Review Article

The Relationship Between Syntax and Semantics in Linguistic Theory

Anik Joshi

Student, Veer Madho Singh Bhandari Uttarakhand Technical University, Sudhowala, Uttarakhand, India

I N F O

A B S T R A C T

The relationship between syntax and semantics is a central focus in linguistic theory, as it investigates how sentence structure (syntax) and meaning (semantics) interact to form a cohesive understanding of language. While traditionally studied separately, recent linguistic frameworks emphasize their interdependence. This review explores key theoretical approaches, such as Generative Grammar, Formal Semantics, and Cognitive Linguistics, highlighting their treatment of the syntax-semantics interface. We discuss essential issues, including argument structure, ambiguity, compositional semantics, and the role of syntactic movement in interpretation. The article concludes that a comprehensive understanding of language requires recognizing the dynamic interplay between syntax and semantics, with each influencing and shaping the other in the process of meaning construction.

Keywords: Syntax, Semantics, Syntax-Semantics Interface, Generative Grammar, Formal Semantics

Introduction

- **Syntax:** Syntax is the study of the rules, principles, and processes that govern the structure of sentences in a language. It explores the hierarchical relationships between words and phrases, and how they combine to form grammatically correct and meaningful structures.

At its core, syntax concerns itself with the organization of constituents—groups of words that function as a unit within a sentence. These constituents could be noun phrases (e.g., "the red apple"), verb phrases (e.g., "is running"), and others. Syntax also studies the grammatical roles these constituents play, such as subjects, verbs, objects, and complements.

Additionally, syntactic structures are represented through tree diagrams or phrase structure rules, where the hierarchy and relationships between elements are visualized. Syntactic theory focuses on understanding the rules that determine word order, agreement (e.g., subject-verb agreement), and subcategorization (how verbs combine with their arguments, like "throwing a ball").[1]

Key subfields of syntax include:

- **Phrase Structure Grammar:** Focuses on how sentences are broken down into smaller units.
- **Transformational Grammar:** Examines how sentences can be transformed into different structures without changing their underlying meaning (e.g., active to passive sentences).
- **X-bar Theory:** A theoretical framework that explains the internal structure of phrases and sentences.

Syntax is concerned primarily with the form of sentences—how sentences are constructed according to specific language rules. However, these forms must eventually be linked to meaning, which is where semantics plays a critical role.

21

Joshi A
J. Adv. Res. Comput. Linguist.: J. Comput. Sci. Lang. 2025; 1(1)

Semantics

Semantics, in contrast to syntax, is the study of meaning in language. It focuses on how words, phrases, and sentences convey meaning in different contexts, and how these meanings are structured and interpreted. Semantics addresses the problem of how linguistic expressions correspond to the world, abstract concepts, or human experiences.

Semantics can be categorized into two primary areas:

- **Lexical Semantics:** The study of word meaning. This involves understanding how individual words carry meaning, how meanings shift in different contexts, and how words relate to one another within a language. For example, "dog" refers to a specific animal, but the meaning of the word can also be understood in relation to its synonyms (e.g., "canine") or antonyms (e.g., "cat").
- **Compositional Semantics:** This area focuses on how the meanings of smaller linguistic units combine to form the meaning of larger units, like phrases and sentences. It looks at how word meanings interact based on syntactic structures. For example, the sentence "The cat chased the dog" is understood based on the individual meanings of "cat," "chased," and "dog," and how these meanings combine through syntax.

Semantics also examines more complex issues like ambiguity, where a single sentence can have multiple meanings depending on interpretation (e.g., "I saw the man with the telescope"). Another area of focus is pragmatics, which studies how context influences the interpretation of meaning. Pragmatics is closely related to semantics but often focuses more on how meaning is used in communication, rather than just what the meaning is in isolation.[2]

Key subfields of semantics include:

- **Truth-Conditional Semantics:** This approach interprets sentences in terms of the conditions under which they would be true or false in a given world.
- **Model-Theoretic Semantics:** A formal method that represents meaning in terms of mathematical models.
- **Semantic Ambiguity:** The study of how a single expression can have multiple meanings depending on context (e.g., "bank" could refer to a financial institution or the side of a river).

While syntax focuses on how sentences are structured, semantics is concerned with how those structures convey meaning. This connection between form and meaning is vital, and understanding it requires a careful analysis of both domains.

Interdependence of Syntax and Semantics

Although syntax and semantics are often treated as distinct fields, they are interdependent and complementary. Syntax provides the structural framework that allows semantic elements to be combined, while semantics provides the content and interpretation that guides how syntactic structures are understood. For instance, in the sentence "The cat chased the dog," the syntactic structure (subject-verb-object) helps convey the meaning that one entity (the cat) performed an action (chased) on another entity (the dog). Without syntax, this relationship would be unclear, and without semantics, the meaning of the individual words would be meaningless without context.

In modern linguistic theory, it is widely accepted that syntax and semantics interact dynamically—meaning emerges not just from a static relationship between syntax and semantics, but from how the two systems work together during language processing and communication. The study of this interaction is crucial for understanding how humans use and understand language, and how languages vary in their syntax and semantic constructions.[3]

By focusing on both form (syntax) and meaning (semantics), linguists can construct a more comprehensive model of linguistic theory, which is critical for the analysis and interpretation of human language.

The Interplay Between Syntax and Semantics

Generative Grammar (Chomskyan Approach)

Generative grammar is a formal theory of syntax developed by Noam Chomsky that aims to describe the implicit knowledge speakers have of their language. According to generative grammar, the syntax of a sentence is generated by a set of universal principles known as Universal Grammar (UG). UG consists of a set of innate, universal rules that underlie all human languages, though the actual realization of these principles can vary from language to language.

In the Chomskyan approach, syntax plays a central role in sentence structure formation, and meaning is often regarded as emerging from the interaction of syntax with other components, such as the lexicon (the mental dictionary of words) and context. According to this framework, the relationship between syntax and semantics is one of interpretation: syntactic structures are mapped to meanings via rules that interpret those structures.

In Generative Syntax, sentence structures are generated step by step from deep structures to surface structures through transformational rules (such as movement or passive formation). For example, the deep structure of the sentence "John kicked the ball" might be transformed into the passive form "The ball was kicked by John." The

Joshi A
J. Adv. Res. Comput. Linguist.: J. Comput. Sci. Lang. 2025; 1(1)

22

meaning of the sentence remains largely the same, but the syntactic structure changes.

Although generative grammar separates syntax and semantics into distinct components, the framework also acknowledges that meaning is derived from syntactic forms through interpretation. Semantics, in this model, is concerned with the representation of meaning based on the syntactic structure, but the two are not entirely integrated into a single unified framework.[4]

Principles and Parameters: One of the key insights in Chomskyan theory is the principles and parameters model. This idea suggests that while the fundamental rules of syntax (principles) are universal across all languages, individual languages can differ in how they set certain parameters. For example, languages might differ in word order (Subject-Verb-Object vs. Subject-Object-Verb), but they still share the same fundamental syntactic principles. This allows for both universality and diversity in human language.

Formal Semantics (Montague Grammar)

Formal semantics, particularly Montague Grammar, represents a significant shift in the study of the syntax-semantics relationship. Developed by Richard Montague in the 1960s, this framework aimed to formally represent the relationship between syntax and semantics using mathematical logic. Montague's approach was revolutionary because it treated syntax and semantics as part of a unified formal system rather than separate, isolated components.

Montague proposed that the meanings of sentences could be derived directly from their syntactic structures using semantic rules. These meanings are expressed as logical forms (often in predicate logic or lambda calculus), which can be interpreted in terms of truth conditions—i.e., the conditions under which a sentence would be true or false.

According to Montague, a sentence like "John kicked the ball" can be analyzed in terms of its syntactic structure (such as subject-verb-object order) and then mapped to a logical form that expresses its meaning in a precise, formal way. This logical form can then be interpreted in various contexts (different possible worlds), which determines whether the sentence is true or false in those worlds.

Truth Conditions and Possible Worlds: Montague's grammar operates on the assumption that the meaning of a sentence is about how it fits into the world. The truth-conditional semantics he developed works by evaluating sentences according to their truth conditions in possible worlds. For example, "John kicked the ball" is true in a possible world if, in that world, John performed the action of kicking the ball. This formal approach allows for a precise, mathematical interpretation of meaning, offering a strong connection between syntax and semantics.

By using formal logic to represent meaning, Montague Grammar allows linguists to examine how the syntactic structure of a sentence directly determines its meaning and provides a rigorous method for analyzing linguistic meaning.

Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar

In contrast to the formal, rule-based approaches of generative grammar and Montague grammar, Cognitive Linguistics (CL) and Construction Grammar take a more integrated view of syntax and semantics. These frameworks emphasize that syntax and semantics are deeply interconnected and cannot be fully separated.

Cognitive Linguistics is grounded in the idea that language is closely tied to thought and cognition. According to CL, the structure of a language reflects the structure of human thought, and meaning is shaped by cognitive processes such as categorization, metaphor, and experiential grounding. In this view, syntax does not exist independently of meaning. Instead, syntax is a way of organizing and expressing conceptual structures that arise from our experiences, perceptions, and cognitive abilities.

For instance, in CL, the sentence "The cat chased the mouse" is not just a syntactic structure; it represents a conceptual structure in the speaker's mind. The syntax of subject-verb-object reflects the way human beings cognitively organize actions, agents, and objects in the world. The meaning of the sentence is inherently linked to both the conceptual structure (the experience of an agent chasing an object) and the syntactic structure used to express it.[5]

Construction Grammar goes further by claiming that constructions—pairings of form and meaning—are the fundamental units of language. A construction is a specific linguistic form (like a sentence or a phrase) paired with its associated meaning. Constructions can range from the simplest (such as a noun phrase like "the cat") to more complex ones (like the passive construction "The ball was kicked by John"). In this approach, syntax and semantics are inseparable, as the meaning of a construction is inextricably tied to its form.

Constructions and Syntax-Semantics Interaction: In Construction Grammar, meaning and form are inseparable, and syntactic structures are not merely the result of abstract grammatical rules but are shaped by the meanings they express. A sentence like "John kicked the ball" is not merely a syntactic structure that must be parsed according to formal rules; it is also a conventionalized pairing of a specific form and meaning in the language. The meaning of "kicked" is inseparable from the syntactic structure that represents an event involving an agent (John), an action (kicking), and a patient (the ball).

23

Joshi A

J. Adv. Res. Comput. Linguist.: J. Comput. Sci. Lang. 2025; 1(1)

This view contrasts with the more traditional models that treat syntax as a largely independent component of language. For Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar, syntax and semantics are co-constructed: syntactic forms are shaped by meaning, and meanings are shaped by their syntactic forms.[6]

The Interplay Between Syntax and Semantics

In summary, the relationship between syntax and semantics has been explored through several distinct theoretical approaches. Generative grammar, with its focus on Universal Grammar, views syntax as a set of independent principles interacting with meaning via interpretation. Montague grammar integrates syntax and semantics through formal logical systems, providing a precise, mathematical framework for understanding their relationship. Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar, on the other hand, emphasize the intrinsic link between form and meaning, viewing them as inseparable components that co-evolve in the cognitive process of language use.

Each of these approaches provides unique insights into the interplay between syntax and semantics, reflecting the diverse ways in which linguists attempt to understand how language functions. Understanding how syntax and semantics interact is crucial for uncovering the underlying principles of human cognition and communication.

Key Issues in the Syntax-Semantics Interface

Argument Structure and Syntactic Structures

Argument structure refers to the set of syntactic roles (or theta roles) that a verb or predicate can assign to its arguments, such as the agent, patient, experiencer, or theme. These roles are deeply connected to the semantic roles that these arguments play in a sentence's meaning. For example, in the sentence "John kicked the ball," "John" is the agent (the doer of the action), and "the ball" is the patient (the entity that undergoes the action). The verb "kick" assigns these specific roles, and the syntactic structure must reflect this assignment.

The interaction between argument structure and syntactic structure is a central issue in the syntax-semantics interface, and different linguistic theories offer varying perspectives on how this relationship is organized. In Generative Grammar, this interaction is formalized in Theta Theory, which posits that each argument in a sentence must be assigned a theta role (e.g., agent, patient, etc.). This theory allows linguists to formalize the link between syntax (the structure of arguments in the sentence) and semantics (the meaning of those arguments and their roles).[7]

In Generative Grammar, theta roles are assigned to the arguments of verbs, and the syntactic structure is determined by the syntactic position of those arguments (e.g., subject, object). For example, in the sentence "She baked a cake," "She" is assigned the role of agent, and "a cake" is assigned the role of theme. The syntax must reflect these semantic roles by placing the agent in the subject position and the theme in the object position.

However, in more flexible frameworks such as Construction Grammar or Cognitive Linguistics, this relationship is seen as more dynamic. Rather than rigidly assigning roles based on syntactic position, these theories suggest that syntax and semantics can interact in more flexible ways. The meaning of a sentence can be influenced by constructions (pairings of form and meaning), and argument structures are seen as more context-dependent and open to variation. For example, in construction grammar, an argument can have different syntactic roles depending on the specific construction in use, thus making the relationship between syntax and semantics more context-sensitive and less determined by fixed syntactic rules.

Ambiguity and Composition

Compositional semantics is the study of how individual words combine to form the meaning of a sentence. This process is highly dependent on syntax, as the arrangement of words within a sentence determines how their meanings are combined. In a compositional system, the meaning of the whole is built up from the meanings of the parts, following the rules of the language's syntax. For example, in the sentence "The cat chased the mouse," the meanings of the words "cat," "chased," and "mouse" are combined according to the syntactic structure to generate the overall meaning.

However, ambiguity is a major challenge in this process, as sentences can often be interpreted in multiple ways based on their syntactic structure. Ambiguity can arise in several ways, including:

- **Syntactic Ambiguity:** When a sentence can have multiple interpretations because of different possible syntactic structures. For example, the sentence "I saw the man with the telescope" can mean either that "I used a telescope to see the man" or "I saw a man who had a telescope."
- **Scope Ambiguity:** This occurs when the scope of quantifiers (such as "some," "all," or "many") is unclear, leading to multiple interpretations. For instance, "Every student read a book" could mean either that "each student read a different book" (universal scope) or "there exists a book that all students read" (existential scope).
- **Lexical Ambiguity:** Words themselves can have multiple meanings depending on the context in which they appear. For example, the word "bank" could refer to a financial institution or the side of a river.[8]

Joshi A
J. Adv. Res. Comput. Linguist.: J. Comput. Sci. Lang. 2025; 1(1)

24

The resolution of such ambiguities often depends on the syntactic structure of the sentence and how different components of the sentence (such as nouns, verbs, and quantifiers) are combined. This highlights the importance of syntax in guiding compositional meaning, as the syntactic structure often determines how multiple meanings or interpretations are constructed. However, ambiguity also reveals the challenges of trying to align syntax and semantics, as multiple syntactic structures can often lead to different meanings.

This issue of ambiguity is crucial in understanding the relationship between syntax and semantics, as it reveals how syntactic rules must be flexible enough to account for multiple possible meanings and interpretations. The debate surrounding scope ambiguities and syntactic movement is particularly relevant to theories of compositionality, as these phenomena raise questions about whether meaning can always be derived compositionally from syntax.[9]

Movement and Interpretation

Syntactic movement refers to the process by which elements of a sentence are moved from one position to another in order to form a different syntactic structure. This is a key feature of many syntactic theories, particularly in Generative Grammar, where transformations like wh-movement (e.g., "What did you see?" vs. "You saw what?") or passivization (e.g., "John kicked the ball" → "The ball was kicked by John") are used to derive different surface structures from an underlying sentence structure.

Syntactic movement raises important questions about how meaning is affected by these transformations. In many cases, the core meaning of the sentence remains unchanged, even though its syntactic structure is altered. For example, the passive construction "The ball was kicked by John" has the same core meaning as the active sentence "John kicked the ball," even though the syntactic structure has undergone a transformation. This phenomenon suggests that syntax and semantics are not entirely independent, as the meaning of a sentence is often influenced by syntactic transformations.

Thematic Roles and Movement: Movement can sometimes affect the thematic roles of sentence elements. For example, in a passive sentence, the agent (e.g., "John") is moved to a by-phrase (e.g., "by John"), while the patient (e.g., "the ball") becomes the subject of the sentence. Although the syntactic structure changes, the thematic roles (who did what to whom) are maintained, indicating that syntax and semantics are dynamically linked in this process.

The issue of movement and interpretation challenges the idea that syntax and semantics are fully independent. Instead, it suggests that syntactic transformations do not merely alter the form of a sentence but also contribute to how the sentence's meaning is interpreted. The relationship between syntax and semantics is thus seen as interactive—syntactic movement both shapes and is shaped by the meaning of the sentence.[10]

Conclusion

The relationship between syntax and semantics is a complex and multifaceted issue in linguistic theory. Key issues such as argument structure, ambiguity, and syntactic movement all highlight the interplay between form (syntax) and meaning (semantics). While traditional linguistic theories often treated syntax and semantics as separate components, more recent approaches emphasize their interdependence and dynamic interaction.

Understanding the syntax-semantics interface is crucial not only for linguistic theory but also for understanding how humans use and process language. The challenge of reconciling compositional meaning with issues like ambiguity and syntactic movement underscores the complexity of human language and offers insights into how meaning is constructed through the interaction of syntax, semantics, and context. This intersection continues to be a vibrant area of exploration, with significant implications for fields like cognitive science, language processing, and communication.

References

1. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton; 1957.
2. Montague R. Universal grammar. Theoria. 1970;36(1):373–398.
3. Fillmore CJ. The case for case. In: Bach E, Harms R, editors. Universals in Linguistic Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston; 1968. p. 1-88.
4. Goldberg AE. Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.
5. Langacker RW. Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008.
6. Lakoff G. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1987.
7. Jackendoff R. Semantics and Cognition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1983.
8. Culicover PW, Jackendoff R. The Syntax-Semantics Interface. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2005.
9. Pullum GW, Huddleston RW. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2002.
10. Pollard C, Sag I. Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1994.