PHONOLOGICAL THEORIES IN LANGUAGE

Abdujalilova Muslimaxon Anvarjon qizi
Fergana State University, department Forign language and literature chair. English language and literature

Abstract: This is a critical review of two major phonological theories: linear natural phonology and the nonlinear optimality theory. Natural phonological theory asserts that phonological processes are phonetically based. Phonological error patterns help organize treatment targets and assess generalization. However, the natural phonology’s explanation of speech sound learning in children does not attain the status of a scientific theory. Process proliferation and poor definitions are other limitations. Optimality theory proposes that speech sounds may be marked (complex, more difficulty to produce, etc.) or unmarked (simple, easier to produce, etc.). Optimality replaces rules with markedness and faithfulness constraints. Constraints are common to all languages, but their ranking are unique to each language.

Keywords: Phonema, pronouncing, sound, morpheme, intonation, elongation.

It is up to date with the following phonological theories (them We concentrate and briefly explain the definitions given to the fan): Psychological phonema of Bamdun de Kurtene. It is based on this theory "The psychic equivalent of phonema-speech sounds." The phoneme is one or pronounced articularity and acoustic within the framework of several sounds. The vision of the imagination is, and psychological counsel is a specific common general is shown as a concept or imagination. In other words, the phoneme If a general imagination of sound is the sound of the pronunciation of the fan. It is refused to imagine anik (concrete). Later I.A.I.Boden de Kurtene Phonemes Morphemes that are the most small meaningful units in language He looked as a component. Because Bunuident Fonema is in Morphes .It was taken into account that the tradition of recurrent exchange is to interpret means. English Fonthist D.Djounz's acoustic phoneme theory, D.Jounza «Fonema» He admits the concept of academic L.V.Sherba. U faneman "Artikulyionion and acoustic family of the same sounds" describes and The primary phoneme (most inputs in speech) and assistant (it or that it shows that it is "members," and representatives. Phoneme in thisory and the

difference between the sound is not specified. That is, is a saying within a sound all sounds combine as a "family" for a foneme. (For example, I1, I2, I3 phoneme). It is known that the phoneme is the same number of people from a sound scope can manifest in sounds. This phonological theory is in foreign linguistics (Anyme, England, USA) is used.

Phonology is linked with phonetics, which is the science of speech sound production and classification. Speech articulation is a phonetic event. Both phonology and phonetics study certain common factors of speech sounds. For instance, both are concerned with the description of speech sounds, sound sequences, and sound patterns that result when speech is produced. A major distinction is that phonology is concerned with abstract rules and knowledge that govern the production of speech sounds. Phonetic rules are grounded in speech physiology and acoustics; hence they are empirically observable and measurable. Phonological rules are a part of mental and unconscious knowledge; hence they are abstract and not directly observed. Phonetics is descriptive and experimental, whereas phonology is theoretical. In speech-language pathology (SLP), the value of phonetic study of speech sounds is well-established and devoid of controversy. Speech-language pathologists (SLPs) appreciate the need to understand the physiological mechanism of speech sound production as well as the physical (acoustic) properties of speech sounds produced and modified in the human vocal tract. The value of phonological theories that entered SLP in more recent times, however, is debatable. Therefore, this paper offers a critical review of two major phonological theories and their relevance to an understanding of speech sound disorders in children. A prototype of an innate mentalistic approach to language that began to influence SLP in the 1960s was Chomsky’s (1957) theory of universal grammar. Subsequently, Chomsky and Halle’s (1968) distinctive feature theory influenced the analysis of speech sounds and speech sound disorders. However, since the advent of newer phonological theories, the distinctive feature analysis has tapered off in SLP. Therefore, this review will be limited to currently influential phonological theories.

In a linear phonological theory, phonemic segments are independent of each other, not hierarchically organized, and form a *linear string of segments*. A segment may be a sound, a combination of sounds, or a unit that is more abstract than a sound (e.g., the sonorant quality of a sound). Examples of phonemic segments include such properties as *vocalic*, *sonorant*, *low*, *nasal*, *voiced*, and so forth. Chomsky and Halle’s (1968) distinctive feature theory is a classic and standard linear theory in which phonemic segments are a bundle of independent

features that may combine with any other segment. Children have an inner level of mental representation of speech sounds from which they derive the outer level of surface productions. To translate mental representations to speech production, children apply the rules sequentially (i.e., linearly), one at a time, not simultaneously. Components are two independent combination of the components You can calculate the phoneme. In Uzbek language (DJ), (Tsh) and the Russian language (Ts) Sound compounds are not divorced in words, and because of this is an Affordation Fonems are curled as (DJ, ch, s). Additional Addiction to this Code and Affrikts Their explosive and glazor to say independent phonemes Access to the opposition (DJ DJ-J), (T-S) is taken into account. The second code will complete the first. The stroke of the sound greater in unicornness Ruy gradually, or slowly weakens or shortening during the pronunciation. If he gives, such sounds are a crucial flashing. Above-handed .The first elements of the affrocose start with explosive pronunciation and gradually The slowdown will strengthen the glorious. So, this is also their two elements it is pronounced in unity and they are independent fanes on the Arician is calculated. In some languages (such as English, English, Laters and other languages) two sounds.The diphtongs consisting of the combination are also required to the upper seats, Must have independent phonemes. They are also on the third command of the following comes. The doctrine has been determined to the plaque of other phonemen in this language. Sound compounds can be considered as a representative of a fan. Usually, Difthlongs' cheese in this language (e.g., English) Slouns vow is equal to the grazics of phonemes.

In their **Natural phonology** or **natural phonological theory** (NPT), Stampe (1979) and Donegan and Stampe (1979) proposed that to learn their speech sound productions, children simplify adult productions. Such simplifications are *phonological processes* that may affect an entire class of sounds sharing a common articulatory difficulty. Simplifications result in speech sound errors in the context of adult models, but those errors are unlearned because they stem from phonetic-physiological limitations. Learned speech sound errors cannot be attributed to a natural process (Donegan and Stampe, 1979). In SLP, the currently preferred term is **phonological patterns,** but I shall continue to use the term *phonological processes* because that is the term in the theory. The theory is called *natural* because the children’s simplifications of adult sound productions are due to their phonetic (speech production) limitations. Because children learning different languages simplify the adult production in similar ways, Stampe proposed that phonological processes are both universal

and natural. NPT retains the Chomskyan assumption (Chomsky, 1995) of innately given adult phonological system that children are supposed to possess. However, in contrast to the Chomskyan theorists, natural phonologists believe that children do not follow some kind of rules in learning to produce their speech sounds. Processes are not abstract cognitive or mental rules, but they are a product of phonetic or physiological limitations of young children trying to master speech sounds. Children's speech improves as their speech production mechanism becomes more competent and their productions better match the adult models. Consequently, the simplification processes fade. Phonological processes are unlearned, innate, involuntary, and natural and work at an unconscious level. Children cannot verbalize the process they exhibit. Rules, on the other hand, are not natural because they are not based on physiological (phonetic) limitations. Most language rules are characteristics of dialects of a verbal community, and hence are learned. Learned rules may be verbalized. Americans pronounce the word *pentagon* as [pɛntagɑn] and the British pronounce it is [pɛntəgən]. Both are instances of dialectal learning, not a matter of phonetic limitations of the speakers, and hence not phonological processes. Most speakers in either dialect (American or British) may be able to describe the rule of how *pentagon* is pronounced in their dialect. However, a child who says [top] for *stop* is not following a rule. Given the child's phonetic limitations, it is a natural phonological process of cluster simplification, not a learned response. The child cannot verbalize the process of cluster reduction (Donegan and Stampe, 1979).

Conclusion: Several phonological theorists ignore the influence of well-established phonetic factors in speech sound production (Behrman, 2023; Raphael *et al.*, 2012). An exception is Stampe's (1979) natural phonology which takes phonetic and physiological factors into consideration. The OT adherents are especially vulnerable to the charge that they woefully ignore the workings of the speech production mechanism, its limitations in children, and phonetic sequencing factors. Aerodynamic factors, physical and acoustic features of speech, physiologic, motoric, and neuromuscular variables also play no role in deductive and generative phonological theories.

REFERENCES

1. Avanesov R. I "Phonetics sovremennogo ruskogo letka yazыka." MGU, 1956.
2. Ahmanogo O. S Fanology, Morrofology, morphology. MGU, 1966.
3. Basakov. N. A "VVIDENE and IZUXUNENIE TURSKI YESSUKK" M., 1969.
4. Minder L. R «Обсчая Fonetics" LGU, 1960.
5. Refformery A. A "VVIDENE I YZYKOSIDENE" m., 1967.