The Development of the Ideas About Syntactical Relations in English Grammar

Abas Elvira Babayeva [1]

[1] *Azerbaijan State Academy of Physical Education and Sport*
98 Fatali Khan Khoyski, Baku, 1072, Azerbaijan

Abstract. As one of the most significant syntax elements, syntactical relations are vital in forming a phrase and a sentence in English. The formation of grammatical rules and regularities related to subordination and coordination in contemporary English did not happen suddenly. Reviewing individual works from the first English grammar to the most contemporary ones gives a reason to understand how this linguistic phenomenon has been formed in modern English grammar. Since the first English grammar was based on the Latin model, they focused more on the language's morphology. They extensively covered the explanation of parts of speech, and syntactical relations were neglected like other syntax issues. Although it is not fully compatible with the modern English language, in essence, each of the authors of prescriptive grammar managed to express different ideas concerning syntactical relations. Making some mistakes regarding determinations of the syntactical links and relevant systematizations does not reduce the historical importance of those grammars. In some way, reflecting such ideas in grammar led to introduction of more accurate and complete approaches to the subject in classical English grammar in the later period. The scientific basis of syntactical relations was developed in classical grammar, as in all grammatical elements. Finally, modern English grammar has completed the most comprehensive explanation of this topic. Syntactical ties have also been reviewed in detail, with most or all contemporary English grammar devoted to syntax.

Keywords: grammar; syntax; syntactical relations; coordination; subordination.

INTRODUCTION

Syntax is the branch of linguistics studying word combinations such as phrases and sentences. There must be appropriate linguistic relations between their elements. Grammatical rules and regularities surrounding these relations were not created suddenly. The differences and development observed when reviewing the works of different grammarians from this aspect make this issue a significant and, at the same time, exciting research object.

Analyzing all theoretical ideas from the earliest English grammar to the most contemporary ones allows us to understand how the rules of syntactical relations in English have been formed.

The first English grammars known to science are not convenient sources for tracing this language's historical development of syntactical relations. Those grammars were mainly devoted to morphology and were compiled according to the grammatical rules of the Latin language. Prescriptive grammar is considered the most fruitful source for investigating how the first ideas about syntactical relations were formed. In the first works describing the grammar of the English language, this issue was explained from a more theoretical point of view.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the grammar of William Lily, considered the first representative of the era of Latin model

grammars, we do not find a comprehensive description of the grammatical rules reflecting the relations between words or even the syntax section [7, p. 1540]. Although Ben Johnson, who wrote the subsequent work after them, paid particular attention to the syntax section, especially the issue of word order, his grammar did not provide information concerning the syntactical relations either [5, p. 1640].

Even if it does not fully reflect syntactical relations in modern English, the first ideas about this topic were reflected in prescriptive grammar. In the era of prescriptive grammar, which was a critical stage in the development of English grammar, the writing of grammatical works in English, the description of this language not according to the Latin language but according to its own rules, as well as the emphasis on syntax were very significant points. As a result, individual works were analyzed along with several syntactical issues and relations between words and sentences. For example, Robert Lowth, known as the author of the first prescriptive grammar in scientific literature, wrote about the connections between words in his commentary on the sentence, noting that there are concord and government between the separate components of the sentence. They play an essential role in the history of the development of ideas about syntactical relations in English [8]. The author's observations about syntactical relations show that he could not fully distinguish *concord* and *government*. So, according to R. Lowth, the agreement of one word with another word is to change the case, quantity, gender and person to match that word [8, p. 101].

Lindley Murray, the most criticized, was also one of the grammar authors who gave the most space to interpreting syntactical relations [10, p. 126]. Distinguishing different types of phrases according to their structural features and forms of expression, L. Murray did not overlook the connections between their constituent parts. He generally divided the syntax section into two parts and considered those parts to be *concord* and *government*. The author defined agreement: "The existence of an agreement between words means that one of the words forming a phrase is classified by changing gender, quantity, case and person to match the other" [10, p. 126]. L. Murray also interpreted concord in his own way: "When there is concord between words, it means that one of the words forming a phrase changes in mood, time, and case under the influence of an-

other" [10, p. 126]. L. Murray systematized the issue of building existing syntactic relations between words in a phrase or sentence and presented it in the form of the following rules:

Rule 1. The verb agrees with the nominative case according to person and quantity. For example, "*I teach*", "*The birds are flying",* and so on. Here, the author compiled various models and did not ignore the existence of exceptional cases (E.g., "*There's three or four of us who have joined the team"*, etc.) and noted specific ideas of previous grammar authors about this rule.

Rule 2. When two or more nouns that are singular in quantity are connected by copulative conjunctions, the verbs, nouns and pronouns used with them are plural. E.g., "*Bloomfield and his students were wise".*

Rule 3. If the words connected by disjunctive conjunctions are singular in quantity, the word they agree with is also unique. For example, "*Tiredness or sleeplessness caused that crash".* However, if one of the words connected by these conjunctions is singular in quantity, and the other is plural, in this case, whichever of those words is closer to the word to be agreed, its quantitative structure plays a leading role in the agreement. For example," *I or you or he is guilty of this*".

Rule 4. When a noun expressing collective content is used with a verb, a pronoun, etc., those words used with that collective noun can be either singular or plural. For example, "*The nation was right*" or "*The nation were right*".

Rule 5. Relative pronouns agree with the word they belong to. For example, "*This is the girl who I work with*".

Rule 6. The relative pronoun becomes the nominative case when it is used between the subject and the predicate. For example, "*The teacher who helped us was our neighbour*".

Rule 7. When a relative pronoun refers to two words in the nominative case, its agreement with the predicate can be according to both terms to which it belongs. For example, "*I am the teacher who help you*" or "*I am the teacher who helps you*".

Rule 8. A pronoun used before a noun as a substitute for an adjective or directly in the place of a noun agrees with nouns and verbs, respectively. For example, "*This journey is pleasant*", "*Few were right*", etc.

Rule 9. The articles "*a*" and "*an*" are used in singular quantity, and the article "the" is used in both singular and plural nouns. For example, "*a hundred, a bird, the flag, the stars*" and so on.

Rule 10. A noun is used in the possessive case to govern another noun and distinguish it from the group to which it belongs. For example, "*my brother's car*", "*woman's happiness*", etc.

Rule 11. Verbs used in the active voice govern the object case. For example, "*My parents support me*", "*It enables her*", etc.

Rule 12. A verb governs another verb that follows it and causes it to be used in the infinitive form. For example, "*He should be ready to leave the meeting immediately*". L. Murray also mentioned that the particle "to" is dropped in exceptional cases depending on the governing verbs (e.g., *bid*, *dare*, *need*, *make*, *see*, *hear*, *feel*, *let*). For example, "*You let him go*" [10, p. 163].

Rule 13. When words and phrases are connected to express the content of time, the presence of this relation should be observed. However, according to the author, it is not an easy task to define a special rule here [10, p. 163]. For example, instead of "*I remember him more than ten years*", it should be "*I have remembered him more than ten years*".

Rule 14. Participles are governed according to the verb from which they are formed. For example, "*She is following me*".

Rule 15. Adverbs are usually used before adjectives, after verbs, between primary and auxiliary verbs. For example," *He spoke emotionally*".

Rule 16. Two negations cancel each other out or are equivalent to an affirmation.

Rule 17. Prepositions govern the object case. For example, "*We know a bad character of him*".

Rule 18. Conjunctions connect nouns, pronouns, and verbs of the same form and tense. For example, "*His father taught his sister and him to dance*".

Rule 19. Conjunctions can be used with different forms of verbs. For example, "*If I were to go there, they would not know*".

Rule 20. When the properties of different concepts are compared, the second noun or pronoun is governed by the verb and not by the conjunctions "*than*" or "*as*"; in other words, it agrees with the verb. For example," *She loved you more than me* (*more than she loved me*)".

Rule 21. Elliptical and incomplete syntactic forms are used to avoid repetitions in speech and to express the idea more briefly.

Rule 22. All members of the sentence must be consistent with each other.

Although there are some inconsistencies in L. Murray's classification, introducing such an approach in the era of prescriptive grammar was a progressive step [10].

One of the grammars that played an essential role in the development of syntactical relations in English was written by Charles P. Mason. In "*English Grammar*", he mentioned four types of these relations: *the predicative connection* between the subject and the predicate, *the attributive relation* between the noun and the word that defines it, *the object relation* between the predicate and the object, and *the adverbial relation* between the predicate and the adverb that explains it from different aspects [9, p. 91].

Alexander Bain chose a unique way regarding syntactical relations among the authors of this period. He noted syntactical ties: "There are principles of *concord*, *agreement* and *word order* to connect words in a sentence" [1, p. 299].

Joseph Priestley, another representative of the period of prescriptive grammar, also wrote about syntactical relations, but he also interpreted this issue in his way. He distinguished two types of agreement: agreement according to quantity and arrangement of particles [13, p. 185].

During classical grammar, he considered the next stage of development of English grammar; Henry Sweet paid particular attention to the relations between words [15, p. 30]. He stated five ways to create connections between words in English: *intonation*, *stress*, *word order*, *suffixes*, *and functional parts of speech.* Although this explanation does not fully correspond to the rules of syntactical relations in modern English, it is essentially consistent with it.

Compared with other periods, the grammatical relations between words were studied in detail in the modern grammar of the 20th century, which gave extensive coverage of the analysis of syntax and many other issues. Lillian Gertrude Kimball noted that such connections between the subject and the predicate are mainly through conjunctions [6, p. 165]. Charles Talbut Onion, who wrote the grammar at the same time as him, showed in his work "*Advanced English Syntax*"

that there are also grammatical relations between the predicate and the object of a sentence [11, p. 29].

Hendrik Poutsma, who wrote one of the most valuable works of the era of modern scientific grammar, managed to explain syntactical relations accurately. The author, who mentioned these relations in modern English as *coordination* and *subordination*, also explained their semantic differences. In the grammar of H. Poutsma, three types of compliance have been shown, according to the connecting means: *copulative*, *adversative*, and *casual* or *illative*. H. Poutsma naturally distinguished the types of complex sentences while explaining the mentioned topic [12, p. 544].

Although Otto Jespersen, one of the authors of modern scientific grammar, did not mention syntactical relations as a separate topic, he was one of those grammarians who contributed to the development of the history of ideas related to this issue when he showed dependency between the members of a phrase or a sentence [4, p. 107].

Syntactical relations in the works, from prescriptive English grammar to contemporary ones, have been analyzed using traditional methods. However, in the most modern syntactic trends, preference is given not to the terminological explanation of such grammatical relations but to graphical representations reflecting the structural features or movements of the components [3, p. 27; 14, p. 58; 2, p. 6].

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, although the ideas about syntactical relations, considered the most important means to form a sentence in modern English, were first introduced by prescriptive grammarians, their improvement was possible with a long historical development. When the relevant rules and regularities, which were somewhat improved in classical English grammar, became a more critical research topic for researchers in modern grammar, its comprehensive study put the final point in its development.

REFERENCES

1. Bain, A. (1879). *A Higher English Grammar*. London: Longmans and Co.

2. Bowers, J. (2018). *Deriving Syntactic Relations*. doi: 10.1017/9781316156414

3. Chomsky, N. (2002). *Syntactic Structures*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

4. Jespersen, O. (1933). *Essentials of English Grammar*. London: George Allen And Unwin Ltd.

5. Jonson, B. (1640). *The English Grammar*. New York: Sturgis & Walton Company.

6. Kimball, L. (1900). *The Structure of The English Sentence*. London: Forgotten Books.

7. Lily, W. (1540). *Latin Grammar*. N. d.

8. Lowth, R. (1762). *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*. London: Pall-mall.

9. Mason, Ch. P. (1858). *English Grammar*. London: Bell & Sons.

10. Murray, L. (1824). *English Grammar Adapted to Different Classes of Learners*. Hallowell: Glazier & Co.

11. Onion, Ch. T. (1924). *An advanced English syntax based on the principles and requirements of the Grammatical society*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

12. Poutsma, H. (1929). *A Grammar of Late Modern English* (Vol. 1). N. d.: Groningen P. Noordhoff.

13. Priestly, J. (1761). *The Rudiments of English Grammar*. London: Printed for R. Griffiths.

14. Radford, A. (2020). *An Introduction to English Sentence Structure*. doi: 10.1017/9781108884327

15. Sweet, H. (1892). *A New English Grammar. Logical and Historical*. London: Cambridge University Press.