

Scotopia: A multidisciplinary biannual peer-reviewed e-journal

ISSN: 2455-5975

Website: <https://scotopia.in/>

A SPEAKER HAS A LANGUAGE AT HIS DICTATE

Dr. Amrita Dutta

Principal

Netaji Nagar College

email: amritaroy59@gmail.com

Abstract:

Here I want to explore why J.L. Austin's want to say that unlimited expression of the use of language depends on the depth of human thinking. Austin's is interested to use his own phrase in 'the total speech act in the total speech situation'. He reminds us of how many things men can do with words, they can state facts and describe what they see; they can warn people and frighten them, persuade and dissuade them; they can promise things and hide things, deflect attention and attract love.

Keywords: linguistic, phenomenology, elucidate, blinker, illocutionary, pragmatic

INTRODUCTION:

John Langshaw Austin's was a great British philosopher and we remember him specially for his major two work, first, his 'linguistic phenomenology', and second, his 'speech act theory'. Here, I want to explore why J.L. Austin's want to say that unlimited expression of the use of language depends on the depth of human thinking. Austin's is interested to use his own phrase in 'the total speech act in the total speech situation'. He reminds us of how many things men can do with words, they can state facts and describe what they see; they can warn people and frighten them, persuade and dissuade them; they can promise things and hide things, deflect attention and attract love. All of these and many more can be done by and in 'performing speech acts.

DISCUSSION:

Austin's was the word 'total' to express holistic conception—the situation as a whole must be seen in order for the speech act. By the total speech act Austin's does not mean the concept of a whole that is a unity of organic, internal parts, over and against a whole that is a

Scotopia: A multidisciplinary biannual peer-reviewed e-journal

ISSN: 2455-5975

Website: <https://scotopia.in/>

mere sum. Rather he wants to mean such a concept that hovers indecisively between 'all', 'essential', and 'concrete'. The total speech act is meant to be the speech out considered in all its aspects or at least in all its essential aspects and not in just one or some; and it is does thus taken to be the concrete speech act over the against some abstraction.

J.L. Austin's is trying to remove traditional view of language in order to relook and see afresh how men use language in situations, that is, in the world. To elucidate the total speech at in the total speech situation is more than the different from anything that goes by the name of logical or linguistic analysis. To him, elucidation is relooking, a looking without blinkers, a seeing things freshly.

It has become clear that it is possible to be concerned with language in a very different way. Labels like 'linguistic analyses' and 'philosophy of language' are sometimes used to cover a number of distinct and diverse approaches to philosophy. Austin's discussion throws into sharp relief many of the problems associated with the language we used to talk about people's abilities, and make it clear that these are an important part of the traditional problem of free will.

It is clear from Austin's discussion that speech act theory is undoubtedly important in the historical development of pragmatics. The notion of speech act has been absorbed into the much richer notion of face threatening act. Speech is a medium of language, and it contacts with writing and with sine language.

Austin's analysis of language is extremely important for providing the contribution to our understanding of language as a concrete and many-sided phenomenon. In general, we understand that Austin's wants to stop philosophical thinking without understanding. To him, prime function of language is to communicate something and when we use it for this purpose; we should use it as efficiently as possible.

As the father of diachronic linguistic, Austin has shown his interest in words, syntax and in idioms and wishes to use linguistic analysis not supplely to resolve philosophical problems; but to study language for its own sake. We know that Austin employs his all efforts to give very detail and minute studies of ordinary language and tries to describe the detail function of many sorts of linguistic expressions. Austin examines the closely related terms 'mistake' 'accident',

Scotopia: A multidisciplinary biannual peer-reviewed e-journal

ISSN: 2455-5975

Website: <https://scotopia.in/>

‘inadvertence’ etc. By his diachronic analysis he tries to find out the conceptual resources of our language. He demands a scrutiny of the words we use. He says speech may be ambiguous and erroneous. But he believes that the right clarification and hair-splitting analysis of language can remove all kind of riddles and ambiguity. Austin is pointed this sense. It is significant that nearly always all the new terms Austin introduce are meta terms, terms to talk about way we talk. The implications of Austin’s discussion have far more than merely analytical interest when we are reminded of the sheer extent and diversity of acts which can be performed in speaking. This ought to put us on our guard against facile distinction between speech and action in every field. Austin is more concerned with the study of how we talk in some particular speech-situation than giving any general account as such. So, from his doctrine of illocutionary act, it seems speech act is the basic minimal unit of linguistic communication.

In this connection, I think that Austin’s interest in natural language/ ordinary language is needed to propagate in such a way so that Austin’s contribution, his novelty in this field can properly be assessed. Austin has recommended ordinary language as an effective method to solve the philosophical problems. He discusses the ordinary as a subject in its own light. According to him, we need to have a careful observation of this natural language, so that it might be at least a ‘begin - all’ it not an ‘end - all’- in the careful investigation of them.

CONCLUSION:

Austin’s conviction regarding- ordinary language is that it provides a new expression of the empiricist temper: more systematic, more accurate technique can be fruitfully achieved through ordinary language and systematic use of ordinary language may lead to the foundation of a new science of language. Austin wants to make the point clear that in starting the expression of a natural language, we can expect that our day-to-day use be matter of greater interest than that of studying the proposed alternative of philosophers.

REFERENCES:

Austin, J.L.: How to do things with words, Clarendon Press, Oxford,1962

Austin, J.L.: Sense and Sensibilia, Oxford University Press, London,1950

Ayer, A.J: Language, Truth and Logic, Gollanez, London,1950

Scotopia: A multidisciplinary biannual peer-reviewed e-journal

ISSN: 2455-5975

Website: <https://scotopia.in/>

Baker, G.p & Hacker, P.M.S.: Scepticism, Rules and Language, Basil Blackwell, New York, 1984.

Banerice, K.: Austin's philosophy of language. Grantha Nilay, Calcutta ,1991