A Comparative Analysis on the Views of The Speaking Subject through the Philosophical Writings of Ferdinand De Saussure and Emile Benveniste

Nancy Mata Zabat

Ph.D. in English Language & Literature Candidate
Instructor, Department of English
College of Education, Majmaah University
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

This paper attempts to analyze 'Course in General Linguistics' by Ferdinand de Saussure and 'The Problems in General Linguistics' of Emile Benveniste's philosophical writings theorizing the speaking subject with other intellectual writers in their range of perspectives from Julia Kristeva, Jacques Derrida, and Stuart Hall.

The readings cultivated questions on the parallelism of some thought-provoking ideas about Language. Every human being possesses a Language. A language that is for all, with normal neurological and mentally challenging conditions. A language can be shown in linguistic {verbal} and non-linguistic expressions (body movements, facial expressions, and gestures). Language is the most significant contribution to civilization. Indeed, it is universal and powerful.
In this paper, there are three foregrounds in the readings that will anchor the speaking subject's interpretation.

First, Language has two elements involved in functioning, which are ideas and sounds. In ideas, Language can be in its field of work. Language has arbitrariness in the bonding of signified and signifier; Language {*la langue*} is distinct from human speech *(la Parole}. La parole is what causes Language to evolve (Saussure 1959,19). {Speech is many-sided and heterogeneous, straddling several areas simultaneously-physical, physiological and psychological-it belongs both to the individual and to society (Saussure 1959, 9). Benveniste's theory that human speech is a combined or isolated action of physiological, psychological, or mental forces (Benveniste 1971,30).*

Second, the human being has the capacity and ability to store words in the brain. Words in abstraction in the brain need to be in reality, and that is stated by (Saussure 1959, 102) {The signs that makeup Language are not abstractions but real objects} Moreover, *{For the speaker, there is a complete equivalence between Language and reality. The sign overlies and commands reality. (Benveniste 1971,46).*

The third theory highlighted is the inquisition on Language's continuous progression, which resulted in mass and countless literary texts publications. The abundance of audio, charts, and other Language-related materials is timely and relevant. This illustration describes what linguistics has gone through in its diachronic history as well as its synchronic condition. Thus, dealing with history is also dealing with social interactions, humans, and society. It proves that Saussure's antecedent questions about the puzzlement of Language awaken abounding researchers in the social sciences field. Indeed, as Benveniste affirmed that man is not born in nature but culture (39). Saussure highlighted the importance of linguistics to the general culture that the individuals and societies speech is essential, that speech has both an individual and a social side. Every means of expression used in culture is based, in principle, on collective behavior or- what amounts to the same thing-on convention {Saussure, 1959, 68}. The latter markedly agreed by Benveniste in the premise that Language is linked to man and society, and society cannot be conceived without each other {Benveniste 1971, 26}.

In pondering these mentioned theories above, there are running questions that need to be discussed. If the bond between the signifier and the signified or linguistic sign is arbitrary, how can a human being with constrained vocabulary words form an endless communicative sequence? Furthermore, how can each speaker and hearer comprehend boundless interpretations in communicative situations? Do humans have innate rules in the brain/mind? How can the abstraction of linguistics signs relate to linguistic value? How can a speaker create grammatically correct simple to complex expressions? How can the speaker of different languages communicate with each other? What is the vital role of collective behavior in the interpretation and comprehension of the linguistic signs?

These questions will be construed in the succeeding explication. As part of close reading, careful evaluation of these literary texts sufficiently explains the enumerated questions stated.

First Theory

How can each speaker and hearer comprehend boundless interpretations in communicative situations? *Speech is many-sided and heterogeneous, straddling several areas simultaneously-physical, physiological and psychological-it belongs both to the individual and to society (Saussure 1959, 9)* Language is mysterious, from the individualized cognitive collection of real-world language data to a single word utterance to the sequence of sentences, which we call human speech. Language is self-contained (9) that has its natural order and instinct (10). The stored words come to life when any words come out from the mouth producing sounds conveying meaning in a conversation. What makes human speech distinct from Language? Language has its accomplishment when we speak. Each speaker can comprehend various speech acts. Each can semantically analyze the thought of every sentence sequence based on its intended meaning and purpose. The knowledge of putting words into meaningful context is one of the phenomena that each speaking subject has supremacy over the other creations. Besides the meaning of the words in the sentences, paralinguistics is part of the interpretation of meaning.; the body language (facial expressions, gestures, body movement), and speech characteristics (loudness, speed, and pitch range. These are indispensable in the dialogue; the momentary characteristics of speech make it disparate from other forms of discourse. Saussure's axiom that there is a tie between linguistics and the physiology of sounds (7). The I-you polarity, individual, and society's virtue is complementary terms (Benveniste 1971, 23). When I is the center speaker of any sounds from natural to invented ones become the naming process of something is how the physical, psychological and physiological interrelated in creating a new vocabulary that can be stored for future use in any communicative situations when onomatopoeia is an utterance together with the single phoneme, syllables, and letters combined to form a name.

In everyday lives, human minds are busy doing countless interpretation and comprehension of every word appropriate and acceptable in every communicative situation.; it is astonishing to know that any neurologically normal one possesses the mechanism for speaking. Language represents the highest form of a faculty inherent in the human condition, the faculty of symbolizing. The faculty represent the real by a " sign" and understand the 'sign' wherein humans achieve a certain level of symbolic relationships. Language and speaking are then interdependent (Saussure 1959, 19). Language is the instrument, and speaking is the product, but their interrelatedness does not prevent their being two different things. How do people communicate with each other?

How do people organize their thoughts before they speak? If they talk, they need a receiver or a hearer - a speaking circuit. A speaking circuit is one that requires the presence of at least two people. Almost everything that surrounds us in living or non-living things have their references or names. Before naming each, arbitrariness and psychological recognition are happening. For example, when I see an object, and I do not know what it is, I can use my senses to name it, based on its usefulness, but what if my naming is different from others' view? This question follows Saussure's concept of the psychological phenomenon followed by a physiological process (12). When does the physiological occur? It starts by creating a word name that involves building a letter to three (3) to more letters to form a word, leading to phonation. Another phenomenon is when each subject speaks to the object with a various concept, where the object is the signifier, and the concept is the signified. Naming-process can be based on the conceptual meaning of an object or the literal meaning of the signified based on its characteristics and value. Simultaneously, the associative meaning can be used too, a meaning given to any signifier based on the speaker's connection. The establishment of meaning for any signified is the framework for building a direct relationship between personal ideologies and perspective to the world. In Benveniste's axiom placing man in his relationship with nature with language mediation, society is established (26). The formulation of signified meaning with its complex meanings is part of language development for all languages. This is not focusing on the English Language alone, but this phonation applies to all languages in the universe. As Saussure stated that '*each linguistic term is a member, an articulus in which an idea is fixed in a sound, and a sound becomes the sign of an idea (113)*

Indeed, Language is universal with its role to serve as a link between thought and sound- the mental entities creating the wave of sounds. The sounds that every speaker can create. All the sounds people make are the results of muscles contracting. There are forty-four distinctive speech sounds, twenty-four (24) consonants, and twenty (20) vowels. In the Filipino alphabet, there are 28 letters, while the Arabic alphabet is divided into two groups, the moon letters and the sun letters. Imagine how many languages with their distinctive phonemes and phonology. The individuality in pronunciation makes each word different from one speaker to another. This articulation is a clear illustration of Benveniste that a phonic symbol of reality affects its relationship with reality (48). From phonetics to phonology, that even speakers of other languages can communicate because any Language can be learned. A clear description that the uniqueness of every "I" in the communicative situations has its way in deciphering the appropriate pronunciation anchored on collective behavior and acceptance.

Second Theory

Do humans have innate rules in the brain or mind? How can the abstraction of linguistics signs relate to linguistic value? How can a speaker create grammatically correct simple to complex expressions? Imagine in a conversation speaking a single word only; will this suffice the entire exchange of communication? To have a meaningful two-way dialogue, a speaker expresses her thoughts by stitching each word from corpora (a vast collection of words in the brain), forming syntactically correct order of words in a sentence. In the English Language, we follow the pattern of Subject-Verb-Direct Object. In the Filipino language, to form a sentence, the first part is the simuno followed by panag-uri. Do rules exist in mind? A frequent question that is debatable until in our contemporary period. For Noam Chomsky, he differentiates the Language vs. language; the Language (capital L) is the part of the mind or brain that allows each speaking subject to speak, whereas language (lower case l) is an instantiation of the ability to speak any language; as Saussure stated that linguistic signs are psychological and are united in the brain by an associative bond(66) and Benveniste cleared that each speaking subject possesses language the faculty of symbolizing which is the highest form of inherent faculty in the human condition (23). The ability to group words into meaningful output is a mesmerizing truth about the human being. A human that has the magical power to use productive and combinatory Language and form comprehensible utterances. The recursion of unlimited word usage to form comprehensible sentences meaning is one of the language phenomena. The sentences we created are bound to the flow of dialogue, speaker -hearer are getting the contextual meaning to give a meaningful communicative sequence. *Execution is always individual. The individual is still its master: I shall call the executive side speaking (Parole) (Saussure 1959, 13).*

In every communicative circumstance, each word is a unit that strikes the mind, which Benveniste called this Language's mechanism. How does one know the appropriate utterance in the conversation? Kristeva's axiom about communication theory has catalyzed the *langue* speech distinction and has given it a new and operant signification (Kristeva 1996,6). In every communicative situation engaged in a two-way conversation wherein we used a classification system or a diagram representing the invariable and fundamental structures of the message, structures belonging to both the sender and the receiver, with which the receiver can reconstruct the message. A human being knows to adjust the context of communicative discussions considering the varied age group, social class, educational background, and culture as a speaking subject. Through different kinds of sentences that show various speech acts, man learned to psychologically and cognitively comprehend syntactically and semantically correct sentences to make the discourse meaningful. As Saussure explicitly mentioned, this is called the study of language proper(21), and speech is based on natural order (9). There are instances in the conversation that a speaker tries to find collocations, synonyms {lexical relations} of a particular word to express the intended purpose of spoken words fully; this is an illustration of Derrida's theory that expounded that the meaning of the word is deferred; there is nothing outside of the text. It is locating words in their appropriate usage. This also explains Saussure's theory, the multiplicity of signs, or the necessary diversity of signs are necessary to form any language. Besides finding the lexical relations of a word, understanding the semantic meaning of the utterance in the speaking circuit is essential.

In speaking, it is a fact that some ambiguous sentences need rephrasing because the meaning and sound image do not agree with its intended purpose. What is the forthright reaction of the speaker when encountering this in the dialogue? What makes a sentence ambiguous?

Saussure illustrated the answer to this question through the analogy of a plant's inner organism modified by alien forces (terrain, climate, etc.) He asked the question, too, " does not the grammatical organism continuously depend on the external forces of linguistic change?".

There are numerous external changes, as mentioned by Saussure, that technical terms and loan-words that abound in Language with their development; There are words that can be comprehended based on conceptual meaning and associative meaning. The former is the literal meaning of the words, and the latter is the meaning based on personal experience or sensorial meaning. How misinterpretation and ambiguous sentences solve by a speaking subject? Saussure's theory can answer this ambiguity in sentences about Mutability and Immutability(74). Time ensures the continuity of Language and influences the rapid change of linguistic signs. Man invents and understands symbols (24). There are some linguistic signs like code, which are not capable of change called immutability; on the other hand, words capable of change and modification are called mutability. Every speaker has the instinct ability to comprehend and place the words in their proper order, the Syntax and Morphology of words. Benveniste's words explain that this the intrinsic reality of Language, making it formal and systematic science. (19) It is a science because each speaking subject applies the methodology to sentence structure. Each shows the ability to gather and observe vast linguistic signs and use them correctly in the community discussions.

Third Theory

Language is a science that studies the life of signs within society, a part of social psychology. Saussure referred to it *as Seismology* (from Greek *semeion* "sign"). Supported by Benveniste's theory that Language and society cannot be conceived without each other, that man in his relationship with nature and by the mediation of Language, society is established, as emphasized by Kristeva's theory. There is no society without Language; that the basis of social communication is Language. All Language that is produced is to be communicated in social exchange
(Kristeva 1992, 3).

 The human being as a speaking subject created a relation between Language and all sorts of institutions. (Saussure, 1959, 21) These are the external elements of a Language. Speakers around the world have their nonidentical ways of formulating their own set of collective Languages.

In every dialogue, there is a communicative objective and purpose. Speakers created Language from varied disciplines. There is a specific vocabulary language for every speaking encounter. It is impossible in any conversation that two (2) or more gather together and discusses random ideas; this is leading to a fruitless discussion; topics from personal (belief, psychology, ideology) to social (culture, economics, political, education) unfold for Language development. The myriad issues lead to direct and intellectual community discussions, and even the unresolved, unfinished discussions are a fragment of the whole meaning of discussion. Thus, *the study of speech from several viewpoints simultaneously, the object of linguistics appears as heterogeneous and unrelated things. That every procedure opens the door to several sciences (Saussure 1959,9).* These heterogeneous and unrelated things usher each speaking subject to circumspect the Language to be used in every community discussion. Every speaking subject learns and develops through interaction with others. Benveniste's illustration of a child is born and develops in the society of men depicts an exact analogy of how each adult human beings, his parents, inculcate in him the use of words. The child's discovery that everything has a name and learning the names gives him control over things(26). The discovery of naming, changing, paraphrasing, deleting, and borrowing of words gives way to the Language's formal structure, which Benveniste coined the term as syntagmatic and paradigmatic. The syntagmatic, when Language is taken as a linear relationship within the spoken chain, and the paradigmatic, when the Language is possible for substitution (20). The speaking subject learns that language is the instrument of thought that can be modified, change, expound, and alter depending on the context to be communicated in social exchange. As speaking subject developing rapidly and continuously, the realization that every human speech activity brings the richness and infinite use of Language. Each speaker realizes his immense contribution to the evolution of Language. As Benveniste stated in his analysis of Saussure's question of *where does Language properly belong?* Benveniste expressed that human speech brought together- biological, physical and psychic, individual and social, historical, aesthetic, and pragmatic (30).

Indeed, Language belongs to every human being; without the human being, Language will not come to life. Kristeva's affirmation that Language is the instrument of thought (7). Here, a human being is the only creation that can logically think and has thought of his own and can define an era. Thus, Language defines the era. The latter affirmation about Language directed me to the question, how Language defines the period? From the start of human life, the Paleolithic Era to the contemporary period, Language flourished in many forms. The human being is the center of every epoch and making history. Kristeva conveyed that Language has a history that unfolds in time(3); this explains Saussure's diachrony and synchrony language perspective. To differentiate these terms, diachronic linguistics is the study of how speech habits change as time goes by, while Synchronic linguistics studies a language at one period in the sequence of time. As a speaking subject, how to integrate these two in the in-depth understanding of Language in everyday speech? Discourse can be expressed through writing and oral speech; the latter will be emphasized in this paper- the speaking -subject. In formal or informal conversation, when prompted, the history and development of Language are being discussed. And when talking about history, the presence of a human being is undeniable -Language is intimately linked to man and society (Kristeva, 3); Wherein in a society, the individualized speaking subject is effectuating his place, purpose, and identity in culture and society he belongs. As Stuart Hall's axiom that a theory of ideology begins in the suturing effect, the subject's impact in structures of meaning (Hall 1996,6). Man's identification of himself unfolds when meeting the point of a suture. The suture happens when a man understands himself as having many attributing factors and components to the identity's complex term. Identity is a controversial issue analogous to cultures' issues too. Stuart's essay elaborated the understanding of identity through various perspectives in psychology, philosophy, phenomenology with other philosophical writers defining the identity. With the evolving self, the speaking subject expands his perspectives and ideologies about his existence's value leading to the productive and meaningful communicative sequence in any form of dialogues. When a human being is creating and establishing ideologies in the various complexities of society's components (personal to social needs), man portrays his ideological apparatus to grasp and understand the value of his existence. This illustration explains Althussser's thesis that an ideology always

exists in an apparatus and its practice or practices. This existence is material (Althusser 2007, 1267). As a speaking subject expounded by Saussure and Benveniste, the thesis of Althusser is essential as this develops man's ability and capacity to have an in-depth understanding of himself that can be beneficial in the successful communicative social discussion.

To sum up, some remarkable comparative analysis from these two readings are; Benveniste stated that Language has a double scope (17): the science of Language and the science of languages. The linguists are not only focusing on one Language but also the complexities of languages and their related evolution and development. He also clearly described the two-sides of a Language, the vocal apparatus, and the auditory apparatus for being perceived. In Saussure's illustration, it is the physiological transmission (phonation and audition) and psychological parts (word-images and concepts).

 Another point to be highlighted is the model of a relational structure of Benveniste. This model brings words and concepts into contact. These words and concepts are not only made up of signified (concept) and the signifier (sound-image)of Saussure but with reality too. Saussure showed examples of reality but failed to emphasize to name it, but Benveniste did, in which a reality that symbolizes apparatus which made the thought and Language possible.

Of all Saussure's theories, the principle of human speech is the prime and essential term; everything in Language is to be defined in double terms. Hence, Saussure insisted on each speaking subject from his perspective that can create substance. For Benveniste, the results of logical operations in the speaking circuit.

Saussure and Benveniste's ideas consent to each other theories; Using the analogy of plant and water, the former planted the ideas. The former water them with clear explanations on some problems in linguistics. They both posited that Parole (speech) is a psycho-physical usage of individuals, produce utterances, an encoding of the message, actual and ephemeral. Language is endless as man's self-expression is boundless, too; thus, while man exists, the language will continue to prosper. Its linguistics forms bring not only the internal linguistics development from Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology. Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse Analysis also to External branches of linguistics: Psycholinguistics, Sociolinguistics, Anthropological, Philosophical, Stylistics, Computational, and Applied Linguistics are proof that language has life on its own that endures time. As Kristeva stated, the realization of language is in the speaking subject, A Man himself as a speaking system (4).

As these writers affirmed, Saussure, Benveniste, and Kristeva that language is the instrument of thought. That linguistics is essential to the general culture; individuals and societies speak to one another. Speech is more important than anything else(7).

 I view the readings as equally complimentary to Saussure's significant theories. I honor and give credit to the one who initiated Seismology. That is Saussure; his exceptional ideas, theories, axioms are the epitome of the on-going flourishing intellectual progression in the field of Language. Thus, I favor and admire the Saussure's seed of knowledge and all these fruitful writings from scholars' endeavors. Besides, Benveniste's writing is clear and an enlightenment explanation. It paved the way for describing what Saussure deemed vaguely explained; his ideas are inspired and challenged by Saussurian's theories. His writings supported and enriched views about the science of signs. Along with this is Derrida's and Kristeva's literary text acknowledging Saussure's leadoff ideas about Seismology.

The language will never get old. It is timeless and ever-evolving that has transcended human dialogue over the centuries and across diversifying cultures.

References

Baskin,Wade.1959. Course in General Linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure. The Philosophical library,Inc. 1-22, 65-
        78,101- 122.
Benveniste, Emile. 1971. Problems in General Linguistics. University of Miami Press. 17-40,43-48, 217-227.
Carter, David .2006. Literary Theory. Cox and Wyman, Reading Great Britain.
Richter, David.2007. 'The Critical Tradition' Classic Texts to Contemporary Trends. Bedfort St Martin's, 1263-1278,
        1404-1418.
Fromkin, Victoria, Rodman, Robert, Hyams, Nina. 2011. An Introduction to Language. Cengage Learning
        International Offices.
Hall,Stuart. Du Gay, Paul. 1996. Question of Cultural Identity. Sage Publication. 1-17.
Kristeva, Julia. 1992. Language The Unknown An Initiation into Linguistics. Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Yule, George.2006. The Study of Language. Cambridge University. University of Cambridge United kingdom Third
        Edition.