

Asking about asking (about asking): Revisiting the Performative Hypothesis

Tue Trinh



Leibniz-Zentrum
Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft



SPAGAD Speech Acts
in Grammar and Discourse

56th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

- 1 **The Performative Hypothesis**
- 2 Iterated questions
- 3 A constraint on performative prefixes
- 4 Declarative questions
- 5 Recap

Sentences and speech acts

- Speech acts are the minimal units of linguistic communication

(1) Sentences

A: Is it raining?

B: It's not (raining).

(2) Speech acts

A asks whether it's raining

B asserts that it's not raining

cf. Searle (1969)

An idea with long history

- (3) The Performative Hypothesis (PH)
Speech acts are part of literal meaning

cf. Frege (1879); Stenius (1967); Ross (1970); Lakoff (1970); Sadock (1974); Gazdar (1979); Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2017); Krifka (2001, 2014); Trinh and Truckenbrodt (2018); Trinh (2019); Krifka (2020); Trinh (2022)

Implementing PH: performative prefixes

- Logical forms under PH contain performative prefixes

(4) A: Is it raining?

(i) WHETHER is it t_{is} raining

standard analysis

(ii) A ASK WHETHER is it t_{is} raining

PH-analysis

B: It is raining.

(i) It is raining

standard analysis

(ii) B ASSERT it is raining

PH-analysis

Goal of talk

- discuss cases of question interpretation which
 - requires the presence of performative prefixes
 - requires a constraint on performative prefixes

- 1 The Performative Hypothesis
- 2 Iterated questions**
- 3 A constraint on performative prefixes
- 4 Declarative questions
- 5 Recap

Observation

(5) A₁ Are you married?

B₁ Am I married?

→ iterated question

A₂ Yes. Are you married?

B₂ No. I'm single.

→ B₁ is not asking whether B is married, but is asking whether A is asking whether B is married.

Analysis

- Given PH it is straightforward to capture the intuitive meaning of iterated questions

(6) A₁ Are you married?

A ASK [WHETHER are [you_B t_{are} married]]

B₁ Am I married?

B ASK [WHETHER [A ASK [WHETHER am [I_B t_{am} married]]]]

A₂ Yes that's what I asked.

cf. Ross (1970); Lakoff (1970); Sadock (1974); Krifka (1995, 2001);
Trinh and Truckenbrodt (2018); Trinh (2022)

- 1 The Performative Hypothesis
- 2 Iterated questions
- 3 A constraint on performative prefixes**
- 4 Declarative questions
- 5 Recap

Observation

- A_2 is deviant under the intended reading

(7) A_1 Are you married?

B_1 Am I married?

A_2 #Are you married?

Intended meaning: are you asking whether I am asking whether you're married?

B_2 Yes. Am I married?

Intended meaning: I am asking whether you are asking whether I am married.

A_3 Yes. That's what I asked.

B_3 No. I'm single.

Puzzle

Iterated questions cannot be iterated

SARC

- Speech act recursion is subject to the following constraint
 - (8) Speech Act Recursion Constraint
Recursion of speech acts is limited to **at most two** levels
 - (9)
 - a. p-prefix ...
 - b. p-prefix ... p-prefix ...
 - c. #p-prefix ... p-prefix ... p-prefix ...

Resolving the puzzle

- The deviant readings require the LF in (11) which violate SARC

(10) A₁ Are you married?

B₁ Am I married?

A₂#Are you married?

Intended meaning: are you asking whether I am asking whether you're married?

(11) A ASK [WHETHER [B ASK [WHETHER [A ASK [WHETHER are [you_B t_{are} married]]]]]]]

- Iteration of an iterated question is not possible, because it would require **three** levels of speech act recursion, which is ruled out by SARC

Does SARC explain facts beyond those just considered?

Answer to be defended: **Yes!**

- 1 The Performative Hypothesis
- 2 Iterated questions
- 3 A constraint on performative prefixes
- 4 Declarative questions**
- 5 Recap

Two kinds of polar questions

- Polar questions in English may or may not exhibit subject aux inversion

(12) A₁ John is looking for a vegetarian restaurant.

B₁ Is John vegetarian?

A₂ He is not, but his wife is.

(13) A₁ John is looking for a vegetarian restaurant.

B₁ John is vegetarian? → declarative questions

A₂ He is not, but his wife is.

Puzzle: declarative questions cannot be iterated

(14) A₁ John is looking for a vegetarian restaurant.

B₁ Is John vegetarian?

A₂ Is he vegetarian?

Intended meaning: are you asking whether I am asking whether John is vegetarian?

B₂ Yes, that's what I asked.

A₃ No he's not, but his wife is.

(15) A₁ John is looking for a vegetarian restaurant.

B₁ John is vegetarian?

A₂#He is vegetarian?

Intended meaning: are you asking whether I am asking whether John is vegetarian?

B₂ Yes, that's what I asked.

A₃ No he's not, but his wife is.

Why does declarative word order prevent iteration?

Analysis of declarative questions

- An intuition underlying many analyses of declarative questions is that they ask whether the addressee is committed to the proposition expressed by the prejacent

(16) A: John is looking for a vegetarian restaurant.

B: John is vegetarian?

≈ 'are you saying John is vegetarian?'

- Given PH it is straightforward to generate an LF which captures this intuition

(17) B ASK [WHETHER [A ASSERT [John is vegetarian]]]

- The embedded ASSERT results in declarative word order

cf. Gunlogson (2002, 2003); Trinh and Crnic (2011); Krifka (2017)

Resolving the puzzle about declarative questions

- Because declarative questions already contain two levels of speech acts, iterating them would result in a violation of SARC

(18) A₁ John is looking for a vegetarian restaurant.

B₁ John is vegetarian?

A₂ #He is vegetarian?

Intended meaning: are you asking whether I am asking whether John is vegetarian?

(19) A ASK [WHETHER [B ASK [WHETHER [A ASSERT [he is vegetarian]]]]]

- 1 The Performative Hypothesis
- 2 Iterated questions
- 3 A constraint on performative prefixes
- 4 Declarative questions
- 5 Recap**

- The “iterated reading” of questions occur quite frequently and naturally in conversations, and has an intricate distribution: if the question exhibits subject-auxiliary inversion, it can be iterated once but not twice, and if the question exhibits declarative word order, it cannot be iterated at all. I proposed an account of these facts which assumes that speech acts are represented in the syntax, and that this representation is subject to a formal constraint. The account is thus an argument for the Performative Hypothesis.

Other issues for future research

- the obligatory silence of performative prefixes
- the semantic/pragmatic distinction between (20a) and (20b)

- (20) a. S ASSERT it is raining
b. S ASSERT I_S assert it is raining

I thank Itai Bassi, Anton Benz, Daniel Goodhue and Manfred Krifka for valuable input and discussion. This work is supported by the ERC Advanced Grant “Speech Acts in Grammar and Discourse” (SPAGAD), ERC-2007-ADG 787929. All errors are my own.

- Frege, Gottlob. 1879. Begriffsschrift: Eine der arithmetischen nachgebildete Formelsprache des reinen Denkens. Halle: Neubert.
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. Pragmatics: Implicature, Presupposition and Logical Form. New York: Academic Press.
- Gunlogson, Christine. 2002. Declarative questions. Proceedings of SALT 12:144–163.
- Gunlogson, Christine. 2003. True to Form: Rising and Falling Declaratives as Questions in English. New York: Routledge.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1995. The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. Linguistic Analysis 25:209–257.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2001. Quantifying into question acts. Natural Language Semantics 9:1–40.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2014. Embedding illocutionary acts. In Recursion: Complexity in Cognition, ed. Thomas Roeper and Margaret Speas, volume 43 of Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics, 59–87. Berlin: Springer.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2017. Negated polarity questions as denegations of assertions. In Contrastiveness in Information Structure, Alternatives and

- Scalar Implicatures, ed. Chungmin Lee, Ferenc Kiefer, and Manfred Krifka, 359–398. Springer Cham.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2020. Layers of assertive clauses: propositions, judgements, commitments, acts. In Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie, ed. Jutta Hartman and Angelika Wöllstein, 1–46. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Lakoff, George. 1970. Linguistics and natural logic. Synthese 22:151–271.
- Ross, John Robert. 1970. On declarative sentences. In Readings in English Transformational Grammar, ed. Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum, 222–272. Waltham: Ginn and Company.
- Sadock, Jerrold. 1974. Toward a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.
- Sauerland, Uli, and Kazuko Yatsushiro. 2017. Remind-me presuppositions and speech-act decomposition: Evidence from particles in questions. Linguistic Inquiry 48:651–677.
- Searle, John R. 1969. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Stenius, Erik. 1967. Mood and language games. Synthese 17:254–274.
- Trinh, Tue. 2019. Rule I and speech act representation. Poster presented at SPAGAD 1: Syntactic and Semantic Modeling. Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin, 30/10/2019.
- Trinh, Tue. 2022. Three ways of referring to discourse participants in Vietnamese. Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 15:221–230.
- Trinh, Tue, and Luka Crnic. 2011. The rise and fall of declaratives. Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 15:645–660.
- Trinh, Tue, and Hubert Truckenbrodt. 2018. The Participant-Pronoun Restriction: English and Vietnamese. Proceedings of NAFOSTED 5:317–321.