On [STATE] and [CHANGE]

Top of Form

In reference to my discussion on existence the semantic prime [EXIST] including its argument is a state, a semantic prime [STATE]:

1. [STATE (x)]

I will now assume that the (semantic) prime [EXIST] including its argument is a [STATE]. The concept of [STATE] occurs in contrast with [CHANGE]. [CHANGE] is not implied or inferred in a state. I propose here that [CHANGE] is a semantic prime with three arguments. The first argument I call a theme:

1. [CHANGE (x)]

The theme ‘x’ changes from one state to another. The first state I will call a source or initial state and the second a goal or final state.

In DeArmond and Hedberg (2000), we proposed a bi-level analysis for primary arguments. The theme is common to both and is ranked higher. That is the theme is basic to both [STATE] and [CHANGE]. Source and goal and not arguments of [STATE]; hence they are lower in hierarchy. [CHANGE] also implies it will use subscripts here to differentiate the theme from the two end-point arguments of [CHANGE]:

1. [CHANGE (y2, x1, z2)]

I can also write (2) by listing the arguments of [CHANGE] by theta-their roles, which prime objects:

1. [CHANGE ([Source2], [theme1], [goal2)][[1]](#footnote-0)

Actually, I have introduced none of these terms. The arguments exist, but what we them or how represent them is artificial and done for readability. All these arguments are semantic primes.

Activity verbs are examples of [CHANGE]:

1. John is walking around in the park.
2. Mary is out riding her bicycle.

[CHANGE] is essential to all Aksionsarts except STATE.

An interesting proposal is to tie [STATE] and CHANGE together modifying them by a negative operator. That is, [+CHANGE] is a semantic rime (denoting change), and [-CHANGE] is a state as the term is understood as an Aksionsart, then it must be changing somehow. Now I can reduce [CHANGE] and [STATE] to one semantic prime [CHANGE]. [-CHANGE] refers to a state.

One problem arises with the Aksionsart [ACTIVITY]. Change is explicit, but source and goal are implicit:

1. Elton is playing the piano.

The source is phonetically null but there must be one logically; similarly there must a goal.

So far this abstract universal set goes as follows: If ‘x’ does not exist, then a paradox arises. If ‘x’ exists, then it is either in a positive state or a negative state, which means that it is changing. If ‘x’ changes, it changes from a source state to a goal state.

Suppose that something is constantly changing, that it has been doing so eternally, meaning that there is neither a source state nor a goal state. Does this contradict the primary properties (arguments) of [CHANGE]? If we consider the source state to be infinity and the source state to be infinity, then there is no contradiction. I have not introduced the concept of [Eternity] but no conflict should arise once I have done so.

[CHANGE] is essential to the Aksionsarts except [STATE].
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The Bottom of Form

1. I consider ‘patient’ not be an alternative of theme, but as the final state after a change. For example, ‘*What did you do to Kyle?’ ‘I cut his hair’.* Kyle with short hair is the patient, which technically is a goal represent the end point of the change.  [↑](#footnote-ref-0)