer. We think that our term existence experiencer is appropriate enough. In our opinion the existence from ontological point of view does not express any process.

Grammar structure has the form: **N$_N$ − VF**

Within type a) we distinguish two groups of existence:
**a1) existence that refers to the whole class of entities:**
*Mimozemšťania sú, ale škriatkovia nie sú. Hlupáci boli, sú a budú. Spravodlivosť neexistuje. (Extra-terrestrials exist but dwarfs do not. The dumbs existed, exist and will exist. Justice does not exist.)*
Often there are experiencers whose/which existence is doubtful. It can be beings, places or events of supernatural origin. Experiencer can be in both plural and singular form but when it is abstract word, it is mostly in singular form.
**a2) existence that refers to specific entity**:
*Myslím, teda som. Boh je. Peklo nie je. Veľký tresk sa uskutočnil. Existujú dva druhy iónov − anióny a katióny. (I think, therefore I am. God exists. Hell does not exist. Big Bang occured. There are two groups of ions − anions and kations.)*
Within this group there is always concretized reference to experiencer of existence, not to the whole class. Mostly it is one specific person, place or event so it has singular form. Predicator has plural form only if there are more kinds of experiencer (as in the last example.)
There is a specific subgroup with sentences in which existence associates with occurrence of an attribute of experiencer. Attribute can have the form of subordinate clause or it can be simple concordant or non-concordant attribute. In these sentences there is mostly existence based on real world and within it their validity is closely specified:
*Sú ľudia, ktorým nikdy nevyhovieš. Boli aj nevysvetlené prípady. Existuje aj svet bez závisti. Neexistuje nápoj, ktorý by nevedel namiešať. (There are people who you cannot satisfy. There were also unsolved cases. Also world without an envy exist. There is not a kind of drink that he cannot mix.)*
Semantic structure of such sentences is modified with attribute: **(Exp$_{exi}$ + attribute) − existence**

Verb byť can be often replaced by the verb mať (to have) in this kind of sentences. This replacement is accompanied with change in grammar structure. To the subject position there goes formal construction sentence constituent ty, vy (you) or there is an object as a formal sentence constituent in dative case.
**Formal subject**: *Máš ľudí, s ktorými sa nikdy nedohodneš. Máte prípady, keď sa nedá nič robiť. (You have people with whom you cannot make a deal. You have cases when you are no table to do anything.)*
**Formal object**: *Existujú ti ľudia, s ktorými sa nikdy nedohodneš. Sú vám prípady, keď sa nedá nič robiť. (There exist people (in regard of you) with whom you cannot make a deal. There are cases (in regard of you) when you are no table to do anything.)*

Similar examples occurs when there is non-obligatory dative object in sentences like *Sú **ti** krajiny, kde zjedia nechutné potvory. (There are countries (in regard of you) where they would eat tasteless beast.)* Formally it looks like sentence constituent but it has no semantic function and it is used only to emphasize the content of sentence. We can say that it has a function similar to particula. This non-obligatory object does not occur only within existence sentences but also in other types of elementary sentence structures; for example by expression of state: *Ten **Vám** bol hladný. (He was so (in regard of you) hungry),* or action *Ani **ti** mi nenavarila. (She (in regard of you) did not cook for me.)* In all of such sentences it has only expressive function and this kind of sentence is limited to colloquial style. Considering functional sentence perspective the experiencer is rheme of the sentence and for that reason it is always positioned behind the non-obligator dative object which functions as a theme. According to Slovak word-order rules in neutral sentences theme is always at the beginning of the sentence and rheme follows it.

**b) Existence in relative meaning**. By this meaning we understand an existence that is obligatory related to some circumstance. It can be time, place or aspect. In this sentence existence is always limited and is not valid generally but only partially.
Examples of existence sentences with particular circumstances:
- **Tempus (temp)**: *Jery ešte **v 10. storočí** boli. Prvá svetová vojna zúrila **v rokoch 1914 − 1918**. Ničivý mor sa vyskytol **medzi rokmi 1348 a 1350**. Vojny sú už **odpradávna**. (Jers still existed **in 10th century**. WW1 raged **in 1914-1948**. Terrible plague occurred **between 1348 and 1350**. Wars have existed **since the oldest time**.)*

- **Locus (loc)**: *Život **niekde vo vesmíre** musí existovať. Taký zákon je len **v Číne**. (Life must exist **somewhere in the space**. Such a low exists only **in China**.)*
- **Aspect (asp)**: *Pravda existuje len **v rozprávkach**. Plány jestvujú zatiaľ len **v jeho hlave**. Taká fonéma **v slovenčine** nie je. (The truth exists only **in fairy tales**. The plans exist only **in his head** yet. There is not such a phoneme **in Slovak language**.)*

Validity/non-validity is expressed only in regard of mentioned circumstances in these sentences. J. Nižníková (2001) uses term statuál nositeľ existencie (statual existence experiencer) for **Exp$_{exi}$**. We think that it is not necessary to distinguish processual and statual existence experiencer. I tis always passive, non-processual element that is obligatory related with circumstance in some sentences.
Semantic structure has the form: **Exp$_{exi}$ - existence – tempus/locus/aspect**

Grammar structure has the form: $\mathbf{N_{N/G} - VF - N_D/pre\ N_A\ /ADV_{loc/temp/asp}/prepN}$

The most typical grammar form for **Exp$_{exi}$** is nominative case, but also genitive, as a partitive case, can occur. Partitive genitive is limited to quantitative or negative usage. For his usage in existence sentences stylistically marked negation form niet/nieto is typical:
*Na svete **niet pravdy**. **Niet** iného **východiska**. Ďalšej **šance** už **nieto**. (There is **no truth** in the world. There is **no** other **solution**. There is **no** more **chance**.)*
Genitive case could be replaced by nominative in these sentences:
*Na svete **nie je pravda**. **Nie je** iné **východisko**. Ďalšia **šanca** už **nie je**. (There is **no truth** in the world. There is **no** other **solution**. There is **no** more **chance**.)*
Sentences like **Peter tu už nie je**. *Odišiel domov. (**Peter is not present here**. He went home.)* are not existence sentences. They are sentences of location because they refer to position of entity and not to its existence in ontological meaning.
Specific type of sentences are sentences like: *Nie je **čo** čítať. Je na **čo** sa pozerať. Nebolo **koho** voliť. Niet **komu** veriť. Niet **s kým** chatovať. (There is nothing to read. There was nobody to get our vote. There is nobody to trust. There is nobody to chat.)*
Their particularity is in the fact that existence is related to experiencer that is expressed by a form of personal or relative pronoun (čo, koho, komu, s kým...) The infinitive of the verb expresses the circumstance in regard of which the existence is valid or not.
In some sentences infinitive can be replaced by verbal noun: *Niet nič/ničoho na čítanie. Nie je nikto/nikoho na chatovanie. (There is nothing to read/for reading. There is nobody to chat/for chatting.)*

### 2. Language micro-situation „someone/something arises/vanishes"
In the previous language micro-situation the existence of something/someone was expressed, i. e. pure existence in ontological meaning. In this micro-situation is expressed the fact, that someone or something starts/continues/discontinue the existence. It is important to distinguish between existence meaning and action meaning. In sentences like *Výrobok vznikol v továrni. Pytliaci vybili chránené druhy zvierat.* (The product was made in factory. Jack lighters killed off protected animals.) There is depicted that something started to be and discontinue to be but it was caused by conscious planning – it was an action. In the existence sentences the agent is not present. The first example (Výrobok vznikol v továrni.) is deagentive sentence but in its deep structure agent is present - somebody had to make it. In the second sentence (*Pytliaci vybili chránené druhy zvierat.*) there is an active substance that operates the action. This participant is called agent and is never present in existence sentences.
Predicators that express arising or vanishing of existence have mutational character, i. e. in their meaning shift from one phase of existence into other phase is present. It does not mean that they have processual character. Process needs some active background.
Verbs like *vznikať, narodiť sa, zanikať, zomrieť, stratiť sa, vytrácať sa* etc. *(to arise, to be born, to die, to vanish, to get lost)* serve as predicators in this meaning.
**Examples for arising of existence**: *Ja sa nikdy nenarodilo a nerodí, rodí sa iba telo. Vznikla celá spleť komplikovaných problémov. V ostatnom čase vzplanul záujem o vyhotovovanie rodinných erbov.  Presne v tej chvíli prišiel na svet nový človiečik. Na prelome storočí sa zrodil nový literárny smer – romantizmus. (Ego is never born, only body is born. A net of complicated problems has arisen. In recent time interest in family crests has flamed out. Just in that moment a next little human being was born. At the turn of the century new literary movement arose – romanticism.)*
**Examples for vanishing of existence**: *Mnohé rastlinné a živočíšne druhy sa postupne vytrácajú. Absolútna viera v pozitivizmus sa v tej dobe vytratila. Bohužiaľ, zomrel a už ho niet. Mamuty vyhynuli v období pred 13 000 a 11 500 rokmi – okrem reliktného stavu mamutov srstnatých. Hokejová eufória rýchlo utíchla. (Many kinds of*

*plants and animals die out gradually. The absolute believe in positivism vanished in that times. Unfortunately, he died and he lives never more. Mammoths died out 13 000 − 11 500 years ago − except wooly mammoth. Ice-hockey euphoria calmed down very quickly.)*

Within this micro-situation we distinguish two subtypes. It is similar to previous micro-situation:
a) absolute change,
b) relative change.

a) Absolute change of existence express that there are no surrounding circumstances needed for arising or vanishing of existence: *Neustále vznikajú nové choroby. Čo sa zrodí, musí zaniknúť. Niektoré druhy už vyhynuli, iné sa podarilo zachrániť. Celá násada pstruhov vykapala. Rímska ríša zanikla. (New illnesses arise every day. What was born, must also die. Some kind died out already but some were saved. The whole stock of trout conked out. The Roman Empire vanished.)*
Semantic structure has the form: **$Exp_{exi}$ − change of existence**
Grammar structure has the form: **$N_N$ − VF**

b) Realtive change always needs some obligatory circumstances of place, time or cause. Here are some examples for particular circumstances:
- **time (temp)**: *Svet vznikol **pred dávnymi vekmi**. Postmoderna nastúpila **v druhej polovici 20. storočia**. Slovenský štát vznikol **v roku 1939**. Narodil som sa **v septembri**. (The world begun **billions of years ago**. Postmoderna arose **in 2nd half of 20th century**. The Slovak State came into existence **in 1939**. I was born **in September**.)*
- **place (loc)**: *Jeden náš známy sa narodil **v sanitke**. Naturalizmus vznikol **vo Francúzsku**. (One of our relatives was born **in ambulance car**. Naturalism started i**n France.)***
- **cause (caus)**: *Kultúrne spolky väčšinou zanikajú **pre nedostatok financií**. Africké deti často zomierajú **pre zlú potravu** a **nedostatočnú zdravotnú starostlivosť**. (Cultural organization vanishes **due to lack of money**. African children often die **due to bad nourishment and health care.***
Semantic structure has the form:

$$Exp_{exi} - \text{change of existence} - \text{temp/loc/caus}$$

Grammar structure has the form:

$$N_N - VF - N_D / ADV_{loc/temp/caus} / prepN$$

## Results:

In the table there is a summary of semantic and grammatical specifications of elementary sentence structure existence.

| Expression of existence | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1.** **somebody/something exist/does not exist** | a) absolute meaning | - existence applies to the whole class (*Strašidlá nie sú. Hlupáci boli, sú a budú.*) <br> - existence applies to particular entities (*Boh je. Peklo nie je?*) | **SS: Exp$_{exi}$** – existence <br><br> **GS:** N$_N$ – VF |
| | b) relative meaning | - time (*Jery ešte **v 10. storočí** boli.*) <br> - place (*Taký zákon je len **v Číne**.*) <br> - aspect (*Taká fonéma **v slovenčine** nie je.*) | **SS: Exp$_{exi}$** – existence – temp/loc/asp <br><br> **GS:** N$_N$ – VF –N$_D$/ pre N$_A$ /ADV$_{loc/temp/asp}$ |
| **2.** **somebody/something arises/vanishes** | a) absolute meaning | *Neustále vznikajú nové choroby.* | **SS: Exp$_{exi}$** – existence change <br><br> **GS:** N$_N$ – VF |
| | b) relative meaning | - time (*Slovenský štát vznikol **v roku 1939**.*) <br> - place (*Naturalizmus vznikol **vo Francúzsku**..*) <br> - cause ( *Kultúrne spolky väčšinou zanikajú **pre nedostatok financií**.*) | **SS: Exp$_{exi}$** – existence change– temp/loc/caus <br><br> **GŠ:** N$_N$ – VF –N$_D$/ pre N$_A$ /ADV$_{loc/temp/caus}$ |

## List of abbreviations:

**ADV$_{loc/temp/asp/caus}$** – adverbial of place/time/aspect/cause
**Exp$_{exi}$** – experiencer of existence
**GS** – grammatical structure
**N$_A$** – noun in accusative case
**N$_D$** – noun in dative case
**N$_G$** – noun in genitive case
**N$_N$** – noun in nominative case
**prepN** – any preposition + noun
**pre N$_A$** – preposition pre (for) + noun in accusative case
**SS** – semantic structure
**VF** – verbum finitum

## References

Chafe, W. L. (1970). Meaning and the Structure of Language. Chicago: Chicago Press.

Fillmore, Ch. (1969). Types of Lexical information. In Studies in Syntax and Semantics. Dordrecht: F. Kiefer, (pp.109-137).

Grepl, M. – Karlík, P. (1998). Skladba češtiny. Olomouc: Votobia.

Nižníková, J. (2001). Vetné modely v slovenčine. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita.

Tibenská, E. (1996).Vetné typy s aktívnym subjektom v slovenčine. In  J, Mlacek (Ed.), Studia Academica Slovaca. 25. Bratislava: Stimul – Centrum informatiky a vzdelávania FF UK, (pp.226-238).

Tibenská, E. (1998).Objektový participant sémantickej štruktúry vety. In Slovenská reč. 1998 (pp. 198-209).

Tibenská, E. (2012). Sémantická štruktúra slovenskej vety. Trnava: UCM.