



DISCUSSING PRAGMATICS AND CONTRIBUTION OF AUSTIN TO SPEECH ACT THEORY

V RAMANGOUD

RESEARCH SCHOLAR, SUNRISE UNIVERSITY, ALWAR, RAJASTHAN

DR. VIBHA GUPTA

RESEARCH SUPERVISOR, SUNRISE UNIVERSITY, ALWAR, RAJASTHAN

ABSTRACT

People believe that humans were given the ability to speak. Since the beginning of time, language has been a medium used by man to impart information, express emotions, and ask questions. Our ability to communicate has advanced significantly throughout the years, from drawing hieroglyphics on cave walls to putting updates on virtual world walls. Language has previously been the focus of formalist research. It quickly became clear that not all parts of language could be compartmentalized when analyzed on an equal footing with logic. Pragmatics has been one of the sciences that has examined this aspect of human nature specifically. Pragmatics, a field that investigates "language in use," has witnessed the rise of several ideas.

Keywords: -Speech, Theory, Language, Ideas, Book.

I. INTRODUCTION

The study that will start in the third chapter is introduced and given some background information in this chapter. This chapter starts with the core idea of "Pragmatics" and its historical evolution. We will go into great length on "The Speech Act Theory," which was developed by J. Searle and presented by J.L. Austin. The two types of speech acts will get the most attention. Different conversational tenets will be described. Several key terminology will be briefly presented, including Sentence and Utterance, Context, Deixis, Implicature, Presuppositions, Turn Taking and Adjacency Pairs, Cohesion and Coherence, etc. The importance of problems like immigration, identity, the Diaspora, code mixing and switching,

multiculturalism, etc. as they pertain to the current study will be explained. As a result, an effort will be made to provide a theoretical foundation for the current study.

II. PRAGMATICS: IT'S DEVELOPMENT

The works of Ross, Lakoff, and others from the late 1960s and early 1970s show the first pragmatic approach to linguistics. The roots of pragmatics may be found in Frege's theory of sense and reference, which was first presented in his essay "Funktion and Begriff" (1891) and developed in his book "Ubersinn and Bedeutung" (1892).

The General Theory of signals by Charles William Morris (1903) describes the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic relationships between linguistic and non-linguistic signals. He claims that syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic laws may regulate language. Morris (1938:6) made an effort to define pragmatics as "the study of the relation of signs to interpreters."

Bloomfield was the one who connected phonetics, phonemes, and morphophonemics with linguistics. Chomsky raised the significance of syntax in language studies in the latter half of the 1950s. But he, too, ignored "meaning." Katz and his colleagues made an effort to integrate meaning into a formal language theory in the early 1960s. Lakoff made an effort to connect the study of language usage with syntax. Despite the fact that American researchers predominated in the field of linguistics, independent thinkers like Firth, who pushed for the situational analysis of meaning, and Halliday, who advanced a whole social theory of language, are equally significant. Apart from Ross and Lakoff, Austin (1962), Searle (1969), Grice (1975), and Leech (1983) have had the most significant effects on contemporary pragmatics.

In light of Chomsky, it was he who discussed the significance of semantics in the study of languages. His successors eventually ran into trouble trying to deny the idea that context affects meaning. Semantics therefore made way for pragmatics. The Speech Act Theory was first proposed by J.L. Austin in 1911960, and it was later developed by Searle. He offered guidelines for crafting felicitous speech. He split speech acts into direct and indirect speech acts, classifying speech acts into five basic categories. The cooperative concept was outlined in detail by H.P. Grice.

Grammar and pragmatics are complimentary fields within linguistics, according to Leech (1983:04). Without investigating these areas and how they interact, language cannot be comprehended. Along with being distinct from other multidisciplinary research areas like neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and anthropological linguistics, pragmatics is also a branch of linguistics. These fields each have their own set of restrictions. While Pragmatics is concerned with the complete complexity of language behavior, they are restricted to certain facets of human existence.

III. SPEECH ACTS

We engage in "linguistic activities" such as asking, declaring, demanding, commanding, promising, etc. in addition to our physical and mental activity. 'Speech Acts' are what these verbal behaviors are called.

Before Austin (1911–1960), language was just seen as a "set of correct sentences" or a "combination of sound and meaning." Language was examined via a scientific lens rather than a humanist's. The focus of language research was the structural or formal perspective. Somehow, the fundamental function of language, which is to facilitate communication, was disregarded. Each and every verbal exchange contains a linguistic act. J.L. Austin was responsible for changing philosophers' perspectives on language from a structural to a functional one. He argued that language is a tool for carrying out actions. Speech Acts are "the act of uttering a particular sentence in a given context for determined purpose, i.e. an act of communication," according to Austin (1962). ... Speaking a language includes doing speech actions, such as making comments, issuing orders, asking questions, making commitments, and so forth. (1969:16 Searle)

Speech acts are deeds carried out via words. (Yule G. 1996:47) Speech actions include utterances. A. Thorat 2002:25

Grammarians examine a sentence from a grammatical perspective. On the basis of a sentence, it is possible to study the rules of syntax and semantics. For grammarians, a sentence's structure is more significant than its purpose. Grammarians may use any example to illustrate a particular sentence type. To describe how a declarative sentence's SVO (subject, verb, and object) structure works In general, the example I write a thesis may be used.

S+V+O

Although the aforementioned language complies with the fundamental requirements of an aggressive sentence, in actuality it has minimal communication value. In everyday speech, we don't only say things to comply with grammar rules; we also mean something when we say them. An utterance is "context bound," but a phrase is "context free." Without context, it is impossible to understand what was said. A statement is made with the intention of communicating. An utterance is the expression of intended meaning rather than the exposition of grammatical rules. The level of intended meaning changes depending on the occasion or context. As a result, according to NozarNiazi

... An utterance is a communicational unit whose importance or worth is determined by its context. (2004:13)

IV. AUSTIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO SPEECH ACT THEORY

The endeavor to connect logic and language dates back to ancient philosophers like Plato and St. Augustine and continues with contemporary philosophers like Russell, Wittgenstein, Carnap Ryle, Quine, and Strawson. They held the rigidly dogmatic belief that language is a matter of logic, and that only language that employs logic can be considered right. Language was used in various ways that were seen as metaphysical, emotional, or just wrong. So language was thought to depend mainly on logic. On the other hand, J.L. Austin, known as the "father of the Speech Act Theory," placed a strong focus on the examination of how individuals communicate via language. The posthumous publication of J. L. Austin's 1955 "William James lectures" under the title *How to Do Things with Words* was released in 1962. It is the study of how humans communicate via language. The study's main area of interest is language users' linguistic world knowledge. It is a theory of speaking as acting within the framework of social institutions and discourses, according to J. Lyons. (1981:175)

Insisting that "a statement (of fact) ought to be verifiable," grammarians and philosophers. As a result, many claims were regarded as false claims. Clearly, as KANT initially stated, many grammatically sound phrases were shown to be pure nonsense, and the discovery of these kinds of sentences continued. Austin noted that certain verbs are used to simply describe things. They were used to create 'statements' that were accurate or inaccurate concerning certain circumstances. Such saying (describing) verbs were referred to as "constatives" by Austin. Verbs from the institutionalized Speech Act, including "to baptize," "to sentence," and "to dub," seem to carry out some action rather than just reporting the world around us or generating truthful or untrue assertions. Such verbs are known as "performatives," according to Austin. Consideration of the utterance as the execution of an action was a revolutionary concept in language philosophy. It became apparent that uttering involves doing something (an action), not just speaking it.

V. SEARLE'S CONTRIBUTION

Speaking a language means executing speech acts, as Searle stresses, following Austin. He claimed that using a language means engaged in a behavior that is regulated by rules (Searle 1969:16).

The expressibility principle, which states that everything that may be intended can be spoken, is first introduced by Searle. In general, asking and answering go hand in hand. However, the expressibility principle does not mean that it is always possible to identify or create the precise form of expression that would have the desired effect(s) on the listener(s). This notion does not mean that others will always comprehend or acknowledge what is spoken. The fundamental building block of communication, the speech act, connects the ideas of speech acts, the speaker's meaning, the sentence's meaning, the speaker's intent, the hearer's understanding, and the rules controlling the linguistic parts.

According to Searle, a speaker engages in at least three different types of acts:

- a. Uttering words (morphemes, sentences) = performing utterance Act.
- b. Referring and predicating = performing propositional acts
- c. Making statements, inquiries, demands, promises, etc. are all examples of Illocutionary activities

VI. CONCLUSION

The researcher has succinctly defined in this chapter the fundamental ideas and terminologies that serve as the foundation for understanding speech acts in general and indirect speech acts in particular in the chosen books. Some contemporary essential ideas like Diaspora and Identity are also underlined in this chapter since the chosen books are written by Indian immigrants. By using indirect speech acts, an effort will be made to show how the speakers communicate more. This will highlight the importance of indirect speech acts in both real life and fiction, which is the main focus of the current study.

REFERENCES

1. Kulkarni, Sushma. (2013). A Study of Indirect Speech Acts in the Selected Novels of Indian writers in English.
2. TINKHAM, THOMAS. (2007). Sociocultural variation in Indian English speech acts. *World Englishes*. 12. 239 - 247. 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1993.tb00024.x.
3. Wijana, I. (2021). On Speech Acts. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*. 3. 14-27. 10.18326/jopr.v3i1.14-27.
4. Alemi, Minoo&Irandoost, Roja. (2012). A Textbook Evaluation of Speech Acts: The Case of English Result Series. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*. 1. 199-209. 10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.199.
5. Sukmayanthi, Ni &Tantra, Dewa&Santosa, Made. (2021). An analysis of speech acts in the student's textbook at the Senior Vocational High School. *International Journal of Language and Literature*. 5. 72-78. 10.23887/ijll.v5i2.27657.