

How to Cite:

Lodarosi, A. (2020). General semantics. *Macrolinguistics and Microlinguistics*, 1(2), 69–77.

General Semantics

Amir Lodarosi

University of Kansas, Lawrence, United States

Abstract---This paper aims to explain the meaning of syntax, how the syntactic structure is, to describe the units that compose sentences in English and to explain the differences between phrases, words, clauses, and morphemes. The term Semantics is known from the English Semantics. Actually, there are two branches of linguistics that specifically study words, namely etymology, the study of word origin, and semantics, the study of word meaning. In Indonesian Semantics comes from the Greek 'sema' (noun) which means 'sign' or 'symbol'. The verb is 'semaino' which means 'to mark' or 'to symbolize'. Signs or symbols here can be interpreted as linguistic signs (French: *signé Linguistique*).

Keywords---clauses, compose sentences, English semantics, linguistics, meaning of syntax, morphemes, phrases, semantics, syntactic structure, words.

Introduction

Rullmann & You (2006) states that the linguistic sign consists of (1) a substituting component, which is in the form of a language sound, and (2) a component that is defined or the meaning of the first component. These two components are a sign or symbol, and while what is marked or symbolized is something that is outside the language, or commonly referred to as a referent/reference/thing that is designated. So, semantics is the study of the relationship between linguistic signs and things that are marked, or the same sound is found. For example, the phoneme / b / in the final syllabic of *adab* and *cause* is pronounced [p ']: [adap] and [səbap'], which are exactly the same as the pronunciation of the phoneme / p / on the roof and *swipe*: [roof '] and [wipe ']. Why is that? Because voiceless inhibitory-pop-up consonant [b] is not possible at the position code. When neutralized it becomes a voiceless inhibitor,

© 2020 by The Author(s). 

This journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Corresponding author: Lodaros, A. | Email: amirlodarosi@ku.edu

Manuscript submitted: 27 Jan 2020 | Manuscript revised: 18 Feb 2020 | Accepted for publication: 9 March 2020

namely [p^h], which is the same as the usual realization in the phoneme / p / (Lewis, 1976; Leclercq et al., 2014; Lidz et al., 2003).

If so, are the two sounds not allophones of the same phoneme? Not! This is because in the minimal pairs it has been proven that there are phonemes / b / and / p /. The principle once a phoneme remains a phoneme needs to be enforced. If you want to unify it, some phonologists have proposed the concept of archifonemes, the members of which are phoneme / b / and phoneme / p /. To represent the two phonemes, the archifoneme name is / B / (capital b because the b sound is the least distributed).

Method

Zeroization is the elimination of phonemic sounds as a result of efforts to save or economize pronunciation. This incident is common in the speaking of languages in the world, including Indonesian, provided that it does not interfere with the process and purpose of communication (Hahne & Friederici, 2002; Sanders & Neville, 2003; Gropen et al., 1991). This event continues to grow because it has been tacitly supported and agreed upon by the community of speakers.

In Indonesian, we often find the use of the word *no* or *no for no*, *no for nothing*, *how to do it*, *but for but*. The elimination of some of these phonemes is considered non-standard by the standard Indonesian language. However, because for the sake of simplicity and efficiency, this symptom continues. In English, this zeroization is already a pattern so that the 'value is the same' with the complete structure. For example, the word *shall not* is abbreviated as *shan't*, the word *will not* is abbreviated as *won't*, the word *is not* is abbreviated as *isn't*, the word *is not* is abbreviated as *aren't*, and the word *it is* or *it has been* is abbreviated as *it's* (Rayner et al., 1983; Tyler & Nagy, 1990; Van Herten et al., 2005).

Zeroisation using this abbreviated model is called contraction. When classified, there are at least three types of zeroization, namely apheresis, apocope, and syncope. Apheresis is the process of removing or dating one or more phonemes at the beginning of a word. For example: *but* becomes *but*, *peperment* becomes *candy*, *ritual* becomes *fasting* (Friederici, 1982; Bowerman, 1973; Abels & Muriungi, 2008). Apocope is the process of removing or dating one or more phonemes at the end of a word. For example: *the president* becomes *president*, *the sky* becomes *a rainbow*, *the sea* becomes *an island*. Syncope is the process of removing or dating one or more phonemes in the middle of a word. For example: *baharu* becomes *new*, *first* becomes *first*, *utpatti* becomes *tribute* (Meunier & Longtin, 2007; Cresswell, 1976; Jackendoff, 1991).

Result and Discussion

Diphthongization is the change in a single vowel sound (monophthong) into two vowels or vowels (diphthong) in sequence. The change from a single vowel to a double vowel is still pronounced in one kenya-light peak so that it remains in one syllable.

The member word [aŋgota] is pronounced [aŋgauta], sentosa [səntosa] is pronounced [səntausa]. This change occurs in a single vowel sound [o] to a double vowel [au], but still in the pronunciation of one peak sound. This happens because of the speaker's analogy effort in order to purify the sound in the word. In fact, the writing was adapted to his words, namely anggauta and sentausa. Another example: exemplary [tələdan] becomes exemplary [exemplary] => vowel [ə] becomes [au], and typhoon [tɒpən] becomes typhoon [typhoon] => vowel [O] becomes [au].

Monophthongization

The opposite of diphthongization is monophthongization, which is the change of two vowels or double vowels (diffthong) to a single vowel (monophthong). Vowel singles occur frequently in Indonesian as an attitude to facilitate pronunciation of diphthong sounds. The word crowded [crowded] is pronounced [rame], petai [pətai] is pronounced [pəte]. This change occurs in the double vowel sound [ai] to a single vowel which is usually used in scientific works such as scientific articles, seminars, symposiums, or upgrades (Linebarger et al., 1983; Marks & Miller, 1964; Feldman & Siok, 1999).

To support the accuracy of their presentation, often the authors of the exposition include nonverbal forms such as graphs, diagrams, tables, or charts in their essays. The exposition in the exposition can be in the form of a description of the process, stages, work methods, and the development pattern of illustrations, definitions, and classifications. The development of an exposition framework in the form of an exposition can have the following presentation patterns:

- The order of the existing topics. This sequence pattern is related to the mention of the parts of an object, thing or event without prioritizing which part is the most important. All parts are considered to be of equal value;
- Climax and anticlimax sequences. The presentation pattern starts from easy/simple things to things that are increasingly important or the peak of the event and vice versa for anti-climax (Seidenberg & Gonnerman, 2000; Kim & Osterhout, 2005; Bock & Warren, 1985).

Argument

An argumentation essay is an essay containing opinions, attitudes, or judgments on a matter accompanied by reasons, evidence, and logical statements. The purpose of an argumentation essay is to try to convince the reader of the truth of the author's opinion. An argumentation essay can also contain responses or rebuttals to an opinion by mapping rational and logical reasons (Meteyard & Patterson, 2009; Goucha & Friederici, 2015; Libben, 1998). The development of a framework of argumentation can have a causal, causal, or problem-solving pattern.

- Cause and effect. This sequence pattern starts with the topic/idea which causes the resulting topic / idea to continue;
- Effects. This sequence pattern starts with statements that are the results and continue with the things that are the causes;
- Troubleshooting sequence. This sequence pattern starts from the aspects that describe the problem and then leads to problem-solving.

Description

The word description comes from the Latin *discribere* which means description, detail, or disclosure. The description is an essay that describes an object based on the observations, feelings and experiences of the author. The goal is that the reader gets an impression or image in accordance with the writer's observations, feelings, and experiences so that it is as if the reader sees, feels, and experiences the object himself. To achieve the perfect impression, the description writer details the object with impressions, facts, and images (Bach, 1986; Wahl et al., 2008; Campbell & Janda, 2000).

Judging from the nature of the object, the description is divided into 2 types, namely imaginative / impressionist descriptions, which are descriptions that describe objects according to the impression/imagination of the author and factual/expository descriptions are descriptions that describe objects based on the logical sequence or facts seen. We can make descriptive essays indirectly, namely by observing information in the nonverbal form in the form of pictures, graphs, diagrams, and so on. Anything that is depicted in this visual form can be an accurate material or fact to be presented in a description because the basic element of this essay is an observation of an object that can be seen or felt (Marelli & Luzzatti, 2012; Roelofs, 1996; Schell et al., 2017).

The development of an essay with a descriptive style can be in the form of a partial or place presentation. The presentation of this sequence is used for essays that have a very close relationship with space or place (Deutsch & Bentin, 2001; Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2001; Nespoulous et al., 1988). Usually, the form of writing is descriptive. The pattern of description departs from one point and then moves to another, for example from left to right, top to bottom, or front to back.

Exposition

The word exposition comes from the Latin *exponere* which means to show, explain, or describe. An exposition is an essay that describes or explains in detail (exposes) something to provide information and broaden the readers' knowledge. Exposition essay [e]. The writing was adjusted to be crowded and pete. Another example is if [if] becomes [kalo], the word lake [lake] becomes [dano], the word satai [satai] becomes [sate], and the word peace [peace] becomes [dame] novice author. The outline is useful as follows. a. Guidelines so that writing can be organized and directed. Describing the arrangement of patterns and the links between main ideas / topics. Helping authors see any subject that deviates from the topic and the main idea is the same. To be a general description of the structure of the essay idea so as to help collect the necessary library materials. Based on the form or type, discourse is divided into narrative, description, exposition, argumentative, and persuasion discourse (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2004; Levin & Hovav, 1991; Marantz, 2013).

Narrative

Narrative is a story based on the sequence of events or events. A narrative can contain facts, for example a biography (history of a person), an autobiography / life history of someone who has written himself, or a story of experiences. Such a narrative is called an expository narrative. Narrative can also contain imaginary / fictional stories or fiction, such as those usually found in novels or short stories. This narrative is called an imaginative narrative. Important elements in a narrative are events, characters, conflicts, plot / plot, and setting consisting of time, place, and atmosphere (Lévy, 2010).

The narrative is described in the form of a storytelling which is marked by a chronological description (time sequence). The use of conjunctions that express a time or sequence, such as then, next, the next day, or a year later is often used. A narrative outline can be developed with a time sequence pattern. Time-based presentation is a sequence based on the stages of events or occurrences. This time sequence pattern is often used in short stories, novels, romances, travel stories, historical stories, and so on. A complex sentence (complex sentence), and a compound complex sentence. Meanwhile, sentences in English can be distinguished based on differences in purpose,

namely (1) a declarative sentence (declarative sentence); (2) interrogative sentence; (3) command sentence (imperative sentence); (4) exclamatory sentence.

Discourse

Discourse is a complete language unit. Discourse comes from the English language discourse, which means, among other things, "The ability to advance according to regular and proper sequences." Another definition, namely "Communication of thoughts, both oral and written, which is official and orderly." So, discourse can be interpreted as an orderly writing according to a proper or logical sequence. In discourse, every element must have unity and integrity, there is a complete concept, idea, thought or idea, which can be understood by the reader or listener, without any doubts. The discourse tool used to be cohesive is to use conjunctions, pronouns, and ellipsis, namely the omission of the same part of the sentence contained in the sentence (Daneš, 1968).

Every discourse has a theme because a theme is something that is told or described throughout the contents of the discourse. The theme becomes a reference or scope so that the content of discourse is orderly, directed and does not deviate from anywhere. Before writing a discourse, one must first determine the theme and then the goal. This objective is related to the form or model of discourse content. The theme of discourse will be expressed in what style or type of writing it depends on the goals and desires of the author (Jackendoff & Pinker, 2005). After setting the goal, the writer will make an outline consisting of topics that are the elaboration of the theme. The topics are arranged systematically. This was made as a guide so that the essay can be directed by showing the distribution of the elements of the essay related to the theme. With that, the writer can make various changes to the perfect pattern.

References

- Abels, K., & Muriungi, P. (2008). The focus marker in Kĩtharaka: Syntax and semantics. *Lingua*, 118(5), 687-731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2007.09.003>
- Bach, E. (1986). Natural language metaphysics. In *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics* (Vol. 114, pp. 573-595). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X\(09\)70714-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X(09)70714-1)
- Bock, J. K., & Warren, R. K. (1985). Conceptual accessibility and syntactic structure in sentence formulation. *Cognition*, 21(1), 47-67. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(85\)90023-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(85)90023-X)
- Boudelaa, S., & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2001). Morphological units in the Arabic mental lexicon. *Cognition*, 81(1), 65-92. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(01\)00119-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(01)00119-6)

- Boudelaa, S., & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2004). Abstract morphemes and lexical representation: The CV-Skeleton in Arabic. *Cognition*, 92(3), 271-303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2003.08.003>
- Bowerman, M. (1973). Structural relationships in children's utterances: Syntactic or semantic?. *Cognitive development and acquisition of language*, 197-213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-505850-6.50015-3>
- Campbell, L., & Janda, R. (2000). Introduction: conceptions of grammaticalization and their problems. *Language sciences*, 23(2-3), 93-112. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001\(00\)00018-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(00)00018-8)
- Cresswell, M. J. (1976). The semantics of degree. In *Montague grammar* (pp. 261-292). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-545850-4.50015-7>
- Daneš, F. (1968). Some thoughts on the semantic structure of the sentence. *Lingua*, 21, 55-69. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(68\)90038-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(68)90038-7)
- Deutsch, A., & Bentin, S. (2001). Syntactic and semantic factors in processing gender agreement in Hebrew: Evidence from ERPs and eye movements. *Journal of memory and language*, 45(2), 200-224. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2000.2768>
- Feldman, L. B., & Siok, W. W. (1999). Semantic radicals contribute to the visual identification of Chinese characters. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 40(4), 559-576. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1998.2629>
- Friederici, A. D. (1982). Syntactic and semantic processes in aphasic deficits: The availability of prepositions. *Brain and Language*, 15(2), 249-258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(82\)90059-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(82)90059-1)
- Goucha, T., & Friederici, A. D. (2015). The language skeleton after dissecting meaning: a functional segregation within Broca's Area. *Neuroimage*, 114, 294-302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.04.011>
- Gropen, J., Pinker, S., Hollander, M., & Goldberg, R. (1991). Affectedness and direct objects: The role of lexical semantics in the acquisition of verb argument structure. *Cognition*, 41(1-3), 153-195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(91\)90035-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(91)90035-3)
- Hahne, A., & Friederici, A. D. (2002). Differential task effects on semantic and syntactic processes as revealed by ERPs. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 13(3), 339-356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410\(01\)00127-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410(01)00127-6)
- Jackendoff, R. (1991). Parts and boundaries. *Cognition*, 41(1-3), 9-45. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(91\)90031-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(91)90031-X)
- Jackendoff, R., & Pinker, S. (2005). The nature of the language faculty and its implications for evolution of language (Reply to Fitch, Hauser, and Chomsky). *Cognition*, 97(2), 211-225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2005.04.006>
- Kim, A., & Osterhout, L. (2005). The independence of combinatory semantic processing: Evidence from event-related potentials. *Journal of memory and language*, 52(2), 205-225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2004.10.002>
- Leclercq, A. L., Quémart, P., Magis, D., & Maillart, C. (2014). The sentence repetition task: A powerful diagnostic tool for French children with specific language

- impairment. *Research in developmental disabilities*, 35(12), 3423-3430.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.08.026>
- Levin, B., & Hovav, M. R. (1991). Wiping the slate clean: A lexical semantic exploration. *Cognition*, 41(1-3), 123-151. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(91\)90034-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(91)90034-2)
- Lévy, P. (2010). From social computing to reflexive collective intelligence: The IEMML research program. *Information Sciences*, 180(1), 71-94.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2009.08.001>
- Lewis, D. (1976). General semantics. In *Montague grammar* (pp. 1-50). Academic Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-545850-4.50007-8>
- Libben, G. (1998). Semantic transparency in the processing of compounds: Consequences for representation, processing, and impairment. *Brain and language*, 61(1), 30-44. <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1997.1876>
- Lidz, J., Gleitman, H., & Gleitman, L. (2003). Understanding how input matters: Verb learning and the footprint of universal grammar. *Cognition*, 87(3), 151-178.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(02\)00230-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(02)00230-5)
- Linebarger, M. C., Schwartz, M. F., & Saffran, E. M. (1983). Sensitivity to grammatical structure in so-called agrammatic aphasics. *Cognition*, 13(3), 361-392.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(83\)90015-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(83)90015-X)
- Marantz, A. (2013). Verbal argument structure: Events and participants. *Lingua*, 130, 152-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.10.012>
- Marelli, M., & Luzzatti, C. (2012). Frequency effects in the processing of Italian nominal compounds: Modulation of headedness and semantic transparency. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 66(4), 644-664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.01.003>
- Marks, L. E., & Miller, G. A. (1964). The role of semantic and syntactic constraints in the memorization of English sentences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 3(1), 1-5. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(64\)80052-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(64)80052-9)
- Meteyard, L., & Patterson, K. (2009). The relation between content and structure in language production: An analysis of speech errors in semantic dementia. *Brain and language*, 110(3), 121-134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2009.03.007>
- Meunier, F., & Longtin, C. M. (2007). Morphological decomposition and semantic integration in word processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 56(4), 457-471.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2006.11.005>
- Nespoulous, J. L., Dordain, M., Perron, C., Ska, B., Bub, D., Caplan, D., ... & Lecours, A. R. (1988). Agrammatism in sentence production without comprehension deficits: Reduced availability of syntactic structures and/or of grammatical morphemes? A case study. *Brain and language*, 33(2), 273-295.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(88\)90069-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(88)90069-7)
- Rayner, K., Carlson, M., & Frazier, L. (1983). The interaction of syntax and semantics during sentence processing: Eye movements in the analysis of semantically biased sentences. *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior*, 22(3), 358-374.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(83\)90236-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(83)90236-0)

- Roelofs, A. (1996). Serial order in planning the production of successive morphemes of a word. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 35(6), 854-876. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1996.0044>
- Rullmann, H., & You, A. (2006). General number and the semantics and pragmatics of indefinite bare nouns in Mandarin Chinese. *Where semantics meets pragmatics*, 175-196.
- Sanders, L. D., & Neville, H. J. (2003). An ERP study of continuous speech processing: I. Segmentation, semantics, and syntax in native speakers. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 15(3), 228-240. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410\(02\)00195-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410(02)00195-7)
- Schell, M., Zaccarella, E., & Friederici, A. D. (2017). Differential cortical contribution of syntax and semantics: An fMRI study on two-word phrasal processing. *Cortex*, 96, 105-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.09.002>
- Seidenberg, M. S., & Gonnerman, L. M. (2000). Explaining derivational morphology as the convergence of codes. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 4(9), 353-361. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01515-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01515-1)
- Tyler, A., & Nagy, W. (1990). Use of derivational morphology during reading. *Cognition*, 36(1), 17-34. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(90\)90052-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(90)90052-L)
- Van Herten, M., Kolk, H. H., & Chwilla, D. J. (2005). An ERP study of P600 effects elicited by semantic anomalies. *Cognitive brain research*, 22(2), 241-255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2004.09.002>
- Wahl, M., Marzinzik, F., Friederici, A. D., Hahne, A., Kupsch, A., Schneider, G. H., ... & Klostermann, F. (2008). The human thalamus processes syntactic and semantic language violations. *Neuron*, 59(5), 695-707. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.07.011>