

A Est/  
A-31181

Diss. A-4668

H. RÄTSEP

Doksent P. Palmesele  
22. E 74. austusepa  
autorslt

Est. A

ON DEEP SITUATIONS AND SENTENCE PATTERNS

33100

(1) The study of semantics in modern linguistics has recently made progress both in depth and in breadth. At the same time, its point of departure has often consisted of some mere isolated facts drawn from concrete language matter on the basis of which, and for the interpretation of which, attempts have made to create new theoretical conceptions. Due to certain circumstances, the points of view presented in the present article have a somewhat different origin. We have proceeded from the analysis of a rather extensive material on Estonian sentences. Only the gradual development of the analysis has brought us to the conclusions presented here.

Our first aim was to fix the formal patterns of the Estonian simple sentences by proceeding from the verb and verbal government structures as the central elements of the sentence (details: Rätsep, 1969). The gradual generalization and classification of numerous sentence patterns and elements recurring in them inevitably lead us to a more extensive consideration of semantics. A different sentence pattern usually corresponds to each meaning of a polysemic verb, while the opposite is not always obligatory, i.e. a different lexical meaning need not correspond to each sentence pattern. It has sometimes been said that a different structural meaning corresponds to each sentence pattern.

In the final analysis it was revealed that a conclusive description of the material and interpretation of the results is possible only when the so-called deep situations which form the basis for sentence patterns and which also group them are taken into account. Such an approach was conditioned by a reliance upon the extensive material of one specific language and by the directing influence of the ideas and concepts of generative grammar.

(2) Thus, a closer examination of the structure of the Estonian sentence has brought us to the conclusion that besides a purely formal characterization, formal sentence patterns, an essential role is played in the formation of sentences by the meanings of words and by the abstract situations which form the basis for them (and through them the basis for the sentence as a whole).

We understand a situation to be a certain state or action in reality and an idea or generalization of it; certain objects participate in this situation and the situation has certain relevant features.

Natural languages take into account and present information about various kinds of situations.

First of all, the text provides information about the *communicative situation* in which the text is conveyed. The communicative situation is a state which is conditioned by the particular message being transmitted. In Estonian, the essential relations seem to be those which exist between such components of the communicative situation as the source of the message (the person from whom the message originates), the informer (the person conveying the message), the recipient, the object of the message (the person or object spoken about), the location of the informer and the receiver, and also the relations between these components and the agent of the action presented in the message. Certain grammatical forms and lexical elements provide information about these relations.

We have explained elsewhere (Rätsep, 1971) that a certain feature in the communicative situation is characteristic of the so-called obviative mood and intermediary imperative in Estonian. Namely, the fact that the source of the message and the informer are different persons. For example, let us compare sentences (1) and (2) with sentences (3) and (4).

- (1) Ma minevat täna õhtul professori juurde.  
'I am said to be going to the professor tonight'.
- (2) Ma mingu täna õhtul professori juurde.  
'I have been told to go to the professor tonight'.
- (3) Ma lähen täna õhtul professori juurde.  
'I am going to the professor tonight'.
- (4) Mine täna õhtul professori juurde!  
'Go to the professor tonight!'

In the first sentence the verb is in the so-called obviative mood and here the message does not come from the speaker, the informer himself (from me), but from a certain third person, while in the third sentence the speaker (I) is the source of the message. In the second sentence the verb is in the so-called intermediary imperative (by the way, the intermediary imperative is as yet absent from the verb paradigms in Estonian grammar books) and denotes the fact that the order has not come from the informer himself. The source of the order is a third person. In the fourth sentence, the speaker, informer and the source of the order are identical. In general, we may state that in all moods except the obviative and the intermediary imperative the source of the message and the informer are identical in Estonian.

On the basis of such an analysis we have reached the conclusion that it would be reasonable to join the obviative mood and the so-called intermediary imperative of Estonian into one category form – the intermediary manner of communication or indirectal. The indirectal would thus be opposed to the other category form of the manner of communication – the

direct manner of communication or directal – on the basis of the fact that the informer is not identical with the source of the message. All other traditional moods would belong to the directal. The intermediary manner of communication consists of two moods: the indicative (earlier called the obviative mood) and the imperative (the so-called intermediary imperative). The category of the manner of communication is not the only one directly connected with the communicative situation. The differentiation of separate forms of the category of person is also directly connected with the information about the communicative situation.

Concrete sentences often provide information about *concrete action situations*. This is obvious in sentences (5), (6).

- (5) Peeter sõitis eile rongiga Tallinna.  
'Yesterday Peter went to Tallinn by train?'
- (6) See raamat on mul juba olemas.  
'I have got that book already.'

Each language has its own means of expressing situations concretely. In the Estonian language an essential role is played by the pronouns, proper nouns, means for the topicalization of the time and place, etc. while the whole context (linguistic or extralinguistic) surrounding the sentence may also refer to the concrete situation.

If we 'detopicalize' the sentence presenting a concrete action situation, i.e., if we eliminate from the sentence everything that refers to concrete single objects and refer to concepts only, the result is an *abstract action situation* which all languages have means for rendering. For instance, sentences (7) and (8) present abstract action situations.

- (7) Üliõpilased õpivad ülikoolides.  
'Students study at universities.'
- (8) Koer on koduloom.  
'The dog is a domestic animal.'

(3) In the present paper we shall offer one more situation type which, in principle, is also abstract but is considerably more general than the preceding ones. We shall name abstract situations of this type *deep situations*. Deep situations are directly connected with the structure of languages. They form the basis for the meaning of words and sentences and for surface structure sentence patterns.

We shall deal below with deep situations represented by the verb stems only. The only reason for doing this is that we have been studying sentence patterns with a verb as the central element.

When we establish a sentence pattern in Estonian where *elama* 'live' in

the meaning given in sentences (9)–(12) is the central verb

- (9) Kirjanik elas mere ääres.  
'The writer lived by the seaside.'
- (10) Kirjanikke elab pealinnades.  
'Some writers live in capital cities.'
- (11) Diogenes elas vaadis.  
'Diogenes lived in a tub.'
- (12) Eideke elas alumisel korrusel.  
'The old woman lived on the ground floor.'

we get

$\{N + \text{nom.} \sim N + \text{part.}\} V \text{ Loc}$   
 $V = \text{elama } 9, \dots,$

where N – noun, nom. – nominative, part. – partitive, V – verb, Loc – a substitution class referring to the static place where one finds oneself, ~ denotes substitution relations between two elements in the sentence pattern (details: Rätsep, 1969).

When we begin to generalize these concrete sentences, having in mind the sentence pattern and considering 'living' in the meaning that occurs in these sentences to be the central element, we reach a very general situation which can form the basis for all such cases of living. The essential components in such a situation are the dweller who lives somewhere and the residence – the place where somebody lives. Thus, first we obtain the situation LIVING as the basis for *elama* 9, the relevant components of which are DWELLER and RESIDENCE:

LIVING {DWELLER, RESIDENCE}

(capital letters are always used to designate names of situations and components).

But such a generalization is probably not sufficient, since one element of the sentence – the verb – is actually preserved in a less general form. Here again one should proceed in a more general direction. This is indicated already by the sentence pattern, where the members of V (i.e. a certain verb class) comprise not only *elama* 9, but also, e.g. *asuma* 9 (in sentences (12), (13), *elunema* (in sentences (14), (15), *elutsema* (in sentences (16), (17)).

- (12) Perenaine asus eraldi korteris.  
'The landlady lived in a separate flat.'
- (13) Indiaanlased asuvad ürgmetsades.  
'Indians live in primeval forests.'

- (14) Ürginimesed elunesid koobastes.  
'Primitive men lived in caves.'
- (15) Põgenikud elunesid suurte puude all.  
'The fugitives lived under big trees.'
- (16) Theodor elutses osmikus.  
'Theodor lived in a hut.'
- (17) Kunstnik elutses köögis.  
'The artist lived in a kitchen.'

To put it briefly, we must generalize the action and state itself just as we did with the components of the situation. The result is a still more general situation which covers a whole class of situations, which we shall call a deep situation. In the case of the verbs given above, the deep situation is obviously the situation that denotes location in a certain place. Its essential components are the resident, the person who resides somewhere and the place itself – where the person resides. We could represent the deep situation in the following way

LOCATION {RESIDENT, PLACE}.

It seems that it is possible to reach such a deep situation for all verbs. In addition, it is obvious that the number of such deep situations is considerably smaller than the number of the meanings of the verbs. In the following we shall attempt to draw some more general conclusions, taking into consideration what has been said above.

There must be a certain action or state whose generalization is an abstract situation – corresponding to each lexical meaning. Such a deep situation does not exist in an isolated form but is either directly or indirectly connected with various levels of the formation of sentences and, as will be seen later, it plays an important role in the fixation of sentence patterns.

Deep situation itself is a notion of a certain very general action or state and in the present case, it is the central, determining concept. Components of such situations are concepts which in the case of this deep situation are essential, relevant, and whose peculiarity is determined by their function in the situation (action, state).

As the components of deep situation are general notions, they should be considered to be classes of notions which may have many members. The residents may be quite different, but they are all joined into one class by the fact that in the given deep situation they play the role of the person residing somewhere. The same applies to the members of the class of residence.

It follows from the above comments that a given deep situation need not

be the basis for one word, it usually forms the basis for a whole group of words, since we have to do with a generalized action or state.

Deep situation itself does not become evident in the same way as all the words for which it forms the basis. It seems that all situation components need not be expressed and in some cases cannot be expressed in a concrete sentence. In this sense, deep situation is more complete than the sentence. What is expressed in a sentence and what is not is determined by the rules of the sentence patterns of the respective language and the will of the speaker.

For example, let us try to find deep situations for the verbs *andma 19* 'give' and *ulatama 2* 'pass, hand', which occur in sentences (18)–(21),

- (18) Poiss andis õpetajale raamatu lugeda.  
'The boy gave the teacher a book to read.'
- (19) Vaba käega andis külaline arve ametniku kätte.  
'With his free hand the guest gave the bill to the clerk.'
- (20) Poiss ulatas õpetajale oma raamatu.  
'The boy handed his book to the teacher.'
- (21) Mees ulatas kepi üle plangu sõbrale.  
'The man handed the stick over the fence to his friend.'

In the case of sentences (18), (19) the deep situation seems to be

GIVING {GIVER, RECEIVER, OBJECT OF GIVING,  
INSTRUMENT, PLACE, POINT OF  
DEPARTURE, DESTINATION, HINDRANCE,  
AIM},

where GIVER is the person who gives; RECEIVER – the person who in the course of giving gets something from the GIVER; OBJECT OF GIVING – what the GIVER gives to the RECEIVER; INSTRUMENT – part of the body or an instrument by means of which the GIVER gives the OBJECT OF GIVING to the RECEIVER; PLACE – the place where both the GIVER and RECEIVER are located; POINT OF DEPARTURE – the place where the GIVER or/and the OBJECT OF GIVING are situated; DESTINATION – the place where the RECEIVER is located; HINDRANCE – the hindrance, over or through which the giving takes place; AIM – a secondary action or state in the name of which GIVING takes place.

As we can see, not all situation components are expressed in sentences (18) and (19), but they may be expressed there in certain combinations and

forms – according to the will of the speaker. The form is determined by the sentence pattern, not the deep situation.

When we carry out the same procedure of generalization on the verb *ulatama 2*, the preliminary situation is as follows

HANDING{HANDER-OVER, RECEIVER, OBJECT OF  
HANDING, INSTRUMENT, PLACE, POINT  
OF DEPARTURE, DESTINATION,  
HINDRANCE, AIM}

Since the grade of generalization of such a situation is too low, we must find a more general counterpart to it. It seems that the deep situation of GIVING is best suited for the purpose. Thus, we may substitute the more general GIVING for the detailed and more concrete HANDING.

Variations may occur in a deep situation. Situation variants differ as regards which situation components are essential in the case of a certain concrete action and which are not. A direct result of this is a variation in the meaning of the corresponding word. In the case of *andma 19* and *ulatama 2*, the main difference lies in the fact that in the latter case the difference in the location of GIVER and RECEIVER is essential. This is referred to by the components POINT OF DEPARTURE AND DESTINATION, while in the case of *andma 19*, RECEIVER and his location (DESTINATION) are more essential – the action is directed at them.

The most complete variant of a deep situation is regarded as the main variant of this deep situation, and by proceeding from it we can describe the differences between other variants.

The representation of the deep situation in surface structure takes place according to the rules of the given language. By virtue of these rules, some components may under certain conditions never be realized, others must always be realized, while some of the components may coincide in a certain surface structure element.

The comparison of the deep situations thus obtained and the division of them into groups on the basis of similar features in them, perhaps even some kind of fixation of archesituations, seems to constitute a different problem.

Quite obviously, no similarity can be detected between the deep situations LOCATION and GIVING presented above. A certain similarity may well be observed between the deep situations GIVING, CARRYING and INFORMATION. Let us compare the components of these situations.

GIVING {GIVER, RECEIVER, OBJECT OF GIVING,  
INSTRUMENT, PLACE, POINT OF

DEPARTURE, DESTINATION, HINDRANCE,  
AIM}  
INFORMATION {INFORMER, RECEIVER, TEXT,  
OBJECT OF INFORMATION,  
INSTRUMENT, CODE, PLACE, POINT  
OF DEPARTURE, DESTINATION,  
HINDRANCE}  
CARRYING {CARRIER, RECEIVER, OBJECT OF  
CARRYING, INSTRUMENT, PLACE, POINT  
OF DEPARTURE, DESTINATION, WAY,  
AIM}

The deep situation of GIVING has been explained above.

In the deep situation INFORMATION, information is conveyed from INFORMER to RECEIVER, whereas TEXT is the material rendered and OBJECT OF INFORMATION is what (whom) the information is about. INSTRUMENT may be either a technical instrument or, for example, the human voice, CODE is a certain system of signs. PLACE denotes the area where INFORMER and RECEIVER are located, POINT OF DEPARTURE is the area of the location of INFORMER and DESTINATION is the area of the location of RECEIVER. HINDRANCE is an obstacle in the way of the transmission of the message.

The information situation forms the basis for verbs of saying. Details from the point of view of situation analysis are given in Rätsep (1973), where 'action situation' is still used instead of 'deep situation'.

In the case of CARRYING, an object – OBJECT OF CARRYING is carried (taken) from one place (POINT OF DEPARTURE) to another (DESTINATION) to somebody (RECEIVER) by CARRIER, while it is essential for CARRIER or/and INSTRUMENT to move together with OBJECT OF CARRYING. Therefore, POINT OF DEPARTURE is here the original location of OBJECT OF CARRYING, CARRIER and INSTRUMENT, while DESTINATION is their final place of location. INSTRUMENT is usually a vehicle. WAY is a way or area along which the carrying takes place. AIM is a secondary action or state for the sake of which CARRYING is performed and in which OBJECT OF CARRYING participates after the carrying.

The deep situation CARRYING is the basis for the verbs of the type *viima, tooma, vedama*, as in sentences (22)–(24).

- (22) Ma viisin haigele haiglasse apelsine.  
'I took some oranges to a patient in the hospital.'
- (23) Ma toon sulle apelsine.

'I shall bring some oranges to you.'

- (24) Jaan vedas vilja kuivatisse kuivama.  
'John transported the grain to the drying-room (to dry).'

If we compare the deep situations of GIVING, INFORMATION and CARRYING, we can see that they have rather much in common. In all of them there is an object (be it an object, person or information) whose location is changed, while in all three cases the change is connected with two persons and an instrument (a vehicle) which directly changes the location of the object. Nothing new is created in this action (no new object or quality), only the location changes (sometimes the owner together with it, too). We could create a still more generalized archesituation for these deep situations. TRANSFERING would cover GIVING, CARRYING and INFORMATION, and in addition several other deep situations such as, for example, TAKING.

This archesituation together with its components could be represented in the following way.

TRANSFERING {TRANSFERER, RECEIVER, OBJECT  
OF TRANSFERING, INSTRUMENT,  
LOCATION, POINT OF DEPARTURE,  
DESTINATION}

where TRANSFERER is the person who transfers OBJECT OF TRANSFERING from POINT OF DEPARTURE to DESTINATION to RECEIVER by means of an INSTRUMENT (part of the body, vehicle, etc.). PLACE is the area in the limits of which the transfer occurs.

Such an archesituation of TRANSFERING is easily comparable with the situation of LOCATION if we generalize the latter deep situation into an archesituation covering several other deep situations as, for instance, SITTING, STANDING, etc.

It turns out that not all components of deep situations belong to the components of the archesituation. Components of a deep situation fall into general components that are also present in the archesituation and specific components which are characteristic (only or first and foremost) of this deep situation and are absent from the archesituation.

The situation MOVING will be presented as the third local archesituation.

MOVING {MOVER, POINT OF DEPARTURE,  
DESTINATION, PLACE, INSTRUMENT}

where MOVER is the person who moves from POINT OF DEPARTURE to DESTINATION by means of the INSTRUMENT or without it, PLACE is the area in the limits of which the moving happens.

All verbs of motion belong to this archesituation, e.g. *minema* 'go', *lendama* 'fly', *ujuma* 'swim', *kukkuma* 'fall', *tõusma* 'rise', *veerema* 'roll', etc.

It seems to be reasonable to suggest that the final establishment of archesituations is possible only through an analysis of large amounts of language material.

On the other hand, we cannot leave unmentioned, even in the case of the archesituations under treatment, that certain relations in language and speech originate in archesituations or deep situations.

Several relations of dependence between the words in the sentence may thus be traced back to the relations between the components of the deep situation and the concept of situation itself. For instance, the dependence on the verb *ulatama* in the sentence *Poiss ulatas õpetajale raamatu* 'The boy handed a book to the teacher' certainly represents certain relations occurring in the deep situation.

Naturally, this does not apply to all relations of dependence in the sentence. Each word in the sentence has its own deep situation with its own situation components. Thus, each lexical word in the sentence may represent both the situation component and the concept of situation. In each simple sentence one notion of situation is central while others are subjected to it. For example, in sentence (25)

- (25) *Õpetajale raamatut ulatav poiss seisis akna juures.*  
'The boy who was handing a book to the teacher was standing at the window.'

the words *ulatav* and *poiss* play a certain role in the representation of the components of two deep situations simultaneously. *Poiss* is the expression of TRANSFERER of the deep situation TRANSFERING and that of RESIDENT of the deep situation LOCATION in surface structure. *Ulatav* is at the same time the representation of the situation notion TRANSFERING and of a certain component of the situation BOY in the sentence.

From the above deep situations it should be clear that causality originates in the corresponding deep situations. Several other deep situation pairs similar to MOVING and TRANSFERING could be presented here, e.g. ORIGINATION and CREATION, CHANGE (intrans.) and CHANGE (trans.).

(4) What is the relationship between the meaning of the verb and the deep situation? Obviously the level on which the meanings of words are formed, is higher than the deep situation level, i.e., it is somewhat closer to surface structure.

In surface structure the deep situation is realized as a sentence, word combination or a separate word. Therefore, the expression of the central

notion of the deep situation on the level of word meaning and higher may be rather different in different cases.

Depending on the language, the components of the deep situation may be expressed in separate words which are dependent on the central word of the sentence. In such a case the meaning of the central word of the sentence or word combination is general and closest to the notion of deep situation.

But some of the components of the deep situation may also be represented in the word representing the notion of deep situation as one element of the meaning of the word. At the same time, this component of the deep situation is often made concrete, i.e., the component is not represented as a general notion but as a certain member of the notion class. We shall offer one example. How is the deep situation

COVERING {COVERER, OBJECT OF COVERING,  
MATERIAL FOR COVERING, INSTRUMENT  
FOR COVERING, PLACE OF COVERER,  
PLACE TO BE COVERED ON OBJECT OF  
COVERING}

realized in Estonian?

The realizations of this deep situation on the level of word meaning are numerous, depending on which notions from among the situation components (as members of the notion classes) are chosen and on the way in which the latter are realized in the semantics of the words.

When we realize the deep situation notion COVERING in the meaning of the word *katma* we evidently encounter a situation where the central word of the sentence renders only the deep situation notion, while the components of the deep situation notion are expressed in the sentences in separate words depending on that central word. For example, in sentence (26)

- (26) *Ema kattis laua laudlinaga.*  
'Mother covered the table with a table-cloth.'

*ema* 'mother' represents COVERER, *kattis* 'covered' COVERING, *laua* 'the table' OBJECT OF COVERING and *laudlinaga* 'with a table-cloth' MATERIAL FOR COVERING. In sentences (27) and (28)

- (27) *Meister kattis kastikese väljastpoolt kullaga.*  
'The craftsman coated the outer side of the box with gold.'
- (28) *Meister kattis kastikese töökojas kullaga.*  
'The craftsman coated the box with gold in the workshop.'

*meister* 'the craftsman' represents COVERER, *kattis* 'coated' COVERING, *kastikese* 'the box' OBJECT OF COVERING, *kullaga* 'with gold' MATERIAL FOR COVERING; in sentence (27) *väljastpoolt* 'from the outside' PLACE TO BE COVERED ON OBJECT OF COVERING and in sentence (28) *töökojas* 'in the workshop' PLACE OF COVERER. In sentences

- (29) Pintsel kattis puupinna värviga.  
'The paint-brush coated the wood surface with paint.'
- (30) Ema käed katsid lapse tekiga.  
'Mother's hands covered the child with a blanket.'

*pintsel* 'the paint-brush' and *käed* 'hands' represent INSTRUMENT FOR COVERING.

The Estonian language allows (in some cases) certain deep situation components to be realized in a concrete form (i.e., not general notions but some of their concrete members) in the word which also represents the situation notion. Let us compare, for example, sentences (31)–(33) with the ones above

- (31) Meister kuldab kastikese väljastpoolt.  
'The craftsman gilded the outer side of the box.'
- (32) Meister kuldab kastikese töökojas.  
'The craftsman gilded the box in the workshop.'
- (33) Pintsel värvis puupinna.  
'The paint-brush painted the wood surface.'

In the latter cases certain concrete representatives of the situation component MATERIAL FOR COVERING (GOLD, PAINT) have been added to the meaning which represents the deep situation notion itself, and the result is that we get the quite new word meanings 'to gild', 'to paint'. Certain derivation processes in the construction of the form of words also represent such a semantical operation.

In the case of Estonian the same procedure may be performed on some members of the situation component INSTRUMENT FOR COVERING. For example, in sentence (34)

- (34) Meister pintseldas pinna värviga.  
'The craftsman brushed the surface with paint.'

the concrete member of the situation component INSTRUMENT FOR COVERING – PAINT-BRUSH (PINTSEL) – has been added to the meaning representing the situation COVERING. The result is a new meaning 'pintseldama – to brush.'

Still, it should be emphasized that the expression of the situation component in the form of an element of the meaning of the central word need not be revealed in the form of the word; it need not be clear that the word is a derivative. This is already a question of the composition of the vocabulary of the language concerned.

It is in these possibilities for realizing situation components where the peculiarities of a given language become evident, and this phenomenon can be described rather concretely. We merely have to ascertain for which situation components and in which range such an addition of meanings is possible.

The above examples refer to the fact that the meaning of the word presupposes the existence of a deep situation. The meaning of the word may consist of elements, one of which corresponds to the general notion of situation, while others correspond to the situation components.

Depending on the language, components of the deep situation may be represented in surface structure as separate words alongside with the word representing the situation notion. In this case the meaning of the latter (word) is of a general character and closest to the notion of deep situation. If a situation component is expressed in the same word together with the central notion, the meaning of such a word is considerably more special and detailed, since the added component does not usually represent only a class of notions, but a single notion as well. On the other hand, the more complicated the meaning of the word as regards its composition, the more independent such a word is in the sentence, and the clearer the meaning of the word even when taken separately. If the central word expresses the notion of deep situation only, its meaning is usually vague and becomes clear only in the sentence, where situation components are also represented. Such a word is often polysemic, i.e., its basis may be formed by several deep situations. They can be differentiated only on the basis of a concrete sentence, since it is there that situation components become evident. For example, the meaning of such Estonian verbs as *saama*, 'get, become, receive', *pidama* 'be forced to, keep', *andma* 'give', etc. is not clear outside the sentence. Their meaning becomes evident only in the sentence, where the deep situation (their basis) is clear.

(5) Two factors play an important role in the manifestation of deep situations in surface structure: the will of the speaker and the structure of the language.

First of all, the chosen semantic deep situations are represented on the level of word stems, word meanings are formed, and the question of which lexical units will express this or that component of the deep situation is decided. Only here does it become clear when the expressions of situation



components in surface structure are optional and when they are obligatory. The occurrence of optional elements is determined by the will of the speaker.

The formation of words is accompanied by the appearance of the characteristic features of the part of speech, as the differences concerning parts of speech do not become evident in deep situations – they are phenomena which lie closer to the surface. Actually, even the basis of nouns is formed by deep situations which denote certain general actions or states. Whether the central notion in the language is expressed by the noun or the verb, depends on the will of the speaker, on the one hand, and on the structure of the respective language, on the other. Thus, in the Estonian language the deep situation LOCATION presented above is the basis for both the sentence *Kirjanik peatub hotellis* 'The writer stays in the hotel' and such word combinations as *kirjaniku peatumine hotellis* 'the writer's stay in the hotel', *hotellis peatuv kirjanik* 'the writer staying in the hotel', *hotellis peatuja* 'the stayer in the hotel', *peatus hotellis* 'the stay in the hotel', etc. Derivation is also directly connected with the formation of the meanings of words and the appearance of the characteristic features of the parts of speech.

In the sentence, each lexical word is an expression of the central notion of a certain deep situation. Still, in the Estonian simple sentence all other elements are subjected to the centre of the sentence – the verb. Only after the formal accumulation of the elements of the sentence around the centre of the sentence, the verb, do the lexical units acquire the syntactic relations and functions of sentence parts. Lexical units are joined into word combinations according to the thought to be expressed and the structure of the language. Now the concrete language elements acquire a definite grammatical form according to the sentence pattern characteristic of the central verb and the word combination patterns. Context also has a considerable influence, as do the context rules valid for the given language. These rules may allow the omission of some elements, etc.

Let us take a concrete example. Let us observe the formation of the sentence *Juhataja tühjendas laeka paberitest* 'The director emptied the drawer of papers' in Estonian. In this sentence the central word is the verb *tühjendama* 'empty' and its basis may be suggested as the deep situation

CHANGING (transitive) {CHANGER, OBJECT OF  
CHANGING, RESULT, INSTRUMENT,  
PLACE}

where CHANGER is the person who changes, OBJECT OF CHANGING is what is being changed, RESULT – what or like what the OBJECT OF CHANGING is changed to, INSTRUMENT – by means of what CHANGER changes and PLACE – the place where the CHANGER,

INSTRUMENT and OBJECT OF CHANGING are located during the process of changing.

In the course of the concrete expression of this deep situation in Estonian one concrete member TÜHI (EMPTY) of the component RESULT is added to the expression of the central notion CHANGING of the situation and the word meaning 'tühjendama – to empty' is the result. Such an operation is possible in the semantics of the Estonian language. The rules of the Estonian language also allow such a combination to be rendered by a definite formal derivative. But in Estonian there is another possibility: the central notion of the deep situation acquires a general meaning 'muutma – change' and the concrete meaning of the component RESULT is 'tühi – empty'. It is also a rule in Estonian that the real carrier of the meaning 'muutma – change' in such a connection cannot be the verb *muutma* but the verb *tegema* 'do'. So the synonym of the sentence presented above is *Juhataja tegi laeka paberitest tühjaks* 'The director made the chest empty of papers'. Let us now return to the first variant. The equivalent of the meaning 'tühjendama – to empty' in the form of the central word of the sentence is the verb *tühjendama*. Other components of the deep situation are represented on the word level as follows: CHANGER – *juhataja* 'director', OBJECT OF CHANGING – *laegas* 'drawer'. The components INSTRUMENT and LOCATION are not represented in the given sentence due to the wish of the author of the sentence and not because of language rules.

Which component is represented by the word *paberitest* 'of papers' in the sentence? Here we come across quite a characteristic phenomenon in Estonian. The word *paberitest* in this sentence actually represents the component of the deep situation which is the basis for the meaning 'tühi – empty'. We could provisionally consider the word to be the expression of the component ABSENTEE. This becomes quite clear from the fact that the same *paberitest* is also the representative of the component ABSENTEE in the word combination *paberitest tühi* 'empty as to papers' where the central word is *tühi* and it represents an independent deep situation. In the sentence under observation the meaning 'tühi – empty' is included in the meaning 'tühjendama – to empty'. This meaning 'tühi – empty' requires that the component of its basis situation be expressed by the noun in the relative case, this time as a secondary part of the sentence belonging to the verb. Thus, different elements of the meaning of the verb may require different secondary parts of the sentence to the verb, whereas the syntactic subordination relations are determined by the verb as a whole.

Let us now turn to the form of the above sentence. The verb *tühjendama*, the basis of whose meaning is the deep situation CHANGE (we denote it



as *tühjendama I*) presupposes the following sentence pattern:

$N^1 + \text{nom. V } N^2 + \text{ngp. } (N^3 + \text{el.}) (N^4 + \text{kom.}) (\text{Loc})$   
 $N^4 + \text{nom. V } + 3.\text{p. } N^2 + \text{ngp. } (N^3 + \text{el.}) (\text{Loc}),$

where  $N^1 + \text{nom.}$  is a noun in the nominative which represents CHANGER, V – the verb *tühjendama I* in a certain finite form, V + 3.p. – *tühjendama I* in the 3rd person only,  $N^2 + \text{ngp.}$  – a noun in the nominative, genitive or partitive (depending on other factors) which represents OBJECT OF CHANGING,  $N^3 + \text{el.}$  – a noun in the elative representing ABSENTEE,  $N^4 + \text{kom.}$  – a noun in the comitative and  $N^4 + \text{nom.}$  – the same noun in the nominative; they both represent INSTRUMENT while  $N^4 + \text{nom.}$  is the subject of the sentence; Loc is a substitution class referring to the place of location (that has been mentioned above) and representing PLACE. Elements in brackets are optional. Taking the previous example for our basis, we get the following examples of main variants:

- (35) Juhataja tühjendas laeka. ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V } N^2 + \text{ngp.}$ )  
 'The director emptied the chest.'
- (36) Juhataja tühjendas laeka paberitest.  
 ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V } N^2 + \text{ngp. } N^3 + \text{el.}$ )  
 'The director emptied the chest (as to papers).'
- (37) Juhataja tühjendas laeka oma käega.  
 ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V } N^2 + \text{ngp. } N^4 + \text{kom.}$ )  
 'The director emptied the chest with his own hand.'
- (38) Juhataja tühjendas laeka kabinetis.  
 ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V } N^2 + \text{ngp. Loc}$ )  
 'The director emptied the chest in (his) study.'
- (39) Juhataja tühjendas laeka paberitest oma käega.  
 ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V } N^2 + \text{ngp. } N^3 + \text{el. } N^4 + \text{kom.}$ )  
 'The director emptied the chest (as to papers) with his own hand.'
- (40) Juhataja tühjendas laeka kabinetis oma käega.  
 ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V } N^2 + \text{ngp. Loc } N^4 + \text{kom.}$ )  
 'The director emptied the chest in his study with his own hand.'
- (41) Juhataja tühjendas kabinetis laeka paberitest.  
 ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V Loc } N^2 + \text{ngp. } N^3 + \text{el.}$ )  
 'The director emptied the chest (as to papers) in his study.'
- (42) Juhataja tühjendas kabinetis laeka paberitest oma käega.  
 ( $N^1 + \text{nom. V Loc } N^2 + \text{ngp. } N^3 + \text{el. } N^4 + \text{kom.}$ )

'The director emptied the chest (as to papers) in his study with his own hand.'

- (43) Käsi tühjendas laeka.  
 ( $N^4 + \text{nom. V } + 3.\text{p. } N^2 + \text{ngp.}$ )  
 'A hand emptied the chest.'
- (44) Käsi tühjendas laeka paberitest.  
 ( $N^4 + \text{nom. V } + 3.\text{p. } N^2 + \text{ngp. } N^3 + \text{el.}$ )  
 'A hand emptied the chest (as to papers).'
- (45) Käsi tühjendas kabinetis laeka.  
 ( $N^4 + \text{nom. V } + 3.\text{p. Loc } N^2 + \text{ngp.}$ )  
 'A hand emptied the chest in the study.'
- (46) Käsi tühjendas kabinetis laeka paberitest.  
 ( $N^4 + \text{nom. V } + 3.\text{p. Loc } N^2 + \text{ngp. } N^3 + \text{el.}$ )  
 'A hand emptied the chest (as to papers) in the study.'

The word order (which is free in Estonian to a certain extent) has not been taken into account in the present sentence pattern. To a certain extent, the word order rules rely on just such sentence patterns. Sentence patterns of this type (with the verb as the central element) establish only the form of sentence elements whose form is directly determined by the meaning of the verb and the deep situation that forms its basis.

Such a sentence pattern may be characteristic of one or several verbs. These verbs may, but need not be, close in meaning. For instance, the sentence pattern of *tühjendama I* is also characteristic of the verbs *desinfitseerima* 'to disinfect', *vabastama 4* 'to free', *vallandama 3* 'to dismiss'. The reason for heterogeneity usually lies in the fact that components of the deep situation are sometimes expressed in the meaning of the central verb. Thus the sentence patterns of the verb do not reflect only deep situations but also the later stages of the formation of the meaning of the verb.

Thus, deep situations are a certain general basis for the formation of sentences. To what extent the function of one or other situation component determines the grammatical form of the word corresponding to it in the sentence is a question that needs to be studied further on the basis of extensive material. Certain more detailed relations seem to exist.

Such a situation analysis is rather close to the views presented in the so-called case grammar theory (Fillmore, 1968, 1969). The difference is that deep structures are not considered as relations between logical predicates and arguments, but as so-called deep situations, i.e., abstract actions and states generalized from concrete situations. Situation components therefore are much more detailed units than Fillmore's arguments and their cases.

They are notion classes fixed on the basis of a certain function in the given deep situation. Different deep situations comprise different components. Natural languages are more complicated than logical systems. The predicate, two or three arguments and some ten cases are not sufficient for their description.

*Tartu University*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Fillmore, Ch. J.: 1968, 'The Case for Case', in *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, New York.  
Fillmore, Ch. J.: 1969, 'Types of Lexical Information', in *Studies in Syntax and Semantics. Foundations of Language Supplementary Series 10*, Dordrecht.  
Rätsep, H.: 1969, 'On the Form of Government Structure Types of Estonian Simple Verbs', *Annual Meeting of the Research Group for Generative Grammar*, Tartu.  
Rätsep, H.: 1971, 'Kas kaudne kõneviis on kõneviis? Verbivormide situatsioonanalüüsi', *Keel ja Struktuur 5*, Tartu.  
Rätsep, H.: 1973, 'Government Structure Types of the Verbs of Saying and Action Situations', in *Generative Grammar in Europe* (ed. by F. Kiefer and N. Ruwet), Reidel, Dordrecht-Holland.

\* Diss.  
A - 4668

