

Contents

INTRODUCTION	15
1. The Performative-Constative Distinction and a Preliminary Formulation of the Claim of this Book	15
2. The Structure of this Book	21
<u>Part One</u>	
I. SETTING THE STAGE	29
1. A Note on Terminology	29
1.1 The Three Levels of the Speech Act	29
1.2 The Searlean Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts	31
2. Semantics and Pragmatics – Meaning(s) and Force(s)	36
2.1 “Semantic Pragmatics”, Part 1 – Sentence Meaning and Utterance Meaning	37
2.2 “Semantic Pragmatics”, Part 2 – Sentence Types and Pragmatic Meaning	39
2.3 “Pragmatic Pragmatics” – The Gricean Program, Implicature and Indirect Speech Acts	41
2.4 Semantic and Pragmatic Meaning – Representation and Indication	46
3. Summary of Chapter I	49
II. PERFORMATIVES	51
1. Facing the Problem of Performativity	52
2. Previous Solutions	55
2.1 The Performative Approach	56
2.2 Performatives as Constatives – The (Standardized) Indirectness Approach	58
2.3 The (Searlean) Declarational Approach	61
2.4 The Paratactic Approach	65
2.4.1 The Theory	65
2.4.2 The History	67

2.4.3	The Critique	70
2.4.4	Resurrecting the Paratactic Approach? – Mayer’s (2006) “Parenthetical Experiment”	76
3.	Summary of Chapter II	82
III. COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS SOLUTIONS		83
1.	Critique of the Performative Approach	83
1.1	The Semantics of the Performative Prefix	84
1.2	Against the Pure IFID Hypothesis	92
1.3	The Phatic Analysis – Part 1	99
2.	Critique of the Descriptivist Approaches – Indirectness Approach and Declarational Approach	102
2.1	Critical Aspects of the Indirectness Approach	103
2.1.1	The Alleged Indirectness of Performatives	103
2.1.2	Standardized Indirectness and Direct Constative Force	105
2.1.3	The Delimitation of Potentially Performative Acts	107
2.2	Critical Aspects of the (Searlean) Declarational Approach	109
2.2.1	One Literal Meaning and Two Intentions	109
2.2.2	Derived Constativity	111
2.2.3	The Illocutionary Class of Declarations	112
2.3	Conclusion of Comparative Evaluation	117
3.	Conditions of Adequacy	119
3.1	Introducing the five Conditions of Adequacy	119
3.2	Checking Previous Solutions against the Conditions of Adequacy	122
3.2.1	The Paratactic Approach	122
3.2.2	The Performative Approach	123
3.2.3	The Indirectness Approach	124
3.2.4	The (Searlean) Declarational Approach	125
3.2.5	Summary	125
4.	Summary of Chapter III	127

IV. PERFORMATIVES AND “STATEMENTS” – AN INTERPRETATION OF AUSTIN’S DISTINCTION	131
1. Arguments in Favor of the Rhetic Analysis of Performatives	131
1.1 The Phatic Analysis – Part 2	131
1.1.1 The Argument of (Alleged) Immunity to Referential Failure	133
1.1.2 Indexicals and the “Semantic Transparency” of the Prefix	134
1.1.3 Explicating the Act of Reference	136
1.2 An Excursus – The Inadequacy of the Phatic Analysis w.r.t. Austin’s Theory of Action	138
2. Rheme versus Proposition, and a Defence of the Rhetic-Illocutionary Distinction	143
2.1 Rheme versus Proposition	144
2.2 Justifying Austin’s Rhetic-Illocutionary Distinction	148
2.2.1 Austin’s Conception of the Illocutionary Act	149
2.2.2 The Conventionality of Illocutionary Acts	152
2.2.3 Rheme/Locution and Illocution	155
2.2.4 The Status of the Performative Prefix within Austin’s Conception of Locution and Illocution	160
2.3 Searle on Illocutionary Acts and the Trouble with the Prefix	166
3. Austin on Propositions, “Statements”, and Truth	170
4. Summary of Chapter IV	177

Part Two

V. PERFORMATIVE-CONSTATIVE REVISITED – BRIDGING THE “GREAT GULF”	183
1. Arguments pro/contra Constativity in Performatives	183
1.1. Arguments in Favor of Constativity	183
1.2. Arguments against Constativity	188
1.3. Where We Are Now – Reconciling Constativity with Performativity	192

2. Conceptions of Constativity	193
2.1 Missing General Constativity in Austin's Taxonomy of Illocutions	194
2.2 Notions of (Generic) Constative Force and Their Compatibility with Performatives	196
2.2.1 Searle (1969, 1976), Searle/Vanderveken (1985)	196
2.2.2 Bach/Harnish (1979)	199
2.2.3 Stalnaker (1978)	201
2.2.4 Alston (1994, 2000)	202
2.3 Summary	203
3. Intentionalism versus Conventionalism	206
3.1 The Normative Dimension in (Communicative) Illocutionary Acts	207
3.2 The Absence of a Normative Dimension in Bach/Harnish's Intentionalist Theory of Communicative Illocutionary Acts ..	208
3.3 How Conventionalism accounts for Normativity	212
3.4 Illocutionary Acts as the Speaker's Taking Responsibility – Alston (1994, 2000)	215
4. Summary of Chapter V	220

VI. RECONSIDERING ILLOCUTION – CONVENTIONALITY, ONTOLOGY, RESPONSIBILITY	223
1. Expressed Attitude versus Illocutionary Force	223
1.1 The Difference between Intentionalist and Conventionalist Conception of Illocution	223
1.2 Illocutionary Concepts as Conventionalized Normative Social Practice Types	225
1.2.1 Lexicalization as a Clue to the Conventionalized Normative Practice Concepts	226
1.2.2 Examples	230
1.2.3 Excursus – The Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM)	235
1.2.4 Summary – Reconsidering Conventionality in Illocutionary Acts	237

1.3	Universality of Attitudes and Linguistic Universals	241
2.	Ascribing Illocutionary Force to Primary Performative Utterances	249
2.1	The Alleged Objectivity of Illocutionary Force – (A First Step) Beyond Austin’s Judge Criterion	250
2.2	A General Problem about Pragmatic Acts and Speech Act Verbs – The Ontology of Illocution	256
2.2.1	Verbs and Acts	256
2.2.2	Applying Verbs to Acts	260
2.2.3	Two Notions of Illocution: <i>Austinian</i> and <i>Non-Austinian</i> Forces	268
2.2.4	External and Internal Perspective in Illocutionary Force Ascription	272
2.3	Responsibility in Force Ascription and the “Performativity of Speech Act Reports”	280
2.3.1	Normative Consequences of Speech Act Reports	280
2.3.2	From Speech Act Reports back to Performatives – On the “Performativity of Speech Act Reports”	284
3.	Summary of Chapter VI	289
 VII. COMPLETING THE ACCOUNT		293
1.	The Conceptual Basis of Performativity	293
1.1	Demystifying Illocutionary Conventions	293
1.2	Act Types enabling Performativity	295
1.3	The Descriptive Property of Performative Verbs	304
2.	Completing the Account, Part I – Performativity and the Normative Dimension of Constative Speech	311
2.1	Constative R’ing – Speech Act Reports, Responsibility, and the Constative Aspect in Performatives	311
2.1.1	R’ing in Speech Act Reports	311
2.1.2	Being “One Level Removed” – The Analogy between Speech Act Reports and Explicit Performatives	312
2.1.3	Readjusting Intuition – Performatives “feel” like Constatives	318

2.2	Constative R'ing as the Key to Performatives	320
2.2.1	Constative R'ing in Explicit Performatives – R'ing-Entailment	320
2.2.2	Directness and Meaning Individuation in Performatives	323
2.2.3	Approaching the Constative Force Type in Performatives – A <i>Non-Austinian Force</i> Concept	329
3.	Completing the Account, Part II – Truth and Felicity in Performatives	334
3.1	Two Readings of Performatives	334
3.2	On Truth and Felicity Conditions	338
3.2.1	Self-Verification – The Subjective Reading	339
3.2.2	Truth, Falsity, and Felicity Conditions – The Objective Reading	342
4.	Summary of the Account	345
5.	Conclusion	348

APPENDIX

Building an Account of Performatives in 31 Steps	355
--	-----

REFERENCES	359
------------------	-----