



# **ILLOCUTIONARY HARM AND EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE**

---

**Katarzyna Ciarcńska**  
**University of Szczecin**



# AGENDA

---

**1. INTRODUCTION**

**2. LANGTON'S DEFINITION OF SILENCING**

**3. THREE KINDS OF SILENCING**

**4. SILENCING AND OBJECTIFICATION**

**5. THE INJUSTICE AND HARM OF ILLOCUTIONARY  
SILENCING**

**6. ILLOCUTIONARY HARM**

**7. EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE AND ILLOCUTIONARY HARM**

# INTRODUCTION

---

- **IT IS POSSIBLE TO SILENCE ONE'S SPEECH (LANGTON 1993).**
- **THERE ARE THREE TYPES OF SILENCING: LOCUTIONARY, ILLOCUTIONARY AND PERLOCUTIONARY (LANGTON 2009).**
- **SPECIAL FOCUS ON ILLOCUTIONARY SILENCING (ALSO UNDERSTOOD AS ILLOCUTIONARY DISABLEMENT), SINCE IT HAS TO DO WITH THE NORMATIVE SPHERE, WHERE INJUSTICE HAPPENS (LANGTON 2009, HORNSBY&LANGTON 1998, FRICKER 2007).**
- **HOW IS THE IDEA OF ILLOCUTIONARY HARM RELATED TO EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE? (FRICKER 2007, SCHILLER 2021).**
- **HOW TO RECOGNISE ILLOCUTIONARY HARM AND WHAT KIND OF INJUSTICE IT INFLICTS? (KUKLA 2014, HESNI 2018, SCHILLER 2021).**
- **WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO DESCRIBE WHAT ILLOCUTIONARY HARM IS?**

# LANGTON'S DEFINITION OF SILENCING

---

- **THE ABILITY TO SPEAK IS A DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF A PERSON. IT IS EQUALLY SIGNIFICANT FOR AN INDIVIDUAL AS AUTONOMY AND SUBJECTIVITY (LANGTON 2009).**
- **ABILITY TO PERFORM SPEECH ACTS CAN BE CONSIDERED AS A MEASURE OF POLITICAL POWER (LANGTON 2009).**
- **ABILITY TO SPEAK MEANS DOING THINGS WITH WORDS (AUSTIN 1962).**
- **AUSTINIAN FRAMEWORK PRESENTS SPEECH IN A PERSPECTIVE OF ACTIVITY AND ENCOURAGES US TO SEEK A PERSPECTIVE ON SILENCE ALSO UNDERSTOOD IN RELATION TO ACTIVITY (HORNSBY & LANGTON 1998).**
- **IF SPEECH IS ACTION, THEREFORE SILENCE SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD AS A FAILURE TO DO SOMETHING WITH WORDS (HORNSBY & LANGTON 1998).**
- **SILENCING MEANS PERCEIVING AND TREATING SOMEONE AS IF THEY WERE NOT ABLE TO SPEAK, INCAPABLE TO PERFORM SPEECH ACTS, UNFIT TO PARTICIPATE IN SPEECH ACTS (LANGTON & WEST 1999, LANGTON 2009).**

# THREE KINDS OF SILENCING

---

- **THERE ARE THREE KINDS OF SILENCING – IN ANALOGY TO THE THREE LAYERS OF SPEECH ACTS: LOCUTIONARY, ILLOCUTIONARY AND PERLOCUTIONARY (LANGTON 2009).**
- **LOCUTIONARY SILENCING: ONE IS LITERALLY PREVENTED FROM UTTERING ANY WORDS (LANGTON 2009, TANESSINI 2016). THEY MAY BE SILENCED BY HARASSMENT, THREAT, VIOLENCE, COERTION, SOCIAL PRESSURE OR MANIPULATION (LANGTON 2009, TANESSINI 2016). POSSIBLE THREAT IS ACCOMPANIED BY INTIMIDATION AND CONVICTION OF THE SILENCED THAT THEIR VERBAL PROTEST OR RESISTANCE IS FUTILE (LANGTON 2009), AND FEAR OF CONSEQUENCES OF BREAKING SUCH INDUCED SILENCE (LANGTON 1993).**
- **PERLOCUTIONARY SILENCING TAKES PLACE WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL WILL SPEAK, BUT THEIR UTTERANCE WILL FAIL TO CARRY OUT THE INTENDED EFFECTS (LANGTON 2009).**
- **ILLOCUTIONARY SILENCING OCCURS WHEN SOMEONE SPEAKS THE RIGHT WORDS, FOLLOWS THE CONVENTION, HAS RIGHT INTENTIONS – YET NOT ONLY FAILS TO ACHIEVE THE INTENDED EFFECT, BUT ALSO FAILS TO PERFORM THE INTENDED ILLOCUTIONARY ACT. THEIR WORDS HAVE BEEN DEPRIVED OF ILLOCUTIONARY POWER (LANGTON 2009).**

# SILENCING AND OBJECTIFICATION

---

- **SILENCING IS ONE OF THE FEATURES OF OBJECTIFICATION (LANGTON 2009).**
- **SILENCED INDIVIDUALS CAN BE ASILY REDUCED TO OBJECTS – THINGS DO NOT SPEAK NOR POSSESS A VOICE OF THEIR OWN (MACKINNON 1987, NUSSBAUM 1993; HORNSBY & LANGTON 1998, LANGTON 2009).**
- **SINCE THE ANTIQUITY SPEECH HAVE OFTEN BEEN CONSIDERED AS ONE OF THE ATTRIBUTES OF HUMANITY. ARISTOTLE ASSUMED THAT ABILITY TO SPEECH IS A MANDATORY COMPONENT OF SOCIETY (ARISTOTLE, 1908, 1253a8). ABILITY TO PERFORM SPEECH IS DEEPLY RELATED TO THE SOCIAL SPHERE OF HUMAN EXISTENCE.**
- **OBJECTS DO NOT SPEAK, AND EVEN IF THEY TRIED WE WOULD STILL CONSIDER THEM AS OBJECTS (MACKINNON 1987)**
- **SILENCING IS A CERTAIN FAILURE TO PERFORM THE SPEECH ACT (LANGTON 2009, CAPONETTO 2020). SILENCING ALSO INCUDES THE CASES OF PREVENTING THE PERSON FROM SUCCESSFULLY PERFORMING SPEECH ACTS (LANGTON 2009).**



# THE INJUSTICE AND HARM OF ILLOCUTIONARY SILENCING

---

- **SILENCING IS A FORM OF INTIMIDATION (TANESSINI 2016).**
- **DEPRIVING ONE OF THEIR RIGHT TO PERFORM SPEECH ACTS (LANGTON 2009).**
- **DEPRIVING ONE OF AUTHORITY ON EPISTEMIC AND MORAL LEVEL (LANGTON 2009).**
- **ILLOCUTIONARY HARM ARISES FROM FAILURES TO RECOGNISE AN INDIVIDUAL'S SOCIAL POSITION (KUKLA 2014, HESNI 2018).**
- **ILLOCUTIONARY HARM ARISES FROM FAILURE TO THE INDIVIDUAL AS A FULLY FLEDGED PARTICIPANT OF SPEECH ACT.**

# ILLOCUTIONARY HARM

---

- **DEPRIVES ONE OF THEIR STATUS AS A KNOWER AND THUS LOWERS THEIR CREDIBILITY.**
- **STRIPS ONE OF THEIR AUTHORITY AS AN EQUAL PARTICIPANT OF SPEECH ACT.**
- **BY INTERFERING WITH SPEAKER'S INTENTION IT OVERTURNS THE EXPECTED EFFECT OF THE SPEECH ACT TO THE SPEAKER'S DISADVANTAGE,**
- **IT CREATES HOSTILE COMMUNICATIVE CLIMATE THUS PREVENTING THE SPEAKER'S ILLOCUTIONARY POTENTIAL (CAPONETTO, 2021).**
- **BY DISABLING ONE'S ILLOCUTIONARY POTENTIAL AND PREVENTING ONE FROM EXERCISING THEIR ILLOCUTIONARY POWER AFFECTS THE NORMATIVE SPHERE.**





# EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE AND ILLOCUTIONARY HARM

---

- **MIRANDA FRICKER INTRODUCED THE IDEA OF EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE: HERMENEUTICAL AND TESTIMONIAL INJUSTICE (FRICKER 2007).**
- **ILLOCUTIONARY HARM IS RELATED WITH THE SYSTEMATIC EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN KINDS OF SPEAKERS FROM COMMUNICATION (SCHILLER, 2021).**
- **EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE IS A WAY OF INTERFERING WITH ONE'S RIGHT TO PERFORM OR PARTICIPATE IN THE SPEECH ACT SITUATION.**
- **SPEAKERS EXPERIENCE ILLOCUTIONARY HARM WHEN WE SEE INTERFERENCE WITH ONE'S ENTITLEMENT TO EXERCISE THEIR LINGUISTIC CAPACITY. SUCH INTERFERENCE COMES IN TWO FORMS: DENIAL AND INCAPACITATION (SCHILLER 2021).**



**THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION**

---

