Sentence Meaning and Speaker Meaning From Philosophical Perspective According to Lycan in Philisophy of Language

Besin Gaspar
Universitas Surabaya
Surabaya City, Indonesia
gasparbesin@staff.ubaya.ac.id

Abstract—This article aims at analyzing the sentence meaning and speaker meaning from philosophical perspectives based on Lycan's proposal in Philosophy of Language. So far, the analysis of sentence meaning and speaker meaning isUnder the heading of pragmatics only. The first part will deal with speaker meaning proposed by Lycan with some illustrations on daily communication. The second part deals with the sentence meaning as opposed to speaker meaning. Finally, it tries to see the link between speaker meaning in pragmatics and philosophy. In conclusion, both speaker meaning and sentence meaning are important in daily communication. For the philosophers, in scientific writing, sentence is more important since everything should be literal/explicitly stated. In contrast, in oral communication, speaker meaning is more important since people do not say what they want to say.

I. INTRODUCTION

Philosophy of language which analyzes language from a philosophical point of view has evolved revolutionarily since the 1960s. Prior to 1980, philosophers of language paid Finallygreat attention to formal grammar as articulated by theoretical linguists. This process can be called the process of 'philosophizing the language'. But after 1980, the attention of philosophers of language began to shift to the relationship between language and thought, and the relationship between language and reality.

So, philosophy pays attention to language not only in terms of form (expression) but also in terms of content (meaning). The theory of meaning from a philosophical point of view must be able to explain what series of sounds have meaning and how to distinguish one speech from another which has a different meaning. Theory must be able to explain how it is possible for humans to produce and understand these meaningful utterances.

The tendency mentioned above is seen in William *Lycan's Philosophy of Language* (1999) which discusses the philosophy of language in four parts. The first part discusses reference and referring, with a focus on self-names and references. The second part deals with several theories about meaning, including traditional

theory, Grice theory, verification theory, and truth-condition theory. The third part discusses pragmatics and speech acts. Finally,the fourth part talks about the dark side in analyzing meaning, namely metaphor.

The topic related to speaker meaning is usually dealt with in pragmatics. This can be seen in textbooks by G.Leech, _The principles of Pragmatics_ , 1993. S. Levinson, 1983. J.L. Mey, *Pragmatics: an Introduction*. 1993. Searle, John R. *Speech Acts,* 1969. G.Yulle, *Pragmatics,* 1996. Most of these authors, however, refer to Lycan's ideas in *Philosophy of Language.*Meanwhile, Lycan refers to Grice. Therefore, it is challenging to discuss deeply what is stated by Lycan in his book in order to fully understand the concept of speaking from philosophical perspective.

This short paper will focus on the sentence meaning and speaker meaning presented by Lycan in the third part which is based on Grice's thought. How Lycan defines sentence meaning and speaker meaning and the contradiction between sentence meaning and speaker will be the main problems in this article.

II. REASERCH METHOD

To begin with, we should make clear the difference between sentence and utterance in pragmatics. In principles, " sentence" is written " utterance" is spoken and usually it is written between "_____"

According to Grice (Lycan, 1999: 101), a linguistic expression has meaning only because it is an expression; not because the expression expresses a proposition but because it expresses a concrete idea or the intent of the person using it.

1. Speaker meaning.

Grice (1999: 101) stated that speaker meaning refers to what the speaker wants to convey to the listener when uttering a certain an expression on a certain occasion as well. Because the speaker does not always convey his meaning clearly with what is stated in the sentence, Grice distinguishes between the speaker meaning and the sentence meaning.

" Since the speaker does not always mean what their sentences standardly mean, Grice distinguished this speaker meaning from the sentence's own standard meaning. (Lycan, 1999)

Because the meaning of an utterance depends on the speaker, Grice said that "the natural ground of meaningful

utterance is in what mental state is expressed by the utterance" (p.102). Speaker meaning depends on the speaker's beliefs, desires, and attitudes.

First, speaker meaning is determined by time and place context as shown in the example below

"This is a fine red one"

The problem is the pronoun 'one' whose reference is not clear. The question is, what is 'red'? We must see that object when speaker said that utterance in order to know exactly what he was referring to. On certain occasions, the speaker pointed to the pear (fruit). On another occasion, the speaker pointed to the fire fighting machine.

Thus, the meaning of 'one' can be interpreted or associated with various objects. There is no one convention or agreement that the 'one' in the utterance is X. The meaning of 'one' depends entirely on the speaker's intention, that is, what the speaker really means by "one" in that context.

Second, speaker meaning is determined through a convention to limit meaning that is too broad. This happens in the use of metaphors. In Indonesian, if A says "Rina is a class star in our school" then the meaning meant by the speaker cannot be interpreted freely and broadly because in that sentence the metaphorical meaning of

the word star has been conventionally determined, namely a child who is equal, champion, great. , beautiful. Thus the meaning of the speaker in the utterance is certain or fixed.

According to Grice as quoted by Lycan (1999: 224), 'methaphorical meaning' must be treated as a speaker meaning.To interpret the speaker's meaning correctly, listeners must also have the same insight into making an analogy as seen in the example below

" Simon is a rock"

"Juliet is the sun" (taken from *Romeo and Juiet*)

To understand the meaning meant by the speaker in the two utterances above, the listeners must understand the characteristics of the words "rock" and "sun" which are analogous to humans such as Simon and Juliet. It is illogical to interpret these two statements with literal meanings. When that happens, the speaker and listener have arrived at different goals. Indeed, Grice as quoted by Lycan (1999: 106) reminds us of the following statement

> To mean something and mean it, is merely to express a bilief, usulally but not always hoping or intending or expecting that one's audience will come to share the bilief (Lycan, 1999)

Third, speaker meaning is determined by intonation, word stress and is accompanied by several other elements such as facial

expressions and several statements that appear before or after the utterance. This occurs in sarcasm statements, namely harsh situations such as this:

" That was a brilliant idea"

The above statement can be interpreted as "a great idea" or "a stupid idea". When referring to the first meaning, it means that what the speaker means is the same as the lexical meaning of the word 'brilliant'. In contrast, when referring to the second meaning, what the speaker means is the opposite of the lexical meaning of the word 'brilliant' (what the speaker means is precisely the opposite).

However, if a sarcasm statement is followed by another additional statement, the meaning of the speaker will be predictable as seen in the example below in Indonesian.

"Bagus benar tulisanmu. Seperti cakar ayam"

The phrase 'bagusbenar "(really good)' in the above utterance clearly has the opposite meaning, namely 'very bad' because there is an additional statement as an explanation 'like chicken claw'. The main requirement for understanding the speaker meaning here is that between the speaker and the listener must have the same background knowledge regarding the characteristics of 'chicken claw', so that both can come to the same conclusion the handwriting cannot be read clearly. In this case, cannot be interpreted in any other alternative meaning.

2.Sentence meaning

Contrary to speaker meaning, which depends entirely on the speaker, sentence meaning refers to the meaning formed by the elements that make up the sentence or expression. It can't be other than that, as said by Lycan (1999: 109)

Sentences have meanings they do have, and one cannot just
mean anything by them one likes.

For example, the sentence "It is cold here" cannot be interpreted as "It is warm here" because the meaning of the word "cold" is contrary to "warm". This sentence can be interpreted differently if there is context, namely several sentences that appear before or after it.

Sentence meaning can also be interpreted as the meaning that the sentence has in a different and individual expression. In this case, utterances is divided into two, namely structured utterances and unstructured utterances. Structured utterances have meaningful parts, such as individual words, that contribute to the overall meaning of the sentence as shown in the following example

- The house has five rooms (S-V-O)
-The boy comes from a small town (S-V-Adv)

On the other hand, unstructured utterance is a single expression whose meaning does not contribute to a larger part as seen in the following example

Ouch!

-Wow!

- Hey.

In some cases, sentence meaning refuses to cooperate with speaker meaning in the sense that the sentence already has a fixed meaning so that it cannot be interpreted differently. For Grice, (Lycan, 1999: 103), the meaning of the sentence is a function of the meaning of the individual speaker (the sentence meaning is the function of the individual speaker meaning). So Grice tries to reduce sentence meaning to speaker meaning. For example, in Indonesian, if a guest who comes from far away wants to ask for a drink because he is thirsty, he has several means of saying it, a sentence or phrase, to express his wish.

-"Panas sekali ya".(sambil kipas-kipas) (" So hot ")

"Jendelanya dimana?" (where is the window?)

"Saya tunggubemosatujamlebih" (Iwaitedforthe minibús onehour)

"Jauh ya rumah ini dari kampus" (so far, this house from the campus)

Sentences 1- 4 have their own meanings, no more than what is written, and that meaning is called the sentence meaning. . These four sentences which have different meanings are used by the speaker to express only one wish, namely, he is thirsty and he asks for a drink. In short, the intended meaning of the four sentences is: I am thirsty. I want to have a drink. In the real communication, people do not say that. They say something and mean something else. The job of the listener is to guess the meaning meant by the speaker. This is called pragmatic competence.

III. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Since speaker meaning is related to implicature, it is necessary to present the main concepts of implicature here.Implicature, according to Mely (1993: 99-100), comes from the word 'to imply' which means 'to fold something into something else in order to be understood'. The noun form is 'implicature'. Grice (1975) distinguishes 'to imply' and 'to implicate'. The noun implicature derives from 'to implicate' which means something / what is implied. To put it in another way, to imply means

to mean something by saying something else. According to Grice (Wijana ,1997), an utterance can imply a proposition which is not part of that utterance. The proposition which is implied is called implicature. The relationship between the implicature and the utterance is not a necessary consequence. Mely (1993) is right when he says that "logic and everyday life does not always look at things in the same way". What a speaker means is determined by the speaker's intention. This can be seen in the following dialog, between Bambang and Yudi, who do not have the shared background information about Harvard University

Bambang: "Is Joko qualified for the job?"
Yudi: "He is a graduate of Harvard University"

    Bambang: "What do you mean? Good or not?"

The dialog shows that the second utterance is not the part of the first utterance. Yudi does not answer Bambang 's question explicitly.. Bambang does not understand what Yudiinformation about Harvard. Accordingly, they do not come to the goal.In pragmatics, what the speaker says should be distinguished from what the speaker means to say as seen below. What does Yudi say:? Yudi said that Joko was a graduate of Harvard. What does Yudi mean to say?: Yudi means to say that Joko is qualified because he is a graduate of Harvard. It is widely known that Harvanrd is one of the best universities in the world. So, Joko must be qualified.

IV. CONCLUSION

The philosophers want language to be literal so that it isin line with logical reasoning. When there is a deviation, that is, someone states sentence A with a different meaning than what is stated in sentence A, then the sentence meaning and speaker meaning need to be distinguished. According to Grice, sentence meaning is a function of the individual meaning of words said by the speaker. To make a point, the speaker will use several sentences with different structures with different literal meanings. To understand the speaker's point, Grice suggests two stages in reasoning. In the first stage, the listener analyzes whether the meaning of the statement is a literal meaning (sentence meaning). If not, the second stage is making interpretations to capture the speaker's intent. Interpretation or conclusions drawn must refer to the

context and background knowledge shared between the speaker and the listener. This interpretation skill is referred to as pragmatic competence. The listener should have this skill to make the communication successful.This is important since in the real communication, people do not say what they mean to say.

References

[1] Edmondson, Willis. *Spoken Discourse*. Singapore: Longman, 1981.

[2] Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation" in *Syntax and Semantics, Volume III: SpeechActs.* New York: Academic Press, 1975.

[3] Leech, Geoffrey. *The Principles of Pragmatics* London: Longman,, 1993.

[4] Levinson, Stephen. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.1983

[5] Lycan, William.*Philosophy of Language*. London: Routledge. 1999

[6] Mey, Jacob L. *Pragmatics: an Introduction*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1993.

[7] Searle, John R. *Speech Acts* : Cambridge University Press, 1969.

[8] Syamsuddin, dkk. *Studi Wacana Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Depdikbud, 1997.

[9] Suriasumanantri.J 2003. . *Filsafat Ilmu*. Jakarta: 2003.

[10] Wijana, Dewa Putu. *Dasar- dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi, 1996.