



## Philosophical Review

---

Meaning

Author(s): H. P. Grice

Source: *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 66, No. 3 (Jul., 1957), pp. 377-388

Published by: [Duke University Press](#) on behalf of [Philosophical Review](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2182440>

Accessed: 16/09/2014 10:50

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Duke University Press and *Philosophical Review* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Philosophical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## MEANING

CONSIDER the following sentences:

“Those spots mean (meant) measles.”

“Those spots didn’t mean anything to me, but to the doctor they meant measles.”

“The recent budget means that we shall have a hard year.”

(1) I cannot say, “Those spots meant measles, but he hadn’t got measles,” and I cannot say, “The recent budget means that we shall have a hard year, but we shan’t have.” That is to say, in cases like the above, *x meant that p* and *x means that p* entail *p*.

(2) I cannot argue from “Those spots mean (meant) measles” to any conclusion about “what is (was) meant by those spots”; for example, I am not entitled to say, “What was meant by those spots was that he had measles.” Equally I cannot draw from the statement about the recent budget the conclusion “What is meant by the recent budget is that we shall have a hard year.”

(3) I cannot argue from “Those spots meant measles” to any conclusion to the effect that somebody or other meant by those spots so-and-so. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same is true of the sentence about the recent budget.

(4) For none of the above examples can a restatement be found in which the verb “mean” is followed by a sentence or phrase in inverted commas. Thus “Those spots meant measles” cannot be reformulated as “Those spots meant ‘measles’” or as “Those spots meant ‘he has measles.’”

(5) On the other hand, for all these examples an approximate restatement can be found beginning with the phrase “The fact that . . .”; for example, “The fact that he had those spots meant that he had measles” and “The fact that the recent budget was as it was means that we shall have a hard year.”

Now contrast the above sentences with the following:

“Those three rings on the bell (of the bus) mean that the ‘bus is full.’”

“That remark, ‘Smith couldn’t get on without his trouble and strife,’ meant that Smith found his wife indispensable.”

(1) I can use the first of these and go on to say, “But it isn’t in fact full—the conductor has made a mistake”; and I can use the second and go on, “But in fact Smith deserted her seven years ago.” That is to say, here *x means that p* and *x meant that p* do not entail *p*.

(2) I can argue from the first to some statement about “what is (was) meant” by the rings on the bell and from the second to some statement about “what is (was) meant” by the quoted remark.

(3) I can argue from the first sentence to the conclusion that somebody (viz., the conductor) meant, or at any rate should have meant, by the rings that the bus is full, and I can argue analogously for the second sentence.

(4) The first sentence can be restated in a form in which the verb “mean” is followed by a phrase in inverted commas, that is, “Those three rings on the bell mean ‘the bus is full.’” So also can the second sentence.

(5) Such a sentence as “The fact that the bell has been rung three times means that the bus is full” is not a restatement of the meaning of the first sentence. Both may be true, but they do not have, even approximately, the same meaning.

When the expressions “means,” “means something,” “means that” are used in the kind of way in which they are used in the first set of sentences, I shall speak of the sense, or senses, in which they are used, as the *natural* sense, or senses, of the expressions in question. When the expressions are used in the kind of way in which they are used in the second set of sentences, I shall speak of the sense, or senses, in which they are used, as the *nonnatural* sense, or senses, of the expressions in question. I shall use the abbreviation “means<sub>NN</sub>” to distinguish the nonnatural sense or senses.

I propose, for convenience, also to include under the head of natural senses of “mean” such senses of “mean” as may be exemplified in sentences of the pattern “*A* means (meant) *to do so-and-so* (by *x*),” where *A* is a human agent. By contrast, as the previous examples show, I include under the head of non-

natural senses of “mean” any senses of “mean” found in sentences of the patterns “*A* means (meant) something by *x*” or “*A* means (meant) by *x* that. . .” (This is overrigid; but it will serve as an indication.)

I do not want to maintain that *all* our uses of “mean” fall easily, obviously, and tidily into one of the two groups I have distinguished; but I think that in most cases we should be at least fairly strongly inclined to assimilate a use of “mean” to one group rather than to the other. The question which now arises is this: “What more can be said about the distinction between the cases where we should say that the word is applied in a natural sense and the cases where we should say that the word is applied in a nonnatural sense?” Asking this question will not of course prohibit us from trying to give an explanation of “meaning<sub>NN</sub>” in terms of one or another natural sense of “mean.”

This question about the distinction between natural and non-natural meaning is, I think, what people are getting at when they display an interest in a distinction between “natural” and “conventional” signs. But I think my formulation is better. For some things which can mean<sub>NN</sub> something are not signs (e.g., words are not), and some are not conventional in any ordinary sense (e.g., certain gestures); while some things which mean naturally are not signs of what they mean (cf. the recent budget example).

I want first to consider briefly, and reject, what I might term a causal type of answer to the question, “What is meaning<sub>NN</sub>?” We might try to say, for instance, more or less with C. L. Stevenson,<sup>1</sup> that for *x* to mean<sub>NN</sub> something, *x* must have (roughly) a tendency to produce in an audience some attitude (cognitive or otherwise) and a tendency, in the case of a speaker, to *be* produced *by* that attitude, these tendencies being dependent on “an elaborate process of conditioning attending the use of the sign in communication.”<sup>2</sup> This clearly will not do.

(1) Let us consider a case where an utterance, if it qualifies at all as meaning<sub>NN</sub> something, will be of a descriptive or informative kind and the relevant attitude, therefore, will be a cognitive one,

<sup>1</sup> *Ethics and Language* (New Haven, 1944), ch. iii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.

for example, a belief. (I use "utterance" as a neutral word to apply to any candidate for meaning<sub>NN</sub>; it has a convenient act-object ambiguity.) It is no doubt the case that many people have a tendency to put on a tail coat when they think they are about to go to a dance, and it is no doubt also the case that many people, on seeing someone put on a tail coat, would conclude that the person in question was about to go to a dance. Does this satisfy us that putting on a tail coat means<sub>NN</sub> that one is about to go to a dance (or indeed means<sub>NN</sub> anything at all)? Obviously not. It is no help to refer to the qualifying phrase "dependent on an elaborate process of conditioning. . . ." For if all this means is that the response to the sight of a tail coat being put on is in some way learned or acquired, it will not exclude the present case from being one of meaning<sub>NN</sub>. But if we have to take seriously the second part of the qualifying phrase ("attending the use of the sign in communication"), then the account of meaning<sub>NN</sub> is obviously circular. We might just as well say, "X has meaning<sub>NN</sub> if it is used in communication," which, though true, is not helpful.

(2) If this is not enough, there is a difficulty—really the same difficulty, I think—which Stevenson recognizes: how we are to avoid saying, for example, that "Jones is tall" is part of what is meant by "Jones is an athlete," since to tell someone that Jones is an athlete would tend to make him believe that Jones is tall. Stevenson here resorts to invoking linguistic rules, namely, a permissive rule of language that "athletes may be nontall." This amounts to saying that we are not prohibited by rule from speaking of "nontall athletes." But why are we not prohibited? Not because it is not bad grammar, or is not impolite, and so on, but presumably because it is not meaningless (or, if this is too strong, does not in any way violate the rules of meaning for the expressions concerned). But this seems to involve us in another circle. Moreover, one wants to ask why, if it is legitimate to appeal here to rules to distinguish what is meant from what is suggested, this appeal was not made earlier, in the case of groans, for example, to deal with which Stevenson originally introduced the qualifying phrase about dependence on conditioning.

A further deficiency in a causal theory of the type just

expounded seems to be that, even if we accept it as it stands, we are furnished with an analysis only of statements about the *standard* meaning, or the meaning in general, of a "sign." No provision is made for dealing with statements about what a particular speaker or writer means by a sign on a particular occasion (which may well diverge from the standard meaning of the sign); nor is it obvious how the theory could be adapted to make such provision. One might even go further in criticism and maintain that the causal theory ignores the fact that the meaning (in general) of a sign needs to be explained in terms of what users of the sign do (or should) mean by it on particular occasions; and so the latter notion, which is unexplained by the causal theory, is in fact the fundamental one. I am sympathetic to this more radical criticism, though I am aware that the point is controversial.

I do not propose to consider any further theories of the "causal-tendency" type. I suspect no such theory could avoid difficulties analogous to those I have outlined without utterly losing its claim to rank as a theory of this type.

I will now try a different and, I hope, more promising line. If we can elucidate the meaning of

" $x$  meant<sub>NN</sub> something (on a particular occasion)" and  
 " $x$  meant<sub>NN</sub> that so-and-so (on a particular occasion)"

and of

" $A$  meant<sub>NN</sub> something by  $x$  (on a particular occasion)" and  
 " $A$  meant<sub>NN</sub> by  $x$  that so-and-so (on a particular occasion),"

this might reasonably be expected to help us with

" $x$  means<sub>NN</sub> (timeless) something (that so-and-so),"  
 " $A$  means<sub>NN</sub> (timeless) by  $x$  something (that so-and-so),"

and with the explication of "means the same as," "understands," "entails," and so on. Let us for the moment pretend that we have to deal only with utterances which might be informative or descriptive.

A first shot would be to suggest that " $x$  meant<sub>NN</sub> something" would be true if  $x$  was intended by its utterer to induce a belief in some "audience" and that to say what the belief was would be to say what  $x$  meant<sub>NN</sub>. This will not do. I might leave  $B$ 's

handkerchief near the scene of a murder in order to induce the detective to believe that *B* was the murderer; but we should not want to say that the handkerchief (or my leaving it there) meant<sub>NN</sub> anything or that I had meant<sub>NN</sub> by leaving it that *B* was the murderer. Clearly we must at least add that, for *x* to have meant<sub>NN</sub> anything, not merely must it have been “uttered” with the intention of inducing a certain belief but also the utterer must have intended an “audience” to recognize the intention behind the utterance.

This, though perhaps better, is not good enough. Consider the following cases:

- (1) Herod presents Salome with the head of St. John the Baptist on a charger.
- (2) Feeling faint, a child lets its mother see how pale it is (hoping that she may draw her own conclusions and help).
- (3) I leave the china my daughter has broken lying around for my wife to see.

Here we seem to have cases which satisfy the conditions so far given for meaning<sub>NN</sub>. For example, Herod intended to make Salome believe that St. John the Baptist was dead and no doubt also intended Salome to recognize that he intended her to believe that St. John the Baptist was dead. Similarly for the other cases. Yet I certainly do not think that we should want to say that we have here cases of meaning<sub>NN</sub>.

What we want to find is the difference between, for example, “deliberately and openly letting someone know” and “telling” and between “getting someone to think” and “telling.”

The way out is perhaps as follows. Compare the following two cases:

- (1) I show Mr. *X* a photograph of Mr. *Y* displaying undue familiarity to Mrs. *X*.
- (2) I draw a picture of Mr. *Y* behaving in this manner and show it to Mr. *X*.

I find that I want to deny that in (1) the photograph (or my showing it to Mr. *X*) meant<sub>NN</sub> anything at all; while I want to assert that in (2) the picture (or my drawing and showing it)

meant<sub>NN</sub> something (that Mr. *Y* had been unduly unfamiliar), or at least that I had meant<sub>NN</sub> by it that Mr. *Y* had been unduly familiar. What is the difference between the two cases? Surely that in case (1) Mr. *X*'s recognition of my intention to make him believe that there is something between Mr. *Y* and Mrs. *X* is (more or less) irrelevant to the production of this effect by the photograph. Mr. *X* would be led by the photograph at least to suspect Mrs. *X* even if instead of showing it to him I had left it in his room by accident; and I (the photograph shower) would not be unaware of this. But it will make a difference to the effect of my picture on Mr. *X* whether or not he takes me to be intending to inform him (make him believe something) about Mrs. *X*, and not to be just doodling or trying to produce a work of art.

But now we seem to be landed in a further difficulty if we accept this account. For consider now, say, frowning. If I frown spontaneously, in the ordinary course of events, someone looking at me may well treat the frown as a natural sign of displeasure. But if I frown deliberately (to convey my displeasure), an onlooker may be expected, provided he recognizes my intention, *still* to conclude that I am displeased. Ought we not then to say, since it could not be expected to make any difference to the onlooker's reaction whether he regards my frown as spontaneous or as intended to be informative, that my frown (deliberate) does *not* mean<sub>NN</sub> anything? I think this difficulty can be met; for though in general a deliberate frown may have the same effect (as regards inducing belief in my displeasure) as a spontaneous frown, it can be expected to have the same effect only *provided* the audience takes it as intended to convey displeasure. That is, if we take away the recognition of intention, leaving the other circumstances (including the recognition of the frown as deliberate), the belief-producing tendency of the frown must be regarded as being impaired or destroyed.

Perhaps we may sum up what is necessary for *A* to mean something by *x* as follows. *A* must intend to induce by *x* a belief in an audience, and he must also intend his utterance to be recognized as so intended. But these intentions are not independent; the recognition is intended by *A* to play its part in inducing the belief, and if it does not do so something will have gone wrong



with the fulfillment of *A*'s intentions. Moreover, *A*'s intending that the recognition should play this part implies, I think, that he assumes that there is some chance that it will in fact play this part, that he does not regard it as a foregone conclusion that the belief will be induced in the audience whether or not the intention behind the utterance is recognized. Shortly, perhaps, we may say that "*A* meant<sub>NN</sub> something by *x*" is roughly equivalent to "*A* uttered *x* with the intention of inducing a belief by means of the recognition of this intention." (This seems to involve a reflexive paradox, but it does not really do so.)

Now perhaps it is time to drop the pretense that we have to deal only with "informative" cases. Let us start with some examples of imperatives or quasi-imperatives. I have a very avaricious man in my room, and I want him to go; so I throw a pound note out of the window. Is there here any utterance with a meaning<sub>NN</sub>? No, because in behaving as I did, I did not intend his recognition of my purpose to be in any way effective in getting him to go. This is parallel to the photograph case. If on the other hand I had pointed to the door or given him a little push, then my behavior might well be held to constitute a meaningful<sub>NN</sub> utterance, just because the recognition of my intention would be intended by me to be effective in speeding his departure. Another pair of cases would be (1) a policeman who stops a car by standing in its way and (2) a policeman who stops a car by waving.

Or, to turn briefly to another type of case, if as an examiner I fail a man, I may well cause him distress or indignation or humiliation; and if I am vindictive, I may intend this effect and even intend him to recognize my intention. But I should not be inclined to say that my failing him meant<sub>NN</sub> anything. On the other hand, if I cut someone in the street I do feel inclined to assimilate this to the cases of meaning<sub>NN</sub>, and this inclination seems to me dependent on the fact that I could not reasonably expect him to be distressed (indignant, humiliated) unless he recognized my intention to affect him in this way. (Cf., if my college stopped my salary altogether I should accuse them of ruining me; if they cut it by 2/6<sup>d</sup> I might accuse them of insulting me; with some intermediate amounts I might not know quite what to say.)

Perhaps then we may make the following generalizations.

(1) “ $A$  meant<sub>NN</sub> something by  $x$ ” is (roughly) equivalent to “ $A$  intended the utterance of  $x$  to produce some effect in an audience by means of the recognition of this intention”; and we may add that to ask what  $A$  meant is to ask for a specification of the intended effect (though, of course, it may not always be possible to get a straight answer involving a “that” clause, for example, “a belief that . . .”).

(2) “ $x$  meant something” is (roughly) equivalent to “Somebody meant<sub>NN</sub> something by  $x$ .” Here again there will be cases where this will not quite work. I feel inclined to say that (as regards traffic lights) the change to red meant<sub>NN</sub> that the traffic was to stop; but it would be very unnatural to say, “Somebody (e.g., the Corporation) meant<sub>NN</sub> by the red-light change that the traffic was to stop.” Nevertheless, there seems to be *some* sort of reference to somebody’s intentions.

(3) “ $x$  means<sub>NN</sub> (timeless) that so-and-so” might as a first shot be equated with some statement or disjunction of statements about what “people” (vague) intend (with qualifications about “recognition”) to effect by  $x$ . I shall have a word to say about this.

Will any kind of intended effect do, or may there be cases where an effect is intended (with the required qualifications) and yet we should not want to talk of meaning<sub>NN</sub>? Suppose I discovered some person so constituted that, when I told him that whenever I grunted in a special way I wanted him to blush or to incur some physical malady, thereafter whenever he recognized the grunt (and with it my intention), he did blush or incur the malady. Should we then want to say that the grunt meant<sub>NN</sub> something? I do not think so. This points to the fact that for  $x$  to have meaning<sub>NN</sub>, the intended effect must be something which in some sense is within the control of the audience, or that in some sense of “reason” the recognition of the intention behind  $x$  is for the audience a reason and not merely a cause. It might look as if there is a sort of pun here (“reason for believing” and “reason for doing”), but I do not think this is serious. For though no doubt from one point of view questions about reasons for believing are questions about evidence and so quite different from questions

about reasons for doing, nevertheless to recognize an utterer's intention in uttering  $x$  (descriptive utterance), to have a reason for believing that so-and-so, is at least quite like "having a motive for" accepting so-and-so. Decisions "that" seem to involve decisions "to" (and this is why we can "refuse to believe" and also be "compelled to believe"). (The "cutting" case needs slightly different treatment, for one cannot in any straightforward sense "decide" to be offended; but one can refuse to be offended.) It looks then as if the intended effect must be something within the control of the audience, or at least the *sort* of thing which is within its control.

One point before passing to an objection or two, I think it follows that from what I have said about the connection between meaning<sub>NN</sub> and recognition of intention that (insofar as I am right) only what I may call the primary intention of an utterer is relevant to the meaning<sub>NN</sub> of an utterance. For if I utter  $x$ , intending (with the aid of the recognition of this intention) to induce an effect  $E$ , and intend this effect  $E$  to lead to a further effect  $F$ , then insofar as the occurrence of  $F$  is thought to be dependent solely on  $E$ , I cannot regard  $F$  as in the least dependent on recognition of my intention to induce  $E$ . That is, if (say) I intend to get a man to do something by giving him some information, it cannot be regarded as relevant to the meaning<sub>NN</sub> of my utterance to describe what I intend him to do.

Now some question may be raised about my use, fairly free, of such words as "intention" and "recognition." I must disclaim any intention of peopling all our talking life with armies of complicated psychological occurrences. I do not hope to solve any philosophical puzzles about intending, but I do want briefly to argue that no special difficulties are raised by my use of the word "intention" in connection with meaning. First, there will be cases where an utterance is accompanied or preceded by a conscious "plan," or explicit formulation of intention (e.g., I declare how I am going to use  $x$ , or ask myself how to "get something across"). The presence of such an explicit "plan" obviously counts fairly heavily in favor of the utterer's intention (meaning) being as "planned"; though it is not, I think, conclusive; for example, a speaker who has declared an intention

to use a familiar expression in an unfamiliar way may slip into the familiar use. Similarly in nonlinguistic cases: if we are asking about an agent's intention, a previous expression counts heavily; nevertheless, a man might plan to throw a letter in the dustbin and yet take it to the post; when lifting his hand he might "come to" and say *either* "I didn't intend to do this at all" *or* "I suppose I must have been intending to put it in."

Explicitly formulated linguistic (or quasi-linguistic) intentions are no doubt comparatively rare. In their absence we would seem to rely on very much the same kinds of criteria as we do in the case of nonlinguistic intentions where there is a general usage. An utterer is held to intend to convey what is normally conveyed (or normally intended to be conveyed), and we require a good reason for accepting that a particular use diverges from the general usage (e.g., he never knew or had forgotten the general usage). Similarly in nonlinguistic cases: we are presumed to intend the normal consequences of our actions.

Again, in cases where there is doubt, say, about which of two or more things an utterer intends to convey, we tend to refer to the context (linguistic or otherwise) of the utterance and ask which of the alternatives would be relevant to other things he is saying or doing, or which intention in a particular situation would fit in with some purpose he obviously has (e.g., a man who calls for a "pump" at a fire would not want a bicycle pump). Non-linguistic parallels are obvious: context is a criterion in settling the question of why a man who has just put a cigarette in his mouth has put his hand in his pocket; relevance to an obvious end is a criterion in settling why a man is running away from a bull.

In certain linguistic cases we ask the utterer afterward about his intention, and in a few of these cases (the very difficult ones, like a philosopher asked to explain the meaning of an unclear passage in one of his works), the answer is not based on what he remembers but is more like a decision, a decision about how what he said is to be taken. I cannot find a nonlinguistic parallel here; but the case is so special as not to seem to contribute a vital difference.

All this is very obvious; but surely to show that the criteria

*MEANING*

for judging linguistic intentions are very like the criteria for judging nonlinguistic intentions is to show that linguistic intentions are very like nonlinguistic intentions.

H. P. GRICE

*St. John's College  
Oxford*