Paper in Conference Proceedings

Syntax and Syntactic Concept in the Structure of English Language

Natalia Sergueevna Andrianova[1], Olga Fedorovna Ostroumova[2], Elena Anatolyevna Vanchikova[3], Elena Anatolyevna Andreeva[4]

[1]Department of Theory and Practice of Foreign Language Teaching, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; *natalia_an83@mail.ru*

[2]Department of Theory and Practice of Foreign Language Teaching, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; *ofostroumova@mail.ru*

[3]Department of Theory and Practice of French, Spanish and Italian, N.A. Dobrolyubov Nizhny Novgorod State Linguistics University, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia; *vanchik510@yandex.ru*

[4]Department of Foreign Languages, Kazan State Power Engineering University, Kazan, Russia; *info-ea@bk.ru*

Abstract

New units, the syntaxeme and syntactic concept, replace the system of sentence parts, which reflects the syntactic structure of the sentence and is a fundamental idea in grammar. Semantics, morphology, and syntax are the three criteria used to identify the syntaxeme, which first appeared in the 1960s. The syntactic criterion separates syntaxemes in the positions of the dependent and predicate features as well as their bearers, while the morphological criterion is connected to the parts of speech, the semantic criterion to the proposition's semantic roles. The syntactic concept, which first appeared in cognitive linguistics at the close of the 20th century, is associated with a type proposition that is fixed by a particular simple sentence structural scheme. A novel method of sentence analysis is made possible by the theory of the syntaxeme and syntactic concepts, which are founded on the cognitive nature of these units. The opposition of one syntaxeme to another in the same syntactic position is demonstrated by the possibility of distinct syntaxemes occupying the same syntactic position. The syntactic position of the subject may therefore contain an agential, experiential, locative, object, instrumental, and address syntaxeme. In the predicate position, there is also an oppositional sequence of syntaxemes, such as actional, statal, existential, etc. Although the concept of a syntaxeme is nonexistent in cognitive linguistics, a syntaxeme is a cognitive unit, much like a syntactic concept. In addition to being the smallest unit in functional syntax, the syntaxeme interacts directly with the syntactic concept. We are able to examine a sentence in its entirety without breaking it down into levels thanks to the units of study.

Keywords: Theory of the Syntaxeme; English Language; Syntactic Concept.

1. Introduction

The system of sentence parts, which has been around since antiquity and is a holdover from the formal-logical approach to language, is still a fundamental idea in modern linguistics. However, since the 1970s of the 20th century, the theory of sentence parts has experienced a serious crisis in the scientific literature as the doctrine of structural scheme propagators and constituents has replaced the problem of sentence parts in reputable academic publications on Russian grammar. It is during this period that the syntaxeme—the basic syntactic unit—is created, and the functional approach to syntax study emerges. Mukhin (1961) (on English material) and Zolotova (2001) (on Russian material) are conducting parallel studies in this field. The authors create a new minimal syntactic unit called the syntaxeme after analyzing the syntactic organization of languages belonging to two different systems: synthetic and analytical. Semantics, morphology, and syntax interact indissolubly in a triple criterion for identifying a linguistic unit, which is supported and contradicts the conventional idea of the bilateral nature of the linguistic sign. The new unit combines syntactic elements as its variants, which have a semantic function in the language and are distinguished by specific distributive features. This represents the unity of two sides, both form and content (Sadykova & Kayumova, 2014; Fedorov, 2013).

The relationship between form and content is also evident in the writings of Canadian linguists: an utterance's meaning is determined by its grammatical structure rather than by the meaning of its constituent parts. Three rules of correspondence guarantee isomorphism between the syntactic and conceptual structures: first, every syntactic element is equivalent to an element of the conceptual structure; second, the syntactic core is equivalent to the predicate's function;

and third, syntactic elements that rely on the core are arguments of the conceptual structure. It is well recognized that language serves as a cognitive system, facilitating information transmission and reception. "We believe that the laws of speech, which are so important in today's world, should be connected to the foundation and dynamics of human cognitive skills." "The description of 'division of reality' reflected in language paradigms (lexical and semantic, lexico-phraseological, and structurally syntactic groups and fields)" is what the cognitive approach, one method of functional language description, suggests. The study of cognitive grammar focuses on how language is used to generate messages and how the world is conceptualized and categorized, as well as how these processes are reflected in language. The notion is the main idea in cognitive linguistics. Currently, it is acknowledged that concepts can be expressed through multiple language levels: "concepts can be represented by a word, a word-combination; a sentence, a whole text." The ideas conveyed through linguistic syntax are examined in works from the past few years. The existence of a syntactic sign with a plan of expression and a plan of content is currently discussed within the framework of cognitive linguistics; the concept of "syntactic concept" is introduced along with the terms "lexical concept" and "lexical-phraseological concept." According to Bulynina (2012) and Kuzmina (2012), "the typical proposition, which is fixed by a specific structural scheme of a simple sentence, is in our understanding a syntactic concept."

2. Literature Review

While macroparametric variation was the main focus of attention for linguistic varieties within the dominant Chomskyan framework of the early 1980s, a growing number of syntacticians are now also interested in microparametric variation across a variety of languages (Henry 1995). Although there was prior research on this topic (Carden 1973; Kimball and Aissen 1971), it was not until the 1990s that it gained theoretical attention. The interest in dialect syntax has not only been seen in transformational generative grammar; Bhatt (2000) offers an OT account of some aspects of variation within Indian English, and constraint-based approaches to grammar like HPSG and LFG (Bender, 2001) and Construction Grammar (Leino and Östman 2005) also contain such work.

There is no such thing as a "correct grammar," as Bhatt (2000) pointed out; rather, the theorist is free to select any grammar that best describes the system, and there may be many different options. Remarkably, this viewpoint enables us to study language without reference to the minds that create the linguistic system; all we require is a theory of the system. Quine and other proponents of philosophically externalist perspectives on language can be roughly described by the E-language perspective. Lavandera (1978) provided examples of how the standard understanding of the sociolinguistic variable—again, conceived primarily with phonetic and phonological research in mind—was ontologically different from the syntactic variable.

According to Adger (2006), morphosyntactic variants can be thought of as having an abstract underlying unit with a variety of exponents, much like allophones and allomorphs. He refers to this variation as VE, or exponence. According to this reading, the variable is just like a phoneme or morpheme. The variants of the variable are not only determined by the linguistic context in which they appear, nor are they simply in free variation, which sets them apart from the phoneme/morpheme. Instead, a variety of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors, including the speaker, the audience, and the preceding discourse, will influence their selection to some extent. To put it another way, the VE of variables is related to the language that is being used rather than being limited to linguistic representation. It is also formal and functional.

However, Adger (2006) also proposes that variation can also originate from "the combinatorics of the syntactic system itself," where variations can result from essentially distinct syntactic pathways leading to the same goal. Similar to the phonological research of Anttila or Guy (Antilla 1997), Adger contends that the system's combinatorics can affect the frequency of the variants. But even in these kinds of systems, factors related to online production and interaction (like word choice that suits the interlocutor or ease of lexical access) will affect the likelihood of specific lexical choices in specific contexts (Adger & Trousdale, 2007; Martyanov et al., 2018).

3. Methodology

The study analyzes sentences using a semantic-cognitive method to determine the conceptual meanings of the constructions. A new method for analyzing the formal and semantic components of sentences is made possible by the theory of syntactic concepts, which is based on the cognitive nature of syntactic structures and the theory of the syntaxeme, which unites meaning and form.

4. Results

As the signs that bind the sentence's syntactic and semantic structures together, the syntactic notion and the syntaxeme are compelled to interact. A syntaxeme is defined by three criteria: morphological, semantic, and syntactic. It is a new unit that differs fundamentally from a sentence part. There is a universal syntax that is present in all languages. The concepts of part-of-speech separation are intrinsically linked to a syntaxeme's morphological feature. One of them is the object's nature that is being shown, which holds that the human mind identifies and processes objects and their properties first. Adjectives and adverbs indicate the qualities of substances and processes, while nouns and verbs express substances and processes. We can distinguish between substantive, procedural, and qualificative syntaxemes based on the morphological criterion. The characteristic of substantiation is the denotation of a substance, or object; nouns and pronouns are the primary verbs used to express substantive syntaxemes. Verb forms express procedural syntaxemes, while adjectives and adverbs express qualificative syntaxemes.

A syntaxeme's syntactic position and function are related to its syntactic characteristic. The syntaxeme could be positioned as a dependent component, a subject, or a predicate. Additionally, secondary predicative relations may be formalized by the syntaxeme. It is best to give up on the syntactic positions of subject and predicate, which lead the researcher back to the term "sentence part." A syntaxeme's syntactic position is connected to the sentence structure, which can have dependent components and primary and secondary predicative relations. As a result, syntaxes that formalize the primary predicative relations—the predicative feature itself and the bearer of the feature—as well as syntaxes that build secondary predicative relations and dependent components of primary and secondary predication can all be studied. The syntactic organization of the compound sentence, the simple sentence with a compound syntactic structure, and the simple sentence is fully reflected in the aforementioned characteristics.

We believe that the existing set of semantic functions will more appropriately correlate with the semantic nature of the syntaxeme. There is a typical set of these functions that are repeated from researcher to researcher even though the inventory of semantic roles varies amongst researchers. The collection of semantic roles developed by English authors is the most fascinating and comprehensive. It differentiates between the following: agent, which is an animate object that initiates and controls a process; object, which is an animate or inanimate entity that is directly targeted by an action; beneficiary, which is an animate object affected by a process; instrument, which is an inanimate object controlled by the agent; locative, which is the spatial center of the action; goal, which is the concrete or abstract entity to which the process is directed; result, which is the object that is the outcome of the process; and source, which is the entity from which another entity originates or is removed. The inventory of semantic functions should be further specified as this list of semantic roles is not comprehensive. It is a given that a syntaxem's morphological form and content characteristics are somewhat related. As a result, procedural syntaxemes—which are represented by both personal and non-personal verb forms—have predicate types' semantic properties, such as activity, passivity, stativity, and existentiality. The substantive characteristics of substantive syntaxemes, such as nouns and substituted pronouns, are determined by the roles of semantic actants. This means that the presence of agentive, experiential, instrumental, locative, temporal, object, address, and possibly other syntaxemes is assumed. Adjectives and adverbs are examples of static, passive, qualitative syntaxemes.

5. Discussion

According to the study, the syntactic and semantic structures of a sentence are united by the syntaxeme, a cognitive unit that interacts directly with the syntactic concept. The sentence's subject, predicate, and subordinate portion make up its syntactic structure, while the predicate and semantic roles make up its semantic structure. A particular sentence structure (syntactic structure) fixes the syntactic concept associated with the proposition (semantic structure). Syntax, morphology, and semantics are all combined into a cross-level unit called a syntaxeme. The syntactic concept and the syntaxeme, two new units, enable an integral analysis of the sentence without segmenting it into levels.

Certain linguists argue that the syntactic concept is not best understood as a proposition because, when actualized in language, it takes on the structure of a proposition with a distinct and logical order. It would be more accurate to state that a concept takes on the form of a proposition when a certain type of proposition is made that corresponds to the concept. The information about a type of situation (a collection of objects and the relationship between them), expressed by a sentence's structural scheme and represented as a type proposition (a structured set of meanings), is known as the syntactic concept. It is this information that human thought assigns to the observed piece of reality.

6. Conclusion

The syntactic structure of the sentence corresponds to a particular proposition, hence the simple sentence is distinguished by both its syntactic and conceptual organization. Direct interactions between the different syntaxemes and the type proposition expressed by the corresponding structural schema are syntactic concepts. Standard word form sequences, or sentence structural schemes, serve as symbols for typical propositions. The content of a simple sentence's structural scheme is a typical proposition. As a result, the object is impacted and the scheme of who does what is expressed by the syntactic concept of agent. Syntactic concept and syntaxeme are signs that possess both structural and content features: semantic content and grammatical (morpho-syntactic) expression for the syntaxeme, and proposition and structural schema for the syntactic concept.

Acknowledgements

References

Adger, D. (2006). Combinatorial variability. *Journal of Linguistics,* 503-530.

Adger, D., & Trousdale, G. (2007). Variation in English syntax: theoretical implications. *English Language & Linguistics.*

Anttila, A. (1997). Deriving variation from grammar. *AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE SERIES 4*, 35-68.

Bender, E. (2001). *Syntactic Variation and Linguistic Competence*. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Bhatt, R. (2000) Optimal expressions in Indian English. *English Language and Linguistics, 4*, 69-95.

Bulynina, M. M. (2012). The problem of syntactic concept. *Sholokhov Moscow State University Bulletin: Philological Sciences*, *4*, 67-73.

Carden, Guy (1973). *Dialect Variation and Abstract Syntax*. in R. W. Shuy (ed.), Some New Directions in Linguistics. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1-34.

Fedorov, V. A. (2013). *National Specificity of Syntactic Concepts: Thesis of Doctor of Philology*. Voronezh, 380 p.

Henry, A. (1995). *Belfast English and Standard English: Dialect Variation and Parameter Setting.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kimball, J., & Aissen, J. (1971). I think, you think, he thinks. *Linguistic Inquiry, 2,* 241-246.

Kuzmina, S. E. (2012). The Concept of Syntactic Concept. in *Linguistic Studies Vestnik of Chelyabinsk State University: Philology.* Art History, 17 (271), Vyp. 66, 87-90.

Lavandera, B. (1978) Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop?. *Language in Society*, *7*, 171-182.

Leino, J., & Östman, J-K. (2005). Constructions and variability. In Fried, M. and H. Boas (eds.) *Construction Grammar: Back to the Roots*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 191-213.

Martyanov, D., Kulsharipova, R., & Oglezneva, N. (2018). Experimental Phonetics in Applied Linguistic Research, *Helix*, *8*(1), 2946-2949.

Mukhin, A. M. (1961). Syntax as a functional syntactic unit. *FN, 3*, 53-65.

Sadykova, A., & Kayumova, D. (2014). The correlation between linguistic and conceptual worldviews: the role of metaphor. *Life Science Journal*, *11*(6), 552-555.

Zolotova, G. A. (2001). *Communicative Aspects of Russian Syntax*. Moscow : Editorial URSS, 368 p.