Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 12, Issue No. 2, January-2017, ISSN 2230-7540

An Analysis upon Phonological Comparison between English and Hindi Language

Saroj Bishnoi*

Abstract – Bilingual speakers of Hindi and English regularly combine English and Hindi in their regular discussion. This propels us to raise a mixlanguage Hindi-English recognizer. For this reason, we require decently prepared English and Hindi recognizers. For preparing our English recognizer we have available to us numerous hours of clarified English speech information. For Hindi, nonetheless, we have exceptionally constrained assets.

Information from the phonology of English has been significant in the advancement of phonological and sociophonological theory all around its later past. Assuming that we had not had English to examine, we assert, with both its one of a kind and its broadly imparted phonological phenomena, linguistic theory may have advanced contrastingly. In this article, we record a percentage of the courses in which specific English phonological phenomena have driven hypothetical advancements in phonology and identified zones, as a commitment to the history of later phonological theorising. As we do this, we set in their connection the other distinct articles in the Special Issue of Language Sciences on 'Issues in English Phonology' to which this article is a presentation, illustrating both their substance and how they identify with and look to development our comprehension of the English phonological phenomena being referred to.

----------X----------

INTRODUCTION

Phonology is the investigation of the sound systems of languages, and of the general lands showed by these systems. By appear differently in relation to phonetics, which examines all conceivable sounds that the human vocal device can make, phonology mulls over just those complexities in sound (the phonemes) which make contrasts of importance whithin the language. When we listen painstakingly to the way individuals talk English, we will hear many slight diffferences in the way people pronounce specific sounds. For instance, one person might pronounce /s/ in |a detectably slushy way, while an alternate might pronounce it in a drawling way. A phonetician might be intrigued by portraying precisely what these distinctions of explanation are. A phonologist, on the other hand, might bring up that both explanations are sorts of/s/, regardless of how the /s/ changes, presses on to stand out from /bet/and /met/ and different words wh ere there is only one fundamental unit, or phoneme, included.

Accordingly when we discuss the phonological system of English, we are alluding to the amount of phonemes which are utilized within this language, and to how they are ordered. To say there are twelve immaculate vowel sounds in English implies that there are twelve units which can separate word implications: short /I/ is not quite the same as long /i:/, for instance, since there are combines of words, (for example boat and sheep) which could be recognized exclusively by reinstating one of these vowels by the other. This implies that the twelve immaculate vowels we are running to manage in this theme owe their presence to this rule.

Then again I may as well highlight the way that we are accustomed to seeing the composed language as an arrangement of letters, divided by little sections of space. This is the way we were taught to compose. We structured our letters one at once, then gradually and carefully united them in signed up composing. We figured out how to call five of these letters "vowels" (An, E, I, O, U), and the others "consonants".

We might additionally have discovered that letter Y is likewise frequently utilized as a vowel.

Everybody conceived with the ordinary limit to study procures the capability to listen and talk much sooner than the capacity to read or compose. Also, when the English alphabet was initially conceived, its letters were dependent upon an attention of the way of the sounds in Old English1. The beginnings of the composed language lie in the spoken language, not the other path round. It is in this way one of life's

incongruities that customarily in present-day training we don't look into spoken language until well after we have studied the fundamental lands of the composed language. Therefore, it is unavoidable that we consider discourse utilizing the casing of reference which has a place with composing. We even utilize a portion of the same terms, and it can come as fuming of a stun to understand that these terms don't dependably have the same importance. Thusly and continually acknowledging that the primary point is to advance the informative capability our curtxblum incorporates the phonological knowledge under the square of substance "linguistic knowledge". Actually, one substance for the first course in optional school is "Difficult phonemes. Vowels and oral diphthongs. Vowels and nasal diphthongs. Consonants and consonantic gatherings. The syllabic division", and this is unquestionably a phonological substance that is created in the accompanying courses.

HISTORY OF PHONOLOGY

Extraneously requested rules obeying Principle much as those illustrated above were utilized in a synchronic record of the phonology of a language by the incredible Sanskrit grammarian Panini over twenty-five hundred years back. They were expected standardly—without much exchange throughout the nineteenth century (and later) in records of distinctive sound changes.

It is to some degree challenging to sympathize with the conviction generally held around linguists in the 1930s that standards agent in languages considered synchronic systems working self-rulingly were totally unique in relation to the standards agent in the recorded advancement of languages. Specifically, to the linguists of that day Principle and determinations of the sort delineated above appeared suitable just to historical portrayals, not to synchronic records.

Common Phonology was a theory dependent upon the productions of its advocate David Stampe in 1969. In this view, phonology is dependent upon a situated of widespread phonological courses of action which collaborate with each one in turn; the ones that are animated and the ones that are stifled are language-specific. Instead of following up on sections, phonological techniques follow up on notable characteristics inside prosodic gatherings. Prosodic gatherings could be as little as a part of a syllable or as huge as a whole articulation. Phonological methodologies are unordered regarding one another and apply at the same time (however the yield of one process may be the data to an alternate). The second-most noticeable Natural Phonologist is Stampe's wife. Patricia Donegan; there are numerous Natural Phonologists in Europe, however likewise a couple of others in the U.s, for example Geoffrey Pullum. The standards of Natural Phonology were amplified to morphology by Wolfgang U. Dressier, who established Natural Morphology.

Government Phonology, which originated in the early 1980s as an attempt to unify theoretical notions of syntactic and phonological structures, is based on the notion that all languages necessarily follow a small set of principles and vary according to their selection of certain binary parameters. That is, all languages' phonological structures are essentially the same, but there is restricted variation that accounts for differences in surface realizations. Principles are held to be inviolable, though parameters may sometimes come into conflict. Jean Lowenstamm, Jean-Roger Vergnaud, Monik Charette. John Harris, and many others.

PHONOLOGY

- Phonology is the extension of linguistics which studies the courses in which sounds are utilized within diverse languages to structure words by emulating some system.
- So, Phonology is basically the portrayal of the systems and examples of discourse sounds in a language.
- It is, essentially, in view of a theory of what each speaker of a language unknowingly thinks about the sound examples of that language.
- Because of this hypothetical status, phonology is concerned with the unique or mental part of the sounds in language instead of with the genuine physical enunciation of discourse sounds.

There are some traditional documentation in the field of Phonology and we should study them first.

Assuming that we allude to any physical sound of a language, we put them under two slices i.e. /p/, /t/ and /k/.

- However, assuming that we discuss the representation of a sound in the psyche as a theoretical unit called telephone, we put them in square sections, for example [p], [t] and [k].
- What ought to be the qualification of physical Vs mental sounds?
- In different words, what is the contrast between a telephone and a phoneme?
- Let us make this reasonable first preceding we continue any further in looking into phonology.

Think about the sound of the consonant in the English word the. This sound is a voiced dental fricative. In French, this sound does not exist, which is the reason English spoken with a French stress is

celebrated around the world for trading it with a voiced alveolar fricative r, which is very much alike. The purpose behind this is that the amount of linguistic sounds which humans can process is more terrific than the number which really happens in every language. The point when examining a singular language, for instance English, we can in this manner center in just the sound that happen in that language and the system by which they identify with one another. Examining a system of sounds is called phonology.

Phonology is concerned with the regularities that legislate the phonetic realizations of sounds in words of a language. It takes a gander at and tries to make a system of sound qualifications applicable to a specific language. It then tries to confirm how the components of this theoretical system act in genuine discourse. Phonology really depicts the working of sounds specifically settings.

The wellspring of Sound: The physiology of the discourse sound might let us know that the wellspring of any sound in human figure is the lungs. The lungs must produce sufficient wind stream and pneumatic force to vibrate vocal folds.

The vocal folds (vocal strings) are a vibrating valve that cleaves up the wind stream from the lungs into capable of being heard beats that structure the laryngeal sound source. The articulators explain and channel the sound that turns out from the larynx and can communicate with the laryngeal wind stream to alter the sound to meet the prerequisite of the setting.

The vocal folds, likewise known normally as vocal strings, are made out of twin inholdings of mucous layer extended on a level plane over the larynx. They vibrate, adjusting the stream of air being ousted from the lungs throughout phonation. Vocal folds are found inside the larynx at the highest point of the trachea. Some pictorial portrayal of these human voice organs will help us to know the methodology of phonation better.

HINDI PHONOLOGY

A thought of the correspondence between the geography of Devnagari and Hindi discourse gives the feeling that it is general and systematic. For an area of the vocabulary which incorporates structures from Middle Indo-Aryan and Modern Indo-Aryan, regarded as "tadbhava" structures, this is to a great extent correct, as additionally for later borrowings from English and different languages. For the structures which are regulate borrowings from Sanskrit, in any case, reputed to be "tatsama" structures, the correspondence is not dependable, as these structures are at fluctuation with contemporary Hindi discourse. We examine beneath the fundamental parts of phonetic and phonological certainties that the orthography speaks to.

Phonological truths of representation:

Data structures - Hindi orthography avoids the impacts of the phonological procedures of Schwa Deletion, Nasal Assimilation (alternatively), Consonant Gemination, and Word- last Lengthening, and speaks to structures that are inputs to these techniques.

PHONOLOGICAL RULES

Generalizations about the patterning of allophones can be stated as phonological rules. For instance, to describe the patterning of [ei] and [ei] given above, one might write a rule like this: /ei/ Shortening.

The phoneme /ei/ *is realized as extra short when a voiceless consonant follows.*

We will refine our rules from numerous points of view underneath, yet this may as well get over the fundamental thought. The notion of rule is vital to phonology; here are a few elaborations.

First and foremost, rules are language-specific: the shortening of/ei/ (and, as it tries out, of different vowels) must be acknowledged as a rule of English: it is not an all inclusive rule, nor a general rule of discourse verbalization. We know this since we have information from different languages that evidently fail to offer any role of this kind. Case in point, not Polish or Saudi Arabic abbreviates vowels before voiceless consonants. The shortening rale of English is part of the phonological example of the English language, and must be studied in some structure by kids securing English.

Second, rales are typically gainful as in they reach out to novel cases. "Yake" and "praig" are not words of English, however assuming that they come to be words, we might be certain that they might comply with the rales and be pronounced [veik] and [p.teig].

Third, rules offer ascent to well-formedness instincts. Assuming that a phonetician, or a discourse synthesizer, were to make exemptions to the rule, English speakers sense the ungainliness of the effect; therefore [seiv] and [seif] are improper as characteristic interpretations of recovery and safe. As it were, rale violations are sensed naturally.

Fourth, phonological rales are untaught. Rather, they are taken in instinctively by youngsters from the encompassing language information, utilizing systems that are so far obscure. In this admiration, phonological rales are altogether different from rales that are conferred by immediate guideline, for example

for instance) the rales for activity lights, or rales of regularizing language structure like "don't end a sentence with a preposition." Finally, phonological rales are obviously a manifestation of oblivious knowledge. Regardless of how- hard we attempt, we can't access our phonological rales through thoughtfulness.

One shouldn't be shocked that this is along these lines, in light of the fact that the vast majority of the reckonings that our brains cany out are likewise blocked off to cognizance. For instance, we can distinguish color consistency under variable states of light and shadow, or the bearing of sound sources when defer between our ears. These mental procedures include fast, immediate mental processings that can't be intuited by the cognizant personality as they happen. We deliberately recognize the consequence of such calculations ("this protest is consistently red"; "an auto is approaching from my left"), yet not the way it is carried out. To follow such forms, cognitive researchers surmise their systems on the groundwork of perception, experimentation, and speculating. Nobody tries to ask individuals how they do these things, since individuals don't have a clue. Phonology is comparative. When we talk, we immediately comply with hundreds, maybe many phonological rules, however we cannot watch or verbalize what these rales are. Therefore, when this book examines "rales", what is implied is rales of the oblivious kind. We can't look into these procedures through thoughtfulness, however must continue in a roundabout way, through information assembling, trial, and development of hypotheses.

CONCLUSION

We have asserted in this article that information from English have helped resolved the bearing of phonological theory on occasion. Others have noted the pervasiveness of English information, be that as it may have not made the same association (Bermu'dez-Otero and Mcmahon, 2006, for instance contend just that key hypothetical enhancements "have habitually been delineated by methods of detailed analyses from English"), yet we battle here that if there had not been English, with its specific own and broadly imparted phonological phenomena, phonology might not have advanced in decisively the ways that it has. A few provisos are required here. Firstly, we do not intend to intimate that we accept a straightforward deterministic model of the history of linguistics, on the other hand an aimlessly deterministic role for the phenomena of English in this history – if there had not been English, phonology might in any case have taken a portion of the ways portrayed above, in any event in those phenomena where information from English was just compelling in blend with information from different languages. Furthermore, it is plainly the case that different languages have given urgent information, too, that have driven improvements in phonology in regardless way that English has – this is extremely self-evident. Thirdly, the way that information from English has been so paramount in some cases in the improvement of phonological theory can't be divided from the way that later phonological theory has basically improved in North America, where most individuals talk English (along these lines are regularly intrigued by the phonology of English furthermore know something of it, if they take a shot at the language in portion or not). It is hence scarcely astonishing that English may as well have assumed this role and it is obviously not because of it having a characteristic interestingness or criticalness more excellent than any viable language.

REFERENCES

Agrawala, V. S. (1966). The Devnagari script. In *Indian Systems of Writing*, (pp. 12–16). Delhi: Publications Division.

Clements, G.N. & Keyser, J. (1983). *C V phonology: A generative theory of the syllable*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Clements, G.N. (1985). The geometry of phonological features. *Phonology Yearbook*, *2*: pp. 225–53.

De Lacy, Paul (2004). Markedness conflation in optimality theory. *Phonology* 21, pp. 145–199.

GIMSON, A.C. (1970). *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English.*

Goldsmith, J. (1999). Phonological Theory: The Essential Readings. Blackwell, Malden, MA, and Oxford.

Goldsmith, J., Laks, B. (2000). Introduction. In: Goldsmith, J., Laks, B. (Eds.), Folia Linguistica 34, Special Issue: The History of Phonology in the Twentieth Century, pp. 1–10.

Harmer, J. (2003). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.*

Honeybone, P. (2005). Diachronic evidence in segmental phonology: the case of obstruent laryngeal specifications. In: van Oostendorp, M., van de Weijer, J. (Eds.), The Internal Organization of Phonological Segments. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 319–354.

Kelly, G. (2000). *How to Teach Pronunciation*.

Steriade, D. (1995). Markedness and underspecification. In J.Goldsmith (ed.), *Handbook of phonological theory,* (pp. 114–174). Oxford: Blackwell

Corresponding Author

Saroj Bishnoi*

E-Mail – rohitkumarjangra1@gmail.com