

# Illocutionary Affixes and Illocutionary Force Understanding

*Susumu Kubo*  
Matsuyama University

## 1. Introduction

This is a pilot study of speech act morphology and illocutionary force understanding. In this paper, we would like to clarify a partial mechanism with which we can predict the illocutionary force of an utterance with an illocutionary affix. We will assume the philosophical ideas of speech act theory proposed in Searle(1969), Searle & Vanderveken (1985), and Vanderveken (1990). The formulation of our proposals is given with pure prolog programs which are simply designed to be clear and explanatory rather than computationaly efficient.

## 2 Illocutionary affixes

### 2.1.0 Introduction

Vanderveken(1990) claims that 'hereby' is an illocutionary force marker in English which represents declaration and makes the utterance which contains it a declarative utterance. In Japanese, there are several affixes which function just like 'hereby'. An utterance which includes an affix of that type obtains an illocutionary force which is different from the force named by the matrix verb of the utterance. They are used to express particular illocutionary points with or without some degree of strength of modes of achievement and special propositional contents, preparatory or sincerity conditions. For the sake of discussion, we henceforth call them illocutionary affixes.<sup>1</sup>

In this section, we will observe how these affixes behave as illocutionary force markers and will seek for devices with which we can predict the illocutionary force of an utterance that contains these affixes. Some of the illocutionary affixes are given in (1). They are not exhaustive but enough to show the types of illocutionary affixes.<sup>2</sup>

- (1) a. '-tearu', '-teiru',  
b. '-teoku',  
c. '-temorau',  
d. '-teyaru', '-teageru', '-tekureru'

They are the results of combinations of a verbal connective particle '-te' and some basic verbs of several different sorts in (2).

- (2) a. verbs of existence: 'aru' (= exist[-animal]),  
'iru' (= exist[+animal])  
b. a verb of putting: 'oku' (= put)  
c. a verb of receiving: 'morau' (= get)  
d. verbs of giving: 'yaru' (= give), 'ageru' (= give), 'kureru' (=give)

Then, let us observe the kinds of illocutionary affixes and how they affect the illocutionary forces of utterances.

### 2.1.1 '-tearu' and '-teiru'

Compare (3) with (4a) and (4b).

- (3) Ore wa omae ni so meijiru.  
I TOP you DAT so order  
(=I order you to do so.)

- (4) a. Ore wa omae ni so meiji-tearu.  
 I TOP you DAT so order  
 (= [I('11) tell you that] I've ordered you to do so.)
- b. Ore wa omae ni so meiji-teiru.  
 I TOP you DAT so order  
 (= [I('11) tell you that] I've ordered you to do so.)

While (3) is an utterance whose matrix verb is bare and is not conjoined with any affix, (4a) and (4b) are utterances whose matrix verbs are conjoined with '-tearu' and '-teiru', respectively. The matrix verb in (3) is a directive illocutionary verb in the explicit performative construction specified in (5), thus (3) has a directive illocutionary force.

- (5) (Ore-wa)(omae-ni) ...koto-wo PERFORMATIVE VERB  
 I-TOP you-DAT MATTER-ACC

In contrast to (3), (4a) and (4b) have assertive illocutionary forces which are the result of the neutralization of the directive illocutionary force named by the matrix verb, 'meijiru(=order)' by the modification of the illocutionary affixes, '-tearu' and '-teiru'. In other words, the illocutionary forces obtained in (4a) and (4b) are not those of the matrix performative verb, 'meijiru' but are the ones originated from the illocutionary property of illocutionary affixes '-tearu' and '-teiru'. In uttering (4a) and (4b), the speaker asserts it to be true in a given state of affairs that he has ordered the hearer to do so. This is the case irrespective of the illocutionary types of the matrix verb with which these affixes are conjoined. Examine utterances with the verbs of other illocutionary types in (6).<sup>3</sup>

- (6) a. Ore wa omae ni sore wo tsutae-tearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP you DAT it ACC report  
 (= [I('11) tell you that] I've reported it to you.)  
 ['tsutaeru' (=report):an assertive verb]
- b. Ore wa omae ni sore wo yakusokushi-tearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP you DAT it ACC promise  
 (= [I('11) tell you that] I've promised it to you.)  
 ['yakusoku-suru' (=promise):a commissive verb]
- c. Ore wa omae wo gicho ni shimeishi-tearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP you ACC chairman DAT nominate  
 (= [I('11) tell you that] I've nominated you chairman of the board.)  
 ['shimei-suru' (=nominate):a declarative verb]
- d. Ore wa omae no seikou wo iwatearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP your GEN success ACC celebrate  
 (= [I('11) tell you that] I've celebrated your success.)  
 ['iwau' (=celebrate):an expressive verb]

Thus, here, we assume that both '-tearu' and '-teiru' have the illocutionary function which neutralizes the illocutionary force of an utterance named by the matrix verb they modify and makes their illocutionary points as the illocutionary forces of the utterance.<sup>4, 5</sup>

### 2.1.2 '-teoku'

Compare (3) above with (7) first.

- (7) Ore wa (kokoni) omae ni soo suru-yoo meiji-teoku.  
 I TOP hereby you DAT so do order  
 (= I hereby order you to do so.)

While (3) has a directive illocutionary force obtained by the matrix directive illocutionary verb in an explicit performative construction, (7) is an utterance whose matrix verb, namely 'meijiru' is conjoined with an illocutionary affix, '-teoku'. In contrast to (3), (7) has a declarative illocutionary force which is the result of the neutralization of the directive illocutionary force named by the matrix verb, 'meijiru(=order)' by the modification of the illocutionary affix, '-teoku'. In other words, the illocutionary force obtained in (7) is not that of the matrix performative verb but the one originated from the illocutionary property of the illocutionary affix '-teoku'. In uttering (7), the speaker declares that he orders the hearer to do so, which brings into existence a state of affairs that the hearer is ordered by the speaker. This is the case irrespective of the illocutionary types of the matrix verb with which '-teoku' is conjoined. Examine utterances with the verbs of other illocutionary types in (8).

- (8) a. Ore wa (kokoni) omae ni sore wo tsutae-teoku.  
 I TOP hereby you DAT it ACC report  
 (=I hereby report it to you.)
- b. Ore wa (kokoni) omae ni sore wo yakusokushi-teoku.  
 I TOP hereby you DAT it ACC promise  
 (=I hereby promise it to you.)
- c. Ore wa (kokoni) omae wo gicho ni shimeishi-teoku.  
 I TOP hereby you ACC chairman DAT nominate  
 (=I hereby nominate you chairman of the board.)
- d. Ore wa (kokoni) omae no seikou wo iwate-teoku.  
 I TOP hereby your GEN success ACC celebrate  
 (=I hereby celebrate your success.)

In uttering each sentence in (8), the speaker performs an action specified by the matrix verb which brings into existence a state of affairs by representing himself as performing that action. Moreover, these are the cases with/without a declarative adverb 'kokoni(=hereby)'. However, utterances in (7) and (8) have another illocutionary force if we replace the second person noun phrase 'omae(=you)' with a third person noun phrase 'aitu(=that guy)', and thus convert explicit performative constructions to non-explicit performative constructions. Examine (9).

- (9) a. Ore wa aitsu ni soo suru-yoo meiji-teoku.  
 I TOP that guy DAT so do order  
 (=I promise you that I will order that guy to do so.)
- b. Ore wa aitsu ni sore wo tsutae-teoku.  
 I TOP that guy DAT it ACC report  
 (=I promise you to report it to that guy)
- c. Ore wa aitsu ni sore wo yakusokushi-teoku.  
 I TOP that guy DAT it ACC promise  
 (=I promise you that I will promise it to that guy.)
- d. Ore wa aitsu wo gicho ni shimeishi-teoku.  
 I TOP that guy ACC chairman DAT nominate  
 (=I promise you to nominate that guy chairman of the board.)
- e. Ore wa aitsu no seikou wo iwate-teoku.  
 I TOP that guy GEN success ACC celebrate  
 (=I promise you to celebrate that guy's success.)

Here, every utterance in (9) has a commissive illocutionary force which is the result of the neutralization of the illocutionary force named by each matrix verb, 'meijiru', 'tsutaeru', 'yakusoku-suru', 'shimei-suru', and 'iwau' by the modification of the illocutionary affix, '-teoku'. In other words, the illocutionary force obtained in (9) is not that of matrix performative verbs but is the one originated from the illocutionary property of the illocutionary affix '-teoku'. In uttering

each sentence in (9), the speaker commits himself to the act specified by the matrix verb in the future course of action. (9) shows that this is the case irrespective of the illocutionary types of the matrix verb with which '-teoku' is conjoined.

These observations show that utterances with the illocutionary affix, '-teoku' have two different illocutionary forces, namely a commissive force and a declarative force, and their illocutionary forces are determinable according to the type of sentence constructions in which the illocutionary affix occurs: they are declarative if they occur in explicit performative constructions and commissive if they are used in non-explicit performative constructions.

This illocutionary distinction with respect to the type of performative sentence constructions is not found in '-tearu' and '-teiru'. Examine the utterances in (10) whose second person dative noun phrases are replaced with third person pronouns. They do not change their illocutionary forces irrespective of the type of performative sentence constructions.

- (10) a. Ore wa kare ni so meiji-tearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP he DAT so order  
 (= [I ('11) tell you that] I've ordered him to do so.)
- b. Ore wa kare ni sore wo tsutae-tearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP him DAT it ACC report  
 (= [I ('11) tell you that] I've reported it to him.)
- c. Ore wa kare ni sore wo yakusokushi-tearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP him DAT it ACC promise  
 (= [I ('11) tell you that] I've promised it to him.)
- d. Ore wa kare wo gicho ni shimeishi-tearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP him ACC chairman DAT nominate  
 (= [I ('11) tell you that] I've nominated him chairman of the board.)
- e. Ore wa kare no seikou wo iwatearu/-teiru.  
 I TOP his GEN success ACC celebrate  
 (= [I ('11) tell you that] I've celebrated his success.)

### 2.1.3 '-temorau'

Compare (3) above with (11) first.

- (11) Ore wa (\*kokoni) omae ni soo suru-yoo meiji-temorau.  
 I TOP (\*hereby) you DAT so do order  
 (= I request you to order me to do so.) [directive]

In contrast to (3) which has a directive illocutionary force obtained by the matrix directive illocutionary verb in an explicit performative construction, (11) has a directive illocutionary force which is the result of the neutralization of the directive illocutionary force named by the matrix verb, 'meijiru (=order)' by the modification of the illocutionary affix, '-temorau'. In other words, the illocutionary force obtained in (11) is not that of the matrix performative verb but the one originated from the illocutionary property of the illocutionary affix '-temorau'. In uttering (11), the speaker attempts to get the hearer to order the speaker to do so. It sounds strange at first to claim that the directive illocutionary force of the matrix verb is neutralized since the illocutionary force of the utterance (11) is also directive. However, this is a mere coincidence of the illocutionary force of matrix verb and that of the utterance. To clarify this matter, examine utterances with the verbs of other illocutionary types in (12).

- (12) a. Ore wa (\*kokoni) omae ni sore wo tsutae-temorau.  
 I TOP (\*hereby) you DAT it ACC report  
 (= I request you to report it to me.) [directive]

- b. Ore wa (\*kokoni) omae ni sore wo yakusokushi-temorau.  
I TOP (\*hereby) you DAT it ACC promise  
(=I request you to promise it to me.) [directive]
- c. Ore wa (\*kokoni) omae ni dareka wo gicho ni shimeishi-temorau.  
I TOP (\*hereby) you DAT someone ACC chairman DAT nominate  
(=I request you to nominate someone chairman of the board.) [directive]
- d. Ore wa (\*kokoni) omae ni seikou wo iwat-temorau.  
I TOP (\*hereby) you DAT success ACC celebrate  
(=I request you to celebrate my success.) [directive]

In uttering sentences in (12), the speaker attempts to get the hearer to carry out the acts specified by the matrix verbs. Therefore, the explication given above regarding the illocutionary force of (11) is true irrespective of the illocutionary types of the matrix verb with which '-temorau' is conjoined. Utterances in (12) also show that utterances with '-temorau' do not obtain declarative illocutionary forces, since '-temorau' does not cooccur with the declarative adverb 'kokoni(=hereby)'.

In addition to the observations above, just like '-teoku', utterances with '-temorau' have another illocutionary force if we replace the second person noun phrase 'omae(=you)' with a third person noun phrase 'aitu(=that guy)', and thus convert explicit performative constructions to non-explicit performative constructions. Examine (13).

- (13) a. Ore wa aitsu ni soo suru-yoo meiji-temorau.  
I TOP that guy DAT so do order  
(=I promise you that I will request that guy to order me to do so.)
- b. Ore wa aitsu ni sore wo tsutae-temorau.  
I TOP that guy DAT it ACC report  
(=I promise you that I will request that guy to report it to me.)
- c. Ore wa aitsu ni sore wo yakusokushi-temorau.  
I TOP that guy DAT it ACC promise  
(=I promise you that I will request that guy to promise it to me.)
- d. Ore wa aitsu ni gicho ni shimeishi-temorau.  
I TOP that guy DAT chairman DAT nominate  
(=I promise you that I will request that guy to nominate me chairman of the board.)
- e. Ore wa aitsu ni seikou wo iwat-temorau.  
I TOP that guy GEN success ACC celebrate  
(=I promise you that I request that guy to celebrate my success.)

In uttering sentences in (13), the speaker commits himself to bring about the state of affairs specified by directive propositional contents in the future course of action.

These observations show that utterances with the illocutionary affix, '-temorau' have two different illocutionary forces, namely a directive force and a commissive force, and their illocutionary forces are determinable according to the type of sentence constructions in which the illocutionary affix occurs: they are directive if they occur in explicit performative constructions and commissive if they are used in non-explicit performative constructions irrespective of the illocutionary types of the matrix verb with which '-temorau' is conjoined.

#### 2.1.4 '-teyaru', '-teageru' and '-tekureru'

Consider illocutionary forces of the utterances in (14) first.

- (14) a. (Ore wa omae wo) yurushi-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
I TOP you ACC excuse  
(=I declare that I excuse you.)  
['yurusu(=excuse): a declarative verb]

- b. (Ore wa omae wo) mitome-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you ACC accept  
 (=I declare that I accept what you have said/done.)  
 ['mitomeru(=accept): a commissive verb]

In uttering (14a), the speaker declares that he excuses the hearer, which brings into existence a state of affairs that the hearer is excused by the speaker. In the same way, in uttering (14b), the speaker declares that he accepts what the hearer has said or done, which brings into existence a state of affairs that what the hearer has said or done is accepted by the speaker. (14) shows that utterances with the illocutionary affixes, '-teyaru', '-teageru' and '-tekureru' have declarative illocutionary forces. However, this is not the case as we can see in (15). Examine (15).

- (15) a. Ore wa omae ni soo suru-yoo meiji-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you DAT so do order  
 (=I promise you to order you to do so.)  
 [meijiru(=order): a directive verb]
- b. Ore wa omae ni sore wo tsutae-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you DAT it ACC report  
 (=I promise you to report it to you.)  
 [tsutaeru(=report): an assertive verb]
- c. Ore wa omae ni sore wo yakusokushi-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you DAT it ACC promise  
 (=I declare that I promise it to you.)  
 [yakusoku-suru(=promise): a commissive verb]
- d. Ore wa omae wo gicho ni shimeishi-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you ACC chairman DAT nominate  
 (=I hereby nominate you chairman of the board)  
 [shimei-suru(=nominate): a declarative verb]
- e. Ore wa omae no seikou wo iwateyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you GEN success ACC celebrate  
 (=I declare that I celebrate your success.)  
 [iwau: an expressive verb]

Here, (15c), (15d) and (15e) have the same illocutionary force as that of (14a) and (14b). They do not have commissive illocutionary forces without including the futurity adverb such as 'izure(=sometime)' or 'sono-uchini(=one of these days)', implicitly or explicitly. Examine (16).

- (16) a. Ore wa omae ni izure sore wo yakusokushi-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you DAT soon it ACC promise  
 (=I promise you that I promise it to you soon.)  
 [yakusoku-suru(=promise): a commissive verb]
- b. Ore wa omae wo izure gicho ni shimeishi-teyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you ACC soon chairman DAT nominate  
 (=I promise you that I nominate you chairman of the board soon.)  
 [shimei-suru(=nominate): a declarative verb]
- c. Ore wa omae no seikou wo izure iwateyaru/-teageru/-tekureru.  
 I TOP you GEN success ACC soon celebrate  
 (=I promise you that I celebrate your success soon.)  
 [iwau: an expressive verb]

In contrast to (15c), (15d) and (15e), (15a) and (15b) have commissive illocutionary forces which are the result of the neutralization of the illocutionary forces named by the matrix verbs by the modification of the illocutionary affixes, '-teyaru', '-teageru', and '-tekureru'. In other words,

the illocutionary forces obtained in (15a) and (15b) are not those of matrix verbs, but are the ones originated from the illocutionary property of the illocutionary affixes '-teyaru', '-teageru', and '-tekureru'. In uttering each sentence in (15a) and (15b), the speaker commits himself to the act specified by the matrix verbs. However, unlike (14), (15a) and (15b), none of these utterances in (15) have declarative illocutionary forces.

These observations show that utterances with the illocutionary affixes '-teyaru', '-teageru', and '-tekureru' have two different illocutionary forces according to the types of verbs. Moreover, we have not touched upon how the utterances in (14), (15c), (15d), and (15e) can obtain the declarative illocutionary force which is the different force named by the matrix verbs of the utterances.

### 2.1.5 Summary

Based upon the observations above, we can summarize as follows: (i) Some illocutionary affixes such as '-tearu' and '-teiru' have a definite illocutionary point. Thus, their illocutionary points are determinable by themselves in the lexicon as shown in (17. i), (ii) Some illocutionary affixes such as '-teoku' and '-temorau' have more than one illocutionary points irrespective of the verbs with which they are conjoined. Their illocutionary points are not determinable by themselves, but are determinable with respect to the types of performative sentence constructions in which they are used as shown in (17. ii), (iii) Some illocutionary affixes such as '-teyaru', '-teageru' and '-tekureru' have more than one illocutionary points with respect to the verbs they are conjoined. Their illocutionary points are not determinable either by themselves or with respect to the type of performative sentence constructions in which they are used, but are possibly determinable according to the property of the verbs with which they are conjoined as tentatively shown in (17. iii).

- (17) (i) a. ip('-tearu', '[+assertive]').  
 b. ip('-teiru', '[+assertive]').  
 (ii) a. ip('-teoku', '[+declarative]') :-  
       sent\_type(X, '[+explicit\_performative]').  
 b. ip('-teoku', '[+commissive]') :-  
       sent\_type(X, '[-explicit\_performative]').  
 c. ip('-temorau', '[+directive]') :-  
       sent\_type(X, '[+explicit\_performative]').  
 d. ip('-temorau', '[+commissive]') :-  
       sent\_type(X, '[-explicit\_performative]').  
 e. sent\_type(X, '[+explicit\_performative]') :-  
       read(X),  
       np\_2ndp(Y),  
       matrix\_verb(Z),  
       performative\_verb(Z),  
       member(Y, X),  
       member(Z, X).  
 f. sent\_type(X, '[-explicit\_performative]') :-  
       read(X),  
       np\_3rdp(Y),  
       matrix\_verb(Z),  
       performative\_verb(Z),  
       member(Y, X),  
       member(Z, X).  
 (iii) a. ip('-teyaru', '[+declarative]') :-  
       matrix\_verb(X),  
       has\_the\_property\_of(X, w).

- b. ip('teyaru', '[+commissive]') :-  
 matrix\_verb(X),  
 has\_the\_property\_of(X, y).

If our tentative conclusions are correct, we can assume that illocutionary force of an utterance is reducible to that of an illocutionary morpheme and representable in the lexicon. Then, we can also assume a rule such as shown in (18) with which we can predict the illocutionary force of an utterance by the help of facts and rules in (17).

- (18) illocutionary\_force\_of\_utterance(X, Y):-  
 read(X),  
 illocutionary\_affix(Z),  
 ip(Z, Y),  
 member(Z, X).

(18) is read as follows: 'An utterance X has an illocutionary force Y if X is an utterance read in and Z is an illocutionary affix, and the illocutionary affix Z which is a member of X has the illocutionary point Y.'

In the next section, to clarify the illocutionary properties of verbs that illocutionary affixes modify, we would like to focus on those illocutionary affixes of 'teyaru' type.

## 2.2 The illocutionary properties of expressives

### 2.2.0 Introduction

In this section, we would like to clarify the illocutionary characteristics of verbs that illocutionary affixes modify focusing on the combination of verbs with illocutionary affixes of the 'teyaru' type. To carry out this task, we will observe the result of the tests of acceptability of those utterances whose matrix verbs are affixed with illocutionary affixes of 'teyaru' type. Here, we selected 23 Japanese expressive illocutionary verbs which are the Japanese counterparts of English expressive illocutionary verbs chosen in Vanderveken(1990). We chose expressives for this task because they do not have either commissive or declarative illocutionary forces in themselves which 'teyaru' type illocutionary affixes have. This enables us to refrain from mixing the illocutionary force of a matrix verb with that of an illocutionary affix in the interpretation of the illocutionary force of an utterance. Those expressives are shown in (19).

- (19) a. approve -->{manzoku-suru/manzoku-ni-omou}  
 b. compliment -->{home-tataeru}  
 c. praise, laud, extol -->{home-tataeru}  
 d. plaudit, applaud -->{shousan-suru}  
 e. acclaim -->{zessan-suru}  
 f. brag, boast -->{jiman-suru}  
 g. complain, disapprove -->{nageku, kobosu/fuman-ni-omou/fuhei-wo-riu}  
 h. blame -->{togameru}  
 i. reprove -->{tashinameru}  
 j. deplore -->{nageku, kuiru, zannen-ni-omou}  
 k. protest -->{monnku-wo-riu}  
 l. grieve-->{kanasiku-omou/zannen-ni-omou}  
 m. mourn, lament -->{itamu}  
 n. rejoice -->{uresiku-omou}  
 o. cheer -->{kassai-wo-okuru}  
 p. boo --{yajiru}  
 q. condole -->{kuyamu}  
 r. congratulate -->{iwau}  
 s. thank -->{kansha-suru/ arigataku-omou}



- t. apologize -->{ayamaru, wabiru}
- u. greet -->{kangei-suru}
- v. welcome -->{kangei-suru}

These verbs name expressive illocutionary acts but not all of them can be used in the explicit performative utterance construction shown in (5).<sup>6</sup>

Let us observe the result of the test of acceptability of those performative utterances whose matrix verbs are expressives in (20) and (21). Utterances in (20) and (21) are respectively acceptable and unacceptable as performative utterances.

- (20) a. (Ore wa)(kokoni) (omae ni) { ayamaru }  
 I TOP hereby you DAT { wabiru }  
 { kansha-suru }  
 { manzoku-suru }  
 { kassai-wo-okuru }
- b. (Ore wa)(kokoni) omae-no-seikou-wo { iwau }  
 I TOP hereby your success ACC { home-tataeru }  
 { shousan-suru }  
 { zessan-suru }  
 omaeno-koto-wo { kanashiku-omou }  
 your matter ACC { ureshiku-omou }  
 { itamu }  
 { kuyamu }  
 { kangei-suru }
- (21) a. \*(Ore wa) kokoni (omae ni) { monnku-wo-riu }  
 I TOP hereby you DAT { jiman-suru }
- b. \*(Ore wa) kokoni omae-wo { tasinameru }  
 I TOP hereby your ACC { togameru }
- c. \*(Ore wa) kokoni omae-no-koto-wo { kobosu }  
 I TOP hereby your matter ACC { yajiru }  
 { nageku }

In uttering sentences in (20), the speaker performs expressively the act specified by the expressive verb in the utterance at the time of utterance. Thus, they are performative. For instance, in uttering the sentence '(Ore wa)(omae-ni) ayamaru', the speaker expresses his mental state of apology to the hearer for something that he has done. And the same descriptions can be made for the other sentences in (20). Thus, the illocutionary forces of (20) are expressive.

In contrast, the sentences in (21) are unacceptable performatives since they can not be modified with the declarative adverb 'kokoni(=hereby)'. Moreover, the sentences in (21) are unacceptable even without the declarative adverb 'kokoni' since verbs in (21) require non-bare forms excepting the sentences which describe habitual acts such as shown in (22).<sup>7</sup>

- (22) a. (Ore wa) itsumo (omae ni) { monnku-wo-riu }  
 I TOP always you DAT { jiman-suru }
- b. (Ore wa) itsumo omae-wo { tasinameru }  
 I TOP always your ACC { togameru }
- c. (Ore wa) itsumo omae-no-koto-wo { kobosu }  
 I TOP always your matter ACC { yajiru }  
 { nageku }

Then, in the same way, let us observe the result of the test of acceptability of those utterances whose matrix verbs are affixed with illocutionary affixes of '-teyaru' type. Examine the utterances

in (23) and (24). Utterances in (23) and (24) are respectively acceptable and unacceptable as performative utterances.

- (23) a. (Ore wa)(kokoni) (omae ni) { ayamats  
I TOP hereby you DAT { wabi } { -teyaru }  
 { kansha-si } { -teageru }  
 { manzoku-si } { -tekureru }  
 { kassai-wo-okut }
- b. (Ore wa)(kokoni)(omae-no-koto-wo) { iwat  
I TOP hereby your matter ACC { home-tatae } { -teyaru }  
 { kangei-si } { -teageru }  
 { shousan-si } { -tekureru }  
 { zessan-si }  
 { kanashiku-omt }  
 { ureshiku-omt }  
 { itan } { -deyaru }  
 { kuyn } { -deageru }  
 { -dekureru }

In uttering (23), the speaker performs declaratively the act specified by the expressive verb in the utterance. They have declarative illocutionary force which is the result of the neutralization of the illocutionary forces named by the matrix verbs by the modification of the illocutionary affixes of '-teyaru' type. In other words, the illocutionary forces obtained in (23) are not those of matrix verbs, but are the one originated from the illocutionary property of the illocutionary affixes '-teyaru', '-teageru', and '-tekureru'. In uttering each sentence in (23), the speaker brings about a state of affair specified by the matrix verb with an additional mode of attitude, namely mental distortion by virtue of the performance of the declaration.<sup>8</sup> For instance, in uttering '(Ore wa) (omae-ni) ayamats-teyaru', the speaker brings about the state of affairs which realizes speaker's apology with an additional mode of attitude by virtue of the performance of his declaration. And the same descriptions can be made for other sentences in (23).

An utterance is distortive if and only if a speaker of an utterance expresses his mental state of false mercy which counterfeits his generosity in the utterance. Thus, we name the illocutionary affixes such as '-teyaru', '-teageru' and '-tekureru' in (23), distortive affixes in the sense that they realize the speaker's mental state of false mercy which counterfeits the speaker's generosity in the utterance in which they are used. In this use, the speaker charges the hearer some heavy mental debt or forces him to feel that he owes the speaker and must pay back. The stronger distortion causes arrogance on the speaker's side.<sup>9</sup>

- (24) a. \$(Ore wa)(\*kokoni)(omae-ni) { monnku-wo-it } { -teyaru }  
I TOP hereby you DAT { jiman-shi } { -teageru }  
 { -tekureru }
- b. \$(Ore wa)(\*kokoni)(omae-wo) { kena-shi } { -teyaru }  
I TOP hereby you AC { nonosit } { -teageru }  
 { togame } { -tekureru }  
 { imasime }  
 { tasiname }
- c. \$(Ore wa)(\*kokoni)(omae-no-koto)wo) { koboshi } { -teyaru }  
I TOP hereby your matter ACC { yajit } { -teageru }  
 { nagei } { -tekureru }

In uttering (24), the speaker does not perform the act specified by the expressive verb in the utterance at the time of utterance. Thus, they are not performative. Instead, the speaker commits himself to the act specified by the expressive verb in the utterance with the sense of threatening

at the time of utterance. Thus, they express commissive illocutionary force of threatening. For instance, in uttering '(Ore wa) (kokoni)(omae-no-koto-wo) kenashi-teyaru', the speaker does not speak badly of the hearer at the time of utterance, but instead gives a threat that he will speak badly of the hearer in the future course of action. The similar descriptions can be made for other sentences in (24). Here, we marked with \$ those utterances in (24) which are acceptable as nonperformative illocutionary utterances but unacceptable as performative utterances.

If we examine the group of verbs in (23) and (24), we can capture the common properties shared by each group. Verbs in (23) has the property that if a sentence with a verb in this group is uttered, the utterance expresses the preparatory condition such that the state of affairs represented by the propositional content is good for the hearer, and the sincerity condition such that the speaker is rather reluctant to bring about the state of affairs. We name these verbs which cooccur with distortive affixes pro-distortive verbs. Verbs in (24) has the property that if a sentence with a verb in this group is uttered, the utterance expresses the preparatory condition such that the state of affairs represented by the propositional content is bad for the hearer, and the sincerity condition such that the speaker is glad or happy to bring about the state of affairs. We name these verbs which do not cooccur with distortive affixes con-distortive verbs.

From these observations, we can get the following conclusion:

(1) the illocutionary force of an utterance with '-teyaru'-type illocutionary affixes is declarative if its matrix verb is an explicit performative verb and has the property specific to the verbs which conjoin with distortive affixes, namely pro-distortiveness. Thus, the illocutionary force of these utterance is determinable.

(2) the illocutionary force of an utterance with '-teyaru'-type illocutionary affixes is commissive if its matrix verb is not an explicit performative verb and has the property specific to the verbs which do not conjoin with distortive affixes, namely con-distortiveness. Thus, the illocutionary force of these utterance is determinable.

Moreover, this conclusion matches the results we have seen in (14) and (15). Therefore, we can revise (17iii) as follows:

(25)[revised version]

- a. ip('teyaru', '[+declarative]') :-  
matrix\_verb(X),  
has\_the\_property\_of(X, [pro-distortive]).
- b. ip('teyaru', '[+commissive]') :-  
matrix\_verb(X),  
has\_the\_property\_of(X, [con-distortive]).

### 3. Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown at first that illocutionary affixes excepting '-tearu' and '-teiru' are morpho-lexically ambiguous. And, their ambiguity can be disambiguated either by the help of performative sentence constructions if they are explicit performatives or non-explicit performatives, or by the help of the properties of the matrix verbs with which these affixes are conjoined if they are pro-distortive verbs or con-distortive verbs. Thus, we have shown the illocutionary point of each illocutionary affix is determinable. We have also shown that if these facts and relations are specified in the lexicon, an illocutionary force of an utterance with illocutionary affixes is predictable. These treatments are consistent with the general theory of speech acts.<sup>10</sup>

### NOTES

\* This is an abridged version of my paper orally presented at the Asian Conference at Korea University in August and a Philosophy Colloquium at the University of Quebec at Trois Rivieres in September, 1992. I would like to express my gratitude to Professors who gave me useful comments and suggestions, especially to Suk-Jin Chang, Yoshihiko Nitta, Young-Hie Han, Masahito Kawamori; Daniel Vanderveken, J.-Nicholas Kaufmann, Claude Panaccio, Marek Nowak, and Toshihiko Ise .

1. In this paper, I will use the term illocutionary force for illocutionary force type.
2. There are 10 other illocutionary affixes. They are '-tekakaru', '-tekomasu', '-teshimau', '-te(i)nasaru(<-teiru)', '-tenokeru', '-temairu', '-temiru', '-temiseru', '-teorareru(<-teiru)', '-tesashiageru(<-teageru)'. For more information, see Kubo (in preparation).
3. In Japanese, the linguistic (morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic) information embodied in the right-most constituent of a complex verbal construction determines that of total construction which contains the verbal construction. For more information, see the Right-most Principle in Kubo(in preparation).
4. The assertive illocutionary forces expressed with these illocutionary affixes are captured in literal utterances which have conventional implicatures. For instance, sentences in (4) have a conventional implicature such as 'you have not obeyed the order yet'. In addition, interestingly enough, they have a conversational implicature such as 'I urge you to carry out my order'. It shows that sentences in (4) have a secondary nonliteral illocutionary force, namely a directive illocutionary force, as well.
5. Unlike '-tearu', '-teiru' is polysemous and has different morpho-syntactic meaning of PROGRESSIVE and of EXPERIENCE, which has been extensively studied by traditional Japanese grammarians. However, they do not represent any illocutionary force but only their morpho-lexical meanings. Examine examples below:
  - a. Ore wa omae ni so meiji-teiru.  
I TOP you DAT so order PROG  
(=I'm ordering you to do so.)
  - b. Ore wa omae kara so kii-teiru.  
I TOP you from so hear EXPERIENCE  
(=I've been informed so from you.)
 They do not carry any illocutionary force mainly because they do not have any conventional implicatures that '-teiru' in (3) has.
6. This is supported by the general claim in Speech Act Theory such that 'there is no one-to-one correspondence between illocutionary forces and performative verbs or illocutionary force markers in natural languages (see, Vanderveken:1990:5)'.
7. '-teyaru', '-teageru', and '-tekureru' are used in different language uses representing different social relations among the participants in the communication setting. The choice of the expressions designating the speaker and the hearer, for instance, 'boku'-'kimi' pair is preferred to 'ore'-'omae' pair in the utterance which ends with '-teageru'. However, we will neglect the difference for the simplicity of explanation in this paper. For further information, see Kubo (in preparation).
8. (20) shows that not all utterances of bare form have commissive illocutionary force. This is supported by the fact that expressive verbs in (21) are not used in bare form in performative constructions.
9. The notion of distortion is the reverse of the notion of honorification. Thus, we will be able to unify the treatment of distortion with that of honorification. Conventional implicatures may be one of the candidates to think of the connection between the two. For relevant information, see Ikeya(1985).
10. Treatments of illocutionary affixes like these will enable us to make a prediction of decidability of an illocutionary force in general in the analysis of Japanese language use, since Japanese is a agglutinative language and sentence final particles as well as illocutionary affixes are conjoinable one after another. For further information, see Kubo(in preparation).

#### REFERENCES

- Ikeya, Akira (1985) "Japanese Honorific Systems in Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar Framework," in Ik-Hwan Lee (ed.) Seoul Papers in Formal Grammar Theory, Hanshin.
- Kubo, Susumu (in preparation) Kinds of Illocutionary Affixes and Illocutionary Forces, Matsuyama University Research Monograph 13.
- Searle, John (1969) Speech Acts, Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John and Vanderveken, Daniel (1985) Foundations of Illocutionary Logic. Cambridge University Press.
- Vanderveken, Daniel (1991) Meaning and Speech Acts. vols. 1 & 2. Cambridge University Press.