

Jyavāskylā Contrastive Studies 5.

Jyvaskylā:English Department.

Searle, J.R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge:

Combride University Press.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. 1986. Relevance :

Communication and Cognition. Oxford University Press.

Vygotsky, S. 1973. Thought and Language. The MIT press.

Widdowson, H. 1986. "Teaching Language as and for Communication," in H. Widdowson:

Explorations in Applied Linguistics, Vol. 2. Oxford University press.

——— 1991. Aspects of Language Teaching.

Oxford University press.

Wittgenstein, L. 1953. "Philosophical Investigations," translated by G.E. Anscombe.

Blackwell, Oxford, England.

- Speech Sciences Contribute to Contrastive Analysis?" Paper read at the 16th International Conference on Polish-English Contrastive Linguistics. Boszkowo, Poland, December 1978.
- Lightbown, P. 1984. "The Relationship between Theory and Method in Second Language Acquisition Research." in Davies and Cripier (eds.)
- Lyons, J. 1986. Language, Meaning and Context. Fontana, London.
- MacCawley, D. 1976. Grammar and Meaning. Academic Press, New York.
- Robins, R.H. 1980. General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey. Longman.
- Sayavaara, K. 1981. "Psycholinguistic Models, Second Language and Contrastive Analysis," in J. Fisiak: Contrastive Linguistics and the Language Teacher. Pergamon Institute of English.
- Sajavaara, K. and J. Lehtonen, 1979. "Prisoners of Code-Centered Privacy: Reflections on Contrastive Linguistics and Related Disciplines," in K. Sayavaara and J. Lehtonen (eds) Papers in Discourse and Contrastive Discourse Analysis.

- Ellis, R. 1986. Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford University Press. 1990. Instructed Second Language Acquisition. Basil, Blackwell.
- Fodor, D. Janet. 1977. Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar. Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1975. Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hassan. 1990. Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective. Oxford University press.
- _____ 1992. Cohesion in English. London: _____
- Johnson-Larid, P.N. 1983. Mental Models. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Katz, J. Jerrold. 1972. Semantic Theory. Harper and Row publishers. New York.
- Krashen, S.D. 1982. Principle and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Pergamon press.
- Lakeoff, George. 1968. "Instrumental Adverbs and the Concept of Deep Structures," in FL 4, pp. 40-29.
- Leech, Geoffrey, 1974. Semantics. Penguin Books.
- Lehtonen, J. 1978. "How Can the Theory and Methods of

- Akmajian, A.R.A. Demers and R.M. Harnish. 1984.
Semantics. The MIT Press.
- Austin, J.L. 1962. How to Do Things with words.
Oxford: Clarendon Press; Cambridge.
Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Azabdaftari, B. 1993. "An Overreview of Meaning in
Linguistic Studies," in the Journal of
the Faculty of letters and Humanities,
University of Tabriz, Nos. 146-147, PP.
110-159.
- Brown, D.H. 1987. Principles of Language Learning and
Teaching. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Chomsky, M. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.
The MIT Press.
- Cook, V. 1985. "Universal Grammar and Second Language
Learning," in Applied Linguistics 6(1):
2-18.
- Corder, S.P. 1967. "The Significance of learner's
Errors," in IRAL 5:161-9.
- Davis, S.M. 1978. "Audition and Speech Perception,"
in R.L. Seheifelbusch (ed) Bases of
Language Intervention, Baltimore,
MD: University of Park Press.
- Elgin, H. Suzette. 1979. What Is Linguistics?
Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey.

To conclude, I may say that although studies of meaning in linguistics and other relevant disciplines such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, philosophy, logic, pragmatics, stylistics... have contributed a lot to our understanding of the ephemeral nature of meaning, they do not offer a composite coherent picture of the issues involved to EFL teachers and until we have learnt adequately about the nature of language, L2 cognitive variables, and ways of developing communicative competence in L2 learners, I think we English teachers can count on extensive reading as an efficient, convenient and enjoyable means of helping foreign language learners develop L2 competence naturally almost analogous to the child's approach to L1 acquisition. In the meantime, the rate of learning will speed up by the mature L2 learner when he remains alert to various features of language use, which represent the feelings, attitudes, modes of thinking of the personae with whom the student reader identifies and emotionally interacts through the text.

dependence on external context and as such it exploits the possibility of creativity which helps the L2 learner, during his covert interaction with the text, step beyond systemic meaning and look for implicational meaning, find new expressions for new experience and refashion reality in the image of new ideas. We language teachers are told that language acquisition is possible through interaction with the input which is comprehensible and I may add pleasurable as well. Literary texts, replete with implicatures, provide optimum conditions for the L2 learner to deploy problem solving procedures, though subconsciously, in the process of making sense'—the notion which underscores the creative character of language use. In traditional class situations where L2 learner is forced into strict conformity with linguistic rules in language performance (where teaching materials represent research findings inconclusive and often contradictory) and taking into consideration the fact that the nature of language in linguistic studies and the learner's process of language intake still remain to be fully understood, the methodology of having the L2 learner, through exposure, interact with appropriate literary texts will help him to achieve native-like mastery of the target language.

competence; it includes phonology, lexis, syntax, semantics as well as sociocultural, discorsal and situational features. Literature is a vicarious experience and its language represents vicarious uses to which language is put during the verbal interactions between the personae in their personal and interpersonal lives. To be able to realize the representational mode of meaning in literary texts, the L2 learner need to develop his interpretive procedures in order to cope with pragmatic features, the ability which characterizes communicative competence. "Representation," says Widdowson (1984:106), "is a curious hybrid mode of meaning: On the one hand, it requires us to focus on the form of the signs, as if they were symbols, and on the other hand, it requires us to engage interpretative procedures as if these signs were indices. Thus, literature forces us into a reappraisal of the nature of both sign and object, provides us with a fresh perspective on both language and life. Literature has a way of exploiting resources in a language which have not been codified in terms of linguistic rules and if it is subjected to regulation standards in an attempt to tailor it to L2 language needs, it may look 'threadbare' — its beauty spoiled.

In fiction the language is detached from its social setting and so presents meaning without

the process of language development is the same as the process of language learning."(Ellis,1986:176). Here two points are worth noting. First, the acquisition of L2 competence will be, through absorbing comprehensible and immensely pleasurable texts, subconscious hence analogous to L1 acquisition by child; second, in an EFL situation, the mature L2 learner, whose cognitive ability is a big asset, will remain sensitive to beautiful expressions—figures of speech and formulaic speech in the text. This will help him to speed up the rate of learning process which is of its nature slow in the naturalistic language acquisition settings. It is important to emphasize the two-facet feature of the learning that takes place through exposure to literary texts, namely, the learning process is subconscious while the learner does not fail to notice the beauties of language expressions. This methodology allows the L2 learners to work out the language system for themselves in much the same way as young children acquire mother tongue.

The reason why we suggest the L2 be exposed to literature as a source of comprehensible and pleasurable input is that it represents various components of both linguistic and communicative

with input data, have challenged the researchers to study learner's linguistic output though the evidence is indirect and many of ongoing internal processes still remain out of reach of scientific enquiry. It is axiomatic, however, to say that there will be no production without a prior comprehension and that the quality of linguistic product is generally influenced by the kind of input data to which L2 learner is exposed. Considering the complex nature of language and with regard to the proliferation of linguistic findings which are often far from being consistent, the notion that linguistic output is a reflection of input data offers a way out of the problematic situation that EFL teacher is in—namely, the necessity of exposing L2 learners to appropriate literary texts in target language. The L2 learner, when engaged interacting with a comprehensible and pleasurable text, is assumed to acquire language in the way analogous to the subconscious acquisition of L1 by child. Such an assumption is not without empirical evidence (Krashen, 1982, Ellis, 1990). It is said that in order to explain the linguistic output, it is necessary to explain how the learner takes part in discourse. "An account of language use is at the same time an account of language development...

learner-external to learner-internal process. The change in the research trend led the researchers to focus on language acquisition by the child and SLD came to be influenced by the methodology and theory of L1 acquisition research.

Language teachers have sought to derive pedagogical implications from naturalistic SLD research findings in order to make language teaching more effective in the classroom situation. Some of the findings, though informative in terms of patterns of regularity in learner's developing interlanguage, are inconsistent (Cook, 1985, Lightbown, 1984). Given the inconsistency in the findings of the researchers concerned with second language development, it is natural to assume that opposing views will hold the ground to challenge the rationale behind the methods, syllabuses and materials of L2 language teaching. Unless we language teachers have a clear understanding of the factors contributing to second language acquisition we will not be able to help L2 learner attain a native-like linguistic competence in tutored settings.

With the pendulum swinging toward learner-internal factors in accounting for SAL, the cognitive processes, utilized by the learner while interacting

discussion of which constitutes the final section of this paper as we promised in the preceding pages.

1.5. Implications for Classroom SLD

Although the field of second language acquisition is scarcely more than twenty years old, the research literature abounds in approaches, theories, models, laws and principles — all intended to account for an indeterminate number of types of SLD as a result of the variety that exists both in the learner and the learning context (Ellis 1986:251). With no psychology of second language learning available, researchers of SLD still extrapolate from general learning theory to account for an enormous number of issues which still remain unsettled in the field.

The main factor stimulating SLD research is, according to Ellis (ibid), the paradigm shift brought about in linguistic studies. After behaviorist account of language learning was discredited and the contrastive hypothesis, following Corder's seminal paper "the significance of learner's errors" (1967), was challenged by researchers who were concerned with the universal pattern of second language acquisition, the focus of attention shifted from

A central question in pragmatic theory is to describe how the participants in a verbal interaction construct a new context for every utterance. To answer this question, we have to consider the schema theory and also to remember that human cognition is relevance oriented. This means that in a verbal communication to the extent that one knows the cognitive environment of an individual, one can infer which assumptions he is likely to entertain and how a change in that environment might affect his train of thoughts. The assumptions and the conditions giving rise to the assumptions (perceptual schema) of the interlocutors are manifested through the particular language used. The language involved is like an ice-berg, a small portion of which is visible with the bigger part (underlying presuppositions) remaining hidden under water, inaccessible to linguistic enquiry. This reminds us once more of the fact that language is a complex phenomenon and that any linguistic account falls short of accounting for the whole truth.

Faced with the situation we are in and entrusted with the task of imparting a native-like competence to the L2 learner, we EFL teachers need to find a solution for this pedagogical problem, the

there is a gap between the semantic representation of sentences and the thoughts actually communicated by utterance.³ This gap is filled not by mere coding, but by inference. Understanding a message is the result of inferential and decoding processes which are quite different. An inferential process, according to Sperber and Wilson (1987:10), takes a set of premises as input and yields as output a set of conclusions which follow logically from the premises. A decoding process, however, takes a signal as input and yields as output a message associated with the signal by an underlying code. The set of premises used in interpreting an utterance constitutes, in the authors' word, the context. Thus, a context is a psychological construct, a subset of the interlocutor's assumptions about the world.

-
- 3) The study of the semantic representation of sentences belong to grammar; the study of the interpretation of utterances belongs to pragmatics. To put it in other words, the linguistic sign in the sentence functions as a symbol and in the utterance as an index.

whole meaning potential of his language and also employs procedures for making sense. To illustrate the point consider the following lines by Emily Dickerson:

Because I could not stop for Death.
He Kindly stopped for me'
The carriage held but just ourselves
And immortality.

Here the inanimate noun 'Death' is referred to by the anaphoric pronoun 'he' which is inadmissible in the analyst's description of language because his abstract rules will not allow 'death' to possess the semantic feature '+animate'. Interestingly enough, this outlandish use of language, a simple specimen of all that happens in poetry, is not only comprehensible in the context in which it is used, but also it enhances the beauty of expression through the subtle shading of meaning which cannot be captured by the linguist's abstract rules.

This issue is also discussed by Sperber and Wilson (1987) in their scholarly paper: "precis of Relevance: Communication and cognition." The authors have argued that much recent work in psycholinguistics, pragmatics and the psychology of language shows that

which represents a distinct mode of reality. The analyst represents language in terms of an abstract system by devising a model which conforms to principles of scientific inquiry. The analyst's model must, according to the author, be precise, and precision is achieved by the observer taking up a detached position. In the user's model, meanings, negotiations of which lies at the heart of communicative behavior, are worked out by interactive endeavour. In this model, communicative behaviour is vague, imprecise and ambiguous because it draws on resources for meaning in the language which cannot be reduced to linguistic rules. To put it in other words, competence in Chomskyan sense is a set of abstract rules which are manifested through analytic models of description. Performance is a realization of language resources for communicative purposes. Some of these resources will, according to Chomsky (1965), correspond to rules specified by the linguist analyst, in which case the rules can be said to have psychological validity. In other cases, however, the speaker will use communicative procedures which cannot be accounted for by the analyst. Widdowson (1986:11) has posited the fact that the analyst's rules represent an ideal knowledge system; the user's model draws on the

There is consensus among linguists and teachers that meaning is a product of both linguistic knowledge and pragmatic knowledge (awareness of inferential principles). The distinction made between these two types of knowledge is similar to the distinction made between 'language' and 'parole', which, in a sense correlate with "the linguist's meaning" and "the speaker's meaning," respectively. Both types of knowledge deal with meaning, the difference being related to two different uses of verb 'mean' : what does X mean? What do you mean by X? Meaning in semantics, therefore, is a property that an utterance has, but in pragmatics, it is a relation which meaning has with the speaker. For instance, "What a nice fellow he is!" will convey its literal meaning in semantics, but in pragmatics the expression, depending on the speaker's intention, may have derogatory overtones. Leech (1974) has captured the distinction in a telling expression, namely, "semantics and pragmatics have a dual and trirelation with meaning, respectively."

Widdowson (1986), in an article entitled: "Applied linguistics: The pursuit of Relevance." examines two approaches of study to meaning: the analyst's model and the user's model, either of

through pragmatic knowledge with utterance indices playing the major role. R. Hasan (1990:76) has observed that "exophorically interpreted implicit devices create an opaque link between the text and its context so far as speakers outside the context are concerned." It is natural to see the communicative function of language diminishes when two persons, familiar with each other's inner worlds, say very little but mean a lot, thus the speech looks to the outsider.*

* S. Vygotsky (1973:141) says mutual understanding can be achieved through utterly abbreviated speech when the subject is the same in two minds; total misunderstanding may occur even with full speech when people's thoughts wander in different directions. Widdowson (op cit, 102) shares the same view: "people who have particular knowledge and experience in common, whose contextual realities... are closely congruent, will manage to communicate by engaging relevant aspects of contexts with only sparing use of linguistic resources at their disposal... Those who have little in common have to place greater reliance on the language."

1.4. Symbolic vs Inferential Meaning in Verbal Exchanges.

Widdowson(1986), in a paper; "English in Training and Education" has distinguished two types of knowledge: systemic/symbolic knowledge signalled by language symbols and their combination in sentences, and inferential/indexical knowledge which is achieved by means of linguistic signs treated as indicators to the meaning sources in the context of the immediate situation of utterance or in the context of our knowledge and experience. "The symbols of the sentence carry their meaning with them. The indices of the utterance draw our attention to where meaning might be found outside themselves, and direct us to conjure up a situation, a state of affairs, to which they could conceivably refer" (P.203). This is similar to Halliday's and Hasan's positions concerning the implicit encoding devices employed in a text. The source for interpretation of such devices could either be co-textual or purely contextual. The interpretation of an implicit device, when carried out within the co-text, is endophoric (with two referential types of anaphoric and cataphoric) and it is exophoric when the source for the interpretation of the implicit device lies outside the co-text. In the latter case, communication objective is achieved

6) She makes such good coffee that it's impossible to drink only one cup.

The subordinate clause of result — (that) 'it's impossible to drink only one cup. — when considered separately, has a negative meaning; but when it is joined to the main clause with the subordinator 'such...that,' the same subordinate clause implies an opposite meaning, namely, one is not content with drinking only one cup of coffee.

The examples proliferate but the few ones cited will suffice to substantiate the fact that there are many subtleties of meaning which do not lend themselves to formal linguistic treatment without being semantically distorted. Furthermore, studies on SLA have provided ample evidence to the indication that formal language teaching does not contribute enough (and in Krashen's view it never does) to the development of communicative competence to be of considerable use in spontaneous verbal communication. This is a problem in second language methodology but what is the solution? We will take up this issue in the final section of this paper after we have discussed the two facets of meaning in verbal communication in the section below.

(Johnson-Laird, 1983, quoted by Widdowson, loc cit).
Some of the lexical entries can be predicated, according to McCawley, on the basis of the existing lexical items. McCawley, following G. Lakoff (1968a) has called this phenomenon 'reification'.

4a) John's dissertation deals with premarital affairs.

4b) John's dissertation weighs five pounds.

The word 'dissertation' in (4b) is an example of reification, i.e. it is treated as a object rather than an abstract noun as in (4a).

Lakoff makes the distinction clearer by the following example;

5a) *James Bond broke the window with himself.

5b) James Bond broke the window with itself.

In (5a) it is understood that James Bond broke the window with a push given by his body; therefore, it is incorrect to use the reflexive pronoun 'himself' because it requires an animate subject.

The asterisk (*) is used to indicate that the sentence is incorrect.

implies an affirmative meaning. And if we treat the sentence in terms of explicit rules we will strip it of its peculiar feature hence impoverishing the communicative ability of language.

2) John is not rich, but he is handsome.

The clause 'John is not rich', though negative, has the presupposition-'John is rich'. We intuitively expect that the second clause joined by the coordinator 'but' should read like 'but he is poor' because the logical relationship between the two clauses is that of contrast and this relationship is expressed by words such as 'but', 'yet', 'however' 'nevertheless', 'still', 'while', 'although' 'on the contrary... and sometimes through words which are opposite in meaning.

3) This coat is warm.

This sentence, like (2), implies two different meanings: (a) The coat itself is warm, and (b) The coat keeps (the body) warm. McCawley (1976) gives (3) to illustrate the fact that no language contains all the lexical entries in its lexicon. A dictionary does not record meanings which are within the competence of all language users. It is a truism that "we understand and use words in context whose meanings we do not know in any exact sense,"

1.3. Meaning Is More Than Its Constituents

Today it is generally held that the meaning of a sentence is not merely the sum of the meanings of its constituting parts; rather the way in which the parts of the sentence are arranged together with the function marks plays an important role in determining the meaning of the sentence. The following examples, some of which are given by McCawley (1976), represent aspects of meaning that have not, to the best of my knowledge, been fully accounted for by linguistic theories. We consider these examples important because they can be used to show the inadequacy of linguistic knowledge to draw on for classroom SLD hence the necessity of looking for a solution, based on either intuition or teaching experience, which we have realised in terms of exposing L2 learners to TL texts reflecting negotiations of meaning through verbal interactions.

Here follows a few examples:

1) John does not beat his wife because he loves her.

The implicit meaning of (1) (not to mention the straight forward denotative meaning) is that 'John beats his wife but not because he loves her. It is interesting to note that the negative statement

guarantee identity of linguistic behavior. It is not surprising, therefore, to learn of Fodor's view to the effect that "in studying meaning we have to rely heavily on intuition and when it comes to formulizing these intuitions we find that while it may be hard to devise any representation system for some aspects of meaning, for many others there is an embarrassment of apparently distinct alternatives." (1977:271).

To Wittgenstein, the meaning of a word is its use in the language. "Don't ask for the meaning, ask for its use" (1953). He views language not as an abstract calculus but as a tool, and just like a hammer or a can opener, the proper characterization of a linguistic expression must include an account of how it is used and what it is used for. The theory of meaning as use, though promises to integrate naturally with the linguist's approach to language description, suffers from a flaw in the sense that the notion language use must be constrained in some way if it is to prove useful. The expressions 'fish and chips' and 'chips and fish', for example, mean the same, though the rule involved generates only the first expression.

finds these identity theories inadequate as they do not give, according to the author, correct answers to the question of what 'meaning' is.² For example, the two phrases: 'the morning star' and 'the evening star' both refer to the same thing, the planet venus, but they do not mean the same. Thus identity of reference is not a sufficient condition for identity of meaning. In ideational approach to meaning it is said that two expressions have the same meaning if they are associated with the same idea. In the ideational theory, therefore, the two expressions: 'the morning star', and 'the evening star' have different meanings as they are connected with two different ideas. In behavioral theory of meaning, the meaning of an expression is said to be the stimulus situation that evokes its utterance and/or the response which it elicits from the hearer. This theory, too, is implausible because identity of stimulus situation does not

-
- 2) The meaning of an expression is said to be what the expression refers to (referential), or the idea associated with it in a person's mind (ideational), or the stimuli which elicit utterances or evoke behavioral responses (behavioral).

it is the pragmatic/implicit meaning that has proved 'a hard nut to crack' and the linguist who sought to treat semantics in terms of precise, clear linguistic rules (similar to what is going on in exact sciences) got bogged down, like generative semanticists, who were frustrated in their aspirations. Robins (1980), in his brief discussion of semantics, points out three different types of meaning: lexical, syntactical, and extralinguistic, and argues that for verbal communication to be effective the speaker will need to know not only the lexical as well as the structural meaning but awareness of the social context of language use is also needed. "Our concepts of meaning provides us," says Widdowson (op cit, 102), "with bearings on what words mean in context and the context in turn provides us with evidence for extending our conceptual representations of these meanings." Continuing the discussion, Widdowson posits the fact that symbolic meanings inhere in the signs themselves and indexical meanings are achieved by language user associating symbols with some relevant aspect of the world outside the language.

Janet Fodor (1977), while examining theories of meaning, discusses three theories of meaning, the referential, the ideational, and the behavioral and

component in the linguistic system, expresses the view that "the fundamental task of the semantic component is to match the sequences of a language with their proper meanings...The semantic component must also account for the native speaker's ability to understand the pre-suppositions of a sequence as part of its meaning." Widdowson(1991:99-114)in his paper 'The Negotiation of Meaning' gives a detailed discussion of the issue involved, saying:

"...Understanding what people mean by what they say is not the same as understanding the linguistic expressions they use in saying it... A sentence has only one invariant meaning, or if it has more than one, as in the case of structural or lexical ambiguity, the meaning can be exactly specified. Utterances, on the other hand, are protean in character. Their meanings change continuously to suit the circumstances in which they were used...The conventional meaning of linguistic signs, and their contributions in sentences, constitutes **types** of conceptualization codified as linguistic knowledge and the **tokens** of particular and actualized instances must clearly be set in correspondence with them."

It is worth noting that in the discussion concerning knowledge of grammatical rules (systemic knowledge) and putting this knowledge to appropriate uses in verbal interactions (operational knowledge),

A few examples of the attempts made by linguists will illustrate the diversity of the views expressed on the issue and will provide the rationale for the methodology which we intend to suggest in a bid to help the second language teacher out of the 'troubled waters' he is in.

1.2.Views on the Meaning of Meaning

Halliday and Hasan (1990:44) have defined meaning in terms of two metafunctions of systemic theory: interpersonal and ideational — the former is doing the function and the latter is the learning or thinking function. They have also considered a third metafunctional component of meaning in language to which there is no corresponding function in the sense of 'use'; it is referred to as textual meaning, which "enables the discourse to cohere not only with itself but also with its context of situation"(P.45).

A.Akmajian, et al(1984:238) have given twelve sentences, each containing the word 'mean' with a different meaning and have only discussed two uses of the word, exemplifying two important types of meaning: linguistic meaning and speaker's meaning. Elgin(1979:29), while examining the semantic

straight forward answer similar to the question "What is the capital of France?" to which the direct answer " Paris" can be given. The question "what is meaning?" is a theoretical one, like "What is light?" or "What is electricity?" and the answer given is itself a whole theory.

Linguists and philogophers who have dealt with semantics have found it possible to give some sort of condensed answer to the question 'What is meaning?' by equating it with something else, e.g. reference, disposition to use words correctly, stimuli that elicit and control verbal refences, a body of platonic archetypes, mental images so connected with words as to serve their external sensible signs, and so on. Few saw, according to J.Katz, the necessity of going further, of taking the approach of theory construction, or attempting to work out an answer in the way that scientists do in their fields of expertise. It is, therefore, natural to find a multiude of views, in many cases in direct opposition to one another, on semantics; and language pedagogy, drawing on these speculations is caught in a perplexed state of indicision as to how to help the L2 learners develop communicative competence in the tutored settings of language teaching.

- 1) Mary means well.
- 2) That red flag means danger.
- 3) Smoke means fire.
- 4) John means trouble.

While (1) implies that Mary intends no harm, the notion of intention would be lacking in (2). In both (2) and (3) one thing is said to be a sign of something else; yet there is an important difference between the two cases: whereas smoke is a natural sign of fire, the red flag is a conventional sign of danger; it is a culturally established symbol. According to Lyons, these distinctions between the intentional and non-intentional, on the one hand and between what is natural and what is conventional, on the other hand play a central part in the theoretical investigation of meaning.

Some linguists and philosophers in their study of meaning have suffered from misconceptions about how the study of meaning should best proceed. J. Katz (1972:2) has aptly pointed out that the question of what meaning is does not admit of a direct and

threatening, expressing surprise, ... (i.e. perform different communicative acts) depending on the social contexts in which it is used.

hence open to the imagination of the specularor.

Linguists in their discussion of the meaning of meaning have shown different aspects of the issue. John Lyons (1986:13) gives the following examples to illustrate the point:

and Lehtonen, 1979). The choice of the model involves a choice between a static conception of language and a dynamic one — the distinction which has been captured by various polemic terminologies: structural vs operational modelling of the chain of speech (Lehtonen, 1978; Davis, 1978), referential meaning vs inferential meaning (Janet Fodor, 1977), linguist's meaning vs speaker's meaning (Widdowson, 1986), locutionary/propositional meaning vs illocutionary/pragmatic meaning (Austin 1962; Searl, 1969), and so on. While the structural model aims at describing the language as a set of rules abstracted and idealized from language data, the dynamic view presupposes that "grammatical rules have to be regarded only as description of certain regular structures of language, which function primarily as constraints, and not as models for the mental processes in operation when people are speaking or listening to speech." (K. Sajavaara 1981:107). The underlined part of the quotation (which is mine) sheds light on the interpretation of psychological reality of linguistic rules, namely, to what extent a speaker's language behaviour represents his linguistic knowledge. Many examples can be cited pointing to the division which is often found existing between the propositional meaning of a sentence in isolation and its pragmatic meaning in discourse. A simple statement such as 'You are not going out' may imply prohibition, confirmation,

aspects which do not lend themselves to formulization hence liable to be acquired subconsciously rather than learned at a conscious level.

There is consensus among linguists that the main question in semantic studies is "What is meaning?" But at this point agreement ends and interminable controversies crop up as soon as the scholars address themselves to the elusive nature of meaning. The mental operations that take place in the course of matching with their meanings are not available for observation; therefore, semanticists, in their attempt to describe the semantic component of human verbal interaction, present a symbolic model of such an interaction — the model which does not have a psychological reality¹,

1-D.B.Brown(1981)has given the following definition of psychological reality—"The degree to which a theory accurately accounts for actual behavior." To offer a tangible view of psychological reality, we may refer to the distinction made between a linguistically-orientated and communicatively-oriented approaches to the processes of production and reception. A linguistically-oriented approach aims at explaining how a linguistic representation results in speech output or is derived from speech input; a communicative approach describes how a speaker utilizes his linguistic rules to express his meaning, how his interlocutor deciphers the speaker's intentions, and how these two interact in particular situations of communication(Sajavaara

in various social settings(vicarious of its very nature) making it possible for him to make inferences from the situation to the text, and from the text to the situation, the phenomenon which characterizes natural communication through language.

1.1 Semantic Studies in Linguistics

Linguistics has shied away from semantic problems and has occupied itself instead with phonology, Syntax and sometimes, with lexicon. The focus of research has always shifted to manageable problems and those that are found "unmanageable", as in the case of semantic phenomena, have receded further from the attention of linguistic community though we English teachers are constantly reminded that the ability to express one's meaning fluently and to understand the meaning expressed by the participant(s) is the ultimate goal which the L2 pedagogy should strive to achieve — a paradoxical situaion! However, in the few exemplary studies which are devoted to the discussions of semantics we come across some interesting aspects of meaning which, due to their illocutionary force/pragmatic effect in verbal communication, defy formal treatment,

the language proficiency of L2 Learner and along the lines of his interests,abounds in a great number of man's social settings, the features of which correlate with the features of the text.The great variety of human interactions through language is too immense to be captured by linguists' efforts,and despite the so many SLD models, second language pedagogy is still suffering from the lack of a sound theoretical base. This is the reason why I am inclined to side with the educational linguists who,while using their own initiative and language teaching experience,try to come up with solutions for pedagogical problems rather than wait for the linguist's pronouncements on the nature of language or language teaching methods in order to achieve performance objectives. Faced with a multitude of views expressed by linguists, phiologists, logicians, literary critics ... on what MEANING* is,I venture to suggest a methodology based on self-motivated reading literary works which will place our presumptive L2 learner

* See: "An Overview of Meaning in Linguistic Studies," by B.Azabdaftari,Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities, University of Tabriz, Serial No.146,1993.

for the various facets of verbal exchanges in natural communication situations. It is, therefore true, to say that theoretical speculations on Language pedagogy, partially based on linguistic principles and partially based on the principles of psychology of learning, cannot be relied on as supportive of the teacher's efforts, who aims at helping the L2 learner achieve a native-like communicative competence. The insufficiency of linguistic knowledge, on the one hand and of psychological knowledge of language learning, on the other hand prompts me to look for a way out of the problematic situation of second Language instruction where the teacher is left with no psychology of second language teaching, with no comprehensive linguistic theory and, indeed, in many cases is faced with contradictory pronouncements on methods of Language pedagogy.

In the second part we intend to suggest a methodology by means of which the teacher can help the learner build up his L2 competence through getting him submerged in the TL text which is, in Halliday's words. (1990:57)"an instance of the process and product of social meaning in a particular context of situation." English Literature (especially novels and short stories) which is compatible with

Behrooz Azabdaftari, Ph.D.*

**Acquisition of Semantic Complexities:
Extensive Reading as Psycholinguistic Mediation
in L2 Settings****

0.1. Introduction:

This paper comprises two major parts. In the first part the paper seeks to present, through exemplification, some of the semantic phenomena in Language studies in an attempt to show the Linguistic theories, committed as they are to explain the nature of Language, generally fall short of accounting

* University of Tabriz

**This paper was presented at the 11th International Conference of Applied Linguistics (AILA), University of Jyväskylä, Finland, August 4-9, 1996.