

I utter certain words, with certain semantic properties thereby (the locutionary act), thereby betting Texas will win the game (the illocutionary act), thereby causing the bookie to make an inscription in her book (the, or a, perlocutionary act)....

Rough test for illocutionary vs perlocutionary. I perform the illocutionary act *IN* speaking those words. I perform the perlocutionary act *BY* speaking them. The illocutionary act is much more conventionalized and rule-governed in most cases; the perlocutionary act is more part of the world's natural, causal order. Illocutionary acts tend to be governed by Grice-style reflexive intentions; I inform you of BLAH by getting you to recognize my intention to do so.

Austin's illocutionary taxonomy:

Verdictives ("delivering a finding"): assessing, estimating, acquitting

Exercitives ("decision for/against"): appointing, dismissing, nominating, vetoing, excommunicating

Commissives ("undertaking a commitment"): inviting, offering, promising, swearing, volunteering

Expositives ("expounding, rehearsing, clarifying"): affirm, answer, argue, concede, classify

Behabitives ("attitudes to conduct"): apologizing, condoling, congratulating, greeting, deploring

Searle's complaints. 1) Austin is distinguishing illocutionary verbs, not acts. 2) No clear organizing principles. 3) Overlap between categories and heterogeneity within them.

Searle hopes for an independent characterization of each act-type. Searle's dimensions of variation. Differences in...

(i) Illocutionary point or purpose – asserting vs asking

(ii) Propositional content – describing vs denying

(iii) Direction of fit – asserting vs ordering

(iv) Sincerity conditions – predicting vs promising

(v) Preparatory conditions – promising vs threatening

Strength with which the illocutionary point is presented – suggesting vs insisting

Status or position of the speaker and hearer – requesting vs ordering

How the utterance relates to the parties' interests – promising vs threatening

Relations to the rest of the discourse – concluding vs supposing

P is a device for promising iff (ii) *P* is used to predicate future act *A* of the speaker, (iii) the world should conform to that predication, rather than the other way around, (i) the utterance of *P* counts as the undertaking of an obligation to do *A*, (iv)(v) *P* is to be uttered only if the speaker intends to do *A*, and only if the hearer would prefer that the speaker do *A* than not do it, and it is not obvious to both of them that the speaker will do *A* in the normal course of events.

Searle's illocutionary taxonomy.

Type		Content	Point	Direction	Sincerity	Prep	Example
Assertives	-	X is P	Commit to X being P	Word-world	S believes X is P	H lacks belief	Asserting
Directives	!	H does A	Get H to A	World-word	S wants H to A	Not obvious H would A	Demanding
Commissives	C	S does A	Commit to A-ing	World-word	S intends to A	Matters whether S A's	Vowing
Declaratives	D	X is P	Make X P	Both	S intends X to be P	S has power	Firing
Expressives	E	S is P	Express attitude	Neither	S is P (e.g. grateful)	???	Thanking

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

24.251 Introduction to Philosophy of Language
Fall 2011

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.