A SPECIFIC ISSUE IN LINGUISTIC

Iran (Romana) Dolati
English Language Department,
Salzburg University,
Austria

Dr. Jitendra Arolia
Department of English
Govt. Vrinda Sahai College
Dabra, *Gwalior, (M.P.)*

Introduction

This study has tried to mention to the definition of all subsections of a language and finally it will have an investigation on syntax which, is one of the most important parts in the language, but in relation with phonology which could not be separated from each other. The history of language refers to many years ago when human has been created and the people have used many things for having relationship among themselves and with the foreigners , drawing, painting ,sign and pantomime were the ways for declaring their nations and they have not have any choice except to use this language . Then language is improved with words and every place have token special words based on their living place and based on the nature that they have had and finally nowadays language has involved many main parts and subsections.

Phonology and syntax are in turn registered within wider conceptions of the nature of language in general and of the suitable conduct of linguistic research. Beyond this point, however, uncertainties appearance things: it is not immediately apparent how much similarity there ought to be between phonology and syntax simply because both are components of language (in the ordinary sense), nor is it clear whether the conceptions of language current in the two disciplines accord or conflict with each other. This Special Issue2 provides a platform for the exploration of these questions, which have been repeatedly raised by developments in linguistic theory but have found little space for discussion elsewhere. In the early 1980s, for example, the rise of Principles and Parameters syntax and the attendant birth of Government Phonology prompted a flurry and confusion of interest in comparisons between the nature of syntax and phonology.

1. What is linguistic?

Broadly conceived, linguistics is the study of human Language, and a linguist is someone who engages in this study. The study of linguistics can be thought of along three major axes, the endpoints of which are described below:

- Synchronic and diachronic - Synchronic study of a language is concerned with its form at a given moment; diachronic study covers the history of a language (group) and its structural changes over time.

- Theoretical and applied - Theoretical (or general) linguistics is concerned with frameworks for describing individual languages and theories about universal aspects of language; applied linguistics applies these theories to other fields.
- Contextual and independent - *Contextual* linguistics is concerned with how language fits into the world: its social function, how it is acquired, how it is produced and perceived. *Independent* linguistics considers languages for their own sake, aside from the externalities related to a language. Terms for this dichotomy are not yet well established--the Encyclopadia Britannica uses *macrolinguistics* and *microlinguistics* instead.

2. Areas Of Theoretical Linguistics
Theoretical linguistics is often divided into a number of separate areas, to be studied more or less independently. The following divisions are currently widely acknowledged:
- <u>**Phonetics**</u>, the study of the different sounds that are employed across all human languages
- <u>**Phonology,**</u> the study of patterns of a language's basic sounds.
- <u>**Morphology,**</u> the study of the internal structure of words.
- <u>**Syntax,**</u> the study of how words combine to form grammatical sentences.
- <u>**Semantic ,**</u> the study of the meaning of words (Lexical semantic), and how combine to form the meanings of sentences.
- <u>**Paragmatic,**</u> the study of how utterances are used (literally, figuratively, or otherwise) in communicative acts.
- <u>**Historical linguistics**</u>, the study of languages whose historical relations are recognizable through similarities in vocabulary, word formation, and syntax.
- <u>**Linguistic Typology**</u>, the study of the grammatical features that are employed across all human languages.
- <u>**Stylistic ,**</u> the study of style in languages.

3. Linguistics before the 1950s
It has often been argued (e.g. by Robins 1997 and Lightfoot 1999) that the origins of contemporary linguistics may reasonably be sought in the diachronic explorations of the early nineteenth century. The earlier contributions such as Bopp (1816), Rask (1818), and Grimm (1822-37) there gradually developed a systematic approach to linguistic research that perfected in the scientific achievements of the neogrammarians (e.g. Osthoff & Brugmann 1878, Paul 1880). It has a deep effective upon twentieth-century linguistics. The early twentieth century continued to see wonderful advances in the field of phonology. Some of these crucial developments underpin all subsequent reflection upon language in general. Moreover, European structuralist phonologists articulated the view that linguistic form can indeed should be studied apart from external substance. This was again a crucial break, which would later have a considerable impact on the study of syntax within the generative paradigm. It is therefore, hardly surprising that, during the structuralist period, the relationship between phonology and syntax was largely one-sided, with phonology exerting a direct influence upon syntax. Interestingly, Hjelmslev expected to find close analogies between phonology and syntax exactly because he took both to be subject to purely formal laws of structure, quite independent from the matter of sound and thought.

In contrast, Bermúdez-Otero & Börjars, who are doubtful about the extent of such purely formal analogies, explore the possibility that phonology and syntax may be similar in their

relationship with extra linguistic domains, which they take to be mediated by grounded markedness constraints.

3.1 Transformational Grammar: Rules In Phonology And Syntax

The fundamental conception of language at the heart of transformational grammar was equally phonology and to syntax. In fact, as Burzio (1995) and others have noted, the transformational framework provided a standardized formal treatment for phonological and syntactic phenomena. In the light of successive developments, it is significant that, in the process of acquisition, transformational theory still accorded a relatively small role to deduction (from a universal set of representational primitives and rule formats); language-specific constructions in the form of (ordered) rules were still dominant.

By providing a workable frame for the exploration of syntax, however, Chomsky achieved a major advance with respect to structuralism. Newmeyer (1986) argues further that the true significance of this development was in fact to situate syntax at the centre of language. This had the effect that, in later periods, many of the key ideas in linguistic theory would come from syntactic research. The assumed centrality of syntax (dubbed .syntactocentrism. by Jackendoff 2002) would also encourage a growing feeling that syntax was special. And, parallel, that phonology was different.

3.2 Principles And Parameters Syntax And The Persistence Of Rules In Phonology

It is approved that, while transformational grammar remained in the ascendant, phonology and syntax developed more or less in tandem. This state of affairs came to an unexpected end with the start of Chomsky.s second theoretical shift and the rise of the Principles and Parameters framework, heralded by the publication of Chomsky (1981). Most, if not all, of the initial and conceptual work behind this revolution in generative linguistics was carried out by syntacticians and supported with empirical arguments from syntax. At this point, therefore, syntax takes the guide in theorizing about the nature of language, at least within the generative example. In this connection, it is probably not accidental that Chomsky has not undertaken any major piece of phonological research since Chomsky (1951) and Chomsky & Halle (1968).The Principles and Parameters framework arose from a supposed need to provide a more essential answer to Plato.s Problem *(this is taken as grounds for assuming that UG has a phonological component. After this point, however, there is no further mention of Plato.s Problem in the body of the text. More clearly, the index to Goldsmith (1995) does not contain entries for either .Plato.s Problem. or .poverty of the stimulus..)* in language acquisition than was possible in transformational grammar (Chomsky 1986). In the latter, the formal space to be searched by the child during the acquisition process was unbounded and, more importantly, poorly organized, as Universal Grammar (UG) provided no more than a format for grammatical rules and an evaluation measure for choosing between competing grammatical hypotheses; induction from primary linguistic data still played a major role in the framing of those hypotheses. In Principles and Parameters syntax, in contrast, the space of possible grammars is tightly controlled and richly structured. As a result, the deductive component of the acquisition task increases dramatically. One of the ways in which this result is achieved is by removal core grammar of language-specific constructions acquired by inductive means. In Principles and Parameters syntax, constructions are treated as epiphenomena of innate universal principles, interacting with a limited number of language-specific parameter settings.

4. The Main Issues: A Synoptic View

So far, we have shown that present views of the nature and relative position of phonology and syntax are deeply fixed in the development of linguistic theory during the twentieth century, to the point that some aspects of the current discuss may seem incomprehensible to those unfamiliar with its significant background. To restore the balance, therefore, it may be useful at this moment to provide a synoptic view of the problem field as it appears to be constituted today in the light of the articles included in this study.To a large extent, each author's position in respect of the independence debate determines his or her response to questions concerning (i) the origins of phonological and syntactic knowledge, (ii) the presence or absence of formal analogies between phonology and syntax, and (iii) the division of labour between the two. The key judge of opinion, therefore, is whether phonology and syntax are regarded as autonomous from, grounded on, or emergent from nonlinguistic reality (where the latter includes the physics and physiology of speech, the situation of communication, world knowledge, etc.)

Conclusion

This study provides clear evidence of eager common awareness between phonology and syntax. As we have seen in this study, this is a stable feature of modern linguistics. Amusingly, the arrow of influence is level to turn sharply in unpredictable ways. Hjelmslev formulated his analogies due to principle structural. And at a time when linguists looked on phonology as their pilot science; yet the neo-Hjelmslevian efforts undertaken in theories to restore the equality between phonology and syntax when the latter, following the advent of the Principles and Parameters framework, seemed to have outstripped the former. In view of such range of opinion, it shows that the relationship between syntax and phonology should remain a focus of linguists and attention in future. Regardless of whether the courses that the two orders follow in the future prove to be similar or different, mutual awareness is essential if conceptual coherence is to be maintained across linguistics as a whole.

Work Cited

Bopp, Franz, 1816. Über das conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache. Reprinted 1975. Hildesheim, Olms.

Burzio, Luigi, 1995. .The rise of Optimality Theory. Glot International 1:6, 3-7.

Chomsky, Noam, 1951. Morphophonemics of Modern Hebrew. Master.s thesis, Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. Published 1979, New York, Garland.

Chomsky, Noam, 1981. Lectures on Government & Binding. Dordrecht, Foris.

Chomsky, Noam & Halle, Morris 1968. The Sound Pattern of English. New York, Harper and Row.

Chomsky, Noam, 1986. Knowledge of Language: its Nature, Origin, and Use. Westport, Praeger.

Goldsmith, John, 1995. The Handbook of Phonological Theory. Cambridge, Mass.,Blackwell.

Grimm, Jacob, 1822-37. Deutsche Grammatik. 4 volumes. Göttingen, Dieterich.sche Buchhandlung.

Hjelmslev, Louis, 1948. .Le verbe et la phrase nominale. In: Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d.histoire ancienne offerts à J. Marouzeau, 235-81. Reprinted in Essais Linguistiques, 165-91. (Travaux du circle linguistique de Copenhague 12.)

Jackendoff, Ray, 2002. Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Lightfoot, David, 1999. The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution. Cambridge, Mass., Blackwell.

Newmeyer, Frederick, 1986. Linguistic Theory in America. Second edition. San Diego, Academic Press.

Osthoff, Hermann & Brugmann, Karl, 1878. Morphologische Untersuchungen. Leipzig. Paul, Hermann, 1880. Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte. Halle, Niemeyer.

Rask, Rasmus, 1818. Undersogelse om det Gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse. Copenhagen, Gyldendalske.

Robins, R. H., 1997. A Short History of Linguistics. Fourth edition. London, Longman. Sagey, E., 1986. The Representation of Features and Relations in Nonlinear Phonology. PhD, MIT. Published 1990. New York, Garland.