

Socio-Linguistics as Stimuli to Understand Partition I literature

The origin of lang. remains a speculation till date. We know nothing of its origin, neither do we know for sure whether spoken language developed well before written lang. or vice-versa. There has been a total lack of any kind of an evidence, and this resulted in a series of speculations about the origin of human speech.

According to one view, God created Adam, and what was given to the generations 'was the name thing'. According to the Hindu tradition, lang came from the goddess Saraswati. In many religions, the origin of lang. has been assigned to some divine source. But the basic hypothesis seems to have been that, if infants were allowed to grow up without any language they would spontaneously begin using the original God-given language. However, all the experiments to confirm the existence of this 'divine-source' have been given conflicting results.

A different view stressed the concept of 'natural sounds'. It suggests that all the primitive words would be an imitation of the natural sounds, which primitive men & women heard around them. The primitive men imitated the 'Caw-Caw' sound of the object sitting ^{on} the tree and later used the same sound to refer to the object associated with the same sound. Likewise 'Cuckoo' etc. Even sounds used today have that 'echo' of natural sounds like splash, bang, boom, hiss etc and forms like 'bow-wow'. This type of view has been called the 'bow-wow theory' of the lang origin. How ever the origin of abstract & soundless words are difficult to be explained acc. to this theory. The other 'natural sound' proposal is called as the 'yo-heave-ho theory'. This involves the physical effort, especially when ~~in~~ involving the coordination of several people. ^{indicating a social context} Consequently, a series of words of grunts and groans and swear, would have been produced while carrying trees and lifelike mammoths. However this theory fails to explain the origin of the sounds produced.

One suggestion involves the link between physical gesture and orally produced sounds, indicating a wide range of emotional states and intentions. Many

Many such physical gestures are still used by humans as a means of non-verbal communication. This 'oral-gesture theory', claims that originally a set of physical gestures were used for communication. Then oral gestures involving the mouth developed. This proposal involving what was called "a specialized pantomime of tongue and lips", seems outlandish now. ~~For~~ For example - if we want to communicate the message "My uncle thinks he's invisible", using gesture we are sure to face a certain amount of misunderstanding.

Another speculation, concentrates only on the physical makeup of the humans, which is different from other creatures, which gives us the clue that the creature possessing such traits probably had the capacity to speak. For example - Human teeth is upright, and more or less of equal size which helps in producing sounds like 'f', 'v', 'th'. Lips have intricate muscle entangling resulting in flexible production of 'p', 'b', and 'w'. Also the small mouth and the flexible tongue, the total human having the human brain which functions and analytic tool-using device in the production of language. This also involves the bringing of one sound in contact with another sound.

There is no doubt about the fact that human sound is the incorporated version of natural sounds like 'cuckoo' and 'ding-dong' and also emotional reactions like 'wow', 'ugh' and 'oops'. Much of human speech is accompanied by physical gestures, which all fulfill the interactional function of language. This considers how humans use lang, how they interact both socially & emotionally.

All these are just speculations to the origin of lang. But it's no secret, but an established fact that lang has been changing over the years. Again it is true that there is no reason to expect that vocabulary, pronunciation, morphology, syntax and semantics will all change at the same pace & same time, because it is definitely not so.

This change is very clear as words like 'icebox', 'record player', 'car phone' etc used by our previous generation, have now changed over to 'compact disc', 'cellular phone', 'pidge' etc. Hence the change in vocabulary is clearly evident.

There is change also in pronunciation. The word 'nuclear' was pronounced as /nuːkliər/ has now changed to /nuːkjələr/. Again 'realtor', pronounced earlier as /riːltər/ is now called /riːltər/. Even regional accents and dialects change.

The meaning of the word also changes. The English verb 'starve' (OE steorfan) meant 'die', but today it has come to mean 'death by hunger'. 'Deer' was originally assigned to all kinds of animals, but now it indicates one particular kind.

There can also be morphological and syntactic differences in the speech of two generations. Shakespeare used 'Does the king hence today?' in 'Macbeth', will now be put as 'Is the king going out today?'

Some linguists are of the opinion that language change reflects corruption. Whatever the fact, whether lang has refined or deteriorated, it is certainly true that it has changed and is always in the process of changing and does not stand still.

Owing to the above mentioned fact ^{it} can be established that language due to the ongoing changes that affect a language is that a single lang can develop into several languages and hence the develop of lang to the stage it is today. Language is always in the state of flux and if any attempt is made to codify and rigidify the lang that the language will die. It would hence be correct to say that 'lang does not exist, but happens', all on itself and by itself.