

## SYNTAX

### **Mario Brdar**

*School of English Studies, Faculty of Philosophy, Josip Jural Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia*

### **Rita Brdar-Szabó**

*School of Germanic Studies, Faculty of Philosophy, Loránd Eötvös University of Budapest, Hungary*

**Keywords:** grammar, morphology, constituency, immediate constituents, dependency, valency, embedding, recursiveness, subordination, coordination, word order, phrases, endocentric phrases, exocentric phrases, heads, complements, modifiers, X-bar syntax, clause, sentence, grammatical relations, semantic roles, subject, object, predicate, predicator, predicate-argument structure

### **Contents**

1. Introduction
  2. Basic syntactic concepts
    - 2.1. Organizational principles of grammatical structure
    - 2.2. Constituency
    - 2.3. Dependency
    - 2.4. Embedding and recursiveness
    - 2.5. Subordination and coordination
    - 2.6. Word order
  3. Syntactic units
    - 3.1. Phrases
    - 3.2. Clauses and sentences
- Glossary  
Bibliography  
Biographical Sketches

### **Summary**

As a traditional linguistic term, the label syntax is generally used to refer to the study of the ways in which words may be combined to form larger grammatical units, i.e. phrases, and sentences, simple or complex ones. Syntax is usually opposed to morphology, which deals with the structure of words, i.e. with inflection and derivation of words. The word syntax itself comes from Greek, where it literally meant ‘putting together.’ Informally, we could say that syntax is about the togetherness of grammatical units or constructions of various types. Two fundamental questions seem to follow from such an understanding of syntax: 1. How do grammatical units hang together, or put more specifically, what grammatical phenomena (syntactic arrangements, operations, mechanisms, or organizational principles in general) hold these grammatical units together? 2. What are the grammatical units held together by these operations or mechanisms? Part 2 identifies the basic grammatical mechanisms keeping grammatical units together, constituency and dependency. Part 3 is concerned with syntactic units of vari-

ous types and how they embody basic principles of syntactic organization and function within larger wholes.

## 1. Introduction

As a traditional linguistic term, the label syntax is generally used to refer to the study of the ways in which words may be combined to form larger grammatical units, i.e. phrases, and sentences, simple or complex ones. Within grammar as a more general traditional area of study in linguistics, syntax is usually opposed to morphology, which deals with the structure of words, i.e. with inflection and derivation of words.

The word syntax itself comes from Greek, where it literally meant ‘putting together.’ Informally, we could say that syntax is about the togetherness of grammatical units or constructions of various types. Two fundamental questions seem to follow from such an understanding of syntax:

- How do grammatical units hang together, or put more specifically, what grammatical phenomena (syntactic arrangements, operations, mechanisms, or organizational principles in general) hold these grammatical units together?
- What are the grammatical units held together by these operations or mechanisms?

These two questions account for the basic structure of the present article. In Part 2, we identify the basic grammatical mechanisms keeping grammatical units together, which can be more or less conspicuous or central at other levels of linguistic organization as well, and focus on their syntactic aspects. It must be pointed out that more or less the same basic syntactic arrangements (as well as most concepts, terms and procedures used in syntactic descriptions) are found not only in all areas of syntax independently of the size of syntactic units, but also in other areas of study, e.g. in morphology. Simplifying things to a degree, we may concur with Bolinger (1968: 136) when he suggests that the first rule of syntax is that what belongs together will stay together. In other words, it is possible to identify certain chunks in utterances that form grammatical units or constituents that are parts of larger wholes, while they themselves may be internally complex and in turn contain some constituents in the above sense. Typically, the elements that enter a construction, i.e. form a constituent will tend to be adjacent to each other. However, they are recognized as entering a construction not only because they are adjacent to each other (note that constructions can be discontinuous as well) but also because there are certain types of functional and more or less visible formal relations holding between elements. It will be claimed that formal relations holding between elements (visible or invisible), such as constituency, word order, agreement, etc. are derivatives of functional dependency relations as one of the most important form of the instantiation of syntagmatic relations. However, the other fundamental axis in the organization of human languages, the paradigmatic one, is no less important. Syntactic structures can be expanded by embedding them into other syntactic structures of the same or some other type, resulting in subordination, or by juxtaposition, resulting in coordination. Both subordination and coordination are recursive operations, i.e. they can be in principle repeated any number of times.

In Part 3, we take a look at syntactic units of various types and study how they embody

basic principles of syntactic organization and how they function within larger wholes. The units in question may be phrases or clauses and sentences. It is customary to distinguish between two branches of syntax, according to the size of syntactic units they focus on—phrasal syntax, on the one hand, and clausal syntax, on the other, the latter also dealing with complex and compound sentences.

## 2. Basic syntactic concepts

### 2.1. Organizational principles of grammatical structure

Grammatical structure, and therefore structure in syntax as well, is not just the product of linguistic analysis—it exhibits undisputable signs of cognitive and observational reality. According to Givón (1995: 177), the best proof that grammar has observable reality is the fact that the speaker/listener is able to segment the apparently continuous stream of speech. In doing so the speaker/listener relies on four basic types of signals that are accessible to him or her:

- a. linear order
- b. nested hierarchical structure
- c. grammatical morphology
- d. rhythmic: intonation and pauses

It will be seen that out of these four signals proposed by Givón only the first and the last one are immediately accessible. Linear order is a fairly good indicator of syntactic structure, provided we can determine the nature of linearly ordered units. It is demonstrated in 2.2 that words as intuitively most plausible linguistic units are not necessarily the only, or the best units in terms of which syntactic structures should be described, and this also applies to linear order (although grammarians commonly talk about word order). It appears that linear order is an epiphenomenon of a more abstract grammatical structure, i.e. it is a reflex of it and can be sensibly talked about only once that abstract organization is discovered.

Grammatical morphology must be abstracted away on the basis of recurrent regularities concerning the linear order that appear to obtain within a reliable sample of actual language usage events. The formal exponents of grammatical morphology are easier to identify than their functions. This also applies to free grammatical morphemes, such as prepositions, articles, etc., which can also be subsumed under grammatical morphology. But again, grammatical morphology is just a way of signalling structure and does not produce structure in its own right. Just like linear order, it is also an epiphenomenon of a more abstract grammatical structure. Free and bound grammatical morphemes, i.e. function words and inflections, will be discussed here only insofar as their functions are concerned.

It is also obvious that what has been said above about linear order and grammatical morphology also applies to prosodic phenomena. Although it is immediately observable, it is clear that intonation and pauses are a consequence of syntactic structure and not its source. Pauses indicate syntactic boundaries but do not create them. Intonation, on the other hand, signals discourse functions of syntactic units but the latter exist independ-

ently of particular intonation and discourse function.

The second type of Givón's signal, what he calls nested hierarchical structure, is closely "confounded" with other more immediately observable types of signals—and again cannot be observed directly. It can only be inferred a posteriori on the basis of the observed behaviour of serially-ordered adjacent segments, i.e. thanks to the fact that these segments can be observed, again within a reliable sample of actual usage events, to appear adjacent to each other.

The fact that we appear to have a whole utterance on the one hand, and recurrent chunks of segments that hang together on the other, already bears testimony to the existence of hierarchical structure—the relationship between the whole on the one hand and what appears to function as parts on the other can only be hierarchical, such that the whole is hierarchically dominant. Such wholes in syntax (and elsewhere in grammar) are called constructions, and their parts are said to enter into a construction.

-  
-  
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE 58 PAGES OF THIS CHAPTER,  
Visit: <http://www.eolss.net/Eolss-sampleAllChapter.aspx>

### Bibliography

Abney, S. (1987). *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect*. PhD, MIT, Cambridge, Mass. [This dissertation is a defense of the hypothesis that the noun phrase is headed by a functional element, i.e. non-lexical category, identified with the determiner]

Anderson, S.R. (1988). Objects (direct and not-so-direct) in English and elsewhere. *On Language: Rhetorica, Phonologica, Syntactica: A Festschrift for Robert Stockwell from His Friends and Colleagues* (eds. C. Duncan-Rose, T. Vennemann), 287-314. London & New York: Routledge. [This paper is a review of research on object as a grammatical relation, pointing out inadequacies and inconsistencies in both traditional and recent literature.]

Bolinger, D. (1968). *Aspects of Language*. New York – Chicago – San Francisco – Atlanta: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. [This is a comprehensive introduction to the study of language from a functionalist and descriptive point of view.]

Borg, A.J., B. Comrie (1984). Object diffuseness in Maltese. *Objects: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations* (ed. F. Plank), 109-126. London: Academic Press. [The paper applies a Keenan-type procedure account of object relations in Maltese, showing that the notion of diffuseness of a grammatical relation is equally applicable to direct objects.]

Brown, E.K., J.E. Miller (1980). *Syntax: A Linguistic Introduction to Sentence Structure*. London: Hutchinson. [This is an invaluable comprehensive introduction to syntactic argumentation, complete with a set of exercises.]

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press. [This volume is primarily an attempt to review and extend developments in the early stages of the transformational-generative grammar, proposing substantial reformulations]

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris. [This book is a proposal

of a modular theory of grammar positing several distinct modules, each with its own laws, that interact according to general principles of the grammar.]

Comrie, B. (1981). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. [This book combines the form of an introduction to current studies of language universals and typology on the one hand and theoretical description and systematization of the current state of research in this domain on the other.]

Corbett (1999). Agreement. *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories* (eds. K. Brown, J. Miller), 12-18. Amsterdam: Elsevier. [The article gives an overview of the state of the art in research on agreement by examining its ingredient features in turn, such as the categories of agreement, the range of targets, controllers and domains, the nature of agreement, and its origins and function.]

Croft, W. (1984). Semantic and pragmatic correlates to syntactic categories. *Papers from the Parasession on Lexical Semantics* CLS 20(2), 53-70. [The paper explores methods of representing major syntactic categories in such a way as to capture their universal features while still allowing for the variation present in natural language. The property of markedness is brought to bear on the development of a prototype analysis of grammatical categories, and then the concept is extended to "natural correlations," in which any particular correlation of grammatical elements, each from a distinct category, is considered unmarked relative to any other possible grouping. This procedure makes it possible to characterize some particular linguistic prototype as an unmarked natural correlation.]

Crystal, D. (1997). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell. [This is the standard reference work among dictionary of linguistic terms, its coverage comprehensive and its definitions clear and most up-to-date.]

Dik, S.C. (1978). *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. [This is an outline of basic tenets of F Dik's theory of Functional Grammar]

Dik, S.C. (1980). *Studies in Functional Grammar*. London and New York: Academic Press. [The monograph is an application of the theory of Functional Grammar to a number of grammatical phenomena in various languages.]

Dik, S.C. (1989). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris. [The book presents the basic principles of functional grammar and applies them to nonderived, noncomplex clauses. Elements of the functional grammar model are outlined with principal focus on nuclear, core, and extended predication. The relationship of clauses, propositions, and predications is dealt with in the framework of predicate and predication operators. Also discussed are states of affairs, the assignment of grammatical functions subject and object, as well as pragmatic functions and the hierarchy of semantic functions.]

Dowty, D. R. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3), 547-619. [The paper suggests that the problem of argument selection be solved by abandoning the traditional system of a number of discrete semantic roles and replacing it by a set of two cluster-concepts only, proto-Agent and proto-Patient.]

Givón, T. (1984). *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction. Vol. 1*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [This introduction is a presentation of a theory of grammar that incorporates functional and typological approach, with particular emphasis on languages in the larger context of human physical and cultural development.]

Givón, T. (1995). *Functionalism and Grammar*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [This volume examines theoretical and methodological foundations of functional approaches to grammatical analyses. Topics discussed include discourse and conversational analysis, semiotics, iconicity, typology, grammatical relations, cognition, universals, acquisition, and text processing]

Huddleston, R. G. Pullum, eds. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [This is a comprehensive grammar handbook of English departing in a refreshing way in many respects from the received grammatical wisdom.]

Keenan, L.E. (1976). Towards a universal definition of 'subject'. *Subject and Topic* (ed. C.N. Li), 303-333. New York: Academic Press. [In this pioneering study, Keenan advances the view that subjects may be defined/identified universally and bases his claim on two crucial premisses: an empirically-based definition of the subject relation is available, and, the concept of 'subject' is a gradient one.]

Matthews, P.H. (1981). *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [This textbook is among the most popular student's introductions to the basics of syntactic structure, including constituency, dependency, coordination as well as various kinds of sentence types.]

Matthews, P.H. (1993). Central concepts of syntax. *Syntax. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (eds. J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, Th. Vennemann), 89-117. Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter. [The paper is an attempt to formulate the concepts common to most treatments of syntax by positing a basic division between syntactic relations and realization devices. It discusses the nature of sentences as the domain of syntax as well as the units of syntax proposing a constituent hierarchy including sentence, clause, phrase, and word. The section on syntactic relations addresses constituency relations, coordination and dependency.]

Panther, K.-U. (1994). *Kontrollphänomene im Englischen und Deutschen aus semantisch-pragmatischer Perspektive*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. [Using German and English examples, the author convincingly argues that the interpretation of implicit subjects of infinitival complement clauses is only minimally guided by syntactic principles and that a number of semantic and pragmatic factors have to be taken into consideration.]

Plank, F. (1984a). Verbs and objects in semantic agreement: Minor differences between languages that might suggest a major one. *Journal of Semantics* 3, 305-360. [It is claimed that even though languages may not have classificatory Vs, they may have predicates that signal particular categories of nominal classification. The semantic agreement of this kind is argued not to be as unsystematic as is commonly assumed. Further, the incidence of semantic V-O agreement is not a minor and unpredictable difference between languages, but correlates with the typology of the grammatical core relations of subject and object.]

Plank, F. (1984b). Introduction: Ces obscurs objets du désir. *Objects: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations* (ed. F. Plank), 1-8. London: Academic Press. [This is the introduction to a collection of articles investigating the properties of direct and indirect objects in different languages, particularly focusing on the issue of definition and identification of objects in specific languages.]

Plank, F. (1990). Objets trouvés. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 43(1) 59-85. [This is an attempt at working out a radial network involving various types of objects. Making use of a cluster of object properties similar to that employed by Keenan, operationalized through an intricate network of tests, the author distinguishes between the core direct objects and several types of non-direct objects (indirect, oblique, adverbial) in English, and also computes the relative closeness or distance of these non-direct objects from the prototype, which is visually presented in a two-dimensional space. These findings are briefly compared with the situation found in German.]

Quirk, R, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman. [This handbook embodies the results of corpus-based descriptive research, containing a full synchronic and morphological description of the common core of educated English.]

Reis, M. (1982). Zum Subjektbegriff im Deutschen. *Satzglieder im Deutschen. Vorschläge zur syntaktischen, semantischen und pragmatischen Fundierung* (ed. W. Abraham), 171-211. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. [The main thrust of the paper is to show that the concept of subject is redundant in German since all the generalizations for which it appears to be necessary can be captured in terms of the concept of nominative NP.]

Rosenbaum, P. (1970). A principle governing deletion in English sentential complementation. *Readings in English Transformational Grammar* (eds. R.A. Jacobs, P.S. Rosenbaum), 20-29. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn and Company. [The paper is an attempt to solve the problem of the choice of the NP in the matrix clause with which the subject of the embedded infinitival clause is referential by recourse to the Minimal Distance Principle (MDP): the implicit subject of the infinitival clause is expected to be identical with the closest NP in the superordinate clause.]

Stowell, T. (1981). *Origins of Phrase Structure*. Doctoral dissertation, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass. [This much-cited dissertation proposes a version of X-bar theory that postulates the existence of structural subjects for each of the lexical projections.]

Valin, R.D. van (2001). *An Introduction to Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [This is a sound and innovative introduction to a variety of formalism currently employed in syntactic theory, ex-

emphified on data from a typologically diverse sampling of languages.]

### **Biographical Sketches**

**Mario Brdar and Rita Brdar-Szabó** are Professors at Josip Juraj Strossmayer University (Osijek, Croatia) and Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest, Hungary), respectively. They teach courses in syntax, morphology, semantics and contrastive linguistics. They have published extensively on a number of topics dealing with morphology, syntax, lexicology, functional grammar and cognitive grammar (particularly conceptual metonymy, metaphor, blending, and construction grammar). Their contrastive work involves the comparison of English, German, Croatian, Hungarian and Russian.

UNESCO – EOLSS  
SAMPLE CHAPTERS