

# Universal Grammar

**Dr. Marcia R. Pinheiro**

RGMA, AMS, PROz

drmarciapinheiro@gmail.com

## Abstract

We are interested in creating a universal grammar structure, so that learning languages becomes a much easier task than it is now. We obviously cannot dream of having all languages on earth adopting this universal grammar, so that this is at most for those languages that are associated with our occidental style of writing. The Brazilian and Portuguese peoples decided to unify their language once and then reached several agreements which, basically, formed a new language. With this, Brazilian Portuguese and Portuguese Portuguese became almost the same thing. In the same way, we could have all languages that adopt the occidental style of writing sharing the same grammar structure. This paper is then about a dream, but, because of the experience with the Portuguese language, we know that this is an achievable dream.

**Key-words:** universal, grammar, language, occidental, unification

## 1. Introduction

Noam Chomsky, professor of linguistics at MIT, has developed the *universal grammar* theory of language development. Chomsky's theory proposes that the human brain contains a predefined mechanism (universal grammar) that is the basis for the acquisition of all language. In analogy, the brain can be thought of as a kind of partially programmed machine ready to be configured. The configuration comes from encounters with the perceived world through the senses, and thus the corresponding language pattern forms. Chomsky's universal grammar directly parallels the nature of math and science and can be better understood through the following rationalization. It would appear that the derived system of physics, geometry, and various other mathematical schemes fit all too perfectly into the reality of the inner-workings of the world. This perfect fit is a phenomenon which many scholars and philosophers, including Albert Einstein, find difficult to believe could simply be coincidence. It is Chomsky's belief that the reason thought fits so precisely to our world is that the reality of the world is the reality of our minds; they are one and the same. Nature created us – it is what we are, so it would only make sense to have such a correlation. Chomsky sums it up very simply, I think, *yet the world thinks in me*. [1]

We will discuss the above-mentioned piece of theory in this paper. We are particularly concerned with *universal grammar* as an expression.

We will prove that what Chomsky imagined (or what Brister [1] thought that Chomsky imagined) could not possibly be true through very well-known facts.

Besides, we will propose that we create a grammar structure that be considered logical by Logicians, so that it is the easiest to assimilate. This might even be a structure that already exists or a quilt formed of pieces of varied grammar structures.

So many degrees separate us from the true learning of a new language: grammar, graphical accents, localisms, thinking patterns, gaps, gluts, original occlusion, original voice emission patterns, original culture, emotional problems, and etc.

If we can eliminate one of these more than ten degrees of distance, we are a bit closer to finding it all easy, is it not?

## 2. Development

We obviously intuitively know that Chomsky could only be wrong.

We spend an average of twelve years studying Mathematics and our first language just to master the foundations and basic structures of application of those two disciplines. It is universally agreed that almost every adult will present some amount of mistake in any sort of exam on the foundations and basic structures of those two topics at any stage of their life.

Australia, for instance, recently decided to test its inhabitants for literacy and found out that half of their electrical apprentices fail [2] basic numeracy and literacy tests, so that it is not that they have some mistakes, they actually fail the basic tests.

If things were inside of us in the way they are outside and if reality were still perfectly reflected in our theories, we obviously would not need so much study, formal study, to master just the basics of our theories and we obviously would never fail exams on the basics after going through twelve years of formal studies of those.

Notice that human kind speaks a diversity of languages (6,909 according to [3]) and therefore nature is definitely not the same for all of us. If one claims, as Chomsky seems to have done, that at least our linguistic processes, those involved in language acquisition, are a common place, then one has to believe that either the environment influences us equally or our inner natural universe is in agreement with our group conventions in terms of language.

It is not so much about the variety of the languages, and therefore about the cardinality involved, but it is definitely about the structure of the grammar of those languages, which may vary so completely that one will put drawings (one close to another) that represent entire sentences to express the same ideas that the other would express with words.



The above rectangle brings the sigmatoid [4] *world* in Chinese according to [5]. We now see two separate drawings, formed of 16 strokes in total, for the Chinese language, and four separate drawings formed of 10 strokes for the English language.

There is a lady (Ms. Ruth McNeill) who is told to never have understood the simplest mathematical operations with negative numbers. For not accepting those, she changed her professional paths, so hard and unnatural all was for her [6].

There are people who will absolutely never accept or learn anything about the Cartesian Plane. Yet, they would have attended all the basic twelve years of school... .

If our theories were able to reflect our impression of the world, then we would probably remain by the *application level* of the Bloom's Taxonomy [7] all the time when we were, for instance, seeing, once more, the same piece of theory regarding grammar at school.

Unfortunately, almost all of us seem to think that it is all new once more instead.

We simply would get bored, complain, and change the system if we thought, as for the vast majority, in places like Brazil, that it was indeed all obvious repetition. Very unfortunately, studies have been made several times just to confirm the need of seeing those basic topics again and again instead [8].

This is to prove that our inner universes cannot be naturally in agreement with our group conventions.

We could still consider the environmental influences, but what do Australia and England have in common in terms of environment?

Yet, the language of Australia is the same language we see in England. England is close to Italy and Australia is close to Indonesia. Yet, the languages these countries adopted are different. In Italian, they write *Ti Amo*, but in English they write *I Love You*, just to mention a striking difference, since *Amo* means *Love* and *You* means *Ti* here [9].

The distance between Australia and England is also non-negligible, so that claiming that it has to do with the environment is a bit odd. As for being surrounded by water, Indonesia also is.

We say *yellow cab*, in Indonesian, in this way: *Taksi Kuning* [10].

In this way, we could, for instance, determine that all verbs that start sentences appear in the gerund form and the subject *people* is to be equated to the subject *they* for agreement purposes.

These rules would then be valid for every language that is seen associated with our occidental alphabet or for all the languages participating in our agreement, say, drawing a parallel between this and the agreement between Portugal and Brazil [11]. Perhaps we would have to get people to sign the agreement little by little, and start with a small agreement between a few countries only.

We can see that some people with similar minds are already thinking about the topic and publishing their thoughts, people like Giuseppe Longobardi [12]. This is an extract from [2]:

In the previous cases, the kinds are all countable (sets of individuals named that way). With an empty determiner we should expect shifted proper names to designate mass kinds (sets of arbitrary sizeable subquantities named that way). This kind of shift is definitely marginal, though not absolutely impossible, if a lexical determiner requires it:

(66) a. ?Hanno messo piu` anticaRoma in questo film che in tutti i precedenti.

'They put more ancient Rome in this movie than in all the previous ones.'

b. ?Parecchia Francia di destra e di sinistra teme va Le'on Blum piu` di Hitler.

'Much right- and left-wing France feared Le'on Blum more than Hitler.'

c. ?Napoleone conquistava ogni settimana troppa Russia per poterla tenere sotto controllo.

'Napoleon was conquering too much Russia every week to be able to keep it under control.'

### 3. Conclusions

The linguistic theory of Universal Grammar seems to be simply an allurements for us to notice how the human mind can be completely away from reality and believe that it is right, *on the dot*.

Trivially, things could never have been in the way that Brister [1] proposes that Chomsky imagined.

In fact, very little is intuitive in terms of grammar, so little that we seem to never be able to master it, as for the vast majority of us, regardless of how much we study it, how long it takes us to study it, how many different teachers have instructed us on the topic, etc.

We would like to propose a change in the World Object/World Reference [13] for the expression Universal Grammar, however, through this paper: We would like to propose that we have a universal grammar in the sense of having rules that be adopted by all countries where the official language is one of the occidental languages.

We believe that, in this way, we will be reducing the effort to learn a new language from one step at least, and a very meaningful step. There are more than ten different aspects of the target language that must be mastered by us in order for us to be able to use it as an expert would. If we make the grammar structure be the same for all occidental languages, we will already know the grammar structure of the new language, so that the elimination of one aspect of the target language from our list of concerns is our result.

#### **4. References**

- [1] Brister, E. (2004). Quine: Terms in translation. Retrieved December 2 2013 from [http://www.rit.edu/cla/philosophy/quine/universal\\_grammar.html](http://www.rit.edu/cla/philosophy/quine/universal_grammar.html)
- [2] Carter, L. (2013). Half of electrical apprentices fail basic numeracy and literacy tests. Retrieved December 2 2013 from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-11-01/apprentices-failing-basic-numeracy-and-literacy-tests/5064902>
- [3] Anderson, S. R. (2016). How Many Languages Are There in the World? Retrieved April 27 2016 from <http://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/how-many-languages-are-there-world>
- [4] Pinheiro, M. R. (2015). Words for Science. Indian Journal of Applied Research. Retrieved April 27 2016 from [https://www.academia.edu/12181924/Words\\_for\\_Science](https://www.academia.edu/12181924/Words_for_Science)
- [5] Zhang, J. (2003). 21F.108/21F.158 Chinese II (Streamlined), Spring 2003. Retrieved April 27 2016 from <http://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/36848/21F-108Spring-2003/OcwWeb/Foreign-Languages-and-Literatures/21F-108Chinese-II--Streamlined-Spring2003/CourseHome/?sequence=1>
- [6] Pinheiro, M. R. (2013). Negative numbers and basic operations. Retrieved December 2 2013 from <http://www.mathematicalcircle.blogspot.com.au/2013/07/negative-numbers-and-basic-operations.html>
- [7] Cornwell, J. (2011). Bloom's Taxonomy: Encouraging Higher Cognitive Thinking in Primary School Classrooms. Retrieved December 2 2013 from <http://juliaec.wordpress.com/2011/03/23/blooms-taxonomy-encouraging-higher-cognitive-thinking-in-primary-school-classrooms/>
- [8] Souza, P. R. (1996). Presidência da República. Retrieved January 8 2016 from [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/Leis/L9394.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Leis/L9394.htm)
- [9] No author. (2016). I Love You. Google Translate (English -> Italian). Retrieved April 28 2016 from <https://translate.google.com.au/#en/it/i%20love%20you>
- [10] No author. (2016). Yello Cab. Google Translate (English -> Indonesian). Retrieved April 28 2016 from <https://translate.google.com.au/#en/id/yellow%20cab>
- [11] Da Silva, G. (2016). O Novo Acordo Ortográfico da Língua Portuguesa. Retrieved January 8 2016 from <http://monografias.brasilecola.uol.com.br/educacao/onovo-acordo-ortografico-lingua-portuguesa.htm>
- [12] Longobardi, G. (2005). Toward a Unified Grammar of Reference. *Zeitschrift fur Sprachwissenschaft*. Walter de Gruyter, vol. 24.
- [13] Pinheiro, M. R. (2015). Words for Science. Indian Journal of Applied Research. Vol. 5, issue 5.