

SYNTAX OR SEMANTICS: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Hassan Alamgeer

Visiting Lecturer, Kohsar University, Murree, Pakistan
hassanalamgeerabbasi14493@gmail.com

Zoulfiqar Ali

SST (English), SED, Govt of the Punjab, Pakistan
zoulfiqarali.pk@gmail.com

Muhammad Iftikhar

Lecturer in English, Govt Associate (Boys) College, Raiwind, Lahore
miftikhar.linguist@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim and purpose of this study was to investigate whether semantics was more important for a language or syntax. In other words, it is proposed to know whether meaning is more important for a language or structure. It aimed to investigate why semantics or syntax has more importance and how. This study was proposed to answer the research questions that how and why semantics is comparatively more important than syntax for a language. The research was conducted to analyze both the domains comparatively and analytically. The findings suggest that semantics is more important for a language because meaning is both internal and external to language unlike structure which is internal to language as the world and the context rely on the words and the text. Furthermore, the findings suggest that semantics is preferred over syntax because the violated categories of syntax have a potential to convey a meaning whereas the ambiguous meaning can result in the failure of cooperative communication. The common syntactic patterns of the languages e.g. SOV, VSO and SVO can still make the meanings clear if they are not patterned appropriately except for some cases according to the findings. The findings illustrate that the assumptions of semantics have more potential to be focused than syntactic elements. The results suggest that semantics fits into usefulness of language in real life unlike syntax which is an internal reality of a language. Accordingly, meaning is concerned with linguistic and non-linguistic elements whereas structure deals with only linguistic elements. Semantics gained importance because semantics has more significance in comparison with syntax in language comprehension and in terms of semantic characteristics.

Keywords: Semantics, Syntax, Structure, Meaning, Language, Importance, Comparison.

INTRODUCTION

Syntax is the scientific study of how words are patterned and structured to make a sentence. The words are hanged together because there is a logical connection of the words. There is a subject-verb agreement in the sentence. It is necessary to maintain a structure of words i.e. a subject or agent complements a verb followed by an object. There is consensus on this agreement. Similarly, it is also obligatory to add 's' or 'es' with a verb when it is a present indefinite tense. If the rules are broken, it can result in the syntactic violation.

Semantics is the scientific study of meaning. The ideas are logically connected because the words are not only cohesively but also coherently related. A speaker doesn't only speak the vocabulary, words and syntactic categories but there is also a semantic and literal representation of those words as well. If a person is following a structure but doesn't have meaning can result in invalidity e.g. 'colorless green ideas sleep furiously' has syntactic representation but it is semantically odd. Similarly, 'child is a father of man' seems correct syntactically but there is no true literal representation or there is illogical connection of ideas in these sentences. Another sentence 'She walks in beauty' again seems odd semantically because there is

no coherence here in the sentence. There is a dire need to make an interaction between cohesion and coherence or syntax and semantics to convey unambiguous meaning to speak cooperatively or communicatively. There is a paradigmatic relationship between words along with syntagmatic relationship. According to these explanations, both semantics and syntax are important for a language. Language is a source of communication. It is a tool to convey information but a communication can be affected badly if there is a violation of semantic and syntactic categories. This study is conducted to know whether meaning is more important than structure or vice versa. In order to know the more important domain, it is first needed to understand the ideas related to both semantics and syntax.

According to philosopher, being in an intentional state is a matter of being related to a sentence in a mental language, a 'language of thought.' According to this view, 'the mental representations that make up the items of this language have semantic and syntactic properties (CRANE, 1990).' Moreover, there is a claim of pure syntactic language of thought without intervention of semantics as 'he does think that there is a language of thought, but it is a purely syntactic language without semantics (CRANE, 1990).' If language is a mental and cognitive system so this claim that language of thought is purely syntactic without semantics seems vague. It is ontological hypothesis which needs epistemological proof. If a language is a mental construct or system, it demands for an intervention of semantics in syntactic structures. There should be an interaction between semantics and syntax to convey words meaningfully. Semantics represents the words literally. This is, then, possible that syntactic structures convey meaning without intervention of semantics when the syntactic categories are pragmatically related. When there is a meaning in use based on the shared knowledge then 'child is a father of man' or 'she walks in beauty' has also a meaning which is conveyed pragmatically and communicatively by the specific members to a specific discourse community which is aware of the discursive events and discourse categories e.g. a poet has a license to break the rules to communicate aesthetically i.e. 'child is a father of man' has pragmatic meaning conveyed to the receivers although the semantic representation is violated here. If a person invites someone and says, 'bring a plate' doesn't mean to bring a plate in actual but here the meaning is in use which refers to bringing some cereal things if he or she is invited for the dinner. A person who is not aware of discourse categories can mean it literally or semantically. Pragmatic or discourse meaning is independent from the semantic and literal representation of meaning.

If a purpose is to cooperate with the listeners or receivers semantically then the stretches of language should be clear semantically without vagueness, obscurity and ambiguity. Accordingly, a language of thought needs both syntactic structures and semantic patterns to be followed strictly to convey meaning semantically and syntactically. It is obvious sometimes that meaning is clear but the syntactic structures are not followed. Mostly second language speakers who are not competent syntactically still have ability to convey meanings e.g. 'I wants go post office' is syntactically violated but this sentence has still potential to convey the proposition of it. This illustrates, somehow, that semantics has more significance than syntax i.e. the syntactically violated stretches have potential to convey meanings. It is clear that language is a source of conveying something i.e. information. It is also obvious that both semantics and syntax are important for a language but still it has a possibility that semantics is more important than syntax or vice versa. It is also possible that both studies have more importance in their own specific areas i.e. semantics is more important to convey meaning than syntax to make speakers sure whether they are following the cohesive devices or not. It has also a possibility that sometimes syntax or sentence structures are more important to be followed to convey a sense instead of literal meaning i.e. 'Child is a father of man' and 'she walks in beauty' are syntactically correct and have more potential to convey a sense than a literal meaning. Therefore, stylistics is supposed to analyze these stretches scientifically to make the readers know that how foregrounding theory is applied by breaking the rules to attract the aesthetics and attention of the readers.

The researchers and philosophers are skeptic about syntax as a pure 'language of thought' without intervention of semantics as 'a number of philosophers have expressed skepticism about the idea that the syntax of intentional states, if they have any, can be completely independent of their semantics (Denett, 1982).' We adopt linguistic ways to convey information and to represent the constructions of the realities of the world but there are many non-linguistic ways e.g. picture to define the realities. The purpose behind

using linguistic ways is that there is a logical connection between words and meanings i.e. the words are combined together to make a meaningful sentence. Therefore, syntax can't be dealt separately without intervention of semantics and vice versa because both are important for a language. This is another debate whether syntax or semantics is more important for a language as it is a matter of comparison. This study is an attempt to know whether syntax is more important or semantics.

Statement of the Problem

There is no denying the fact that both semantics and syntax are important for a language but at the same time, it has a possibility that semantics is more important than syntax or vice versa. This is also possible that both are equally important for a language. On the other hand, both could be significant in their own specific and respective areas of a language i.e. semantics is a scientific study of meaning to get the idea that how the meanings are conveyed semantically but sometimes true syntactic stretch has no literal meaning. That correct syntactic representation could have potential to convey a 'sense' which is pragmatically concerned. The competent poets who have mastered in their native language experience such kind of violations. They, being correct syntactically, violate the meanings to convey a sense e.g. 'Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.' They, sometimes having true representation of meaning, violate the structures e.g. 'I doesn't like him' and 'He me saw.' So the competent speakers or poets can convey a meaning without speaking correct syntactically. Similarly, they can convey a sense and syntactic categories truly without dealing with semantic representation of the utterances. Simply, semantics and syntax both are important for a language but it is possible that semantics is more important than syntax or vice versa. The possibility of their importance for language in the related and specific areas is also obvious in many ways. Therefore the proposed study would intend to know whether semantics is more important for a language or syntax. It is also an attempt to study that semantics or syntax is more important for a language. This is ontology whether semantics or syntax is more important for a language needs to be proved epistemologically. This is also obvious in many ways that both are equally important for a language as language can't deal with them separately but it needs the speaker to interact with them altogether. It needs to make an interaction between words and meaning to convey something to someone communicatively. These ontologies are those gaps and spaces need to be filled epistemologically in order to facilitate the language learners and speakers to get in touch with the scientific study of meaning and structure in accordance with their core needs. The proposed study would therefore try to investigate and find whether semantics or syntax is more important or they both are equally important in order to meet the needs of the conduct and facilitate the language learners.

Significance of the Study

This study is focused to determine the importance of semantics and syntax for a language that how they are related to it. The study is of prime significance because it will facilitate the students, language learners, linguists, and researchers to know the importance of semantics and syntax for a language. They will get to know that which is more important for a language: semantics or syntax. Moreover they will get to know if both have equal importance or they are equally important in their particular domains. Furthermore, there is not a huge work which had been done yet on this aspect of more importance of any of the semantics or syntax for a language. This study would be significantly important to know the importance of semantics and syntax for a language which can lead the readers and researchers to use this conduct for their further studies. In particular the study will contribute to the guidance for those who want to be aware of whether semantics is more important than syntax or vice versa. The proposed study may also produce some other useful results from many perspectives i.e. both studies are equally important for a language or both have more importance in their particular domains. This study is determined to answer the following research questions.

Research Questions

1. Which is more important for a language: semantics or syntax?
2. What is the importance of semantics for a language in comparison with syntax?

3. How semantics or syntax is more important for a language?
4. How syntax is nothing without semantics?
5. How word structures are significantly related to meanings?

Objectives of the Study

1. To identify whether semantics or syntax is more important for a language.
2. To explore the significance or importance of semantics for a language in comparison with syntax.
3. To examine whether syntax is more important for a language or semantics?
4. To analyze whether syntax is nothing without semantics or not.
5. To find the significant relatedness of word structures with meanings.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The research is needed to investigate and find the importance of semantics and syntax for a language. This is needed to know that which is more important for a language: semantics or syntax. This is an ontological hypothesis that semantics or syntax is more important for a language which needs to be epistemologically proved. The possibility of their more importance in the particular domains is also obvious i.e. semantics is a scientific study of meaning which is important for a language whereas syntax is a scientific study of structures or how the words are combined and patterned to make a sentence. There are number of research studies on the importance of semantics and syntax for a language but there is a need to investigate the importance of semantics and syntax for a language comparatively to know which is more important for a language: semantics or syntax. This study is an attempt to fill in this gap to identify that which domain of language; semantics or syntax has more importance and to examine; why and how semantics or syntax is more important for a language.

One of the scholars namely Tim Crane proposed a study entitled as ‘The Language of Thought: No Syntax without Semantics’ and points out, ‘different languages talk about languages differently. (...) The doctrine of Linguistic Determinism---the idea that thought is determined by language (CRANE, 1990) (...)’. Tim Crane points out in the article, ‘Semantics should be concerned with relations between words and things---meaning is at least partly a matter of reference. (...) But either way, the point is clear: sentences and words have meaning only because they are intentionally used by people (CRANE, 1990).’ Another scholar namely Elisabet Britt Engdahl proposed a dissertation entitled as ‘The Syntax and Semantics of Questions in Swedish and points out, ‘the main part of the dissertation consists of an analysis of the semantics of constituent questions (Engdahl, 2014).’ (...) According to the scholar, B. Partee points out that it is unbounded syntactic rules that involve variable binding in the semantics (Partee, 1977). Another study is conducted by Lera Boroditsky entitled as ‘Sex, Syntax and Semantics.’ According to a scholar, Whorfian view proposes that thought and action are entirely determined by language (Boroditsky, 2000). Another great scholar namely Noam Chomsky conducted a study entitled as ‘Logical Syntax and Semantics: Their Linguistic Relevance.’ He points out, ‘I do object to the thesis that incorporating logical syntax and semantics into linguistic theory will solve certain of its problems, or that the theory of meaning in natural languages is in any way clarified by constructing artificial languages in terms of rules (...) (Chomsky, 1955).’ One of the scholars Marilyn A. Nippold conducted a study entitled as ‘Language Development during the Adolescent Years: Aspects of Pragmatic, Syntax, and Semantics.’ According to him, ‘growth in syntax during the adolescent years is gradual and subtle (...) (Nippold, 2000).’ As far as growth in semantics is concerned, he points out, ‘An aspect of semantics that develops gradually during the adolescent years is the understanding of figurative language’ (Nippold, 2000). Figurative language e.g. proverbs and metaphors are the complex part of any language and it is obvious that this aspect of semantics develops gradually. But syntactic development is gradual and subtle thoroughly which indicates, somehow, that the understanding of meaning is more important than syntax in terms of their growth and development. If a person starts understanding the meanings it means he or she has aural comprehension which leads him or her to produce orally.

Hudson & Bergman (1985) probed the way of word recognition by lexical knowledge. They analyzed the word length and word frequency in the phenomenon of naming and the lexical task. They

recommended that settling on lexical choices to words and naming words get to similar portrayals of those words in the psychological dictionary. It is indicated that the connection between stimuli over task is because of word length in letters as opposed to word recurrence.

Freebody and Anderson (1986) investigated the connection between a suggestion's sequential position, its evaluated significance, and the likelihood of its appearance in free review conventions as it was inspected. An aggregate of eight entries were each perused and reviewed by around 60 sixth-grade understudies. It was discovered that both evaluated significance and position anticipate review. Moreover, the quadratic of sequential position was a noteworthy indicator, showing a "recency" impact.

Fillmore (1982) examined that the Students who are learning English as a subsequent language are plainly confronted with more than learning the syntax of another dialect. However, exceptionally deficient depictions of the full scope of language aptitudes required in a study hall are the main ones accessible to date. The investigation has created some new bits of knowledge into the particular language abilities under studies requirement for school by dissecting the understanding and creation of both oral and composed language in a homeroom. What's more, bits of knowledge have been picked up with respect to the capability understudies must accomplish in the utilization of language to be full members in the study hall. The entirety of this data has added to the plan of a language test which endeavors to evaluate capability in oral and composed language use. This creative structure will be portrayed quickly towards the finish of the paper.

Scholars have done their researches with reference to the importance of semantics and syntax individually. Researchers are less interested in knowing which domain is more important for a language: semantics or syntax. Rather they are giving equal importance to both of the areas of linguistic studies therefore there is a need and requirement of current study to investigate the importance of syntax and semantics comparatively and to examine which is more important for a language: semantics or syntax. A comparison of both the domains is needed to know which, why and how semantics or syntax is more important for a language. No one can deny the importance of both semantics and syntax but it is a possibility to know which is more important for a language. This is necessary because the current study requires making an attempt to fill in this space. This study is an attempt to fill these gaps and effort to tell the readers that which domain has more significance or importance for a language: semantics or syntax.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data collection

This study is proposed to examine the importance of semantics and syntax for a language comparatively by looking into the ideas and concepts of both the domains analytically. The current study aims to analyze the concepts and ideas related to semantics and syntax comparatively and analytically. It aims to consult with the internet, related articles, and books to collect the data for analytical and comparative analysis. Articles are downloaded in PDF form from the website namely 'Google Scholar.' The books are also consulted recommended by the teachers and researchers.

Procedure and Methodology

Multi-method approach is adequate to apply to analyze any data. This multi-method way can yield more superior results. Every method has weaknesses can be overcome by the strengths of another approach or method. The qualitative analytical approach is applied to compare the ideas and concepts related to semantics and syntax in order to know which is more important for a language: semantics or syntax. A qualitative researcher engages in active analytic processes of reading, understanding and interpreting. Qualitative analytic methodology rely on the general approach called 'comparative analysis' which takes the ideas, concepts, themes or statements and compare it with related, similar or dissimilar ideas and concepts. The analytical or comparative analysis is applied to generate or create knowledge.

This study is proposed to follow the multi-methodological operations of similar kind i.e. qualitative methodology, analytical approach and comparative analysis. In other words the approaches are applied qualitatively. Research is conducted within limited time and resources therefore a researcher is not supposed to use the tools like questionnaire, interview or observational tool instead internet, books and articles are used as a tool to compare the ideas and concepts in order to know whether semantics is more important

than syntax for a language or vice versa. Moreover, why and how semantics or syntax is more important for a language is focused majorly. Simply, the multi-methodology which is applied can be called an armchair theorizing which is an approach to develop some findings without collecting the data from the participants. Instead it focuses on the careful analysis of existing data. In other words, this is non-participant analytical methodology to accomplish the research task to know which, why and how semantics or syntax is more important for a language.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Assumptions of Semantics in Comparison with Syntactic Categories

Every discipline is based on certain assumptions. Similarly, semantics which is a scientific study of meaning has established some assumptions which are: Reference and Sense, Utterances, Sentences, Propositions, Literal and Non-literal meanings. These assumptions are necessary to understand in order to know the importance of semantics for a language in comparison with the assumptions of syntax.

Reference and Sense

Semantics is the scientific study of meaning. Every discipline is based on some assumptions. Semantics has also established some assumptions. It deals with reference and sense. Accordingly, there is a relationship between linguistics and non-linguistic elements. Linguistic elements refer to the codes or languages whereas non-linguistic elements are those which are referred through the linguistic codes. In other words, there is a relationship between the words and the world. People need words to refer to the realities of the world. People experience the world but they need words to associate the meanings with their experiences. According to Palmer, 'reference deals with the relationship between the linguistic elements, words, sentences and the non-linguistic world of experience' (Palmer, 1976).' We can conclude from this definition that meaning of a word exist in the world e.g. 'the mosque of that city is located near the river.' Here we can see an interaction between the words and the real world. Here 'the mosque', 'that city' and 'the river' are not just the words but they are the existing realities in the real world. The meanings of these linguistic elements exist in the real world of experience. The people who are aware of these realities of the world can grasp the meanings of the words.

Reference is contextualized whereas sense is de-contextualized and abstract phenomenon which is not concerned with the relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic elements. It refers to the cognitive meanings within the words. In talking of sense, the relationship is in between the linguistic elements themselves and not between the words and the world. For instance, this is a sense which tells about the things which are referred to i.e. a referent is same whether it is an evening or morning star in 'a star is beautiful' but it is a cognitive meaning or sense which means evening star in the evening and morning star in the morning. According to Palmer, sense is 'concerned only with intra-linguistic relation (Palmer, 1976).'

The meaning is more focused here because a same sentence or structure 'the mosque of that city is located near the river' could have one or different referents. This is not the structure which is conveying a meaning but it is a shared knowledge and meanings between interlocutors who can grasp that 'the mosque', 'that city' and 'the river' mean what. Similarly, the referent is a same in talking of a sense i.e. 'a star is beautiful.' It is the person's sense or experience which can enable him or her to grasp a meaning or sense. Here the 'sense' is focused instead of a 'structure' or 'sentence' to make sure whether it is evening or morning star as the sentence is same for both 'senses.' It doesn't mean that syntax or structure is not important for a language but it is a matter of comparison as meaning is preferred over a structure in a language.

Utterances, Sentences and Propositions

Proposition refers to the words which have a meaning. A sentence may have different meanings. Proposition deals with the lexical words because they have meanings e.g. 'I abominate the girl.' Its proposition is 'abominate' and 'girl.' Sentence is higher level of language which could have many propositions and meanings. If a sentence could have many propositions then it is also obvious that one sentence has a different meanings in different contexts e.g. 'you are supposed to bring a plate' is one sentence but it has

different propositions. This is a shared knowledge and discursive event which can make a person grasp the real meaning whether it is simply 'to bring a plate' or 'to bring the cereal things.' Similarly, '*baahir nikal ky dikha*' is one sentence but it proposes different explanations whether it is a simple statement or a threat. This illustrates that language is more concerned with the meanings in use of same sentence. This doesn't deny the importance of syntax but meanings is preferred over a structure. Meaning is focused more than a structure because one sentence could have different meanings. On the other hand, different sentences also could have one meaning as discussed a bit more below.

Different sentences could have even one proposition e.g. 'he went', 'Osama went', 'he has went' or 'he had went' have similar propositions i.e. 'he went.' We could have two different sentences with almost same meanings e.g. 'He ate an apple' is same to 'An apple is eaten by him.' Different structures can convey a same meaning illustrates that both syntax and semantics are important for a language but meaning is more important because language is no more a source of communication if the meaning is ambiguous or obscure i.e. 'sense' speaks the meaning in particular context to avoid ambiguity. Therefore the major focus of language is making an attempt to convey non-ambiguous meanings. The different sentences can convey a same meaning illustrates that language's core purpose is not to put the structures in a particular order instead a meaning or proposition should be conveyed successfully. Sentence is when the words are patterned and when the sentence gains a sound it becomes an utterance which is written in inverted commas e.g. *I ate apple* becomes an utterance when it is in inverted commas, "I ate an apple."

Literal and Non-literal Meanings

Literal meaning is concerned with what is said. It has semantic representations of the words. Dictionary tells the literal meanings of the words. The main source of the literal meaning is a society which associates meanings to the words e.g. this is a society which names 'chair' to a wooden material with four legs and two arms along with a seat. When a society gives meaning to anything becomes a literal or dictionary meaning. Society doesn't name a 'table' a chair that is why dictionary doesn't represent a table as chair. Non literal meaning is not told by a dictionary which is called figurative meaning e.g. metaphor, metonymy, irony, and synecdoche. 'Time is money' and 'Islamabad announces a lockdown during Covid-19' are the examples of figurative language.

We have two kinds of meaning discussed above; literal and non-literal meaning. Literal meaning is conveyed to the receiver successfully because it is clear in terms of both meaning and structure. Syntax is the organization of the words chosen within a sentence i.e. putting the words in particular order makes sense. Non-literal meaning is ambiguous because of a violation of semantic and syntactic rules e.g. 'my dog has a bark as loud as thunder' is an example of simile but there is a violation of syntactic rule here, 'my dog has a bark.' The word 'bark' is a verb and has not put in particular order. Though there is a syntactic violation but still it communicates a meaning which illustrates that non-literal meanings can be conveyed even if the words are not put in particular order. It is making clear that the core purpose is to speak meaning instead of structure as meaning can be conveyed even it is non-literal.

Roots of Syntax in Relation to the Semantics

Every discipline has some roots on which it is based. Syntax is a scientific study of how the words are structured to make a sentence. These roots and components are necessary to understand in order to know the importance of syntax for a language in comparison with the assumptions of semantics. The subject-verb and object agreement is a fundamental component of syntax. The ordering of subject, verb and object in all languages makes a sense. All the languages are common in a sense that they have their particular structures i.e. majority of the languages either have SOV, VSO or SVO structures e.g. English has SVO whereas Arabic has VSO structure. Similarly, Urdu has its own structure i.e. SOV. Word orders are likely to change over time. The sentence 'Man hit the dog' can easily be understood by its native speaker. Similarly, '*ZARAB AL-WALADU AL-KALBA*' is also understandable by anyone who knows Arabic. If an Urdu speaker says, '*Aadmi ny kutty ko maara*' can easily make another person understand what he wants to convey. We can analyze here that there is an association of meanings with the words structures which ensures that both syntax and semantics are important for a language. But a core purpose of a language is to convey a meaning

i.e. a person who is a language beginner violates a syntactic patterns still can make anyone understand a meaning. A proposition can be conveyed even there is a severe violation of syntactic categories e.g. if English speaker says, 'Man dog hit' can make sure to convey a true meaning. This is obvious in the societies where English is the second language for non-nationals who are not the competent speakers but still they can convey a meaning with the help of violated categories of syntax. Similarly, Non-Arabian can convey a meaning saying, '*zaraba al kalba al waladu*' although the pattern is VOS against the common structure of Arabic VSO. Urdu speaker can use this utterance, 'kutty ko admi ny maara' to convey a same proposition although here the structure is OSV which is against a common pattern SOV. No one can claim that syntax has no importance but when it comes to know the importance of syntax and semantics it seems that semantics has a bit more importance than syntax. It is because the core purpose of any language is to convey a meaning. This is obvious from the above explanations that violated categories of syntax still have a potential to convey a meaning. If a meaning is obscure and ambiguous then a speaker can't speak communicatively and cooperatively.

Sometimes syntax gains a bit more importance because the violation of pattern can make a meaning ambiguous e.g. 'dog bites a man' is clear but if it is against the common SVO pattern as 'a man bites a dog' can change a meaning completely. It is obvious that semantics and syntax both are important for a language but semantics has more importance because the violated syntactic categories still have potential to convey a meaning commonly except for some cases. The main thing is to cooperate with the readers semantically i.e. the utterances shouldn't be ambiguous.

The Usefulness of Language in Daily Life

It is necessary here to get an idea of what meaning is. This is important to know the importance of meaning for a language. Meaning is a relationship between external and internal reality. Words are not the meanings because what a word mean typically get more words in L1 and L2 e.g. when a person says, 'lion is a kind of animal' can lead to a next question what 'kind' and 'animal' means. Holism claims that meanings of words depend upon their relationship with other words e.g. 'tall' is the opposite of 'short' and can be synonymous with 'tall' and 'high (Portner, 2005).' If the words are not meanings because a word typically gets more words so we can assume that meanings are something in mind. Meaning, for a time being, can be a thought or concept. Words could have same meanings and they can conflict too in terms of antonyms. They can also be understood in terms of entailment e.g. 'bird entails both robin and sparrow.'

According to idea theory every person has different experiences with something. For example, if two persons with the dogs are asked what kind of dog is, answers could be same if it is an idea or concept of dogs. DOG (with capital letters) means same for all doesn't mean that all the 'dogs' (with small letters) are same as everyone has his own experience with his dog. Meanings, therefore, are not ideas because DOG is an idea same for all but it doesn't mean that all 'dogs' are the same.

If meanings are not internal to language, not words and not concepts or ideas so they can be said as internal plus external realities which involve the knowledge of conditions under which words and sentences occur i.e. to know meaning amounts to know a condition (Portner, 2005). Thinking of meanings as truth conditions we should be aware of synonyms, antonyms, entailment and contradiction because meaning is internal and external reality and a notion that they can be got through the words in terms of their relationship with other words is somehow true.

Semantics is the study of meaning which deals scientifically. It is more important for a language than a structure because when we think of meaning as truth conditions fits into usefulness of language in daily life. Syntax is internal to language and deals with the rules to be followed by language or codes whereas semantics is concerned with the truth conditions which fits into usefulness of language in daily life. Semantics, unlike syntax, is a scientific study of meaning which is both internal and external to language. Syntax is concerned with the abstract rules to make words follow to construct a sentence whereas semantics is an interface between the words and real world. It is a study of linguistic and non-linguistic elements.

It is obvious that meaning is more important for a language than a structure because of the usefulness of meaning in daily life unlike syntax which is useful only within a language. When we associate

the meanings with the truth conditions fits into usefulness of language in real world. Usefulness of language in daily life refers to the reasons why we talk to one another. It refers to passing information about world through the words, languages and codes. The words are used by the speakers to know the world. The speakers know the context through the text. They share and get benefit from the experiences. The meaning is associated in the usefulness of language in the real world to use the information given by the interlocutors and to determine which actions and deeds can lead to the destination and the outcomes they desire. When the speakers communicate meaningfully it can refine their beliefs and to act in a rational way. The association of meanings of internal words with the external world can lead the speakers to speak rationally as the more they are rational in their words and deeds, the more chances are there to achieve the desires in order to be satisfied with the outcomes.

Simply, semantics is more important than syntax for a language because it doesn't only consider the words, concepts, ideas and thoughts as meanings but it focuses more on the knowledge of language which depends on the knowledge of meanings. It focuses on the knowledge of meanings because they depend on the knowledge of conditions. Moreover, the knowledge of truth conditions involve the speaker and urge them to be aware of synonyms, antonyms, entailment and contradiction because meaning is internal plus external reality and a notion that they can be got through the words in terms of their relationship with other words is somehow true. Meanings are not only internal to language like 'structure' but they are both internal and external realities. It doesn't mean that syntax is not important for a language but it is a matter of comparison. Semantics seems more important for a language than syntax comparatively because the knowledge of meaning depends on both the internal and external realities which urge the speakers to think of meaning as truth conditions fits into usefulness of language in daily life unlike syntax which is internal to language.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the importance of semantics and syntax for a language comparatively. It examined that how semantics and syntax are important for a language. It analyzed that both syntax and semantics are important for a language but when it is the matter of comparison, semantics seems more important than syntax. Semantics has more importance because language has more concern to convey a meaning. Furthermore, the violated syntactic categories can communicate a meaning whereas if there is not true semantic representation of what is said leads to non-cooperative communication between interlocutors. Moreover, semantics is a scientific study of meaning which has to do with both internal and external realities unlike syntax which is internal to language. Semantics deals with both linguistic and non-linguistic elements whereas syntax is interested in linguistic elements only. Semantics fits into usefulness of language in real life because the world and context rely on the words and texts. Syntactic violated categories still have potential to convey a meaning but semantic violation results in a gap between interlocutors in their communication. They can't cooperate communicatively without true semantic representation of the stretches. Languages have their own patterns which they follow i.e. Urdu shares SOV pattern and English follows SVO. But the findings illustrate that violated patterns have potential to communicate cooperatively there the meaning is more focused. Findings makes clear that second language speakers can convey a meaning with severe violation of syntactic elements. The focus is on the meaning more because the fundamental purpose of language tool is cooperative communication. It doesn't mean that findings prove no significance of syntax but when it is a matter of comparison, it seems meaning is spoken importantly than a structure. Meaning is more important in comparison with structure in terms of the illustration of the assumptions of the semantics too. The study answered the research questions that whether semantics is more important for a language or syntax. It was an attempt to know the importance of semantics for a language in comparison with syntax. It made clear that how semantics is more important for a language than syntax. Moreover, syntax is nothing without semantics according to the findings of this conduct because semantics has more significance in comparison with syntax in language comprehension and in terms of semantic characteristics. This study also investigated the roles of semantics in syntactic configuration of sentence i.e. the concept of frame which illustrates the significance of semantics for a language a bit more than syntax.

The findings and results show that both semantics and syntax are important for a language but meaning is preferred over structure. From the findings we can infer that meaning has more importance than structure because the ultimate purpose of a speaker is to communicate meaning and semantics instead of structure and syntax. This study is proposed within limited time and resources. It investigated the comparison of semantics and researches on this particular topic to compare both of them to reach a conclusion. This study can be contributing to know the importance of both the domains comparatively. There is a need to conduct more researches to explore and examine that how semantics or syntax is more important for a language. It is needed to know the importance of semantics and syntax in accordance with their core needs in their particular areas comparatively. The more researches can be conducted the more aspects can be analyzed to meet the requirement of this conduct and to fill in the gaps not filled yet by this research within limited resources.

REFERENCES

- Boroditsky, L. (2000). Sex, Semantics, and Syntax. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1-6.
- Chomsky, N. (1955). Logical Syntax and Semantics: Their Linguistic Relevance. *JSTOR*, 36-45.
- CRANE, T. (1990). The Language of Thought: No Syntax Without Semantics. *ISSN Basil Blackwell*, 188-212.
- Denett. (1982). *Beyond belief*. In A. Woodfield.
- Engdahl, E. B. (2014). The Syntax and Semantics of Questions in Swedish. *ScholarWorks*, 1-234.
- Filmore. (1982). Language Minority Students and School Participation: What Kind of English Needed? *Journal of Education* .
- Frase. (1969). Paragraph organization of written materials: The influence of conceptual clustering upon the level and organization of recall. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 394-401.
- Freebody and Anderson . (1986). Serial position and rated importance in the recall of text. *Journal Discourse process* , 31-36.
- Hudson and Bergman. (1985). lexical knowlege in word recognition: word length and word frequency in naming and lexical decision tasks . *journal of memory and language* , 40-58.
- Miller, G. A., Heise, G. A., & Lichten. (1951). The intelligibility of speech as a function of the context of the test materials. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 329-335.
- Nippold, M. A. (2000). Language Development during the Adolescent Years: Aspects of Pragmatics, Syntax, and Semantics. *Aspen Publishers*, 15-28.
- Palmer, F. (1976). *Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Partee, B. (1977). Comments on Bresnan's Ppaer. *Academic Press*.
- Portner, P. H. (2005). *What is meaning*. Bodmin (UK): Blackwell Publishing.
- Roediger and Crowder . (1976). recall instructions and suffix effect . *American Journal of Psychology* , 115-125.
- Sacks, Scheglof, & Jefferson . (1974). some criticisms on turn taking . *R. J. D. POWER and M. F. DAL MARTELLO*, 29-40.