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**Introduction**

The chapter is based on relevant references and assumptions as well as theoretical and empirical findings of different researchers consistent with the presented thesis study. It is based on the previous relevant conducted researches. The purpose of the research is also to provide an insight into the relationship of the research study and previous findings.

To demonstrate the importance of the research, the researcher has resorted to the previous conducted researches as reliable and valid references. The researcher has also applied a critical appraisal of the previous findings in an unbiased manner to demonstrate the most appropriate categories and sub-categories.

The researcher deals with historical background as well as different assumptions on lexical knowledge. Notwithstanding all differences on clear definition of lexical knowledge, lexical categories and sub-categories, the researcher has attempted to dissect, to analyze and to give definite definitions of the respective issues. Concurrent with the dissertation study entitled 'A contrastive study of lexical knowledge between ESL&EFL (Mysore & Tehran) at undergraduate level', the researcher has given clear definitions and has demonstrated various controversial and rational assumptions on contrastive analysis, semantics, ESL and EFL learner differences, lexical knowledge, synonymy, antonymy, idiomaticity, collocation, concrete and abstract categories. Besides, the researcher has considered all possible sub-categories and eventually revealed the strong points and shortcomings of the preferred and relevant ones.

**2.1. Contrastive analysis (CA)**

**2.1.1. Definition**

Contrastive analysis is a discovery strategy in which a native speaker follows to conceptualize the perceptions that differ in the compared languages (Ziahosseini, 1999). Contrastive analysis follows the scientific path. Thus, it can be modified in process of time following the onset of new discoveries in scientific arena. Fries (1945, p.9) calls CA (Contrastive analysis) as a "scientific description of the language learned, which can be carefully compared with a parallel description of the native
language of the learner". CA can be based on discovery of strategies adopted by native speakers. Concurrently, Ziahesseini (1999, p.4) has defined CA as a scientific procedure which can "convey insight into the differences and similarities between languages being compared". Caroll (1968) has mentioned that contrastive linguists analyze the similarities and differences of two languages to reach a reasonable interpretation. In the same way, systematic comparison and contrast of two languages include:

- Selection: Selecting the items that should be compared
- Description: Describing the systems of two languages
- Comparison: Detecting the similarities and differences in terms of form, meaning and distribution of the two languages
- Prediction: Predicting the difficult points of two languages
- Verification: Finding the coincidence of prediction with realities

Taylor (1979, p.11) has noted that contrastive linguistics is "composed of two components", which are both Predictive contrastive analysis and diagnostic error analysis". On the whole, contrastive analysis aims at demonstrating areas of difficulties between the learner's mother language and the target language to predict learners' errors (Doughty, 2005).

2.1.2. Theories

Weber (1978) believes that "Contrastive analysis is born of classroom experience, but has grown up, and is still growing as linguistics itself has grown and is growing" (p.87). The author implies that contrastive analysis is a very controversial issue that has deeply undergone ups and down. Consequently, it can be considered from different aspects. Contrastive analysis is flourished during the heyday of structuralism and behaviorism. The fact is still considered as a criterion by the researchers in the dichotomy between source and target language as well as the pedagogical practices of language teaching and learning. Following due attention to surface structure of language paradigms, Krzeszowski (1967, p.33) has asserted, "Surface features seem much more important to the language learner than any possible similarities and differences in deep structure". Lipinska (1975) as an advocate of structural approach indicates that the primary goal of CA is to help the foreign students to run up the obstacle of language learning. Nevertheless, it is implied that transformational grammar can be as a great theoretical model for CA. Besides, the
taxonomic model adopted by the structuralists is not an appropriate reply to the detailed linguistic phenomena, which can be construed in different ways. Isamu (1990) opines that the supplementary sociocultural transformational grammar can be helpful to make the taxonomic model more suitable. Hence, Contrastive linguists are now concerned with the linguistic behavior, which can be defined in terms of a wide scope of human culture and society.

Filipovic (1967) urges that combination of structural and transformational procedures, despite the entire heterogeneities, can contribute to laying a solid model for CA that was tenable. Lado (1957) and Fries (1945) as two prominent pioneers in CA are of the opinion that by comparing and contrasting two languages, a contrastive analyst can appropriately predict the second language learning difficulties. Lado, in his book entitled 'Linguistics across cultures', (1957, p.2) argue, "Those elements that are similar to the learners' native languages will be simple for him/her, and those areas that are difficult will be difficult". Furthermore, he adds that CA can contribute to predict the difficulties in learning the problematic points in language. Accordingly, he underlines that the contrastive analysis studies, which are developed by structuralists, has shed light on taxonomic model and caused new insights into the foreign language teaching. Lado also pinpoints that analogy from explanation, which further aggravates the situation of language learner while facing second language challenges, leads to misinformation, misinterpretation and misconception. Wardhaugh (1970, p.124) notifies that contrastive analysis hypothesis (CAH) falls into two "strong and weak versions". Based on the strong version, the majority of L2 errors are committed due to negative transfer, whereas the weak version predicts that the native language does not interfere, rather, helps. Nevertheless, Oller and Ziahesseini (1970) prefer proposing a moderate version of CAH to predict and to explain a hierarchy in language difficulties. "The advocate of the theory believe that instead of transfer, the principle of stimulus generalization is at work in the learning of a native or foreign language" (Ziahosseini, 1999, p.13). He further elaborates on rationale for adopting the moderate version that confusion in L2 learner arises when minimal distinction is detected in two languages in terms of form or meaning.

2.1.3. The Issue of Transfer

The issue of transfer is significant when the effect of mother language on second language learning especially in the bilingualism phenomenon is taken into
consideration (Odlin, 1989; Thomason and Kaufman, 1988). According to structuralism (1950's), transferring the mother language (ML) to the foreign language (FL) can be either positive or negative. Positive transfer facilitates language learning, while negative transfer causes interference, which is predictable via CA. Structural differences of two languages result in interference, indicating the effect of the L1 on L2, which can be crystallized in the domain of 'transfer'. In this category, positive transfer induces learned behaviors, while negative one engenders deviation from the norm. It should be noted that native language is considered as a criterion or norm in contrast with other languages. Concurrently, Fries (1945, p.9) has underscored the importance of ML (Mother language) and noted, "The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner". Corder (1983) uses the word 'mother tongue influence' instead of 'transfer'. In a similar way, Selinker (1969) has attributed all difficulties in second language learning to mother tongue interference, which can be duly considered through contrastive analysis studies. It is worth mentioning that the 'transfer' concept can be interpreted in various ways e.g., in educational psychology, it refers to the effect of past knowledge and experience on new ones.

Besides, the issue of interlanguage (IL) "as a linguistic knowledge developed by a non-native learner of a language" is emphasized by Ziahosseini (1999, p.73) and is manifested under different terms such as approximate system (Nemser, 1979) and idiosyncratic dialect (Corder, 1971). James (1980) and Fries (1945) scrutinize the second language leaning phenomenon and conclude that fossilization in the interlanguage system is due to mother tongue interference. Taylor (1979) posits that "contrastive analysis has proven valuable in locating areas of interlanguage interference" (p.5). However, Dulay and Burt (19740) are of the opinion that transfer is an unimportant issue in the creation of interlanguage. Richards (1971, p.174) has made a contrast between interlanguage error, which is based on L1 interference, and intralingual error, which is based on overgeneralization, simplification, communication-oriented elements and induced errors. Corder (1967) pinpoints that committing an error is a natural mental process of hypothesis formation.
2.1.4. Contrastive Analysis Applications

Contrastive analysis can empower the teachers in the pedagogical practices to detect the major hindrance in subject matter preparation, which arises from the NL (Native language) and TL (Target language) interference (Rey, 1987). In a broad sense, Taylor (1979) has emphasized the role of contrastive analysis on preparation of textbook materials. Dahlsted (19720) states the implicit effect of CA studies on improving language-teaching strategies is highly applicable to the teachers. Ziahesseini (1992, p.2) also notes, "Contrastive analysis is concerned with the comparison of two languages for the purpose of translation and foreign language teaching". Despite several advocates of CA effect on foreign language, Halliday and McIntosh (19640) are rather suspicious of the CA usage on educational systems. In contrast with the term 'CA', Sharwood (1986) uses the term 'cross linguistic influence' to demonstrate the impact of 'L3 on L2' not 'L1 on L2' on a learner encountering a multilingual environment.

2.1.5. CA & Lexical knowledge

Prator (1967, p.31) has propounded "degrees of difficulty" as a contrastive gauge based on the notion of transfer to predict the relative difficulty of a given foreign language, which is applicable to semantics, syntax and phonology:

(The following examples are based on Persian language as L1 and English language as L2)

1. "Level 0 (Zero) or Transfer": It is a positive transfer, and it is predicted that no problem arises (e.g., Divar=Wall). In this case, L1 and L2 have no commonalities in which two distinctive concepts neither contributes nor impedes learning.

2. "Level 1 or Coalescence": Two or more items (e.g., words) in L1 are equivalent to one item in L2 (e.g., Moallem, Dabir, Amouzegar=Teacher).

3. "Level 2 or Underdifferentiation": L1 item has no equivalent in L2 (e.g., the word Jihad in L1).

4. "Level 3 or Reinterpretation": The items, which exist in both L1&L2, are not quite equivalent (e.g., the word traffic and terror in L1 are similar and different from English language).

5."Level 4 or Overdifferentiation": The equivalent item in L2 does not exist in L1 (e.g., the word Valentine's Day, which is meaningful in L2, is meaningless in L1).
6. "Level 5 or Split": An item in L1 diverges into two or more items in L2 (e.g., the word Raies=Manager, Head, Chief and boss).

Isamu (1990, p. 60-61) mentions that three points as "What words to teach, how to analyze them and how to present them to the students" should be considered in vocabulary teaching within the domain of contrastive analysis. To achieve the goal, "Frequent words as the most commonly-used words, the universal words, the functional words and the cultural words" are considered as the cornerstones of research in the realm of contrastive analysis (CA).

Lado (1957) distinguishes seven patterns of similarities and contrast across languages (Persian language as L1 and English language as L2):

1. Cognates: It is considered as the easiest types of words, which is due to borrowings and other etymological sources. (e.g., Baradar=Brother, Dar=Door).
2. False or deceptive cognates: The so-called similarity of the words in L1 and L2 is not deep-rooted (e.g., Kelas=Class, Perofesor=Professor).
3. Similarity in meaning but difference in form: It comprises a large bulk of words (Doust=Friend).
4. Words with strange meaning: It is based on
   a. Convergence or coalescence: Several concepts in L1 are compatible to one concept in L2. For example, there are eight different concepts in L1 represented in English by one concept on the word 'cousin'.
   b. Divergence or split: one source in L1 is divided into two or more concepts in L2; for example, the word 'bozorg' in L1 can be divided into various ideas as 'big', 'great' and 'major'.
5. New forms, idioms, phrasal verbs and unfamiliar meaning: The word 'dull' as an example can be used in different words or phrases in L1, 'dull knife=chaghoye kond' and 'dull weather=abo havaye kesel konandeh', and the words 'call=seda sazan' but 'call up=zang zadan'.
6. Words with different connotations in two languages: For instance, the word 'pub' has a negative connotation in L1 rather than L2.

Laufer and Girsai (2008) also pinpoint collocation as combination of words, which can be problematic in detecting equivalent word in L1 or L2 words like Sobh
2.2. ESL and EFL (English as a Second Language and English as a Foreign Language)

2.2.1 Vocabulary Knowledge in ESL and EFL Learner

English Language is divided into four skills comprising two productive skills as speaking and writing as well as two receptive skills as listening and reading along with some sub-skills such as vocabulary and grammar. Despite the concentration on syntactic knowledge in linguistics, semantic knowledge is rather gravely taken into consideration in recent years. Many interdisciplinary researches have underlined the semantic knowledge importance in terms of vocabulary knowledge. Alderson and Bachman (2001, p. IX) notes, “The study of vocabulary in applied linguistics is flourishing”. Lexical knowledge is an inseparable part in the knowledge of language. Seal (1991) vigorously states that the essential component of communication competence is ‘word’. In contrast with the traditional view, Meara (2002) gives more importance to vocabulary acquisition and considers word knowledge as a decisive and distinctive factor that contributes to improvement in other skills and sub-skills. Insufficient vocabulary knowledge will be an impedimental process in conceptualization. That's why, the pedagogical practices are to change the potential vocabulary knowledge into virtual and practical concepts in the educational Spheres. Carter (1987) underscores the vocabulary knowledge in testing and language learning. However, the heterogeneity between vocabulary testing and learning is the cause of disagreement that fans the flame of discrepancy among semanticists. Meara (1980, p.239) states “a very large proportion to the work on vocabulary acquisition has been concerned with vocabulary testing teaching rather than with vocabulary learning, it does not throw much light on how words are learned”. It is, nevertheless, the matter of question: Is it possible to overgeneralize the vocabulary acquisition in L1 to L2 within the framework of ESL/EFL category?

Coardy (1993) suggests that L2 acquisition is similar to L1 acquisition and vocabulary acquisition is of no exception. The controversy arises whether vocabulary knowledge can is a separate category regardless of grammatical category or not. However, Wilkins (1972, p. 111) differentiates the two categories and expressively asserts, “Without grammar little can be conveyed”. Other Scholars agree that the
quality of vocabulary knowledge between native speakers and ESL/EFL learners is different. Sinclair (1987) notes that native speakers frequently use the idiom principles, whereas the second language learners employ cognitive open-choice principles by combining single words with grammatical rules. However, it does not mean a direct relationship between vocabulary knowledge and grammatical rules is expected in all aspects. Blaas (1992) notes those lexical errors occur three times more than grammatical errors. The finding implies different mental processes of two categories, and it shows complexity of mental lexicon retrieval. Laufer's (1997) finding shows that vocabulary knowledge is a major impediment in ESL/EFL reading comprehension. Meara and Jones (1988, P. 80) argue, “Vocabulary knowledge is heavily implicated in all practical language skills”. They conclude, "speakers with a large amount of vocabulary knowledge perform better on a wide range of linguistic indicators than speakers with more limited vocabulary”. Undoubtedly, various adopted stratagems as the essential parts of the school curriculum can improve vocabulary knowledge in ESL/EFL students. According to Pessley (2002), “The vocabulary activities can help the students to increase their vocabulary knowledge” (p.20). Coardy (1993, p. 5) argues, “Good language habits, and exposure to language itself, would eventually lead to an increased vocabulary”.

The importance of vocabulary knowledge has given rise to modification in testing, measurement and evaluation compatible to that category. Concurrently, Cronbach (1942) claims the ability to define the word, recalling, applying the word in real situation, using the word and selecting the appropriate word are the rubrics and the blueprints of determining the learners' rate of vocabulary. Richards (1974) suggests frequency, register characteristics, syntactic behavior, underlying form, word association, connotation, semantic features and word meaning association are the most important elements in vocabulary knowledge. Nonetheless, Richards (1976) claims knowing a word deals with knowing general frequency knowledge of use, syntactic and situational elements, underlying form semantic features network and word meaning association.

2.2.2. The Relationship of Vocabulary Knowledge of ESL/EFL Learners with other Skills

The mental lexicon can be triggered by vocabulary input and other skills. Anderson and Freebody (1981) emphasize that a person with great vocabulary
knowledge is good at comprehension, which is due to his/her mental agility. Their
findings show a positive relationship between word knowledge and reading
comprehension. It is also shown that vocabulary knowledge can be in close contact
with other skills, or even it can be considered as building blocks of the other skills.
Bernhart and Kamil (1995) assume that syntactic and lexical knowledge along with L1
reading ability can be considered as the general language proficiency. Furthermore,
Hunt (1978) claims that achievement on a vocabulary test of testees implies their high
verbal aptitude. Brown (2000) suggests that ESL/EFL students' extensive reading can
contribute to the word knowledge improvement. Despite the fact that vocabulary can
be the components of different skills, it does not mean four skills (reading, listening as
receptive skills and writing and speaking as productive skills) are fully compatible
with each other. “The gap between the reading and writing was larger in EFL learners
than ESL ones” (Choi, 2007, P. 102). It implies that the gaps, due to differences in
applying the appropriate skills, are even deeper in ESL/EFL learners.

2.2.3. ESL/EFL Distinction

Tittle (1997) has mentioned that ESL/EFL students have irrational beliefs that
cause anxiety, which can affect their language achievements. According to the
viewpoint, ESL/EFL distinction is meaningless. In other words, all would-be
influential factors engendering the ESL and EFL difference are ignored. In contrast
with the above viewpoint, the other assumption gives more importance to the
environment as external factor such as educational difference and background
knowledge and appropriate communication. Laufer and Goldstein (2004) suggest that
the difference between ESL/EFL students is related to the skills evaluated in school. In
which EFL students are mostly evaluated in terms of comprehension skills, whereas
ESL students are evaluated in terms of spoken and written skills. Other aspects of
ESL/EFL distinction are detected in other research findings. Laufer et al. (2004) state
EFL students learn English only in the classroom or through English texts, while the
ESL students use English on a regular basis. Thus, it raises the question whether direct
vocabulary teaching is appropriate or not.

Nation and Wary (1997) argue that direct vocabulary instruction seems to be
inadequate for ESL/EFL classroom, which is supposed to contribute to the increase of
their vocabulary knowledge. The other finding shows that the ESL/EFL distinction is
not real and removing the learning defects can fill up the gap of distinction. Chamot
(1999, p. 1) states “EFL learners can be better learner if they learn strategies in language”, which corresponds with Laufer and Goldstein (2004) who suggest ESL/EFL patterns of performance are different, which can be attributed to different learning procedure. Trans-Thi-Chau’s (1975) studies demonstrate that second language learners’ errors contribute to detecting learning shortcomings, and it can consequently improve teaching strategies. Laufer and Paribakht (1998), in their next finding, reveal that the gap between receptive and productive vocabulary is smaller in EFL learners than in ESL learners. It implies that external factors, which are more provided for ESL learners (e.g., communication in the form of routine conversation), can make them more distinctive. The assumption is strengthened by Richard’s (1974, p.8) finding that the main difference between EFL and ESL learners is the quality of English they are exposed to. Laufer and Goldstein (2004, p.103) demonstrate that “The ESL learners are better than the ESL ones in reading task, while the EFL learners perform better in writing task”.

The lexical knowledge difference can also be attributed to background knowledge derived from various learning contexts. Laufer and Paribakht (1998) suggest that amount of lexical knowledge depends on the different learning contexts, which can differentiate EFL students with limited opportunities to be exposed to input from ESL students. It is also shown that EFL students make more effort rather than ESL students in acquiring the passive (receptive) vocabulary (ibid). EFL students versus ESL ones gain less hands-on experience for studying English in a dominant English atmosphere (Choi, 2007). The same observation is made by Fallahi (1991, P.23) who postulates that ESL/EFL learners can be distinguished from each other since ESL learners are those who study in English speaking countries, while EFL learners are those who study in non-English speaking countries.

2.2.3.1. Environment

ESL students live in the social context of English Language. Then “they have more opportunity to be in direct contact with language” (Fallahi, p.23). Despite the fact that they are in the classes on a regular basis, they develop their language skills, which is materialized in a rather dominant English community. Conversely, EFL learners live in an environment in which communication is provided through their mother tongue. “He/she (EFL learner) continues to think, hear and speak in his/her native language (ibid, p. 26).
2.2.3.2. Mother –Tongue Influence

ESL learner is not aware of the process of learning. The errors they commit are not due to the interference of their mother tongues (ibid). The interference occurs when “the native language is superimposed upon the target language” (Brooks, 1969, p.27). It implies the profound influence of mother tongue on EFL learners. Fallahi (1991, p. 27) gives some examples to prove the mother language influence: “My friends own a piece of land in Tehran, the earth revolves around the sun, the globe is a planet inhabited by man and the electric circuit is connected to the ground”. In majority cases, An Iranian EFL students cannot differentiate the words ‘land’, ‘earth’, ‘globe’ and ‘ground’ from each other because there is a single equivalent word in their mother tongue as 'zamin', which is the reason of interference. In other words, Iranian patterns as mother language of the Iranians are deep-rooted, which cause interference due to lack of enough knowledge on target language.

2.2.3.3. Contrastive Analysis Role

Fallahi (1991) raises the question whether the role of CA (contrastive analysis) on predicting difficult points of source and target languages is crucial or not. However, the role of CA as a rough estimate of predicting the difficulties in language learning is underestimated or overestimated (ibid). Brown (1967, p. 81) mentions, “CA is uniquely an appropriate method for further study of fundamental process of transfer and interference in learning tasks”. Nevertheless, the feasibility of application of CA in ESL/EFL students is crucially taken into due consideration in different linguistic domains.

2.3. Semantics

2.3.1. Definition

Radford (1988, p.4) defines semantics as “the study of meaning”. He further states “The native speakers’ semantic competence is reflected in intuition about semantic well-formedness and structure” (ibid). It seems that semantics is constantly considered as an inseparable part of syntax in a broad perspective of grammar in traditional view of linguistics. Deaborn and Stranzy (2005, P.949) define semantics as “the development of theory of meaning”. In compositional semantics, the meaning of an expression can be understood in terms of its parts. However, the compound words
with different meanings irrespective of the meaning of their parts can be one of the shortcomings in defining the compositional semantics (e.g., the compound noun of ‘bookworm’ which means a person who reads a lot has no relationship with its parts, namely ‘book’ and ‘worm’. Study of meaning, as one of the priorities in semantics, is not merely restricted to it. It can also be detected in other rather interrelated disciplines:

a. Psychology: It is concerned with retaining, recalling and classifying information as well as finding out how mind seeks meanings.

b. Philosophy: It deals with any fact that is axiomatic as true along with some categories such as presupposition, entailment, mutual contradictory statements etc.

c. Linguistics: It seeks the language function, commonalities as universalities and principles as well as varieties dealing with parameters and modules. It is to determine the influential meaningful elements in a language to conclude a comprehensive interpretation of all languages at observational, descriptive and explanatory adequacy.

Semantics is a distinctive part of linguistic semantics within the realm of meaning: “Semantics is the systematic study of meaning, and linguistic semantics is the study of how languages organize and express meanings” (Kreidler, 1997, p.3).

Semantics is classified into indexical, iconic and symbolic signs in terms of the traditional taxonomy (Dearborn and Strazy, 2005):

a. Indexical sign (s): Indexical signs show the casual connection of sign or representation to meaning. It is posited by Grice (1957) and is called the natural meaning of a sign (e.g., the redness of a face is an indexical sign of anger).

b. Iconic sign(s): The icons are based on similarity principles of perceptual structures. The geographical map is the iconic sign of territory. Thus, an icon indicates the relation of sign and meaning in terms of a perceptual similarity (Dearborn and Stranzy, 2005).

c. Symbolic sign(s): Symbols can be defined in terms conventional rules and the principles, which make semantics in direct contact with pragmatics. For examples: “A interprets B, which represents C”. In this case, ‘A’ can be considered as interpreter, ‘B’ as an object, event, symbol or representation and ‘C’ as the meaning of ‘B’ (ibid, p.47). The red sign
can symbolically mean as a stop sign, which indicates the vehicles should stop. It represents the relationship in which the meaning can be in terms of a conventional rule.

The meaning of an expression can be what it stands for e.g., its reference. In this case, reference is considered as a semantic value, which depends on a particular domain of interpretation. The notion of sense as the concept of meaning is traditionally defined in terms of a set of 'necessary and sufficient' conditions, indicating the reference of an expression. In other words, there are discrete boundaries to concepts, which are compatible to classical or traditional classifications.

If something is an instance of the concept, then it should have the 'necessary and sufficient' conditions. Accordingly, if something is defined in terms of 'necessary and sufficient' conditions, it is an entity of a concept. This is a vicious cycle in which a concept like 'A' is defined in terms conditions like 'B', while conditions of 'B' are meaningful when concept 'A' is properly defined. The other challenge is the extraneous influential factor in defining the meaning of a concept, while it is not considered within the framework of 'necessity and sufficient' condition. According to Putman (1975), a stereotype is a mental representation of a paradigmatic instance of an object or property, which can make an entity meaningful when it is accompanied with experience. Thus, the interrelationship between internal and external factors is overlooked in the traditional paradigms.

In 'prototype theory' (Rosch, 1977), in contrast to classical view, there is a single mental representation, which is the prototype or the best example (e.g., sparrow is the best example of a typical bird than a penguin). It means our mental structure is based on an ideal typical of a given example. In other words, defining an entity heavily relies on displaying the most representative one with its entire features that it belongs. Hintzman and Nofosky (1986) in the exemplar view, pinpoint bundles of features or a disjunctive set of exemplars for defining an entity. For instance, the concept of ‘bird’ including all birds such as robin or penguin, which can be defined in terms of neither ‘necessary & sufficient’ nor ‘prototype’ ideal typical member.

Frege (1822) has introduced the concept of sense. He has elaborated on the issue: notwithstanding the different proper name of an entity, it has a clear symbolic meaning. For instance, 'Hesperus is Phospherus'. Both words refer to the same object, which is ‘Venus’. If Hesperus is 'A', Phospherus is 'B' and Venus is 'C', then A=B=C. In other words, all categories refer to one thing. If referring to one thing means full
compatibility, thus the result of \( A = B \) is \( A = A \). As a good example, ‘Hesperus is Hesperus’, which is redundant. If ‘Hesperus’ is meaningful due to being referred to ‘Venus’, then the two identical words should have the same cognitive value. However, when we say ’Hesperus is Venus’ we learn a new thing, which is different from ’Hesperus is Hesperus’. Thus, the meaning of a proper name is not its mere reference.

Communication and mutual interaction are powerful tools, which give meaning to a given word. The concept of word is meaningful when external factors in terms of interaction in communities are taken into consideration (Kreidler, 1977). Thus, the people's feedback can be very good extraneous acid test in recognizing the correctness of given word. It is worth noting that it is not merely the reaction of a people, which makes a word seem to be appropriate but the context in which a word is used. Thus, it raises the question whether the concept of a text is superimposed on word, or a word per se is a meaningful concept. Ogdon and Richards (1923) suggest a triangle of concept in which the bond between word and concept is called ‘association’, the bond between concept and object is known as 'reference' and finally bond between object and word is called 'meaning'. In the conceptual theory of meaning, things are related through the medium of concepts of the mind. Accordingly, word is a symbol, object is what an entity represents and meaning or concept is as a thought. Saussure (1911) uses the terms as 'signified' (Treeness as a mental image or sense), 'signifier' (The sound image of tree). Accordingly, ‘tree’ is considered as a 'sign' comprising a sense or 'signified' and a sound image or 'signifier' which refers to something outside as represent or a physical object as 'tree'.

In logics, the meaning of a sentence can be determined by its truth-value and the reference can be considered as its truth-value. In classical semantics, there are two truth-values: True and false. Actually, the truth-value of a sentence depends on empirical and tangible issues until its meaning is determined (Deaborn, Stranzy, 2005). However, the plausibility of the application of logics in semantics in natural languages as a very complicated issue is a matter of question. Montague (1974) is one of the advocates of the applicability of logic in solving the problems in understanding the complicated categories in language. Tarski (1944) assumes that truth conditions are the building blocks of understanding the concept of meaning. Wittgenstein (1953) mentions that the meaning of a given thing can be understood in terms of its use and situation. In other words, meaning is a situation-oriented category.
In other study, the relationship between proficiency and understanding semantic pattern is proved. Meara (1983) states that students with low level of proficiency demonstrate unstable and disorganized semantic pattern in a language test.

2.3.2. Semantic Classifications

2.3.2.1. Intenalist Vs Externalist Theory

Steven and Drendan (2004, p.93-97) have classified semantics into two broad "internalist and externalist semantic theory" categories. Internalists have mainly focused on mental state defined as context independent category without any reference to individual’s physical and social environments, whereas the externalists put more emphasis on environmental contexts.

2.3.2.1.1. Internalist Semantic Theory

It refers to grammatical and semantic elements. According to I-semantic (internal semantic) theory, no relationship is detected between lexical and non-linguistic items.

2.3.2.1.1.1. Internalist Atomic Semantic Theory

The meaning of the word is in the language of thought. In other words, what people think of a word irrespective of its componential features can determine the real meaning of a word. For example, the word ‘bachelor’ is not meaningful as [+unmarried, +adult, +male], but it refers to a holistic meaning inferred from its atomistic features. This is a mental or internal phenomenon.

2.3.2.1.1.2. Internalist Molecular Theory

It is an encyclopedic and analytic semantics encompasses all features of a word.

2.3.2.1.2. Externalist Semantic Theory

It is also a mentalist theory but committed to external objects e.g., the word ‘apple’ refers to a tangible apple.
2.3.2.1.2.1. Atomic Externalist Theory

It refers to an analyzable meaning. Lexical item is associated with concept and concept is related to an object e.g., the concept of gold should apply to a gold object; otherwise, the concept of gold is not tangible.

2.3.2.1.2.2. Molecular Externalist Theory

Lexical entries can determine the meaning of what they refer e.g., ‘spinster’ is composed of [+unmarried female, + adult], and those components refer to the same object.

2.3.2.1.2.2.1. Fregan Sense and Externalism (1956)

It is called the theory of reference, which means people can come to the same sense of a sentence when they understand the same declarative sentence.

2.3.2.1.2.2.2. Character and Externalism

The value of a character is a context and the value of a context is the referent.

2.3.2.1.2.2.3. Model of Theory and Externalism

There is a way in which natural languages can be represented in the mind of speakers, which is traced back to the external factors.

2.3.2.1.2.2.4. Rules and Mentalism

The meaning of lexical items is psychologically real, which can be represented by the mental rules defined as internal and psychological semantic competence.

2.3.2.2. Approaches to Lexical Semantics

Cruse (2000, p.96-102) has enumerated various approaches to lexical semantics, which are as follows:

2.3.2.2.1. One-Level Vs Two-Level Approaches

These are two distinctive approaches to lexical semantics as 'word is meaningful on its own' and 'word is meaningful in relation to the external world or encyclopedic knowledge'. Some semanticists believe that both lexical knowledge as a 'single –level' and encyclopedic meaning as a 'dual level' of extra linguistic factor cannot be posited.
within the framework of a dichotomy, but it is better they will be considered as a continuum.

2.3.2.2.2. Mesosemic Vs Polysemic Approaches

The mesosemic approach means, “If one thing is the extension of another thing, then only one should be recorded and the other should be left to the operation of lexical rules” (ibid, 97). In polysemic approach, multiple extensions of meaning can be detected, which eventually contribute to clear distinction of word meanings.

2.3.2.2.3. The Componential Approach

“The meaning of a word is constructed out of smaller, more elementary and invariant units of meanings” (p.98). Other names are also mentioned for the componential approach such as 'semantic features', 'semantic primes', 'semantic markers', 'semantic components', 'semes' and 'semantic atoms'.

2.3.2.2.4. Holist Approach

It is classified into two parts:

a. Localist view

b. Holist approach, which is based on Haas (1962) and Lyons' (1977) points of view.

According to localist view, contextual variation is due to interaction with contexts. According to Haas (1962), words are known by company they keep, which is based on both paradigmatic dimension in terms of substitution and syntagmatic relation in terms of grammatical well-formedness. According to Lyons (1977) compatible with Saussurian approach, the concept of a word is not substantive but relational e.g., a horse is a kind of animal, which is not a cow, dwells in stable etc. On the other hand, the word ‘concept’ can be defined in terms of a complex network of relations, which make it meaningful.

2.3.2.2.5. Formal Approach

It seeks the meaning through a strict formalism in a standard logic.
2.3.2.2.6. Conceptual Approach

It is based on a cognitive system of family resemblance in which the members of a large family resemble each other, which is later modified by Rosch (1973) as the cognitive psychologist. In this viewpoint, members of a category are the same but vary in terms of how typical or prototypical they are. The theories are against Aristotelian notion of necessary and sufficient criterion.

2.4. Lexical Knowledge

2.4.1. Definition

Lexical Knowledge is “a collection of word or words with labeled relations between them” (Romanand, 2007, p.7). It is used under the rubric 'lexical semantics' as the study of what and how the words of a language denote (Pustejovsky, 1995) and the systematic study of meaning (Jurafsky and Martin, 2000) along with semantics as "the study of the meaning of signs and representation, both mental and linguistic" (Dearborn, 2005, p.49). Lexical Knowledge deals with word (s), and “the dictionary definition of a word is its sense” (Winkler, 2008, p.135). However, the definition of word is not always clear-cut.

When we give the data as input to the computer, which is based on a binary list of properties, it may face some vagueness e.g., the word ‘mare’ can be defined in terms of components such as the [+equine, +female and +mature] and ‘bull’ as [+bovine, -female and +mature], but how can it define the word ‘happiness’. It seems to be impossible to detect any specific lists of properties to convey the exact meaning (Winkler, 2008). Moreover, reaching an agreement on the exact components of even tangible words seems not to be an easy task. Accordingly, definitions of gradable items are generally distorted. For example, giving a clear definition of the word ‘coldness’ seems to be accompanied with some inaccuracies. Moreover, classifying a given word into specific components is not a panacea to the entire problems in defining the meaning of the word. For example, the collection of different meaning of various parts of a car does not make it sense to understand the holistic meaning of the car (ibid). The next problem is that ‘word’ per se can be manifested in different formats; for example, the function words are those, which have no physical represent in real world. How can we define definite articles or conjunctions as grammatical elements in terms of atomistic components? In addition, there are some imaginary words (e.g., unicorn and elf), which do not have any real representation, but they are
meaningful in real world (e.g., they can be easily understood by the people in communicative atmosphere). It is possible that we encounter some words, which exist in real world but has no specific definition or reference e.g. ‘The king’s assassin must have died in the explosion’, "the assassin may be an unknown person , so there is not a known reference, but the sense of the word assassin is still clear" (ibid, p.136). It should be noted that the meaning of words, despite all commonalities, varies in terms of every single individual, which accentuates idiosyncratic interpretation of each word. For instance, interpretation of the word ‘mother’ as an emotionally defined word varies in terms of the number of interpreters. In spite of all shortcomings in defining the meaning of word, Wolter (2001) states that the mental lexicon includes a core vocabulary, which is well known based on lexical commonalities along with several peripheral layers of lexical knowledge, which can be defined in terms of idiosyncrasies. A mental picture of a word can be formed in our mental lexicon, when we directly or indirectly trigger the memory. The problem arises when you intend to communicate with an interlocutor who has a different mental lexicon. It seems there is a shared knowledge comprehensible for an encoder as a sender of a message and a decoder as a receiver of it. Despite all commonalities, the question is raised whether any misconception emerges or not (Kreidler, 1997). Many intervening variables such as communication environment, channel and mode of communication and other factors are influential in all misinterpretation and misconception.

Defining the terms 'lexeme', 'vocabulary', 'lexicology' and 'lexicography' also contribute to understanding the meaning of lexical knowledge. Furthermore, elaboration on the terms facilitates attaining the purpose of the study. "Lexeme is minimal unit that can take part in referring or predicting. All lexemes of a language constitute the lexicon of the language" (ibid, P.51). Vocabulary is the lexical system of a language. Lexicology and Lexicography are derived from Greek word lexiko or lexis, which means speech way of speaking. Both of them deal with word, and word is the lexical unit of language. ‘Lexicology’ is derived from ‘word’ is the science of words. Etymology, which deals with the study of the origin, history and changing the meaning of words, shows that ‘Lexicography’ is derived from Greek word means ‘word' and ‘writing’, which is the science of writing the words. Lexicography depends on lexicology, which is in the domain of applied lexicology. Lexicography in a concrete form is generally meaningful in writing a dictionary. Lexicological structure is either general or specific. The general category is concerned with universals in
language, while the specific one deals with the words in a particular language. Kreidler (1995, p.51) argues, "Lexical Knowledge deals with the lexical rules, which can demonstrate and explain the lexical units relationship based on synonymy, antonyms etc. Lexical relationships can be categorized into two broad approaches":

a. “Semantic field theory : It classifies the lexemes based on shares and differences” e.g., ‘moth’ and 'housefly' denote insects, which do not sting, ‘termite’ is an insect ,which can fly but can’t sting and ‘wasp’, ‘hornet’ and ‘bee’ are insects, which can fly and sting. Thus, the factors of ‘flying’ or ‘stinging’ can be elements for their distinctions or similarities. “It can be based on componential analysis e.g., man= [+adult, +male, +human] and analogy e.g., man is not woman or girl” (P.88).

b. Truth conditional semantics: It is “the study of lexical relations by the same referring expressions”, which can be defined in terms of entailment, paraphrase and contradiction.

Qian (1998) has mentioned two influential factors in vocabulary knowledge as the 'size of vocabulary knowledge', indicating the number of words a person knows and the 'depth of vocabulary knowledge', indicating how well a person knows a word ,whereas Chappelle (1998) has stated four dimensions for the definition of vocabulary as 'vocabulary size',' word knowledge', 'lexical organization' and 'lexical access'.

2.4.2. Compositionality and Non-Compositionality

Katz and Fodor (1963) who initially introduce compositional lexical semantics argue that the meaning of a word, the same as the sentence, can be analyzed into semantic components. Compositional sentences are those whose meanings can be understood by adding the primary meanings of the individual words, while the meaning of individual words does not denote more than a literal meaning (Winkler, 2008). Westerstahl (1998) raises the question whether compositionality is a non-empirical issue or not. The rationale is that it can be defined in terms of certain formal features. Synonymy as an example can be meaningful from compositionality aspect. However, each word can be differentiated in terms of being individual or combined as well as a literal meaning or being meaningful in a given occasion. Nevertheless, compositionality means all accompanied words convey one meaning in the sentence or context.
2.4.2.1. Compositionality and Limits as Non-compositionality Expressions

2.4.2.1.1. Compositionality

Cruse (2000, p.67) has considered three factors for defining compositionality:

a. “The meaning of a complex expression is completely determined by the meaning of its constituents.

b. The meaning of a complex expression is completely predictable by general rules from the meaning of its constituents.

c. Every grammatical context has a meaning, which contributes to the meaning of the whole”.

Two modes of combinations are also taken into consideration as endocentric and exocentric (ibid, p.68):

2.4.2.1.1.1. Endocentric Combination

“The resultant meaning is of the same basic type as one of the constituents” (ibid). Thus, the meaning on the entire sentence can be guessed by the combination of its constituents. It falls into following four parts:

a. Boolean combination: When we refer to 'a green hat', ‘green’ as an adjective is a modifier and 'hat' as a noun is a head, but the phrase refers to 'hat', which is central in meaning e.g., ‘what a hat!’ and ‘what a green hat!’ are ontologically the same since they deal with a 'hat', which is a core word.

b. Relation descriptors: The meaning of a word can be interpreted in terms of its relation with other words. A ‘large mouse’ is surely smaller than a ‘small elephant’, but it is meaningful in terms of a size compared to its normal category, namely a normal mouse.

c. Negational combination: There are some lexical items, which can negate a word either directly (un, non, not) or indirectly. For example, an ‘ex-voter’ is a former voter, a 'fake vase' is not real and a 'former president' is not an incumbent president.

d. Indirect types: The meaning is intact; while the format is different. For instance, ‘a beautiful dancer’ is a person who dances beautifully. Beautiful and beautifully are modifiers in which a 'dancer'(noun) is a modifier and 'dance'(verb) is a root.
2.4.2.1.2. Exocentric Combination

“The resultant meaning is of a different basic type to either of the constituents” (ibid, 68). For example, in the phrase ‘on the table’, ‘on’ is a preposition, which denotes a relation and ‘the table’ is the noun phrase which denotes a thing. However, ‘on the table’ is the prepositional phrase, which denotes a place. In other words, in exocentric combination, we deal with a kind of transformation.

The other relations in the categories, which cannot be restricted to compositionality, are known as non-compositionality expressions.

2.4.2.1.2. Non-compositionality

Non-compositionality falls into following classifications (ibid, p. 70-76):

2.4.2.1.2.1. Semantic Constituents

The combination of different constituents may convey different meaning, which sometimes leads to misconceptions. For example, the word 'to appoint', which means 'to select' can not be made negative by prefix ‘dis’, which means 'not' and the word 'disappoint' does not mean 'not appoint' as an opposite. In other example, the word ‘retort’ has no relationship with ‘re’ and ‘tort’ or even the compound word ‘yellow jacket’ with a stress on the first syllable means ‘bee’, which does not show any relationship with a jacket which is yellow.

2.4.2.1.2.2. Idioms (Idiomaticity)

They can be defined in terms of

a. “Elements are not separately modified without loss of idiomatic meaning.

b. Elements do not coordinate genuine semantic constituents.

c. Elements cannot take a constituent stress.

d. Elements cannot refer back anaphorically e.g., * John pulled her sister’s leg, Mary pulled it too (Pull somebody's leg is used when you are going to tell someone something that is not true). It should be noted that asterisk or * sign means the sentence is wrong.

e. An idiom does not serve the substitution of any of its constituent elements by synonymy or near synonymy.
f. Some aspects of grammar may or may not be part of an idiom” (ibid, P. 74).

2.4.3. Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Relations

Haastrup and Henriksen (2000) have define the depth of knowledge as “the knowledge on sense relations e.g., Paradigmatic (antonymy, synonymy) and syntagmatic (collocation) relationships” (p. 222). Sense indicates a semantic relation of linguistic meaning of a word, which is defined as 'sameness'(synonymy), 'oppositeness'(antonymy) and 'inclusiveness (hyponymy)'. Malmakjaer (2002) has defined lexical field in terms of four types of information:

A. Paradigmatic information such as synonymy and antonymy indicates the interdependence of words within the lexical system.

B. Syntagmatic information such as collocation indicates the relation of words in the pattern of arrangement.

C. Analogical information includes both paradigmatic and syntagmatic information (e.g., Horse is an animal, which can parade, trot etc).

D. Diasystemic information indicates the styles of language e.g., formal, informal, obsolete etc.

It should be noted that words constantly undergo changes in terms of form and meaning. Similarities and contrasts are those devices, which are used in the interrelationship of lexical units of word, foster clarifying the meaning of a given word. Word as a concept can also takes its meaning from context. It represents a spectrum of meaning, which highly depends on the interpretation of the interlocutor(s). Word can also be studied as phraseological unit or set of combinations, which is in contrast with the meaning of word in isolation.

2.4.4. Application

Read (1993) asserts that determining the high frequency words ,due to multivariate meanings, is not possible e.g., the word 'bank' refers to both a business providing financial services and a river bank. It raises the question which type of word is of great importance. For example, the first and second meanings of bank are important for a 'bank manager' and an 'oceanographer' respectively. Thus, the word 'frequency' may not be a very decisive factor leading to conclusion that one meaning of a word is generally better than the other meanings. No meaning is better than the
other is. In other words, it is the usage of a word in a context enabling a person to
determine which meaning of the word is more important than the others are. Inferring
the meaning of a word has its own complexities. Sternberg (1985) argues that when
learners face an unfamiliar word, they make tentative guesses to draw the meaning
from the context.

Stahl and Fairbanks (1986) suggest that encountering new words in context
triggers deeper processing of mental lexicon, which contributes to reaching the
meaning of words. Despite the above-mentioned general rule, the mental processing of
L1 and L2 learner is different, which can be attributed to various influential internal
and external factors. Widdowson (1984) has attributed the L1 and L2 learner
differences to their background knowledge. Baalan – Kapteijins and Elshout – Mohr
(1981) have emphasized the role of contextualization based on approximation. In other
words, when learners encounter an unfamiliar word, they resort to familiar lexical
concept compatible with the context to draw approximate meaning of the word. The
importance of vocabulary knowledge is also emphasized by Bernhardt (2005) who has
differentiated the skilled reader from the less-skilled one in terms of their accessibility
to lexical knowledge. Alderson (2000) also emphasizes the effect of vocabulary on
improving the reading comprehension and Schachter (1990) demonstrates the
significant difference of vocabulary knowledge between native speakers and non-
native ones. The relationship of proficiency and vocabulary knowledge is detected by
various researchers. For example, Meara (1996, P.48) has noted that assessing the
lexical knowledge as the mental lexicon is “a useful way of distinguishing between
learners at different levels of proficiency”. Accordingly, Schmitt (2000) has argued
that word knowledge can be acquired gradually with higher level of Proficiency for
both native and non-native speakers.

2.5. Synonymy

2.5.1. Definition

Blake (2008) defines synonymy in terms of the words with the same meaning
such as perplexed /bewildered, help/assist/aid and hackneyed/trite. Synonymy can be
detected in many crosswords. The problem of synonymy is that it is difficult to
differentiate various synonym words e.g., we shout ‘help’ not ‘assist’, or native
speakers say ‘first aid’ not ‘first assist’. It indicates that choice of synonymous words
is based on its usage. Synonymy is defined as different words with identical or similar
meaning, and the synonymy is a phenomenon in which synonymous words are shaped. The word synonymy is derived from Greek word as ‘Syn=with’ and ‘onyma=name’. Besides, two words are called synonymys when they possess the same denotative and connotative meanings. Synonymys can be detected in different parts of speech such as noun (liberty/freedom), verb (buy/purchase), adjective (pretty/nice), adverb (rapidly/quickly) and even preposition (in/at). If synonymy is merely defined in terms of 'sameness of meaning' criteria, it should be noted that, it is a rare phenomenon to find two words with exact meaning (e.g., pavement/sidewalk, kingly/royal/regal). The relation of the words can be determined in terms of paradigmatic form; it is shown by substitution, which is often applicable to synonymous words. Labor (1992) defines synonymy in terms of difference. Nevertheless, similarity of words is superimposed on difference in synonymy. Synonymy is a relative category. It is possible that the words, which seem to be synonymys from the viewpoint of ESL/EFL learners, are not synonymous in native speakers’ points of view. It is worth noting that even some words, which seem to be synonyms for a given native speaker, are not the same from the other native speaker. It indicates that background knowledge, culture, geographical areas, which are mentioned just a few, are influential to make some words seem to be synonymous (Winkler, 2008). It is also possible to define synonymy in terms of distinctive features e.g., There are three synonymous words such as ‘coach’, ‘sofa’ and 'davenport’. However, the word ‘davenport’ seems to be used by older people. It should be further mentioned that synonymy can also be defined as a matter of taste e.g., the pair of words ‘sofa’ and 'coach' seems to be absolute synonymys for some people, but it is not the same for the others (ibid). For example, some native speakers believe that ‘sofa’ is a formal word, which can be found in a living room, but ‘coach’ is a piece of furniture which is in your family room and you can lie down or sit freely (e.g., the word ‘coach potato’ as a lazy person indicates intimacy and informality).

Winkler (2008) has cited more examples of synonymy differentiation: The word ‘settee’ is used in the north Great Britain instead of ‘Sofa’, and the word ‘davenport’ is used as a small writing desk, while the word ‘davenport’ is defined in American Heritage Dictionary (2006) as a type of sofa that may be opened as a bed. It seems many varieties such as emotive, attitude, dialectal and stylistic aspects, which are mentioned as a few, engender fuzzy meanings and concepts for people from all lifestyles. The situation in which a word is used plays very crucial role in determining the most appropriate choice of word from of synonymous words. Cruse (1997, p.284)
mentions the causes of varieties as field and mode, “Field and more variants resemble dialectal variants in that they can be regarded as semantically neutral when they occur in their normal contexts, but become alive in situation (i.e., we evoke meaning when it transports to an alien environment):

a. Oh, look! A neonate (newborn baby)! Isn’t he lovely?”

Holiday et al. (1964) argue that style demonstrates the relationship of particularities in a linguistic exchange such as formal/informal, interviewer/interviewee etc. Thus, the situation and the choice of appropriate style are two concepts, which are closely linked to each other. Cruse (1977, p.285) has mentioned, “style variants are not semantically passive, even in their most normal contacts; they actually, in a sense, express aspects of situations, and can therefore help to create them”. Beer et al. (2004) consider the synonymy category in terms of synonymy/antonymy e.g., “Frozen chilly, cool, tepid, balmy, warm, hot” (Moats, 2000, P.280). Labor (1992) pinpoints synonymy as the adolescent slang terms. Accordingly, many researchers have referred to synonymy as a testing tube, which is applicable to syllabus exercises to measure the lexical knowledge of the testees more than any other lexical categories.

Some scholars pin hope to the issue of synonymy, which is meaningful regardless of its grammatical role. In other words, lexical categories, specifically, synonymy rather conveys the same meaning in different languages with different grammatical functions. Winkler (2008, p.139) has shown that native speakers are fully aware of changes grammatical changes of synonymous words, but it does not prevent them from expressing synonymous utterances e.g., Both utterances "Bob is standing by Jenny's sports car" and "Bob is standing by the red sports car that belong to Jenny's"(ibid) mean the same despite grammatical difference. Grammatical or morphological devices can also contribute to differentiating meaning e.g., the word ‘boy’ in English language is ‘batanglalaki’ in Tagalog language ‘batang’ means child and ‘lalaki’ means male. However, the word ‘boy’ in English language is equivalent to two words in Tagalog language in which masculinity feature is a prominent factor.

2.5.2. Elaboration on Theoretical Aspects

Despite the wide applicability of synonymy phenomenon in linguistic domains, not due attention is paid to its theoretical aspects. Nonetheless, it is highly used in philosophy, computational linguistics, lexicography and psycholinguistics and even in
the interdisciplinary domains. In other words, it seems there is consensus towards a comprehensive meaning of synonymy (Edmons, and Hirst, 2002). Synonymy is also defined in terms of semantic relation. In other words, the meaning of the words is defined in terms of the meaning of other words or the role that they play in a given situation. It can also be a criterion to substitute two pairs of words, which are denotatively and connotatively similar to each other. Hjoland (2007) argues that synonyms are the words with the same semantic relations but with different associations. Despite all meaning similarities in synonymous words, the distinctive meaning nuances can also be detected, which contribute to differentiating them from each other. Quine (1951) enumerates two types of synonymy as 'complete synonymy' and 'Partial synonymy'. The former refers to the words with identical meaning components. He claims a complete synonym is rare and it is often posited at the theoretical level, which is due to constant change of words in monolingual or multilingual settings. It is probable to detect some synonymous words, which are the same in most of the essential components in specific situation. For instance, the two words 'finish' and 'terminate' are synonyms in an appropriate situation. In other words, they can substitute with each other. Nevertheless, the two words cannot substitute with each other in all contexts since each word has its own distinctive meaning. For instance, ‘finish’ and ‘terminate’ are synonyms. The former means the final stage, but the latter means reaching a limit (ibid). Quine (1960) further argues that it is impossible to define synonymy, whereas Katz and Fodor (1963) note that it is possible to define synonymy in terms of full semantic meaning. Noda and Taber (1969, p.73) suggest that synonymy means “the words which share several characteristics with one another”.

In logics, two expressions are synonymous if and only iff they have the same meaning; however, the definition has led to skepticisms on 'intentional semantics' and 'intentional contexts'. Quine (1951) is against the term 'intentional semantics' since it is defined in terms of meaningful relations, which are based on analytic synonymy and antonymy. He postulates that semantic concepts are meaningful when they are defined in terms of either formal logical arguments or linguistic and observational elements. Despite the controversy surrounding assumptions of word meaning in logics, synonymy is defined in terms of substitution and is compositional in meaning in case of a fixed truth-value (ibid).
Mates (1952) is against ‘substitution’ as a constant criterion for defining synonymy. 'X' is 'X' every time because they are both one category with a truth-value but 'X' is not 'Y' even if they are synonymous. The truth-value of one relationship does not guarantee another relationship. Church (1946) and Cresswell (1985), as the advocates of structural approach, define synonymy in terms of syntactic structure and constituents. Frege (1968) states the role of synonymy in a sentence is defined in terms of analytic point of view. A sentence can be analytic if it meets two basics:

a. It is logically true
b. It can be substituted by synonymous expressions.

Quine (1951) argues that a logical truth will be true under every semantic interpretation even if it is illogical. Synonymy is also defined in terms of sense. According to Wikipedia (2008), sense of words indicates whether two words are synonyms or not. For example, the word ‘pupil’ can be 'a small part of an eye' that in this case it is not synonymous with the word 'student'. Besides, there are many synonymous words, which are borrowed from other languages. They are synonyms with each other, but etymologically they are from different origins e.g., the words 'folk' (Saxon word) = 'people' (Norman word) and 'freedom' (Saxon) = 'liberty' (Norman French). In other words, no pair of words can be synonymous if we consider all distinctive factors such as etymology, orthography, styles, usages and other qualities. Nevertheless, synonymy category and its sub-categories can be more meaningful if we define synonymy in terms of interchangeability in a specific context.

Hurford and Heasky (1983) note that synonymy is the relation between two predicates that have the same sense e.g., 'mercury = quicksilver', 'stubborn=obstinate'. The semanticists are on the horns of a dilemma whether people's judgment is of vital importance or not. If the criterion for calling two words synonymous is the judgment of people, then we will have numerous judgments in terms of the number of people. Chen (2000) mentions that the native speakers' judgment due to their varieties is not a reliable and authentic factor in finding the appropriate meaning distinction of the synonymous words. The following words are synonyms in terms of style difference (formality Vs informality), which heavily depends on the judgment of people and the situation they are used e.g., horse=gee gee', 'receive=get' and 'father=dad'. Hurford and Heasky (1983) note that synonymy can be defined in terms of the relation between predicates irrespective of the relation between the words. It means that each pair of synonyms is independent of the other. The relation is established when they are used
in their appropriate context. For example, the two words 'hide' and 'conceal' are synonymous when they substitute with each other in an appropriate context:

a. “The word 'hide' as a transitive verb: ‘Hide your sweeties under the pillow’

b. The word 'hide' as an intransitive verb: ‘Let’s hide from mommy’

c. The word 'hide' as a noun: ‘We watched the lords from a hide’

d. The word 'hide' as a noun: ‘The hide of a 9X weighs 200lbs.

The word ‘conceal’ can be synonymous with hide only in the sentence a” (ibid, p.103).

The sense is meaningful in terms of the judgment of competent speakers in discerning the synonymous words. Sense and referent are closely related to each other. Katz (2004) states that the relation of sense and referent is not a determining factor in differentiating the synonymous words from each other. Mates (1950) devises the following formulae as a criterion for determining synonymy(X=word, S=sentence):

a. X1 and X2 have the same meaning.

b. Then S1 and S2 should be synonym.

Such kind of formulae has met with a hail of criticism:

If ‘a’ is true, it does not necessarily result in ‘b’. In addition, the formulae do not make any clear distinction between different types of synonymy. Besides, word and sentence are two categories, which are not necessarily merged with each other in making two words synonym e.g., two words can be shown as synonymous in a dictionary, but they may not be synonyms in different contexts. Accordingly, rhetoric and communicative devices used in a word are different from a sentence. Ambiguity is also one of the other frequently used devices, indicating the role of deep structure in defining the meaning of a given word:

a. The lamb is too hot to eat (The lamb is to hot to eat or it is too hot for lamb to eat something.

b. Visiting professor can be fun (Visiting the professor is fun or the professor who is to visit is fun).

Absolute synonymy in many researchers’ papers is mentioned; however, the term is just an empty word or invalid. In other words, it cannot be within any synonymy classification. Despite being theoretically a correct concept, it does not virtually solve any problem. Cruse (1977) mentions that the issue of absolute synonymy is not meaningful when we consider degrees of synonymy. However,
degree of synonymy raises the question whether there are both zero synonymy and absolute synonymy as two extremes in synonymy. Besides, we should have a lexicon of degrees of synonymy; however, in many synonymous words, we cannot find some intact continuum of words. Moreover, experimental tests do not support storage or retrieval of information in the mental lexicon in terms of continuum of words.

Cruse (1997) applies binary classification for defining the synonymous words. He uses plus (+) as normal or unmarked (usual) sign and minus (-) as less normal or marked (unusual) one:

a. “Arthur is always chewing gum.
b. Arthur is always munching gum” (ibid, p.269).

‘Chew’ and ‘munch’ are synonymous, but the word ‘chew’ is normal and ‘munch’ is less normal in ‘a’ and ‘b’ sentences. However, the issue of normality is not an absolute concept since it pertains to the interpreter's judgment. Besides, the word ‘chew’, which seems to be normal in the above sentence, may be less normal in other sentence. In addition, the issue of ‘normality’ and ‘less normality’ is a vicious cycle, indicating we can have the least normal or degrees of normality which gives relative concepts of words that are not tangible in majority cases. If two synonym words are not synonyms in a given situation, it does not mean that they are not ontologically synonymous e.g., the two words ‘hide’ and ‘conceal’ are synonyms even if they are not synonyms in some context. Cruse (1997) uses the word ‘non-synonymous’ when two synonymous words cannot be called synonyms in a given situation:

a. Where is he hiding? (Normality)
b. Where is he concealing? (Odd)

2.5.3. Application

Synonymy is also defined in terms of semantic overlap e.g., ‘truthful’ and ‘honest’ are synonyms with high detected semantic overlap. Is semantic overlap an appropriate term, which can cover all concepts of synonymy? For example, the words ‘tree’ and ‘dog’ overlap in ‘bark’, but it is not a reasonable explanation to make the two words synonyms. Cruse (1997, p.266) mentions, “Synonymy must not only manifest a high degree of semantic overlap, they must also have a low degree of impact contractiveness”. Synonymy is also defined in terms of central and peripheral (minor) semantic traits. The synonymous words can be singled out by words or phrases such as ‘or’ or ‘that is to say’:
a. “He was cashiered, that is to say, dismissed”. The phrases such as, 'rather', or 'more exactly' can also be used:

b. “He was murdered, or rather executed”. However, the following sentence is odd because the words ‘dog’ and ‘cat’ can not be synonymous with each other:

c. “Arthur’s got himself a dog, or more exactly, a cat” (ibid, p.267).

Cruse (1985, p.266) further notes “there is not a neat way of characterizing synonyms”. He also adds, “Synonyms must not only manifest a high degree of semantic overlap, they must also have a low degree of implicit contractiveness” (ibid, p.266). For example, the two words ‘Alsatian’ and ‘Spaniel’ (two breeds of dogs) cannot be synonyms if their distinguishing traits are too highlighted. Nevertheless, distinguishing the overlapping meaning in synonymy is not definite in many cases (Markman, 1989). Asher and Simpson (1994) have mentioned different classifications of synonymy:

a. Synonymy between lexemes: The two words can be synonymous if they are paradigmatically the same in the range of meaning, which can be substituted.

b. Synonymy between words in context: The synonymous words can partially substitute with each other in a context if they have the same semantic values.

c. Avoidance of synonymy: If we consider an isomorphic organization of relationship in terms of forms and meaning, the concept of avoidance of synonymy in an ordinary communication can be more obvious

In cross-linguistics, the issue of synonymy is controversial; for example, the two words ‘four’ and ‘quart’ (or ‘quartz’ in French) are with the same meaning, but each one is used in its special context, indicating they cannot be considered exactly the same. That’s why, the importance of concept is once again emphasized.

2.5.4. Distinctive Types of Synonymy
2.5.4.1. Absolute Synonymy

It can be defined as words, which are equinormal in all contexts. Almost such kind of synonyms cannot be found in any language; however, some semanticists believe that it is possible e.g., the two words ‘gorse’ and ‘furze’ seem to be absolute synonyms. True (absolute) synonymy is considered not in terms of sameness but
distribution. Absolute synonymy is defined as pairs of words, which are interchangeable in all given contexts. The controversies arise when two words have the same meaning with dialectical difference e.g., the Germanic word of ‘Saturday’ is ‘Samstay’. Frankin et al. (2007, p.189) have defined true synonymy as “the words or expression that have the same meaning in some or all contexts”. The words ‘Annoy/pester/worry/irate/vex/heckle/bother/nettle/tantalize/disquiet/ruffle/persecute/molest’ are synonyms. Nevertheless, none of them can be used instead of each other in all contexts. If we limit the concept of ‘all’, then the concept of synonymy will be under question because we will find ’partial’ or, ’not absolute sameness' in synonymy classification. Some words have rather exact meaning with different roots. They are not even called absolute synonymy since they are differentiated from each other in terms of being 'new’ or ‘old’, ‘familiar’ or ‘unfamiliar’. Further distinctions are also detected. The following English words are differentiated in terms of their roots (The first pair of words is with Germanic and the second one with Latin roots): Manly/virile, heal/recuperate/and go down/descend.

Lyons (1995, p.61) mentions the following conditions to call the words full synonyms:

a. “All of their meanings are identical.

b. They are synonymous in all contexts.

c. They are semantically equivalent in all aspects of their meanings”.

Moats (2000, p.115) gives an example of near perfect synonyms: “Picture and photograph are synonyms; it means they can be used interchangeably, but picture refers to a framed painting”. In other words, synonymy is meaningful in terms of relative synonymy. Pure synonymy may be defined in terms of languages contact (napkin/serviette), in abbreviation (bicycle/bike), euphemistic domains (expire/die). Absolute synonymy is also referred to complete compatibility of meaning in which the contextual normality in intact: If 'X' is anomalous or normal in a context, 'Y' should have the same features to be full synonym with it. Cruse (2000, p.157) calls binary signs a basic requirement in differentiating the 'normality' from 'less normality' in synonymy. Binary signs are shown by plus (+) as normal and minus (-) as less normal respectively:

a. "Little Billy was so brave at dentist’s this morning.

b. Little Billy was so courageous at the dentist’s this morning".
The word ‘brave’ and ‘courageous’ are synonyms, but the former is normal and the latter is less normal in the above-mentioned sentences (ibid).

The complete synonymy is also expressed in terms of complement analysis (Klans-Bernhard, 2000): ‘Girl’ and Cat’ are common in 'breathing', 'having lungs' and 'metabolic systems'. However, not all of these commonalities are sufficient to make the two words synonyms. The problem of such kind of analysis is that it can merely name some restricted factors or grids in classification in which in some of them the two words can be synonymous and in the other non-synonymous. The truth of the assumption can be tested by ‘or’, ‘rather’ or ‘or more exactly’: a.? ‘She is black or rather white’. Cruse (1986, p.270) states, “natural language abhors absolute synonyms just as nature abhors a vacuum”. It is concurrent with Clark's (1992) assumption and Goodman's (1952) empirical findings.

2.5.4.2. Near – Synonymy

Lexicographers consider synonymy in terms of likeness of meaning with distinction, which makes one pair of synonymous words different from the other. Kay (1988, p.9) has mentioned, “The main point of those definitions is that near-synonyms must have the same essential meaning but may differ in peripheral or subordinate ideas”. Cruse (1985) notes that near-synonymy is differentiated in terms of various aspects of meaning. Cruse (2000, p.160) argues that near-synonymy does not merely indicate relative close meaning, but it is considered in terms of contrast in a given context e.g., “He was killed, but I can assure you he was not murdered, madam”.

Near-synonymy as a general term falls into various classifications (ibid, p.160):

a. Scale of degree: Mist, Laugh: chuckle, hot: scorching, big: huge
c. Aspectual distributions: calm: placid
d. Difference in prototype center: brave (physical) =courageous (moral)
e. Background difference: pretty (female): handsome (male) and both of them mean good-looking, but the gender difference is like man: woman

Cruse (1997, p.265) argues that two words can be synonyms when “they bear a special sort of semantic resemblance to one another; however, the intuitive class of
synonyms is by no means extended by the notion of cognitive synonyms”. He has also contrasted cognitive synonyms and plesionyms (near-synonyms):

A. Cognitive synonyms: They are the words substituted in a sentence in the preserved truth condition (Cognitive synonymy is under different titles of descriptive referential or propositional synonymy. The synonymy can be used in the same context without changing the truth condition), which may not be changed and can be expressed in terms of 'the expressive meaning', 'style', 'register, and 'different idiosyncrasies'.

B. Plesionym synonyms: They are those types of synonymy in which the truth conditions are changed but still results in semantically similar sentences e.g., mist: fog.

Edmons and Hirst (2002, p.197) pinpoint partial or near-synonymy in terms of meaning distinction(s): “Indeed, near-synonyms are pervasive in language; examples are easy to find such as 'lie', 'falsehood', 'untruth', 'fib' and 'misrepresentation'. For example, The word 'lie' is 'a deliberate attempt to deceive' that is a flat contradiction of the 'truth', whereas the word 'misrepresentation' may be more indirect, as by misplacement of emphasis, an 'untruth', might be told merely out of ignorance, and 'fib' is 'deliberately but relatively trivial', possibly informal, children term, whereas 'falsehood' is quite limited, and 'untruth' can be based euphemistically to avoid some of the derogatory implications of some of the other terms”.

Kats and Fodor (1963) emphasize the conceptual schema, indicating the relationship of words and concepts. Each word is related to schema. Thus, the synonymous words should denote the same schema. Mental structure schema can be defined in terms of a set of attributes, which can be called concepts.

Cruse (1997, p. 286) refers to plesionymous pairs that “there is only one member of plesionymous pair which is possible to assert, without paradox, which simultaneously denies the other member:

a. It wasn't foggy last Friday – just misty.
b. You didn’t thrash us at badminton – but I admit you beat us.
c. He is by no means fearless, but he’s extremely brave.
d. He wasn’t murdered, he was legally executed.

Applying 'or more exactly', 'more exactly' can be a good test for near – synonymy:

a. ? He kicked the bucket – or, more exactly, he died.
b. ? Is that your daddy? Not exactly, it is my father.
c. He stopped by the side of a late – or, more exactly a loch, since there was an opening to the sea.

d. ? d. He was murdered – or more exactly, he was killed.

e. He was executed – murdered, more exactly.

f. Was he killed? ? Not exactly – he was murdered”(ibid).

Cruse (1997, p.87) has further mentioned that it is rather difficult to give a clear-cut meaning of plesionymy. Furthermore, near synonym words are either subordinate or capital e.g., the word ‘nag’ refers to a worthless ‘horse’. The word 'horse' is a capital word in which many near synonymous as subordinate words directly or indirectly refer to it (ibid). In other words, we can consider a spectrum or range of similar and partially different words in which one word is generally considered as a capital word, which is more or less a neutral word e.g., the word 'pretty' in “good looking- pretty – handsome”. Traits can be differentiated in the spectrum of meaning. However, the word 'nice' is a capital and a general word among the above-mentioned synonymous words. The two words 'stallion' as a male horse and 'bull' as an adult male animal of the cattle family are non-synonyms since they are different in subordinate semantic traits and capital ones. Thus, existence of capital and subordinate(s) words is the inevitable reason for defining pairs of words near synonymous words. Moats (2000) argues that ‘chip’, ‘crack’, ‘shatter’ and 'demolish' are synonyms of ‘break’ but with distinctive meaning. In other words, subordinate words have all qualities of capital word. Cruse (1997, p.289) argues, “If two words are centrally congruent, then they are no longer plesionyms, but cognitive synonyms”. Plesionymy can also be expressed in terms of micro-relations in the following examples:

a. “Micro-incompatibility like execute: murder

b. Micro-compatibility like overlap: review: article

c. Micro-hyponymy like pretty: good looking”(ibid)

2.5.4.3. Propositional Synonymy

Cruse (1997, p.270) defines propositional synonymy as “a pair of lexical items must have certain properties in common. They can also be defined in terms of truth – conditional relations e.g.

a. He plays the fiddle very well.

b. He plays the violin very well.”
Fiddle and violin are proportional synonyms, which do not change the truth condition. “'X' is a proportional synonym of 'Y' if a. 'X' and 'Y' are syntactically identical b. Grammatical declarative sentence 'S' containing 'X' has equivalent truth conditions to another sentence 'S1', which is identical to 'S' except that 'X' is replaced by 'Y’” (ibid, p.88).

Cruse (1997, p.272) adds "if we are going to express the word 'pain' by an intensifier e.g., I felt a sudden sharp (very sharp /extremely sharp) pain. The intensifier does not clarify what the meaning of pain is, but it only gives expressive rather than propositional meaning to the word". Propositional synonyms are “lexical items differing only in repeat of inherited expressions traits or potential expressively e.g., jolly: very, cat: pussy, infant: baby, go on: continue” (ibid, p.277). Cruse (2000) has noted that propositional synonymy can be in terms of entailment: “If two lexical items are propositional synonyms, they can be substituted in any expression with truth – conditional properties without effort on those properties e.g., 'John bought a violin' entails and is entailed by 'John bought a fiddle' and 'I heard him turning his fiddle', entails and is entailed by 'I heard him turning his violin’” (p.158). He has also differentiated absolute synonyms from propositional ones: “Fiddle and violin are not absolute synonyms, which their truth conditions are intact. Fiddle for an unprofessional is colloquial word or jocular, whereas for a professional one, it is a neutral term. The words shin: fibula, are propositional synonyms in which the second one is used by a medical specialist. The phrases 'have intercourse' (in law) and 'make love' (in conversation) are also propositional synonyms” (ibid, p.158). Thus, Propositional synonymy can also be defined in terms of variation, which can be dialectal etc. The following synonym pairs are propositional synonymy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall: Autumn</th>
<th>Elevator: Lift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen: Valley</td>
<td>Wee: Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullery: Kitchen: Kitchenette</td>
<td>Serviette: Napkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavatory: Toilet: Lav</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Wireless: radio' and 'swimming bath: swimming pool' are the words, which also create dialectal synonymys (spoken by different generations) whose overall
significance is of the same order as that of geographical variances” (Cruse, 1997, p.283). Age, class and regional affiliation are also effective factors engendering variation (Hudson, 1980). “If the names differ only in respect of the fields of discourse in which they typically appear, thus they will be propositional synonyms” (ibid, p.49). The synonym words also differ in terms of being formal or informal such as 'receive: get', 'Pusillanimous: faint – hearted'. Propositional synonymy is differentiated from near synonymy: Cruse (1997, p.290) suggests that propositional synonyms are more synonyms than plesionyms, which are in turn, are more synonymous than non-synonymy”. Propositional synonymy is defined as full congruence in general with closest relationship, but near-synonymy is defined in terms of degree e.g., 'daring: bold' in which ‘daring’ shows higher degree of fearless than ‘bold’.

2.5.5. Other Synonymy Classifications

Edmonds and Hirst (2000) consider different types of synonymy, which are defined in terms of different attitudes e.g., Denotational indirect words, ('error = mistake'), emphasis ('enemy = foe'), denotational fuzzy words ('woods = forest'), expressed attitude ('skinny: slim: thin: slender'), emotive ('dad = father') and selectional force ('ruin = annihilated').

These types of classifications are in majority cases personal, unclear, redundant and overlapped. Classification of synonymy in terms of other criteria can also be controversial, bias and personal e.g., Different styles ('buy=purchase'), different connotations ('thrifty = stingy = economical') and dialectal differences ('autumn = fall', 'tube = underground').

2.6. Antonymy

2.6.1 Antonymy Definition

Antonymy refers to the words with opposite or nearly opposite meaning e.g., near ≠ far, war ≠ peace, increase ≠ decrease.

The words synonym and antonym are antonyms. Even synonymy is sometimes defined in terms of antonymy when synonymy is considered as a continuum (Beer et al. 2004). It is worth nothing that some words have more than one antonym: 'happy ≠ sad' 'happy = unhappy'. In this case, the antonyms of happy are synonyms with each other like 'sad = unhappy'. Antonyms can be in used in very restricted usage rather than synonyms. In other words, they are not as pervasive as synonyms especially in
Besides, synonymy can work in tandem e.g., 'neat and clean', but it is rare that native speakers use antonyms repeatedly. Moreover, many words do not have any antonym e.g., plastic (it is possible to contrast plastic with other items, but it is situational not a conventional antonymy). Sometimes synonym words behave like antonyms e.g., 'Peel: skin' in 'the chef has to peel a raw potato, but you can skin a boiled one'. In this sentence, 'peel: skin' behaves in a contrastive manner.

Miller and Fillbaum (1991) have shown that a second language learner learns the two opposite items at the same time. Casagranda and Hale's (1967) finding show that people can take benefit from antonymy as one of the common communicative tools. Antonymy can also be considered in terms of incompatibility, which is attributed to lack of referential overlap. Antonymy rather runs the gamut of incompatibility e.g., the words 'bottle', 'container' and 'courage' are incompatible since they have different meanings and show no overlap. Thus, difference in meaning can pertain to antonymy but in terms of incompatibility. Incompatibility is not a sole and unique criterion for antonymy. On the other hand, antonymy should not always be defined in terms of incompatibility e.g., the two words 'green' and 'blue' are rather in contrast not incompatible since the combination of two colors makes 'turquoise', which is a greenish-blue color. Incompatibility engenders entailment: Sentence 'A' is 'X' entails sentence 'A' is not 'Y' e.g., It is a 'mouse' entails it is not a 'cat'. However, many words can substitute for 'cat'. It is better to consider incompatibility as one of mediums of conveying the meaning of antonymy: 'fast ≠ slow', it is 'fast' entails it is not 'slow'.

Murphy and Andrew (1992) are of the opinion that native speakers can satisfy their demands by using synonymy and antonymy, but they just include small portions in communication e.g., 'dentist/patient' (In the context of dentistry, the dentist suggests and the patient accepts or rejects. These types of interaction are meaningful in a real situation. It should be noted that functional - notional method is based on such natural situation). Antonymy is classified into unmarked (usual) and marked (unusual) one e.g., 'How long is the pen?' is unmarked or neutral, but 'How short is the pen' is unusual which shows a presupposition. Blake (2008) argues that antonyms should be defined in terms of inequality or unequal status e.g., heavy/light 'how heavy is it?' is normal or unmarked, but 'how light is it?' is not. In other words, in English culture, the heaviness is more important than lightness. Clark and Gard (1969) have found that the unmarked adjective antonyms can be understood better than the marked ones. People
mostly substitute the unmarked adjectives for marked ones; however, the reversed
trend is rare. Jackson and Amvela (2000, P.98) have demonstrated that “Antonymy is
mostly found in adjectives”. However, it can also be found in other word classes:
adjective (light ≠ dark), noun (death ≠ life), verb (bring ≠ take), adverb (noisily ≠
quietly), conjunction (after ≠ before) and preposition (above ≠ below).

Cruse (1986) defines the meaning of every individual word in terms of semantic
differences. On the contrary, Justeson and Katz (1992) regard antonymy as a lexical
association, which is independent of meaning. In other words, antonym is considered
as the co-occurrence of words devoid of meaning. However, people use distinctive
devices to show the trivial differences of meaning in their feelings. Words can behave
in an integrated form, which means the compositionality of meaning depends on the
combination of its constituents. Accordingly, the concept of lexical association and co-
ocurrence play very important role in defining antonymy. Murphy and Andrew
(1992, p.4) have analyzed the concept of anatomy and noted, “If antonymy is just a
kind of lexical association, then the semantic components would be superfluous,
whereas in fact it seems to be a crucial element”. Charles and Miller (1989) have
elaborated on two assumptions of co-occurrence and substitutability of adjective in
antonymy: “co-occurrence means two adjectives are heard together and suitability
means two adjectives are interchanging each other in most contexts” (p.30). Cruse
congruency of antonym pairs. On the other hand, people can easily remember the other
antonym word when they hear the first part e.g., 'right /wrong', 'inside/outside'.
Intuition of native speakers is a good criterion to help them differentiate various types
of antonymy. Some opposites like 'happy ≠ sad', 'down ≠ up' seem to be good
prototyped antonyms, but 'vigorous ≠ feeble' and 'loud ≠ quiet' are not. Intuition of
native speakers is a relative issue since some native speakers confirm some pairs as
good prototyped antonyms, while the others do not think so.

Murphy and Andrew (1992) pinpoint the conceptual meaning in antonymy. Thus,
when people say something, they convey their ideas by different words and
word relationships. Antonymy is as one of the significant devices that they use to
satisfy their need. Bartling (1992) mentions certain sentences, despite being rare,
contain antonym on its own e.g., ‘In the good or bad times, ‘All creatures big and
small’.
Gross (1988) has shown that one of the implications of the lexical organization is that direct antonymy (e.g., near/far) is easier to understand than the indirect one (e.g., far/proximate). However, there are pairs that are difficult to classify them as direct antonymy such as 'happy/unhappy' or 'happy/sad'. It raises the question, which one is direct or more direct. Gross et al. (1988, p.3) mention, “any adjective with no direct antonym will be similar in meaning to some adjective with a direct antonym.

Cruse (1986, p.62) mentions “non-propositional meaning is important to anatomy e.g., ‘tubby’ and ‘emaciated’ are not fully opposites, although they incorporate a binary directional opposition. The reason is that ‘tubby’ has positive connotation which means overweight, while emaciated refers to a medical description”. Besides the word ‘tubby’ is informal and the word ‘emaciated’ is formal.

2.6.2. Different Types of Antonymy

2.6.2.1. Complementaries (Non-Gradable Antonymy)

There are wide ranges of discrepancies in dividing antonymy into some categories. Despite all differences, Raybeck and Herrmann (1990) note that there is a cross-cultural agreement on antonymy, which is an innate property of human language.

Complementaries are words such as dead/alive, true/false, inside/outside, obey/disobey, and continue/stop, possible/impossible, male/female, stationary/moving. Cruse (2000, p.168) argues that complementaries “constitute a very basic form of oppositeness and display inherent binary in perhaps its present form”. He also adds “if anything can not fall into the other, and if something does not fall into one of the compartment, it must fall into the other” (ibid). He has also defined complementary in terms of logical relationship: “F(X) entails and is entailed by not – F(Y)” (ibid, p.168). Furthermore, he has differentiated complementsaries from other misconceptions:

a. "X or Y is not equivalent to X or not –X’; it is based on tautology or redundancy.

b. ‘Neither X nor Y, neither X nor not –X’; it is a contradiction” (ibid).

When we say ‘neither male nor female’ or ‘neither dead nor alive’, we deal with something unusual. For example, scientists may make a creature, which is 'neither male nor female' by using some engineered method or may be some people who are homosexuals can be detected in nature, but it is an anomalous situation. It should also be noted that something, which seems anomalous in one situation might seem normal.
in other cases. In other words, the linguistic division, as what Cruse (2000) believes, is sharp; however, it can be modified by external and may be uncertain realities. Besides, the exceptional cases cannot be overgeneralized in majority cases. The word antonymy is used by Lyons (1963) in a narrow sense compared to opposite. However, antonymy and opposite are synonym with each other. Complementary opposite or contradictory opposite has no middle values, which can be shown in different parts of speech such as true/false (adjective) day/night (noun), pass/fail (verb) and in/out (preposition). The complementary opposite (*Asterisk means wrong and ≠ means antonym):

a. Does not take ‘er’ or ‘more’
b. Will not be accompanied by intensifier e.g., very, quite (* quite dead)
c. Can be in a reversionary manner e.g., appear/disappear, enter/leave

Egan (1968, p.27) also adds that complementary opposite can “signify a quality, verbs or nouns, which signify an act or state that reverse or undo the quality, act or state of the other”. Cruse (1997, p.199) refers to the example of dead/alive as a relation that does not affect the medico-legal uncertainty”. He has also classified the complementsaries into some parts:

a. Reversives: Change of state in one results in the confirmation of other or it is “complementary interaction in generating lexical triplets” e.g., live ≠ die, (ibid, p.201). In the words 'born: live: die', born and die are reversionary in terms of changing in opposite directions. The other examples are 'start: keep on: stop' and 'earn: save: spend'.

b. Interactive: It refers to words such as command: obey: disobey. In the example, ‘command’ is a stimulus, the response is ‘obey’ and 'obey: disobey' are complementaries. Besides, the relation of ‘command’ and ‘obey’ is based on interaction. Other examples are 'request: grant: refuse', 'tempt yield: resist' (ibid).

c. Satisfactives: For instance, 'aim: hit: miss'. ‘aim’ denotes an attempt to do something, ‘hit’ denotes success for performance in which the relationship shows a weak form of oppositeness. Other examples are 'compete: win: lose' and 'try: succeed fail'.

d. Counteractive: It refers to words such as 'attack: counterattack'. In the example, the former is an active word and the latter is a passive one, which is based on neutralization of the former. Another example is 'punch: counter punch' (ibid).
Lipka (1990) has classified semantic oppositedness into two parts as binary and non-binary opposition. In binary opposition, complementary opposite is posited just as a part of it.

a. Complementary: It is based on contradiction e.g., 'even/odd'. In other words, when something is even it cannot be odd and vice versa.

b. Antonymy: it is based on contrariety e.g., 'hot/cold'. It means presence of one is the absence of the other (it is not based on negation).

c. Perspectival: It is based on relational converseness e.g., 'husband/wife', if ‘A’ is the husband of ‘B’, ‘B’ will be the wife of ‘A’. (It is classified as a separate category in the research).

d. Directional opposition: it is based on spatial orientation of opposite direction e.g., north/south, go/come etc. It is also called ‘reverseives’ and 'antipodals' (Cruse, 2000). They are based on change in direction, movement e.g., 'rise/fall', 'enter/leave' and difference in transitive and intransitive opposite directions e.g., 'tie/untie', 'dress/undress' etc. However, it should be noted, “the action of tying bow in a ribbon is likely to be rather different from the action of untying the same bow” (ibid, p.171).

Cruse (2000, p. 174-175) has also posited polarity in terms of positive and negative elements:

a. Morphological polarity: “one term bears a negative affix; the other doesn’t (ibid, p. 174).

b. Logical polarity: one negative term cancels another e.g., Mary is not tall.

It is true that its true then it is true (positive and positive results in positive) or it’s false that it’s false means it’s true (negative and negative results in positive) e.g., “she succeeded in succeeding or she fails to fail (reversal)”.

c. Privative polarity: Absence of something is the presence of the other e.g., 'dead' which is negative and is the absence of being 'alive'. It is based on some salient opposite properties e.g., 'married ≠ single' or 'wide ≠ narrow'.

d. Evaluative polarity: “one term is evaluatively positive (based on comment), and the other is negative” e.g., 'good ≠ bad' and 'brave ≠ cowardly'. In this case, one item is a dominant word and neutral e.g., 'How clean is it? (It is neutral in the sentence and evaluatively, it is positive). If something is 'clean', which gives a positive attitude means absence of 'dirt', which engenders a negative attitude.

Cruse (2000, p.167) considers three oppositenesses:

a. Binary: when someone is 'dead', it entails s/he is not 'alive'.
b. Inherentness: When we refer to a 'bus', it will be a 'single' or a 'double-decker bus', but 'triple-decker bus' is inherently illogical; however, it is possible. In other words, triple-decker bus is accidental, which is possible in pragmatics. When we say 'up: down', the inherentness opposite of 'up' is 'down', which is based on prototypical feature for oppositeness.

c. Patency: As an example, Saturday: Monday is in linear opposite of Sunday or the rest days in a week. Saturday is as yesterday and Monday is as tomorrow compared to Sunday.

Lyons (1997) also considers three types of markedness in pairs of oppositeness (Cruse, 2000, p.173):

a. Morphological markedness: It occurs when using morphological marks or affixes or used e.g., 'possible ≠ impossible', 'happy ≠ unhappy'. One part does not have any mark and the other has the mark of difference.

b. Distributional: As an example, the word ‘long’ in ‘How long is it?’ is neutral or unmarked, which can be used in a normal situation, but the word ‘short’ in ‘How short is it?’ is marked.

c. Semantic markedness: The words ‘lion≠lioness’ are based on sex contrast.

There are many controversies on these types of classifications. For example, the distributional markedness is not applicable to complementary or non-gradable antonyms, ‘How deal is he?’

It is not also attributed to the patency oppositedness. For example, Saturday and Monday cannot be categorized as non-gradable antonyms. When a day is Saturday, it cannot be Monday or any other in a week (Saturday is not Monday, cannot be any other day in a week. Besides, it is in contrast with any other day in a week). Murphy notes the problem of antonymy is that there is no way to determine a perfect taxonomy.

2.6.2.2. Gradable Antonymy

Lyons (1971) and Cruse (1984) define the antonymy while they often attribute it to a gradable oppositedness and opposite category. Louwrens (1992, p.157) mentions that antonymy means "opposites in meaning between lexical items". Blake calls antonyms as the words with opposite meaning. Frankin et al. (2007, p.190) assert that gradable antonyms are "the antonym words representing the end of a scale, which can be defined in terms of degrees e.g., fast ≠ slow". Gradable antonymy is not based on
an absolute scale. For example, small elephant is bigger than a large mouse, or the category of a fast 'Labrador' may be slow for a 'Greyhound'. The negative of one part of gradable antonymy e.g., 'fast' does not necessarily refers to the other pair e.g., 'slow'. Since gradable antonymy is defined in terms of a scale, it can be tested by comparative marks such as 'er' and 'more'. For instance, the pair of words 'fast' and 'slow' are gradable antonyms since their comparative forms like 'slower' and 'faster' are meaningful. Moreover, intensifiers can precede the gradable antonyms such as 'quite easy', 'very easy' and 'too difficult'. Lipka (1990) mentions two types of semantic oppositedness:

a. Complementaries: In complementary category, the first part, namely binary opposition is taken into consideration.

b. Gradable antonym: In this category, non-binary opposition is discussed. Non-binary can be one dimensional in terms of serially ordered opposition in the form of scale, rank and cycle. The multi-dimensional opposition can be divided into directional opposition and incompatibility. The scale is based on a gradable, antonymy such as 'hot –worm-trepid-cool-cold', which is based on temperature fluctuation. Ranking is also considered as a gradable antonymy like military rank such as 'general – colonel-major-captain-lieutenant'. Multidimensional opposition is based on an opposite, which are combined into complex system of coordinates. It is obvious that there is no clear-cut distinction to differentiate the above-mentioned categories in terms of graded (gradable) and non-graded (non-gradable) antonymy. Besides, several overlapping in the opposite words can be detected e.g., 'up/down' can also be antonymy (based on Lipka classification) in addition to being directional or 'hot/cold' are regarded as scale in non-binary opposition and antonymy as a binary opposition. In the same way, Cruse (2000) uses the term ‘reversive e.g., 'up: down', 'forwards: backwards', 'north: south' in one category. Moreover, the term antonym is sometimes used as opposite, and it is sometimes differentiated from it. All of these ambiguities have made antonymy classifications controversial. In addition, some semanticists have gone into details on antonymy, but they are not able to draw comprehensive conclusions.

Cruse (2000, p.169) defines polar or gradable antonyms as pair of words such as 'heavy/light', 'thick/thin, large/small', 'deep/shallow', 'wide/narrow', which are with distinguishable feature:

a. Gradable: It refers to a wide range of antonyms, which can be used with degree of modifiers e.g., “Very/slightly, rather, quite/too/long”.
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b. Comparative and superlative: They can take the comparative form e.g., long, longer, longest and short, shorter, shortest (long: short)

c. Relative: Gradable antonyms are based on interpretation and background knowledge. For example, the words ‘small’ or ‘long’ are relative. It means their meaning heavily depends on what and how an interpreter comments. Besides, the interpretation also depends on the situation the gradable antonyms are used. Small elephant is meaningful compared to big one or to a criterion in which the size of elephant is taken into consideration. However, it does not mean that a big mouse is bigger than a small elephant.

d. “One of antonymous words is more prototypical than the other one”. For instance, 'How long is it?' is a neutral sentence; however, 'How short is it?' is not (it is not meaningful without having any presupposition) (Cruse, 2000, p.170).

e. It shows a degree of difference e.g., cool and cold are different in term of degree or scale.

f. It is not complementary: The pair of words 'dead # alive' is complementary antonyms. When someone is dead, s/he is not alive. Gradable antonymy is based on a scale. In other words, negation of one of the pairs does not necessarily result in the other e.g., when something is not long, it is not necessarily short.

g. “A is heavier than B entails and is entailed by B, which is lighter than A”. For example, wardrobe is heavier than suitcase; it means suitcase is lighter than wardrobe.

h. “Something does not presuppose the real entity of it”

“X is longer than Y does not presuppose that X is long similarly with shorter” (ibid).’ Mary's hair is longer than me’ does not necessarily mean Mary's hair is long.

i. Gradable antonyms are based on a continuum (sometimes scale and continuum is differentiated from each other) e.g., appalling, terrible, bad, poor, satisfactory, fair, good, excellent and incredible. Nevertheless, complementary antonymy indicates opposite concepts with no continuum. Complementary antonymy shows a binary relationship as an extreme (He is dead or alive) with no intervening antonym e.g., 'man: woman', 'push: pull' and 'attack: defend'.

Gradable opposites can be tested by using 'more or less' e.g., He is cheerful means he is more or less happy. The problem of gradable opposite in terms of a continuum is that the continuum is not every time clear-cut. Besides, the meaning in gradable opposites is subjective. In other words, the meanings depend on context. Gradable antonyms are based on dichotomy unmarked (usual) and marked (unusual)
classification e.g., old/young ‘How old are you?’ not ‘How young are you?’. Franklin et al. (2007) have adduced from the evidence that gradable antonymy can be unmarked and marked but only the former can be used in questions in terms of degree:

a. How high is the building?
b. *How low is the building?
c. 20 feet high
d. * 20 feet low

Jackson and Amvela (2000, p.101) claim that ‘gradable antonyms are found only in the adjective class, or among adverbs derived from adjectives: 'slowly/quickly', 'frequently ≠ rarely'; however, the noun class contains some complementary antonym pairs e.g., 'sleep/insomnia' and some converse antonyms e.g., 'parent, child', 'employer, employee'. Unmarked and marked phenomenon is also called uncommitted and committed. Committed phenomenon implies a particular value and it is impartial, but uncommitted one does not such a characteristic and is impartial:

a. How tall is Mary? (Uncommitted or unmarked)
b. How short is Mary? (Committed or marked) (Cruse, 1986 & Lyons, 1977).

Lehrer (1985) has propounded some criteria for discerning unmarkedness from markedness: For example, the scale of 'length' is related to 'long' (uncommitted) rather than 'short' (committed):

(a). Ali is twice as old as Reza (old is unmarked)
(b). Ali is twice as young as Reza (young is marked)

Cruse (2000, p.17) has pinpointed equivalent or overlapping antonymy (graded antonym). Equivalent antonyms such as 'hot/cold' and 'happy/sad', but it is wrong to say, “The coffee is hot, but it’s colder than another one.

The equivalent antonymy is neither impartial nor committed e.g., hotter presupposes 'hot' and colder presupposes 'cold'. However, one member of overlapping antonyms “for instance 'good: bad', yields an impartial comparative, and the other a committed comparative:

a. *John is an excellent player, but, he’s worse than Tom”.
b. “b. * How good is John’s backache?
c. How bad is John’s Backache?” (ibid, p.171).

If two 'bad' things are different in term of 'badness', they are differentiated in terms of degree. This is the innateness of overlapping antonyms. Sundos Al-Ajeel
(2002) has shown that the test of 'neither/nor' to discern gradable antonymy from upgradeable one is not correct in Arabic language, indicating it is not a universal test. Nevertheless, Cruse (1986, p.212) has identified another test to discern the co-occurrence of antonymous words by using the word 'twice': For instance, "A is twice as fat as B", sounds better to native speakers than "A is twice as thin as B", in the 'fat: thin' relation as antonymous pair of words. However, in some other pairs of words, it is not applicable e.g., 'hot/cold or good/bad': "A is twice as good as B, and A is twice as bad as A". The unmarked antonymy is more important and seems to be crucial rather than the marked one. Nevertheless, discerning the unmarked and marked classification is problematic for ESL and EFL students who do not have sufficient background knowledge on target language. In general, the adjacent antonymous sentences are in the form of two extremes or complementaries e.g., 'a matter of life and death', 'from start to finish' 'wanted dead or alive' or 'it is the beginning of an end'. Antonyms can follow each other even irrespective of word class e.g., 'Lighten (verb) our darkness (noun)' or 'He shut (verb) the door open (noun)'.

Jackson and Amrela (2000, p.99) mention solely three types of antonymy:

a. Gradable antonymy: “it doesn’t represent 'either/ or' relation but rather a 'more/less' relation on the basis of a continuum with no absolute value.

b. Contradictory, complementary or non-gradable antonymy: It is defined in terms of binary antonymy.

c. Converse or relational antonymy: it is defined in terms of antonymous relations between a pair of words. In other words, one antonym word shows the converse relation with other.

2.6.2.3. Converse Antonymy (Relational Opposite)

Relational opposite (Cruse, 1986), conversive antonymy (Lyons, 1971) or relative antonymy (Egan, 1968), which are sometimes used interchangeably can be defined as 'The presence of X includes the presence of Y'. It is based on relation of two parts. 'When X is husband of Y, then Y is the wife of X', which is applicable to several pairs of antonymous words e.g., 'husband: wife', 'employer: employee', 'predator: prey', 'send: receive'. It is also based on doer-patient relation e.g., 'predator: prey'. It is also shown by 'er' and 'ee' such as 'employer: employee' (Franklin, et al., 2007). Cruse (2000, p. 171) gives more examples of converse antonymy from different parts of speech such as" 'lend: borrow', 'buy: sell', 'doctor: patient', 'lecturer: student', 'rapist:
victim', 'precede: follow', 'in front of: behind', 'husband: wife', 'parent: offspring' and 'predator: prey'. Chung (2008) defines converse antonymy in terms of involvement of a relationship of mutual entailment to form a complete pair e.g., 'confine: release'. In other words, converse antonyms depend on each other. You cannot buy anything unless another person sells it. Thus, the pair of words 'buy:sell' are converse antonyms. However, the words 'give: take' are not exact converse antonyms because if 'X takes something from Y', it does not necessarily mean that 'Y gives that thing to X' e.g., 'come: go': if you go somewhere, that place does not come to you (Hurford, Heasley, 2007).

Lyons (1977) considers converse opposition as a major type, defined in terms of formulae: 'if X is P to Y', and then 'Y can be Q to X'. Besides, if 'Y is Q to X', then 'X is P to Y'. Cruse (2000) has considered converse opposition as a sub-type of directional opposition, whereas Murphy (2003) has mentioned a clear-cut formula for converse words (They are maximally similar but minimally different. e.g., 'father: daughter' cannot be considered appropriate since their contrast is more than one factor e.g., gender). Jones (2000) has also considered a borderline for converse antonymy e.g., 'doctor: patient', the former is not the co-existence of the latter. Lyons (1977) considers converse antonymy in contrast with directional opposite e.g., 'north/ south' are in opposite directions, but Murphy (2003) believes that they can also be converse antonymy. Murphy (2003, p.15) mentions, “If X is above Y, then Y is necessarily below X”). Fillmore (1978) asserts that converse antonymy can be defined in terms of opposite meaning, which is based on a relational type in a schema frame; whereas Cruse (1986) mentions that, the purity of opposite words is a vague concept. In other words, it is problematic to come to a decision on opposite words and their different types. He also (2000, p, 171) mentions that converse opposite is defined in terms of movement (it is just the definition of directional antonymy, which is based on movement in one or opposite direction) e.g., 'bequeath: inherit' is based on the movement of money, or 'precede: follow' is based on movement of time. It is difficult to attribute all converse antonyms to the opposites of movement e.g., 'sell: buy'.

Converse antonyms can be Two-place: The predicate has two arguments e.g., 'above: below', Three-place: The predicate has three arguments (nouns): Ali borrowed money from Reza. ('lend: borrow') and Four-place: The predicate has four arguments e.g., 'buy: sell'. Cruse (2000) further mentions, despite all distinctive signs, distinguishing the converse antonymy is sometimes difficult e.g., 'doctor: patient' is
reasonable, but 'dentist: patient' is a little strange. Besides, in 'lecturer: student' or 'lecturer: listener', both relations are correct, indicating the importance of interpreters and the situation. Moreover, 'teacher: student' and 'lecturer: student' do not show that 'teacher' and 'lecturer' are entirely compatible with each other. In other words, the social role and the role of situation should not be ignored in reaching an acceptable interpretation towards converse words (Egan, 1968).

2.6.2.4. Auto-Antonymy

Auto-Antonymy means one sense of a word is antonym of another sense of just the same word (Fellbaum, 1988). It is a situation-oriented phenomenon in which one of the two antonymous meanings of a word is meaningful. On the other hand, auto-antonym carries a pair of antonym senses. The phenomenon is attributed to a change of concept in a word leading to the meaningful opposite complementary sense e.g., ‘bad’ in slang language means ‘good’. “Autonymic pairs that are pronounced the same but spelled differently are similar to auto-antonyms” (Franklin, et al. 2007, p.190). Using different prefixes can engender antonymy. For example, the prefixes 'un, non, in, im...' can engender antonymy in the pairs of words such as likely/unlikely, able/unable, conformist/non-conformist and direct/indirect. Nevertheless, the same prefixes can act differently in other words:

a. The prefix 'im' in 'impossible' means not possible, but 'im' in 'import' does not mean not.

b. Agreement/disagreement in which ‘dis’ means not, but the word ‘dissolve’ in the sentence ‘Dissolve two spoons of powder in warm water’, does not mean not solve.

c. Suffix ‘less’ means not in ‘harmless’, but it does not mean ‘not’ in the sentence ‘His comments were general and valueless’; ‘less’ is opposite meaning of ‘not’

d. ‘In’ means 'not' in ‘inaccessible’; however, its meaning is opposite in ‘inflammable’. In other words, 'inflammable' does not mean 'not flammable', but as something, which burns very easily.

Thus, 'in, im, less’ and other prefixes and suffixes can act as auto-antonyms, it means auto-antonymy is not only applicable to word, but it is meaningful morphologically. Auto-Antonymy is a type of antonymy in which a word has two opposite meanings. In other words, it is its own antonym. Accordingly, it is a word
with two or more distinct and contradictory meanings. Other words are used instead of auto-antonym is also called 'antilogy', 'antagonym', 'contranym', 'enantriodome' and 'Janusword' (Janusis or Janus is a two-headed Roman god in mythology who was the god of gates of new beginnings. It had two faces in which with the front face looked at the future and with the back face looked at the past). Auto-Antonym is sometimes called 'self-antonym', which means a word with multiple or reversed meanings. Some contronymous (auto-antonymous) are true homonyms. In other words, some words have the same form with different etymology:

| 1. cleave | a. separate (old English) |
|          | b. adhere |
| 2. let   | a. allow |
|          | b. stop or hinder (in tennis) |

Contronym can form polysemy as a single word with opposite meanings:

| 1. quite | a. completely |
|         | b. Free, clear |

Contronyms can be as varieties in language:

| 1. table a bill | a. remove from debate (American English) |
|                 | b. make it ready for debate (British English) |

### 2.1.2.4.1. Auto-Antonymy Examples

According to Wikipedia (2006). Auto-antonym is the word, which its meaning depends on context or circumstance and denotes opposite concepts. Some examples of auto-antonyms are as follows (it seems the first meaning is used with more usage in communications):

<p>| 1. sanction | a. Punishment |
|            | b. Permission |
| 2. injunction | a. order |
|              | b. ban |
| 3. dust     | a. remove something |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. fast | a. move  
|     | b. fixed  
| 5. moot | a. argue  
|     | b. not worthy of arguing  
| 6. clip | a. cut off  
|     | b. hold tightly  
| 7. citation: | a. award  
|     | b. penalty  
| 8. oversight | a. watchful = care  
|     | b. not noticed = error  
| 9. carry on | a. behave normally  
|     | b. behave abnormally  
| 10. over | a. once more  
|     | b. finished  
| 11. bolt | a. secure in place  
|     | b. dash away  
| 12. peer | a. an equal  
|     | b. a noble man  
| 13. enjoin | a. instruct  
|     | b. prohibit  
| 14. screen | a. show  
|     | b. conceal, hide  
| 15. rent | a. lend = lease out  
|     | b. borrow = hire  
| 16. custom | a. usual  
|     | b. special  
| 17. handicap | a. advantage  
|     | b. disadvantage  
| 18. quantum | a. very small  
|     | b. very large  
| 19. table | a. suggest  
|     | b. postpone  
| 20. weather | a. withstand  
|     | b. stand up to = bear  
| 21. consult | a. take advice  
|     | b. give advice  
| 22. trim | a. remove  
|     | b. add  

83
23. strike  
   a. hit  
   b. miss (in basketball)  

24. adumbrate  
   a. clarify  
   b. cast a shadow over  

25. off  
   a. off  
   b. on (alarm clock)  

26. bomb  
   a. success  
   b. failure  

27. aught  
   a. anything  
   b. nothing  

28. resign  
   a. cease  
   b. continue (working)  

29. raise  
   a. build up  
   b. cut down  

30. scan  
   a. read carefully  
   b. skim  

31. hold up  
   a. support  
   b. delay = hinder  

32. give out  
   a. produce  
   b. stop  

33. root  
   a. remove completely  
   b. become firmly  

34. skin  
   a. cover with a skin  
   b. remove the skin  

35. quite  
   a. completely  
   b. clear = free  
   (in Middle English)

Winkler (2008, p. 140) states “some words like ‘on’ and ‘off’ are absolute and have no range of meaning, but words like ‘cold’ and ‘hot’ are participant and context-dependent”.

2.7. Idiomaticity

2.7.1. Idiom Definition

Idioms are “combinations of words whose individual meanings do not add up literally to their understood meaning” (Winkler, 2008, p. 145). Chomsky (1965) has called idioms as arbitrary phrases that their meanings can be taken for granted directly. Ackerman (1982) has considered idiomaticity in terms of non-compositional view, which has arbitrary meaning and is stored in the mental lexicon irrespective of other
categories. Similarly, Fromkin et al. (2007, p.181) has noted, “Idioms have a fixed meaning, that is, a meaning that is not compositional”. It is further added, “Idioms consist of more than one word, with meanings that can not be inferred from the meanings of the individual words” (ibid, p.184). Idioms are not decomposable since it has a fixed meaning e.g., ‘cut it out’ and ‘eat my hat’ (ibid). Cacchairi (1993, p. 33) has defined idioms as “non-compositional lexical units”. Accordingly, Flores d’ Arcais (1993, p.80) has argued “non-compositional means idiomatic expression always occur with its specific constituent words representing a frozen unit”. Jesperson (1994, p.24) has referred to idiom as “a unit, which cannot be further analyzed or decomposed in the way a free combination can”. Accordingly, Griffin (1989) has noted that, due to indistinguishable and ambiguous elements, the meanings of idioms cannot be recognized from their components.

Adkins (1968) refers to idioms as “modes of expression or phrases, which are peculiar to a given language” (P. 149). According to the above assumptions, idiomatic phrases cannot be understood literally. Searle (1979, p.99) has noted, “A reader primarily analyzes the literal meaning and then detects any inconsistency with the context”. Idioms have a non-compositional semantic structure since the meanings of the parts may not completely convey the whole meaning. Some idiomatic phrases cannot be understood separately e.g., ‘snap out of it’. Conversely, there are also some other idioms that their meaning can be guessed with high probability such as ‘give a piece of your mind’. Besides, it should be noted that sometimes the borderlines of idioms are not clear leading to overlapping with other categories. Moreover, there are some idiomatic phrases, which can be interpreted literally when their historical aspects are taken into consideration e.g., ‘it’s raining cats and dogs’ means ‘it’s raining hard’, which has no relation with the literal meaning, but it has a historical background. Winkler (2008, p.145) has narrated that “very long ago when roofs were somewhat slanted and made of plant materials, cats and dogs were often kept on the roof, and when it rained hard, the roofs became slick and the animals fell off them”.

Since all parts of idiom convey one meaning, it can be equivalent of a word in a dictionary. Idiom can act as a word in which any change in its parts can result in confusion. Furthermore, Carter (1987) adduces that some words are idiom prone; in other words, they are frequently used in idiomatic expression e.g., go, come, take etc. Smith (1990) believes that idiomatic expressions are interwoven with daily life as a
significant indication of culture, ideas and the common experiences of the people involved in language community.

2.7.2. Classifications

Idioms are also defined in terms of grammatical or syntactical categories, with specific meanings (Fromkin et al. 2007). Fillmore et al. (1988, p.505) has differentiated “substantive idioms as requisite lexical collocation from formal idioms as open lexical in requisite syntagmatic frames or colligation”. Makkai (1972, p.57) has recognized two idioms of “encoding” and decoding”. “Idioms of encoding” or “phraseological idioms” are those phrases in which the learner has no information and learns them in a conventional context e.g., ‘hit the road’ instead of ‘drive on the road’. In decoding idiom, the learner has a background and schematic knowledge e.g., a football player is familiar with football situation and can learn the football terms (idiomatic expressions) sooner. Thus, idioms can be considered as a continuum, which ranges from ‘encoding’ to ‘decoding’ in terms of paraphrasing the meaning (ibid).

Makkai (1983) has expounded upon the rationales of the existence of idiomatic expression: People tend to use shorter words instead of using longer or unfamiliar ones. Idioms are often rhythmic and sometimes based on alliteration, synonymy and antonymy e.g., 'take the cake' (rhythmic), 'spick and span' (alliteration and even rhythmic, 'by hook or crook' (synonymous and rhythmic), and 'move heaven and earth' (antonymy).

According to Carter (1998), Chomskyian approach cannot account for all anomalties like idioms in language: Idioms are not always semantically but syntactically well formed e.g., 'by and large'. Idioms show deficiency in transformation e.g., 'kick the bucket' not *the bucket was kicked by her. Idioms are non-compositional since meaning cannot be drawn from elements e.g., 'beat around the bush'. Idioms are frozen in form and do not accept substitution e.g., 'bury the hatchet' is correct but 'hide the hatchet' as an idiom is incorrect. Accordingly, 'bury the hatchet', which means 'stop argument, can not change into '*stop the hatchet' as an idiom. In other words, idioms are the phrases with rather fixed meanings and inflexible to substitution. Chu (1985, p.27-48) has considered six syntactic divisions for idioms:

1. Verbal idiom: It comprises a verb that makes the whole phase act as an idiom. “verb + adverb (go by), verb + preposition (tell on), verb + adverb + preposition (fool around with). verb + noun (do the track), verb + pronoun (beat it), verb + adjective
(keep cool), verb + noun / verb + pronoun + adjective (take it easy), verb + N/pronoun + adverb (get it all together), Verb + preposition + noun / pronoun (fall in love with), Verb + noun + preposition + noun (take the bull by the horns).

2. Adjectival idiom: It functions as an adjectival phrase in a sentence:
   a. Subject complement (I was still wet behind the ears)
   b. Object complement (I found him on pins and needles)
   c. Noun modifier (a hard-nosed teacher).

3. Adverbial idiom: It modifies verb, adjective, clause and sentence. It is also in the form of Adverbial phrase (fade and away), Prepositional phrase (on foot) and Noun phrase (rain or shine).

4. Noun idiom: It comes with a determiner or its modifiers (he is nobody’s fool, a feather in my cap) and Noun compound (flip-flop).

5. Prepositional idiom: A preposition does not necessarily take the form of preposition; it can be as an adverbial phrase or adjective phrase.

6. Clausal idiom: it is an idiom in the form of a clause or a competence sentence, which can be independent or dependent (within another sentence) e.g., his left hand doesn’t know what his right hand is doing”.

It seems some loopholes are detected in these categories: Firstly, it is just based on syntactic differentiation and semantic aspect of idiom is overlooked. Secondly, the categories do not encompass all syntactic details. Thirdly, it does not include a very comprehensive division. On the other hand, it engenders idiosyncratic interpretation and classification of idiomatic expressions without reaching a holistic conclusion. For example, Cousie et al. (1983) have considered idioms as non-compositional phrases, which can be categorized as a continuum:

   a. Pure idioms: They are fixed combination of words, which are defined as non-compositional elements in meaning. They do not permit any substitution.
   b. Figurative idioms: They are both literal and non-compositional e.g., ‘kick the bucket’ means ‘to die’, but it can also refer to a person who kicks the bucket.
   c. Semi-idioms: They are as the overlapping borderlines between idioms and collocations e.g., ‘blind alley’; it is meaningful in a special context, the word 'blind' is a figurative interpretation of 'alley' and it is meaning
per se. Thus, a person can guess the meaning by imagination or background knowledge.

d. Open collocation: It is based on free combination of words.

The above classifications draw the following criticisms:

a. The classification is to draw imaginary extremes on idiom with intervening ones. However, it seems that idiom classification into zero and full idioms do not solve any problem. When something is a zero idiom, it is not an idiom, and it should not be mentioned in this category at all. Accordingly, when something is full idiom, it is idiom and the adjective 'full' cannot solve any problem.

b. Attributing any phrase as an idiom is not an easy task since it shows overlapping borderlines with other categories; besides it depends on the judgments of interpreters.

2.7.3. Distinctions or Similarities

Idioms can be considered as a figure of speech (a word or expression, which is used different from the normal meaning that people infer), which indicates non-compositionality. Davies (1983) has emphasized the non-compositionality aspect of idiom since it is different from conventionality of literal meaning. For example, the idiomatic expression of ‘Mary blew off steam’ cannot be like a literal meaning because the meaning of the parts does not convey the meaning of the whole, and it cannot be under passivization ‘steam was blown off the sky’.

Some researchers such as Gibbs (1994) and Green (1989) and O’Brien (1990) have considered idioms as dead metaphors. Conversely, Pangal (1989) holds different view in this context: “Contrary to traditional notions that idioms are dead metaphor, experiment has shown that speakers can recover the underlying conceptual metaphors” (p.9) e.g., the idiom ‘let off the steam’ can be symbolized as a relation with anger, which is ‘heat in a pressured container’. Gibbs (1992), Nayale and Gibbs (1990) have confirmed that idiomatic expressions are not meaningful when they are considered as dead metaphors e.g., ‘flop your lid’, ‘hit the ceiling’ and ‘blow your stalk’ will be meaningful within the conceptual metaphor indicating ‘getting angry’. They can be interpreted and conceptualized ‘anger’ as a ‘heated fluid in a container’.

Pangal (1989, p.9) has noted that “idioms that are highly similar in meaning (which have the same stage of a conceptual prototype) like ‘get hot under the collar’
and ‘blow your stalk’ were differentiable on the basis of the conceptual information encoded on the discourse contexts in which they occurred”.

Weinreich (1966) has mentioned that idioms can be interpreted in terms of literal meaning, whereas the central part of idiomaticity is based on ambiguity e.g., ‘red herring’ means a fact or idea that takes people’s attention from the important points because it can be symbolized as a ‘herring with blood’, which can be a phony issue. Nevertheless, considering idioms in the literal meanings needs understanding the underlying meaning of idioms; otherwise, we face challenges in understanding their meanings, which are rather ambiguous (Lodge and Leach, 1975). Slangs (e.g., grease a ball) and Jargons (e.g., the word ‘boot’ in computer) are used with a certain group of people, which can be differentiated from idioms.

2.7.4. Idiom Analyzability or Non-Analyzability

Gibbs et al. (1989) have asserted that analyzability of idiomatic expressions is a crucial factor in understanding its meaning. In other words; the more analyzable an idiom is, the more understanding is expected. Sinclair (1991, p.11) has summarized the principle of idiom as: “A language user has available to him or her large number of semi-reconstructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they might appear to be analyzable into segments. To some extent, this may reflect the recurrence of similar situations in human affairs; it may illustrate a natural tendency to economy of effort; or it may be motivated in part by the exigencies of real time conversation”.

Pangal (1989, p.9) has noted that “experiments showed that judgments of the similarity in the figurative meanings of two idioms (e.g., ‘play with five’ and ‘out on a limb’) was based on temporal properties of conceptual prototype were judged to more similar in meaning than idioms referring to different temporal stages”. According to the classification, idioms can be differentiated from each other, while the shortcoming is that it is not very clear-cut.

2.7.5. Research Findings

Gribbs and Brien (1996) have shown consistency of meaning in some idiomatic expressions (e.g., ‘spill the bean’ can refer to a container in which beans are spilled). It means idiomatic expressions can be conceptualized, which contribute to understanding their meanings. However, ‘spill the bean’ means divulging the secrets to people, which is irrelevant to spilling the beans. Even if historical background and conceptualization
contribute to understanding the idiomatic items better, it does not show that people's understanding is merely determined by those factors. Slaver et al. (1987) have demonstrated that idiomatic expressions can be based on central concept e.g., the word anger can be defined in terms of events as specific antecedent conditions (e.g., swallow one’s pride, kick in the teeth), behavioral manner (e.g., hold your temper) and self-control (e.g., getting red in the face). Carter (1989, p.11) assumes that phrases “break the ice, break the speed limit, break a leg are the words their meanings can not be easily separated from their meaningfulness to individuals who bring different kinds of knowledge to the process of interpretation”. In this case, the word 'break' plays a central role, which can contribute to better understanding of respective idioms. Exact meaning can also be inferred following interaction with surroundings such as people and situation.

Fromkin et al. (2007, p.185) argues that idiomatic expressions are similar to ordinary phrases but “it’s a frozen form, which cannot enter other combinations:

a. She put her foot in her mouth (idiomatic expression).
b. She put her bracelet in her drawer (ordinary sentence)."

They have the same structure, but they are not the same e.g., idioms cannot be in passive voice:
c. "*c. Her mouth was put by her foot.
d. The bracelet was put in her drawer.
e. The drawer in which she put her bracelet was hers”.

'c' is the passivization of the idiomatic expression, which is wrong, 'd' and 'e' are the passivization of ordinary sentences in two different forms, which are correct. It shows that "idiomatic change is restricted; whereas the changes in ordinary sentences are with few limitations”. There are some idioms, which can change into passive voice without changing the meaning:
b. Tabs were kept on radicals by the FBI.
c. Radicals were kept tabs on by the FBI.” (ibid, p.185).

“Idioms can violate the semantic rules”: 

a. He ate his hat.
b. Eat your hat.
c. His hat is eaten.
‘b’ and ‘c’ are not related to idiom ‘a’. Besides, the word ‘eat’ takes the object which is edible which is not true in ‘a’ as an idiom.

“Idiom often leads to humor:

a. What did the doctor tell the vegetarian about his surgically implanted heart value from a pig?

b. That it was okay as long as he didn’t ‘eat his heart out’? (ibid, p.186).

Flores d’ Arcais (1993) pinpoints specific feature of idiomatic words that they are more flexible than frozen as very fixed words. On the contrary, Gibbs (1994) has mentioned that the phrase “face the music” can keep its figurative meaning, but it can be flexible because it can change into passive: The music must be faced by John.

Winkler (2008, p.145) refers idioms to “non-compositional phrases, which can be substituted for the synonyms:

a. Bill argues a lot
b. Bill discusses a lot.

It is further argued, “Changing the meaning of the word in a synonymy form is possible; however, changing the literal word will make it funny, irrational or unacceptable:

a. *My brother is a sofa potato.
b. My brother is a coach potato”.

Besides, the stress pattern of idiomatic expression is more fixed than compositional sentences (It does not undergo stress shift).

Passivization is possible in idiomatic sentences, but the meaning may change:

b. The book is hit by me.” (ibid, p.146).

Gribb’s (1987) finding demonstrates that older children are good at both frozen and flexible idioms rather than the young ones. Besides, the flexible idioms (e.g., hold your tongue) is easier to be learned than the frozen or distant related idioms (e.g., by and large). Pangal (1989) has also differentiated loosely related idiomatic words (e.g., do a slow turn, hold your temper) from closely linked ones (e.g., blow your stack, do a slow burn). Weinreich (1969) claims idioms are stored in our mental lexicon of idiom list. In this case, all various parts of language should be stored in different parts of brain, which raises some challenges e.g., Researches should prove partitionality of lexical knowledge categories and the overlapping of various lexical knowledge categories should be taken into consideration. Bogards (2001) notes idioms with
similar meanings can be learned and remembered sooner than the sporadic idioms. It implies a systematic mental procedure in sorting out the idiomatic phrases. Our mental lexicon contains set phrases in a fixed sequence of words, which should be learned by heart (Blake, 2008). According to this comment, idiomatic phrases cannot be understood by analyzing them into atomistic parts. Makkai (1983) states that people use the idioms to make new concepts and senses drawn from the combination of words. Gibbs (1994) as a psycholinguist confirms the above assumption that idioms are new concepts per se because idiomatic expressions are not mentally processed longer than literal phases.

2.7.5.1. Context

Ackerman (1982) implies that children cannot understand the idiomatic interpretation unless they take benefit from context. Kemper (1986) has also confirmed that explicit contexts can contribute to learning idioms better than casual ones. Lakoff (1987) has demonstrated that some idioms are context-oriented, which confirms Schweiger and Moats (1988), and Gacci and Levorator’s (1989) findings on the importance of context length and understanding the idiomatic expressions. Prinz (1983), Gibbs (1980, Swing and Cutler's (1979) studies on children confirm the importance of context in understanding the idioms especially at later ages.

2.7.6. Idiom Differentiation

Idiom is differentiated from frozen metaphor. The idiom ‘I cannot read like an open book’ is a dead metaphor, which cannot be defined in terms of semantic constituents. Nevertheless, idioms are more flexible than frozen metaphor. For example, Flexible idioms are those idioms in which the meaning of the constituents somehow conveys the entire meaning. Idiom is also differentiated from collocation as a word or phrase, which are accompanied with another word or phrase in a rather fixed arrangement. Arrangement of words is rather of great importance in collocation, whereas emotional meaning and the effect on listeners or readers play a significant role in the idioms. Idiom is different from cliché defined as the frequent boring phrase e.g., 'My position is absolutely clear'. Frequently used idioms transform into clichés when it rather loses its emotional effect.

According to the definition of 'Longman dictionary' (2005), "Proverb is a short well-known statement that gives advice or expresses something that is generally true:
'A penny saved is a penny earned' is an example of a proverb", whereas idiom is "a group of words that has a special meaning that is different from the ordinary meaning of each separate word e.g., 'under the weather' is an idiom meaning ill".

2.8. Collocation

2.8.1. Definition

There are many different definitions of collocation, which are more or less similar to each other. Benson (1986) has noted that collocation is “a great of words that occur repeatedly in a language” (p.61). Zhang (1993, p.1) and Lewis (1997, p.25) have called collocation as the "co-occurrence of words" or "a sequence of words" and the words that “co-occur naturally with greater than random frequently” and with “mutual expectancy”, respectively. Benson, Benson and Ilson (1997) have defined collocation as the phrases, which are fixed, non-idiomatic and identifiable. Fox (1998) has mentioned that collocation is “the words, which are frequently used together” (p.33). Accordingly, Cruse (1991), Franklin et al. (2007, p. 379) have defined collocation as “the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a corpus”. In other words, “the presence of one word in the text can affect the occurrence of other words”. Dillon (1997, p.128) has mentioned that “collocation seems relatively fixed or restricted but without semantic motivation”. Doughty et al. (2005, p. 68) have defined collocation as “lexical chunks, which result from memorizing the sequence of frequent large stretches of language adequately described by finite-state grammar” or as “patterns flow into each other”. Yule (1996, p.118) states that collocation is a context-oriented category: “There are many occasions when one word is appropriate in a sentence, but its synonyms would be odd because words are not always intersubstitutable in a sentence”. According to the definition, collocation is a unique phenomenon in which each substitution makes the sentence weird. Collocation is also defined in terms of the restrictions imposed on words. In other words, it is accompanied with specific verbs or nouns etc.

According to Wikipedia (2007), some common features of collocation are as follows:

a. Non-substitutability: Substitutability is impossible because it changes the collocation meaning or concept

b. Non-modifiability: Syntactic transformation or modification is impossible in collocation.
Collocations is defined as Pairs of words, which co-occur e.g., 'cosmetic surgery', 'nuclear family', 'crystal clear' etc. Some collocations are in the form of compound nouns e.g., 'riding boots', 'motorcycle' etc. Specific syntactic relations are also found in collocation e.g., 'make a decision' (verb + object). The studies conducted on collocation reveal that it is statistically significant as a lexical category. Collocation is stylistically meaningful, indicating style variation e.g., ‘pay attention to’ or ‘take into consideration’ are mostly used in formal situation. Besides, many spoken forms of collocation are in the form of rhythmic chunks.

It is worth noting that research on collocational words contributes to divulging the secret of phraseological competence. Fontenelle (1994) and Moon (1992) have mentioned that collocational knowledge is very important part of phraseological competence in English.

2.8.1.1. Elaboration on Collocation

Collocation issue is on the horns of dilemma whether it is considered within the grammatical or lexical frameworks. Malmkjaer (1991, p. 302) has called collocation as "the relation of co-occurrence of items and sets, which are open-ended". Conversely, Cruse (1990, p. 161) has defined collocation as “co-occurrence restriction” e.g., ‘I send hot regards’ is incorrect (Benson, Benson and Ilson, 1986). From the other aspect, collocation is considered as a category, which can be defined in terms of lexical knowledge. Halliday (1966) has argued that collocation is a complementary category to lexis, which agrees with Pawley and Syder's (1983) findings on the important role of lexical items in collocation, which guarantees speaking fluency and Lewi's (2000, p.29) studies on collocations as the “words which are statistically much more likely to appear than random chance suggests”.

2.8.1.2. Findings

Farghal and Obiedent (1995) have classified collocation in terms of receptive and productive collocation and have argued that there is a big gap between the receptive and productive knowledge of collocations. Gitsaki (1999) has noted that the conducted studies on collocation at the pedagogical or research levels are insufficient. Sung’s (2003) finding has shown that there is a positive correlation between the subjects’ knowledge on lexical collocations and their use. Accordingly, Biher et al. (1999) have concluded that collocations are used mostly in spoken rather than in
written language. Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.286) have found that “cohesive effect of pairs that have similar patterns of collocations will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences”. Partington (1996, p.18) has argued, “Knowledge of collocation in a particular environment is an important part of communicative competence”.

2.8.1.3. Collocation vs. Idiom

Words and Mcload (1981, p. 177) have suggested a continuum “idioms-collocations-colligations-free combinations”. Lewis (2000, p.137) has differentiated collocation from colligation: “colligation does not refer to word + pattern but pattern + pattern” e.g., ‘commit suicide’ or ‘commit a crime’ are within the pattern of verb + noun. Kjellmer (1984, p.163) has noted that idiom is differentiated from collocation in which "the meaning cannot be deduced from the combined meanings of its constituents". Idiom is a unique form of collocation (Leverato, 1993), which is virtually situated on the learners’ conceptual knowledge of figurative competence, whereas, Benson (1985, p.62) has differentiated collocations from idioms: “collocations are not idioms because their meanings are more or less flexible from the meanings of their parts”. Grass and Selinker (2008, p. 459) have argued that there is a systematic word combination (in collocation) because “individual words often appear together on a regular basis”. Furthermore, they have implied that some collocational words are more common than the others are: “collocations such as 'broad daylight', 'green with envy' and 'deep sign' are common in language and are more often processed as single units. They are different from idioms such as ‘kick the bucket’, which means ‘to die’ with the parts that are not related to the whole. Idioms also "signify a particular meaning represented by single words in many languages"(ibid). Nevertheless, more flexibility in grammatical structure is detected in idioms rather than collocations. Lewis (1997) has noted that inflexibility in the grammatical structure is more detected in collocations rather than in idioms and specifically in Verb + Noun (make a decision) and Adjective + Noun (thick eyebrows).

2.8.1.4. Collocation & Mental Process

Firth (1951) has called collocation as one of “levels of meaning” and has differentiated the “meaning of collocation” from “conceptual and contextual meaning” (p. 195).
The concept of meaning is very important in the fields of psychology, which is interwoven with memory and perception facilitating communication (Glenberg & Robertson, 2000). Nation (1990) states the low proficient learners prefer to “encode words in memory on the basis of sound and spelling rather than by association of meaning” (p.3). Collocational words can be more tangible if they deal with concrete words, which can be processed, in the right hemisphere. Bub and Lewine’s (1988) finding show a large RVF (right visual field) in abstract words interwoven with opposite hemisphere (Lewis hemisphere) and weak RVF in concrete word, indicating involvement of right hemisphere. Day’s (1977) studies also reveals right hemisphere is very important part in interpreting the concrete words (concrete words can be easily conceptualized they are much more tangible). Nation (2001, p.318) has defined collocation in terms of language knowledge in the form of "storage of chunks of language in long-term memory. Collocational is also differentiated in terms of style, indicating different parts of memory for language variation. Kjelmer (1989, p.140) has shown that “longer collocations are generally used in formal conditions three times more than the informal genre”.

2.8.2. Collocation & Theories

2.8.2.1. Classifications

Various classifications are suggested on collocations, which are as follows:

Allan (2001) has suggested three elements leading to the emergence of collocation concept. a. Semantic field: It is based on conceptual fields, which can be defined in terms of kinship, color, marital relations etc, b. Meaning boundaries: it is based on overlapping boundaries of meaning within the frame work of co-occurrence of words and c. Collocational restriction: It is based on limited co-occurrence of words. Not every co-occurrence can be collocation.

Collocation is posited from various perspectives, including (Glendhill, 2000) a. Co-occurrence: This is based on statistical findings reveal recurrent appearance of collocational words in a text, b. Construction: Collocation can be considered in terms of lexical-grammatical pattern and c. Expression: Collocation can be taken into account from pragmatic view in terms of a conventional unit of expression. Cruse (1986) has suggested three restrictions for collocation as Systematic, Semi-systematic and Idiosyncratic, whereas Albert (1991) has noted that collocation continuum ranges from rigidity to flexibility: a.“Open components: It is uninterrupted sequence of
words” (ibid, p.117), b.“Predictive relations: Two words are repeatedly used together” (p.121) and c.“Phrasal templates”: it is similar to “idiomatic phrases” (p. 219). Collocation as a continuum also includes Free combination like ‘bank of a river, central bank, deposit money in the bank, bank loan etc. Carter (1998, p.70-72) has noted that collocation falls into four parts: a. "Unrestricted collocation: It includes core words and a wide range of other words" such as 'fat' in fat belly, fat chicken, fat man etc., b. "Semi-restricted collocation": It includes core words with restricted accompanied words compared to unrestricted collocation such as ‘harbor’ in harbor suspicious, harbor grudges, c. "Restricted collocation": It is based on limited co-occurrence of words: stark naked, and d. "Familiar collocation: It keeps regular company with each other, or it communicates a particular meaning” e.g., unmitigated disaster.

2.8.2.2. Paradigmatic or Syntagmatic

Halliday (1966, p.152) has detected “syntagmatic relations” in collocation. Kjellmer (1994) has argued that words can be as ready-made chunks, which are manifested in collocation. Thus, collocation is chunks of words, which are systematically and syntagmatically-oriented. Concurrently, Firth (1957, p.196) has mentioned, “Meaning by collocation is an abstraction at the syntagmatic level and is not directly concerned with the conceptual or idea approach to the meaning of words”. Firth (1957) has argued that collocation could be possible for all words, which can be combined with each other, and it is as a sign of language knowledge. Fillmore (1979) has confirmed Firth’s finding and added that knowledge of collocation can foster language fluency. Aghbar (1990) has shown that the combined words in collocation can be retrieved as a chunk.

2.8.2.3. Lexical and Grammatical Collocations

Robins (1967), Benson (1986) and Benson, Benson and Ilson (1997) have classified collocation into two broad fixed Lexical and Grammatical dimensions, which are significantly different from the other suggested divisions.

2.8.2.3.1. Lexical Collocation

Lexical collocation comprises the components in which lexical choice plays very important role. It “consists of two equal open-class lexical components with no
subordinate elements (Fontenelle, 1998, p.192). Robins (1967, p.21) has mentioned, “Words do not exist in isolation, and they differ according to collocations in which they are used” e.g., 'strong tea' is correct but *'powerful tea’ is incorrect. Teliya et al. (1998) have attributed lexical collocations to the restricted stereotyped cultural-oriented elements. McCardell (1995, p.9) asserts, “Lexical collocation are frequently occurring in word pairs in natural language whose presence are not always predictable by their usage” e.g., some examples are ‘a bar of soap’, ‘a ream of paper’ ‘a loaf of bread’, and ‘a tin of sardines. Aghbar (1991) has attributed the lexical collocations to a sequence of lexical items bound strictly to each other e.g., 'high wind', 'acute pain'. Cruse (1986) has defined collocation in terms of semantic cohesion. Henning (1973) has demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between language proficiency and vocabulary knowledge. It is worth noting that lexical collocation plays a crucial role in vocabulary knowledge.

2.8.2.3.2. Grammatical Collocation

It is based on analyzing collocational words in terms of parts of speech, which are called as “closed class” (Fontenelle, 1998; Gitaski, 1999, p.24). Syntactic relations in collocation can be as: adjective + noun (heavy rain), adverb + verb (completely forget), adverb + adjective (totally awesome), adjective + preposition (interested in), noun + noun (a business trip), Verb combinations like take care of, keep in touch with, commit suicide, which are due to combinations of verb with noun, preposition etc. Gitaski (1997) has pinpointed that verb combination is the dominant grammatical combination. Verb combination can be followed by infinitive (agree to help), gerund (avoid helping) or clause.

2.8.2.4. Collocation in ESL/EFL Learner

Nattinger (1989) and Seal (1991) have noted that ESL/EFL students should be fully aware of restrictions of co-occurrence, namely collocation. Collocation knowledge is as an index for recognizing the advanced ESL/EFL learners. Howarth (1998) and McCarthy (1990, p. 13) have shown that ESL/EFL learners demonstrate deficiency in collocation knowledge and “collocational appropriacy” compared to native speakers. Al-Zahrani (1998) and McArthur (1992, p.232) have also called collocation usage of ESL/EFL learners as the most challenging issue in language learning and as “a major indicator of foreignness”. Lenno’s (1996) finding reveals that
learners mostly commit errors in high frequently words such as 'take' and 'get' (when they are in combination with other words). Accordingly, Gitsaki (1999) and Biskup (1992) have also attributed the highest frequency of common errors to collocational words leading to language interference among ESL/EFL learners. Teliya et al. (1998) have attributed the errors of ESL/EFL students to the syntactic and semantic similarity between L1 and L2 (Language one as a source language and language two as a target language). Native speakers use some special co-occurrence of words e.g., 'sour milk', 'rancid milk' and 'curdled milk', which are stored in their memories, but * 'rotten milk' is incorrect. ESL/EFL learners who do not have such kind of knowledge, and they have just memorized the words ‘sour, rancid, curdled and rotten’ may use ‘milk’ preceded by 'rotten'. Collocational words should be learned as prefabricated patterns and should be memorized in a fixed manner, whereas it is very probable that the combination of words is meaningful.

2.9. Concrete & Abstract Categories

2.9.1. Concrete Word (s)

De Groot (1989, p. 826) has defined the concrete words as “words that refer to easily imaginable concepts are typically concrete, whereas words referring to concepts are that are hard to imagine tend to be abstract”. Concrete words refer to things, which are tangible or can be realized with our senses (Clark, 2003). The word ‘concrete’ is derived from ‘crescere’, which means grow together or grow harder. Walker and Home (1999, p. 826) have defined the concreteness effect as “a measure of the extent to which a word denotes a material object as opposed to an abstract quality, state, or actions, and may be thought of as an index of how directly the referent of a word can be experienced by the senses”. In above definitions, concrete words can be attributed to physical and bodily specifications of the given objects, which are tangible. However, degree of tangibility varies in terms of usage of the words and other intervening factors. For example, the word ‘pen’ is used more frequently for a writer rather than the word ‘truck’. The issue of sense or meaning is important in the rate of tangibility of a given word e.g., the word ‘shoe’ is more meaningful for a shoemaker than a house agent. Besides, the accessibility rate to a given word is crucial in rate of its tangibility e.g., when a person is involved in an activity, the number of his/her vocabulary knowledge in that context is more than other non-professional one. Some concrete words are easier to imagine, which can be as an idiosyncratic, cultural-
oriented or universal phenomena (Frye et al. 1985). Kerr and Johnson (1991) have shown that even congenital blind adults use more visual imagery words. Martin (2001, p.153) has argued, “The information stored in our brain about objects and words” is different for each word. That’s why, the word ‘book’ and ‘Libro’, which are roughly the same, are treated differently. Halgreen (1990) has shown that concrete words are with N400 (negatively peaking at 400ms) indicate right lateralization and anterior part of the brain. Levin and miller (1979) refer to concrete words as imaginable concepts. They have considered two concrete and abstract stages in understanding the words. Concrete stage indicates doing, performance of an activity or tangibility e.g., drawing picture. Concrete words (nouns) deals with senses, touching, seeing, tasting, hearing and smelling. Abstract stage indicates a symbolic stage e.g., using mathematical symbols such as +, -, ÷ and ×.

2.9.2. Abstract Word (s)

The word ‘abstract’ is originated from Latin components ‘abs=away’ and 'trahere=to pull' that means ‘remove from’ (Frye et al. 1985). Abstract words refer to concepts e.g., steadfastness, perseverance, freedom etc. Abstract words refer to properties of things, which can be general or conceptual such as goodness, truth. They are also related to feelings and ideas with no physical referents e.g., justice, love, success, morality. The words ends with ‘ism’ are abstract words, which do not stay alone. The abstract words are susceptible to interpretations more than concrete words. Abstract words also refer to entities linked with events, which cannot be experienced through senses. They deal with feelings (e.g., jealousy), ideas (e.g., peace and freedom) and qualities (e.g., generosity, determination).

2.9.3. Findings on Concrete & Abstract Categories

2.9.3.1. Semantic Features

Hinton and Shallice (1991) & Plaut and Shallice (1993) argue that abstract words have fewer semantic features than concrete ones. It is concluded that concrete words are more accessible in the mental lexicon. Nevertheless, concrete words can be defined by many abstract properties. Coltheart et al. (1987) have carried out experiments on patients who have frequently made semantic errors. Their finding shows that their subjects can find concrete words in reading sooner than abstract ones.
Accordingly, Gentner (1981) puts more emphasis on the role of concrete word knowledge in developing the vocabulary knowledge.

2.9.3.2. Lexical Decision

Various findings indicate the prevalence of lexical decision in concrete words rather than abstract ones. De Groot (1989) and Jame's (1975) findings show that lexical decision of abstract words is longer than the concrete words. In other words, the reaction time for mental process for concrete words is shorter than abstract words. Schwanenflugel et al. (1992) have also confirmed the readiness of subjects in finding concrete words is a sign of shorter reaction time in recognizing them. Bird, Franklin and Howard (2000) have reached the same result and have noted that lexical decision in concrete words is shorter than abstract words. Thus, it can be concluded that concrete and abstract words are categorized in different parts of the brain. Besides, concrete words are more accessible rather than abstract words. Holmes and Langfoot (1976) have also mentioned that subjects can detect and answer the concrete sentences sooner than the abstract ones in a meaningful situation. Haberlandt and Graesser (1985) have shown that time of comprehending sentences with concrete words is shorter than abstract ones. Walker and Hume (1990) have also revealed that bilinguals’ reaction time for concrete words is shorter and abstract words are less meaningful for them. Reilley (2005) claims the mental process of concrete words with all length is sooner than abstract ones.

2.9.3.3. Framework

Sebastian and Elizaberth (2005) have noted that the representational frameworks of concrete and abstract words are different from each other. Schwanenflugel (1992) and Gentner’s (1982) claim subjects' performance in concrete tests is better than abstract ones. Paivio (1986) differentiates concrete/abstract binary and notes that abstract words do not have direct sensory referent to concrete words. Souza-Poze and Rohrberg (1977) argue that many representational gestures can be elicited from the concrete words. Thus, it can be concluded that concrete words are often accompanied with activities, or they can be easily conceptualized in a series of activities. Conversely, Galbraith and Underwood (1973) claim abstract items foster larger variation in making and administrating tests for exam. De Groot’s (1987) studies on bilinguals demonstrate that they frequently use concrete words in compound but
abstract words in a coordinate way. Warrington and Shallice (1983) have shown that the aphasic patients and those who suffer from some forms of dementia have fewer problems to imagine concrete words rather than abstract ones.

2.9.3.4. Context

Warrington's (1975) and Miller (1999) finding show that significant difference on concrete and abstract comprehension in a context is detected. They show that concrete words seem to be understood better than abstract ones. Strain, Patterson and Seidenberg (1995) have concluded the same result in dyslexia readers. Patterson and Marcel (1977) have also shown that reading accuracy with concrete words is 70%, whereas it is 10% with abstract words. It should be mentioned that not all concrete words show the same results. The rate of background knowledge, word frequency, length and the usage are propounded as important factors, which differentiate the concrete words from each other. Kieras (1978) suggests the 'context availability model' in which comprehension variation is due to contextual information. Thus, concrete and abstract differentiation can be detected in the rate of information, which can be elicited from a context or in the test results.

2.9.3.5. Cognitive Domain

Pavio (1971) has pinpointed the difference between concrete and abstract categories in cognitive operations of mental functions. It seems that concrete words, which refer to specific objects or events show more cognitive advantages over abstract ones. Even the complex concepts can be understood better, when they are in concrete form. Levin and Miller (1979) and Ellis and Beaton's (1993) finding show that concrete words can be recalled sooner than the abstract ones. Palvio (1985) and Walker and Hume (1999) argue that concrete words can be traced in long memory, whereas abstract words do not have such a specification (Marschark and Pavio, 1977). Moreover, Pavio, Welsh and Bons (1994) and Franklin’s (1989) studies show that the patients with brain damage have more difficulty in understanding the abstract words rather than concrete words in reading. Statistical parametric map of the brain activity shows that abstract words cause significant activation of brain parts. In other words, abstract words are hard to be processed since they take more time and engage more parts of the brain.
Noppeney and Price's (2002) study show that left front temporal areas and right temporal areas are responsible for processing concrete and abstract words respectively. Similar results are reported by Perani et al. (1999) & Fiebach and Fried (2004). Their findings demonstrate that PET (Positron Emission Tomography) shows great activation of left temporal areas for concrete words and FMRI (Functional Magnetic Resource Imagine) shows strong activation of right temporal areas of the brain for abstract words. Concrete and abstract category distinction is also reported by Swaab et al. (2002). They have pinpointed the results drawn by EEG (Electroencephalography), indicating variation of scalp topographies and distinct cortical generators for concrete and abstract words. According to Sebastian and Elizabeth (2005) who oppose the above-mentioned results, neurolinguistic researches conducted on concrete and abstract categories are lop-sided since abstract word is rarely considered as a separate entity. In other words, it is often regarded as a second category compared to concrete one. Morsella and Miozzo (2002) pinpoints lexical nodes precede phonology selection. Lexical retrieval is an index of understanding the mental semantic system. Concrete words are meaningful since they demonstrate reality, tangibility, which are in close contact with events, and provide specific meanings. On the contrary, abstract words are factual insufficient phenomena, which do not often engender pictorial representation. They are mostly impressive and sometimes remain obscure with no specific meanings e.g., ‘red’ is a concrete word, but ‘redness’ is abstract. Most studies on concrete and abstract words indicate that concrete words are easier to be mentally processed than abstract ones.