

The Distinction Between Semantic and Pragmatic Meaning With reference to the third year students - Dept. of English, College of Basic Education: A Practical study

Mrs. Istabraq Rasheed Ibrahim
Dr. Abass Jassim Abbas
Al-Mustansiriya University
College of Basic Education

Abstract

Pragmatics and Semantics are inter-related subjects and the distinction between them is necessary to provide a framework for explaining the variety of ways in which what a speaker conveys can fail to be fully determined by the (conventional) linguistic meaning of the sentence he utters.

In a more positive vein, the distinction between semantics and pragmatics has served to separate strictly linguistic facts about utterances from those that involve the actions, intentions, and inferences of language users (speaker-hearers). However, there are some linguistic phenomena that seem to straddle the semantics-pragmatics boundary.

In this research, we will introduce meaning in the first chapter because, in our opinion, meaning has to have a fair share in this study since pragmatics main concern is to deal with meaning, and to set forth the use of pragmatics discourse so that it will clarify how pragmatics function in a discourse or conversation, as well as, its basic concepts of pragmatics, functions, speech act theory, Paralinguistic, and linguistic aspects .

Chapter two will explain and verify all the subjects that are related to Semantics, for instance, linguistics, function words, denotation, sense and reference, Moreover, the origin of English language.

After introducing each subject regarding pragmatics and semantics, chapter three will concentrate on the finding of this study, through a practical type of study by analyzing the errors of EFL students in the college of Basic Education in cloze test.

The study draws conclusion, finding, recommendations and suggestions. One of the most recommendations of the research is that: most of the third year students are not aware about the differences between the pragmatic and semantic meaning of the discourse or a text, therefore, the study recommend that the syllabuses of students courses need to be revised, and presumably student's need more practice in this aspect.

Introduction

1. The problem

Language is a means of communication used by people in any kind of social interaction. The use of language is one of the salient attributes that distinguish humans from other creatures. Therefore, understanding language is an important part of understanding humanity in general. Accordingly, language forms the heart of human life, without which many important activities are inconceivable.

As People mainly use language to communicate with each other, the study of human communication by means of language has attracted the attention of scholars, whose propositions deal with disciplines including linguistics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, anthropology and many others. The main function of communication is to convey ideas, attitudes and feelings from the addresser to the addressee(s), which are conveyed in terms of meaning by means of language. Different levels and types of meaning have been identified. The focus of this study is to investigate and identify the similarities and/or the differences between the pragmatic meaning and the semantic meaning in interaction.

In this study the problem tackled here is that in any verbal interaction, different levels and types of semantic and pragmatic meaning are involved. The relation between them may often be blurred due to the overlap which may raise certain difficulties in interpreting the overall communicative value of the linguistic behavior in specific situations.

2. The hypotheses:

The study intends to verify the hypotheses that:

1. Any verbal interaction is necessarily analyzed by semantic and pragmatic interaction without relying on one side or another of language user interaction.
2. Pragmatic meaning consists of a wide range of topics and elements e.g. entailment, presuppositions and implicature that helps verifying the working process.

3. The aim of the study

The study aims at investigating the relation between the language use and the socially determined constraints on the language use, and showing the relationship between the pragmatic and semantic meaning as well as the similarities and differences between them. It also endeavors to explain how the pragmatics and the semantics contribute to the overall communicative value of the interaction, through analyzing the errors of EFL students in the College of Basic Education in cloze test.

4. The procedures

The following procedures will be followed;

1. Exploring the aspects of the successfully communicated meaning in interaction, and some relevant notions. as well as the way in which they are conveyed from the addresser(s) to the addressee(s).
2. Detecting how the pragmatic meaning and semantic meaning affect the processes of communication and meaning interpretation.
3. Exploring the distinction between semantics and pragmatics within their aspects and properties. These can be fulfilled by up dated examination of literature and practical type of studies, therefore we analyze the errors of EFL students in the College of Basic Education in cloze test.

5. The limited of the study

The study is limited to the exploration of the contribution of the pragmatically and semantically significance through their distinction to the overall communicative value of the interaction and practically it is limited to third-year students at the department of English, College of Basic Education, Al-Mustansiriyah University for the academic year 2008-2009.

6. The value of the study

The present research work forms an attempt in the study of meaning in interaction, through the distinction between semantics and pragmatics, expected to be valuable for researchers interested in the study of language in use and its relation to society. It is an attempt to improve third year EFL college students' achievement in English reading, comprehension and other language aspects.

Chapter One

1. An Introduction to Meaning:

Since this research is about pragmatics and semantics, "meaning" is a part of these Subjects, in which they both deal with meaning that is derived from speech, therefore, this study will define different types of "meaning" in the field of pragmatics and semantics.

The word "meaning" refers to a thing or idea that a sound, word, sign, etc. represents, as well as, it is the thing or ideas that somebody wishes to communicate to you by what they say or do. (Rivers,1968,p.45)

It can sometimes be used to describe the interpretations that people have of the world in another sense the word, "Meaning," describe the internal workings of the mind, independently of any linguistic activity. "Meanings" vary according to the types of the thing that is being represented or concerned with conceptual inaccessible individual value of understanding. However, one can say that the concept of meaning is not easy to be defined in absolute term. Namely, there are the things in the world, which might have meaning, as well as, signs of other things in the world, and so, are always meaningful(i.e., natural signs of the physical world and ideas within the mind and concepts); There are things that are always necessarily meaningful, such as words, and other nonverbal symbols. The major contemporary positions of meaning come under the following partial definitions of meaning:

Psychological theories, exhausted by notions of thought, intention, or understanding; Logical theories, involving notions such as intension cognitive content, or sense, along with extension, reference, or denotation; message, information, or communication; Truth conditions; Usage, and the instructions for usage; and Measurement, computation, or operation. (www. wikipedia.org. 2008).

Now after setting a number of definitions to meaning, it is a necessary to move on to the main interest of this study, which is defining the distinctions between Pragmatics and semantics. The next part will be allocated for pragmatics and its related fields.

1.1 Pragmatics in linguistic discourse

Pragmatics plays a major role in discourse. When the speaker and the hearer share knowledge about the world, therefore, both the speaker and the hearer will make assumptions according to the shared knowledge. "Pragmatics" refers to the strategies (exploitation of shared knowledge, assumptions about communicative intent, etc.), by which language users relate the dictionary/grammar meaning of utterances to their communicative value in context.

"Pragmatics" generally refers to the encoding of particular communicative functions, especially those relevant to interpersonal exchanges, in specific grammatical and lexical elements of a given language.

So that all the structures of a language encode two levels of meaning, "semantic" and "pragmatic," both of which must be learnt for communicative competence. (Metaphysics research lab. CSLI, Stanford University, encyclopedia. 2008).

After defining pragmatics and explaining its role in discourse, it is necessary to Introduce pragmatics' basic concepts.

1.2 Pragmatics: the basic concept

It is necessary to highlight the basic concepts of pragmatics. It is beyond words meaning is that what pragmatics is all about, a person might say a sentence that have many meanings (non-direct meaning), hearer needs to read between the lines to get the meaning, makes assumptions, and guessing, therefore, sharing knowledge about the world makes it easier to derive the speaker's meaning. These are few examples that illustrate it:

1. My car is in a no parking zone, and a police officer approaches. I tell him "My car has a flat tire".
2. I enter a tire store, and tell the person at the counter: "My car has a flat tire".

The sentences are both true, and indeed they mean the same thing in both cases So in the sort of thing pragmatics concerned with what we see and understand, i.e. "Meaning beyond words".

In both contexts, I am reporting my flat tire; but in each case I am also communicating some second message as well ("It's not my fault I'm in a No Parking zone"; "I would like you to fix the tire".) (www.ux1.eiu.edu. 2008)

Those examples showed that one sentence could have different meaning in different Situations.

In addition to the basic concepts of pragmatics, there are four elements in which they Very closely linked to the working of the utterance.

1.3. Elements of pragmatics

Pragmatics includes a wide range of topics and elements that helps verifying the working process of all its elements which they are listed below:

1.3.1 Entailment

While defining pragmatics we saw that interpreting utterances involves a considerable amount of in elegant guess work where the hearer draws Inference from the speaker's words to arrive at the speaker's meaning. In this section, we will look at Entailment a relationship between two sentences where the truth of one (A) requires the truth of the other (B). For example, the sentence (A) the president was assassinated. Entails (B) The president is dead. Notice also that if (B) is false, then (A) must necessarily be false. To show entailment, we must show that (A) true forces (B) to be true and (B) false forces (A) to be false. (ibid).

We will look at another kind of inference below (presuppositions).

1.3.2 Presuppositions

We look at presupposition another kind of inference, which is very closely linked to the working of the utterance.

A presupposition is a background belief, relating to an utterance, which must be mutually known or assumed by the speaker and hearer for the utterance to be considered appropriate in context will generally remain a necessary assumption whether the utterance is placed in the form of an assertion, denial, or question, and can be associated with a specific lexical item or grammatical feature (presupposition trigger) in the utterance.

In pragmatics, a presupposition is an assumption about the world whose truth is taken for granted in discourse. Examples of presuppositions include:

1- Do you want to do it again?

Presupposition: You have done it already, at least once.

2- My wife is pregnant.

Presupposition: The speaker has a wife. (ibid).

Presuppositions are inferences that are very closely linked to the words and grammatical structures actually used in the utterance, but they come from our knowledge about the way language users conventionally interpret these words and structures.

After giving definition to presupposition and giving examples to illustrates the definition. We will look at another kind of inference, it is (Implicature).

1.3.3 Implicature

Another subject related to pragmatics is "Implicature" which is, anything that is concluded from an utterance, but that is not a condition for the truth of the utterance. It is a technical term in the linguistic branch of pragmatics coined by Paul Grice. It describes the relationship between two statements where the truth of one *suggests* the truth of the other, For example, the sentence "*Mary had a baby and got married*" strongly *suggests* that Mary had the baby before the wedding, but the sentence would still be *strictly true* if Mary had her baby after she got married.

Further, if we add the qualification "*not necessarily in that order*" to the original sentence, then the implicature is *cancelled* even though the meaning of the original sentence is not altered. This can be contrasted with cases of entailment. For example, the statement "*The president was assassinated*" not only *suggests* that "*The president is dead*" is true, but *requires* that it should be true. The first sentence could not be true if the second were not true; if the president were not dead, then whatever it is that happened to him would not have counted as a (successful) *assassination*. Similarly, unlike implicatures, entailments cannot be *cancelled*; there is no qualification that one could add to "*The president was assassinated*" which would cause it to cease entailing "*The president is dead*" while also preserving the meaning of the first sentence". (www.wikipedia.org. March 2008)

After explaining inferences to that are linked to pragmatics, we will look at some fields that are also related to pragmatics in which pragmatics' sometimes need not to be full sentences but utterances that express the speakers feelings, in the next section we will look at (speech act theory) that will explain this subject in more detail

1.4 Speech Acts Theory

Making a statement may be the paradigmatic use of language, but there are all sorts of other things we can do with words. We can make requests, ask questions, give orders, make promises, give thanks, offer apologies, and so on. Moreover, almost any speech act is really the performance of several acts at once, distinguished by different aspects of the speaker's intention: there is the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, such as requesting or promising, and how one is trying to affect one's audience.

It must reckon with the fact that the relationship between the words being used and the force of their utterance is often oblique. For example, the sentence 'This is a pig sty' might be used non literally to state that a certain room is messy and filthy and, further, to demand indirectly that it should be straightened out and cleaned up. Even when this sentence is used literally and directly, say to

describe a certain area of a barnyard, the content of its utterance is not fully determined by its linguistic meaning--in particular, the meaning of the word 'this' does not determine which area is being referred to. A major task for the theory of speech acts is to account for how speakers can succeed in what they do despite the various ways in which linguistic meaning Underdetermines use.

In general, speech acts are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses a regret. As an act of communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker's intention, the attitude being expressed. (ibid).

1.5 Paralinguistics

Paralinguistics is a linked with pragmatics in which it deals with the non-semantic aspect of speech -- everything but the words themselves; that is how things are said. A study by psychologist (Baker, 1992, p.54) suggests that approximately 38 percent of the impact in most conversations derives from how things are said. In recent years, researchers have concentrated their studies on the effects various vocal characteristics have upon listeners. They have found that listeners, to a significant extent, can judge a speaker's age, sex, race, education, status, geographic origin, and emotional disposition. Paying attention to such vocal qualities as volume, pitch, rate, and emphasis will often provide this insight. The high-pitched voice has been equated with such emotions as helplessness, tenseness, and nervousness; whereas, the low-pitched voice, with strength and maturity. Words spoken slowly and deliberately might be taken to signify anger or excitement. Frightened patients incline toward halting or quavering speech. Word pronunciation also plays an integral role in the study of paralanguage. (www.wikipedia.org. March 2008).

We will look closer at paralanguage in the next section, for which it is a field within Paralinguistics.

1.5.1 Paralanguage

Since pragmatics concentrates on communication, paralanguage is another way of Communication, which refers to the non-verbal elements of communication used to modify meaning and convey emotion. It may be expressed consciously or unconsciously, and it includes the pitch, volume, and, in some cases, intonation of speech.

Sometimes the definition is restricted to vocally produced sounds. The study of paralanguage is known as paralinguistics.

It is used as a cover term for body language, that is not necessarily bound to speech. The paralinguistic properties of speech play an important role in human speech communication. There are no utterances or speech signals that lack paralinguistic properties, since speech requires the presence of a voice that

can be modulated. This voice must have some properties, and all the properties of a voice as such are paralinguistics. However, the distinction linguistics vs. paralinguistics applies not only to speech but to writing and sign language as well, and it is not bound to any sensory modality. Even vocal language has some paralinguistics as well as linguistic properties that can be seen lip reading, and even felt, e.g. by the Tadoma method (ibid.).

1.5.2 Linguistic Aspects

In pragmatics the way that a word or an utterance is being uttered makes a difference in the meaning of the word or the utterance being said, therefore, some of the linguistic features of speech, in particular of its prosody, are Paralinguistics or pre-linguistics in origin. A most fundamental and widespread phenomenon of this kind is known as the "frequency code" (Horman, 1981, p.21). This code works even in communication across species. It has its origin in the fact that the acoustic frequencies in the voice of small vocalizers are high while they are low in the voice of large vocalizers. This gives rise to secondary meanings such as 'harmless', 'submissive', 'unassertive', which are naturally associated with smallness, while meanings such as 'dangerous', 'dominant', and 'assertive' are associated with largeness. In most languages, the frequency code also serves the purpose of distinguishing questions from statements. It is universally reflected in expressive variation, and it is reasonable to assume that it has phylogenetically given rise to the sexual dimorphism that lies behind the large difference in pitch between average female and male adults. In text-only communication such as email, chat rooms and instant messaging, paralinguistic elements can be displayed by emotions, font and color choices, capitalization and the use of non-alphabetic or abstract characters. Nonetheless, paralanguage in written communication is limited in comparison with face-to-face conversation, sometimes leading to misunderstandings. (www.wikipedia.org. March 2008)

This chapter was about pragmatics and its sub-genres fields, in the next chapter, of the study, it is useful to talk about semantics, its fields and related subjects.

Chapter Two

2. Semantics

This subject has been chosen along with pragmatics to show the distinction between both subjects. It is worth mentioning that they both are concerned with (meaning) but each in its own unique and different way.

The perennial problem in semantics is the delineation of its subject matter. The term meaning can be used in a variety of ways, and only some of these correspond to the usual understanding of the scope of linguistic or computational semantics. A criterion assumption in computationally oriented semantics is that knowledge of the meaning of a sentence can be equated with knowledge of its truth conditions: that is, knowledge of what the world would be

like if the sentence were true. This is not the same as knowing whether a sentence is true, which is (usually) an empirical matter, but knowledge of truth conditions is a prerequisite for such verification to be possible. Meaning as truth conditions needs to be generalized somewhat for the case of imperatives or questions, but is a common ground among all contemporary theories, in one form or another, and has an extensive philosophical justification.

A semantic description of a language is some finitely stated mechanism that allows us to say, for each sentence of the language, what its truth conditions are. Just as for grammatical description, a semantic theory will characterize complex and novel sentences on the basis of their constituents: their meanings, and the manner in which they are placed together. The basic constituents will ultimately be the meanings of words and morphemes.

The modes of combination of constituents are largely determined by the syntactic structure of the language. In general, to each syntactic rule combining some sequence of child constituents into a parent constituent, there will correspond some semantic operation combining the meanings of the children to produce the meaning of the parent.

The tradition in semantics has been to assume that word meanings can by and large simply be plugged into semantic structures. This is a convenient and largely correct assumption when dealing with structures like every X is P, but becomes less tenable as more complex phenomena are examined. However, the relevant semantic properties of individual words or groups of words are seldom to be found in conventional dictionaries and closer cooperation between semanticists and computationally aware lexicographers is required, (Watzlawich & Jackson, 1967 , p.35).

More integration between sentence or utterance level semantics and theories of text or dialogue structure. Recent work in semantics has shifted emphasis away from the purely sentence-based approach, but the extent to which the interpretations of individual sentences can depend on dialogue or text settings, or on the goals of speakers, is much greater than had been suspected ,(Metaphysics research lab, 2008) .

Since semantics is a study of words and sentences, it will be suitable if we take a look on linguistics for getting more knowledge about the way how individuals use their words in appropriate situations.

2.1 Applied linguistics

Applied linguistics often refers to the use of linguistic research in language teaching, but results of linguistic research are used in many other areas, as well. Many areas of applied linguistics today involve the explicit use of computers. Speech synthesis and speech recognition use phonetics and phonemic knowledge to provide voice interfaces to computers. Applications of computational linguistics in machine translation, computer-assisted translation, and natural language processing are extremely fruitful areas of applied

linguistics which have come to the forefront in recent years with increasing computing power. Their influence has had a great effect on theories of syntax and semantics, as modeling syntactic and semantic theories on computers constrains the theories to computable operations and provides a more rigorous mathematical basis, (Bates,1976,p.54) .

2.2 Function words

Words that have little lexical meaning or have ambiguous meaning, but instead serve to express grammatical relationships with other words within a sentence, or specify the attitude or mood of the speaker. Some adverbs are function words e.g. (*then, why*).

It can only describe the general usages of function words. Function words may be prepositions, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, conjunctions, grammatical articles or particles.

Interjections e.g. (*ouch!, wow!*) are sometimes considered function words but they belong to the group of open class words.

They may or may not be inflected or may have affixes. They also belong to the closed class of words in grammar in that it is very uncommon to have new function words created in the course of speech.

Each function word gives some grammatical information on other words in a sentence or clause, and cannot be isolated from other words, or it may indicate the speaker's mental position as to what is being said.

Here are a list of types of words included in function words:

2.2.1 Type of words included in function words

- a. Articles - *the* and *a*. in highly inflected languages, the articles may take on the case.
- b. Of the declension of the following noun.
- c. Pronouns - inflected in English, as *he-him, she-her*, etc.
- d. Appositions - uninflected in English.
- e. Conjunctions - uninflected in English.
- f. Auxiliary verbs - forming part of the conjugation (pattern of the tenses of main verbs), always inflected.
- g. Interjections - sometimes called "filled pauses", uninflected.
- h. Particles - convey the attitude of the speaker and are uninflected, as *if, then, well, however, thus*, etc.
- i. Expletives - set up sentences, among other functions, *It is, There are*, etc.
- j. Pro-sentences -*yes, okay*, etc. (www.wikipedia.com. March 2008)

Now it is necessary to have a look at a subject that is linked to semantics in a way that both are concerned with the literal meaning of the word which is (Denotation).

2.2.2 Denotation

Denotation is the literal meaning of a word, a denotation is the strict, dictionary definition of a word, devoid of any emotion, attitude, or color. It has

no natural connection to the thing it signifies. It is too, culturally and historically created.

Example: -Stop Sign

Stop (even without words, we recognize the meaning from the shape and color) ,(Nunberg,1978,p.45).

Our attempt to verify all the linked subjects to semantics has never ended yet, However, It is one step closer to include them under this chapter, to show the Differences among semantics and pragmatics, by including their sub-genres and their functions.

2.2.3 Sense and Reference

The reason for including (sense and reference) in my study and particularly in this Chapter is that they both refer to meaning, however, the reference is the object that the expression refers to in the real world, For instance, the name Mark Twain refers to Mark Twain, i.e. Samuel Clemens, the man who lived in the U.S. and wrote satires. The name Samuel Clemens also refers to that man. Hence, the two have the same reference.

On the other hand, the sense is the "cognitive significance" or "mode of presentation" of the referent, and to the inter-relation between linguistic elements themselves, it is inter-linguistics relation. Linguistic Expressions with the same reference may have different senses. Fosold(1990, p.51) uses the following example to illustrate this view. Let a, b, and c be three lines, each of which joins one vertex of a triangle to the midpoint of the opposite side (each of a, band c is thus a median). Then it is a theorem that he point of intersection of a and b is then the same as the point of intersection of band c. So we have different designations for the same point, and these names ('point of intersection of a and b', 'point .of intersection of band c') likewise indicate the mode of presentation; and hence the statement contains actual knowledge. (Smith & Wilson, 1979, p.50) state at one time, it was common to identify the sense of a name with an identifying description, which would put Smith's view close to the later Wilson's description theory of names. For example, the name "Mark Twain" might just mean the man who wrote Tom Sawyer, and Samuel Clemens might mean: The eldest son of John and Jane Clemens. Thus the reference would be determined as whatever fit the description. Scholars now almost unanimously reject this interpretation.

Unfortunately, however, a detailed replacement has not been forthcoming. But what is clear is that Smith certainly did not mean that the sense of a name is merely a collection of ideas a particular user of a name happens to associate with it: Because they figure into the meanings of terms in a public language and can be communicated, senses must be objective.

For smith(ibid, p.52), writers have used the terms sense, meaning, intension, connotation, and content.

For Wilson (ibid, p.53), writers have used the terms reference, referent, meaning, extension, denotation, nominatum, and designatum.

Confusingly, each one has translated each expression differently.

2.3 Semantic axis:

According to other linguists "The semantics of a phrase or sentence depends on such as the ordering of the words ..." the semantic axis has probable meanings of the words, one of which will be selected, based on the emplacing along the other two axes. By using semantic methods of persuasion includes using metaphor, ambiguous words and sentence structures that 'say things without saying them' and leads the listener into putting themselves situations. Semantics may also be applied to actions, and body language adds great meaning to communications. (www.changingminds.org. 2008)

There are two types of axis (Functional axis) and (Thematic axis). We will look at them in the next section.

2.3.1 Functional axis

According to some linguists "The functional axis adds what the words do, giving them purpose ..." they also denote that words should be attached to the outer world of things or the inner world of ideas.

The words may identify issues, assign cause, propose solution, and excite audients. they see that people make mistakes with words, for example in the signal response of confusing the map with the territory.

These errors can be deliberately caused by canny speakers whose intent is that the words function as persuasive elements (ibid.) .

2.3.2 Thematic axis

According to Rosen, (1990, p.37) "Thematic (or textural) wording adds unity and overall feel to the message". They may all combine to add vision, tell a story, and build a sense of purpose.

Themes may be contrastive, such as light and dark or good and bad, comedy or gothic they may be subject-based such as children or dogs.

They may make heavy use of metaphor to suggest and develop a bigger picture. Themes may also use the sounds of words, creating poetic hammering of consonants or flows of rhythm and rhyme.

Before ending the thesis, we would like to introduce the origins of English language and reasons for becoming English language the way we all know it today, and related this sub-title with naming and semantic meaning.

2.4 Origins of English Language and Naming:

The English vocabulary has changed considerably over the centuries. Like many languages deriving from Proto-Indo-European (PIE), many of the most common words in English can trace back their origin (through Germanic) to PIE. Such words include the basic pronouns I, originally ic, (cf. Latin ego, Greek ego, Sanskrit aham), me (cf. Latin me, Greek erne, Sanskrit mam), numbers (e.g. one, two, three, cf. Latin unus, duo, tres, Greek oios, duo, treis),

common family relationships such as mother, father, brother, sister etc (cf. Greek "meter", Latin "mater", Sanskrit "mat?"; mother), names of many animals (cf. Sankrit mus, Greek mys, Latin mus; mouse), and many common verbs (cf. Greek gign?mi, Latin gnoscere, Hittite kanes;to know). Germanic words (generally words of Old English or to a lesser extent Norse origin) tend to be shorter than the Latinate words of English and more common in ordinary speech (Nunberg,ibid.,p.21).

Since the majority of words used in informal settings will normally be Germanic, such words are often the preferred choices when a speaker wishes to make a point in an argument in a very direct way. A majority of Latinate words (or at least a majority of content words) will normally be used in more formal speech and writing, such as a courtroom or an encyclopedia article. However, there are other Latinate words that are used normally in everyday speech and do not sound formal; these are mainly words for concepts that no longer have Germanic words, and are generally assimilated better and in many cases do not appear Latinate. For instance, the Words Mountain, valley, river, aunt, uncle, move, use, push and stay are all Latinate.

A question may be arising and a need for knowing behind the reason for naming objects. Persons, etc...

Many scholars have attempted to find the reason behind naming convention that are applied to people. We will look at the pioneers who studied the phenomenon. The scholar Bates (1976, p.42) believed that true names must never be equivalent to a description, but conceded that most of the apparent "names" in English really were equivalent to descriptions, specifically to definite descriptions. In this position, there are two different functions nouns can serve:

Describing (and perhaps indirectly referring), referring (directly, without description) Bates' position is that most or all-English names really do the former. This position came to be known as Descriptivism with respect to singular terms, and was prominent through much of twentieth-century analytic philosophy.

In 1962 Ullmann gave a series of lectures arguing against Descriptivism, and holding, among other things, that names are rigid designators, expressions that refer to objects independently of any properties those objects have. However, often descriptions are used to pick out references, to explain to others which objects are being discussed by reference to an agreed-upon property. According to this theory, it does not follow that any of the agreed-upon properties constitute the meaning of the name.

Whorf `s work (1956) led to the development of various versions of the Causal theory of reference, which in various forms claims that our words mean what they do, not because of associated descriptions, but because of the causal history of the acquisition of that name in a vocabulary.

2.5 The main differences:

Pragmatics is the study of the ability of natural language speakers to communicate more than that which is explicitly stated. The ability to understand another speaker's intended meaning is called pragmatic competence. An utterance describing pragmatic function is described as metapragmatics. Another perspective is that pragmatics deals with the ways we reach our goal in communication. Suppose, a person wanted to ask someone else to stop smoking. This can be achieved by using several utterances. The person could simply say, 'Stop smoking, please!' which is direct and with clear semantic meaning; alternatively, the person could say, 'Whew, this room could use an air purifier' which implies a similar meaning but is indirect and therefore requires pragmatic inference to derive the intended meaning .

Pragmatics is regarded as one of the most challenging aspects for language learners to grasp, and can only truly be learned with experience.

Language meaning can be analyzed at several levels. It has a direct connection with semantics and pragmatics.

While Semantics concentrates on the meaning that comes from linguistic knowledge, Pragmatics concentrates on those aspects of meaning that cannot be predicted by Linguistic knowledge alone and takes into account our knowledge about the physical and the social world.

The focus of pragmatic analysis is on the meaning of speakers' utterances rather than on the meaning of words or sentences. Utterances need not consist of complete the focus of pragmatic analysis is on the meaning of speakers' utterances rather than on the meaning of words or sentences. Utterances need not consist of complete sentences. Each utterance is a unique physical event created at a particular point in time for a particular communicative purpose.

In our point of view, pragmatics helps the translator or the interpreter in finding clues in the utterances the speakers make which leads him to find the appropriate equivalent in the target language.

Finally, the question of how semantics relates to pragmatically oriented theories is, Smith & Wilson (ibid., p34) say, "Wide open." For them, semantics deals with those aspects of meaning that remain constant whenever a given expression is uttered:

Semantics covers what expressions mean, while pragmatics covers what speakers mean in using the expressions.

To summarize: Pragmatics involves how speakers use language in contextualized social interactions, how they do things with words, as Leech(1974, p.64) would say. Semantics invites a focus on meaning and truth conditions without regard to communication and context.

This study have been made useful for who are majored in the field of translation, as well as to make the distinction between pragmatics and semantics

from our point of view, showing all the related subjects to pragmatics and semantics.

In relation to the role that semantics and pragmatics plays in language aspects and in the process of learning and teaching EFL, no study has undertaken the task of investigating the effect of semantic and pragmatic distinction on students achievement in English text. Thus, chapter three will tackle this study.

Chapter Three

We have clearly noticed how the subject matter of the distinction between semantics and pragmatics overlap to some extent . In fact, this relatively new and fast expanding topic has connections with the various branches of Linguistics which link Language with the external world and they are so hard to define clearly . Hence, the researchers tackle the subject matter of "the distinction between semantics and pragmatics" empirically and this chapter will discuss the procedure that have been adopted in carrying out the empirical work of the study. A cloze test has been chosen by the researchers which considers as example of semantic and pragmatic Language testing procedures. The test consists of a text of approximately 400 words in length. It is usually constructed by omitting every ninth word in a continuous passage of discourse. The students are expected to read the text carefully, filling in all the omitted words according to their projections of evolving meaning, this tests their knowledge of many aspects of the Language in a context of a meaningful discourse (Rivers,1968, p.68).

The population of the study is limited to the third-year students of the department of English in the college of Basic Education in AL. Mustansiriyah University for academic year 2008-2009. The sample consists of '45' students, randomly selected from this population. The researchers have made sure that they have selected a suitable passage for the testees in term of age, culture and Language ability; for this reason, the researchers have chosen the passage for John Henery Newman which is called "An Educated Man". It consists of 426 words. The test has administered to 45 students selected randomly from the third-year classes of English Department. The following statistical means are used as follows:

Alpha_ Cronbach coefficient has been used for determining test reliability which is,

$$a = \frac{n}{n-1} \left[1 - \frac{\sum Si^2}{S^2} \right]$$

Where:

N= number of items of a test.

Sx² =variance of the test scores.

Si²=variance of a single item.

(Mehrens &Lehmann,1973:256)

3- analysis of Results

Every Language cuts up the world in different ways. It is not simply that one Language sometimes has more overlaps than another in certain areas. Hence, The researchers have found in their analysis of data that the testees have many semantic and pragmatic errors in using verbs, adverbs, articles, adjectives, conjunctions etc. and the total number of errors made by the testees is "2280" with a percentage of '89,73'.

3-1 Semantic Errors

The study of meaning is normally referred to as semantics. A linguist who is studying meaning tries to understand why certain words and constructions can be combined together in a semantically acceptable way, while others cannot (Aitchison 1972, p.79) . Actually, the researchers found that the empirical study revealed that the testees used many sentences which were all well-formed syntactically: nouns, verbs and so on. They were all in the right order. But they were contradictory which means that the testees made many comprehension errors and involve using words that are completely different from the right words. The total number of errors is `1560` with a percentage of `71.83` . Some of these errors, e.g., they used adjectives instead of nouns as in :

*1- to come to clever with them. It should be, to come to an understanding with them.

*2- Of private good. It should be, of private life .

They also used verbs instead of nouns , e.g. :

*3- To be serious with help. It should be , to be serious with effect .

*4- He has common speak . It should be , he has common ground.

*5- The great ordinary understand .It should be , the great ordinary means .

The testees made many different errors by not only using adjectives and verbs instead of nouns but also they used adverbs instead of nouns as in the following examples ;

*6- His own opinion and completely .

*7- He is happily companion .

They should use judgment instead of completely in sentence (6) and a pleasant instead of happily in sentence (7) . In fact, the researchers found that there were some students who respond rather indifferently, or maybe they were confused so as to answer the test and so they used main verbs instead of auxiliaries or vice versa as in these examples ;

*8- To have right . They should use , to get right .

*9- It has in him . They should say , it teaches him .

*10- He went at home .

*11- He gave nothing .

Here, they should use auxiliaries instead of main verbs as in ; is instead of went in sentence (10) and has instead of gave in sentence (11) .

3.2 Pragmatic Errors

Pragmatics, in the broadest sense, is the study of the meaning of language in use or language in context, to Leech (1983). It is meaning in relation to speech situations linguistics of language are mainly concerned with context as the fundamental aspect of utterance interpretation. And the general study of how context influence the interpretation of meaning is called pragmatics and in its speech acts theory within its terminology (locutionary and perlocutionary act) students made so many mistakes. In fact, the researchers find it difficult to handle and mention all the errors that are made in this area. Though the total number of these errors are (720) with a percentage of (28.17) . For example , they have found that some of the testees are unable to use the right verb that agrees with its subject which should be uttered in locutionary act theory in well-formed meaningful sentences , as in ;

*12- It includes within their scope .

*13- When they has nothing .

*14- He were at home .

They should use its instead of their in sentence (12) and he instead of they in sentence (13) and is instead of were in sentence (14) in order to have a well. Formed meaningful sentence. They also fail to use the right articles in the right position according to illocutionary act theory , e.g., they misused the article before an adjective or a noun , as in :

*15- which gives a man clear conscious .

*16- How to come to understanding .

*17- He can ask question .

They should use the article a before the adjective clear in sentence (15) and before the noun question in sentence (17) and the article an before the adjective understanding in sentence (16) . Actually , there are a lot of wrong usage of tenses form concerning meaning when it has been found that many testees have many errors in selecting the right tense of verbs. According to perlocutionary act which is the effect of the utterance on the hearer or reader which led him to use improper words as in using present continuous tense instead of present simple tense or infinitive, e.g. ;

*18- He is able to conversing .

They should use converse instead of conversing . They also fail in using past simple tense instead of present simple tense, e.g. ;

*19- Which served him in public .

They should use present simple tense serves instead of the past simple tense served , etc. Finally , it is useful to rank the categories of errors and gives an indicator of their gravity, as in this table (1).

The frequencies and percentages of Errors

Percentage	Frequency	categories
71.83	1560	Semantic Errors
28.17	720	Pragmatic Errors
100	2280	Total

3-3 Discussion of Results

Through out this study, it has become quite evident that answering the test is difficult for third- year college level. This fact has been certified by the number of errors of the testees. It is also discovered that the testees have many errors in mastering many aspects of the English language . To specify, testees have semantic and pragmatic errors which the study has indicated in details . These results can be attributed to a number of reasons, such as ;

- 1- The distinctions between semantics and Pragmatics in general form a great trouble spot for the majority of our students and this is due to the ignorance and misunderstanding to many aspects of the English language .
- 2- Superficial thinking and usage and reliance on their mother tongue rules to interfere within learning the English language is considered to be the most important phenomenon for teaching the English language .
- 3- In certain cases, the aspects of the English language within semantics and pragmatics fields are not easy for most of our testees to understand due to the Deficiency in the vocabulary repertoire of the testees .
- 4- The weak level of the testees in understanding the distinctions between semantics and pragmatics which are more concerned with meaning interpretation. Testees still deal with meaning differently ; semantics is context independent meanings, where as pragmatics studies meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader) . It is the intention of the speakers meaning.

3-4 Conclusions

The researchers reveal that the findings of the present study highlight the importance of analyzing EFL college student`s errors in understanding the language aspects (semantics and pragmatics) in this test. This process will help teachers detect the problematic areas in their students` mastery of the foreign language they are learning . In fact, the researchers attribute the semantic and pragmatic errors of the testees to their mother tongue interference , weakness in vocabulary and reading comprehension . This type of errors may be regarded as a guidance to insure that it is necessary to concentrate on our program to our students on different level on how to understand meaning of linguistics element and knowledge and differentiate between connotation and denotation of the words as well as the intention of speaker writer meaning of any discourse.

3.5 Recommendations

Due to vagueness and difficulties caused by misunderstanding for the distinctions between semantics and pragmatics and in order to help EFL learners avoid semantic and pragmatic errors, the researchers recommend the following points ;

- 1-The empirical work indicates that subjected students are mainly unaware about the main differences between semantic and pragmatic meaning of linguistic elements so their program need to be revised and they are also in need for more practice .
- 2- Instructors of English language ought to pay much more attention to learning vocabulary and grammar though our students must be trained to use an appropriate word in its place .
- 3- Students should be encouraged to ask about any information which is invalid or seems to be difficult, otherwise the whole effort of the instructor will be like a mirage which vanishes whenever you try to approach it , viz. the use of semantic and pragmatic aspects .

3.6 Suggestions for further studies

- 1- A study is needed to investigate the distinctions between semantics and pragmatics in teaching the English prose to the students of the college of Arts.
- 2- A similar study in other grades of the university levels .
- 3- Investigating the application of semantics and pragmatics in teaching poetic discourse at college level .

3.7 Suggestions for further researches

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following are suggested further studies:

- 1- A similar study in other distinctions between pragmatics and sociolinguistics meanings.
- 2- A similar study in other distinctions between semantic and syntactic aspects of some randomly selected texts .
- 3- Semantic axis and interrelated meaning with pragmatic and functional meaning of words and utterances as well conceptual meaning need to be studied deeply as well.

3.8 References to these studies

- Dittmar,N. (1976) **Sociolinguistics: A Critical survey of theory and application.** London : Arnold .
- Leech , G. N.(1983) **Principles of Pragmatics:** London : Longman .
- Levinson, S. C.(1997) **Pragmatics,** Cambridge University Press.
- Verschueren, J.(2002) **Understanding Pragmatics,** London : Edward Arnold .

Bibliography

- Aitchison,J.(1972) **General Linguistics:** London , Hodder & Stoughten .
- Baker, Mona (1992) **In Other Words,** London: Routledge .
- Bates, E. (1976) **Language and Context : The Acquisition of Pragmatics.** New York: Academic Press.

The Distinction Between Semantic and Pragmatic Meaning With reference to the third year students - Dept. of English, College of Basic Education: A Practical study

Mrs. Istabraq Rasheed Ibrahim , Dr. Abass Jassim Abbas

Fosold, R.(1990) **Sociolinguistics of Language**, Cambridge, Mass., Black well .

Horman, H.(1981) **To mean to understand problems of Psychological Semantics** , Springer: Verlage Berlin Heidelberg .

Leech ,G. N.(1974) **Semantics**, Harmondsworth : Penguin .

Mehrens, William A. and Irwin Lehman, J. (1973) **Measurement and Evaluation and Psychology**, New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Inc.

Metaphysics research lab. CSLI, Stanford University, Encyclopedia, 12th April,2008.

Nunberg, G.D. (1978) **The Pragmatics of Reference**, Mimeo. Indiana University Linguistics` club .

River, Wilga M. (1968) **Teaching Language Skills**, Chicago : University of Chicago Press .

Rosen, S. T.(1990) **Argument Structure and Complex Predicates**, Garland, New York.

Smith,N. & Wilson, D.(1979) **Modern Linguistics : The results of Chomsky`s Revolution**, Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Books .

Ullmann, S. (1962) **Semantics : an introduction of the study of meaning** , Oxford: Basil Black well.

Watzlawich, P.,Beavin,J.H.& Jackson, D.D.(1967) **Pragmatics of Human Communication**, New York: W.W.Norton .

Whorf, B.L.(1956) **Language, thought and reality: selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf**,ed. J.B.Carroll, Cambridge, Mass. ;MIT. Press.

www. Changing mind, org. 25th Jan. 2008.

www.UX1.eiu.edu. 17th May 2008 .

www.wikipedia. Org,29th March 2008.

Appendix (A)

The Educated Man

John Henry Newman

A university is not a birthplace of poets **or** immortal authors or founders **of** schools, leaders of colonies, or conquerors of nations. It does not **promise** a generation of Aristotles or Newtons, of Napoleons **or** Washingtons, of Raphaels or Shakespeares, though such miracles **of** nature it has before now contained within its **precincts**. Nor is it content on the other hand **with** forming the critic or the experimentalist, the economist or the engineer, though such too it includes within **its** scope. But university training is the great ordinary **means** to a great but ordinary end; it aims **at** raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating **the** public mind, at purifying taste, at **supplying** true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed to **the** ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise **of** political power, and refining the intercourse of private **life**. It is the education which gives a clear conscious view of his own opinions and **judgments**, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in **expressing** them, and a force in urging them. It **teaches** him to see things as they are, to **get** right to the point, to disentangle a skein **of** thought, to detect what is sophistical, and to **discard** what is irrelevant. It prepares him to fill **any** post with credit, and to master any subject **with** facility. It shows him **how** to accommodate himself **to** others, how to throw himself into their state **of** mind, how to bring them his own, how to

influence them, how to come to an **understanding** with them, how to bear with them. He is at home in any society, he has common **ground** with every class; he **knows** when to speak and when to be silent; he is able to **converse**, he is able to listen; he can ask a question pertinently, and gain a lesson seasonably, when he has nothing to impart himself he is over **ready**, yet never in the way; he is a **pheasant** companion, and comrade you can depend upon; he **knows** when to be serious and when **to** trifle and he has a sure tact which enables him **to** trifle with gracefulness and to be serious with **effect**. He has the repose of mind which lives **in** itself, while it lives in the world, and **which** has resources for its happiness at home when **it** cannot go abroad. He has a gift which serves him in public, and supports him in retirement, **without** which good fortune is but vulgar, and with **which** failure and disappointment have a charm.

تمهيد

تتناول هذه الدراسة الجانب النظري والعملي لموضوع أهم الفروقات في المعنى اللغوي في شقيه المعنى الدلالي (سيمانتكس - علم الدلالة) والمعنى الواقعي العملي (علم البرغماتكس - الواقعي العملي) واثبات ذلك عمليا للغرض الكلامي ومدى فهم الغرض والمعنى مما يقصده المتخاطبين من نصوص كلاميه وتحليلها دلاليا وعمليا للجملة الكلامية. لذا فقد تناول البحث في جزءه العملي دراسة تجريبه عمليه لطلبة المرحلة الثالثة لقسم اللغة الانكليزية في كلية التربية الأساسية لمعرفة مدى استيعابهم للمعنى الدلالي والمعنى الواقعي العملي من خلال كشف أخطائهم وتحليلها في إحدى النصوص التخاطبيه والأدبية، ومن خلال التفاعل والتواصل لاستعمال اللغة للمتكلم والمتلقي مما يخلق أحيانا سوء الفهم لما يقصده المتحدث وخاصة عند عدم فهم المتلقي لما يقصده المتكلم عمليا دون الاكتفاء بمعنى الكلام كنص لغوي لوحده في تحديد فهم المعنى اللغوي.

لذا فقد تناول البحث في جزءه الأول التطرق للمعنى اللغوي بشكل عام وحدد موضوع المشكلة التي يعاني منها المتخاطبين وقد حدد موضوع البحث وأهدافه في الوصول إلى أهم الفروقات بين المعنيين كما ذكر سابقا من خلال الجانب النظري والعملي وحدود البحث وتحديد الوسائل العلمية المتبعة في هذا الخصوص للوصول إلى تحقيق أهدافه.

أما الجزء الثاني فقد خصص لتوضيح استخدام المعنى الواقعي لكيفية توظيف اللغة العملية من خلال الاستخدام اللغوي ليأخذ معناه الأشمل في تفسير المعنى للنص اللغوي.

لقد كرس الجزء الثالث من البحث للمعنى الدلالي ومناقشة ما توصل إليه علم اللغة وعلماؤه في تحديد وظائف الكلمات و معانيها المتنوعة وما لها من دلالات حسية ووجودية وخبريه. كما تطرق البحث لأهم الفروقات بين المعنيين.

توصل البحث إلى نتائج ودلالات من خلال التحليل لأخطاء الطلبة في الجانب العملي وقدم توصيات ومقترحات من أبرزها : عدم تفريق أطلبه موضوع البحث بين المعنيين الدلالي والعملي حيث وصلت أخطائهم لنسبة 89%، إن اغلب الطلبة يعانون من عدم وعيهم لهذه الفروقات ولا يدركوها ، ولذا أوصى البحث بإعادة النظر بمناهج اللغة وتطويرها ومحاولة تدريب أطلبه بشكل مستمر بهذا الاتجاه من خلال الفهم الشامل للنصوص اللغويه ، كما وأكد البحث على مقترحات وتوصيات أخرى.