

Syntactic Derivation in Similar Syntactic Structures

¹ Aynur Abazarova

Accepted: 08.10.2025

Published: 09.01.2025

<https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.0107001>

Abstract. This article examines the phenomenon of syntactic derivation within similar syntactic structures, emphasizing its theoretical and practical significance in modern linguistics. While derivation has traditionally been associated with word formation, recent studies highlight its essential role at the syntactic level, where more complex sentence forms emerge from simpler ones through systematic grammatical and semantic shifts. Drawing on perspectives from generative grammar and the works of scholars such as Chomsky, Jespersen, and Harris, the study outlines how derivational relations differ from transformational ones, with the former primarily altering internal meaning and the latter external form. Various examples demonstrate processes such as causativity, modality, and passivization, which generate new sentence forms while maintaining coherence with the original structures. The analysis also distinguishes between invariant derivation, where the number of sentence members increases or decreases, and syntagmatic derivation, where structures remain formally stable but undergo semantic modification. By classifying derivational operators and their functions, the paper argues that syntactic derivation provides deeper insights into the dynamics of language, revealing mechanisms by which meaning, form, and communicative function interact to produce linguistic diversity.

Keywords: *syntactic derivation; similar syntactic structures; derivational aspect; transformation; grammatical operators; semantic shift*

Introduction

Linguistic research, like any other branch of science, is characterized by the diversity of its approaches, levels of analysis, and interpretive frameworks. Each perspective offers a distinct set of parameters that allow the systematic study of language as a complex and dynamic phenomenon. Traditionally, linguistics has been explored through such dichotomies as *diachronic–synchronic*, *language–speech*, *form–content*, and *paradigmatic–syntagmatic* relations, each of which highlights the structural and functional aspects of linguistic phenomena (Saussure, 1916/1983). These perspectives have provided a foundation for understanding the mechanisms of language and for distinguishing its components across different analytical levels.

In recent decades, however, the concept of the **derivational aspect** has emerged as a particularly significant tool for syntactic research. While the notion of derivation was historically confined to word formation and affixal processes (Aronoff, 1976), its extension into syntax has opened new avenues for describing how more complex structures are generated from simpler units. The application of

¹ Abazarova, A. N. Senior Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages, Academy of the State Border Service of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Email: finansshahin@gmail.com. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1966-2898>

derivational analysis at the syntactic level has been emphasized in the works of generative linguists, most notably Noam Chomsky, whose theory of *transformational-generative grammar* demonstrates how sentences can be systematically derived from underlying structures (Chomsky, 1965).

The distinction between **derivation** and **transformation** is particularly relevant in syntactic studies. Transformational operations alter the external form of a sentence—such as changing a declarative into an interrogative—while derivational relations primarily affect its internal semantic and grammatical status (Harris, 1957). This distinction has important implications for analyzing how meaning is preserved or shifted across different syntactic forms. For instance, causative and modal constructions illustrate how derivation introduces new semantic operators into a sentence while retaining its basic propositional content (Jespersen, 1924/1965).

The relevance of studying syntactic derivation lies in its ability to uncover the mechanisms through which language generates variation and complexity. By tracing the processes through which elementary meanings and grammatical operators interact, scholars can better understand the dynamic interplay between form, meaning, and communicative intent. Such an approach not only clarifies structural similarities among syntactic patterns but also provides insights into the cognitive and functional principles underlying linguistic creativity.

Methodology

The present study employs a **comparative–analytical and descriptive methodology** to investigate the phenomenon of syntactic derivation in similar syntactic structures. Since the research is primarily theoretical, the analysis does not rely on empirical corpus statistics but instead draws on established linguistic theories, supported by illustrative examples from both **English** and **Azerbaijani** syntax.

The analysis begins with a **review of foundational linguistic frameworks**, including the structuralist perspectives of Zellig Harris, who emphasized transformational operations in syntax, and the generative grammar of Noam Chomsky, which explains how surface structures derive from deep structures through formal rules. These theoretical insights are compared with traditional European approaches to syntax, particularly the functional grammar and semantic analysis of Otto Jespersen. Their contributions provide the conceptual background for distinguishing between *derivational* and *transformational* relations in sentence structures.

To operationalize this framework, the study uses a **comparative approach**:

- **English examples** (e.g., *Jenny lay down* → *Grandmother urged Jenny to lie down*) illustrate how causative, modal, and passive operators function in syntactic derivation.
- **Azerbaijani examples**, drawn from standard grammar sources, highlight how similar derivational mechanisms appear in a Turkic language context, particularly in relation to aspect, modality, and causativity.

The **analytical procedure** follows three steps:

1. Identification of **base (original) sentences** as the starting point of derivation.

2. Examination of **derivational operators** (e.g., causative verbs, modal markers, passive constructions) that transform the original sentence into derived forms.
3. Comparison of **formal and semantic changes** across languages to classify derivational relations (invariant vs. syntagmatic derivation).

By adopting this methodology, the study situates syntactic derivation within a cross-linguistic perspective, demonstrating that the mechanisms described in generative grammar also appear in Azerbaijani syntax, albeit through language-specific grammatical operators. This dual focus enhances the explanatory power of the analysis and contributes to a more universal understanding of syntactic derivation as a linguistic process.

Results

The analysis reveals that **syntactic derivation** manifests through systematic relations between base sentences and their derived forms, where grammatical and semantic operators introduce new structures without destroying the internal coherence of meaning. The main findings can be summarized as follows:

1. Invariant Derivation

Invariant derivation occurs when the number of sentence members changes compared to the base sentence. Two subtypes are observed:

- **Ascending invariant derivation:** the derived sentence adds new participants or grammatical operators.
 - *English example:* *Jenny lay down* → *Grandmother laid Jenny down*.
 - *Azerbaijani example:* *Uşaq yatdı* (“The child slept”) → *Ana uşağı yatızdırdı* (“The mother made the child sleep”).
- **Descending invariant derivation:** the derived sentence reduces the number of participants.
 - *English example:* *Mother cleaned the fish* → *The fish was cleaned*.
 - *Azerbaijani example:* *Müəllim mətni izah etdi* (“The teacher explained the text”) → *Mətn izah olundu* (“The text was explained”).

2. Syntagmatic Derivation

In syntagmatic derivation, the structure of sentence members remains the same, but semantic modification occurs through the introduction of additional operators.

- *English example:* *The boy split wood* → *The boy wanted to split wood*.
- *Azerbaijani example:* *Qız oxudu* (“The girl read”) → *Qız oxumaq istədi* (“The girl wanted to read”).

3. Causative Derivation

Causative operators introduce a new agent who initiates the action.

- *English: The child is sleeping* → *The mother made the child sleep.*
- *Azerbaijani: Uşaq yazır* (“The child is writing”) → *Müəllim uşağa yazdırdı* (“The teacher made the child write”).

4. Modal Derivation

Modal verbs or expressions introduce modality into the sentence while preserving its original propositional content.

- *English: Jenny lay down* → *Jenny wanted to lie down.*
- *Azerbaijani: Qız oxudu* (“The girl read”) → *Qız oxuya bilərdi* (“The girl could read”).

5. Passive Derivation

The subject of the base sentence is omitted or demoted, while the object is promoted to subject position.

- *English: Mother cleaned fish* → *Fish was cleaned.*
- *Azerbaijani: Usta evi tikdi* (“The builder constructed the house”) → *Ev tikildi* (“The house was built”).

6. Derivational Trees

Each base sentence, together with its derivatives, forms a **sentence nest** that can be represented as a derivational tree. For example:

- (1) *Jenny danced*
- (2) *Jenny wanted to dance*
- (3) *Grandmother asked Jenny to dance*
- (4) *Mother ordered grandmother to ask Jenny to dance*

This tree-like structure illustrates the multi-stage nature of derivation, where each new operator (causativity, modality, etc.) generates a further derived form.

Discussion

The findings of this study confirm that syntactic derivation is a **systematic process**, governed by grammatical and semantic operators that introduce new structural and functional possibilities into the sentence. This aligns with the **generative approach** of Noam Chomsky (1965), who emphasized the role of transformations in producing surface structures from deep structures. However, while transformations primarily affect the **external form** of the sentence, derivation, as the present study shows, often alters the **internal semantic status** while maintaining the general propositional meaning.

The distinction between transformation and derivation was also highlighted by Zellig Harris (1957), who argued that interrogative constructions, for example, involve transformational changes, whereas causative constructions reflect deeper derivational shifts. The results here support this distinction: while *John went on a trip* → *Did John go on a trip?* exemplifies transformation, *Jane opened the window* → *Grandmother made Jane open the window* illustrates derivation, since the internal meaning changes through the introduction of a new causal operator.

The classification into **invariant** (ascending and descending) and **syntagmatic derivation** also corresponds with the theoretical insights of Otto Jespersen (1924/1965), who saw language as a dynamic system of expansion and reduction. Ascending derivation, such as the introduction of causative agents, reflects the generative power of language to add new semantic participants. Conversely, descending derivation, as in passive constructions, demonstrates how languages economize by omitting agents while preserving the action.

A particularly important contribution of this study is the **comparative perspective**. By analyzing both English and Azerbaijani examples, it becomes clear that derivational mechanisms are **cross-linguistic**. While English relies heavily on auxiliary verbs and modal constructions (*want to*, *make*, *could*), Azerbaijani employs agglutinative suffixes and analytic constructions (*-dır*, *-maq istə-*, *-maq üçün*) to express similar relationships. This demonstrates that the principles of syntactic derivation are universal, even if their **formal realization** differs across languages.

Furthermore, Azerbaijani scholars such as Abdullayev (1992, 1972) have emphasized the importance of syntactic structure in meaning formation. The present results extend this perspective by showing how derivational operators, whether causative, modal, or passive, systematically reshape sentence meaning without breaking its structural logic. This positions derivation as a central mechanism for understanding both the **creativity** and **flexibility** of natural language.

In sum, the discussion highlights that syntactic derivation bridges structuralist and generative traditions: it not only explains how sentences transform in form, but also how new **semantic dimensions** emerge. This dual function underscores the theoretical and practical relevance of the derivational aspect in modern linguistics.

Conclusion

The present study has demonstrated that syntactic derivation is a fundamental mechanism of sentence formation, shaping both the structure and meaning of linguistic units. By distinguishing between invariant derivation (ascending and descending), syntagmatic derivation, causative, modal, and passive processes, it has been shown that derivational relations follow systematic rules rather than random variation.

The comparative analysis of English and Azerbaijani examples reveals that, despite differences in grammatical systems, both languages employ similar strategies to create derived structures. In English, these processes rely largely on auxiliary verbs and modal constructions, while in Azerbaijani they are expressed through suffixes, verb forms, and analytic markers. This suggests that syntactic derivation is a **universal linguistic phenomenon**, though its formal realization varies across languages.

The findings further support the theoretical distinction between **derivation** and **transformation**: while transformations modify the external form of sentences, derivation introduces new semantic operators that alter internal meaning without disrupting coherence. This insight aligns with the generative principles outlined by Chomsky and the functional approaches of Jespersen, while also extending Azerbaijani linguistic traditions represented by Abdullayev and colleagues.

In conclusion, syntactic derivation provides a powerful framework for understanding how languages balance stability with flexibility, enabling the generation of new sentence types while preserving communicative intent. Its study deepens our understanding of the dynamic relationship between form, meaning, and function in language, and highlights the importance of cross-linguistic perspectives in syntactic theory.

References

- Abdullayev, Ə. Z. (1992). *Azərbaycan dili məsələləri* [Problems of the Azerbaijani language]. Bakı Universiteti.
- Abdullayev, Ə. Z., Seyidov, Y. M., & Həsənov, A. Q. (1972). *Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Sintaksis* [Modern Azerbaijani language. Syntax] (Vol. 4). Maarif.
- Aliyev, S., & Mammadova, Z. (2023). EXAMINATION OF THE TERMINOLOGICAL ENDEAVORS OF THE ACADEMY FOR PERSIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. *European Research Materials*, (4).
- Aronoff, M. (1976). *Word formation in generative grammar*. MIT Press.
- Berlin, S. A., & Veikhman, A. S. (1973). *Obucheniye angliyskoy intonatsii* [Teaching English intonation]. Vysshaya Shkola.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, J. W. (1967). *Early English: A study of Old and Middle English* (2nd ed.). Leningrad.
- Harris, Z. (1957). *Methods in structural linguistics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Illarionov, S. V. (1968). Gnoseologicheskaya funktsiya printsipa invariantnosti [The gnoseological function of the principle of invariance]. *Voprosy Filosofii*, 12, 15–21.
- Ivanova, I. P. (1976). *Istoriya angliyskogo yazyka* [History of the English language]. Vysshaya Shkola.
- Jespersen, O. (1965). *The philosophy of grammar*. W. W. Norton. (Original work published 1924)
- Jespersen, O. (1950). *Language: Its nature, development and origin*. Longman.
- Kanter, L. A. (1938). *Sistemnyy analiz rechevoy intonatsii* [Systematic analysis of speech intonation]. Nauka.
- Rastorgueva, T. A. (1983). *Istoriya angliyskogo yazyka / A history of English*. Progress.

Saussure, F. de. (1983). *Course in general linguistics* (C. Bally & A. Sechehaye, Eds.; R. Harris, Trans.).
Duckworth. (Original work published 1916)