The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances, Volume 6, Issue 1, Winter and Spring, 2018, pp. 13-26

A Tribute to Professor H. G. Widdowson

On the Occasion of his Visit to Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, 2018

Behrooz Azabdaftari* (Corresponding Author)
Emeritus Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran.
Email: azabdaftari@iaut.ac.ir

Abstract

In this article which has been written on the occasion of Professor Henry Widdowson's visit in April 2018 to Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University in Tabriz, Iran, professor Widdowson's thoughts and contributions to applied linguistics and language teaching are reviewed in passing. The author make this issue his point of departure and takes up some of the ground breaking ideas of Professor Widdowson and elaborates very briefly on the following notions:

1) English in Training and Education.
2) Applied Linguistics and Linguistics Applied.
3) Authenticity of Teaching Materials in ESP.
4) Present Situation versus Target Situation Analysis of Students' Language Learning needs: The Language Audit
5) Linguistic principles and intuitive interpretation

Keywords: Applied Linguistics, Linguistics Applied, Language Teaching, The Language Audit, Linguistics Principles

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: Friday, July20, 2018
Accepted: Thursday, August 2, 2018
Published: Thursday, February 7, 2019
Available Online: Saturday, February 2, 2019
DOI: 10.22049/JALDA.2018.26289.1079

Online ISSN: 2383-2460; Print ISSN: 2383-591x; 2019 © *Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University Press*

Introduction

There are some great names in language studies who are accredited with having introduced new concepts in linguistics and neighboring disciplines - and to whom we remain deeply indebted - for example, Noam Chomsky and Transformational Generative Grammar (TG)[1], Lev S. Vygotsky and the concept of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), A. R. Luria and the social genesis of mind, Ervin Goffman and the concept of 'frame' in Politeness Theory , Howard Gardener as the spokesman of Multiple Intelligence, Harold Garfinkel , the innovator of Ethnomethodology. There are also some other big names which ring familiar to the practitioners involved in language study and language teaching; for example, Michael Halliday developed Systemic Grammar, Roman Jacobson is associated with Functional Sentence Perspective, K. L. Pike with Tagmemics, S. M. Lamp with Stratificational Grammar, and Louis Hjelmeslov with Glossmatics, Lakoff and McCawley with Generative Semantics, and French linguist, Lucien Tesniere (1893-1954), with Dependency Grammar, to mention a few of them.

Well, these scholars epitomize the researchers who have explored the uncharted terrains in human epistemology. Today we have one of these great scholars, a trail blazer in language study, literary discourse, English for Special Purposes, and educational philosophy, Professor, H. G. Widdowson, the founding father of Applied Linguistics. We, the teachers and students of EFL alike, who have gathered here from all over Iran, are truly gratified to see him in person, hear his voice, feel his touch and benefit his erudite views on the issues concerned as always.

Of course, the lion's share of the credit goes to the administrative body of Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University. It is because of their lofty insight and grand generosity that we are blessed with this great occasion, but one name deserves a special thank for this convocation – Dr. Farzad Salahshour, who had the honour of being the advisee of Professor Widdowson while doing PhD research in Applied Linguistics at the University of Essex, England, where he graduated in 1379/2000. I should make an announcement to the effect that Dr. Salahshour used to be my student majoring in English language at Tabriz University some thirty years ago. Now under this very ceiling you see the three generations of EFL students coming together. An English proverb says 'Like the church, like the priest,' or 'Like the son, like the father,' or 'Like the mother, like the daughter.' In the same vein, I venture to say *Like the trainer, like the trainee,* but siding with Professor Widdowson, I would never say 'Like the teacher, like the teachee'. There is a rationale behind this position. To put it in simple words, teaching is a matter of art; training is a matter of science. It is possible to have two or more identical trainees, but it is impossible to

1. Another version is Transformational Generative Grammar.

have two identical teachees. It is this logical positivism, a loaded concept, that sets us teachers apart from each other. I am going to make this issue my point of departure and take up some of the ground breaking ideas of Professor Widdowson and elaborate very briefly (regarding the time restrictions) on the following notions:

6) English in Training and Education.
7) Applied Linguistics and Linguistics Applied.
8) Authenticity of Teaching Materials in ESP.
9) Present Situation versus Target Situation Analysis of Students' Language Learning needs: The Language Audit
10) Linguistic principles and intuitive interpretation

In Passing, I may say that the topics given above are fully discussed by Professor Widdowson in his works: *Explorations in Applied Linguistics* (Vols. 1 & 2, 1985 and 1986, sec. edition) and *Aspects of Language Teaching* (1991, sec. edition). Back to the drawing board.

English in Training and Education (*Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2* (1986), pp. 201-212)

In this paper, the author addresses himself to two questions:

1. What does it mean that foreign students need to know English?
2. What is training and how is it different from education?

To answer the first question, Widdowson makes a distinction between knowledge of language system (symbolic/linguistic knowledge) and knowledge of conventional schemata (indexical/inferential knowledge). In language use, meaning is achieved through both types of knowledge – symbolic and indexical knowledge. To illustrate his viewpoint in case, the author has given several examples, but here one example in English as well as one in Farsi will drive home the point:

a. The butcher sliced the meat.
b. The waiter sliced the meat.

There is no difficulty in getting the symbolic meaning, but it is difficult to understand it as an utterance. The first sentence (being symbolic) carries the meaning within itself; the indices of the utterance (as evidenced in the second sentence) draw our attention outside the sentence. Thus in (a), the word 'meat' refers to raw one; in (b), it refers to cooked one. To put it differently, in both (a) and (b) the linguistic signs are the same, but the indexical meanings are different. That is why (c) sounds so natural and familiar, but (d) calls up a strange picture to the mind (cannibalism):

c) The waiter sliced the meat; it smelt delicious.

d) The butcher sliced the meat; it smelt delicious.

In Farsi, take the following examples: [saat chandeh?]This question in Farsi implies two different meanings, depending on the situational context: a) *What time is it?* and b) *How much is it?* Or take this one: [in ghabel-e hall ast.]. This Persian statement implies at least two different meanings: a) *This (e.g. problem) is solvable;* b) *This material is dissolvable.*

The author concludes that meaning in language use is achieved by taking bearings on our knowledge of familiar frames of reference - schematic knowledge (world knowledge) as well as our knowledge of the formal elements (systemic/linguistic) knowledge. When a gap opens up between these types of knowledge, an extempore negotiation is necessary to comprehend the intended meaning. In order to be able to derive the meaning intended, there is need for another training, i. e. *education.*

Note should be taken that *training* is oriented towards specific aims, but *education* is directed at developing general intellectual capacity, cognitive sets, or disposition. According to Widdowson (1986), in education the instructional input is intended to be converted into something other than itself, transcends the particular subjects of instruction. Remember this axiomatic expression by Widdowson(1986: 208): *The trainer produces trainees; the teacher does not produces teachees.* The purpose of training is to bring the knowledge of language system and the knowledge of language behavior into a close correspondence as much as possible; the purpose of education, on the other hand, is to allow a disparity between theoretical system and practical schemata, and to provide for an ability to mediate between the two by referring back to principles and checking them against a particular situation. Widdowson (1986) suggests that this ability, i. e. to derive indexical meaning of utterances from language system (propositional meaning) can be developed by associating target language with activities which are required of student learner in pursuit of their specialist objectives so that the solving problems in particular subjects is contingent on the solving problems in language use, and vice versa. Incidentally, it is here that ESP, according to the author, is part of TESOL. In ESP, training techniques - filling blank spaces , reading off symbol combinations, labeling figures – cannot of their nature achieve educational ends. In ESP programs some allowance should be made for the intellectual development of the learner and the ability of solving unpredictable problems. I am going to take Prof. Widdowson's position on *Applied linguistics versus Linguistics applied,* which bears heavily on this topic.

Applied linguistics versus Linguistics applied (*Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2* (1986, pp. 7-20)

Widdowson (1986), in his paper "Applied linguistics; the pursuit of relevance", calls into question the relevance of linguistics for language teaching, a position glaring in the face. Well, indeed he means the way the linguist conceive of language may not be appropriate for teaching purposes. The author criticizes the view expressed by McIntosh and Strevens (1964), which says that there is no conflict between application and theory. As such, he strikes almost the same note when Chomsky (1971) warns that teacher should be careful in applying linguistic insight to their profession.

While elaborating on his position, Widdowson (1986) brings up the question whether a relevant model for teaching language is to derive it from the analyst's model or from the user's model. The analyst represents language in terms of abstract system. In this system there can be no tolerance for vague notions, impression, and ambiguity. The description is based on accurate principles. As an aside, I may say that there is no complete description available about the speaker's language competence. The speaker's competence is realized through performance, i. e. communicative behavior, and communicative behavior is vague, imprecise and ambiguous. The language user draws on resources for *meaning* that cannot always be reduced to linguistic rules, and indeed, it would defeat the communicative purposes if they were reducible to linguistic rules. These two models of analyst's and of user's are not always congruent with each other. Widdowson illustrates his viewpoint by citing a poem by E.E. Commings, the American poet, writer, and painter: "he sang his didnt he danced his did". The trouble is that the analyst's model does not generate sentences like those of Cummings. If we tinker with the grammar so that it could generate the above sentence by E. E. Cummings, it will generate all other deviant sentences. The fact is that there is a great many poetical expressions which are at variance with the analyst's model, and to compose a poem with regard to the analyst's model is beating the air, so to speak. In another example, given by the author, *the sun* is both human and inanimate, and it is crucial to the understanding of the poem that this ambiguity remains unresolved. Consider the lexical ambiguity of the following sentence – The cannon ball took away the soldier's legs and he had to lay down his *arms.* To be able to understand some of the utterances used by the speaker, similar to the examples given above, we need to be aware of the potential meaning resources of the language which is realized in contexts of actual communication. These potential resources of meaning cannot be reduced to rules. Metaphorical expressions, for instance, cannot be reduced to rules; once they are, they cease to be metaphors. The user keeps the two meanings of the sentence, say, *flying planes can be dangerous* in his mind at the same time, but the analyst cannot cope with concurrent meanings; he deals with either meaning separately, hence dissolving the ambiguity in the sentence.[1]

1. When sentences are understood in terms of code relations, they have propositional meaning;

Whether and to what extent the analyst's model can be made to correspond with the user's model is a major theoretical question in applied linguistics. The theoretical question is related to the notion of *psychological reality of linguistic rules.* In Chomskyan School of linguistics, it is the speaker's, competence that is considered to have psychological realty because linguistic rules are part of the speaker's innate property of his mind; hence linguistics, according to Chomsky, is a field of psychology. The proponents of communicative approach to language instruction consider the speaker's performance as having the trait of psychological reality. We may put it differently- in the past it was thought that the analyst's model represents the real nature of language, the concern being with the structures of language. Today we are thinking of notions, cognitive semantics, and speech acts. Widdowson (1986) opts for the user's model of language and in so doing he points out many factors to be considered – age, cognitive development, needs of the use, and so forth. Meanwhile, Widdowson sets great store by mastering language system (rules of grammar).

To put the finishing touches to this discussion, we may that it is the responsibility of the *Applied Linguistics*to consider the criteria for 'an educationally relevant approach to language instruction'. *Linguistics applied* is indeed a teacher-centered approach to language teaching and falls short of catering for the emotional needs and intellectual development of the student learner.[1]I cannot bring myself to finish the topic without making a reference to a Greek mythology about Procrustes, a rogue smith and bandit, who physically attached people by stretching them or cutting off their legs so as to force them to fit the size of an iron bed. A procrustean bed is an arbitrary standard to which exact conformity is forced. In second language teaching, the teacher who insists on conforming the student learners to his preconceived notion of a particular linguistic theory without any regard to the learner' language needs, interests, goals, and cognitive development tis indeed acting up to the precept of Procrustes, i. e. cutting off the legs of the language learner rather than to stretch the bed in a bid to meet the learner's need. He is using *Linguistics applied* instead of *Applied Linguistics* in his teaching career.

Authenticity of Teaching Materials in ESP

Let me at outset mention that ESP is an enterprise involving both education and training in designing language course and relevant teaching materials. Unlike those involved in EGP, ESP practitioners need to have some knowledge of the content they are supposed to be teaching. The use of authentic teaching material is a moot point in ESP courses. In the discussion bearing on this issue, we find Widdowson (1986) striking a note entirely different from what is a common fashion in the

when sentences are understood in terms of contextual relations, they have pragmatic meaning.
1. The user's model of language provides the basis for a learner-centered methodology. Analyst's model leads to a teacher-centered pedagogy.

literature on ESP. In his paper titled "ESP and the Curse of Caliban" (pp. 189-200) again we witness the invisible theoretical thread that binds Widdowson's disparate views on applied linguistics into a cohesive unity. In this section of my paper, I intend to sound him on his view regarding the issue of authenticity of teaching materials in EFL classroom.

The author, having cited a few lines on Prospero to Caliban/teacher to pupil from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* Act 1, Scene 1, points out that the teaching fails because it is not suited to the pupil's needs and then relates his example to the teaching materials used in ESP courses.[1]Widdowson (1986: 189) argues that the pupil refuses to be confined by the ESP prescribed for him – thereby risking confinement of a different kind: being pegged within the knotty entails of an oak, in Widdowson's words. According to the author, ESP is practiced on the assumption that the language to be learned should be delimited to match a specification of learner requirements. Widdowson is against such an assumption, contending that such delimitation at the same time delimits the target language so that it, beyond the confines specified, fails to function as a communication means. The argument is that if we base our ESP on the specifications of the learner needs, we will produce a set of clones who will behave like robots.

Widdowson (1986) in the same paper argues that employers have employees, but teachers do not have teachees; no matter how precisely we specify the ESP syllabus, the learner will defy its delimitation. Indeed, the learner's errors are an indication of the fact that the process of teaching and learning are not parallel. Errors are evidence of an extension from what has been taught. Errors, according to the author, are teachee's failures but learner's achievements – a very subtle point to consider. Widdowson (1986:193) argues that we reduce our learners to teachees who are obediently submissive to the language patterns we impose on their behavior. To drive out the devil error by means of incantation of drill, we have our students dancing on sentence strings like marionettes, in Widdowson's words. The author argues that despite the fact that there is no correspondence between teaching and learning, we use materials and methods of teaching that would direct learning towards specific objectives and thus we change them to teachees. On the other hand, if the teachers changes the sociology of the classroom and lets the learner adopt his behavior to learner requirements, then there is the problem the student learner may fail to structure his own learning activity. In between these two extremes, the author suggests that the learner must be allowed some room for independent maneuver; the problem is to know how much and of what kind.

Widdowson (1986) defends a method which reconciles the teacher and the learner roles. In his search for a way out of this problem, the author raises two questions: 1)

1. Prosperto wants to teach Caliban language in order to make him a better slave. ESP could be interpreted as a device for keeping people in their place.

How to identify the learner's target needs, and 2) How to meet those needs. As to the first question, one has to take into consideration particular content words, function words, certain tenses and also grammatical properties of a particular register. Such a selection tells us what people in certain occupations favor particular words and structures but does not tell us anything about these people's purposes in producing such forms. Widdowson (1986) contends that discourse is the process of negotiating meaning by interaction, and that communicative competence is the ability to enact discourse i. e. to exploit knowledge of rules to arrive at a negotiated settlement. We have to note that communicative competence is essentially a capacity for solving problems, not a facility for producing prepared utterances. If we are going to specify a restricted repertoire, it should be represented as a range of problem-solving strategies, not a collection of items. Thus Widdowson (1986) argue for discourse developing strategies of problem solving because in this way, according to the author, both forms and functions are taught simultaneously. It is an attested truth that language use promotes acquisition just as acquisition promotes language use: the relationship is reciprocal. This is an article of faith held by Widdowson: discourse-processing strategies provides for effective language pedagogy. The teaching objective should be to develop the learner's capacity for using language to negotiate meaningful solutions of the problems involved. And the teacher's task should be to identify and analyze those problems that will require the learner to use the language contingently, i. e, to use the structures that are invoked by the problems in case. In Widdowson's proposed program of language teaching including ESP, the direction of dependency changes: The teacher proceeds from language functions to linguistic forms instead of going from linguistic forms to language function. (Incidentally, in natural language acquisition as well as in child first language acquisition, this is the route taken by both the second language learner and the child.)

Widdowson (1986) concludes his argument by mentioning a salient point; namely, ESP can contribute to TESOL. TESOL is said to have no specific purposes, and no particular problems to rely on. The author suggests that purposes and problems of other school subjects can supply TESOL with teaching content. As such, all TESOL might become ESP – an intriguing thought.

To end the discussion, for Widdowson, authenticity is congruence between the language producer's intentions and the receiver's interpretation. This congruence is effected through a shared knowledge of language conventions. The teacher's task is to help the student learners develop an awareness of those conventions. To act up to the spirit of authenticity of teaching materials, the teacher should use simple accounts rather than simplified ones. Simple texts are specifically written for students in accordance with their linguistic skills. Simplified texts are the doctored

version of original texts. Generally speaking, simplified texts are adapted in terms of vocabulary and structure, but not conceptually.

Present Situation versus Target Situation Analysis of Students' Language Learning Needs: The Language Audit

The language audit (what kind of language is required) is possible by considering both present situation analysis (PSA) and target situation analysis (TSA). To conduct the language audit, a target profile of language skills is prepared, then a profile of present ability is established, showing the distance existing between present situation and target situation of the student language learning needs. In his paper "Criteria for course design," (*Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*,1986pp. 177-188), Widdowson contends y that designing ESP courses only with reference to terminal needs leaves out of account the learners' transitional needs. The contention is that itemization of language forms, functions and skills ignores the actuality of language use. It is argued that through an engagement with the negotiation of meanings (i. e. achieving a successful communication) in discourse can learning effectively take place. According to the author, the communicative process cannot be directly taught; it can only be carried out by the learner going beyond the confines of course specifications, converting the teacher's input to his own use. Widdowson is against the idea expressed by Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens (1964), who maintain that detailed studies of restricted languages used by doctors , nurses engineers , … etc. will furnish the basis of designing ESP course with confidence and certainty. This is a goal-orientated definition of learner needs; namely the ends are taken into consideration; the means are left to shift for themselves. Widdowson finds this assumption mistaken and offers alternative criteria for course design i. e. a process-oriented approach to teaching which is intended to take care of the transitional behavior of the learner. In such an approach, the language content of the course is selected not because it is representative of what the learner will have to deal with after the course is over but because it is like to activate strategies for learning while the course is in progress. Thus Widdowson looks upon the language of ESP course not in terms of the learner's terminal needs but in terms of its facilitative effect. If one follows a goal-oriented approach he will take his bearings from models of linguistic description; if one takes a process-oriented approach, he needs to be cognizant of learning theories. The first approach has an affiliation with *linguistics* and *training,* the second approach with *psychology* and education.[1]

1. This issue recalls to the mind the notions of the *Serialist versus the Holist* and the *convergent versus the divergent* types of language learners. For further information, refer to same paper, p. 185.

Linguistic Principles and intuitive Evaluation

In his paper titled "linguistic insights and language teaching principle," (*Exploration in Applied Linguistics,* Vol. 1, pp. 215-233), Widdowson addresses himself to the relationship between theoretical linguistics and practical language teaching. The author observes that linguistics stands in need of interpretation, and that the language teacher needs to derive insights from theoretical language studies. Widdowson rightly reminds us that the rules of language description have their origin in the intuitive interpretation of the linguist, but these rules (language system) are not open to intuitive evaluation. To say it differently, we have in the generative model an exact account of language rules, but interpretation is needed to relate these findings (rues) to actual facts (language behavior).

Both de Saussure and Chomsky have offered a static well-defined mode of language description (idealization of data), but this solution, in Widdowson's words, is 'a draconian one' because the solution leaves out what people are interested in language uses. Indeed, the idealization of data is made to conform the data to what the linguist has in mind. Thus the characteristics of speech delivery such as hesitation, self-editing, repetition (of interest to the psychologist) are ignored by the linguist. Also, the manner in which language is realized as an actual communicative activity is ignored by the linguist. The language teacher should be able to interpret linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics in order to incorporate them into a language teaching pedagogy.

Why is the teacher in deed of linguistic insights? The answer is that language teaching is essentially a theoretical enterprise: Is language use a set of habits, a set of rules, or a set of functions? Different answers are given to the question posed throughout the history of language instruction. The teacher needs to have an approach (belief in a theory) and explicit principles to translate the theory into action. Language teaching is not based directly on language description. Language description can be broad, including psychological and sociological aspects of language –*macro-linguistics*, and narrow one, *micro-linguistics*, consisting of a description of language system.

In his paper, Widdowson (1985: 219) is concerned with both micro-linguistic (syntactic description) and macro—linguistics (social and psychological conditions of verbal acts). Sentences, according to the author, are rules of *usage*, and not rules of *use.* He gives the following examples to illustrate the point in case:

1. Macbeth killed Duncan.
2. Duncan was killed by Macbeth.
3. It was Macbeth who killed Duncan.

4. It was Duncan who was killed by Macbeth.
5. What Macbeth did was to kill Duncan.
6. What happened to Duncan was that he was killed by Macbeth.

Theses sentences (1-6) with different structures are propositionally equivalent, but each of them has its own function in a text. We may put it this way: they are equivalent in *signification,* but not in *value.* According to the author, to derive the same proposition (sentence meaning) from different surface realizations is important for comprehension. It is seen that students often manipulate sentence into different structures (e.g. changing active sentences into passive ones) without considering the conditions under which they would make use of one form rather than another. Their attention retains focus on sentences and it is not directed towards the *text.* Students should realize the distinction between the signification of sentences and their textual value. The description of *usage*, according to the author, leads us to think of sentences in terms of propositions, but the description of sentences in terms of *use* leads us to think of sentences in terms of communicative acts. Widdowson (1985) gives several examples to elaborate the point regarding how a sentence meeting the appropriate conditions of verbal communication can take on various values such a command, suggestion, warning, advice, threat, confirmation, and so on. For example, the sentence *you are going out tonight* can perform different functions depending on the situation of communication and the relationship between the interlocutors, such as

a. (A host to the guest) You stay here tonight; it too late to leave now.
b. (In the police station) You are under arrest.
c. (In the hospital) You are under treatment.

In a language teaching program, the concern should be a) the transition from a concentration on sentences (like the examples given above) to concentration on speech acts (what is called in linguistic parlance *form-function* relationship)and b) the transition from speech acts to discourse. Acts do not occur in isolation; they combine to form *a coherent discourse,* as propositions do not occur in isolation; they combine to form *a cohesive text.* The following examples, given by Widdowson (1985: 232-33), shed light on the point of discussion:

Teacher: This work needs to be done again.
Student: My pen is broken.

The two sentences do not make a cohesive text, but they make a coherent discourse. Or take the following example:

The unions refused to accept the government's proposal. Unemployment has been rising steadily over the past few months.

Widdowson ends his discussion by giving the caveat that the language learner has ultimately to deal with actual language use and to concern himself with the way in which the language he is learning conveys propositional content and functions as communicative activity. The student learner will be better off with the *acquisition* of principles for effecting the transition from sentence to speech act to discourse. I underscore the word *acquisition* of language appropriately by means of doing extensive reading literary texts – novels, short stories, plays. Speaking from my own personal language learning experience (Azabdaftari, 2016), I venture to say that the efficient way of coping with meeting the conditions of verbal interaction is not through understanding the complex rules governing our verbal behavior; rather it is through subconscious acquisition of form-function relationships as exposed in literary texts. The process is not unlike to the way child acquires first language or the adult second language learner picks it up in natural verbal settings.

References

Azabdaftari, Behrooz. 2016. *The Legacy of the Green Years of my Academic Life: A Collection of English Paperson Language and Interdisciplinary Studies.* University of Tabriz.

Chomsky, N. 1972. *Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.

Halliday, M. A. K., Angus McIntosh and Peter Strevens. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching.* London: Longman.

Lakoff, G. 1971. *On Generative Semantics.* In Steinberg, D. D., Jakobovits , L. A. (eds.) *Semantics.* Cambridge University Press.

McCawley, J. D. 1967. "The role of semantics in a grammar," in Bach, E. and R. Harms (eds.) *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. Holt, Reinhart & Winston: New York.

Mathews, P. H. 2007. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. and R. Schmidt. 2010 (4th edition). *Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* Longman.

Walrs, K. 1989. *A Dictionary of Stylistics.* Longman.

Widdowson, H. G. 1985. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 1), Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. 1986. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 2), Oxford University Press.

Appendix: Explanation of *Generative Semantics, Interpretive Semantics, Cognitive Semantics,* and *Frame Linguistics*

Generative Semantics is an approach to linguistic theory which grew to Chomsky's syntactic-based Transformational Generative Grammar. It considers that all sentences are generated from a semantic structure. This semantic structure is often expressed in the form of a proposition which is similar to logical proposition in philosophy. Linguists working within the theory have, for instance, suggested that there is a semantic relationship between utterances such as *This dog strikes me as being like her master* and *This dog reminds me of her master* because they both have the semantic structure of '*X perceive that Y is similar to Z''* (J. C. Richards and R. Schmidt, 2010, 4th edition).

Generative Grammar was first introduced in linguistics from mathematics by Chomsky (1957) to describe a specific group of grammars which explicitly aim by a set of finite rules to describe and produce (*generate)* all and only the grammatical sentences of a language. The most significant of these rather complex grammars, and the one Chomsky himself later developed in 1965was Transformational Grammar (TG), hence the terms *generative grammar, transformational generative grammar,* and *TG* are often used synonymously. *Generative Semantics* grew out of TG in the late 196os and 1970s. It is the result of the discussion about the nature of deep structure of the sentence. For semanticists like Lakoff (1971) and McCawley (1968) a *semantic* component is the base of deep structure, but TG proposes a *syntactic* (and lexical) deep structure, from which the meaning of a sentence can be derived (Katie Wales, 1989).

Interpretive Semantics is a theory about the place of meaning in a model of Generative Grammar. This theory differs from Generative Semantics in that in *Generative Semantics*, syntactic rules operate on the meaning of a sentence to produce its form. In *Interpretative Semantics*, semantic rules operate on the words and syntactic structure of a sentence to reveal its meaning.

Cognitive Semantics is a movement in linguistics since the late 1980s, whose defining slogan is that the ability to speak and understand a language is continuous with other mental, or in a broad sense, cognitive abilities. This movement is opposed to the view of Chomsky and his followers who maintain that knowledge of language forms an independent mental system interfacing with other mental systems. Leading proponents of this movement include R. W. Langacker and G. P. Lakoff, both of whom were advocates of Generative Semantics in their early careers. It I well worth considering that this movement is related in some aspects to *Frame Semantics* (P. H. Mathews, 2007).

Frame Semantics is developed by C. J. Fillmore in 1970s. It emphasizes the ways in which words change their meanings with the frame of reference in which they are used. Thus *set* has one meaning in a frame one might distinguish as that of 'tennis' , in which it is related variously to those of *game, serve , love,* etc.; but in another frame one might talk of a complete *set* of crockery.

It is worth noting that in 1970s, it became obvious that the semantic representations could not be assigned by rules of grammar independent of the knowledge, beliefs, etc. of the individual speakers.

To me, linguistics, concerned only with language system, is like a 'closed see', but once it came to consider the social and psychological aspects of language use, it, like an 'open see', gained a fascinating position, its voice being heard in literary criticism and poetry today as well. Indeed, it has grown into a well-developed enterprise with the ability of elaborating fully man's verbal behavior.

Author Biography



Professor Behrooz Azabdaftari is emeritus professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of Tabriz. As a prolific author his publications include tens of books and hundreds of articles within Applied Linguistics, Teaching English as Foreign Language, and Second Language Writing.