2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The term ‘grammar’ is used in a number of different senses—the grammar of a language may be understood to be a full description of the form and meaning of the sentences of the language or else it may cover only certain, variously delimited, parts of such a description. Here we shall use it in one of these narrower senses, embracing syntax and morphology. Syntax is concerned and with the way words combine to form sentences, while morphology is concerned with the form of words. We will launch without delay into a discussion of basic concepts in syntax and morphology, returning in §8 to the distinction between grammar in this sense and various other components of a full description and to the basis for dividing grammar into syntactic and morphological subcomponents. The only terms that we shall need to anticipate are ‘phonology’ and ‘semantics’: phonology deals with the sound system, with the pronunciation of words and sentences, semantics deals with meaning.

Morphology studies and attempts to describe the primary meaningful units of speech, these are called morpheme is also called the term in linguistics for what is most briefly described as the smallest grammatically meaningful unit in a language. It may be a word—free form (boy, tall, Medan) or a part of a word that can combine with other elements—bound morphemes (—s, —ing, anti—, —ness).

A prefix is an element that can be placed before a word or root to make another word with a different meaning or function: anti— (antiprohibition), 4 bi— (biweekly), mis— (misfit), (criticize), —ish (foolish), —ful (playful), —th (warmth).
Morpheme is a term in linguistics for what is most briefly described as the smallest grammatically meaningful unit in language. It may be a word, or part of a word that can combine with other elements—“bound form”—(-s, -ing, anti-, ---ness).

Suffix is an element that can be placed after a word or root to make a new word of different meaning or function (—ize + critic — criticize, —ish + fool Foolish, —ful + play playfull).

Any language in the world has the same functions. Now our examples are drawn mainly from English—is an extraordinarily complex phenomenon. The more thoroughly languages are analyzed, the more astonishing their complexity becomes. This complexity suggests a structure, and even the earliest ancient Greek investigators of language recognized the existence of a structure.

Linguistics has been defined as the scientific study of language. A more modest definition would be the systematic study of human languages. Scientific study is today commonly associated with such natural sciences as physics, chemistry, and biology, whose conclusions lend themselves to objective verification more readily than those arrived at by in instigators of human behavior. Since speech is a uniquely human phenomenon, the systematic study of it remains, despite the assistance received from other disciplines, a humanistic study, a study whose ultimate objectives are based on human values. Linguistics is scientific, nevertheless, both in the rigor received from the natural and social sciences.

Since language is sequences of sound, and sound is invisible, we cannot see its structure as we can, for example, see the bony structure of a body – its skeleton.
As we recognize the basic elements of the linguistic structure we invent names for them and attempt to describe the total structure part by part. It is one of the great beauties of plane geometry that its structures can be seen in their entirety. Though the native speaker seems to have a full grasp of the total grammatical structure of his language, we have no way of describing that structure so that it can all be seen at once. Instead we must break it up into what seem to be its most significant or at least its most conveniently describable parts and present them one after another. This is a most exasperating approach. All the parts are interrelated and necessary to the functioning of the whole, and a native speaker controls them all, utilizes them simultaneously, and never gives a conscious thought as to how he is using the structure to communicate his ideas. We know our English but we seldom know how it works. So we find it irritatingly hard to learn a lot of names for what we do so easily and unconsciously. It is the function of linguistics to discover the structure, to find names for its parts, and to use those names to explain how the system operates. Some of the basic areas of linguistic investigation are briefly defined below:

1). Phonology studies and attempts to describe the primary sound units of speech. Two related approaches are made in phonetics and phonemics.

2). Morphology studies and attempts to describe the primary meaningful units of speech; these are called morphemes.

3). Syntax studies and attempts to described the arrangement of morphemes in meaningful utterances, usually called sentences.
4). Grammar is a term with a number of senses. Linguistics is concerned with the first two which are defined in the article grammar.

5). Semantics studies and attempts to describe meaning. In this definition “meaning” is not used in the same sense. Morphological meaning is restricted to the linguistic unit itself; the s on cats means “plural” and is recognized as such even though we don’t know what a cat is. For example, if the sentence “I saw a dat” is changed to “I saw some dats,” we know that dats is plural though we have no notion of what a dat is. Semantics studies the relationship between the word and what it stands for; the relationship between cat and the concept of a feline which it represents for us is its meaning.

Semantics gets its into what is called met linguistics-studies that go beyond linguistics-matters that involve more than the language itself. Most of the concern of this topic is metalinguistics because it deals with such matters as spelling, dictionaries, rhetoric, dialect, jargon, as well as the lexical meanings of words. The structures of meaning, in so far as they exist, are certainly far less apparent than the structures examined in phonology, morphology, and syntax. The modern linguist has therefore given most of his attention to these more obvious aspect of language. There is an irony in this because the layman is far more interested in what an utterance means than in how it is structured. And his attitude is right to this extent: Language does have as this primary purpose the communication of meaning. But the educated layman tries to have some understanding of all the more significant aspects of his environment. Language is the most important of these and he should therefore have some understanding of it. This linguistics tries to provide.
The purpose of a composition or communication course is to further the communicative skills of the students. Its organization and general direction should aim toward this end, based on the principles of composition-rhetoric. The current language is the medium, and consequently the rhetoric must be presented on the basis of this language. (In the last few generations “grammar” has often triumphed over “rhetoric”, partly because of the uncertain control of Standard English by many student and partly because the elementary facts of language have seemed more definite and consequently easier to present and test).

Because of the tremendous importance of language in life, there have been numerous pressures for practical applications of the methods and findings of the new science. To date, the notable successes have been in recording and analyzing languages not previously written, recording many that were on the point of extinction, and in teaching the spoken form of a second language through more

Considerable progress has been made in describing English in newer and more precise terms. Features like word order and intonation patterns have been more systematically explored. Real advances have been made in abandoning or at least minimizing some categories inherited from Latin grammar but not significant for English, such as form for case in nouns and mood in verbs; in defining various categories more objectively, such as the parts of speech (or form classes)—defining them by references to form and function rather than to meaning; in giving more definite recognition to the phrase patterns basic to syntax; and in providing a syntax grounded in observation of speech.
The description of English should be as accurate as possible, and gradually linguistics is furnishing a more complete and consistent description. Even now there are gains in using some of the terms and categories of linguistics: a few topics such as sentence boundaries and restrictive punctuation can be more accurately presented than formerly, even though the precise definitions of the terminals involved are uncertain.

But a composition course is not an introduction to linguistics and can hardly spare time for a very secure grounding in such a technical field—though some teachers with specialized training in the field report considerable success in using linguistics as the basic material of the course.

The language part of a composition course, beyond a few pretty elementary topics, is certainly in the area of met linguistics, involving social habits and attitudes. Most of the questions are of the order of “Shall I say or write this in this situation?” Linguistic generalizations, whether in traditional or more scientific form, can help in presenting general patterns, in summarizing general practices, but they do not go far in guiding choices between similar expressions when both are in the range of Standard English. To make these decisions student need not only the paradigms but a wide knowledge of the varieties of current usage, what educated people say and write. Since this knowledge by itself will not answer the questions, principles are also needed, especially principles of appropriateness.

The two most basic units of syntax are the sentence and the word. The sentence is the largest unit of syntax: as we move upwards beyond the sentence we pass from syntax into
discourse analysis; the word is the lowest unit of syntax: as we move downwards beyond the word we pass from syntax into morphology. And just as a sentence cannot normally contain any smaller sentence within it, so a word cannot normally contain any smaller word within it. Thus although we can analyze the word blackbird, for example, into black + bird, each of which occurs as a word in the sentence The bird was black, we shall not regard black and bird as words when the’ occur within the word blackbird: here they are merely stems.

The most elementary words, such as boy, cat, good, in, have the form of simple stems, ‘simple’ in the sense that they are not analyzable into smaller morphological units. Other words are then formed from the stock of simple stems by various morphological processes. The two such processes traditionally recognized as the most important are compounding and affixation.

Compounding involves adding two stems together, as when we join black and bird to form blackbird, or gold and smith to form goldsmith, and soon. Blackbird arid goldsmith are then said to be compound stems.

In affixation, an affix is added to a stem to yield a complex stem. More specifically, we can distinguish between prefixes like pre-, sub-, un-, which are added to the left of the stem, and suffixes like -able, -s, -ing, -mess, which are added to the right. Thus the complex stems substandard and unkind are formed by prefixation, payable, and goodness by suffixation.
It should be emphasized at this point that what was said earlier about the descriptive status of syntactic transformation applies equally to morphology processes. That is, it must not be thought that when we speak of compounding, affixation and so on, we are talking of mental operations performed a speaker in using the words: we are simply concerned with the linguistic analysis of the morphological structure of words, relating the words to the more elementary units contained within them.

When two morphological units are put together—a stem and an affix, or two stems—either or both may undergo some modification of phonological form (and/or spelling) Thus if we suffix -ion to decide the result is decision; abominate and a considerable number of other verb stems drop the -ate when -able is suffixed, as in abominable, rather than abominatable, the vowel of man o r’du( (If In a n ills (ornpounded with gentle, police or whatever: and soon; the morphological rules of the grammar most clearly specify in detail such modifications.

Words mas’ he ormed by the application of more than one morphological process. In unselfconsciousness, for example, the first step is one of compounding, joining the simple stems sell and conscious to form the compound stem self-conscious. To this is then added the prefix un-, yielding the complex stem unselfconscious; and finally -ness is suffixed, to give the final complex stem unselfconsciousness. We take the prefixation to apply before the suffixation in this example because it enables US to give a more general account of the distribution of the prefix un-, i.e. of whereabouts it can occur: un- can be added to a large set
of adjective stems as in kind, happy, wise — and selfconscious, but not (or at least not with the same sense as it has in unkind, unhappy”, etc.) to noun stems. The fact that we have a word unselfconsciousness but not a word ungoodness is thus attributable to the fact that un- can be prefixed to the adjective selfconscious but not good; we would not say that it can be prefixed to self consciousness but not goodness.

A third type of morphological process, particularly important in the grammar of English, is conversion. This is exemplified in the formation of the verb bottle (as in I must bottle some plums) from the noun bottle. We take the noun and verb to be distinct words (and hence distinct stems), with the noun bottle being primary: the verb is then formed by conversion of the stem from one class to another.