

Meaning in Semantics

Asst . Lect . Marwa Khashan Ebadi

MarwaKhashanEbadi@utq.edu.iq

Department of English , College of Education for Human
Sciences , University of Thi-Qar , Thi – Qar , Iraq

Abstract

Semantics can be defined as a branch of linguistics which deals with the meaning of words , phrases and sentences . In semantics , there is always an effort to shed light on what the words traditionally mean , rather than on what an individual speaker might intend them to mean something in a specific situation . This approach is concerned with objective or general meaning and not with subjective or local meaning . So , meaning as the core of the study of semantics has been recently received sustained attention in order to explore its nature , its definitions , types , levels , theories over the daily life . This research comes with an adequate , sufficient , and satisfactory explanation about the concept of meaning and its importance in semantics .

Key words : Semantics , meaning , types of meaning , and theories of meaning .

المعنى في علم المعاني

م.م مروة خشان عبادي

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية / كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية / جامعة ذي /العراق

الملخص :

علم المعاني يمكن تعريفه بأنه فرع من اللسانيات والذي يتعامل مع معنى الكلمات ، العبارات والجمل . في هذا العلم هنالك دائما جهد لتسليط الضوء على ماذا تعني الكلمات أصطلاحيا وليس على ما ينوي أو يقصد المتحدث تلك الكلمات لتعني شيئا ما في موقف معين أو محدد . هذه الطريقة ترتبط بالمعنى الموضوعي أو العام وليس المعنى غير الموضوعي أو المحلي . وبناءا على ذلك فإن المعنى كجوهر أساسي لعلم المعاني حاز على اهتمام مبالغ وواسع من اجل معرفة طبيعته ، تعريفاته ، ومغزاه وفحواه ، أنواعه ، نظرياته في مجمل ومعتك الحياة اليومية . هذا البحث جاء بشرح وافى وكافي ومرضي عن ماهية ومفهوم المعنى وأهميته في علم المعاني .

١ . Introduction

Semantics is the study of meaning in language . The emergence of this branch of linguistics can be traced back to the French philologist (a language historian) **Michel Breal** in ١٨٨٣ . He was the first person to use the word semantics (French , *semantique*) in the late ١٩th century (Riemer , ٢٠١٠ : ٤) .

Like many other names of branches of linguistics , the word semantics has its roots and orientation in the ancient writings of Greek thinkers and philosophers from the ٥th century BC onwards . Semantics comes from the ancient Greek word " *semantikos* " , which is an adjective means " relating to signs " , based on the name " *semeion* " which means " sign " (*ibid*) .

٢ . What is Meaning

Language is considered to be the first and the important means of communication among people . People cannot keep in touch without the use of language in any daily life routine or task because through language they can express their feelings , needs , or basically reflect what they actually want to express . Language needs meaning to be expressed in a smoothly way but meaning exists in our minds and thus we need to express what's in our minds by using a form of verbal (vocal) communication whether it is a spoken or a written form to send and receive our messages or by using a form of non – verbal (non – vocal) communication such as (social distance , gestures , facial expressions , etc .) .

Since semantics is dedicated to be the study of meaning in language , a question has been raised about the essence of meaning , " What is meaning ? " , or " What does meaning mean ? " .

Lobner (٢٠٠٢ : ٣) states that meaning is a notion with a large assortment of applications , some of which belong to the area of semantics while others lie beyond it .

He (*ibid*) clarifies that meaning is always the meaning of something . Words , phrases , and sentences have meanings , but actions may have meaning too . For example , if a government applies a certain policy , we may ask what the purpose is beyond this and what the meaning is if doing so . The meaning of a deed or an action is what impression it makes , or what intention it serves or what it is useful for . Generally speaking , we adopt the notion of meaning to all kinds of studies and phenomena that we try to give explanation and interpretation of , wondering what is the " meaning " of them all .

Crystal (٢٠٠٨ : ٢٩٨) points out that meaning is a basic notion used in linguistics both as a datum and as a criterion of analysis . Linguists study meaning and use it as a criterion for studying other components of language .

Kroeger (٢٠١٩ : ٨) declares that in order to answer this crucial question about the entity and existence of meaning , an approach has proved its usefulness for the linguistic analysis of meaning . This approach focused on how speakers use language to talk about the world . For example , the phrase " yellow submarine " , knowing the meaning of words like " yellow " and " submarine " helps us to identify the genre of objects in a specific domain , or universe of discourse , which those words can be utilized to refer to , that is " yellow " as a kind of colours and " submarine " as a kind of watercraft capable of independent operation under water . Similarly , knowing the meaning of a sentence will help us to state whether that sentence is true in a particular area or not .

Obviously , sentence like " It is raining " is neither true nor false . When a speaker says this sentence at a particular time and place , we can look out the window and make sure whether the speaker is telling the truth or not . The sentence is true if its meaning coincides to the situation being described : is it raining at that time and place ? . This approach is called " Correspondence theory of truth " .

٣ . Types of Meaning

٣ . ١ Yule's Classification of Meaning

Yule (٢٠١٠ : ١١٣) divided meaning into two main types :

١ . Conceptual Meaning . Conceptual meaning can be defined as a type of meaning which covers the basic elements , which are in turn given by the literal use of a word . Dictionaries are categorized and revised to describe this type of meaning . For example , the meaning of the word " needle " might include " thin , sharp , steel instrument " .

٢ . Associative Meaning . Associative meaning can be defined as a type of meaning that people might connect with the actual use of words . For example , the word " needle " might associate with " pain , illness , blood , drugs , thread , knitting , etc . " These associations may differ from one to another .

٣ . ٢ Leech's Classification of Meaning

Leech (١٩٨١ : ٩) classified meaning into the following types :

١ . Conceptual Meaning . Sometimes called " denotative " or " cognitive " meaning . It is the essential or the core meaning which correlates to the primary

dictionary definition . Conceptual meaning deals with the core meaning of expression . It is the denotative or literal meaning .

٢ . Connotative Meaning . Connotative meaning is defined as the emotional associations (personal or communal) connected to a word . Its main application is with reference rather than with sense because reference concerned with the external – world status and truth – value of terms and lexical items . For example , the connotative meaning of the word " December " might include (bad weather , dark evenings , parties , Christmas , etc.) .

٣ . Social Meaning . Social meaning refers to the cultural and social factors that affect the explanation of language beyond its literal meaning. This type of meaning includes a wide range of aspects such as education , cultural values , social status , and the social relationship between the speaker and the hearer .

٤ . Affective Meaning . This type of meaning relates to the speaker's feelings and attitudes towards the world he / she is talking about . Affective meaning depends completely on the speaker's point of view . Therefore , whatever feelings and emotions the speaker carries will convey a meaning that may be different than another person's experience .

٥ . Thematic Meaning . This type of meaning is usually found in literary works and it is conveyed through many literary devices such as symbolism , allegory , imagery , and metaphor . So , thematic meaning can be defined as an implied message an author wants to hand over through his work . It can be derived from a long piece of writing through precise analysis of a specific concept .

٦ . Reflected Meaning . This type of meaning is defined as a phenomenon in which a single word or phrase has more one sense or conceptual meaning due to the existence of multiple concepts in the word . Meaning that appears can be described as a result of many conceptual meanings , such as when one sense of a word or a phrase is part of our response to another .

٧ . Collocative Meaning . It is a type of meaning in which a word or an expression is associated with other words in a text . For example , pick axe , wheel barrow , measuring tape , and trowel collocate with construction tools . Collocative meaning can be very predictable depending on the group of words that are occurred together .

٣ . ٣ Al khuli's Classification of Meaning

Al khuli (٢٠٠٢ : ٩٥ – ١٠٩) classified meaning into the following types:

١ . Analytical Meaning . It is a type of meaning in which the truth – value is deduced from the elements of the sentence being spoken or written . The sentence

is always true by itself , totally true , true by the nature of relations among the elements inside the sentence . Look at these sentences :

- (١) The elephant is an animal .
(٢) Lettuce is a kind of vegetables .
(٣) The woman is a female .

If we examine sentences (١ - ٣) , we notice that each sentence is true because there is no elephant which is not an animal , there is no lettuce which is not a kind of vegetables and also there is no woman who is not a female . So , we do not need additional explanation to prove the truth of these sentences .

٢ . Synthetic Meaning . It is a type of meaning in which the truth _ value of the sentence cannot be elicited only by its elements . That is , we cannot judge the truth or falsity of the sentence depending on its internal language . We have to examine its truth outside the sentence itself . Look at these sentences below :

- (٤) John is forty years old .
(٥) His father is a lawyer .
(٦) Salim's cumulative average is ٧٩ .

If we examine sentences (٤ _ ٦) , we find that there is nothing in the sentence itself determining whether it is true or false . We have to make external investigation to verify the truth of these sentences .

٣ . Lexical Meaning . This type of meaning is considered to be a part of sentence meaning . It is provided by words or lexemes . If a word in a sentence is substituted by another non - synonymous word , the sentence meaning will be changed . The more words are substituted in the sentence , the larger the change in sentence meaning will be .

٤ . Grammatical Meaning . This type of meaning can be defined as the part of meaning that varies from one construction to another . It is divided into two sub - types :

٤ . ١ Morphological Meaning . It is part of grammatical meaning and it is usually represented by prefixes , infixes , derivational suffixes , and inflectional suffixes added to the word . For example :

- (٧) a . I feel happy .
b . I live in happiness .

From the sentences above , we can notice how the meaning changes from one sentence to another according to the type of derivational and inflectional morphemes .

٤ . ٢ Syntactic Meaning . It is another type of grammatical meaning , and it is basically represented by word order inside the sentence .

(٩) a . The lion killed the man .

b . The man killed the lion .

From the sentences above , we find that the two sentences have the same words , but they actually have different meaning and the difference in meaning is caused by word order .

٥ . Relative Meaning . This type of meaning is concerned with relativity , that is , all languages have relative words and these words have relative meanings . Such as (near , far , small , large , easy , difficult , short , tall , black , white , clean , dirty , etc.) . What makes this type of meaning is distinguishable is that relativity differs in several ways :

a . The judgment about such words differs from one speaker to another . What is " near " in this speaker's opinion may be " far " in another speaker's opinion .

b . The meaning of such words differs from time to time , the meaning does not have a stable criterion . That is , what you judge as " heavy " in the past may be now judged as " light " by yourself . The judgment slightly depends on the situation and the psychological mood of the individual .

c . The meaning of such words is slightly reliant on what is being described . For instance , a small elephant is quite larger than a large mouse .

٦ . Psychological Meaning . A word usually has a primary meaning , i. e. , the meaning that is written in dictionary . It is an observational common meaning used by all native speakers of a specific language .

Therefore , some words have a kind of psychological meaning or emotional meaning , e.g. , (home , father , mother , brother , friendship, etc.) . Actually , the father is the male parent , but psychologically , father is an instructor , advisor , a protector , etc. , . The psychological meaning is different from one language to another in several ways as illustrated below :

a . The psychological meaning of a word may be " general " , i.e., familiar to all native speakers of a specific language , e.g., the meaning of words such as (father , mother brother , sun , and daughter) .

b . The psychological meaning may be " special " , i.e., reliant on a specific individual's experience . For example , a " dog " may become a terrible symbol to a kid once bitten by a dog .

c . Psychological meaning of words may be " positive " if they are linked with positive emotions like (friendship , happiness , integrity , faith , loyalty , and honesty) .

d . Psychological meaning of words may be " negative " if they are linked with negative emotions such as (fear , anger , loneliness , hate , sadness , jealousy , guilt , and apathy) .

٧ . Literal Meaning . The literal meaning of a word is its original , primary , meaning . It is the most obvious meaning of a word , not figurative or metaphorical . For example :

(١٠) They cornered him , and he couldn't runaway .

From the above sentence , we notice that the cornering is literal : they pursued him , and in the end he was in the corner unable to escape away .

٨ . Figurative Meaning . The figurative meaning of a word is a meaning that is not literal ; but it is the metaphorical , idiomatic , or ironic meaning of a word or an explanation . For example :

(١١) They cornered him , and he couldn't deny .

From the above sentence , we find that the cornering is figurative : they faced him with evidences , and in the end he was unable to deny these evidences .

٩ . Basic Meaning . Sometimes called " primary " or " conceptual " meaning . This is the basic or dictionary definition of a word or an explanation , without extra context or explanation .

١٠ . Secondary Meaning . Sometimes called " additional " or "associative" meaning . This is the additional meaning of a word or an explanation besides its basic meaning . It is said to be not central but supplemental meaning . Look at these sentences :

(١٢) They behaved like sheep . (submissive)

(١٣) He was like a rabbit . (coward)

(١٤) They fought like lions . (courageous)

From the sentences above , we notice that the basic meaning of " sheep " does not include " submissive " , which is another secondary meaning of the word . So is the same with the two later sentences , each of which has an additional meaning not already available in its basic meaning .

١١ . Stylistic Meaning . It is the type of meaning that determines the stylistic level of the word . It indicates whether the word is formal , standard , colloquial , slang , poetic , or terminological . For instance , " aunt " is more formal than " auntie " . Consider these pairs of words : side / margin , explain / illustrate , ask / enquire ,

help / assist , wrong / incorrect , small / diminutive , important / significant . If we look at each pair , we can smoothly find that the first word is less formal than the second . This formality level of the word is denoted by its stylistic meaning .

١٢ . Echoic Meaning . It is the type of meaning in which some words elucidate a part of their meaning in their phonetic structure . Such words are often called " onomatopoeic words " , such as clang , buzz , hiss , splash , bang , blech , quack , screech , beep , crash , drizzle , hiccup , and meow . Such words are available in all languages although they are few in number . The general rule is that most words do not display a reasonable relation between their phonetic structures and their meanings , such relation is usually a randomly one . Why is a book called " a book " , a pencil , " a pencil " , or a table " a table " ? . There is no vivid reason at all .

٤ . Theories of Meaning

٤ . ١ Lyon's Theories of Meaning

Lyon (١٩٩٥ : ٤٠) mentioned the following theories of meaning :

- ١ . The Referential or Denotational Theory . The meaning of an expression is what it refers to or denotes .
- ٢ . The Ideational or Mentalistic Theory . The meaning of an expression is the idea , thought , or the concept , correlated with it in the mind of any individual who knows and understands the expression .
- ٣ . The Behaviorist Theory . The meaning of an expression is either the stimulus that arouses it or the response that it arouses , or an incorporation of both , on specific cases of an utterance .
- ٤ . The Meaning – is – Use Theory . The meaning of an expression is marked by , if not identical with , its usage in language .
- ٥ . The Verification Theory . The meaning of an expression , if it has one , is marked by the verifiability of the sentences , or suggestions , that is containing it .
- ٦ . The Truth – Conditional Theory . The meaning of an expression is its participation to the truth – conditional of the sentence , which is containing it .

٤ . ٢ Riemer's Theories of Meaning

Riemer (٢٠١٠ : ٢٥ – ٣٧) illustrated the following theories of meaning :

٤ . ٢ . ١ Meaning as referents / denotations

The basic essence of this theory is to stress the role of the referent or denotation as the main constituent of the meaning of a linguistic utterance or expression . Under this theory , meta language interpretations of a meaning should be considered as names of the referents of the object language term . In any

English discourse , it is very important to draw an implicit identification between an utterance's meaning and its referent :

(١٦) In Sydney , " the bridge " means the Harbour Bridge .

The speaker of this sentence is correlating the meaning of the word " bridge " with its referent or denotation , which is the " Sydney Harbour Bridge " . This identification of meaning and referent / denotation helps in breaking the definitional circle because it correlates meaning with non- linguistic objects in the world : the meaning of " bridge " in a specific case of use is the real bolts and metal construction .

Like any ordinary theory , the referential theory of meaning has three main weak points or problems . They are :

The first problem is that the identification between meaning and referents might be useful in breaking the identification circle , but it leads to a very separated perspective about the nature of language : on the referential theory of meaning , " bridge " has as many different meanings as it has different referents . This variety encounters with our natural intuition that the meaning of " bridge " is in fact something much more unified : although there are many different individual bridges out there in the world , the meaning of the world " bridge " is still a unified , single entity .

The second problem deals with the idea that an expression's meaning is its referents or denotations is easy to apply for nouns referring to discrete , concrete things but what about the referents of abstract nouns like freedom , generosity , wealth , justice , bravery , and others ? . Since there is no an undividable object in the world to which these abstract nouns refer , the notion of a referent is rather very difficult to invoke . The same thing is applied with adjectives like (sweet , bright , soft , sharp , dark) and verbs like (to have , to allow , or to go) . In the case of " grammatical words " , the problem is very greater : what is the denotation of " of " or " of the " ? . These cases all cause problems for the referential theory of meaning : because some words have no referents or denotations , they are left without any specific meaning .

The third problem concentrates on the fact that a single referent may be referred to by a variety of different expressions . Thus , the expressions in the two below sentences refer to a single entity .

(١٧) The first country to adopt a law requiring parental leave ; the home country of IKEA .

(١٨) Institution for lending money ; institution for depositing money .

In (١٧) we have alternative ways to refer to Sweden , in (١٨) also different expressions to refer to the word " bank " .

Sometimes it happens that the objects referred to by the expressions have the same denotation but they actually don't have the same sense as in (١٨) , the expressions " institution for lending money " and " institution for depositing money " refer to the same thing " **bank** " , but let's imagine a bank which suddenly stopped lending money even though it continued to accept deposits as it happened during the Argentinian financial crises of ٢٠٠٢ and the global one of ٢٠٠٨ . So , if meaning is referent or denotation , then expressions like these should not be reasonable . The fact that linguistic expressions can be identical in reference but different in meaning leaves us no option or no way out to come to the point that there is more to meaning than referent / denotation .

٤ . ٢ . ٢ Meaning as concepts / mental representations

The main core of this theory is that to identify meanings with concepts . In this theory , the meta language definitions of an object language meaning are the names of the concepts connected with the object language term .

Concepts can be considered to be a way of talking about the basic components of thought . The assumption that meanings are concepts has an attractive attention which is to be considered as strength points of this theory . They are :

First , this theory answers to the intuition that language is confidentially attached to the rest of our mental lives . It does seem exactly to be because of the thoughts and concepts we have that we use the words we use . If an individual says " horse – drawn carriages are old – fashioned " , then this assumption will often be because this is precisely what he / she thinks : he / she is matching a link between the concepts " horse – drawn carriages " and the concept " old – fashioned " . Language and thought are very difficult to separate gently even we do or do not always think " in language " , we usually need to use language to manifest the results of our thought , to carry these results to the public field for the aims of communication , and it sounds to be in language that the majority of our ideas can be given their most exact form .

Second , the conceptual theory of meaning has been used to illustrate compositionality and relations between meanings . Thus , the concept " horse – drawn carriage " can be taken as built up from the concepts " horse " and the concept " carriage " , as well as the word " drawn " . Equivalently , the meaning of the linguistic expression " horse _ drawn carriage " has these three parts , and they can be separately changed to make different expressions with different meanings .

In such matters , we can elucidate the changed meanings as correlating to changed concepts . Thus , instead of a " horse _ drawn carriage " , we can think of an " ox – drawn carriage " or a " horse _ drawn plough " : in these cases , we have replaced the concepts " ox " and " plough " with " horse " and " carriage " , and these replacements clarify the changed meaning of these expressions .

The conceptual theory of meaning also demonstrates specific other links between the words " horse _ drawn carriage " and other words . For instance , the expression " horse – drawn carriage " can be seen to be a member of the more inclusive concept " means of transport " , and is linked , by association , with such concepts as " coach man " , " passenger " , " reins " , " wheel " , etc.

Third , the theory that meanings are concepts guarantees the genuineness of communication . This arises from the fact that when two people are talking , agreeing or disagreeing about something , they are doing more than " playing with words " ; precisely , they are talking , agreeing or disagreeing about specific concepts , and these concepts are being compared and gradually adapted with each other during the process of alteration . And as the concepts are intricate , easy , common or un common , so are the meanings .

There are , however , three reasons which are considered to be weak points to the claim that meanings correspond to concepts . They are :

١ . Some words seem more intrinsically appropriate than others with an explanation of their meanings as concepts . Thus , while it seems quite reasonable to say that the meanings of " democracy " , " punctuation " , " panorama " or " love " are concepts , this move is less vivid for words such as " ouch " , " me " , " you " or " this " , or so – called " function words " , like " if " , " not " , " very " , etc. Words like these do not appear to be able to recall the rich range of associations and intrinsic connections which characterize " democracy " , " love " , etc . The point here is not to set aside the possibility that the meaning of all these words may actually correspond to concepts , but easily to suggest that the initial intuitive reasonableness of this is not as great .

٢ . Concepts , just like meanings , cannot appeared or identified un ambiguously . This means that their assumption is not directly manageable by objective , experimental means . Psychologists and psycholinguists have developed experiments in which the properties of specific theoretical concepts can be experimentally approved , but this has just been done for a part of words , mostly from famous languages , and , like any experimental results , the findings are open to a diversity of interpretations . It is therefore ambiguous whether the assumption

of concepts is scientifically proved or whether it is easily a term we have adopted from our intuitive , pre – theoretical views about the nature of our mental lives .

٣ . Even if an expression or an utterance's meaning can incompletely be identified with the concept it recalls , there must be more to it than that. For instance , if a speaker says " Wallace Stevens was a poet and an insurance broker " , he does not mean that his concept of " Wallace Stevens was a poet and an insurance broker " : he means that a certain real person , Wallace Stevens himself , was a part of what he means , is the actual , real – world person that his words refer to .

٤ . ٢ . ٣ **Meaning as brain states** . This theory concentrates on a natural thought about meaning which is understanding or intending a specific meaning should be having the neurons of one's brain in a specific configuration . From one point of view , this natural thought seems very reasonable because in the end language is a product of our brain . If we understand how the brain works , we will understand all the details of language .

Studying brain states will only tell us how language is implemented . As a result , meanings are inevitable as part of the interpretation of utterances . If an individual says " my head is killing me " , then part of the interpretation for his utterance involves his belief that his head hurts him , his desire to communicate this fact to the others , and the fact that those words convey that idea as " their meaning " . He could have expressed the same belief in a set of different ways , for instance by saying " I've got a migraine , or my headache's come back , or by clutching his head and saying the usual problem again in a long – suffering tone of voice . Because each of these utterances is expressed differently , they would correlate to different brain states . The fact is that even though the brain states are different , but these expressions or utterances are united in the similarities of the meanings they carry . Meanings are the thread that guides us through the diversity and disorders of brain states and input – output sequences ; only by recalling meanings we can correlate language to human behavior and psychology perfectly.

٤ . ٢ . ٤ **Meaning and use** . An alternative to the three previous theories is the theory which claims that a word's meaning shapes simply in the way it is used . This theory is called the use theory of meaning , and it has been advanced and developed by behaviorist psychologists such as Skinner (١٩٥٧) , and linguists such as Bloomfield (١٩٣٣) . Behaviorist supporters of the use theory generally refuse the notion that words have hidden , unnoticeable meanings : since meanings are intrinsically unnoticeable , it is unscientific to use them in interpretations . Use theorists have claimed that the only objective , scientific way

to explain language is to cancel suggesting un noticeable objects called meanings , and to pay attention only to what may in fact be noticed , the remarkable sequences of words and expressions that occur in real examples of language use , and to depict the relation between these linguistic forms and the attitudes in which they are used . Accordingly to these investigations , the explanatory task of semantics is to supply not an abstract characterization of meanings , whether they are concepts or denotations , but a causal , predictive account of the way a particular language is used .

Skinner (١٩٥٧ : ٥) (as cited in Riemer , ٢٠١٠ : ٣٦) demonstrated that what happens when an individual speaks or responds to speech is actually a question about human behavior , and the only correct way to answer it is to introduce an exact account of what linguistic behavior is possibly to be produced in different cases .

Bloomfield (١٩٣٣ : ١٣٩) (also cited in Riemer : ibid) stated that the only meaning a linguistic expression has is the event or situation in which the speaker utters it and the response which it evokes in the listener . For instance , the word " sorry " ; one of the meanings of " sorry " in English might be used in a situation where the speaker apologizes about something ; the listener's normal response will be to treat the utterance as an apology and behave consequently .

There is , however , an objection against the use theory of meaning . This objection arises from the mind – boggling diversity of the events or situations in which linguistic forms may be used , the sequence of different situations in which language is used is boundless or infinite . For instance , another meaning of " sorry " might be used to express sympathy for someone else who is suffering or has problems that have caused un happiness .

References

- Al Khuli , M , A. (٢٠٠٢) . An Introduction to Semantics . Amman : Dar Al – Falah .
- Bloomfield , L. (١٩٣٣) . Language . New York : Holt .
- Crystal , D . (٢٠٠٨) . A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics . (٦th edition) . Oxford : Blackwell .
- Kroeger , P, R . (٢٠١٩) . Analyzing Meaning : An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics . (٢nd edition) . Berlin : LSP.
- Leech , G . (١٩٨١) . Semantics . Harmondsworth : Penguin .
- Lobner , S. (٢٠١٣) . Understanding Semantics . (٢nd edition) . Penguin Books : England .

Lyons , J . (١٩٩٥) . Linguistic Semantics : An Introduction . (١st edition) . Cambridge : CUP .

Riemer , N . (٢٠١٠) . Introducing Semantics . (١st edition) . Cambridge : CUP .

Skinner , B . (١٩٥٧) . Verbal Behavior . New York : Appleton – Century – Crofts .

Yule , G . (٢٠١٠) . The Study of Language . (٤th edition) . Cambridge : CUP .

