What is a speech act?
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Speech acts are characteristically performed in the utterance of sounds or the making of marks. What is the difference between just uttering sounds or making marks and performing a speech act? One difference is that the sounds or marks one makes in the performance of a speech act are characteristically said to have meaning, and a second related difference is that one is characteristically said to mean something by those sounds or marks. Characteristically when one speaks one means something by what one says, and what one says, the string of morphemes that one emits, is characteristically said to have a meaning.

[...]

But what is it for one to mean something by what one says, and what is it for something to have a meaning? To answer the first of these questions I propose to borrow and revise some ideas of Paul Grice. In an article entitled ‘Meaning’, ¹ Grice gives the following analysis of one sense of the notion of ‘meaning’. To say that A meant something by x is to say that ‘A intended the utterance of x to produce some effect in an audience by means of the recognition of this intention’. This seems to me a useful start on an analysis of meaning, first because it shows the close relationship between the notion of meaning and the notion of intention, and secondly because it captures something which is, I think, essential to speaking a language: In speaking a language I attempt to communicate things to my hearer by means of getting him to recognize my intention to communicate just those things. For example, characteristically, when I make an assertion, I attempt to communicate to and convince my hearer of the truth of a certain proposition; and the means I employ to do this are to utter certain sounds, which utterance I intend to produce in him the desired effect by means of his recognition of my intention.
to produce just that effect. I shall illustrate this with an example. I might on the
one hand attempt to get you to believe that I am French by speaking French all
the time, dressing in the French manner, showing wild enthusiasm for de
Gaulle, and cultivating French acquaintances. But I might on the other hand
attempt to get you to believe that I am French by simply telling you that I am
French. Now, what is the difference between these two ways of my attempting
to get you to believe that I am French? One crucial difference is that in the
second case I attempt to get you to believe that I am French by getting you to
recognize that it is my purported intention to get you to believe just that. That
is one of the things involved in telling you that I am French. But of course if I
try to get you to believe that I am French by putting on the act I described, then
your recognition of my intention to produce in you the belief that I am French
is not the means I am employing. Indeed in this case you would, I think,
become rather suspicious if you recognized my intention.

However valuable this analysis of meaning is, it seems to me to be in certain
respects defective. [...] It fails to account for the extent to which meaning is a
matter of rules or conventions. That is, this account of meaning does not show
the connection between one’s meaning something by what one says and what
that which one says actually means in the language. In order to illustrate this
point I now wish to present a counter-example to this analysis of meaning. The
point of the counter-example will be to illustrate the connection between what
a speaker means and what the words he utters mean.

Suppose that I am an American soldier in the Second World War and that I am
captured by Italian troops. And suppose also that I wish to get these troops to
believe that I am a German officer in order to get them to release me. What I
would like to do is to tell them in German or Italian that I am a German officer.
But let us suppose I don’t know enough German or Italian to do that. So I, as it
were, attempt to put on a show of telling them that I am a German officer by
reciting those few bits of German that I know, trusting that they don’t know
enough German to see through my plan. Let us suppose I know only one line
of German, which I remember from a poem I had to memorize in a high-
school German course. Therefore I, a captured American, address my Italian
captors with the following sentence: ‘Kennst du das Land, wo die Zitronen
blühen?’ Now, let us describe the situation in Gricean terms. I intend to
produce a certain effect in them, namely, the effect of believing that I am a
German officer; and I intend to produce this effect by means of their
recognition of my intention. I intend that they should think that what I am
trying to tell them is that I am a German officer. But does it follow from this
account that when I say ‘Kennst du das Land …’ etc., what I mean is, ‘I am a
German officer’? Not only does it not follow, but in this case it seems plainly
false that when I utter the German sentence what I mean is ‘I am a German
officer’, or even ‘Ich bin ein deutscher Offizier’, because what the words mean
is, ‘Knowest thou the land where the lemon trees bloom?’ Of course, I want my
captors to be deceived into thinking that what I mean is ‘I am a German
officer’, but part of what is involved in the deception is getting them to think
that that is what the words which I utter mean in German. At one point in the
Philosophical Investigations Wittgenstein says ‘Say “it’s cold here” and mean
“it’s warm here”’. The reason we are unable to do this is that what we can
mean is a function of what we are saying. Meaning is more than a matter of
intention, it is also a matter of convention.

Grice’s account can be amended to deal with counter-examples of this kind.
We have here a case where I am trying to produce a certain effect by means of
the recognition of my intention to produce that effect, but the device I use to
produce this effect is one which is conventionally, by the rules governing the
use of that device, used as a means of producing quite different [...] effects. We
must therefore reformulate the Gricean account of meaning in such a way as to
make it clear that one’s meaning something when one says something is more
than just contingently related to what the sentence means in the language one
is speaking. In our analysis of [the meaning of acts of speech] we must capture
both the intentional and the conventional aspects and especially the
relationship between them. In the performance of an [act of meaningful
speech] the speaker intends to produce a certain effect by means of getting the
hearer to recognize his intention to produce that effect, and furthermore, if he
is using words literally, he intends this recognition to be achieved in virtue of
the fact that the rules for using the expressions he utters associate the
expressions with the production of that effect. It is this combination of
elements which we shall need to express in our analysis of the [meaning of acts
of speech].
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