

THE DIFFERENCE AND SIMILARITIES OF THE ORAL AND WRITTEN ENGLISH GRAMMAR

*Mamun University NEI, Faculty of "Philology"
Department of "Roman-German Philology",
Teacher Abdullayeva P.U.*

Abstract

This article is devoted to some challenges that can occur in variety languages when pronouncing the linguistic utterances, their formation and their usage in communication.

Keywords: *The descriptive approach to the Language, The Theory of Constituency and Recursion, The theory of Modularity, The descriptive approach to the Language*

Аннотация

Данная статья посвящена проблемам, которые могут возникнуть в разных языках при произношении лингвистических слов и при их употреблении и образовании в общении

Ключевые слова: *Описательный подход к языку, Теория конституции и рекурсии, Теория модульности, Описательный подход к языку*

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada lingvistik soʻzlarni talaffuz qilishda va ularni muloqotda qoʻllashda va shakllantirishda turli tillarda yuzaga kelishi mumkin boʻlgan muommalarga toʻxtalib oʻtilgan

Kalit soʻzlar: *Tilga tafsifiy yondashuv, konstitutsiya va rekursiya nazariyasi, modullik nazariyasi*

In order to understand the subtleties of sentence structure, it is necessary to understand how phrases are built from the words they contain, how phrases are combined into larger phrases and sentences. It is also necessary to understand what can happen to phrases and sentences after they are built – namely, parts of them can be moved and deleted. Movement and deletion take place under particular restrictions, and speakers “know” these restrictions, apparently without this being taught to them. All languages share these fundamental structural properties, but the principles that underlie them are broad enough to allow considerable differences among languages. The chapter includes a sampling of these differences.

We are presenting the structure of sentences with a primary emphasis on their form. However, there has been considerable research about the effect on the structure of sentences that comes from its use by language users. The chapter concludes with an example of this research and how it compares with a more formal approach.

Goals:

- explain how sentences are constructed
- explain the concept “poverty of the stimulus”
- explain the notions “language organ” and “Universal Grammar”
- present examples of subtle restrictions that limit the ways in which sentences can be constructed and interpreted

- present a few examples of differences in sentence structure in languages from around the world

- present the differences between formal and functional analysis of sentence structure

Many linguists argue that the capacity to acquire key aspects of natural language is exclusively human. Human language is built on an intricate foundation of grammatical principles. People don't have to learn a lot of what they know about these principles. The grammatical principles we are talking about don't have much to do with the grammar you learn in "grammar school." In fact, you have probably never heard of them, precisely because apparently they don't have to be taught. What children know about language goes beyond what they should be able to derive from what they hear, and very far beyond anything they are explicitly taught. The idea that people display a knowledge of grammar that is deeper than what they could get from the evidence around them is called the poverty-of-the-stimulus argument.

Applying the metaphor to the structure of sentences It is just this sort of reasoning that has led many linguists to the conclusion that people are "preprogrammed" with principles of grammar. In the first few years of life, children develop cognitive systems that characterize the structure underlying their linguistic capacity. We call these systems "grammars." A grammar, in this view, is biological – a language organ (Anderson and Lightfoot 2002). We don't know just how a grammar is physically represented in an individual's brain. But the systematic behavior that people display when they speak, and when they are asked whether or not certain structures are allowed, makes it possible for us to describe the grammar quite specifically. Just as the robot became intuitively aware of the rules of basketball as it watched some games, the grammar emerges when children are exposed to particular experiences, and its emergence is closely guided by genetically encoded principles. For example, English speakers have grammars that allow *Kim loves herself*, but not *People around Kim love herself*. English speakers can tell you that the first example is fine and the second isn't, but they can't tell you why. If they try, they are likely to get it wrong. They almost certainly were not taught anything about these examples in school.

Grammars, in this sense, have certain defining properties. A fundamental property of the grammar of every language is that it is compositional: sentences are made of clauses and phrases, which in turn are made up of smaller clauses and phrases or words.

Projection

Composing the structure of a sentence begins with words that belong to categories like noun, verb, preposition, adjective, and determiner. These words are the heads of phrases. Let's take a sentence like *Those children want a puppy* as an example. In this sentence, *those children* is a determiner phrase (DP). Its head is the determiner *those* and it also includes the noun phrase *children*. *A puppy* is another determiner phrase; its head is the determiner *a*, and it includes the noun phrase (NP) *puppy*. *Want a puppy* is a verb phrase (VP) headed by the verb *want* and it includes the determiner phrase *a puppy*. *Children and puppy* are phrases too. They are noun phrases that consist of their heads only. The sentence is composed of phrases and the phrases are composed of words (even though some phrases are composed of only one word).

Current research on grammar assumes that phrases are constructed "bottom-up": words are drawn from a lexicon – a mental dictionary stored in people's brains rather than in a book – and merged into structures one by one. Here's how this works in detail. Every word is a member of a category. There are two types of categories, lexical categories and functional categories. Words that belong to lexical categories are semantically rich and contribute primarily to the meaning of the

sentence. The common “parts of speech” – nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and prepositions – are lexical categories. Words in functional categories are semantically weak, and contribute more to the structure of the grammar of sentences than to the meaning. Articles are a subset of determiners, a functional category. To build phrases and sentences, we start with words, which then project phrases of the same category. You can think of a word as a kind of seed and its projection as a stalk that it sends out. Let’s start with the simple sentence *Those children want a puppy* and see how this works. The grammar starts by selecting the nouns *children* and *puppy* from the lexicon and letting them project phrases of the same category – i.e. noun phrases (NPs).

Merger

Once the complement node of the transitive verb is projected, it has to be combined with a phrase of the type it needs. To do that, the grammar must have a mechanism that combines phrases. This is done by merging one phrase with another. Each of the determiners in our example – *those* and *a* – projects a determiner phrase, and each of these determiner phrases needs a noun phrase as its complement.

The generation of the sentence by the grammar is almost complete. There has to be a mechanism to get the present tense (PRES) attached to the verb. In this sentence, PRES is not audible so you can’t hear whether it attached or not. But if our sentence had been *My child wants a puppy*, we could have seen the present-tense marker in the suffix *-s*. Similarly, if we had chosen the past tense, the sentence would have come out *Those children wanted a puppy*, also with the tense-marking suffix on the verb. The mechanism that combines verbs and their tense turned out to be surprisingly complicated for syntactic theory, so we’ll just state here that there is a way to get tense inflections where they belong. Our grammar must have one more functional category, the complementizer.

Complementizers

Complementizers are words like *that* in *I heard that those children want a puppy*, *for* in *She hopes for good things to happen*, and *if* in *He wondered if it would rain*. Complementizers project high-level phrases that take inflection phrases as complements. Complementizer phrases (CPs) are functional categories that allow clauses to be embedded in other clauses. For example, in a sentence like *I heard that those children want a puppy*, the clause *that those children want a puppy* is embedded in a higher clause as the complement of the verb *heard*. Complementizer phrases also are necessary to understand the structure of questions and relative clauses (e.g. *The man who came in was angry*), as well as indirect quotations (e.g. *He said that those children want a puppy*).

Adjunction

There are two methods for building phrases: projection and merger. We have seen how merger joins phrases by placing one phrase into the complement or specifier of another phrase. It is also possible to merge phrases that are not complements or specifiers of their host phrase. This is called adjunction and it adds modifiers to phrases. Heads, complements, and specifiers make up the core meaning of a phrase, while adjuncts add extra description. Since adjoined phrases are different from heads, complements, and specifiers, adjunction creates a site for merger by extending the phrasal node of the host phrase.

Movement and deletion

Once phrases have been built by projection and merger (including adjunction) the grammar can apply further operations to them. Besides building phrase structures, syntax can also move parts of phrase structures around, by detaching them from the position in which they were projected or

merged, and merging them somewhere else, or delete them. Movement functions by copying an item into a new location, leaving a copy in the original position. This copy must later be deleted. We will illustrate movement with two common operations, auxiliary movement and WH-movement, which generate questions.

Auxiliary movement

Aux movement comes into play when we want to generate a simple question like Does the man like movies? Using the projection and merger functions we've already described, the grammar first generates the sentence in (2). (2) [CP e [IP [DP the man] [I' PRES [VP like movies]]]] Example (2) shows a complementizer phrase headed by an empty complementizer (that's what the "e" stands for), and it has an inflection phrase as its complement. The IP has the determiner phrase, the man, in its specifier position, its head is PRES, and its complement is the verb phrase like movies. Aux movement takes whatever I is (here, it is PRES) and moves it to the previously empty head position, C, leaving a copy behind. The copy is later deleted. The result is (3).

WH -movement

There's another kind of question called the WH-question. WH -movement, in questions, follows Aux movement. In WH-questions, there is a word like who, when, where or how at the beginning of the sentence. These WH -words start life within the sentence and are then moved to the specifier position of CP. The grammar would generate the question What would you like? as in (5).

Grammars are finite; language is not

Although capable of remarkably complex processes, human beings' brains are finite. There are a limited number of cells in the human brain, and therefore a limited (though large) number of connections between those cells. Since grammars are part of people's brains, grammars must be finite, too. But an individual human being has the capacity to understand and produce an infinite number of sentences. People say and hear completely new, or novel, sentences all the time. Take any sentence from the last chapter. Although you had never heard it, read it, or said it before in just that form, you were able to understand what it means. How can a finite grammar have an infinite capacity for producing and understanding sentences?

Recursion

Regardless of where we were raised and whether we grew up in some English-speaking community or in Tokyo or Ulan Bator, speakers of every language have recursive devices – means by which the same grammatical processes can apply more than once – in their grammars that make it possible for them to produce sentences of indefinite length. Multiple adjunction One thing this means is that we can insert words of the same kind repeatedly with no principled limit by repeated adjunction. You can easily imagine someone saying, *She fell in love with this intelligent guy*. This is accomplished by adjoining the adjective intelligent to the noun phrase guy. But it

would be possible to go a lot beyond that; you could say, *She fell in love with this really intelligent, handsome, considerate, romantic, thoughtful, adorable guy* simply by adjoining more adjectives. In principle, you could go on until you exhausted all the applicable adjectives in the English language, then you could continue by coining new adjectives. Of course, nobody ever does this, because they would get tired of talking and – more to the point – everybody else would get tired of listening. But grammar would not prevent you from going on and on, because of the recursion feature.

References

1. Fasold R.W. Connor-Linton J. and co-authors. An Introduction to Language and Linguistics. –Cambridge. –P.20
2. Bolton, Whitney F. 1982, A living language: the history and structure of English, New York: Random House. -P.5
3. Twaha, A. I. (2017). Intonational Phonology and Focus in Two Varieties of Assamese. Ph. D. thesis. IIT Guwahati. Guwahati.
4. *New Statesman*, 22 Feb. 1963, p. 27|,
5. Galperin I.R Stylistics. Moscow: Higher School, 1971

