Yönlendirici Söz Eylemlerinin Anlamsal Özellikleri ve Fiil-tamamlayıcıları: "Ask" ve "Request"

Cemre İŞLER, Fırat Üniversitesi, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3622-0756

Öz

Bu çalışma, yönlendirici söz eylem kategorisindeki "ask" ve "request" yönerge fiillerinin semantik ve söz dizimsel özelliklerini araştırır. Çalışmaya yön veren araştırma soruları şunlardır: (1) "Ask" ve "request" söz eylemlerinin benzer ve farklı semantik özellikleri nelerdir? (2) "Ask" ve "request" söz eylemlerinin benzer ve farklı sözdizimsel özellikleri nelerdir? Bu sorular ışığında, aynı kategoride sınıflandırılan bu iki fiili incelemek için hem nicel hem de nitel yöntemler uygulanmıştır. Veriler sözlükler ve derlem olmak üzere iki ana kaynaktan elde edilmiştir. Sözlük olarak; Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (OALD), Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (LDCE), The American Heritage Dictionary of English (AHDE) ve derlem olarak da Çağdaş Amerikan İngilizcesi Derlemi (COCA) kullanılmıştır. Veri analizi için, bu iki yönlendirici söz eylem, açık edimseller biçiminde kullanıldıkları (örneğin, ben bunu soruyorum) bildirgelerle sınırlandırıldı. Açık edimselleri uygulayan tüm cümle kalıpları analize dahil edildi. Bu analizlerde amaç aynı söz eylem kategorisine ait olan "ask" ve "request"in kullanımında farklı anlamsal ve sözdizimsel özelliğin gerçekleştirilip gerçekleştirilemeyeceğinin belirlenmesidir. Çalışma, odağını fiiller arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıklar olarak belirleyerek, paylaşılan anlam ve gramer kalıplarını ve fiillerde biri uyarken diğerinin uymadığı farklı anlam ve kalıpları ortaya koydu. Bulgular, her iki fiilin de yönlendirici söz eylemleri olarak aynı kategorizasyon altında sınıflandırılırken, her ikisinin de kullanımlarında farklı anlamsal özellikler ve gramer kalıpları sergilediğini göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: söz eylem, yönerge fiilleri, COCA

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Giriş

Söz Eylem Kuramı, İngiliz dil felsefecisi John Austin (1955, 1962) tarafından ortaya konmuş ve daha sonra öğrencisi John Searle (1969) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Bu kurama göre, konuşmak dünya hakkında bir takım gerçekleri ve olguları dile getirmenin yanı sıra soru sormak, emir vermek yada söz vermek gibi bazı sözceleri kullanarak bir edimde bulunmayı da kapsar. Öyle ki, bir şey söylemek aynı zamanda bir şey yapmaktır. Sözce kullanarak aynı zamanda eylem gerçekleştirdiğimiz bu işleme söz eylem denir. Austin söz eylemleri üçlü yapıya ayırır. Bunlar, düz söz eylemi, yani bir sözceyi dilbilgisel kurallara uygun bir biçimde ifade etmektir, etkisöz eylemi, dile getirilen sözcenin yarattığı etkidir, ve buna göre sözceleri kullanarak insanları ikna edebilir yada özrümüzü kabul ettirebiliriz, ve üçüncü olarak, edimsöz eylemi, sözceleri kullanarak gerçekleştirilmek istenen amacı ifade eder, örneğin; misafirliğe davet etme amacını bir sözce ile dile getirmek. Burada dikkat çeken, aynı kelimeleri kullanarak farklı bağlamlarda farklı edimsöz gerçekleştirebiliriz. Örneğin; "Saat 8.00'de iş yerinde olunuz" sözcesi, bir müdürün toplantıda çalışanlarına iş yeri kurallarını hatırlatarak verdiği bir emir olabilirken, aynı zamanda çalışanının disiplinsizliğinden bunalmış bir patronun uyarısı manasına da gelebilir. Bu sebeple, karşılıklı iletişimin başarılı olabilmesi için farklı edimsöz taşıyan aynı yapı ve anlamdaki kelimelerin bağlama uygun bir şekilde yorumlanması gerekmektedir. Dolayısıyla, edimsözlerin sınıflandırılması dilbilim çözümlemeleri açısından önemlidir. Buna yönelik olarak, Searle (1976) beş türde söz eylem grubu önerir. Bunlar:

1. İddia ifadeleri: Konuşucunun üzerinde emin olduğu yada sadece varsayım yaptığı olaylar hakkındaki sözceleridir.

2. Yönlendirici ifadeler: Konuşucunun karşıdaki kişiye iş yapmasını sağlamak amaçlı verdiği talimat sözceleridir. Emretmek, rica etmek, izin vermek, yasaklamak gibi.

3. Yükümleyici ifadeler: Konuşucunun gelecekte gerçekleştirmeye yönelik bir işi üstlenmesine sebep olan sözcelerdir. Söz vermek, garanti etmek gibi.

4. Yansıtıcı ifadeler: Konuşucunun bir olay karşısında dışa vurduğu duygusal tepkiyi ifade etmeye yarayan sözcelerdir. Teşekkür etmek, tebrik etmek gibi.

5. İlan edici ifadeler: Dünyada bir durum değiştirmekte kullanılan sözcelerdir. Sizi karı-koca ilan ediyorum gibi.

Yukarıda sıralı söz eylem gruplarından da anlayacağımız üzere, sözceler yoluyla belirli koşullar altında insanlara emir verebilir, rica edebilir, medeni durumlarını değiştirebilir yada teşekkür edebiliriz. Bu sınıflandırma, dilsel çözümlemede anlambilim ve edimbilim arasındaki farkı göstermede yararlıdır, öyle ki aynı yapı ve aynı anlamda kullanılan kelimeler bağlama göre farklı işlevde karşımıza çıkabilir.

Amaç

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Searle'nin (1976) söz eylemleri sınıflarından biri olan yönlendiricileri ele alarak ve iki yönlendirme eylemi olan "ask" (sormak) ve "request" (rica etmek)'i, anlamsal ve sözdizimsel özellikleri açısından incelemektir. Bu anlamda, bu çalışmaya iki araştırma sorusu rehberlik etmiştir:

1. "Ask" ve "request" söz eylemlerinin benzer ve farklı semantik özellikleri nelerdir?

2. "Ask" ve "request" söz eylemlerinin benzer ve farklı sözdizimsel özellikleri nelerdir?

Yöntem

Bu iki söz eylem fiilini analiz etmek için hem nicel hem de nitel yöntemler kullanılmıştır. Veriler çeşitli sözlükler ve derlem, Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), olmak üzere iki ana kaynaktan elde edilmiştir. *Ask* ve *request* arasındaki anlamsal özellikler bakımından benzerlik ve farklılıklara ışık tutmak amaçlı üç sözlük seçilmiştir. Bu üç sözlük, Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (OALD), Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (LDCE) ve The American Heritage Dictionary of English (AHDE)'dir. Bu sözlükler, verilerini derleme dayalı otantik İngilizce'den türettikleri için seçilmiştir. Anlamsal özelliklerin analizinde sözlüklerin yanı sıra COCA verileri de dikkate alınmıştır. COCA'da her iki fiil de sıklıkları ve kullanım şekilleri bakımından analiz edilmiş olup sıklık sorgularının sonuçlarına dayalı olarak, her fiil için tamamlayıcı türlerinin bir listesi oluşturulmuştur. Bu liste, söz dizimsel açıdan fiiller arasındaki benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları görmemize yardımcı olmuştur. Söz dizimsel kalıbın fiillerin anlamsal özellikleri üzerindeki etkisi hakkında daha fazla bilgi sahibi olmak için her fiil-tamamlayıcı bulguya COCA'dan örnekler verilmiştir.

Bulgular

Aynı sınıfa ait iki söz edimi arasındaki benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları bulmaya yönelik bu çalışma, "ask" ve "request" söz eylemlerini anlamsal ve söz dizimsel özellikleri açısından araştırmıştır. Geleneksel sözlükler ve derlemler kullanılarak sözlük anlamları incelenmiş ve ardından fiil tamamlayıcıları derlem verilerinde analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, bu iki söz eylemin ortak özellikleri, paylaştıkları ve farklılık gösterdikleri sonuçları ortaya çıkarmıştır. Sonuçlara göre, "ask" ve "request" söz eylemleri "birinden bir şey yapmasını istemek" bakımından aynı anlama sahiptir. Derlem verileri de bu bulguyu desteklemektedir. Ancak "request" söz eylemi, anlamı gereği daha fazla nezaket ve formalite önerisi taşırken, "ask" söz eylemi bu detaydaki anlam içeriğini taşımaz. Bu farklılık, derlemden türetilen örneklerde gösterilmiştir. Bu örneklerde söz edimi olarak "request"in "hükümet", "Beyaz Saray" gibi formalite ifade eden kelimelerle birlikte kullanılma eğiliminde olduğu görülmektedir. Üstünlük konumunda olan bir dinleyiciye "ask" söz eyleminin kullanıldığı örneklerde konuşan ile işiten arasında bir dereceye kadar yakınlık gözlemlenmiştir. Bu nedenle, bu bulgu, konuşmacıların "birinden bir şey yapmasını istemek" için "ask" kullanımı eğilimindeyken, durumun formalite ve nezaket gerektirdiği bağlamlarda, "ask" söz eylemi yerine "request"i tercih etme olasılıklarının daha yüksek olduğunu göstermiştir. Söz dizimsel yapıların sonuçlarına gelince, her ikisinin de tümceyi fiil tümleci olarak ve "I + verb + sb + to V.inf" kalıbını aldıkları görülmüştür. Bu fiiller ayrıca farklı fiil tamamlayıcılarıyla birlikte de kullanılır. Derlem verilerinde "ask" söz eyleminin "if clause" cümleleri ile "verb + for + sb + to + V.inf" yapısı ile kullanılabilirken, bu formlar içerisinde "request" söz eylemi yer almaz. Ancak "request" söz eylemi "verb + smt + from + sb" yapısı ile kullanılabilirken "ask" bu şekilde oluşturulamaz. Her bir fiil, hangi isim ve zarfların onları bir araya getirdiğini bulmak için daha fazla analiz edildiğinde, her ikisinin de isim eş dizimi olarak çoğunlukla "sizi" aldıkları ve eş dizimlerin meydana geldiği her bir kalıp için ortak zarf eş dizimlerini paylaşmadıkları görülmektedir.

Tartışma & Sonuç

Bu bulgulardan, her iki fiilin de yönlendirici söz eylemleri olarak aynı söz edim kategorisi altında sınıflandırılırken, her ikisinin de farklı anlamsal özellikler ve gramer kalıpları

sergiledikleri sonucuna varılabilir. Bu, aynı gruba sahip olmanın benzer olarak adlandırılacak fiilleri niteleyemeyeceği anlamına gelir. Bu noktadan hareketle, daha sonraki çalışmalar aynı grup içinde farklı fiil türlerini ele alabilir, farklılaşma ve benzerlikleri araştırabilir. Ayrıca, benzer anlama ve söz dizimine sahip aynı söz edim kategorisinde yer alan söz eylemlerin söylemin konusuna veya alanına; gerçekleştiği yazılı, sözlü, elektronik vb. ortama göre nasıl farklılık gösterdiği konusu da çalışmaların kapsamına alınabilir. Bu çalışmada amaçlanmamakla birlikte derlemden elde edilen verilere bakıldığında akademik türde bu söz edimlerinin kullanımının oldukça az olduğu söylenebilir. Daha fazla araştırma, örtük performatifleri dahil ederek konuyu genişletip inceleyebilir.

Semantic Features and Verb-complements of Directive Verbs: "Ask" and "Request"

Cemre İŞLER, Fırat University, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3622-0756

Abstract

This study investigates semantic and syntactic features of two directive speech act verbs: "ask" and "request". The research questions guiding the study were: (1) What are the similar and different semantic features of two speech act verbs, ask and request? (2) What are the similar and different syntactic features of two speech act verbs, ask and request? In order to examine these two speech act verbs, both quantitative and qualitative methods were implemented. Data were derived from two main sources: dictionaries and corpus. These were three traditional dictionaries Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (OALD), the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (LDCE) and the American Heritage Dictionary of English (AHDE), and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). For data analysis, these two directive verbs were confined to declaratives where they were used in the form of explicit performatives (e.g., I ask that). All the sentence patterns that implement explicit performatives were included in the analysis. The attempt was made to find out whether the different semantic and syntactic features can be realized in the use of "ask" and "request". By focusing its attention on the similarities and differences between the verbs, the study showed the shared meaning and grammatical patterns and the different meanings and patterns that while one fits, the other does not. The findings demonstrated that while both verbs are classified under the same group of categorization as directives, they both exhibit different semantic features and grammatical patterns.

Key Words: speech acts, directive verb, COCA

Semantic Features and Verb-complements of Directive Verbs: "Ask" and "Request"

To say something is to do something (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). By saying the words, we, first and foremost, perform an act (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). This idea is the core of the theory of speech acts. Although it may seem apparent, there appears a question: how will the hearer understand the performed utterances in the same way as the speaker intended to convey them? The speech act theory is then inherently a pragmatic theory because "it involves an intention on the part of the speaker and an inference on the part of the hearer" (Birner, 2013). As one of the central in the study of pragmatics, the theory of speech act has been studied in a number of fields, including philosophy (Austin, 1962; Searle; 1969; 1976), linguistics (Bach & Harnish, 1979), and language teaching (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993). This study, different from the majority of research devoted to speech acts, adopts a corpus-based approach. The effort was made to investigate the similarities and the differences between two speech act verbs: ask and request. Although ask and request belong to the same class, directives, they are predicted to differ from each other in terms of their semantic and syntactic features because, according to Searle (1997), each class encompasses a number of speech acts that may show different lexical meaning and grammatical structures. However, since the classification of speech act verbs depends on the relationship between the verbs within the same group (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), it is also predicted that these two verbs can exhibit shared meaning and patterns.

Speech Act Theory: J. Austin's View

The framework of speech act theory was first introduced by British language philosopher John Austin (1962) in his book entitled "How to Do Things with Words". His argument was founded on the fact that speech acts are acts of communication that can be used to accomplish specific purposes. That is, speakers' utterances can perform particular actions by conveying a particular meaning and make hearers do specific things (Austin, 1962). In his view, therefore, we do not just use language to simply make statements but also "do things" with it. On the way of exploration of speech acts, his first step was to distinguish utterances that are used to make statements from utterances that are not just used to say something but do something as well. He uses the terms "constatives" and "performatives" to differentiate between two classes of utterances (Austin, 1962). He uses the term "constatives" to refer to utterances in which the speakers' intention is to assert or state something, as in: "My son is called Edward". In this utterance, a speaker is just saying something about her/his son. As for the "performatives", he mentions their tight relationship with conveying specific actions such as apologies, requests, and promises, as in: "I promise that I will leave tomorrow". In this example, the speaker is not just expressing his future plan by saying I will leave tomorrow, but also offers a promise, I promise that…. By drawing attention to this difference between utterances, he highlights the idea that with words, we can accomplish many actions, and claims that "to say something is to do something; or in which by saying or in saying something we are doing something" (Austin, 1962, p.12).

Austin's Felicity Conditions

In explaining the difference between constative and performative utterances, Austin (1962) posited that constatives can be evaluated as true or false statements, whereas

performatives cannot be subject to truth conditionality but meeting felicity conditions (appropriateness):

"Besides the uttering of the words of the so-called performative, a good many other things have as a general rule to be right and to go right if we are to be said to have happily brought off our action. What these are we may hope to discover by looking at and classifying types of case in which something goes wrong and the act-marrying, betting, bequeathing, christening, or what not-is therefore at least to some extent a failure: the utterance is then, we may say, not indeed false but in general unhappy. And for this reason we call the doctrine of the things that can be and go wrong on the occasion of such utterances, the doctrine of the Infelicities. We call the doctrine of the things that can be and go wrong on the occasion of such utterances, the doctrine of the Infelicities" (p. 14).

In order for a performative to be considered as valid, he proposes that conditions depend on appropriate situations and participants, complete and correct execution of the procedure, appropriate use of language, and sincerity of the intention. Otherwise, the performed utterance will be regarded as infelicitous. For example, if a speaker says, "He promises to come", he is not using a performative since the speaker has no control over him to fulfill his promise. So, the appropriate participant condition is not met in this case. However, if the speaker says, "I promise to come", it can be felicitous due to correct use of language (e.g., I -as subject, promise –present tense), and depending on the condition that the speaker is sincere in her/his intent to come. As another example, if someone shouts from the court, "I divorce you", the force of performative cannot function as a speech act since that person lacks of authority to divorce under the law. Therefore, the correct execution of divorce is unfulfilled.

Locutionary Act, Illocutionary Act, and Perlocutionary Act

After framing the felicity conditions for performative, Austin tests constative and performative utterances by using felicity conditions and truth assertions, and observes that the distinctions between them gets fuzzy since they both fulfill felicity and truth conditions (Austin, 1962). For example, if one says, "I swear the President lives in Kansas", s/he is performing an action that shows her/his belief system, "I swear…"; however, that the true value expressed in the utterance may be judged as either true or false. Also, although the performative utterance, I swear, can be valid due to the speaker's sincere belief, the subordinate clause can be false if the president actually does not live in Kansas. As a result of this problem, Austin abandons his constative/performative distinction and restructures his previous ideas into three levels of acts where one can accomplish each simultaneously (Levinson, 1983, p.236); "locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act".

As an act of communication, Austin argues that utterances involve three acts:

•*Locutionary act* is the production of the utterance "which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference" (Austin, 1962, p.109). That is to say, a locutionary act is the basic act that gives the literal meaning to the utterance of the sentence. For example, if a speaker says, "he said to me, shoot her", it means literally "shooting" by addressing "her" to her.

•*Illocutionary act* is the speakers' intention conveyed through producing "utterances which have a certain (conventional) force" (Austin, 1962, p.109), either directly or indirectly,

such as making a bet, requesting, or commanding. For example, by uttering, "Shoot her!", the speaker performs a specific action: s/he directly orders the hearer to shoot her. An utterance could also be performed by implying indirect force as in: "It is hot in here", which might be an indirect request for somebody to open the windows.

•*Perlocutionary act* is the effect of what is said on the hearer, where the speaker "bring(s) about or achieve(s) by saying something" (Austin, 1962, p.109). For example, "Shoot her!" might result in somebody shooting her.

Levinson (1983) reviews all these as follows:

"… the illocutionary act is what is directly achieved by the conventional force associated with the issuance of a certain kind of utterance in accord with a conventional procedure, and is consequently determinate (in principle at least). In contrast, a perlocutionary act is specific to the circumstances of issuance, and is therefore not conventionally achieved just by uttering that particular utterance, and includes all those effects, intended or unintended…" (p. 237).

To sum up, while producing an utterance, one does not only say what s/he literally means (locution), but also performs an action (illocution) in which the aim is to make the hearer recognize the effect that s/he intends to assign in the meaning of the utterance (perlocution).

Austin's Classification of Speech Acts

Placing illocutionary act on the focus of his speech act theory, Austin (1962) subdivides speech acts due to their illocutionary force into five categories based on the characteristics of the verbs. These are:

1. Verdictives –as the name suggests, these utterances express a verdict, often by an appropriate speaker for the authority requires. They comprise the acts "consist in delivering of finding, official and unofficial, upon evidence or reason as to value or fact so far these are distinguishable" (p.152). Some examples of verdictive verbs are: analyze, calculate, assess, hold, estimate, characterize, etc. (p. 152).

2. Exercitives are the acts that performed while "giving of a decision in favor of or against a certain course of action or advocacy of it…" (p. 154). They are "the exercising of powers, right or influence" (p. 151). Austin lists exercitive verbs as, beg, order, direct, warn, command, and advise, etc. (p. 154-155).

3. Commisives are the acts where the point is to "commit the speaker to a certain course of action" (p.156). Some example verbs are, promise, intend, plan, bet, swear, and oppose, etc. (p. 156-157).

4. Behabitives, this class which causes difficulty for Austin in categorization, "includes the notion of reaction to other people's behavior and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions of attitudes to someone else's past conduct or imminent conduct" (p. 159). Some behabitive verbs are welcome, congratulate, apologize, thank, dare, protest, wish, and favor, etc.

5. Expositives are the last group of acts and they include "expounding of views, the conducting of arguments, and the clarifying of usages and of references" (p. 160). Among

expositive verbs, Austin gives the examples as report, state, mention, describe, ask, accept, recognize and agree (p. 161).

After classifying illocutionary acts on different levels with a limited number of types, Austin (1962) points to the limitations of this classification. As the number of potential illocutionary acts is high and it is not always easy to decide verb-meanings, he refers to a possible need for a new way of categorization by saying, "I am not putting any of this forward as in the very least definitive" (p. 152). By addressing this problem in the classification, Searle (1969) attempts to recategorize the speech acts by introducing another classification.

J. R. Searle' s View

Following Austin (1962), Searle (1969, 1971), Austin's student, contributes much to speech act theory, and defines speech acts as "the minimal unit of linguistic communication" (1969, p.16). He further expands discussions on speech acts and attaches great importance to illocutionary acts. By replacing the term "speech act" with "illocutionary act", he states that "the production of the sentence token under certain conditions is the illocutionary acts, and it is the minimal unit of linguistic communication" (1971, p.39). He, therefore, uses the term "illocutionary act" to mean the same as "speech act".

J. R. Searle' s Felicity Conditions

The occurrence of a speech act depends on necessary conditions to be fulfilled, as stated in the previous section. In his systematization, Searle (1969) discusses that felicity conditions formed by Austin (1962) were not alone sufficient since we cannot solely test a set of performative verbs and truth statements to decide on the force of the utterance. In this sense, he introduces four conditions that are significant in making the illocutionary acts successfully performed. These are preparatory, propositional content, sincerity and essential conditions. In the case of "ordering" for example, the following conditions needs met according to Searle (1969, p.63-69):

•Preparatory condition: Speaker's position (e.g. her/his authority) should be appropriate in order to order something from the hearer.

•Sincerity condition: Speaker's want for the ordered act to be done.

•Propositional content condition: The content of the utterance: in this case, it is ordering, which requires hearer's future action.

•Essential condition: Speaker's intention that her/his ordering will count as an identifiable act by the hearer.

In this ordering context, therefore, the speaker first has to recognize their power relationship with the hearer, and then predict whether the hearer is able to do the act. Second, the speaker has a confidence for the act to be accomplished by the hearer. Third, speaker's ordering places the hearer's act under obligation. Last, ordering is considered as compulsory act by the speaker to make the hearer perform it.

J. R. Searle's Classification of Speech Acts

In relation to Austin's (1962) classification of speech acts, Searle (1976) states that it is of illocutionary verbs rather than illocutionary acts. In an attempt to make consistent

categorization, he forms a reasoned classification of illocutionary acts by considering four criteria: illocutionary point, direction of fit, psychological state, and propositional content. By illocutionary point, Searle (1976) means that every type of illocution has a purpose. For example, the illocutionary point of commanding is to get the hearer to do something for the speaker. Direction of fit is about whether the words uttered matches with the world or whether the world gets the words match to itself. Psychological state points out that each group of speech acts exhibits a psychological point from which they are categorized in accordance. For example, for commisive class, it is intention. The final criterion was related to the "differences in propositional content that are determined by illocutionary force indicating devices" (Searle, 1976, p. 5). Therefore, commisives like threatening is about future while assertives like explaining can be about past or present.

These four criteria are essential to understand how Searle (1976) constructs his classification and distinguish between the classes of illocutionary acts. His classification falls into five categories. These are declaratives, expressives, representatives, commisives and directives:

1. Declaratives are the utterances performed by an authority, which causes immediate action and changes the world via the utterance. For example, Priest is declaring: "I now pronounce you husband and wife." (Yule, 1996, p. 35).

2. Expressives are the utterances expressing speaker's psychological states about situations, where the speaker makes the words fit the world. These are thanking, apologizing, and welcoming. For example, the speaker is expressing her/his sorrow by apologizing: "I am really sorry."

3. Representatives show what the speaker believes about the truth condition of the prepositional content of the utterance, where s/he tries to make her/his words match the world. These are assentations, facts, descriptions and conclusions. For example, "Chomsky did not write about peanuts" (Yule, 1996, p. 53).

4. Commisives are the utterances where the speaker uses to commit her/himself to some future action. By expressing her/his intend, the speaker makes the world fit her/his words. These are threats, refusals, offers and plans. For example, "I am going to get it right next time" (Yule, 1996, p.54).

5. Directives are the utterances that the speaker uses to get someone to do something. By performing directives, the speaker attempts to make the hearer to commit her/himself for future action and makes the world fit the words. These are request, advice, suggestions, commands and begs. For example, "Don't touch that" (Yule, 1996, p. 54).

By developing the classification of speech acts in a more consistent way, Searle (1976) points to speakers' possible intentions and desired actions of the utterances changing according to the different situations.

Method

The Present Study

Searle's (1976) classification of the speech acts was the basis for this study, because it provides a clear-cut, robust and consistent criterion of speech act types when compared to

Austen's (1969). In order to narrow down the scope of research, directives as one of the classes of speech acts were handled in this study, and two directive speech acts, ask and request, were analyzed in terms of semantic and syntactic features. In the analysis, these two directive verbs were confined to declaratives where they were used in the form of explicit performatives (e.g. I ask that). All the sentences patterns that employ explicit performatives were included in the analysis. The attempt was made to find out whether different semantic and syntactic feature can be realized in ask and request, which belong to the same category of speech acts. With this aim, it was useful to first put forward the similarities between these verbs in terms of semantic and syntactic features. In this sense, two research questions guided this study:

1. What are the similar and different semantic features of two speech act verbs ask and request?

2. What are the similar and different syntactic features of two speech act verbs ask and request?

Data Collection Procedures

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in order to analyze these two speech act verbs. Data were derived from two main sources: dictionaries and corpus.

Phase 1. Semantic features of Ask and Request:

Concerning the similarities and differences between ask and request in terms of semantic features, three dictionaries were selected because dictionary definitions provide useful information and evidence for the meanings of these verbs. These three dictionaries are Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (OALD), Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (LDCE) and The American Heritage Dictionary of English (AHDE).

These dictionaries were chosen because they claim that their data derived from authentic English based on language corpora. In addition to the dictionaries, corpus data were also taken into consideration in the analysis of semantic features. Basically, the corpus was used for two reasons: first to provide examples for the given meanings in the dictionaries; second to provide collocations that co-occur with these verbs since surrounding words influence the meaning of a word.

The corpus used in this study was the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). COCA is a large corpus of American English including 520 million words (1990-2015). This corpus was preferred because of its contemporaries, comprehensiveness, and free and easy access.

Phase 2. Syntactic features of Ask and Request

It is known that the syntactic form of English is "SVO". In terms of syntactic features of the speech acts, Austin's (1969) states that their grammatical structure is restricted. His way of specification of the syntactic features was used in the analysis of this study. That is, in order to construct these verbs as explicit performatives, ask and request were searched as a main verb in simple present tense, having active voice and taking 1st person singular as subjects. After fulfilling these conditions, ask and request were analyzed in COCA. The aim was to show the similarities and the differences between these verbs in terms of their complements. To

understand their usage patterns, the first information that needed was their overall frequency patterns for each type of complement. Based on the results of the frequency queries, a list of complement types for each verb was constructed. This helped us see the similarities and the differences between the verbs. Each complement type was provided with examples from COCA to have further understanding about the influence of syntactic pattern on the semantic features.

Findings and Discussion

Semantic Features of Ask and Request

1. Similarities:

In order to investigate speech act verbs *ask* and *request* in detail, the first aim was to put the focus on their semantic features and find out their similarities and differences. Based on the scrutiny of the three dictionaries that consulted, these two verbs being studied were found to share the central meaning as "ask somebody to do something" (see Table 1).

Table 1

Dictionary meanings of ask and request

Verbs	Dictionaries	Meaning	Examples
Ask	OALD LDCE AHDE	"Ask somebody to do something" "Ask somebody to do something." "To make a request for."	"Eric asked me to marry him." "Ask John to mail those letters tomorrow" "Asked that he be allowed to stay out late."
Request	OALD LDCE AHDE	"The action of asking somebody to do something." "To ask someone for something." "To ask (a person) to do something."	"She requested that no one be told of her decision until next meeting" "All club members are requested to attend the annual meeting." "The police requested her to accompany them."

Since the dictionaries do not take *ask* and *request* as speech act verbs, the examples that were provided are not in accordance with Austin's (1969) formula. In this sense, by looking up classical dictionary meanings, we only understood which traditional meaning they shared. However, in order to see whether this common meaning was also valid for *ask* and *request* as speech acts, the corpus examples were drawn and the attempts was made to find out whether the core meaning was shared in those examples as well. Here the corpus examples:

"We have an open relationship so I tell him everything about, you know, things that he needs to know about what's going on out here and **I ask that he** do the same with me."

(COCA: SPOK)

"**I ask that you** not force the permanent loss of a second loved one, but rather allow us to look forward to a time when our pain may slightly diminish and when we may heal together again."

(COCA: SPOK)

"**I request that you** make necessary revisions, publish an apology and take your mistakes into consideration for future coverage."

(COCA: NEWS)

"So **I request that he** belt out a bugle, saying his cheeks will be properly puffed up for an authentic-looking photo."

(COCA: MAG)

When the examples derived from COCA were investigated, it was observed that the shared dictionary meaning of these two speech act verbs were also valid when their grammatical form arranged as how speech acts require (present tense, active voice and I as subject). Accordingly, in each example, it was shown that the speaker asked the hearers (you and he) to do what s/he wanted them to do (not force X, make X and belt out X).

2. Differences:

In order to find out differences between these verbs, in this time the dictionaries were examined for possible changes in their meanings. The findings showed that *request* differs from *ask* in terms of the way and manner it was used (see Table 2). *Request* was found to carry formality in the manner of asking and appeared as an act of politely asking while ask appeared as neutral or colorless term for general asking.

Table 2

Dictionary meanings for request

Dictionaries	Request
OALD	"Ask somebody to do something in a polite or formal way."
LDCE	"Formal: to ask for something in a polite or formal way."
AHDE	"To express a desire for, especially politely; ask for."

Again, in order to see whether the meaning of request given in dictionaries can also be observed in speech act request, corpus data were investigated. The findings showed that request was used to ask something from an authority where the speaker was in a lower position and this way of using assigned formality and politeness to the meaning of request.

"He performed his " death scene " like a ham actor; he also wrote the script: **I request the Government of my country to permit** my body to be buried in these dunes."

(COCA: MAG)

"Because I'm still operating that I need to get things done, and the way I get things done is **I request it from the White House** and they happen."

(COCA: SPOK)

As illustrated in the examples, the Government and the White House have a permanent institutionalized position of authority which require the speakers to use a more polite and formal way of asking, that is requesting. In each example, it was possible that the Government and the White House may refuse or decline to do what the speaker asks.

However, when the examples including ask as a speech act were investigated, it was found that although it was also used in order to ask a person in authority to do something for the speaker, the relationship between the speaker and the hearer did not imply a strict formal one, see examples:

"Participation in elections has decreased through the years, but we don't get rid of them. # If this initiative passes, you will soon see both parties controlled by just a few who have the means to do it. It will only be a matter of time before the end of the political party system. Also gone will be the binding of candidates to the principles and ideologies of each political party. **I ask that Republicans and Independents** join me in seeking defeat of this measure. # SHARRON KLEIN # Denver # The writer is chair of the Denver Democratic Party. # Beware methane wells # Being surrounded by coal-bed methane wells on my land west of the Spanish Peaks, I can only say the public has no idea what traumatic damage will be done to the Rocky Mountains if such mining increases."

(COCA: NEWS)

"Haley said one evening when all three sisters were watching the finale of " Dance Moms " on Lifetime. Tears followed. Sounds like a sweet tweet to us. 714-796-6704 or ghardestyocregister.com 8838 At the start of a phone interview, **I ask director Cullen Hoback** if he minds having it recorded. He agrees, and seconds later a voice comes over Google's free phone service warning him: " This call is now being recorded. " Our voices are saved indefinitely on Google's servers, while the company figures out how to make money by offering such " free " services. " I don't think they should be called free, " Hoback says later in our conversation. " I think that's misleading and a lie."

(COCA: MAG)

In each example, although the hearer has authority over the speaker, the relationships were more intimate which may get the speaker assumes that what s/he wants may be granted. In the first example, the speaker was a politician who may fairly claim that Republicans and Independents should join her/him and with that desire, asked them. In the second example, the speaker was an interviewer who had already got in touch with the director and made a deal for an interview and therefore, reasonably can expect to record the interview. Therefore, as illustrated with the examples from the corpus, it can be concluded that illocutionary force of each verb is clear from the semantic meaning of locution, where *request* appears to have a more formal and polite way of getting the hearer to do what the speaker desires to make him/her do, while *ask* appear more directive way of asking where the speaker assumes that hearer will cause his/her desire to happen.

Syntactic Features of Ask and Request

The verb complements with which each speech act verb tends to occur was queried for any possibility that can emerge. The findings showed that there are two patterns that each shares and four to one patterns one fits in while the other is not likely to occur with (4 patterns for *ask* + 1 pattern for *request).* Below, the similarities and the differences were explained.

1. Similarities:

With respect to similarities, it was found that the shared patterns include a that-clause verb complement and I ask/ request + sb + to + V.inf pattern. However, the frequencies for each pattern vary widely, where the total number of occurrence is large for ask compared to request in terms of both complements (see Table 3).

Table 3

Similar verb-complements for ask and request

Ask	Freq.	Request	Freq.
I ask that S	49	I request that S	20
I ask sb to V.inf	682	I request sb to V.inf	4

As shown in the table above, although they both have shared patterns, the use of request with these patterns appears quite limited (see the examples for each pattern below).

"I **ask that you make** an immediate correction to your article."

(COCA: MAG)

"I **ask him to wait** while I haul the disk up the hill and come back for him."

(COCA: FIC)

"I **request that you apologize** for your rudeness, and return to the table your recent acquisitions."

(COCA: FIC)

"I **request everyone to clear** the weather decks and move to the interior of the ship, away from the windows, balconies and portholes."

(COCA: FIC)

In order to have a better understanding of their usages, that clause complements were analyzed further. Of interest, it was found that that-clauses following each speech act requires subjunctive mood which means the verb is used in the base form where the subjects are either singular noun or pronoun (see Table 4).

Table 4

Subjunctive mood for ask and request

Ask	Freq.	Request	Freq.
I ask that S sub(sg) V.ing	6	I request that S sub(sg) V.ing	6

Although the frequency appeared low, especially for ask, it was actually the total number of sentences where the subjects were singular. So, for all the positions where the subjects were singular, each verb required subjunctive mood (see the examples below).

"Tonight I **ask that he lead** our nation's battle against drugs at home and abroad. To succeed, he needs a force far larger than he has ever commanded before."

(COCA: SPOK)

"So I **request that he belt out** a bugle, saying his cheeks will be properly puffed up for an authentic-looking photo."

(COCA: MAG)

When the rest of the sentences were further analyzed, the verbs were found to occur in the present tense form, except two instances, where *I ask that you* is followed by the modal, *would*:

"And, God, **I ask that you would** reveal yourself to them so that they can cling to you."

(COCA: SPOK)

"**I ask that you would pray** about those issues... that we as legislators can at least bring up the real problems."

(COCA: NEWS)

2. Differences:

In terms of the differences, it was found that these speech act verbs can be distinguished by four verb complements in which they show different patterns. As for *ask*, it was revealed in the analysis that it was used in three different grammatical patterns which were not shared by request. These are "I + ask + sb + if + S", "I + ask + if + S", and "I + ask + for + sb + to + V.inf". As for *request*, only one pattern appeared which was not shared by ask, "I + request + smt + from + sb". In order to see the frequencies, see Table 5, the examples for each pattern were provided below the table.

Table 5

Differences in the verb complements

Ask	Freq.	Request	Freq.
I + ask + sb + if + S	5	I + request + smt + from + sb	1
I + ask + if + S	2		
I + ask + for + sb + to + V.inf	2		

"**I ask Lydia if she wouldn't mind watching** Antonia for a while so I can go help out a friend. " Sure, " says Lydia. " Where are you? " I ask Janette."

(COCA: SPOK)

"I reach him from work and he says he can come out Saturday, eight in the morning. **I ask if he could hold off** till eleven. Saturday I wake at eight like a human alarm clock."

(COCA: MAG)

"I have something else to ask of you, I ask every American. **I ask for you to pray** for this great nation."

(COCA: NEWS)

"Because I'm still operating that I need to get things done, and the way I get things done is **I request it from the White House** and they happen."

Analysis of patterns revealed further findings in relation to clauses followed by "I ask sb if (sentence)" and "I ask if (sentence)". Accordingly, it was found that while "I ask that (sentence)" –that clause pattern contains a verb in present tense form, either modal verbs or future tense -will appeared to occur when used with if clauses (see the examples below).

"When traveling, I carry high-fiber foods with me and try to stay in hotels where there are health clubs. When served a beautiful dessert, **I ask if they can** bring me some fruit. Usually they can."

"More curious than ever about the content of my own muscle, **I ask Goodpaster if he'll** biopsy mine."

"To get rid of him, **I ask him if he'll** get me another beer and promise to look for his lost limb."

"**I ask him if he'd** like me to teach a little English."

"**I ask her if she'll** be my date to the 40th Reunion Mixer."

In order to provide further insights into grammatical patterns of each verb, their collocations were investigated in accordance with their syntactic patterns.

Collocations

Since the words studied are verbs, their collocates are nouns and adverbs. Firstly, to determine which types of nouns each verb modifies, the grammatical structure of the typical performative verb I + ask + sb, I + request + sb and I + request + sth + from + sb were searched. The most frequently occurred were listed below:

Table 6

Noun collocations

I ask sb to V.inf	Freq.	I request sb to V.inf	Freq.
you	271	you	1
them	104	everyone	1
him	80	the doctors, nurses and ambulances	1
her	48	the boy	1
students	17		
people	16		
congress	12		
everyone	7		

From the table above, it can be seen that *I ask* as a speech act is mostly modified by pronouns. "You" is used most frequently in this group, which is followed by the second most frequent "them". In addition to pronouns, it is seen that indefinite nouns also modifies *I ask*. "Students" is used most frequently in this group, which is followed by "people". When I request was searched for the noun which modifies immediately it, it was revealed that this usage is quite limited. Actually, only four examples were found. *I request* has also another grammatical form as I + request + sth + from + sb, so it was also queried for this structure. However, only one example appeared for this form. Although *request* as a verb was found to be used within this form, *I request* as a speech act nearly did not appear.

Secondly, the adverbs modify each speech acts were investigated. In each query, in order to find which adverbs surround these verbs, two positions were searched. The first position is between the subject I and the verb, and the second position comes immediately after the verb. The findings were reported in the following tables.

Table 7

Verb collocation for "I (adverb) ask/request that S" pattern

I (adverb) ask that S	Freq.	I (adverb) request that S	Freq.
only	3	respectfully	6
now	1	further	1
		then	1
		strongly	1

As for the structure of "I (adverb) ask/request that S", collocates that were found with ask and request differed from each other. Accordingly, two collocations, only and now, were found to occur before the speech act verb ask. As for the request, on the other hand, there appeared four collocations where the manner adverb respectfully was used most frequently. However, the type and the token of these collocations were less in amount (see following examples):

"You may think that I'm a coward for what I am about to do, but it is my choice. My release. **I only ask that you shield** Erica from the truth, and that you forgive me for being so weak."

(COCA : FIC)

"Mr. Chief Justice, **I now ask that all senators rise** and let's observe a moment of silence for our friend Scott Bates."

(COCA : SPOK)

"Imagine what would happen if I wrote a letter to Congress and informed its members that because I am fully capable of taking care of my own retirement needs, **I respectfully request that they stop** taking money out of my paycheck for Social Security."

(COCA : MAG)

When the second position was investigated, "I ask/request (adverb) that S", it was found that only *ask* collocates with adverbs after itself. Again, only appeared as the most frequently used collocation with *ask* (see Table 8 and the example).

Table 8

Verb collocation for "I ask/request (adverb) that S" pattern

I ask (adverb) that S	Freq.	I request (adverb) that S	Freq.
only	12	-	-

"If Mr. O'Leary wants to kill himself, that is his choice. **I ask only that he do so** without imposing his drug or discarded filth on me."

(COCA : MAG)

In addition to that clause pattern, "I (adverb) ask/request sb to Vinf" and "I ask/request (adverb) sb to Vinf" were also queried. As for the adverbs occur between the subject and the verb, it was found that while *request* takes only one collocation, *humbly*, with 1 token, *ask* takes various adverb collocations (see them in Table 9).

Table 9

Verb collocation for "I (adverb) ask/request sb to V.inf" pattern

I (adverb) ask sb to V.inf	Freq.	I (adverb) request sb to Vinf	Freq.
just	6	humbly	1
also	4		
always	3		
only, respectfully	2		
weakly, usually, then, simply, respectively, politely, never, kindly	1		

The mostly used adverb was found as *just*, which is followed by *also* and *always*. This time, however, *ask* was found to take manner adverbs such as *politely, kindly* and *respectively* (see examples below):

"But we are a European power. And **I just ask you to think of this**: If, in fact, the European-NATO alliance disintegrates, if there is war in the Balkans, if Greece and Turkey end up (unintelligible) one another or Bulgaria and Romania involved, if that occurs, what is our ability to conduct our foreign policy, let alone in Europe, how about our foreign policy in the Far East?"

(COCA : SPOK)

"**I humbly request you to peruse** my study, herewith attached, Mating Vocalizations of Academic Administrators and Genus Mustela: A Comparative Study, currently under review at the illustrious and prestigious Journal of Mammalogy."

(COCA : ACAD)

As for the structure of "I ask/request (adverb) sb to Vinf", there appeared no use of collocations. The collocations of *ask* was also searched for the last two structures as "I + ask +

sb + if + S" and "I + ask + for + sb + to + V.inf". For "I + ask + sb + if + S" , it was found that *ask* only takes one collocation, just, which appeared in front of it (see Table 10 and the example):

Table 10

Verb collocation for "I + (adverbs) ask + sb + if + S" pattern

I + (adverbs) ask + sb + if + S	Frequency
just	1

"I just ask, that's all I do. **I just ask if you can spare some change**, 12 cents WALKER Twelve? " ED ": Yeah WALKER"

(COCA : SPOK)

However, for the position that collocation follows the verb, "I + ask + (adverbs) +sb + if + S" and for the structure of "I + ask + for + sb + to + V.inf", there appeared no adverb collocation. The analysis also showed same result for the structure of "I + request + smt + from + sb" as no occurrence of collocations neither before nor after the verb request.

Results and Recommendations

In an attempt to find out the similarities and the differences between two speech acts belong to same class, this study investigated *ask* and *request* in terms of their semantic and syntactic features. Specifically, it examined their lexical meanings by using traditional dictionaries and corpus, and then analyzed their verb complements in corpus data. The findings revealed the results where they shared common features and where they differed. Accordingly, *ask* and *request* have similar meaning as simply asking someone to do something. The corpus data also support this finding. However, *request* carries a suggestion of greater politeness and formality in the way of asking while *ask* does not share this manner difference. This difference is shown in the examples derived from corpus. In these examples, it is observed that *request* as a speech act tends to co-occur with the words expressing formality, such as government, White House. In the examples where *ask* was used to a hearer who has in a superiority position, some degree of intimacy between the speaker and the hearer was observed. Therefore, this finding has an implication for illocutionary force that while speakers tend to use *ask* and *request* to simply ask somebody to do something, for the contexts where the situation requires formality and politeness they are more likely to prefer *request* instead of *ask*. As for the results of syntactic structures, they both were found to take that clause as verb complements and the pattern "I verb + sb + to V.inf". In that clause sentences, each verb occurs in subjunctive mood. However, frequency numbers show that the use of *request* as a speech act is much more limited compared to *ask* in shared patterns. These verbs also appear with different verb complements. While *ask* can be used with if clause sentences and with a structure as "verb + for + sb + to + V.inf", request cannot appear within these forms. Yet, while *request* can be used with a structure "verb + smt + from + sb", ask cannot be formed in this way. When each verb is further analyzed in order to find out which nouns and adverbs collocate them, it is seen that they both mostly take "you" as noun collocation and they do not share common adverb collocations for each pattern where collocations occurred. From these findings, it can be concluded that while both verbs are classified under the same group of categorization as directives, they both exhibit different semantic features and grammatical

patterns. This implies that having same group may not qualify verbs to be called similar. From this point of view, further studies can handle different types of verbs within a same group and investigate the differentiation and similarity. Also, register variation can be included in the scope of the studies. Although it was not aimed in this study, by looking at data derived from the corpus it can be said that in academic genre, the use of these speech acts occurred quite less. Further research can examine this by including implicit performatives.

Statement of Interest

There is no potential conflict of interest.

Information on Financial Support

The author did not receive any financial support for research, authorship, and / or publication of this article.

Ethical Approval

Since this study did not require scale and questionnaire application, permission from the ethics committee was not required. The data it implemented were freely available in the public domain (e.g. dictionaries), and the datasets obtained from an open source; Corpus of American English (COCA).

References

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics* (Vol. 38). John Wiley & Sons.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: a crosscultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics, 5*(3*)*, 196–213.

Cohen, A. D. & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 33-56.

Davies, M. (2019). Online. The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): One billion words, 1990–2019.

Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1971). What is a speech act, In JR Searle (ed.) *The philosophy of language* (Vol. 39). London: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

İletişim/Correspondence
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Cemre İŞLER,
cisler@firat.edu.tr