# Universal Grammar and Its Relevance in Contemporary Theories of Language Acquisition

**Asst. Lect. Maryam Sabah Naeem**
**Al-Nahrain University**
maryam.s774@nahrainuniv.edu.iq
**Dr. Noor Sabah Naeem**
Mustansiryiah University, College of Arts, Department of Translation
noorsabah694@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

## Abstract

This study has been conducted to examine the foundational principles of Universal Grammar ،evaluate its role in explaining first language acquisition ،compare UG with contemporary theories such as usage-based theory, connectionism, and social interactionism. ،assess empirical evidence supporting or challenging UG، determine whether UG still holds explanatory power in modern linguistic research. According to Chomsky, Universal Grammar (UG) is the system of principles and computational procedures which define and place limits on the form that grammars for human languages can take. Beside Universal Grammar, other theories have emerged which are the contemporary theories of language acquisition which are Statistical Learning Theory, Connectionist models, and Dynamic Systems Theory. Furthermore, the Universal Grammar is relevant to the following Contemporary Theories of Language Acquisition which are as follows; Usage-Based Theory, Cognitive Linguistics, and The Minimalist Program. A qualitative and comparative analytical approach was adopted. The findings show that universal grammar effectively explains the **speed and universality** of early language acquisition, particularly in accounting for grammatical structures not explicitly taught. However, empirical evidence shows that **input frequency and interaction** significantly influence language development, supporting usage-based and social theories. Connectionist models successfully simulate certain aspects of language learning, such as pattern recognition and error correction. Hence, no single theory fully accounts for all dimensions of language acquisition; instead, each explains different aspects.

***Keywords;*** Grammar, Universal Grammar (UG), Language Acquisition (LA**),** and Language Acquisition Device (LAD).

## 1. Introduction

Noam Chomsky's notion of universal grammar is a framework for studying and understanding how children pick up a second language. Research by Chomsky on language acquisition has shown that even exceptionally intelligent children can learn their native tongue at a rapid pace (Shang and Cui, 2024). This phenomenon defies explanation by structuralize grammar and behaviorist psychology. Even when they don't say a word, children may convey a lot with their body language. Even with a limited vocabulary, children may learn all the rules of grammar and convey an endless amount of thoughts. To him, the "stimulus-response" model fails to adequately account for language's capacity for innovation. A mechanism for learning languages, the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) is essential for children's brain development. Chomsky deduced universal grammar.

Furthermore, the term "universal" suggests that this type of quality exists in everyone's mind; it enables youngsters to successfully acquire and develop their mother tongue. Language Acquisition Device (LAD) is a tool that helps with this. The fact that all children can reach a somewhat proficient level suggests that, despite disparities in context and environment, almost everyone can become fluent in their mother tongue with little exposure to targeted language input. Based on his observations in the actual world, Chomsky came to the following conclusion: when infants learn grammar, they always produce an endless number of linguistic units, both at the microscopic level (sentences and discourses) and the macroscopic level (phrases or clauses). According to Shang and Cui (2024), everyone is born with a set of grammatical rules that all languages share. This set of rules is called universal grammar (UG).

The concept of Universal Grammar (UG) has long been central to understanding how humans acquire language. However, in contemporary linguistics and cognitive science, its relevance is increasingly debated. The research problem addressed in this study is:

*(To what extent does Universal Grammar remain a valid explanatory*

*framework in light of modern usage-based, connectionist, and socio-cognitive theories of language acquisition?).* This problem emerges from the tension between nativist perspectives, which emphasize innate linguistic structures, and empiricist approaches, which highlight input, interaction, and learning mechanisms. However , this study aims to;

1. To examine the foundational principles of Universal Grammar.
2. To evaluate its role in explaining first language acquisition.
3. To compare UG with contemporary theories such as usage-based theory, connectionism, and social interactionism.
4. To assess empirical evidence supporting or challenging UG.
5. To determine whether UG still holds explanatory power in modern linguistic research.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1 Universal Grammar to Language Acquisition

The set of methods (also termed "rules") that generate all of a language's grammatical sentences with the right syntax is called its "grammar." Following is one possible interpretation of UG: UG is the set of rules and computational techniques that specify and constrain the possible forms of human language grammars. Plus, linguistics as a whole has been booming recently. A number of hypotheses have been advanced within the previous hundred years. One that has provided fresh insights into the study of language learning and structure is Chomsky's 1957 theory of Universal Grammar. The idea is described by Chomsky as "a system of principles, conditions, and rules that are elements or properties of all human languages" (1975: 29). The underlying premise is that these mental properties—principles, circumstances, and rules are present in every language.

The main objective is to "understand the mechanisms which underlie the human ability to build mental grammars" (Hawkins, 2001, p. 1), with the ultimate goal of merging "grammar, mind and language at every moment" (Cook and Newson, 2007, p. 11). On the other hand, "the problem of how it [language] is acquired" (Cook and Newson, 2001, p. 2) cannot be solved without first comprehending the inner workings of these systems. Therefore, linguists need to find the answer to the question of how children learn the

complicated knowledge of their home language in order to adequately explain such an abstract mental grammatical system. Chomsky (1957) suggests what he believes to be the most reasonable explanation for this question, building on the idea that language is "as a natural phenomenon" (Lenneberg, 1967, p. vii) and should be studied as a "organ of the body" (Chomsky, 2005, p. 133). According to Chomsky (1957), "there is a specific faculty of the mind/brain that is responsible for the use and acquisition of language, a faculty with distinctive characteristics that is apparently unique to the species in essentials and a common endowment of its members, hence a true species property" (Chomsky, 1992, p. 4). This means that children are born with a foundation of knowledge about how to acquire their native language, which helps them immensely when they set out to learn a second language.

According to Chomsky (1965), there is a difference between competence and performance because most native speakers' everyday speech is not entirely grammatical. Confidence is defined as "the speaker's or listener's knowledge of his language," whereas performance refers to "the actual use of language in concrete situation" (Chomsky, 1965, p. 4). Performance is not always indicative of competence due to mistakes brought about by performance characteristics like clumsiness, misunderstandings, and processing issues caused by inadequate working memory. The notion that "is concerned with what a speaker knows about language as an internal property of human mind rather than something external [the produced utterances]" relies heavily on this distinction. For that reason, Chemsky (1988, page 36). Therefore, UG is more important for competency than performance. According to Chomsky (1986, p. 22), the human "I-language" refers to this internalized system of language, namely grammatical competence..

## 2.2 Contemporary Theories of Language Acquisition

### 2.2.1 Statistical Learning Theory

Statistical learning theory is often considered to be among the best. Many modern machine learning methods can be traced back to it. What allows one to derive appropriate conclusions from empirical evidence is something that the theory helps to study. An outline of statistical learning theory's major

points is given in this chapter. A set of competing hypotheses is considered in statistical learning theory before a single hypothesis is chosen based on empirical evidence. A minor discrepancy between the training error and test error of a class hypothesis is seen if the data generating method is benign. By being exact by mentioning the distinction between training and test error, statistical learning theory often stays away from making metaphysical claims regarding parts of the actual underlying dependency. Various additional forms of machine learning are also covered in the chapter.

Many modern machine learning algorithms have their theoretical roots in statistical learning theory, which is also one of the most elegantly developed areas of AI. Its origins can be traced back to Russia in the 1960s, but it really took off in the 1990s with the advent of the so-called Support Vector Machine (SVM), a pattern identification tool that is now ubiquitous in fields as diverse as computational biology and computer vision. The development of statistical learning theory had other goals besides laying the groundwork for new learning algorithms. At its core, it was a philosophical inquiry into the nature of validating conclusions derived from empirical data (Luxburg and Schölkopf, 2011).

**2.2.2 Connectionist models**

The learning processes that underlie human vision, cognition, and behavior, as well as the storage and retrieval of information from memory, are frequently represented by connectionist models, which are also called Parallel Distributed Processing (PDP) models. Understanding the brain mechanisms that underlie cognition should guide and limit our understanding of behavior and mental states; this approach embodies a particular viewpoint in cognitive research that holds this view. Neural network modeling has been around since the 1950s, but it wasn't until the early 1980s that it became well-known. This was due to the publication of two books edited by D.E. Rumelhart and J.L. McClelland (1986), which established the approach's foundational principles and developed its applications to various psychological topics.

A wide variety of fields have recently put forth connectionist models of cognitive processes, including perception, memory, cognitive control, and various parts of language processing. The "connectionist" method in cognitive science is characterized by a set of fundamental assumptions that are shared by all models, even when their architectures vary greatly from one application to another. Among the approach's defining characteristics is the focus on change mechanisms. The central tenet of connectionism, in contrast to more conventional approaches to computational modeling in cognitive science, is that the way a system evolved and learnt should guide our efforts to understand the mechanisms at work in any given cognitive function. A substantial portion of the ongoing research in the field is devoted to comprehending such processes (Mareschal, Johnson et al., 2007).

The way information is processed in the brain is the basis for connectionist models. Activation is transmitted from one unit to another in processing by means of weighted connections that stand in for synapses or clusters of them, between artificial neurons that are grouped in networks. Then, through its links to other units in the network, each unit communicates its activation level. While activation functions can be simple linear, they are more commonly non-linear, such as sigmoid functions, and explain how each unit calculates its activation from its inputs (Rogers & McClelland, 2004).

**2.2.3 Dynamic SystemsTheory**

The study of the behavior and evolution of complex systems with many moving parts is known as dynamic systems (DS) theory. An important question that DS theory seeks to answer is how, deep inside a complex system, new forms emerge, and how, after stabilizing, they arrange into patterns that are useful to the system. Researchers are interested in investigating human development across the lifespan, and DS theory is a good fit for this field since it can explain the emergence of new forms, functions, and organizational patterns (Fogel, 2011).

For example, how does a baby start to move around on its own two feet, for instance? The development of these talents can be influenced by both internal and external variables, which combine dynamically to produce the skill. Despite this, it may come as a surprise to the child's parents. Therefore,

the process by which a child learns to walk is a dynamic system that may be researched to learn about the characteristics and when a child's walking ability develops in a specific child or to learn about how different groups of children develop in different ways. This page discusses DS analytic methods, key ideas, historical applications, and instances of DS in human development research (Spencer, et al., 2011).

A dynamic system, in its most formal definition, is an equation system that describes the changes that can take place in a system as time passes. In the study of human development, DS can refer to either a human entity (like a bodily system or a relationship) or a developmental process (like learning a new skill), since both include numerous interrelated parts, evolve through time, and can be described by a system of mathematical equations. There are numerous examples of DS in human development across the lifespan: Some examples of these processes are language acquisition in infancy, the bond between parents and children, the physiological effects of stress in adolescence, the process of adjusting to retirement, and mental acuity in old life.From our internal biological processes to the cultures that impact our everyday lives, DS can be observed at every level of human development because most developmental phenomena are controlled by several causes and vary over time (Van Geert, 2011).

In the early 1990s, developmental researchers started studying human development across the lifespan using DS theory and methodologies. Researchers in the field of developmental psychology have been employing DS theory and other foundational theories to understand human development for decades because they share many concepts. Some examples of these models and theories are the organizational approach, the bioecological model, the transactional model, general systems theory, developmental systems theory, and the epigenetic perspective. Theories put out by early thinkers like Gilbert Gottlieb and Ludwig von Bertalanffy provided frameworks for describing human development as an integrated DS process (Van Geert, 2011).

In fact, DS theory is more accurately described as a theory about theories because it incorporates a number of other theories and concepts. Looking at DS theory through the lens of life-span development, two schools of thought have emerged thus far. Witherington (2015) cites the Groningen method as saying that even greater, more traditionally thought-of changes in development can be described as dynamic processes of self-organization since they follow an ordered progression through predetermined stages.

**2.3 Universal Grammar and Its Relevance to Contemporary Theories of Language Acquisition**

**2.3.1 Usage-Based Theory**

Tomasello was the one who first proposed the usage-based theory of second language learning (2003). Structure of language develops through use, and youngsters employ their broad cognitive abilities to construct their language, according to this view. As a result of developing these abilities, youngsters are better able to understand the linguistic patterns and the purposes of native speakers. Young infants generalize previously established patterns to create language-specific abstract categories when they have firmly established and internalized those patterns. The usage-based approach to language development is supported by naturalistic and experimental evidence, according to Bavin (2009). "Universals of linguistic structure derive from the fact that people everywhere have the same set of general cognitive processes" (Bavin, 2009, pp. 85), according to this theory, which appears to contradict the nativists' beliefs. Intention-Reading and Cultural Learning, Schematization and Analogy, Entrenchment and Pre-emption, and Functionally Based Distributional Analysis are the four distinct sets of processes that, according to Tomasello (2003), explain how children build a language.

Two ideas characterize the usage-based approach to language communication: meaning is use and structure arises from use. The first tenet is based on a method for dealing with the semantic or functional aspect of language. Focusing on how people utilize language conventions to attain social purposes is important in this approach. The second tenet is a way of looking at the grammatical or structural aspect of language communication

that centers on the process by which meaning-based grammatical constructs are born out of specific instances of language use.

A usage-based theory of language acquisition was presented by Tomasello (2003), which combines the two theories mentioned above. Two sets of cognitive abilities, he said, are acquired when toddlers learn a language: the ability to understand intentions and the ability to detect patterns. According to the functional approach stated earlier, "intention-reading" refers to the process by which infants culturally acquire linguistic conventions from their elders by figuring out what those adults are trying to accomplish with them when they employ them. Following the grammatical method described earlier, "pattern-finding" is the process by which infants derive general linguistic schemas or constructs from specific sentences. Thus, functional and grammatical aspects are the two primary facets of this theory.

### 2.3.2 Cognitive Linguistics

In the field of Cognitive Linguistics, language is seen as an integral part of man's cognitive abilities. Some of the specific topics that are of interest to this field include: the structural features of natural language categorization, the principles of functional linguistic organization, the conceptual interface between syntax and semantics, the pragmatic and experiential background of language in use, and the relationship between language and thought, including questions about relativism and conceptual universals (Sandra, et al., 1995).

The fact that cognitive linguistics has not yet settled into a single coherent theory discourage us from seeking out basic commonalities and shared viewpoints throughout the several subfields that make up cognitive linguistics.

With the foundational features of the cognitive paradigm in mind, we can better understand Cognitive Linguistics' stance in relation to fields like cognitive psychology and philosophy of science (De Mey, 1992). When we talk about the "cognitive" function of language, we're referring to the important role that intermediate informational structures play in our interactions with the world. This is why cognitive linguistics is so important. Similar to cognitive psychology, cognitive linguistics is based on the

premise that mental processes govern our interactions with the external environment. But, unlike cognitive psychology, it narrows down on the use of language in the organization, processing, and transmission of information. Thus, language is considered as a storehouse of global knowledge, a systematized assortment of significant categories that aids in processing novel experiences and retaining details about previously encountered ones (Lee, 2001).

### 2.3.3 The Minimalist Program

The Minimalist Program is the connection between sound and meaning. According to Chomsky's previous research, the articulator-perceptual system and the conceptual-intentional system, which are parts of the brain that process sound and meaning, are both inputs to the language faculty's computational system. Logical Form (LF) and Phonetic Form (PF) are the two tiers of interface that the computational human language (CHL) uses to communicate with these "external" systems. According to Chomsky, the work done at these interfaces is "poorly understood." The focus here is on the computational system, rather than the interfaces, and we don't know much about it beyond the fact that it should build two representations of the interfaces using lexical items (Sandra, et al., 1995).

This sound-meaning connection is defined as a derivation that takes one set of lexical items as input and produces two interface representations, PF and LF. One does not originate from the other; rather, the two interface representations are distinct. In earlier iterations, the S-structure was the name for the place in the derivation when the computation divided. The derivation from Spell Out to LF isjust a continuation of the derivation from the Numeration to Spell Out, withthe exception that no new elements can be added from the Numeration (Lee, 2001).

## 2.4 Theories and Hypotheses

### 2.4.1 Theoretical Framework:

This study is grounded in four major theoretical perspectives on language acquisition. Each offers a distinct account of how learners acquire grammatical knowledge, and together they provide a basis for examining the role of AI tools in writing development.

1. Universal Grammar (UG) Proposed by Noam Chomsky, UG posits that humans are born with an innate, biologically endowed linguistic system. This system consists of universal principles and parameters that constrain all possible human languages. According to UG, the speed and uniformity with which children acquire complex grammar cannot be explained by exposure alone, because the linguistic input they receive is often incomplete and noisy. UG explains this as the result of an innate "language faculty" that guides learners to hypothesize the correct grammatical rules with minimal data. In the context of writing, UG suggests that learners have an underlying capacity for syntactic structure, even if their surface performance is affected by limited practice or L1 interference.2. Usage-Based Theory

***2.*** Usage-Based Theory, associated with scholars like Michael Tomasello and Joan Bybee, argues that language acquisition emerges directly from language use. Grammar is not a separate innate module but a by-product of frequency, analogy, and statistical patterns in the input. Learners build constructions by repeatedly encountering and producing specific linguistic patterns. High-frequency structures are entrenched faster, while low-frequency or irregular forms remain more difficult. For essay writing, this theory predicts that students' writing quality improves through exposure to well-formed models and through repeated practice, regardless of whether they possess innate grammatical principles.3. Connectionism

***3.*** Connectionism models language learning as a process of forming statistical associations within neural networks. Learning occurs through the strengthening or weakening of connections between linguistic units based on co-occurrence in the input. Complex rules are not stored as abstract principles but emerge from distributed patterns of activation across the network. Connectionist models account for both regular and irregular patterns and explain why learners often overgeneralize rules before refining them through exposure. Applied to AI-assisted writing, this view suggests that AI tools may function as input enhancers, providing students with high volumes of patterned language that can strengthen associative learning.4. Social Interactionism

***4.*** Social Interactionism, developed by Vygotsky and later applied to SLA by scholars like Long and Lantolf, emphasizes that language develops through social interaction and communicative context. Language is learned not in isolation but through negotiation of meaning, scaffolding, and participation in discourse communities. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is central here: learners advance when supported by more capable interlocutors. In writing, peer feedback, teacher correction, and now AI feedback can act as scaffolds that help students move from their current level to a higher level of structural and rhetorical competence.

.2.2 **Hypotheses:**

H1:UG continues to provide a partial explanation for the rapid and uniform acquisition of language in children. This hypothesis acknowledges that while environmental factors are crucial, the underlying uniformity in how children across cultures acquire basic syntactic structures points to an innate predisposition. In writing, this would manifest as a baseline capacity for hierarchical structure that persists even among learners with limited exposure to academic English.H2: Contemporary theories offer more comprehensive accounts of variability and the role of environment.

H2:Usage-Based, Connectionist, and Social Interactionist theories better explain why learners differ in writing proficiency, why some structures are acquired faster than others, and how external factors like AI feedback, instruction, and exposure shape outcomes. This hypothesis expects that variability in essay quality will correlate strongly with frequency of AI use, quality of input, and interaction with feedback.H3: A hybrid model integrating UG with cognitive and social approaches better explains language acquisition than any single theory.

H3:The study hypothesizes that no single theory is sufficient. UG accounts for the underlying structural capacity, while Usage-Based and Connectionist mechanisms explain how patterns are entrenched through input, and Social Interactionism explains how feedback and context refine those patterns. An integrated model best captures the complex process of essay writing in an AI-assisted environment, where innate capacity, statistical learning, and social scaffolding all interact.

3. Methodology

**3.1 Research Design:**

A qualitative and comparative analytical approach was adopted.

**3.2 Data Collection:**

1.Review of existing literature, including theoretical papers and empirical studies.

2.Analysis of child language acquisition data from documented case studies.

### 3.3 Data Analysis:

Comparative analysis of how different theories explain key phenomena such as: Poverty of stimulus , overgeneralization errors , ross-linguistic similarities and differences .

## 4.Findings and Discussions

***Table1; Comparative Table: How Theories Explain Language Acquisition Phenomena***

| Linguistic Phenomenon | Universal Grammar | Usage-Based Theory | Connectionism | Social Interactionism |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Poverty of the Stimulus** | Explains it through innate grammatical principles. Children infer rules not present in the input. | Explains it through analogy and generalization from frequently encountered patterns in the input. | Explains it through statistical learning of recurring patterns in neural networks. | Places less emphasis on this. Argues interaction compensates for gaps in input. |
| **Overgeneralization Errors** | Errors result from applying an innate rule before lexical exceptions are learned. E.g., "goed" for "went". | Errors result from productive generalization of schemas built from repeated examples. | Errors occur due to strengthening of high-frequency patterns in the network. Decline as irregular forms gain activation. | Views errors as part of meaning negotiation with more competent interlocutors. |
| **Cross-Linguistic Similarities** | Attributes them to universal principles shared across all human languages. | Attributes them to similar communicative tasks and high frequency of basic constructions. | Attributes them to shared properties in statistical pattern processing across languages. | Attributes them to similarities in early social interaction contexts. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cross-Linguistic Differences** | Attributes them to parameter setting based on properties of the input language.. | Attributes them to differences in construction frequency in each language's input. | Attributes them to differences in statistical distribution of patterns in each language. | Attributes them to differences in communicative functions and cultural norms. |
| **Main Strength** | Explains the speed and universality of acquiring abstract syntax. | Explains the role of frequency and practice in entrenching constructions. | Explains learning without explicit rules and simulates learning errors. | Explains the role of context and social scaffolding in language progress. |
| **Main Weakness** | Struggles to explain individual variation and differences in acquisition rate. | Struggles to explain acquisition of constructions rare in the input. | Lacks a biological account of innate linguistic capacity. | Does not provide a clear mechanism for acquiring abstract syntax. |

The analysis reveals several key insights:

1.UG effectively explains the **speed and universality** of early language acquisition, particularly in accounting for grammatical structures not explicitly taught.

2.However, empirical evidence shows that **input frequency and interaction** significantly influence language development, supporting usage-based and social theories.

3.Connectionist models successfully simulate certain aspects of language learning, such as pattern recognition and error correction.

4.No single theory fully accounts for all dimensions of language acquisition; instead, each explains different aspects.

**Conclusion**

The study concludes that while Universal Grammar remains an influential and foundational theory, its role in contemporary linguistics has shifted. Rather than serving as a complete explanation, UG is better understood as part of a broader, integrative framework.

Modern research suggests that language acquisition is a **multifaceted process** involving innate predispositions, cognitive learning mechanisms, and social interaction. Therefore, a hybrid approach that combines elements of UG with usage-based and interactionist perspectives provides the most comprehensive understanding.

Hence, Universal Grammar is not obsolete, but its relevance lies in its integration with newer, empirically grounded theories rather than in its dominance as a standalone model.

**References**

Bavin, L. (2009). The Cambridge Handbook of Child Language. Cambridge University Press. New York.

Chomsky, N. (1975). Reflections on language. New York: Random House.

Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Chomsky, N. (1986). Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use, Praeger, New York. Chomsky, N. (1988). Language and Problem of Knowledge. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1992). On the nature, use, and acquisition of Language. In Pütz, T, (Ed). Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution: Studies in Honour of René Dirven on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday. John Benjamins Publishing.

Chomsky, N. (2005). On Phases. In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero & M.-L. Zubizaretta (Eds) Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Cook, V., & Newson, M. (2001). Chomsky's universal grammar. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Fogel, A. (2011). Theoretical and applied dynamic systems research in developmental science. Child Development Perspectives, 5(4), 267–272. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00174.x.

Lee, David. 2001. Cognitive linguistics: An introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lenneberg, E. (1967) Biological Foundations of Language, Wiley, New York.

Luxburg,U. V. and Schölkopf, B. (2011). Statistical Learning Theory: Models, Concepts, and Results. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-52936-7.50016-1Get rights and content.Volume 10, 2011, Pages 651-706.

Mareschal, D., Johnson, M. H., Sirois, S., Spratling, M. W., Thomas, M. S. C., & Westermann, G. (2007). Neuroconstructivism: How the brain constructs cogntion (Vol. 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, T.T., & McClelland, J.L. (2004). Semantic Cognition: A Parallel Distributed Processing Approach. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rumelhart, D. E., & McClelland, J. L. (1986). Parallel Distributed Processing: Explorations in the Microstructure of Cognition. Volume 1: Foundations. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sandra, Dominiek, and Sally Rice. 1995. Network analyses of prepositional meaning: Mirroring whose mind—the linguist's or the language user's? Cognitive Linguistics 6: 89–130.

Shang, J. and Cui, Sh. (2024). Universal Grammar and Universal Grammar's Influence and Related Theories Concerning Second Language Acquisition. DOI: 10.36348/sijll.2024.v07i07.002. ISSN 2616-8677 (Print) | ISSN 2617-3468 (Online) Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

Spencer, J. P., Perone, S., & Buss, A. T. (2011). Twenty years and going strong: A dynamic systems revolution in motor and cognitive development. Child Development Perspectives, 5(4), 260–266. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00194.x.

Tomasello, M. (2003). Constructing a Language: A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Van Geert, P. (2011). The contribution of complex dynamic systems to development. Child Development Perspectives, 5(4), 273–278. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00197.x.

Witherington, D. C. (2015). Dynamic systems in developmental science. In R. Lerner (Series Ed.) and W. F. Overton & P. C. M. Molenaar (Vol. Eds.), Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Vol. 1.

# القواعد العامة وأهميتها في النظريات المعاصرة لاكتساب اللغة

**م.م. مريم صباح نعيم**
جامعة النهرين
maryam.s774@nahrainuniv.edu.iq
**م.د. نور صباح نعيم**
الجامعة المستنصرية – كلية الاداب – قسم الترجمة
noorsabah694@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

**مستخلص البحث:**
أُجريت هذه الدراسة بهدف فحص المبادئ الأساسية النحود العام وتقييم دورها في تفسير اكتساب اللغة الأولى، ومقارنة النحو العام بالنظريات المعاصرة مثل النظرية القائمة على الاستخدام، والنماذج الترابطية، والتفاعلية الاجتماعية، بالإضافة إلى تقييم الأدلة التجريبية التي تدعم أو تتحدى هذا الإطار النظري، وتحديد ما إذا كان النحو الكلي لا يزال يحتفظ بقوته التفسيرية في البحث اللغوي الحديث .وفقًا لـ Noam Chomsky، يُعرَّف النحو الكلي بأنه نظام من المبادئ والإجراءات الحاسوبية التي تحدد وتضع قيودًا على الأشكال التي يمكن أن تتخذها قواعد اللغات البشرية. وإلى جانب النحو العام، ظهرت نظريات أخرى تُعرف بالنظريات المعاصرة لاكتساب اللغة، مثل نظرية التعلم الإحصائي، والنماذج الترابطية، ونظرية الأنظمة الديناميكية .علاوة على ذلك، يرتبط النحو الكلي بعدد من النظريات المعاصرة لاكتساب اللغة، مثل النظرية القائمة على الاستخدام، واللسانيات المعرفية، والبرنامج الأدنى. وقد تم اعتماد منهج نوعي تحليلي مقارن في هذه الدراسة .وأظهرت النتائج أن النحو الكلي يفسر بشكل فعّال سرعة وعالمية اكتساب اللغة في المراحل المبكرة، خاصة في تفسير التراكيب النحوية التي لا يتم تعليمها بشكل صريح. ومع ذلك، تشير الأدلة التجريبية إلى أن تكرار المدخلات اللغوية والتفاعل يلعبان دورًا مهمًا في تطور اللغة، مما يدعم النظريات القائمة على الاستخدام والتفاعل الاجتماعي. كما نجحت النماذج الترابطية في محاكاة بعض جوانب تعلم اللغة، مثل التعرف على الأنماط وتصحيح الأخطاء .وبناءً على ذلك، لا توجد نظرية واحدة قادرة على تفسير جميع أبعاد اكتساب اللغة بشكل كامل؛ بل إن كل نظرية تسهم في تفسير جانب معين من هذه العملية المعقدة.

**الكلمات المفتاحية :**القواعد، القواعد الكونية (UG)، اكتساب اللغة (LA) ، جهاز اكتساب اللغة (LAD).