SHS1207	INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS	L	T	P	CREDIT
		4	0	0	4

Course Objectives:
To introduce students to Linguistics as a scientific study of language and to familiarize them with different branches, basic concepts involved in the area of linguistics

Learning outcomes: At the end of the course, the student will be able to:

- Define the concepts of linguistics as a scientific study of language, demonstrate their knowledge of the main ideas of how the concept of language is defined in linguistics and various branches of linguistics by recollecting key terms and illustrate by giving examples, reason about its applicability on spoken language, written language and sign language, as well as on animal communication.
- Differentiate between a descriptive and a prescriptive view on linguistic phenomena and between fundamental concepts and distinctions in linguistics
- discuss some basic concepts within diachronic variations in language with examples
- describe and illustrate basic concepts like Varieties of dialect, Register, within morphology, such as: defining word, illustrating word formation
- define and analyse linguistic material with regards to the basic Sentence Patterns: Intransitive Predicate Pattern, Transitive Predicate Pattern
- recall definitions of Transformational Generative Grammar. Supra- Sentential Grammar.
- Semantic roles account for basic concepts within semantics and pragmatics with a focus on lexical semantics (e g synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, homophony

UNIT I - Basic Concepts of Linguistics (9 Hrs) What is Language, definitions of language. Language as a means of communication. Language is arbitrary. Language is a system of systems. Language is vocal. Language VS animal communication . Language is a form of social behaviour. Language is a symbol system. Productivity. Why study language? Linguistics- Definition.
Linguistics as a Science. Descriptive, comparative and Historical Linguistics. Branches of Linguistics- Psycholinguistics, Socio linguistics, Anthropological Linguistics, Literary Stylistics. Relationship between branches of linguistics.

UNIT II – Fundamental Concepts and Distinctions in Linguistics (9 Hrs)
The Language / Parole distinction, and competence vs Performance. Branches of Linguistics . Diachronic and Synchronic Approaches.

UNIT III – Modern Linguistics
The Study of Language Variation . Some diachronic variations in Language. Synchronic Variations due to language contact. Varieties of dialect. Register & Classification of Register. **(9 Hrs)**

UNITIV – Study of Language; Study Language (9 Hrs)
Functions and Definitions of Grammar . Morphology and word Formation. Segmentation. Ways of word formation – Affixes, Conversions, compound formation, Reduplication, Clippings, acronyms, Blends and Borrowings.

UNIT V – Syntax and Semantics (9 Hrs)
A Basic Sentence . Basic Sentence Patterns: Intransitive Predicate Pattern, Transitive Predicate Pattern. Structuralists view of Grammar. Transformational Generative Grammar. Supra- Sentential Grammar. Semantics. What is Meaning? lexical and grammatical meaning

Text Book:
Syal P.& Jindal D.V.(2009) An Introduction to Linguistics PHI Learning Pvt Ltd. New Delhi
Reference:
Bruce Haye et al. (2013)Linguistics: An Introduction to Linguistic Theory. John Wiley & Sons. India
Elizabeth Winkler. (2015)Understanding Language: A Basic Course in Linguistics. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Wrenn C. L. English Language ISBN 9780706999068. Vikas Publications. India

Jespersen. Otto. (2010). Growth and Structure of English Language- Nabu Press. ISBN-13: 978-1177766593
Albert C. Baugh. (2012) A History of English Language. Pearson

Verma S.K. &, Krishnaswamy N. (1997) Modern Linguistics: An Introduction. Mazon
Wood. (2014). An Outline History of The English Language. Elements of English
Rhetoric and Prosody- Bose & Sterling
A Textbook of English Phonetics for Indian Students- T. Balasubramanian
'An Encyclopedia of Linguistics- David Crystal An Introduction to Linguistics- Syal and Jindal.

SATHYABAMA
INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
(DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY)
Accredited "A" Grade by NAAC | 12B Status by UGC | Approved by AICTE
www.sathyabama.ac.in

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE & HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIT – I – INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS – SHS1207

Unit - I

Basic Concepts of Linguistics

What is Language

Human beings can communicate with each other. We are able to exchange knowledge, beliefs, opinions, wishes, threats, commands, thanks, promises, declarations, feelings – only our imagination sets limits. We can laugh to express amusement, happiness, or disrespect, we can smile to express amusement, pleasure, approval, or bitter feelings, we can shriek to express anger, excitement, or fear, we can clench our fists to express determination, anger or a threat, we can raise our eyebrows to express surprise or disapproval, and so on, but our system of communication before anything else is language.The first step towards a definition we can say that it is a system of communication-based upon words and the combination of words into sentences. Communication by means of language may be referred to as linguistic communication, the other ways mentioned above – laughing, smiling, shrieking, and so on – are types of non-linguistic communication.

Most of all non-human species can exchange information, but none of them is known to have a system of communication with a complexity that in any way is comparable to language. Primarily, they communicate with non-linguistic means resembling our smiling, laughing, yelling, clenching of fists, and raising of eyebrows. Chimpanzees, gorillas, and orangutans can exchange different kinds of information by emitting different kinds of shrieks, composing their faces in numerous ways, and moving their hands or arms in different gestures, but they do not have words and sentences. By moving in certain patterns, bees are apparently able to tell their fellow workers where to find honey, but apparently not very much else. Birds sing different songs, whose main functions are to defend their territory or to attract a mate. Language – as defined above – is an exclusively human property.

Definitions of Language

Many definitions of language have been proposed. Henry Sweet, an English phonetician and language scholar, stated: “Language is the expression of ideas by means of speech-sounds combined into words. Words are combined into sentences, this combination answering to that of ideas into thoughts.” The American linguists Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager formulated the following definition: “A language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates.” Any succinct definition of language makes a number of presuppositions and begs a number of questions. The first, for example, puts excessive weight on “thought,” and the second uses “arbitrary” in a specialized, though legitimate, way.

A number of considerations (marked in italics below) enter into a proper understanding of language as a subject:Every physiologically and mentally typical person acquires in childhood the ability to make use, as both sender and receiver, of a system of communication that comprises a circumscribed set of symbols (e.g., sounds, gestures, or written or typed

characters). In spoken language, this symbol set consists of noises resulting from movements of certain organs within the throat and mouth. In signed languages, these symbols may be hand or body movements, gestures, or facial expressions. By means of these symbols, people are able to impart information, to express feelings and emotions, to influence the activities of others, and to comport themselves with varying degrees of friendliness or hostility toward persons who make use of substantially the same set of symbols.

Language as a Means of Communication

Language is a means of communication that is used to transfer information, ideas, and feelings from one person to another.Language is also a system of communication based upon words and the combination of words into sentences. By using language,people can develop their knowledge and know about something. Cameron (2001:17), in applied linguistics over the last decades, it has been common to divide language into the four skill"s:Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing, and include grammar,vocabulary and phonology to them.

Learning a language means learning the Language skills and components. The four skill above is the important aspect to increasing student's ability in using English fluently. The one of language skill is listening,it is the important component in human life to communicate, because People spend more than 45 percent of their communication time in listening,which is more than any other communicative activity.Listening is heard specifically or focus on listening the detail, where is listening in order to understand the specific information and centered on the object that listened. Listening skills is the earliest activities.

Language is Arbitrary

Language is arbitrary. I recently stated that language is arbitrary on Twitter in response to the erroneous claim that language is a code. Language is not a code because language is arbitrary. When I state that language is arbitrary, I often receive bewildered and sometimes disdainful replies such as English is 80% predictable, written language codifies spoken language, and language is rule-governed. I shall therefore clarify the linguistic tenet of the arbitrariness of language by unpacking the above statements.

First, what is meant by arbitrary? Some dictionary definitions of arbitrary include based on random choice or personal whim, rather than any reason or system, existing or coming about seemingly at random or by chance or as a capricious and unreasonable act of will, based on chance rather than being planned or based on reason, something that is determined by judgment or whim and not for any specific reason or rule, and based on individual discretion or judgment; not based on any objective distinction, perhaps even made at random.

Why is language arbitrary? Arbitrariness refers to the quality of "being determined by randomness and not for a specific reason." Language consists of signifiers that represent the signified. But the signifier is not the signified. A signifier is a form such as a sound, morpheme, word, phrase, clause, or sign. The signified is that to which a signifier refers such

as an object, action, quality, or quantity. For example, the English word book refers to the object ?. The Spanish word correr refers to the action ?. The German word zwei refers to a quantity of two.

Language is arbitrary because a language form does not have an innate or natural relationship with its meaning. English uses the words turkey and dog to refer to ? and ?. But the signified? does not possess "turkeyness" and the signified? does not possess "dogness." If ? and? possessed turkeyness and dogness, then German would not use the words Truthahn or Pute and Hund and Spanish could not use the words pavo and perro. If the affixation of an -s or -es suffix possessed inherent plurality, then Italian would not change the suffix of gatto meaning "cat" to gatti meaning "cats." Sotho could not use loti meaning "singular money, currency" and maloti meaning "plural money, currency."

Language is a System of Systems

Language is a system and complex as organs of the human body. The system of the body functions through different organs such as the heart, lungs, brain, ears and eyes. These various organs are interconnected and work in coordination. Similarly, the systems of a language function through sound, words and structure. These are integrated with one another and constitute the complex organic whole which is language. While someone says, "My friend is reading a book" he uses language, he uses sounds (m, ai, f, r, e, n, d, z, r, I'd, I, t], a, b, u, k), words (my, friend, is, reading, a book) and an accepted sentence pattern (SvVo). He could not communicate if he were to use only of the elements of language. It should be taught and learnt as a system.

Language is a system of phonetics, grammar and vocabulary, which in themselves are systems.

Phonology: Every language has a set of sounds peculiar to it. The sound stands for words; the words stand for object ideas, processes etc. For example, Pen, advise relative, selling and singing etc. Each word has a meaning. The system of a language is called 'phonology'.

Morphology: Words, their formation and the various Change in their forms is called 'morphology'.

Semantics: The study of the meaning of words and sentences is .called 'Semantics', Syntax: Constructions, arrangement of words into definite chunks, and set of syntactic rules that make a sentence is called 'Syntax'.

Since language is the system of systems, the whole system of language cannot be taught all at once.

Language is Vocal

language is vocal because we have been created with organs, such as vocal cords, a tongue and ears. Obviously, you will need at least two or more people. So this is how language becomes vocal and it is a natural and basic thing about language; we speak and listen and to do that there must be sound to accompany the written words.

It is not a "voluntary" system because this requires an "active will" present before the action. However, nobody thinks twice about their ability to make sounds. It is like breathing. One could however emphasize the importance of thinking before one speaks which is a difficult but very useful method of controlling oneself. But this is another subject not directly related to the question.

The question is in fact very basic and a little unnecessary because the answer is so obvious.

On a positive note, the question makes one grateful for the possibility of basic communication. There are people who are handicapped, dumb and deaf. For them, language unfortunately is not vocal. There are also people in prison or otherwise constrained who cannot communicate freely.

Language Vs Animal Communication

Communication in both animals and humans consists of signals. Signals are sounds or gestures that have some meaning to those using them. The meaning is often self-evident based on context: for example, many animals roar, growl, or groan in response to threats of danger; similarly, humans may wave their arms or scream in the event of something dangerous. These signals in these situations are designed to let others in the species know that something is wrong and the animal or human needs help.

Human communication consists of both signals and symbols. Symbols are sounds or gestures that have a specific meaning to a group of people. This meaning could be cultural, group-related, or even related between two specific people. For example, two people may create a "secret" handshake, or a group may develop a passcode that only members are aware of. Symbols, unlike signals, must be taught and learned; they are not instinctual or self-evident.

The dog who knows 1,000 words: Meet Chaser, a dog that "knows" 1,000 words. Chaser's owners claim that he understands language, as evidenced by his ability to understand novel linguistic stimuli (such as the names of unknown toys). Critics claim that Chaser is not understanding language as humans can, but that he has been conditioned or trained to discriminate between certain phoneme sounds.

What about nonhuman primates, who share many similarities with humans? Nonhuman primates communicate in ways that are very similar to those used by humans; however, there are important differences as well. First and foremost, humans use a larger repertoire of symbols, and these symbols are substantially more complex. Second, and more importantly, nonhuman primates (and other animals who communicate with one another) have what is known as a closed vocal system: this means different sounds cannot be combined together to produce new symbols with different meanings. Humans, by contrast, have open vocal systems, which allow for combinations of symbols to create new symbols with a totally new meaning and therefore allows for an infinite number of ideas to be expressed.

Human language is also the only kind that is modality-independent; that is, it can be used across multiple channels. Verbal language is auditory, but other forms of language—writing and sign language (visual), Braille (tactile)—are possible in more complex human language systems.

One of the most famous case studies in the debate over how complex nonhuman-primate language can be is Koko the gorilla. Koko is famous for having learned over a thousand signs of "Gorilla Sign Language," a simple sign language developed to try to teach nonhuman primates complex language. Koko can respond in GSL to about two thousand words of spoken English. However, it is generally accepted that she does not use syntax or grammar, and that her use of language does not exceed that of a young human child.

Language Is a Form of Social Behaviour

Human behaviour cannot be understood if we separate language and social practice. Language without social practice and social practice without language are senseless. From this perspective, language, as an essential component of social practice, contextualizes every human psychological phenomenon. The logic of
language is grounded on social practice and not on the fictitious universal logic of a rational or formal syntax or grammar. Human psychological phenomena, either identified as an individual experience or as behaviour, become meaningful only in the context of social life, always occurring as language and through language. That is why Wittgenstein asserts that "to imagine a language means to imagine a form of life."

Language is a Symbol System

Language is a system of symbols. The railway guard uses certain symbols with body language for example the green flag, The train is not supposed to start till the driver sees the guard showing the green flag or the green lamp, for they are symbols of "All clear, Go". The train, however, stops or does not start if the guard shows the red flag or the red lamp, for they denote the signal "Danger, means stop''. This system works successfully because the symbols used are known to both the guard and the driver. The system of language similarly works through symbols, the symbols being words. Language functions effectively when the symbols used are known to the speakers and the listener, the writer and the reader. The symbols of the language are varied and complex.

Language symbols represent things and are not the things themselves. The word 'table' is not a table. It stands for a table. The word 'boy' is not a boy. It stands for a boy. There is no logical connection between the symbols and the referent Symbols get their meaning by convention. A sign, on the other hand, has a direct relation to the object it signifies. A road sign showing the figure of a boy with a school bag cautions a vehicle driver that he is approaching a school. The language uses words essentially as a symbol and not as signs for the concepts represented by them.

Language is a powerful source of communication. All languages are used for the purpose of communication. A language is a means by which a person expresses his thoughts and feelings

to others. The communicative aspect of a language is very important. Without it, a language cannot be called a proper language. The function of language is communicating thought from one person to another. It came into use for communication. In the pre-historic days, communication was carried on by means of signals made with the part of the body. Later on, sound signals were evolved. For example, if a man was attacked by a beast, he would make a particular sound signal and others would come to his help. Gradually, speech sounds were developed and language came into use for the purpose of communication.

Language has also been defined in almost the same manner as a learned arbitrary system of vocal symbols through which human beings interact and communicate in terms of their common cultural experience.

Productivity

Productivity is a general term in linguistics referring to the limitless ability to use language—any natural language—to say new things. It is also known as open-endedness or creativity.The term productivity is also applied in a narrower sense to particular forms or constructions (such as affixes) that can be used to produce new instances of the same type. In this sense, productivity is most commonly discussed in connection with word-formation.

"Humans are continually creating new expressions and novel utterances by manipulating their linguistic resources to describe new objects and situations. This property is described as productivity (or 'creativity' or 'open-endedness') and it is linked to the fact that the potential number of utterances in any human language is infinite.

"The communication systems of other creatures do not appear to have this type of flexibility. Cicadas have four signals to choose from and vervet monkeys have 36 vocal calls. Nor does it seem possible for creatures to produce new signals to communicate novel experiences or events....

"This limiting factor of animal communication is described in terms of fixed reference. Each signal in the system is fixed as relating to a particular object or occasion. Among the vervet monkey's repertoire, there is one danger signal CHUTTER, which is used when a snake is around, and another RRAUP, used when an eagle is spotted nearby. These signals are fixed in terms of their reference and cannot be manipulated."

What is Linguistics?

In a nutshell: Linguistics is the scientific study of language. Linguists apply the scientific method to conduct formal studies of speech sounds and gestures, grammatical structures, and meaning across the world's 6,000+ languages.

Linguistics is the scientific study of language. Linguists (experts in linguistics) work on specific languages, but their primary goal is to understand the nature of language in general by asking questions such as:

- What distinguishes human language from other animal communication systems?
- What features are common to all human languages?
- How are the modes of linguistic communication (speech, writing, sign language) related to each other?
- How is language related to other types of human behaviour?

The main goal of linguistics, like all other intellectual disciplines, is to increase our knowledge and understanding of the world. Since language is universal and fundamental to all human interactions, the knowledge attained in linguistics has many practical applications. Linguists, with some training in other appropriate disciplines, are thus prepared to seek answers to questions such as:

- How can a previously unstudied language be analyzed and written?
- How can foreign languages best be taught and learned?
- How can speech be synthesized on a computer or how can a computer be programmed to understand human speech?
- How can the language problems of people with speech abnormalities be analyzed and rectified?
- How are linguistic issues in legal matters to be handled?

Linguistics as a Science

Linguistics is the science of language, and linguists are scientists who apply the scientific method to questions about the nature and function of language.

Linguists conduct formal studies of speech sounds, grammatical structures, and meaning across all the world's over 6,000 languages. They also investigate the history of and changes within language families and how language is acquired when we are infants. Linguists examine the relationship between written and spoken language as well as the underlying neural structures that enable us to use language.

Clearly, many of the questions linguists pose overlap with fields in the life sciences, social sciences, and humanities, thus making linguistics a multidisciplinary field. As a multidisciplinary field, Linguistics, attempts to understand how language is stored in the human mind/brain and how it is part of everyday human behavior through its sister fields of neuroscience, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, sociology, and computer science.

It is important to note that the term "linguist" may cause some confusion because it is known to be used differently in non-academic domains. Sometimes language experts are referred to as linguists, but those individuals do not necessarily conduct the same kind of scientific research on language as carried out by those with advanced degrees in linguistics. "Polyglot"

is the term used for a person who has knowledge of multiple languages. And although it is possible for a person to be both a linguist and a polyglot, it is just as possible that a linguist speaks only one language.

Descriptive, Comparative and Historical Linguistics

It is striking that all good descriptive work, done both in the past and today, in some way combines thorough synchronic description with family-internal comparison and historical reconstruction, or is grounded in these. Conversely, the quality of comparative linguistic studies crucially depends on the quality of the synchronic analyses of the relevant data. In the case of modern languages, these synchronic analyses are often provided by descriptive linguists. In the case of ancient languages, the synchronic analyses are carried out by philologists, whose methodology often overlaps with that of descriptive linguists. Descriptive and comparative historical linguistics have a number of naturally shared domains of research.

For synchronic language description it is crucial to have or accumulate knowledge about the earlier stages of a certain sound, affix or word, and to investigate how these structural items evolved over time to become what they are in the language today. Therefore researchers in the descriptive linguistic group often engage in comparative research on a group of related languages. This type of research also enables them to contribute to the study of the socio-cultural past.

Two main research domains may be distinguished within the programme: (1) language description and (2) linguistic reconstruction and comparative linguistics.

Language description, aiming at in-depth analyses of the world's languages. Descriptive linguistics is concerned with the study of the structure of languages through an analysis of the forms, structures and processes at all levels of language structure: phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, semantics and pragmatics. It is based on data gathered through fieldwork, preferably immersion fieldwork for extended periods of time. It draws on ethnographic and linguistic methods. Languages are of strategic importance in understanding the history and culture of a people and the cognitive capacities of humans, as in Sapir's idea of linguistics as a science. Our main focus areas are Meso- and South America, North, West and East Africa, and insular Southeast Asia. The researchers in this domain strive to expand the regions of expertise in order to improve the coverage of the world's linguistic diversity. Leiden University has a long and strong tradition in producing comprehensive grammars of understudied languages. LUCL researchers are active in the development of the new field of language documentation. Language documentation is broader than description: it not only entails the establishment of searchable annotated audio and video corpora, including the most relevant cultural practices, but also involves reflection on data and on the nature of variation. The challenge for the coming years is to strengthen the programme's position in developing the field of language documentation and to combine this with deeper linguistic analyses of the languages that are studied. The present context of LUCL favours these aims. The world's heritage of linguistic diversity is endangered in many different ways. Our research group is dedicated to documenting that diversity, and we have been able to raise specific funding for this goal.

Linguistic reconstruction and comparative linguistics, aiming at describing and understanding diachronic variation and linguistic developments across time, as well as synchronic older language stages in all their varieties. The span of research stretches historically from Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Semitic (4th and 3rd millennia BCE) up to the present day, and geographically from Iceland and the British Isles to India and Western China in Eurasia, Northern and West Africa, Eastern Indonesia and East Timor, the Andes, Meso-America and the Guyanas.

For prehistoric times, the most advanced insights are developed and applied for the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Semitic and their subsequent stages. Supportive evidence from archaeology and genetics is put to use, and researchers concentrate not only on internally motivated language changes, but also on external factors such as language contact and substrate effects.

For historic times, the research programme is strongly data-oriented: it is based on comprehensive philological study of the sources, on close reading of texts within their social, cultural and pragmatic contexts, and on corpus linguistics. At the same time, the research is well informed by the theoretical concepts of modern descriptive and historical linguistics as well as sociolinguistics.

Branches of Linguistics

Due to the intricate structure of languages and their far-reaching impact, there are various subfields, domains, and specialised branches of linguistics. Here are the main branches of linguistics with examples.

Psycholinguistics - Psycholinguistics is amongst the most popular branches of linguistics that studies the relationship between psychological processes and linguistic behaviour. An example of psycholinguistics is found in the study of how humans perceive language and why certain words have the capacity to trigger us emotionally, more so than other words.
Such branches of linguistics also seek to understand how humans acquire and master languages. Psycholinguists often work with child psychologists and conduct research on speech and language development to understand how humans perceive and produce language.

Sociolinguistics - This is another one of those branches of linguistics that serves a crucial function in our understanding and application of linguistics. Because language is a deeply human and social construct, socio-linguistics deals with the effect of different aspects of society on language.
On top of that, it studies the interaction of languages as people from different cultures and heritage interact. One example of sociolinguistics is the emergence of different dialects of a language, as is the study of language confluence, such as Hindi and English being spoken together as Hinglish.

Comparative linguistics - As the name suggests, this branch is associated with identifying similarities and differences between languages that have a common origin. For instance, romance languages like Italian, French, and Spanish differ in speech and construction even though they all originated from Vulgar Latin of the Roman era. Studies in comparative linguistics also include studying distant languages, such as Sanskrit and German that are

separated by thousands of kilometres and years, but which nevertheless have structural and etymological similarities.
See also: Learn Spanish with these 15+ amazing courses

Historical linguistics - This is one of the more intriguing branches of linguistics. It studies the evolution of languages over a period of time and analyses the changes that took place within them. One of the purposes of this branch is the examination of 'dead' languages, such as Latin, Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, etc., and the emergence of current languages from them. Historical linguistics also enables us to reconstruct earlier stages of languages to understand how grammar, semantics, and phonetics can change over time.

Stylistics - This is another one of the important branches of linguistics. It is the study and interpretation of style and rhetorics as employed by different authors within a language. Oftentimes, such interdisciplinary branches of linguistics include the study of literature which lets one analyze symbolism, rhyme and rhythm, dialogues, sentence structures, etc. For example, the language used in politics and advertising is very different from that of religious texts and classical literature. The analysis of that comes within the domain of stylistics.

References:

1. Syal P.& Jindal D.V.(2009) An Introduction to Linguistics PHI Learning Pvt Ltd. New Delhi.
2. Plag, I., Braun, M., Arndtlappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2015). Introduction to English Linguistics (Mouton Textbook) (3rd ed.). De Gruyter Mouton.
3. Altshuler, D., Parsons, T., & Schwarzschild, R. (2019). A Course in Semantics (The MIT Press). The MIT Press.
4. Genetti, C. (2018). How Languages Work: An Introduction to Language and Linguistics (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

SATHYABAMA
INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
(DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY)
Accredited "A" Grade by NAAC | 12B Status by UGC | Approved by AICTE
www.sathyabama.ac.in

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE & HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIT – II – INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS – SHS1207

Unit - II

Fundamental Concepts and Distinctions in Linguistics

The Language / Parole distinction

The distinction between the French words, langue (language or tongue) and parole (speech), enters the vocabulary of theoretical linguistics with Ferdinand de Saussure's Course in General Linguistics, which was published posthumously in 1915 after having been collocated from student notes. La langue denotes the abstract systematic principles of a language, without which no meaningful utterance (parole) would be possible. The Course manifests a shift from the search for origins and ideals, typical of nineteenth century science, to the establishment of systems. The modern notion of system is reflected in the title of the course: General Linguistics. Saussure in this way indicates that the course will be about language in general: not this or that particular language (Chinese or French) and not this or that aspect (phonetics or semantics). A general linguistics would be impossible by empirical means because there exist innumerable objects that can be considered linguistic. Instead Saussure's methodology allows him to establish a coherent object for linguistics in the distinction between langue and parole.

Langue represents the "work of a collective intelligence," which is both internal to each individual and collective, in so far as it is beyond the will of any individual to change. Parole, on the other hand, designates individual acts, statements and utterances, events of language use manifesting each time a speaker's ephemeral individual will through his combination of concepts and his "phonation"—the formal aspects of the utterance. Saussure points out that the single word "linguistics" therefore covers two very different kinds of study. The study of parole would be entirely focused on individual utterances, using all the available resources of formal and empirical study to analyze actual statements, usually within a specific language. The study of langue would be focused instead on generally applicable conditions of possibility. The Course thus follows the second route in this inevitable "bifurcation," setting out the groundwork for all attempts to grasp the basic conditions of possibility for language and language use generally. There would be no coherent and meaningful utterance without the institution of norms that Saussure calls langue. So it is this that forms the object of study for modern linguistics. Such an object could not ever be made visible (as a stretch of text can) but one can in principle establish the rules and conditions that make it possible to speak and write in meaningful ways. Langue and parole has been translated by alternative semiotic categories like system and process (A J Greimas) or code and message (Roman Jakobson), which interpret Saussure's distinction in specific ways. The main assumptions of structuralism and semiology (or semiotics) would be that for every process (an utterance for instance) there is a system of underlying laws that govern it; and that the system arises contingently (there are no natural or necessary reasons for the relations within it to be as they are).

The scientific approach to systems, inherited by Saussure, assumes that the elements which make them up correspond to organized and integrated unities. Each element in a system should be located in its place on the web of relationships between elements. The elements of the linguistic system are, however, the mental phenomena called signs. A sign is comprised of both a mental image (signifier) and an idea (signified). Saussure's most famous statement

concerns how these signs are differentiated in themselves and related to each other. “In language,” he says, “there are only differences without positive terms.” He distinguishes between meaning and value to get the point across. “What we find, instead of ideas being given in advance, are values emanating from a linguistic system. If we say that these values correspond to certain concepts, it must be understood that the concepts in question are purely differential. That is to say they are concepts defined not positively, in terms of their content, but negatively by contrast with other items in the same system. What characterizes each most exactly is being whatever the others are not” (CGL 115). The notion of value thus designates a quality that is entirely relative to other values in the system. The concept of a dog or a cat, a virtue or a crime, gets its value as a linguistic unit entirely relative to the values of all the other linguistic units. So no linguistic unit can be regarded as a positive pre-existing entity or idea (whether concept or mark). To define a linguistic unit, rather, is to specify in what ways it is similar to or different from the other units within the system. Two marks a and b are not, despite appearances, grasped positively by our consciousness. We grasp the difference between a and b etc. It is for this reason, Saussure says, that each sign “remains free to change in accordance with laws quite unconnected with their signifying function” (116). Linguistic items are therefore always based, ultimately, upon their non-coincidence with the others. This what also allows considerable flexibility in their relations—the play between signifiers and between signifiers and signifieds, their difference.

Competence Vs Performance

How do we know that students have learned a language? We can assess students using formative and summative assessments but how do we know that students will actually be able to use their language in real-life, authentic situations? In short, how do we know that our students are competent in the target language? One way to judge this competency is through students’ performance. However, how do we know that this performance is an accurate measure of what students actually know? In this section we will examine these questions further by looking at competence versus performance.

Chomsky separates competence and performance; he describes 'competence' as an idealized capacity that is located as a psychological or mental property or function and ‘performance’ as the production of actual utterances. In short, competence involves “knowing” the language and performance involves “doing” something with the language. The difficulty with this construct is that it is very difficult to assess competence without assessing performance.

Noting the distinction between competence and performance is useful primarily because it allows those studying a language to differentiate between a speech error and not knowing something about the language. To understand this distinction, it is helpful to think about a time when you've made some sort of error in your speech. For example, let's say you are a native speaker of English and utter the following:We swimmed in the ocean this weekend.Is this error due to competence or performance? It is most likely that as a native speaker you are aware how to conjugate irregular verbs in the past but your performance has let you down this time. Linguists use the distinction between competence and performance to illustrate the intuitive difference between accidentally saying swimmed and the fact that a child or non-proficient speaker of English may not know that the past tense of swim is swam and say swimmed consistently.

Diachronic and Synchronic Approaches

Synchronic linguistics is one of the two main temporal dimensions of language study introduced by Saussure in his "Course in General Linguistics" (1916). The other is diachronic linguistics, which is the study of language through periods of time in history. The first looks at a snapshot of a language, and the other studies its evolution (like a frame of film vs. a movie).

For example, analyzing the word order in a sentence in Old English only would be a study in synchronistic linguistics. If you looked at how word order changed in a sentence from Old English to Middle English and now to modern English, that would be a diachronic study.

Say you need to analyze how historical events affected a language. If you look at when the Normans conquered England in 1066 and brought with them a lot of new words to be injected into English, a diachronic look could analyze what new words were adopted, which ones fell out of use, and how long that process took for select words. A synchronic study might look at the language at different points before the Normans or after. Note how you need a longer time period for the diachronic study than the synchronic one.

Synchronic linguistics is descriptive linguistics, such as the study of how parts of a language (morphs or morphemes) combine to form words and phrases and how proper syntax gives a sentence meaning. In the 20th century the search for a universal grammar, that which is instinctive in humans and gives them the ability to pick up their native language as an infant, is a synchronic area of study.

Studies of "dead" languages can be synchronic, as by definition they are no longer spoken (no native or fluent speakers) nor evolving and are frozen in time.

References:

1) Syal P.& Jindal D.V.(2009) An Introduction to Linguistics PHI Learning Pvt Ltd. New Delhi.
2) Plag, I., Braun, M., Arndtlappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2015). Introduction to English Linguistics (Mouton Textbook) (3rd ed.). De Gruyter Mouton.
3) Altshuler, D., Parsons, T., & Schwarzschild, R. (2019). A Course in Semantics (The MIT Press). The MIT Press.
4) Genetti, C. (2018). How Languages Work: An Introduction to Language and Linguistics (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

SATHYABAMA
INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
(DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY)
Accredited "A" Grade by NAAC | 12B Status by UGC | Approved by AICTE
www.sathyabama.ac.in

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE & HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIT – III – INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS – SHS1207

Unit - III

Modern Linguistics

The Study of Language Variation

The term linguistic variation (or simply variation) refers to regional, social, or contextual differences in the ways that a particular language is used.

Variation between languages, dialects, and speakers is known as interspeaker variation. Variation within the language of a single speaker is called intraspeaker variation.

Since the rise of sociolinguistics in the 1960s, interest in linguistic variation (also called linguistic variability) has developed rapidly. R.L. Trask notes that "variation, far from being peripheral and inconsequential, is a vital part of ordinary linguistic behavior" (Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics, 2007). The formal study of variation is known as variationist (socio)linguistics.

All aspects of language (including phonemes, morphemes, syntactic structures, and meanings) are subject to variation.

"Linguistic variation is central to the study of language use. In fact it is impossible to study the language forms used in natural texts without being confronted with the issue of linguistic variability. Variability is inherent in human language: a single speaker will use different linguistic forms on different occasions, and different speakers of a language will express the same meanings using different forms. Most of this variation is highly systematic: speakers of a language make choices in pronunciation, morphology, word choice, and grammar depending on a number of non-linguistic factors. These factors include the speaker's purpose in communication, the relationship between speaker and hearer, the production circumstances, and various demographic affiliations that a speaker can have."

"There are two types of language variation: linguistic and sociolinguistic. With linguistic variation, the alternation between elements is categorically constrained by the linguistic context in which they occur. With sociolinguistic variation, speakers can choose between elements in the same linguistic context and, hence the alternation is probabilistic. Furthermore, the probability of one form being chosen over another is also affected in a probabilistic way by a range of extra-linguistic factors [e.g. the degree of (in)formality of the topic under discussion, the social status of the speaker and of the interlocutor, the setting in which communication takes place, etc.]"

"A dialect is variation in grammar and vocabulary in addition to sound variations. For example, if one person utters the sentence 'John is a farmer' and another says the same thing

except pronounces the word farmer as 'fahmuh,' then the difference is one of accent. But if one person says something like 'You should not do that' and another says 'Ya hadn't oughta do that,' then this is a dialect difference because the variation is greater. The extent of dialect differences is a continuum. Some dialects are extremely different and others less so."

"[R]egional variation is only one of many possible types of differences among speakers of the same language. For example, there are occupational dialects (the word bugs means something quite different to a computer programmer and an exterminator), sexual dialects (women are far more likely than men to call a new house adorable), and educational dialects (the more education people have, the less likely they are to use double negatives). There are dialects of age (teenagers have their own slang, and even the phonology of older speakers is likely to differ from that of young speakers in the same geographical region) and dialects of social context (we do not talk the same way to our intimate friends as we do to new acquaintances, to the paperboy, or to our employer). . . . [R]egional dialects are only one of many types of linguistic variation."

Some Diachronic Variations in Language

"Diachronic linguistics is the historical study of language, whereas synchronic linguistics is the geographic study of language. Diachronic linguistics refers to the study of how a language evolves over a period of time. Tracing the development of English from the Old English period to the twentieth century is a diachronic study. A synchronic study of language is a comparison of languages or dialects—various spoken differences of the same language—used within some defined spatial region and during the same period of time. Determining the regions of the United States in which people currently say 'pop' rather than 'soda' and 'idea' rather than 'idear' are examples of the types of inquiries pertinent to a synchronic study."

"Most of Saussure's successors accepted the 'synchronic-**diachronic**' distinction, which still survives robustly in twenty-first-century linguistics. In practice, what this means is that it is accounted a violation of principle or linguistic method to include in the same synchronic analysis evidence related to diachronically different states. So, for example, citing Shakespearean forms would be regarded as inadmissible in support of, say, an analysis of the grammar of Dickens. Saussure is particularly severe in his strictures upon linguists who conflate synchronic and diachronic facts."

Synchronic Variations Due to Language Contact

Language contact is typically responsible for morphosyntactic variation (sometimes simply called “change” in the literature) in the languages that are in contact. It often leads to competition between an innovative and a previously existing form or structure. This competition seems to be chiefly responsible either for free variation, or for a new functional distinction between the “new” and the “old” form, or for the abandonment of the “old” form. From a comparative or functionalist perspective, all three of these may be called change.

For some authors, when an innovative form or structure appears or already exists it constitutes a change in the linguistic system. Stolz (2006: 15), for example, defines the notion of (contact-induced) typological change: “For typological change to occur in a language A,

two chronologically different stages T1 and T1+n of A are required with A displaying properties of typological class X at T1 and properties of a typological class non-X at T1+n. This definition allows for the possibility that non-X properties may not have ousted X properties at stage T1+n, i.e., in lieu of a full-blown change from one typologically-defined class to another, language A combines the characteristic traits of more than one typological class at the same time." For others, a second process is needed before the phenomenon can be properly called change – the propagation or diffusion of the innovation. Croft (2000: 185), for example, says that "language change consists of two processes: altered replication of a replicator, i.e. innovation; and differential replication of replicators leading to survival/extinction, i.e. propagation." And lastly, for a minority of authors who adopt this paradigm, not only are diffusion or propagation necessary, but the stability of the system also enters into consideration. For example, depending on their time-frame and stability, contact-induced changes may be seen as completed if "some aspects of the grammatical system of a language do not show any synchronic variation and speakers are hardly aware of these as 'foreign'," and "the contact is now in the past" (Aikhenvald 2006: 21). Alternatively, contact-induced changes may be seen as "in progress," "ongoing," or "continuous" (Tsitsipis 1998) when "the degree of influence of the other language depends on the speaker's competence and proficiency".

From a variationist perspective, synchronic variation is a prerequisite for diachronic change and a characteristic of living languages, and while all three types of change just listed could be called "change in progress," only the last, at a later stage, can indubitably be called a "completed change." Since Weinreich et al. (1968), a considerable body of evidence has confirmed that variation in language and in language use is the norm rather than the exception. Labov's work on the mechanism of change has strikingly demonstrated that patterns of variation are crucial for understanding how change takes places and what drives it (as in his Martha's vineyard pioneering study), even though variation (which is defined as a first stage and plays a role in the long term) does not necessarily lead to "completed" change. Only occasionally does a "new" or innovative form survive for long enough, spread (in the second stage of diffusion), and possibly lead to regularity and to the abandonment of the "old" form.

The S-curve model is largely accepted as representing the transmission and propagation of a linguistic innovation (Aitchison 1991; Labov 1994; Croft 2000; Kroch 1989; Denison 2003). In its ideal manifestation, the innovative form spreads slowly at the beginning, then becomes rapidly more and more frequent before the process slows down considerably, just before reaching completion. The new form, now seen as acceptable and stable, is conventionalized.

Varieties of Dialect

a variety of a language that signals where a person comes from. The notion is usually interpreted geographically (regional dialect), but it also has some application in relation to a person's social background (class dialect) or occupation (occupational dialect). The word dialect comes from the Ancient Greek dialektos "discourse, language, dialect," which is derived from dialegesthai "to discourse, talk." A dialect is chiefly distinguished from other dialects of the same language by features of linguistic structure—i.e., grammar (specifically morphology and syntax) and vocabulary. In morphology (word formation), various dialects in

the Atlantic states have clim, clum, clome, or cloome instead of climbed, and, in syntax (sentence structure), there are “sick to his stomach,” “sick at his stomach,” “sick in,” “sick on,” and “sick with.” On the level of vocabulary, examples of dialectal differences include American English subway, contrasting with British English underground; and corn, which means “maize” in the United States, Canada, and Australia, “wheat” in England, and “oats” in Scotland. Nevertheless, while dialects of the same language differ, they still possess a common core of features.

Although some linguists include phonological features (such as vowels, consonants, and intonation) among the dimensions of dialect, the standard practice is to treat such features as aspects of accent. In the sound system of American English, for example, some speakers pronounce greasy with an “s” sound, while others pronounce it with a “z” sound. Accent differences of this kind are extremely important as regional and class indicators in every language. Their role is well recognized in Great Britain, for example, where the prestige accent, called Received Pronunciation, is used as an educated standard and differences in regional accent, both rural and urban, are frequent. There is far less accent variation in Canada, Australia, and large parts of the United States.

Frequently, the label dialect, or dialectal, is attached to substandard speech, language usage that deviates from the accepted norm—e.g., the speech of many of the heroes of Mark Twain’s novels. On the other hand, the standard language can also be regarded as one of the dialects of a given language, though one that has attracted special prestige. In a historical sense, the term dialect is sometimes applied to a language considered as one of a group deriving from a common ancestor. Thus, English, Swedish, and German are sometimes treated as Germanic dialects.

There is often considerable difficulty in deciding whether two linguistic varieties are dialects of the same language or two separate but closely related languages; this is especially true in parts of the world where speech communities have been little studied. In these cases especially, decisions regarding dialects versus languages must be to some extent arbitrary.

Register & Classification of Register

In linguistics, the register is defined as the way a speaker uses language differently in different circumstances. Think about the words you choose, your tone of voice, even your body language. You probably behave very differently chatting with a friend than you would at a formal dinner party or during a job interview. These variations in formality, also called stylistic variation, are known as registers in linguistics. They are determined by such factors as social occasion, context, purpose, and audience.

Registers are marked by a variety of specialized vocabulary and turns of phrases, colloquialisms and the use of jargon, and a difference in intonation and pace; in "The Study of Language," linguist George Yule describes the function of jargon as helping " to create and maintain connections among those who see themselves as 'insiders' in some way and to exclude 'outsiders.'"

Registers are used in all forms of communication, including written, spoken, and signed. Depending on grammar, syntax, and tone, the register may be extremely rigid or very

intimate. You don't even need to use an actual word to communicate effectively. A huff of exasperation during a debate or a grin while signing "hello" speaks volumes.

Types of Linguistic Register

Some linguists say there are just two types of register: formal and informal. This isn't incorrect, but it is an oversimplification. Instead, most who study language say there are five distinct registers.

Frozen: This form is sometimes called the static register because it refers to historic language or communication that is intended to remain unchanged, like a constitution or prayer. Examples: The Bible, the United States Constitution, the Bhagavad Gita, "Romeo and Juliet."

Formal: Less rigid but still constrained, the formal register is used in professional, academic, or legal settings where communication is expected to be respectful, uninterrupted, and restrained. Slang is never used, and contractions are rare. Examples: a TED talk, a business presentation, the Encyclopaedia Brittanica, "Gray's Anatomy," by Henry Gray.

Consultative: People use this register often in conversation when they're speaking with someone who has specialized knowledge or who is offering advice. Tone is often respectful (use of courtesy titles) but may be more casual if the relationship is longstanding or friendly (a family doctor.) Slang is sometimes used, people may pause or interrupt one another. Examples: the local TV news broadcast, an annual physical, a service provider like a plumber.

Casual: This is the register people use when they're with friends, close acquaintances and co-workers, and family. It's probably the one you think of when you consider how you talk with other people, often in a group setting. Use of slang, contractions, and vernacular grammar is all common, and people may also use expletives or off-color language in some settings. Examples: a birthday party, a backyard barbecue.
Intimate: Linguists say this register is reserved for special occasions, usually between only two people and often in private. Intimate language may be something as simple as an inside joke between two college friends or a word whispered in a lover's ear.

References:

1. Syal P.& Jindal D.V.(2009) An Introduction to Linguistics PHI Learning Pvt Ltd. New Delhi.
2. Plag, I., Braun, M., Arndtlappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2015). Introduction to English Linguistics (Mouton Textbook) (3rd ed.). De Gruyter Mouton.
3. Altshuler, D., Parsons, T., & Schwarzschild, R. (2019). A Course in Semantics (The MIT Press). The MIT Press.
4. Genetti, C. (2018). How Languages Work: An Introduction to Language and Linguistics (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

SATHYABAMA
INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
(DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY)
Accredited "A" Grade by NAAC | 12B Status by UGC | Approved by AICTE
www.sathyabama.ac.in

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE & HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIT – IV – INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS – SHS1207

Unit - IV

Study of Language; Study Language

Functions and Definitions of Grammar

Grammatical function is the syntactic role played by a word or phrase in the context of a particular clause or sentence. Sometimes called simply function.

In English, grammatical function is primarily determined by a word's position in a sentence, not by inflection (or word endings).

"The five elements of clause structure, namely subject, verb, object, complement, and adverbial, are grammatical functions. In addition, we distinguish predicator as the function carried by the main verb in a clause, and predicate as the function assigned to the portion of a clause excluding the subject.

"Within phrases, certain types of units can function as modifiers, more specifically as premodifiers or postmodifiers."There is no one-to-one correspondence between functions and their possible formal realizations. Thus the functions of subject and direct object are often realized by a noun phrase, but can also be realized by a clause." (Bas Aarts, Sylvia Chalker, and Edmund Weiner, "The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar," 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, 2014.)

"The production and interpretation of an utterance act is anchored to the constitutive parts of language: syntax, morphology, phonology, semantics, and pragmatics. While syntax is composed of structural units, for instance, constituents in traditional grammar, phrases in functional grammar and generative grammar, groups in systemic functional grammar or constructions in construction grammar, it is the linear ordering of the individual parts within a hierarchically structured sequence which constitutes their grammatical function. The adverb really, for instance, realizes the grammatical function of a sentence adverbial with wide scope if positioned initially or finally, as is the case in the utterance really, Sarah is sweet. If the adverb really is positioned medially, it is assigned the grammatical function of the adverbial of subjunct with narrow scope, as in Sarah is really sweet. Or, the proper noun Mary can realize the grammatical function of object in Sally kissed Mary, and it can realize the grammatical function of subject in Mary kissed Sally. Thus, it is not the grammatical construction as such which is assigned a grammatical function. Rather, it is the positioning of a grammatical construction within a hierarchically structured sequence which assigns it a grammatical function." (Anita Fetzer, "Contexts in Interaction: Relating Pragmatic Wastebaskets." "What Is a Context?: Linguistic Approaches and Challenges," ed. by Rita Finkbeiner, Jörg Meibauer, and Petra B. Schumacher. John Benjamins, 2012.)

Morphology and Word Formation

In traditional grammar, words are the basic units of analysis. Grammarians classify words according to their parts of speech and identify and list the forms that words can show up in. Although the matter is really very complex, for the sake of simplicity we will begin with the assumption that we are all generally able to distinguish words from other linguistic units. It will be sufficient for our initial purposes if we assume that words are the main units used for entries in dictionaries. In a later section, we will briefly describe some of their distinctive characteristics.

Words are potentially complex units, composed of even more basic units, called morphemes. A morpheme is the smallest part of a word that has grammatical function or meaning (NB not the smallest unit of meaning); we will designate them in braces—{ }. For example, sawed, sawn, sawing, and saws can all be analyzed into the morphemes {saw} + {-ed}, {-n}, {-ing}, and {-s}, respectively. None of these last four can be further divided into meaningful units and each occurs in many other words, such as looked, mown, coughing, bakes. {Saw} can occur on its own as a word; it does not have to be attached to another morpheme. It is a free morpheme. However, none of the other morphemes listed just above is free. Each must be affixed (attached) to some other unit; each can only occur as a part of a word. Morphemes that must
be attached as word parts are said to be bound.

Compounding
Compounding forms a word out of two or more root morphemes. The words are called compounds or compound words.

In Linguistics, compounds can be either native or borrowed.

Native English roots are typically free morphemes, so that means native compounds are made out of independent words that can occur by themselves. Examples:

mailman (composed of free root mail and free root man)
mail carrier
dog house
fireplace
fireplug (a regional word for 'fire hydrant')
fire hydrant
dry run
cupcake
cup holder
email
e-ticket

pick-up truck
talking-to
Some compounds have a preposition as one of the component words as in the last 2 examples.

In Greek and Latin, in contrast to English, roots do not typically stand alone. So compounds are composed of bound roots. Compounds formed in English from borrowed Latin and Greek morphemes preserve this characteristic. Examples include photograph, iatrogenic, and many thousands of other classical words.

Note that compounds are written in various ways in English: with a space between the elements; with a hyphen between the elements; or simply with the two roots run together with no separation. The way the word is written does not affect its status as a compound. Over time, the convention for writing compounds can change, usually in the direction from separate words (e.g. email used to be written with a hyphen. In the 19th century, today and tomorrow were sometimes still written to-day and to-morrow. The to originally was the preposition to with an older meaning 'at [a particular period of time]'. Clock work changed to clock-work and finally to one word with no break (clockwork). If you read older literature you might see some compound words that are now written as one word appearing with unfamiliar spaces or hyphens between the components.

Another thing to note about compounds is that they can combine words of different parts of speech. The list above shows mostly noun-noun compounds, which is probably the most common part of speech combination, but there are others, such as adjective-noun (dry run, blackbird, hard drive), verb-noun (pick-pocket, cut-purse, lick-spittle) and even verb-particle (where 'particle' means a word basically designating spatial expression that functions to complete a literal or metaphorical path), as in run-through, hold-over. Sometimes these compounds are different in the part of speech of the whole compound vs. the part of speech of its components. Note that the last two are actually nouns, despite their components.

Some compounds have more than two component words. These are formed by successively combining words into compounds, e.g. pick-up truck, formed from pick-up and truck , where the first component, pick-up is itself a compound formed from pick and up. Other examples are ice-cream cone, no-fault insurance and even more complex compounds like top-rack dishwasher safe.

There are a number of subtypes of compounds that do not have to do with part of speech, but rather the sound characteristics of the words. These subtypes are not mutually exclusive.

Rhyming compounds (subtype of compounds)
These words are compounded from two rhyming words. Examples:

lovey-dovey
chiller-killer

There are words that are formally very similar to rhyming compounds, but are not quite compounds in English because the second element is not really a word--it is just a nonsense item added to a root word to form a rhyme. Examples:

higgledy-piggledy
tootsie-wootsie

This formation process is associated in English with child talk (and talk addressed to children), technically called hypocoristic language. Examples:

bunnie-wunnie
Henny Penny
snuggly-wuggly
Georgie Porgie
Piggie-Wiggie
Another word type that looks a bit like rhyming compounds comprises words that are formed of two elements that almost match, but differ in their vowels. Again, the second element is typically a nonsense form:

pitter-patter
zigzag
tick-tock
riffraff
flipflop
Derivation Derivation is the creation of words by modification of a root without the addition of other roots. Often the effect is a change in part of speech.

Affixation (Subtype of Derivation)
The most common type of derivation is the addition of one or more affixes to a root, as in the word derivation itself. This process is called affixation, a term which covers both prefixation and suffixation.

Blending
Blending is one of the most beloved of word formation processes in English. It is especially creative in that speakers take two words and merge them based not on morpheme structure but on sound structure. The resulting words are called blends.

Usually in word formation we combine roots or affixes along their edges: one morpheme comes to an end before the next one starts. For example, we form derivation out of the sequence of morphemes de+riv+at(e)+ion. One morpheme follows the next and each one has identifiable boundaries. The morphemes do not overlap.

But in blending, part of one word is stitched onto another word, without any regard for where one morpheme ends and another begins. For example, the word swooshtika 'Nike swoosh as a logo symbolizing corporate power and hegemony' was formed from swoosh and swastika. The swoosh part remains whole and recognizable in the blend, but the tika part is not a morpheme, either in the word swastika or in the blend. The blend is a perfect merger of form, and also of content. The meaning contains an implicit analogy between the swastika and the swoosh, and thus conceptually blends them into one new kind of thing having properties of both, but also combined properties of neither source. Other examples include glitterati (blending glitter and literati) 'Hollywood social set', mockumentary (mock and documentary) 'spoof documentary'.

The earliest blends in English only go back to the 19th century, with wordplay coinages by Lewis Carroll in Jabberwocky. For example, he introduced to the language slithy, formed from lithe and slimy, and galumph, (from gallop and triumph. Interestingly galumph has survived as a word in English, but it now seems to mean 'walk in a stomping, ungainly way'.

Some blends that have been around for quite a while include brunch (breakfast and lunch), motel (motor hotel), electrocute (electric and execute), smog (smoke and fog) and cheeseburger (cheese and hamburger). These go back to the first half of the twentieth century. Others, such as stagflation (stagnation and inflation), spork (spoon and fork), and carjacking (car and hijacking) arose since the 1970s.

Here are some more recent blends I have run across:

mocktail (mock and cocktail) 'cocktail with no alcohol'
splog (spam and blog) 'fake blog designed to attract hits and raise Google-ranking'
Britpoperati (Britpop and literati) 'those knowledgable about current British pop music'

Clipping
Clipping is a type of abbreviation of a word in which one part is 'clipped' off the rest, and the remaining word now means essentially the same thing as what the whole word means or meant. For example, the word rifle is a fairly modern clipping of an earlier compound rifle gun, meaning a gun with a rifled barrel. (Rifled means having a spiral groove causing the bullet to spin, and thus making it more accurate.) Another clipping is burger, formed by clipping off the beginning of the word hamburger. (This clipping could only come about once hamburg+er was reanalyzed as ham+burger.)

Acronyms
Acronyms are formed by taking the initial letters of a phrase and making a word out of it. Acronyms provide a way of turning a phrase into a word. The classical acronym is also pronounced as a word. Scuba was formed from self-contained underwater breathing apparatus. The word snafu was originally WW2 army slang for Situation Normal All Fucked Up. Acronyms were being used more and more by military bureaucrats, and soldiers coined snafu in an apparent parody of this overused device. Sometimes an acronym uses not just the first letter, but the first syllable of a component word, for example radar, RAdio Detection And Ranging and sonar, SOund Navigation and Ranging. Radar forms an analogical model for both sonar and lidar, a technology that measures distance to a target and and maps its surface by bouncing a laser off it. There is some evidence that lidar was not coined as an acronym, but instead as a blend of light and radar. Based on the word itself, either etymology appears to work, so many speakers assume that lidar is an acronym rather than a blend.

A German example that strings together the initial syllables of the words in the phrase, is Gestapo , from GEheime STAats POlizei 'Sectret State Police'. Another is Stasi, from STAats SIcherheit 'State Security'. Acronyms are a subtype of initialism. Initialisms also include words made from the initial letters of a Phrase but NOT pronounced as a normal word - it is instead pronounced as a string of letters. Organzation names aroften initialisms of his type. Examples:

NOW (National Organization of Women)
US or U.S., USA or U.S.A. (United States)
UN or U.N. (United Nations)
IMF (International Monetary Fund)
Some organizations ARE pronounced as a word:
UNICEF
MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving)

The last example incorporates a meaning into the word that fits the nature of the organization. Sometimes this type is called a Reverse Acronym or a Backronym.

These can be thought of as a special case of acronyms.

Memos, email, and text messaging (text-speak) are modes of communication that give rise to both clippings and acronyms, since these word formation methods are designed to abbreviate. Some acronyms:

NB - Nota bene, literally 'note well'. Used by scholars making notes on texts. (A large number of other scholarly acronyms from Latin are used, probably most invented in the medieval period or Renaissance, not originally in Latin)
BRB - be right back (from 1980s, 90s)
FYI - for your information (from mid 20th century)
LOL - laughing out loud (early 21st century) - now pronounced either /lol/ or /el o el/; has spawned compounds like Lolcats).
ROFL - rolling on the floor laughing
ROFLMAO - rolling on the floor laughing my ass off

Reanalysis
Sometimes speakers unconsciously change the morphological boundaries of a word, creating a new morph or making an old one unrecognizable. This happened in hamburger, which was originally Hamburger steak 'chopped and formed steak in the Hamburg style, then hamburger (hamburg + er), then ham + burger

Folk etymology
A popular idea of a word's origin that is not in accordance with its real origin.

Many folk etymologies are cases of reanalysis in which the word is not only reanalysis but it changes under the influence of the new understanding of its morphemes. The result is that speakers think it has a different origin than it does.
Analogy
Sometimes speakers take an existing word as a model and form other words using some of its morphemes as a fixed part, and changing one of them to something new, with an analogically similar meaning. Cheeseburger was formed on the analogy of hamburger, replacing a perceived morpheme ham with cheese. carjack and skyjack were also formed by analogy.

Novel creation
In novel creation, a speaker or writer forms a word without starting from other morphemes. It is as if the word if formed out of 'whole cloth', without reusing any parts.

Some examples of now-conventionalized words that were novel creations include blimp, googol (the mathematical term), bling, and possibly slang, which emerged in the last 200 years with no obvious etymology. Some novel creations seem to display 'sound symbolism', in which a word's phonological form suggests its meaning in some way. For example, the sound of the word bling seems to evoke heavy jewelry making noise. Another novel creation whose sound seems to relate to its meaning is badonkadonk, 'female rear end', a reduplicated word which can remind English speakers of the repetitive movement of the rear end while walking.

Creative respelling
Sometimes words are formed by simply changing the spelling of a word that the speaker wants to relate to the new word. Product names often involve creative respelling, such as Mr. Kleen.

Segmentation

Segmentation refers to the fact that in human language there is a small set of discrete primitive elements that clearly contrast with each other. The words of human language are composed of discrete segments both meaningful (morphemes) and non-meaningful (phonemes). Phonemes (cf. "Sound/sign patterning (phonology)") convey no meaning but constitute the stable inventory of sounds utilized by human language to form morphemes. Morphemes (cf. "Rules of word formation (morphology)") are meaning-bearing segments, e.g. roots and affixes, that combine to yield larger composite meanings (cf. "Combinatorial capacity"). The signs of sign language are also divided into morphemes and phonological segments of handshape, orientation, movement, and (body) location. There is evidence for segmentation of passerine avian, cetacean, and primate and long call systems into discrete acoustic elements. There is no conclusive evidence to date that these systems exhibit segmentation into stable units of meaning across multiple contexts.

References:

1. Syal P.& Jindal D.V.(2009) An Introduction to Linguistics PHI Learning Pvt Ltd. New Delhi.
2. Plag, I., Braun, M., Arndtlappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2015). Introduction to English Linguistics (Mouton Textbook) (3rd ed.). De Gruyter Mouton.
3. Altshuler, D., Parsons, T., & Schwarzschild, R. (2019). A Course in Semantics (The MIT Press). The MIT Press.
4. Genetti, C. (2018). How Languages Work: An Introduction to Language and Linguistics (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE & HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIT – V – INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS – SHS1207

Unit - V

Syntax and Semantics

Basic Sentence Patterns

In English, our sentences usually operate using a similar pattern: subject, verb, then object. The nice part about this type of structure is that it lets your reader easily know who is doing the action and what the outcome of the action is.

A **subject** performs the action in a sentence.

- For instance, in the sentence, "Matt eats pizza," *Matt* is the subject because he is the one eating the pizza.

A **verb** is a word that usually indicates some type of action. There are two basic types of verbs in English: **action verbs** and **linking verbs**. An action verb represents something the subject of a sentence does, whereas a linking verb connects the subject to a specific state of being. In other words, a linking verb describes a subject instead of expressing an action. Linking verbs are also known at **state of being verbs**, and the most common one in English is the verb *to be*.

- If we consider the above sentence, "Matt eats pizza," the verb is *eats*, which is an action verb because it tells us what Matt does – he eats.
- In this sentence, "Matt is hungry," our verb *is*, which is a form of *to be*, a linking verb. Notice how Matt does not do anything in this sentence. Instead, the verb *is* describes how Matt feels – hungry. *Is* links Matt with hunger.

An **object** usually appears after the verb. There are two types of objects in the English language: **direct** and **indirect**.

- A direct object takes or receives the action of the verb. In other words, the subject of the sentence acts on the direct object.
    - The direct object in our sample sentence "Matt eats pizza" is pizza. Matt eats what? Pizza.

An **indirect object** tells us to whom or for whom an action is done. To understand this concept, we need to come up with a longer sentence.

- Our new sample sentence will be, "Matt cuts the pizza for Nate." In this sentence, our subject is Matt, our verb is *cuts*, the direct object is *the pizza*, and our indirect object is *Nate*. The pizza is cut for whom? Nate because Matt cuts the pizza for him.

So, remember, this is the basic pattern of an English sentence: SUBJECT + VERB + OBJECT.

Five Basic Sentence Types

The predicates of sentences can be structured into five different ways. Some books assign them type numbers (like Types 1-5), but these are not used universally. **You need to memorise the names, not type numbers**.

Depending on the type of predicate you have, the verb is labelled intransitive, linking, or transitive.

Predicates with Intransitive Verbs

Intransitive verbs can stand alone as the whole predicate, although they may also have adverbial modifiers. Examples are the verbs in *I slept*, *I slept well*, and *I slept like a baby*. (NB that a prepositional phrase can function adverbially.)

You can perform the following tests to determine if a verb is intransitive:

1. Divide the predicate into phrases and see if it contains only a VP or a VP + an adverbial phrase.
2. If you are not sure if the phrase modifying the VP is adverbial, try replacing it with a prototypical adverb like *there* or *then*. If this works, the phrase is functioning adverbially.

You'll notice if you diagram these sentences that intransitive verbs do not have complements. The adverbial phrase just modifies the verb. All the other types of verbs have complements.

Predicates with Linking or Copular/Copulative Verbs

A **linking verb** is a verb that is completed by a phrase which describes the subject of the sentence. This phrase is a complement.

Linking verbs occur with two different types of complements: **adverbial complements** and **subject complements**. An adverbial complement is an adverbial phrase. A subject complement is an adjectival phrase or a noun phrase that describes the subject. The following examples illustrate this"

1. An adverbial complement: *I am outside*, *I am in the garage*.
2. An adjectival subject complement: *I am happy*, *I feel sick*, *He seems all right*.
3. A noun subject complement: *I am a genius*, *She considers him a coward*.

We'll examine each more closely in turn.

***Be* Followed by an Adverbial Phrase**

Examples are *Jesse is outside*. *Her job interviews were yesterday. Cheryl's notebook must have been on the desk. The reception will be at noon*. You'll notice that they look like intransitive verbs. But compare *The train departs and noon* with *The reception is at noon*. The verbs in the sentences are different because the verb *be* has a special status. It normally functions like an equals sign, between the subject and the complement (e.g. *I am a genius*). Intransitive verbs like *depart* do not function as an equals sign.

***Be* or Another Linking Verb Followed by an Adjectival Subject Complement**

When the subject of a linking verb is described by the verbs complement, the complement is called a **subject complement**. Subject complements can be adjectival or nominal. We'll deal with the **adjectival subject complement** first. Since many grammars use the term **predicate adjective**, that is worth knowing as a synonym. Examples are *Sheila is beautiful*. *His parties were very lavish. Bill is becoming friendly. Your uncle has seemed happy in the past*.

Most people are taught that verbs are modified by adverbs (e.g. *I sang well*). But consider a sentence like *I feel bad about that*. Notice that *bad* is an adjective, not an adverb. Why isn't it *I feel badly about that*? Or is it? Well, we could analyse these sentences like this.

I sang well (Intransitive, adverbial modifier)

I feel bad about that (Linking, adjectival subject complement)

I feel badly about that (Verb Type?, adverbial complement)

As you can see, there is no type that fits the last sentence. However, people do use constructions like this. Probably many examples of adverbs used with linking verbs are the result of hypercorrections by people who were taught that adverbs modify verbs. As you can see, this is a simplification which doesn't acknowledge the difference between a subject complement and a verb modifier which exists in Standard Educated English. It's even possible in some nonstandard grammars to have the distinction broken down in the other direction. Consider *I sang good*.

Even in Standard English, the distinctions are not blurred with a few words. Consider the following sentences.

I feel bad. (Linking, adjectival subject complement)

I don't feel well. (Linking, adverbial complement?)

In Standard English this only occurs with a small number of words. You need to pay attention to Standard Written Usage to learn them.

You can tell whether you have a linking verb followed by an adjectival complement by checking for the following:

1. The main verb is followed by an adjectival phrase describing the subject.
2. The main verb is *be* or can be replaced by *be* without major change to the meaning of the sentence.
3. The most common linking verbs are *be*, *appear*, *become*, *seem*, *grow*, *prove*, *remain*, *turn*, *feel*, *look*, *smell*, *taste*, and *sound*. But note that they do not always *function* as linking verbs, so don't automatically assume that they are.

***Be* or Another Linking Verb Followed by a Nominal Subject Complement**

A **nominal subject complement** is also called a **predicate nominative** in some grammars. The term *nominal* means something that functions as a noun. The term **nominative** is useful for specifying the case of the complement, as we'll see in a moment. Examples are *Those men are brutes*. *The auction was a success*. *Our office is becoming a jungle*. *My three sisters remained friends afterwards*.

An interesting usage problem can be seen in the sentence *It was I who volunteered to write the report*. Many people would say *It was me*, but people with prescriptive attitudes, including many publishers, would correct this. The reason is that there was an early prescriptive rule that nominal subject complements, or *predicate nominatives*, should in the nominative or subjective case. For most noun phrases, this doesn't make any difference, but for pronouns it does. This prescriptive rule has mostly disappeared from spoken standard English, but some speakers still insist on it, and many more follow the rule in writing.

Predicates with Transitive Verbs

A **transitive verb** is a verb that is completed by direct object. A **direct object** is defined as a noun phrase which completes a transitive verb. This circularity causes problems for some people. It is perhaps easier to

think of what a direct object is and what it is not. A direct object is a noun phrase that does not function as a subject complement; that is, it does not describe the subject. Compare the following sentences:

The house looks a wreck. Linking, Nominal Subject Complement

She prefers popcorn. Transitive, Direct Object

Let's sum up by seeing the patterns:

Main Verb Phrase	Complement
Intransitive	--
Intransitive	Adverbial Modifier
Linking	Adverbial Complement
Linking	Adjectival Subject Complement
Linking	Nominal Subject Complement
Transitive	Noun Phrase (Direct Object)

It's important to realise that no other pattern is possible. You can't have, say an intransitive verb with a direct object, or a transitive verb with a subject complement. So be sure not to make that mistake. Memorise these patterns *very* well. You should also memorise the following sentences to reinforces this table:

1. With an intransitive verb no complement exists.
2. With a linking verb an adverbial, adjectival, or noun phrase is the complement.
3. A transitive verb has a noun phrase as its direct object.

Object Complements

Consider the following sentences:

She prefers popcorn. Transitive, Direct Object

She gives him popcorn. Transitive, Direct Object

Both sentences have transitive verbs, but what is the direct object in the second sentence? *Him* is in fact the **indirect object**, a structure we'll look at a little later. For now, follow this procedure:

1. Make sure that you don't have a nominal subject complement.
2. If you have two noun phrases immediately following a verb, the second is the direct object unless it describes the first.

Well what if the second does describe the first? Here's an example: *She considers him a genius*. Notice that *him* is the direct object and *a genius* describes *him*? This is called an **object complement**.

What if the subject is its own direct object?

He cut him (refers to two entities)

He cut himself (refers to one entity)

Notice that English uses the reflexive pronoun to solve the problem!

What about these sentences:

The ball rolled slowly (Intransitive, Type I, Adverbial Modifier)

The child rolled the ball (transitive, Type V, Direct Object)

So is *roll* a transitive or an intransitive verb. This is a pointless debate. It changes depending on whether you have an adverbial modifier or a direct object. Page 225 gives a number of examples of verbs that sometimes function as different types.

Comma Faults

When speaking we frequently interrupt the subject-main verb-complement pattern. For instance, *Our whole class, with the possible exception of the nerd who sits in the front, surely failed the midterm*. Identify the different constituents of the sentence. Notice that, although we don't have a problem in speech, conventions in writing demand that you put commas around all the material that interrupts this pattern. When I say *around* I mean at both the beginning and the end. If you leave one or both out, you have what is called a **comma fault**. Here are some rules for avoiding comma faults.

1. Never insert a lone comma between a subject and predicate or between the main verb and its complement(s).
2. Use two commas to separate off anything that interrupts the subject and predicate or the verb and its complement(s).

You can now see two explanations for people's failure to use commas correctly.

1. They have been taught the Martian rule that commas mark pauses in speech.
2. They are not able to analyse the subject, predicate, main verb phrase, and complement structures, so they can't see where the commas should go.
3. They forget that commas must go on *both* sides of the material that interrupts the subject-predicate or main verb-complement pattern.

Structuralists view of Grammar

The most influential school of linguistics, that of 'structural' was associated with the name of Leonard Bloomfield, the American linguist. The main thesis of this school is that language has a structure. Bloomfieldian or post-Bloomfieldian linguistics envisaged language structure in a precise way. In particular, it was associated with the phoneme as the unit of phonology and morpheme as the unit of grammar. Phonemes are the sounds or strictly the distinctive sounds of language. Both phonemes and morphemes are the units of form, not of meaning. The essential structural approach to language is supposed to be composed of morphemes in sequence, i.e, strings of morphemes, and at a different level, of strings of phonemes. It was recognized that there were other units larger than morphemes, like tagmeme, taxeme, sememe and episememe. The concentration on terminological precision was very beneficial in fostering a more rigorous attitude towards grammatical analysis. These concepts turned out to be the cornerstones on which the whole theories of language structure came to be constructed. One example of this is the sememic approach to

language developed by S.M. Lamb of the Copenhagen School. Another is the theory of K.L.Pike who attempts to apply emic ideas to phonology, grammar and vocabulary, but also insists on applying the same to the analysis of other areas of human behaviour.

A 'structural' view of linguistics took shape, analogous to other sciences where abstractions were made of constant elements and relationships between them was stated. Structural Linguistics relied on formal criteria for these abstractions. In its more excessive manifestations it tried to exclude the study of meaning. It preferred to look at form and substance and ignore meaning because it was thought to be impossible to describe it. Structuralism might be summarized by saying that it sought to explain the working of language in terms of the functions of its components and their relationship to each other. First it was necessary to isolate the various kinds of components, then to analyse their composition in such a way as to enable a generalization to be made concerning their internal structure and then to relate these components and subcomponents in terms of their function in the total structure of which they formed part. The immediate constituent analysis was based on this grammar.

Basic Assumptions of Structuralists

The structuralist grammar may describe two different states of the language, e.g. may describe a) 'the man bought a dog' and b) 'the dog was bought by a man'. As for the assumptions it may be said as follows: 1) priority of the spoken language, 2) objective treatment of all languages, 3) importance of synchronic description, 4) system vs. structure, 5) Language and utterance (langue and parole). According to Harris, the aim of this school is to begin with the raw data and arrive at a grammatical description of the corpus and therefore of the language. There are two major steps at this stage, each applied at every level of analysis (phonology, morphology and syntax). The first of these is the setting up of the elements involved (i.e. phonemic, morphemic and syntactic). The second is to state the distribution of these elements relative to each other. First the phonological elements are set up, followed by a statement of their distribution. Then the morphological elements are set up, then the relations among them. Lastly the syntax is analysed into constituents and their relationship stated in terms of their structures. The resulting statement contains relatively few elements and classes of elements. Thus the structural linguistics is committed to the study of a language in its own terms in order to arrive at an abstract, synchronic description of the organization of the language analysed.

Bloomfield's sentence 'Poor John ran away' might be described as a simple sentence, made up of the noun 'John' modified by the adjective 'poor' and whose predicate is a verb phrase, consisting of the verb 'ran' and modified by the adverb away.' Underlying both the approaches to grammatical analysis is the view that sentences are not just linear sequences of elements, but are made up of layers of immediate constituents, each lower level constituent being part of a higher level constituent. One can distinguish three periods of development in the theory of constituent structure. Bloomfield himself did little more than introduce the notion and explain it by examples. He spoke of a proper analysis of the sentence into its constituents as one, which takes account of the meanings. His followers, Wells and Harris, formulated the principle of constituent analysis in greater detail and replaced Bloomfield's method with explicitly distributional criteria. Finally in the last few years the theory of constituent structure has been formalized and subjected to mathematical study by Chomsky and other scholars who have given considerable attention to the nature of the rules required to generate sentences.

Constructions may be classified according to their distribution and that of their constituents into what are commonly, called 'endocentric' and 'exocentric' constructions. An endocentric construction is one whose distribution is identical with that of one or more of its constituents. All the others are exocentric. In other words, exocentricity is defined negatively with reference to a prior definition of endocentricity. For example, 'poor John' is endocentric, since it has the same distribution as its constituent 'John.' Any English sentence in which John occurs can be matched with another sentence in which, poor John occurs in the same position. On the other hand 'in Vancouver' has much the same distribution in English sentences as 'there' and other adverbs of place. All nouns have the same distribution at the high level of classification for which the term

'noun' is used. At a* lower level two nouns might have a different distribution, one being animate and the other being inanimate, etc. The concepts of end centricity and exocentricity are therefore to be used with respect to some specified sub classification. Endocentric constructions fall into two main types: coordinating and subordinating. Coordinating constructions have the same distribution as each of their constituents, taken separately. Thus 'bread and cheese' and 'coffee or tea' are coordinating noun phrases. However, the two phrases belong to different subtypes, the first taking a plural verb and the second a singular verb. Subordinatingconstructions have the same distribution as one of their constituents.

E.g. A + N

(Poor John); Adv. + V(awfully clever); N (or NP) + Adv. (or adverbial phrase)(the girl upstairs), the man on the bus). The constituent whose distribution is the same as that of the resultant construction is called the head; the other constituent is the modifier. In subordinate constructions one modifier may be recursively nested within another. For example, in 'the man on the top of the bus' there are two constituents- the man (head) and On the top of the bus (modifier). 'On the top of the bus' is an exocentric adverbial phrase consisting of the preposition 'on' and the noun phrase 'the top of the bus.' 'The top of the bus1 is endocentric, its constituents being 'top' (head) and 'of the bus' (modifier).

IC Analysis

The aim of the immediate constituent analysis is to find out the parts of an utterance and how they are put together. It is assun ed that an utterance is decomposable into small units. Moreover, the analysis should reveal the structure of the utterance - that -3, the arrangement of the units. The structuralist assumes that utterances are physically separable and that linguistic structure can be described as a combination of the units and subunits of the spoken form.

Bloomfield's sentence 'Poor John ran away' can be explained in terms of IC analysis.

Poor John can away
Poor John - run away

Poor Poor *run* away

The native speaker recognizes that this sentence can be immediately cut into two: *Poor John* and *ran away. Poor John* and *ran away are* immediate constituents of the sentence. They are immediate because there are no mediating or interrupting entities between them. Similarly *poor* and *John* are the ICs of *Poor John; ran* and *away* are the ICs of *ran away.* Poor, John, ran and away are the ultimate constituents of the construction *Poor John ran away.* The native speaker perceives a hierarchy of relationships and layers of structure. There are groups and groups within groups, which seem to form natural classes. The linguist has to find out what the constituents are - both immediate and ultimate. It should be possible to^ind out the syntax of the language under examination. This seemed a powerful and more insightful way to represent the syntactic structure of languages.

Utilizing the insights of Bloomfield, many other linguists came forward to develop it and make it more meaningful. Eugene Nida in his *A Synopsis ηf English Syntax* made a detailed examination of English and set up classes far mole than any previous analysis. Rulon Wells made a deeper study and presented a systematic account of the IC analysis. Much more rigorous are the procedures and the presentation of Zellig Harris. Charles Fries contributed significantly to the development of syntactic studies with his *A Structure of American English.*

Transformational Generative Grammar

Transformational-generative Grammar, a system of language analysis that recognizes the relationship among the various elements of a sentence and among the possible sentences of a language and uses processes or rules (some of which are called transformations) to express these relationships. For example, transformational grammar relates the active sentence “John read the book” with its corresponding passive, “The book was read by John.” The statement “George saw Mary” is related to the corresponding questions, “Whom [or who] did George see?” and “Who saw Mary?” Although sets such as these active and passive sentences appear to be very different on the surface (i.e., in such things as word order), a transformational grammar tries to show that in the “underlying structure” (i.e., in their deeper relations to one another), the sentences are very similar. Transformational grammar assigns a “deep structure” and a “surface structure” to show the relationship of such sentences. Thus, “I know a man who flies planes” can be considered the surface form of a deep structure approximately like “I know a man. The man flies airplanes.” The notion of deep structure can be especially helpful in explaining ambiguous utterances; e.g., “Flying airplanes can be dangerous” may have a deep structure, or meaning, like “Airplanes can be dangerous when they fly” or “To fly airplanes can be dangerous.”

The most widely discussed theory of transformational grammar was proposed by U.S. linguist Noam Chomsky in 1957. His work contradicted earlier tenets of structuralism by rejecting the notion that every language is unique. The use of transformational grammar in language analysis assumes a certain number of formal and substantive universals.

Supra- Sentential Grammar

Units of language are divided into segmental and supra-segmental. Segmental units consist of phonemes, they form phonemic strings of various status (syllables, morphemes, words, etc.). Supra-segmental units do not exist by themselves, but are realized together with segmental units and express different modificational meanings (functions) which are re-flected on the strings of segmental units. To the supra-segmental units belong intonations (intonation contours), accents, pauses, patterns of word order.

The segmental units of language form a hierarchy of levels. This hi-erarchy is of a kind that units of any higher level are analysable into (i.e. are formed of) units of the immediately lower level. Thus, morphemes are decomposed into phonemes, words are decomposed into morphemes, phrases are decomposed into words, etc.

But this hierarchical relation is by no means reduced to the mechan-ical composition of larger units from smaller ones; units of each level are characterized by their own, specific functional features which provide for the very recognition of the corresponding levels of language.

The lowest level of lingual segments is phonemic: it is formed by pho-nemes as the material elements of the higher-level segments. The pho-neme has no meaning, its function is purely differential: it differentiates morphemes and words as material bodies. Since the phoneme has no meaning, it is not a sign.

Phonemes are combined into syllables. The syllable, a rhythmic seg-mental group of phonemes, is not a sign, either; it has a purely formal significance. Due to this fact, it could hardly stand to reason to recognize in language a separate syllabic level; rather, the syllables should be consid-ered in the light of the intra-level combinability properties of phonemes.

Phonemes are represented by letters in writing. Since the letter has a representative status, it is a sign, though different in principle from the level-forming signs of language.

Units of all the higher levels of language are meaningful; they may be called "signemes" as opposed to "cortemes" (from Lat. cortex "bark, crust, shell"), i.e. non-meaningful units of different status, such as phonemes (and letters as phoneme representatives), syllables, and some others.

The level located above the phonemic one is the morphemic level. The morpheme is the elementary meaningful part of the word. It is built up by phonemes, so that the shortest morphemes include only one pho-neme. E.g.: ros-y [-1]; a-fire [a-]; comes [-z].

The morpheme expresses abstract, "significative" meanings which are used as constituents for the formation of more concrete, "nomina-tive" meanings of words.

The third level in the segmental lingual hierarchy is the level of words, or lexemic level.

The word (lexeme), as different from the morpheme, is a directly naming (nominative) unit of language: it names things and their rela-tions. Since words are built up by morphemes, the shortest words consist of one explicit morpheme only. Cf.: man, will, but, I, etc.

The next higher unit is the phrase (word-group), it is located at the phrasemic level. To level-forming phrase types belong combinations of two or more notional words. These combinations, like separate words,

have a nominative function, but they represent the referent of nomina-tion as a complicated phenomenon, be it a concrete thing, an action, a quality, or a whole situation. Cf, respectively: a picturesque village; to start with a jerk; extremely difficult; the unexpected arrival of the chief. This kind of nomination can be called "polynomination", as differ-ent from "mononomination" effected by separate words.

Notional phrases may be of a stable type and of a free type. The stable phrases (phraseological units) form the phraseological part of the lexicon, and are studied by the phraseological division of lexicology. Free phrases are built up in the process of speech on the existing productive models, and are studied in the lower division of syntax. The grammatical description of phrases is sometimes called "minor syntax", in distinction to "major syntax" studying the sentence and its textual connections.

In order to better understand the nature of phrases as level-forming units we must take into consideration their status in the larger lingual units built up by them. These larger units are sentences. It is within the sentence that any phrase performs its level-determined function (being used as a notional part of the sentence). On the other hand, any notional word, not only a phrase, can be used in the role of a separate part of the sentence, such as subject, object, predicate, etc. We infer from this that in more exact terms the units located above the words in the segmental lingual hierarchy are notional parts of the sentence. These can be formed by phrases (word-groups), or by separate notional words. Since the func-tion of these parts is denotative (they not only name, but also indicate, or denote, objects and phenomena involved in the situation expressed by the sentence), they may be called "denotemes" (in the previous editions of the book they were referred to as "nomemes"). The level at which denotemes are identified is then the denotemic level of language. In this connection, the phrasemic level should be presented as the upper sublev-el of the denotemic level. The demonstrated approach marks the neces-sary development of the theory of levels of language emphasizing the strictly hierarchical principle of inter-level derivational relations of lin-gual units (see above).

Above the denotemic level, the level of sentences is located, or the proposemic level.

The peculiar character of the sentence ("proposeme") as a signemic unit of language consists in the fact that, naming a certain situation, or situational event, it expresses predication, i.e. shows the relation of the

denoted event to reality. Namely, it shows whether this event is real or unreal, desirable or obligatory, stated as a truth or asked about, etc. In this sense, as different from the word and the phrase, the sentence is a predicative unit. Cf.\ to receive - to receive a letter - Early in June I re-ceived a letter from Peter Melrose.

The sentence is produced by the speaker in the process of speech as a concrete, situationally bound utterance. At the same time it enters the system of language by its syntactic pattern, which, as all the other lingual unit-types, has both syntagmatic and paradigmatic characteristics.

But the sentence is not the highest unit of language in the hierarchy of levels. Above the proposemic level there is still another one whose units are formed by separate sentences united into topical groupings. These sentence-groups, each distinguished by its micro-topic as part of a continual text, are tentatively called "super-sentential constructions". For the sake of unified terminology, the level at which they are identified can be called "supra-proposemic".

In the printed text, the supra-sentential construction very often coin-cides with the paragraph (as in the example above).

The supra-sentential construction is a combination of separate sen-tences forming a textual unity. Such combinations are subject to regular lingual patterning making them into syntactic elements. The syntactic process by which sentences are connected into textual unities is analysed under the heading of "cumulation". Cumulation, the same as formation of composite sentences, can be both syndetic and asyndetic. Cf:

He went on with his interrupted breakfast. Lisette did not speak and there was silence between them. But his appetite satisfied, his mood changed; he began to feel sorry for himself rather than angry with her, and with a strange ignorance of woman's heart he thought to arouse Lisette's remorse by exhibiting himself as an object of pity.

In the printed text, the supra-sentential construction very often coin-cides with the paragraph (as in the example above). However, the consti-tutive unit of the level in question, obeying the universal derivational regularity of segmental lingual hierarchy, should be reducible to one sen-tence only, the same as the sentence is reducible to one denoteme (sen-tence-part) and the denoteme is reducible to one lexeme (word), etc. This regularity considered, we come to the conclusion that the generalized unit that is located above the sentence and is distinguished by its topical (micro-topical) function is not necessarily represented by a group of sen-tences, i.e. by a super-sentential construction; in general terms, this unit is formed either by a group of sentences (a super-sentential construction shown above), or by one separate sentence which is placed in a semanti-cally (topically) significant position in speech. In oral speech it is delimit-ed by a long pause combined with the corresponding "concluding" tone of voice. We have called this generalized unit the "dicteme" (from Lat. dico "I speak") [Блох, 1986,48]. In written (printed) text it is often repre-sented by a sentence-paragraph, i.e. by a paragraph formed by a single independent sentence.

Thus, from the point of view of its constitutive units, the supra-sen-tential level may be called the dictemic level, the dicteme being defined as an elementary topical segmental unit of the continual text.

We have surveyed six levels of language, each identified by its own functional type of segmental units. If now we carefully observe the func-tional status of the level-forming segments, we can distinguish between them more self-sufficient and less self-sufficient types, the latter being defined only in relation to the functions of other level units. Indeed, the phonemic, lexemic and proposemic levels are most strictly and exhaus-tively identified from the functional point of view: the function of the phoneme is differential, the function of the word is nominative, the func-tion of the sentence is predicative. As different from these, morphemes are identified only as significative components of words, denotemes present notional parts of sentences, and dictemes mark the transition from the sentence to the text.

Furthermore, bearing in mind that the phonemic level forms the sub-foundation of language, i.e. the non-meaningful matter of meaningful expressive means, the two notions of grammatical description shall be pointed out as central even within the framework of the structural hier-archy of language: these are, first, the notion of the word and, second, the notion of the sentence. The first is analysed by morphology, which is the grammatical teaching of the word; the second is analysed by syntax, which is the grammatical teaching of the sentence.

Semantics

semantics, also called semiotics, semology, or semasiology, the philosophical and scientific study of meaning in natural and artificial languages. The term is one of a group of English words formed from the various derivatives of the Greek verb sēmainō (“to mean” or “to signify”). The noun semantics and the adjective semantic are derived from sēmantikos (“significant”); semiotics (adjective and noun) comes from sēmeiōtikos (“pertaining to signs”); semiology from sēma (“sign”) + logos (“account”); and semasiology from sēmasia (“signification”) + logos.

It is difficult to formulate a distinct definition for each of these terms, because their use largely overlaps in the literature despite individual preferences. The word semantics has ultimately prevailed as a name for the doctrine of meaning, of linguistic meaning in particular. Semiotics is still used, however, to denote a broader field: the study of sign-using behaviour in general.

The notion of linguistic meaning, the special concern of philosophical and linguistic semantics, must be distinguished from other common notions with which it is sometimes confused. Among them are natural meaning, as in smoke means fire or those spots mean measles; conventional meaning, as in a red traffic light means stop or the skull and crossbones means danger; and intentional meaning, as in John means well or Frank means business. The notion of linguistic meaning, in contrast, is the one exemplified in the following sentences:

The words bachelor and unmarried man have the same meaning (are synonymous).
The word bank has several meanings (is ambiguous).
The string of words colourless green ideas sleep furiously is meaningless (anomalous).
The sentence all bachelors are unmarried is true by virtue of its meaning (is analytic).
Schnee ist weiss means that snow is white.

Linguistic meaning has been a topic of philosophical interest since ancient times. In the first decades of the 20th century, it became one of the central concerns of philosophy in the English-speaking world (see analytic philosophy). That development can be attributed to an interaction of several trends in various disciplines. From the middle of the 19th century onward, logic, the formal study of reasoning, underwent a period of growth unparalleled since the time of Aristotle (384–322 BCE). Although the main motivation for the renewed interest in logic was a search for the epistemological foundations of mathematics, the chief protagonists of this effort—the German mathematician Gottlob Frege and the British philosopher Bertrand Russell—extended their inquiry into the domain of the natural languages, which are the original media of human reasoning. The influence of mathematical thinking, and of mathematical logic in particular, however, left a permanent mark on the subsequent study of semantics.

Lexical and Grammatical Meaning

Lexical meaning is “the most outstanding individual of the word that makes it different from any other word”. The lexical meaning of a word may be thought of as the specific value it has in a particular language system, and the ‘personality’ it acquires through usage within that system.

The categories of English words that are lexical include nouns, adjectives, most verbs, and many adverbs.

Lexical meaning is dominant in content words, whereas grammatical meaning is dominant in function words, but in neither is grammatical meaning absent.

Grammatical words include prepositions, modals and auxiliary verbs, pronouns, articles, conjunctions, and some adverbs.

The difference between lexical words and grammatical words is straightforward. It is an important concept for linguists because the distinction seems to exist in all languages, not just English. Understanding these differences helps scholars figure out the relationship between the different languages, as well as the history of the English language. It may even give some insight into how human minds work. Understanding these types of words will help increase your comprehension of English.

References:

1. Syal P.& Jindal D.V.(2009) An Introduction to Linguistics PHI Learning Pvt Ltd. New Delhi.
2. Plag, I., Braun, M., Arndtlappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2015). Introduction to English Linguistics (Mouton Textbook) (3rd ed.). De Gruyter Mouton.
3. Altshuler, D., Parsons, T., & Schwarzschild, R. (2019). A Course in Semantics (The MIT Press). The MIT Press.
4. Genetti, C. (2018). How Languages Work: An Introduction to Language and Linguistics (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.