WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

A Study on Syntactic Awareness and the Understanding of Sentence Structures

Ali Hassan Jasim[1] and Dr. Cheten Mewada[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Linguistics, Gujarat University
[2]Faculty of Arts Department of Linguistics, Gujarat University

ABSTRACT

The paper discusses language comprehension, sentence structure and communication by gradually progressing from syntax to semantics and pragmatics. It examines the roles of generative grammar, usage-based theories and construction grammar in figuring out how syntactic rules assist in learning and using language. Besides, the paper tries to explain, using insights from neurolinguistics which brain areas are important for language processing and how syntactic knowledge is applied in language science, including natural language processing and machine translation. Experts used various methods such as linguistics, cognitive science and computational modeling, to combine the theories and practices of syntax and share ideas on how syntax could be applied to language education, clinical care and advanced language technologies.

Keywords: Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics, Language Acquisition, Computational Linguistics

Introduction

Syntax plays a key role in linguistics and describes the rules for making sentences in all languages. It is also important to note that he was able to construct and interpret difficult sentences because of his mental abilities. Syntax serves to show how different words within a sentence are connected so people can say an endless range of things using a limited collection of grammar rules (Carnie, 2013). For this reason, knowing the details of syntax is necessary for anyone who wants to learn how language, the mind and communication relate to each other.

Because of Noam Chomsky's research in the 1950s, more scientists began to focus on syntax in linguistics. A deep structure for language exists and it is changed into many surface forms with the help of syntax; this transformation is known as transformational-generative grammar, Chomsky said in 1957. In the 1990s, Chomsky introduced the Minimalist Program which claims that the theory of syntax should strive to use as few rules as possible (Chomsky, 1995). Thus, this form of grammar is less complicated in organization, but it remains flexible for people to use. Still, this field is debating whether the form of syntactic knowledge is something children learn by experience or whether it is passed on through inheritance (Newmeyer, 2005).

Still, some other approaches to understanding sentence structure exist such as Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), Construction Grammar and Dependency Grammar. In HPSG, figuring out the way phrases are arranged in a hierarchy is central and features are used to express the relations between them (Pollard & Sag, 1994). On the other hand, Construction Grammar considers that basic language blocks contain the form and the meaning of words blended together. It further suggests that people are taught the way to construct sentences, rather than forming those patterns on their own. The comparison of these approaches (Hudson 2007) is made by looking at how a sentence's words follow the relationship between the main word (head) and the other words it controls which is known as dependency grammar.

You need to examine how syntax works, not only rely on theories, to learn how language is acquired. At first, children learn to form simple sentences and go on to use more complex sentence forms as they get older (Tomasello, 2003; Ingram, 1989). That is why Universal Grammar believes that this can be explained by an inbuilt language learning power, while usage-based models believe that continuous exposure and observation of similar patterns are important for learning a language (Tomasello, 2003, Pinker, 1994).

The study of brain areas related to syntax has allowed us to discover more about neurolinguistics. The research from fMRI and ERPs studies showed that Broca's area and the left inferior frontal gyrus are commonly used in the brain when people understand sentences with complex grammar (Friederici, 2011). From analyzing the P600, scientists have discovered that the brain registers and corrects any problems with sentence structure (Kaan and Swaab, 2003). Consequently, we can see that our brains process syntactic functions apart from both obtaining words and interpreting their meaning.

Both theoretical work and practical solutions use syntax and it plays a big role in NLP. Computer programs are able to look at the grammar of a sentence by analyzing its constituency or dependency structure (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). Improvements in deep learning have made syntactic parsing more dependable and because technology can access large amounts of marked-up language data, syntactic theory remains a benefit.

In this paper, the focus is on these significant elements of syntactic knowledge, like their theories, main processes and how they are used. The investigation therefore seeks to understand how syntax develops, is used and processed both by humans and by computer systems, to get a complete idea of its effects on people's abilities.

Research Methodology

The paper makes use of qualitative research to discuss the links among syntax, semantics, pragmatics and their consequences for learning language, brain research and digital systems. A methodological process is taken into account where one conducts a literature review, analyzes theories and includes findings from fields such as linguistics, cognitive science and computational modelling.

Literature Review and Theoretical Background

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, new ideas in syntax, a branch of linguistics, have explained how sentences are constructed, processed and understood. Daemons of Syntax examine how words are ordered so that they can be helpful in meaning (Carnie, 2013). The next step is to review well-known syntax theories, for instance, generative grammar, the Minimalist program, dependency grammar and construction grammar. Besides, this area also examines the role of syntax in acquiring languages, as well as neurolinguistics and computational linguistics.

A few years after the work of Jerome Morgenstern (1946) and Bruce (1942), as the works of Pojhar (1940) were available, Noam Chomsky (1957) published a generative grammar theory to describe language using a set of limits that allowed an infinite number of grammatical sentences to be created. The main point of this approach is that the visible form (surface structure) is different from the hidden form (deep structure).

According to Chomsky, syntax which deals with the way language is built, is not connected to its meaning. Some researchers argue that there is always a remaining connection between syntax, meaning and context (Jackendoff 2002). Consequently, generative approach has greatly affected language research, especially in relation to parameter theory, generative theory of linguistic universals and syntactic differences in different languages (Chomsky 1999). This model proposes that there are only a few simple principles in Universal Grammar which is why people's language abilities are not the same (Chomsky, 1981).

Chomsky (1995) introduced The Minimalist Program to make the syntactic theory as uncomplicated as possible based on the idea that speaking and understanding language needs the least effort. Basically, speaking and writing well depends on how efficiently the "Merge" and "Move" operations are used in grammar. Merging brings two elements together to form a single phrase and Move is the action where elements are positioned in the phrase which may change its structure to follow the rules of grammar (Hornstein, Nunes and Grohmann 2005).

Scholars are now studying the basic rules of language and how they affect thought in general and syntax from both a physical and mental point of view (Boeckx, 2006). This is why some have disagreed on how much grammar should focus on the form of sentences and their use in speaking or writing (Newmeyer, 2005: chap. 4). Even though the Minimalist Program simplifies the rules, it still does not show how different languages have their own ways of forming sentences (Richards, 2010).

Instead of using trees in charting, dependency grammar just outlines the way each word links to others. In dependency grammar, the relation between words in a sentence is described as head–dependent (Hudson, 2007). While phrase structure rules are the focus of generative grammar, this method tries to form direct links between the words in a sentence. When dealing with languages that allow flexible word order, dependency grammar is much better adapted to show the differences (Nivre, 2005).

Computational linguistics uses dependency grammar by relying on dependency parsing algorithms that analyze sentences in natural language. The simplicity of encoding logic made this method very beneficial for machine translation, information retrieval and text analysis (Kubler, McDonald, & Nivre, 2009).

In contrast to standard syntactic theories, construction grammar holds that language consists of units called constructions which link different forms and meanings (Goldberg, 2006). Therefore, generative grammar rejects the strict separation from syntaxis to lexism, as constructions are seen as the main units in a language. It argues that most of us learn the main rules of grammar through being exposed to them often, not because we are born with a set of grammar rules (Tomasello, 2003).

According to Bybee (2010), the plain usage-based view of language skills is in line with usage-based theories, as they believe that syntactic competence comes from the ability to notice patterns in what we hear. Because language takes time to learn and involves interacting with people and hearing the same words in different contexts, these theories are backed up by this support.

The theory of Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) is based on both constraints and formalization and it also takes aspects of Phrase Structure Grammar (Pollard & Sag, 1994). In HPSG, syntactic information is shown as feature structures supplying details about a word or phrase's syntactic, semantic and morphological features. The model includes the flexibility to deal with word order changes, fixed expressions and unusual language habits which traditional generative models cannot support. HPSG was an important approach in computational linguistics, mainly when parsing grammars was under development (Sag, Wasow & Bender, 2003).

The major concern of linguistic theory is how syntax and semantics relate. Most of the systems in generative grammar focus on syntax alone, while a few have tried to incorporate semantic processing with the analysis of syntax. How is the form of language related to its meaning? Examples in this field include Lexial Functional Grammar (LFG) and Categorial Grammar which involve semantic information to uncover the connection between the parts of speech (Bresnan, 2001). Some theories propose that syntax and semantics are very closely linked and specific syntax is linked to specific semantics (Dowty, 2007).

Examining the syntax-semantics interface uncovers more about linguistic typology which involves discovering similarities and differences between languages based on various syntactic forms and ways roles are assigned in sentences (Comrie, 1989). When looking at many types of languages this way, it's obvious that there isn't one way that syntax must express meaning.

Syntactic theory highlights how important the debate between nativist and usage-based views on language learning is. In contrast, usage-based theories explain that how a child acquires grammar is because of the language they hear and their ability to understand the structure of the words and tunes they hear (Tomasello 2003). Studies on language acquisition show that both inborn brain features and everyday surroundings are involved in forming syntactic knowledge (Pinker, 1994).

The analysis of syntax in linguistics has also been studied by neurolinguistics which looks at brain processes used for syntax. Studies of brain scans also show that parts like Broca's area are vital for forming syntax and when they are damaged, people may lose the ability to use syntax properly such as those with aphasia (Friederici, 2011). In the case of event related potentials (ERPs) such as the P600 which points out how the brain supports reanalyzing sentences while we listen to language, an experiment is given by Kaan and Swaab (2003).

NLP uses the results of syntactic analysis which comes from applying syntactic theory to natural language processing. Because tasks like machine translation and text summarization rely on syntactic research techniques, technologies such as constituency parsing and dependency parsing are crucial in them (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020).

Types of Sentence Structures

The main focus of syntax and understanding what sentences mean and how complex they are is to arrange different sentence structures. Four major sentence structures are found in English: simple, compound, complex and compound complex. Every type completes a specific task in communication and can be arranged in sentences to help express different ideas (Carnie, 2013).

Such a sentence known as a main or independent clause has only a subject and a predicate in it. It is a complete sentence and the simplest kind of sentence structure. Here is a simple example of a sentence: "The cat slept"; this means the cat is the subject and slept is the predicate. For the most part, simple sentences are the building blocks of more complex language skills as a person acquires language abilities (Finegan, 2014). Often used in schools to make sure information is easy to understand and clear.

You create such a sentence when you join two independent clauses using coordinating conjunction (e.g. and, but or or) or by separating them with a semicolon. Two or more clauses make up a compound sentence and although each could be a simple sentence, they are linked together to demonstrate a certain relationship. In the sentence 'The cat slept; the dog barked', the main ideas are joined by 'and', so that you do not have to create subordinate clauses to join complex thoughts. Compound sentences are helpful in narrative since they help move the story forward and show contrast or unity.

Two parts of a complex sentence are an independent clause and at least one dependent (or subordinate) clause. This sentence cannot work as a standalone statement; the whole sentence is formed with the additional clause: The cat slept, while the dog woke. To add more effects or details, you need to use complex sentences, says Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999). When writers want to talk about cause and effect, theories or elaborate explanations in academic subjects, they usually write complex sentences.

This means a compound complex sentence links at least two independent clauses with one or more dependent clauses. The cat might have been sleeping, but the dog stayed awake since it heard a sound. The cat was sleeping, yet the dog stayed awake due to the sound it heard. Combining several ideas in just one sentence through compound-complex sentences adds a sophisticated approach to writing (Finegan, 2014). Such a structure is very useful in formal writing with complex ideas since it makes it possible to combine similar ideas under one structure.

Functional and Stylistic Considerations

Changing the sentence structure can easily alter how a text is read. Simple sentences are used to highlight important points and more complicated thoughts are developed with compound or complex sentences. Adding several sentence types to a part makes the passage's rhythm and readability better and the text appears more appealing (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999). To avoid writing in the same way again and again, writers change the construction of their sentences and pay special attention to informing, persuading or entertaining readers.

One language's pattern can be expressed in different sentences in another language. For instance,the order of Subject, Verb and Object in a sentence (SVO) only occurs in some languages, whereas others have different orders such as SVO, SOV and VSO. Learning about cross-linguistic syntax and what it means for language learning, this is an important aspect.

You should make sure to develop different sentence structures when learning a new language. According to Pinker (1994), at first, children use simple sentences and after their skills increase, they use more complex sentence structures. Knowing how to structure complex sentences is connected to a higher level in language development and thinking, since it helps kids express abstract and related ideas (Tomasello, 2003). Transferring sentence patterns from their first language to the second language is common among learners and this makes it hard for them to use a full range of sentence types in the other language (Ellis, 2008).

When teachers teach students to tell apart different sentences and create them, they enhance their flexibility with language. Using oral and written activities that help people use more complex sentence forms, for example through combining or expanding sentences, has resulted in better writing skills (Strong, 1986). As a result such teaching methods make it easier for students to realize what various sentence types do and how they contribute to well-structured and connected discourse.

Syntax and Language Acquisition

The first point to note is that getting syntactic knowledge is important in language development. This topic has sparked a lot of debates between linguists and cognitive scientists. Kids reach the next stage of word order, known as syntax which helps them arrange words in sentences that sound both logical and useful. There are opinions about syntax learning that place more or less importance on internal language mechanisms, outside stimuli or mental abilities. Here, main theories of how children learn syntax, the stages they go through, possible influences and their role in first and second language learning are discussed.

You can separate theories of syntactic acquisition into two main types: nativist which means people are born ready to learn language and usage-based which explains that language development involves input and general thinking skills.

Noam Chomsky (1981), who is well known for nativist theories, claims that children are equipped with universal linguistic rules at birth which influence their ability to form syntax. The hypothesis of Universal Grammar makes it possible to explain why children everywhere tend to develop language in the same basic way. The theory states that children carry within them certain grammar rules that get adjusted depending on the language they hear. Therefore, children are capable of learning advanced grammar rules with very little help from teachers (Pinker, 1994).

Chomsky's theory is based on transformational grammar which in turn is included in the Universal Grammar framework as the principle of parameter setting. Based on this assumption, the way children vary grammar in different languages is controlled by the way they set certain linguistic parameters. Therefore, instead of having the same sequence (subject, verb and object), some languages have Subject Verb Object (SVO) or Subject Object Verb (SOV) structure. On the other hand, children seem to decide the grammar structures used in the language they learn (Chomsky, 1986). The development of creole languages clearly shows that knowing language is inborn in humans which supports the nativist theory.

According to nativist theories, the learning of syntax is either fixed by birth or strongly programmed; on the other hand, usage-based theories think it takes time and is guided by coming across language input and everyday mental processes. A constructivist perspective on language learning has it that how often and in what ways grammar is presented in input is key (Tomasello, 2003). From this standpoint, children notice the parts of sentences that are common and repeat themselves in the language they hear. It points out that acquiring language is mostly due to imitation, comparison and social interactions and that realizing a pattern comes from exposure, instead of from using innate rules (Bybee, 2010).

Among usage-based theories, the concept known as construction grammar states that language is made up of constructions which link very simple words to complex sentences (Goldberg, 2006). Young people pick up on these constructions when they spot the same patterns in language and connect certain words with their role in the sentence. Unlike some other approaches, this one considers variation in language learning by stating that what a child hears and the environment shape the way grammar is acquired (Tomasello, 2003).

Progression in the Development of Syntax

Most of the time, the learning of syntax moves linearly, going from one stage to the next, regardless of a person's language. The main parts of developing syntax are:

1. During the Holophrastic Stage (One-Word Stage), a child only says one word that stands for a whole phrase. Depending on whether I want milk or if there's milk around me, these words have several meanings. At this point, children are usually between 12 and 18 months of age (Clark, 2009).

2. By the time a child is 18 to 24 months old, he or she starts to say two-word phrases that follow some basic rules of grammar. Usually, the combinations are made up of a noun and a verb ("doggie run") or a noun and an adjective ("big car." Now, we notice the development of word order which means syntax is beginning to form (Brown, 1973).

3. During ages 2 and 3, children tend to leave out the functional words in their talk and speak in a 'telegraphic' manner. So, rather than saying "I want a cookie," a child could say "want cookie." Even though some grammar is absent, the sentence demonstrates that understanding the sentence structure is improving (Radford, 1990).

4. Children between three and four years old learn to connect their sentences with conjunctions, relative clauses and embedded clauses (Diessel, 2004). So, youngsters might use expressions like, "Playing is fun for me" and "The boy is going fast." It is because they understand sentence structure better and can use it for communication in various ways (de Villiers, 1995).

Factors Influencing Syntactic Acquisition

There are many and greatly varying ways in which children develop grammar, each depending on the input they receive, their mental abilities and the people they interact with.

Evidence shows that the amount and quality of language we are exposed to play a major role in developing our syntax. If children receive a wide range of rich input, they develop their syntax much faster and more accurately, as claimed by Hoff (2006). Various studies have shown that child directed speech (CDS) involves making sentences easy to understand, using a clear and high tone and talking slowly which helps children with learning language (Snow, 1995). In addition, talking back and forth with adults improves a child's language skills because they get to practice and practice their grammar (Hart & Risley, 1995).

Acquiring language is linked to mental development and for a person to understand syntax, they must be able to remember, group things together and identify patterns (Gleitman & Newport, 1995). By way of example, working memory helps with processing more complex sentences and having the ability to group language terms improves our grasp of grammar roles and uses (Gathercole & Baddeley, 1993). It is also possible that the reason children often learn some syntactic rules earlier than others is because their minds are limited in their ability (Slobin, 1985).

Learning a language is helped by social interaction, especially when the process is seen through the usage-based framework. Alternately, children acquire syntax by conversing with people to carry out social goals (Tomasello, 2003). Paying attention, copying others and thinking about their intentions help with the development of a child's syntax. If children interact socially with responsive caregivers often, they generally advance more quickly in learning language (Snow, 1995).

Acquiring how to use language grammatically in bilingual or second language learners is different from how monolinguals learn. As a result of 'cross-linguistic influence,' phrases from one language may shape the development of the other in bilingual children. As an illustration, a bilingual child could generalize the sentence structure of one language in their use of the other language (Hulk & Müller, 2000). Also, bilingualism can support a child's understanding of language and help them follow grammar rules in various languages (Bialystok, 2001).

Yet, it is possible for adult L2 learners to misapply their native language's grammar rules when they use the target language (Ellis, 2008). This kind of constant problem with word order, tense and agreement might arise from having different rules in the L1 and L2, more so when the two languages have very distinct rules. With reference to Lightbown and Spada's (2013) theory, instructional approaches that include teaching of syntactic rules are proposed to help L2 learners overcome these problems.

Noticing how syntax is learned can be useful for building lesson plans to help people learning a new language. According to a study (Strong, 1986), using methods like combining sentences makes it easier to learn and write in correct sentences. Besides, when children interact with language that has many different parts of speech, it can lead to better use of grammar. Ellis (2008) explains that teaching about grammar rules and language structures away from the native language benefits L2 learners.

Neurolinguistics and Syntax Processing

Researchers have devoted a lot of effort to exploring the neural mechanisms responsible for language processing in neurolinguistics. Not only does syntax play a key part in linguistics, but it is also a basic aspect of how we think. Here, how the brain supports syntactic processing is explored, along with the areas involved, the timing of these activities and how these factors affect people with language problems.

According to neurolinguists, the left hemisphere's brain regions have a major role in syntactic processing. The left inferior frontal gyrus (IFG) area, known as Broca's area, is frequently included in studies about syntax. It is believed that they play a role in sentence creating, understanding longer sentences and organizing syntax (Friederici 2011). Damage to Broca's area is often regarded as Broca's aphasia and this problem means one can understand simple words but not make grammatical sentences (Caplan, 2006).

Another key part of the brain for syntax is the posterior superior temporal gyrus or pSTG (Friederici, 2011) which brings together elements from both the syntax and other parts of the language system such as meanings and the shapes of words (Friederici, 2011). The left posterior superior temporal sulcus is the brain area responsible for interpreting a sentence's syntactic structure and also for recognizing different sentence structures (Bornkessel-Schlesewsky & Schlesewsky, 2009).

Some suspect that the ATL plays a part in interpreting sentences, especially those that have to do with who does what in the sentence. Integrating syntactic structure details with semantics in the ATL helps prove that syntax only works when placed in context and semantics support this notion (Tyler & Marslen-Wilson, 2008).

Since media neuroimaging is essential for investigating neural timing during the processing of syntax, a lot of research has focused on these techniques (fMRI and ERPs). Thanks to these methods, researchers are able to eliminate the randomness in brain signals and assess the exact timing and spot in the brain where syntactic processing happens.

P600 is a widely recognized name for a positive wave that appears about 600 milliseconds after a syntactic anomaly in a sentence (Osterhout & Holcomb, 1992). It has been understood that the P600 indicates that the brain detects a problem and tries to resolve it grammatically. The P600 response occurs in

the brain when 'eating' is used instead of 'eat' in a sentence such as 'The cat will be eating the fish' since it tries to arrange the unexpected order (Kaan & Swaab, 2003).

ELAN is a brain wave that shows up around 200 milliseconds after spotting a mistake in syntax. The main event seen in response to violations in phrase structure is ELAN and this happens whenever a word that is unexpected for the position appears in a sentence like 'The cat was in the singing'. From the viewpoint of ELAN, syntactic information seems to be dealt with in the brain before semantics have had any processing (Friederici, 2002).

Even so, this data points out that ELAN and the P600 reveal two different phases of syntactic processing, indicating that grammatical information is delivered in a staged manner.

Studies have also found that bundles of neurons or white matter tracts, are responsible for helping different language parts of the brain work together. It makes sense that Broca's area sends information to Wernicke's area through the arcuate fasciculus which may help explain how syntactic and semantic language is processed together (Catani & Mesulam, 2008). Problems in understanding sentences, mainly when they contain complex sentence structures, are seen after damage to the arcuate fasciculus (Saur et al., 2008).

It is also important to note that the uncinate fasciculus is a white matter pathway connecting the prefrontal cortex to the anterior temporal lobe. It is considered important for the processing of sentences that have nested clauses and involve several sentences together (Duffau, 2008).

Several neurolinguistic studies have focused on people diagnosed with aphasia and developmental language disorder (DLD).

Unlike other types of aphasia, broca's aphasia happens because of lesions in the left inferior frontal gyrus and is marked by a pattern of non-fluent speech, grammatical errors and problems understanding syntax (Caplan, 2006). This shows that Broca's area is essential for both forming and understanding complex sentences. Meanwhile, Wernicke's aphasia is caused by damage to the posterior superior temporal gyrus which leads to trouble with syntax but allows speech to be produced mostly with accurate words (but inaccurate in their order).

Children with developmental language disorder which is sometimes called specific language impairment, lack the ability to form sentence structure even when they do not have any neurological problems. Deficiency in the use of complex sentence forms and grammatical morphemes in DLD tends to point to issues in the neural networks that control sentence and grammar processing (Leonard, 2014). In studies involving syntactic tasks, there is less activation of left perisylvian language areas compared to normal brain related tasks, making us think that syntax is being processed differently by the brain (Weismer et al., 2005).

Syntactic processing is considered a distinct part of language to study, yet a lot of information suggests that it is very closely linked to semantic processing. Structures that activate when processing syntax and semantics have been found in the left posterior temporal lobe, as they help understand the meaning of the sentence (Tyler & Marslen-Wilson, 2008). In addition, fMRI has revealed similar brain activation when both syntactic and semantic problems appear, although the pattern is different depending on the nature of the violation (Friederici & Kotz, 2003).

The system of language processing also uses separate paths for syntax in the dorsal stream and for meaning in both the dorsal and ventral streams, while the ventral stream deals with semantics as well (Hickok & Poeppel, 2007). It is the dorsal stream that processes sentence structure and generates words, while the ventral stream connects that structure with the proper meaning.

Information from syntactic processing has helped explain neuroplasticity and the ways language is recovered after brain damage. Studies on people with aphasia show that increased brain activity in perilesional and related areas on the right hemisphere while syntactic processing is happening is linked to rehabilitation (Thompson 2000). By using intensive language therapy that mainly emphasizes learning syntax, folks with brain damage can show significant improvements in both using language and understanding it (Berthier et al., 2011).

Addressing syntactic skills through interventions at a young age in children with developmental language disorders results in lower long-term problems with language. According to studies, training that centers on merging sentences, using more complex sentences and studying grammar rules benefits syntactic ability and language abilities as well (Leonard, 2014).

Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics

Every aspect of language is necessary for successful and meaningful communication: syntax, semantics and pragmatics. The order of the words in a sentence is referred to as syntax, the meaning of words and sentences is called semantics and using words and sentences to communicate is called pragmatics. To fully understand linguistic theory and its uses in language teaching, cognitive science and natural language processing, one must see how these elements relate to each other.

Understanding the link between syntax and semantics has consistently been a main concern for linguists. Linguistics looks at syntax to understand meaning and at semantics to focus on form. Until 1957, according to generative grammar, syntax was seen as a separate area working on its own with rules that did not deal with meaning. Also, most theories formed afterward agree that the positioning of syntax is linked to how meaning is communicated, as Jackendoff mentions in 2002.

Now, when we say the syntax-semantics interface, we simply mean the relationships between syntactic structure and semantic representation. A good example is that the hierarchy of syntactic constituents follows the way syntactic parts and their actions are linked semantically in a sentence (Dowty, 1991).

There are different linguistic theories that link meaning and the way sentences are formed. At present, Jakobson's syntactic semantics and Categorial Grammar, both together with Lexical-Functional Grammar, link syntax and semantics using the association of grammar categories with their functions. Such approaches state that they help determine both the order of words and the meaning of sentences by describing the roles that participants assume in the sentence (Bresnan, 2001). Like Montague, LFG gives syntax the same freedom as semantics by treating them as two separate systems and their actions can be correlated with how LFG interprets expressions logically.

The study of syntax and semantics relies on compositionality which means that the meaning of a whole expression comes from the meanings of its parts (Frege, 1892-/1980). According to compositionality, if our sentences use the same words but differ in structure, they can still mean something else. Even when the words are the same such as, "John loves Mary," and "Mary loves John," their meaning changes because of the role each word plays. We realize here that the arrangement of words and phrases is guided by the syntax of the sentence.

It rather analyzes language use in situations and how speakers organize their words and sentences to achieve what they want to say. Pragmatics looks at parts of meaning that are not easy to figure out without knowing details like the speaker's intention, the listeners' knowledge and the context of the conversation, as opposed to semantics which does this automatically.

Most of the time, language users apply syntactic structures for reasons other than their usual meanings. Different uses for questions or imperatives can be seen in different kinds of conversations. Here, the question is made with the sentence structure: Can you pass the salt? Practically speaking, the structure serves as a polite question that does not challenge the listener's skills (Searle, 1975). The example explains that in order to understand a sentence, we need pragmatic knowledge in addition to syntactic, semantic and socio-contextual knowledge.

Likewise, the way information is organized within a sentence is related to pragmatics. Such a framework allows word order to be rearranged, for instance, to highlight some details or add fresh facts. English has some methods that allow you to highlight a certain part of the sentence by reversing the positions of the Subject, Verb and Object (SVO). In 'It was the cat chasing the rat,' the structure- the cat- is the creature acting in the sentence by chasing out an animal: the rat. This means that communication and understanding are affected by context and this shapes how the grammar of sentences is built (Lambrecht 1994).

The meaning of a sentence comes from the way syntax, semantics and pragmatics interact and share the work. The order of elements in a sentence is syntax, the understanding of each comes from semantics and the meaning is changed with pragmatics through context.

In such cases where one sentence can be understood in different ways because of syntax or meaning, these elements relate to each other. When I say, 'Visiting relatives can be annoying', it means some relatives who come to visit can be disgusting, rather than the act itself. All these factors mean that the syntax is vague and a correct understanding depends on the context given by pragmatics (Crain & Steedman, 1985).

Uncertainty in syntax may come from different ways of attaching words. With the sentence "John saw the man with the telescope," you could say the man with the telescope is part of the man, John saw the man or part of the verb, John saw with the telescope. Being aware of the listener's situation and what they understand is commonly used to understand such sentences (Frazier & Rayner, 1982).

When we try to understand utterances that do things like requesting, commanding or apologising, we relied on pragmatics. Even so, the way a sentence is formed may be used to highlight a specific speech act, but its meaning is still set by the situation it is spoken in. An instance of an indirect request for you to close the window is paying attention to the statement "It's chilly in here" rather than simply saying it's cold (Austin, 1962).

It is necessary when learning a language, to realize how syntax, semantics and pragmatics are connected. They must also learn the grammar, the vocabulary and how people use language in different ways of communication.

Children usually start to understand grammar before they can fully communicate with others using language. As an example, they may not easily grasp the idea of indirect speech and understand the use of figurative language and they need to blend grammar and knowledge of the social situation (Ninio and Snow, 1996). With age, children become able to tell what someone means by a similar sentence form by studying the grammar and realizing that similar sounding sentences can mean different things (e.g., a question and a command) (Clark, 2009).

The context for children can be improved by pragmatic factors which makes it easier for them to grasp the meanings of various sentence structures. For example, people use passive language when it is more important to talk about the action than who did it: 'The window was broken (Crain & Thornton, 1998). Since these situations appear often, it becomes easier to understand when and how to use these forms.

Doing important work in machine translation, speech recognition and sentiment analysis calls for the use of graph-based natural language processing and the combination of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Syntax checks sentence structure, semantics studies the meaning of words and phrases and pragmatic models are used to find the meaning in context (like removing ambiguities and guessing the meaning intended by the speaker) (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020). When there are large, richly texted datasets, configurable models and deep learning models in particular, can analyze the way lexical organization and how it is used relates to the message people try to convey in a given context (Vaswani et al. 2017).

They are all fluid, there is a relationship between them that explains how language is built, understood and used for communication. Syntax presents the grammar, semantics adds more details and pragmatics explains why the appropriate meaning works in the given context. All these aspects work as the foundation for using and understanding language when in different social and situations.

Implications for Computational Linguistics

When computational machines are built to deal with human language, it has effects on syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Linguistic ideas form the base for developing algorithms that help with parsing, translating, generating speech and recognizing what people intend. If an NLP system is to process the complexities and details in human language well, it needs to understand the way syntax, semantics and pragmatics influence each other. In this part, we explore how the findings from these language areas can shape the core topics in computational linguistics, for example, parsing, analyzing meaning, pragmatics and some advanced areas such as machine translation and chatbots.

In syntactic parsing, you analyze the syntactic structure of a sentence, given a sentence and identify the relationships between the words (or parts of it). Syntactic parsing means forming a tree that displays the grammar structure of a sentence which is often referred to as a parse tree. A framework for sentence structure understanding is offered by Context Free Grammars (CFGs), Dependency Grammars and Lexical Functional Grammars (LFG) when they are built on parsing algorithms, as Jurafsky and Martin explain (2020).

There are mainly two types of syntactic parsing in computational linguistics: We consider both constituency parsing and dependency parsing.

1.It is a process where sentences are segmented into smaller groups that follow grammar types (e.g. noun phrases, verb phrases) like a nest. Because of the Penn Treebank Project, constituency parsers based on its large corpus of annotated parse trees have greatly progressed (Marcus, Santorini and Marcinkiewicz, 1993).

2.However, Dependency Parsing involves the relations between words in a sentence by linking each ‘head’ word to the ‘dependents’. For such languages, this is helpful because it allows direct use of syntactic relations (Nivre, 2005).

Improvements to syntactic parsers have come from recent progress in machine learning, especially from RNNs and transformers. As opposed to the other models, they can identify patterns in syntax by reviewing extensive datasets and tend to parse difficult or ambiguous structures with greater accuracy (Vaswani et al., 2017).

Semantic analysis, in computational linguistics, means finding out the meaning of words, phrases and sentences. Apart from this, it brings together grammar and meaning. Word sense disambiguation (WSD) and semantic role labeling (SRL) are important in doing semantic analysis.

1.In Word Sense Disambiguation, the challenge is to determine the right meaning of a word in a sentence. The word 'bank' may indicate where money is stored or the area of a river Miller (1995).

2.SRL highlights each word in a sentence and notes who it acted on, when it happened, where it happened and so on. SRL matches the syntactic components with semantic roles by assigning labels such as agent, patient, instrument and in general all required roles to all arguments. Thanks to such information, machines can now go beyond sentence grammar and understand the actual meaning of what sentences convey (Gildea and Jurafsky, 2002).

Context-based language use is studied under pragmatics and in computational linguistics, pragmatics focuses on the effect of context on meaning and language goals. As opposed to syntax and semantics, pragmatics focuses only on the structure and meaning of a sentence, while considering things like the speaker’s goal, social rules and the place and time the sentence is used.

Even though pragmatics is not needed for all dialogue systems and conversational agents, these are still among the leading uses for pragmatics in computational linguistics. They are designed to interact with users like a human, listen to their input, understand it and respond in a suitable way. Before, aspects such as taking turns, leading the conversation and working with context were taken care of by using pragmatic methods (Bunt & Black, 2000).

The intention behind a user’s input is understood by conversational agents thanks to these advanced models and they give relevant answers in response. They make use of the form of words, their meaning and the past and current environment of the conversation (such as user history) to figure out how the message is meant (Radlinski & Craswell, 2017). E.g. If the user asked, "Will you set an alarm for me at 6 a.m?

Since the system can understand the concept of a request, it will not respond to this kind of statement as though it was asked something.

Pragmatics is significant in another aspect, reference resolution, in which the system has to discover which pronouns or noun phrases are being talked about during the conversation. For instance, John placed the book on the table. He went on to say, “Then he went,” as ‘he’ is his pronoun. However, anaphora resolution has to understand the connections between what has been said earlier, so it’s a complicated matter (Mitkov, 2002).

Anaphora resolution usually involves coreference resolution which discovers every time an expression refers to the same thing in the text. The strategies used in this step rely on grammatical gender and number, as well as on typical ways people hold conversations (Jurafsky & Martin, 2020).

Machine translation which converts text from one language to another, is possible because of syntax, semantics and pragmatics in computational linguistics. At the beginning, MT relied mainly on rule-based systems that depended on syntactic and lexical rules, but other approaches were based on statistics. Still, recognizing how sentences are phrased, the meaning of certain words and the nature of expressions was a tough task for these systems.

SMT was introduced in versions and then NMT started to appear which led us to rely on data and use large sets of parallel data for training. Recent research has found that using transformers in NMT leads to better results since it looks at a complete sentence’s meaning instead of translating each word separately (Bahdanau, Cho, & Bengio, 2015). In this case, the NMT system would notice that “kick the bucket” is an idiom and translates it as a phrase meaning to die.

In machine translation, pragmatics plays a role in dealing with expressions of politeness, issues of culture and coherence in discussion; all these fall under the semantic and contextual activities it covers. For this reason, the latest MT systems use discourse level features and pragmatic elements in their translation models (Tiedemann & Scherrer, 2017).

Other systems in addition to syntactic and semantic processing can do sentimental analysis and opinion mining which involves grasping the emotion and standpoint of the text. To do sentiment analysis, you assign the text to the neutral, positive or negative category (Pang & Lee, 2008). Sentiment can be unclear when someone uses metaphors, sarcasm or situational meanings, so pragmatic thoughts are needed to interpret it correctly.

When you look at it closely, 'love' turns out to be sarcastic and negative, even if it originally sounded good. In turn, this means that sentiment analysis models include syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features, mostly lexicographic embeddings like BERT and GPT (Devlin, et al., 2019).

Software technology in linguistics has improved a lot, although we still haven't managed to fully connect syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Usually, they do well in one or two areas, but are not able to explain all three in real-life situations. Both context and figurative language can be challenging for NLP systems and these problems usually remain unresolved.

They intend to focus on multi task learning, helping models to handle several tasks at the same time, for example, parsing, analyzing sentiments, translation and creating context aware language models that grasp different kinds of pragmatics. Since few-shot and zero-shot learning are able to cover new tasks with small data (Brown et al., 2020), they may also support better processing of syntax, semantics and pragmatics in different applications.

Outcomes from the areas of syntax, semantics and pragmatics are important for both computational linguistics and building advanced NLP systems. Knowing how these areas of language are linked makes it possible for computing systems to both accomplish these activities and respond to people like people do. Blending these factors into a working model has made this field evolve fast and research is still happening to make algorithms that can handle the closeness of language in different situations.

Discussion

Examining the way human language is organized and works by means of syntax, semantics and pragmatics is what this exploration involves. This paper looked at how syntax supports the organization of sentences, how semantics adds meaning to those sentences and how pragmatics affects the way language is used. The study finds that syntactic, semantic and pragmatic patterns are used and passed on together to make communication clear and correct. In this part of the guide, we cover the most important insights, implications, challenges and future directions in studying syntax and how they are used in different areas.

This chapter studies syntax as the basic part of linguistic theory to explain how it contributes to how language works. When speaking about the baby, 'this' by itself isn't enough; the speaker needs to use a set of rules that can allow one word to be used in all sorts of sentences. Generative grammar and Minimalist Program emphasize that a biological capacity, called syntactic processing, is why human language development is the same across different languages. Experts have found that children use similar steps to master language syntax which implies that grammar may be universal.

Although, some frameworks focusing on the way syntax is organized suggest that syntax is not entirely separate from other language functions. The syntax-semantics interface proves that syntax includes semantic information that reflects how elements in the sentence are related. When we want to express who acts, receives an action or aims for an action, we depend on word order in a sentence. What these roles do is crucial for knowing the meaning of a sentence and also for understanding meanings in various situations. Although the sequence of words play little part in clarifying sentences that have multiple meanings, the connection between syntax and semantics is still important, so we should study syntax when processing sentence meaning.

syntax is significant for neurolinguistics since it helps inform how the brain handles language processing. They report that syntax is not only a theoretical aspect; in fact, there is proof that Broca's area and pSTG in the brain are involved in syntax. ERP findings point out that when there is a syntactic anomaly, there is a brain response known as the P600 which is linked to the brain's process of noticing and fixing the error. This shows that syntax is important in understanding language as we encounter it and it indicates that the brain uses grammar to create meaningful ideas.

One useful thing we learn through syntax is how people acquire language, with special focus on how knowledge of syntax affects being able to communicate. Access to basic language structures when they are young allows children to gradually learn more complex structures which helps them form increasingly complicated sentences. Influences on language development include natural abilities and experiences with a variety of sentences and the stronger the development, the more input a child has. The syntax/pragmatics connection appears when children speak to get answers, make requests, narrate stories and so on. Usually, children start with easy sentences and end up using sentences with coordination, subordination and different syntactic features.

Yet, it is not easy for L2 learners to follow syntactic rules when the rules in the first language are not the same. To solve these difficulties, one should practice learning the syntax of a new language through classes and also have many opportunities to interact with native speakers. When students learn to combine sentences and work with grammar, they are able to express themselves in different ways, depending on the situation. Working with syntax is crucial to come up with the best language teaching strategies and useful methods for students learning a new language.

Natural language processing (NLP) technologies are created by blending syntax, semantics and pragmatics, as part of computational linguistics. It is machines that can intensively analyze sentence structure, with the aid of syntactic analysis which plays an important role in machine translation, text

summarization and speech recognition. With the combination of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic approaches, computational systems become more accurate in analysis, partly used for activities like sentiment analysis, examining discourse and handling dialogues.

Since human language is full of variations and uncertainty, computational linguistics is a major challenge for these models. Older systems focused on writing rules for parsing sentences, while nowadays, systems use machine learning and deep learning to identify patterns from big collections of data. Applying these strategies makes models better at working with complex and variable data which improves their performance in areas like combining syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

Future efforts in computational linguistics will aim at creating models that respond well to the language differences across domains and registers. For this reason, pragmatic features like who's talking, the situation and cultural background are used to raise the accuracy of language analysis. The task is to make algorithms understand local details and work with many different types of input.

Conclusion

By examining the relationship between syntax, semantics and pragmatics, one can easily see that language is well-organized and important. With the help of syntax, sentences are constructed correctly and their meaning is formed with the influences of semantics and pragmatics which look at a person's language style and the situation. Because of those tools, they were able to discuss different concepts, thoughts, feelings and intentions in a straightforward manner.

It helps to shape other areas, including language teaching, brain-related language research and computer-based language studies. Thanks to what we have learned, we can handle difficulties in learning languages, solving speech issues and analyzing natural language. Also, it helps us see how the brain works while we are communicating.

So this research will continue, as scientists will work on understanding relationships among syntax, semantics and pragmatics in the future. With the help of linguistics, the cognitive sciences, neuroscience and artificial intelligence, it is achievable. Making new models of language with traits like those in humans and studying communication allows us to program apps that communicate as we speak and write at present and predict changes in communication skills as we get older.

In addition, syntax tells us that language can alter its shape whenever we communicate and explains why it is important and influential to our minds. As new sentences are added, the links between the language, thoughts, culture and human life are more clear to see. Yet, we will keep looking at syntax, semantics and pragmatics since they help us understand humans.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon Press.

Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., & Bengio, Y. (2015). Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Benson, D. F. (1993). *Aphasia, alexia, and agraphia*. Oxford University Press.

Berthier, M. L., Green, C., & Higueras, C. (2011). Rehabilitation of poststroke aphasia: A review. *NeuroRehabilitation, 28*(1), 93–107.

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Longman.

Bickerton, D. (1981). *Roots of language*. Karoma Publishers.

Boeckx, C. (2006). *Linguistic minimalism: Origins, concepts, methods, and aims*. Oxford University Press.

Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, I., & Schlesewsky, M. (2009). The role of the left posterior superior temporal sulcus in sentence comprehension. *Brain and Language, 111*(2), 104–111.

Bresnan, J. (2001). *Lexical-functional syntax*. Blackwell.

Brown, R. (1973). *A first language: The early stages*. Harvard University Press.

Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., ... & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vol. 33, pp. 1877-1901).

Bunt, H., & Black, W. (Eds.). (2000). *Abduction, belief and context in dialogue: Studies in computational pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge University Press.

Caplan, D. (2006). *Neurolinguistics and linguistic aphasiology: An introduction to principles and techniques*. Cambridge University Press.

Carnie, A. (2013). *Syntax: A generative introduction* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Catani, M., & Mesulam, M. M. (2008). The arcuate fasciculus and the disconnection theme in language and aphasia: History and current state. *Cortex, 44*(8), 953–961.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding: The Pisa lectures*. Foris Publications.

Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. MIT Press.

Clark, E. V. (2009). *First language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Crain, S., & Steedman, M. (1985). On not being led up the garden path: The use of context by the psychological parser. In D. R. Dowty, L. Karttunen, & A. Zwicky (Eds.), *Natural language parsing: Psychological, computational, and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 320-358). Cambridge University Press.

Crain, S., & Thornton, R. (1998). *Investigations in universal grammar: A guide to experiments on the acquisition of syntax and semantics*. MIT Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

de Villiers, J. G. (1995). Acquisition of complement clauses. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *The handbook of child language* (pp. 562-589). Blackwell.

Devlin, J., Chang, M. W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 4171-4186).

Diessel, H. (2004). *The acquisition of complex sentences*. Cambridge University Press.

Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language, 67*(3), 547-619.

Duffau, H. (2008). The anatomo-functional connectivity of language revisited: New insights provided by electrostimulation and tractography. *Neuropsychologia, 46*(4), 927–934.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Finegan, E. (2014). *Language: Its structure and use* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Frazier, L., & Rayner, K. (1982). Making and correcting errors during sentence comprehension: Eye movements in the analysis of structurally ambiguous sentences. *Cognitive Psychology, 14*(2), 178-210.

Frege, G. (1980). On sense and reference. In P. Geach & M. Black (Eds.), *Translations from the philosophical writings of Gottlob Frege* (pp. 56-78). Blackwell. (Original work published 1892).

Friederici, A. D. (2002). Towards a neural basis of auditory sentence processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 6*(2), 78–84.

Friederici, A. D. (2011). The brain basis of language processing: From structure to function. *Physiological Reviews, 91*(4), 1357–1392.

Friederici, A. D., & Kotz, S. A. (2003). The brain basis of syntactic processes: Functional imaging and lesion studies. *NeuroImage, 20*(1), S8–S17.

Gathercole, S. E., & Baddeley, A. D. (1993). *Working memory and language*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gildea, D., & Jurafsky, D. (2002). Automatic labeling of semantic roles. *Computational Linguistics, 28*(3), 245-288.

Gleitman, L. R., & Newport, E. L. (1995). The invention of language by children: Environmental and biological influences on the acquisition of language. In L. R. Gleitman & M. Liberman (Eds.), *An invitation to cognitive science: Language* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-24). MIT Press.

Goldberg, A. E. (2006). *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford University Press.

Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Hickok, G., & Poeppel, D. (2007). The cortical organization of speech processing. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 8*(5), 393–402.

Hoff, E. (2006). How social contexts support and shape language development. *Developmental Review, 26*(1), 55-88.

Hornstein, N., Nunes, J., & Grohmann, K. K. (2005). *Understanding minimalism*. Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, R. (2007). *Language networks: The new Word Grammar*. Oxford University Press.

Hulk, A., & Müller, N. (2000). Bilingual first language acquisition at the interface between syntax and pragmatics. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 3*(3), 227-244.

Jackendoff, R. (2002). *Foundations of language: Brain, meaning, grammar, evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2020). *Speech and language processing* (3rd ed.). Pearson.

Kaan, E., & Swaab, T. Y. (2003). Repair, revision, and complexity in syntactic analysis: An electrophysiological differentiation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 15*(1), 98–110.

Kubler, S., McDonald, R., & Nivre, J. (2009). *Dependency parsing*. Morgan & Claypool.

Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge University Press.

Leonard, L. B. (2014). *Children with specific language impairment* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Marcus, M. P., Santorini, B., & Marcinkiewicz, M. A. (1993). Building a large annotated corpus of English: The Penn Treebank. *Computational Linguistics, 19*(2), 313-330.

Miller, G. A. (1995). WordNet: A lexical database for English. *Communications of the ACM, 38*(11), 39-41.

Mitkov, R. (2002). *Anaphora resolution*. Longman.

Montague, R. (1974). *Formal philosophy: Selected papers of Richard Montague*. Yale University Press.

Ninio, A., & Snow, C. E. (1996). *Pragmatic development*. Westview Press.

Nivre, J. (2005). *Inductive dependency parsing*. Springer.

Osterhout, L., & Holcomb, P. J. (1992). Event-related brain potentials elicited by syntactic anomaly. *Journal of Memory and Language, 31*(6), 785–806.

Pang, B., & Lee, L. (2008). *Opinion mining and sentiment analysis*. Now Publishers Inc.

Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. William Morrow.

Pollard, C., & Sag, I. A. (1994). *Head-driven phrase structure grammar*. University of Chicago Press.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman.

Radford, A. (1990). *Syntactic theory and the acquisition of English syntax: The nature of early child grammars of English*. Blackwell.

Radlinski, F., & Craswell, N. (2017). A theoretical framework for conversational search. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Conference Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (pp. 117-126).

Richards, N. (2010). *Uttering trees*. MIT Press.

Sag, I. A., Wasow, T., & Bender, E. M. (2003). *Syntactic theory: A formal introduction* (2nd ed.). CSLI Publications.

Saur, D., Lange, R., Baumgaertner, A., Schraknepper, V., Willmes, K., & Rijntjes, M. (2008). Dynamics of language reorganization after stroke. *Brain, 131*(8), 2331–2341.

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 59-82). Academic Press.

Slobin, D. I. (1985). *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition* (Vol. 1). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Snow, C. E. (1995). Issues in the study of input: Fine-tuning, universality, individual and developmental differences, and necessary causes. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *The handbook of child language* (pp. 180-193). Blackwell.

Strong, W. (1986). *Creative approaches to sentence combining*. ERIC Clearinghouse.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.

Thompson, C. K. (2000). Neuroplasticity: Evidence from aphasia. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 33*(4), 357–366.

Tiedemann, J., & Scherrer, Y. (2017). Neural machine translation with extended context. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Discourse in Machine Translation* (pp. 82-92).

Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Harvard University Press.

Tyler, L. K., & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2008). Fronto-temporal brain systems supporting spoken language comprehension. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *363*(1493), 1037–1054.

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., ... & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (pp. 5998-6008).

Weismer, S. E., Evans, J. L., & Hesketh, L. J. (2005). An emerging view of specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *48*(4), 948–960.