

# The Method of Linguistic Phenomenology and Its Application in Austin's *A Plea for Excuses*

Liu,Yuqiang\*

Social Science Research Center, Hainan University, Haikou, Hainan, 570228, China

**Abstract:** The most valuable of Austin's theories are speech act theory and linguistic phenomenology. At present, the research on speech act theory has been relatively comprehensive, but the research on linguistic phenomenology is insufficient. Therefore, this dissertation mainly analyzes linguistic phenomenology and its application in *A Plea for Excuses*, the study of the concept of "commitment" reflected in this paper specifically. Austin's linguistic phenomenology focuses on ordinary language which is less polluted by traditional philosophy, and he tries to promote the further development of pragmatics by solving the problem of misuse in people's ordinary language. While eliminating the problems caused by language misuse, he makes pragmatics a new development. This dissertation attempts to compare and study Austin's linguistic phenomenology from pragmatics and phenomenology angles, and at the same time provides a detailed analysis and inspection for us to better use ordinary language.

**Keywords:** Austin; Linguistic phenomenology; Pragmatics; *A Plea for Excuses*

DOI: 10.62639/sspjiss01.20240103

Since Ferdinand Saussure's students organized Saussure's linguistics course notes and manuscripts into the *General Linguistics Course*, the book had a huge impact on the world soon. After Saussure, modern linguistics gave birth to many branches. In terms of pragmatics, John Austin of the Oxford School has played a crucial role. This paper uses one of his *Philosophical Papers* as a case analysis and method reference and discusses Austin's language phenomenology.

Regarding the study of Austin's theory, James Opie Urmson (1965) argued that Austin's operational techniques could further solve philosophical problems<sup>[1]</sup>. G.J. Warnock (1958) recorded Austin's theory and the practice of linguistic phenomenology in detail, which provided important help for further study of Austin's thought<sup>[2]</sup>. Based on their records, John Searle (1971) developed Austin's speech act theory and highly valued Austin's contributions to the philosophy of language<sup>[3]</sup>. Of course, Austin's theory has its critics. Stuart Hampshire argues that Austin's approach is a reflection of a personal style of thought, and Derrida's views are opposed to Searle's (K.T. Fann, 1969).<sup>[4]</sup>

The study of linguistic phenomenology itself has made great progress in China. Chen Jiaying (1998), Yang Yucheng (2002), Jiang Yi (2010), and other scholars have comprehensively analyzed Austin's linguistic phenomenology from the perspectives of linguistic analysis methods and linguistic philosophy [5,6,7]. However, these studies lack the specific application of Austin's linguistic phenomenology method. Therefore, after a brief introduction of the linguistic phenomenology method in Austin's *A Plea for Excuses*, this paper mainly focuses on explaining the necessity and scientific of the specific application, and discovering the potential of further promoting philosophical research in the specific application.

---

(Manuscript NO.: JISS-24-3-80001)

## Corresponding Author

Liu, Yuqiang (2000-), Hainan University, Social Science Research Center, Research Area: Continental philosophy, Philosophy of Language.

## 1. The Main Content and Interpretation of A Plea for Excuses

The main purpose of the paper *A Plea for Excuses* is to discuss the various situations of "excuses" in daily use. In this discussion, Austin elucidated his method of linguistic phenomenology, combined with many life experiences<sup>[8]</sup>. Use the example of excuses, such as the scene of a lawyer defending a defendant in a court of law, to explore the language in which people use excuses. In addition, from related fields such as ethology and psychology, everyone can see various connections between action and language. These are some of the important points covered in *A Plea for Excuses* and the following section will expand Austin's deep insights into these topics.

At the beginning of the article, Austin directly points out that excuses are an under-explored problem, so he hopes to illustrate some of the methods to use and some of their limitations. Austin defined excuses as: in general, this situation refers to the person accused of doing something negative, the person to justify their behavior or escape from responsibility, this definition is in line with the use of excuses in our ordinary life. Austin distinguishes two kinds of excuses: one is to accept responsibility but deny it bad, that is, to discuss the perspective of one's responsibility. The second is to admit that it is bad but not accept all or even any responsibility, that is, to discuss it from its responsibility. These two methods have their specific use and produce different results. He emphasized the difference between "justification" and "excuses", and gave examples to illustrate their differences: justification refers to the emotional outburst after dropping the tea tray, while excuses is the description of the wasp causing the person to drop the tea tray.

In addition, the field covered by "excuses" is very broad. Include accusatory expressions that alleviate the dilemma, such as "clumsy," "ignorant," "reckless," etc. This may require a psychological analysis of why these words can act as excuses, and get the other side to forgive. Austin also hoped that the study of excuses would contribute to moral philosophy in the sense of ending the old and ushering in the new. Austin's ambition was not only in linguistics itself, he explored all the conclusions he could draw in language, and "excuses" were a good entry point for him.

We are aware that Austin pays attention to action while paying attention to words, and his argument in *A Plea for Excuses* resonates with his speech act theory: "Doing an action must come down to the making of physical movements with parts of the body; but this is about as true as that saying something must, in the last analysis, come down to making movements of the tongue."<sup>[8]</sup> Therefore, he pointed out that the meaning of language is related to the expression of action.

Austin also discusses the issue of naming, which is to make clear what these words have in common, correct names, rules, and so on. Besides, we shouldn't take naming actions for granted. There are two main ways to study excuses: check for some exceptions or failures; not every failure is "action" related. Faults are classified according to each individual's specific choices. Austin believes that in these ways, a new beginning could be found in the behavioral philosophy, and traditional problems, such as "freedom" could be solved. His interest in excuses began with the observation that Aristotle was unjustly blamed.

Austin argues starting from the study of the timing and reasons for the use of "ordinary language", and demonstrates the rationality of this method. He sees words as tools, against the traps of language, emphasizing their connection to the world, and exploring the nuances of the same words across generations. He rejects the popularity of terms such as "linguistics" or "linguistic analysis", arguing that we pay attention to reality as much as we pay attention to words and that our keen awareness of words enhances our perception of phenomenon.

Therefore, he advocated "linguistic phenomenology" to explore a rich and subtle field of ordinary language and a field that is not so polluted by traditional philosophy. He believes that some disagreement in language usage might be enlightening. Research the excuses can reveal differences between stories. Ordinary language

cannot be said to be the last word, but it encapsulates the experience of many generations focused on the practical aspects of life.

Austin's frequent references to law in his writing are because of the rigor of the law in the use of language. Therefore, the way to learn a language comes from daily life. He also encourages people to expand their research methods with more interest. However, ordinary language derives from resources available to average people, lacks deep exploration, and is susceptible to superstition, error, and fantasy. Therefore, ordinary language should be treated carefully and comprehensively, and no details should be overlooked. He highly affirms the value of ordinary language in language research and believes that its advantages outweigh its disadvantages. Finally, he proposes three steps for the study of "excuses": using dictionary definitions, legal sources, and psychological sources, supplemented by imagination, to understand and classify the meaning of "actions."<sup>[8]</sup>

## 2. Austin's Linguistic Phenomenology

"Linguistic phenomenology" is Austin's original term, which has been clearly stated above. He believes that "linguistic analysis" and other terms cannot well summarize his research methods, so he needed to create a new term to extend the road for this approach. Next, this paper will explain Austin's method of linguistic phenomenology from multiple perspectives from the comparison of linguistic phenomenology and pragmatics, the comparison of linguistic phenomenology with Husserl's phenomenology, and the comparison of linguistic phenomenology with speech act theory.

Austin's Linguistic phenomenology is a part of pragmatics, from which a better transition can be made to Linguistic phenomenology. Here, the first step is studying pragmatics. The linguist Levinson has given several possible definitions of pragmatics, each of which has its focus, but it cannot cover the entire field of pragmatics. Among them, one definition has received more recognition. "Pragmatics is the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate."<sup>[9]</sup> This definition emphasizes language ability, and the appropriate use of sentences by language users is contextually considered.

Context plays an extremely important role in the study of meaning in pragmatics. Context refers to the context in language, or more broadly, the context and situation of the interlocutor. When people are chatting, people will unconsciously presume that the conversation object already has some kind of understanding about the content of their chat, and people only need to say the part that the other party does not understand to complete the conversation smoothly. It is precisely because of the context that pragmatics research is dynamic and developing. In different eras and regions, people use language in different ways and behaviors. This deserves our in-depth study.

The method of linguistic phenomenology is a feasible method for the rigorous study of language use within the framework of pragmatics. Firstly pick out a research area as a target, and then collect as many language resources as possible in some ways. The third step is to study by a group discussion in which situations words can be used. The next step is to collate these results. With the development of time, the construction of a corpus can partially replace the data collection work in linguistic research. Austin points out: "While it is important as a preparatory work to examine the common usage of words in detail, we are always forced to sort them out in the end."<sup>[10]</sup>

The final step is to test the arguments of traditional philosophy against the results of the previous stage. This is the most important segment, because if scholars only study the language itself, then there is no use in going to great lengths; when there are some results and then compared with the past philosophy, it can clearly find the past what is wrong with language use, and which segment make people have unnecessary

misunderstandings, these problems can be solved through detailed analysis of language. It's not just helpful for philosophy, it's also a proven "experimental technique" for their comprehension and language abilities. Mr. Yang Yucheng pointed out, "Austin believes that this method provides us with a large number of linguistic and non-linguistic distinctions and connections—because linguistic distinctions may indicate two different types of things in the world, so, Verbal distinctions also indicate distinctions in the world—not only does it tell us how people generally conceive the world, it may also suggest new possibilities and thus help us keep an open mind."<sup>[6]</sup>

### 3. A comparison of Austin's Linguistic Phenomenology and Husserl's Phenomenology

When it comes to phenomenology, we must mention Edmund Gustav Albrecht Husserl, who was the most classical phenomenologist. In 1900, Husserl published *Logical Investigations*. In the first volume, he criticized psychologism; in the second volume, he laid the foundations of phenomenological theory. Husserl wrote: "Pure phenomenology is an essentially new science, and in this book, we will explore the way to it, describe its unique position relative to all other sciences, and demonstrate that it is philosophical fundamental science. This science, by its essential peculiarities, is far from the natural way of thinking and has therefore only progressed in our time. We call this the science of 'phenomenon'."<sup>[11]</sup>

"Phenomenon" is something that can manifest itself; at the same time, it can also refer to other things. For example, the sky is blue, which is a phenomenon that not only explains the color of the sky but also it is sunny now. Phenomenology does not focus on what humans cannot know, but mainly on human consciousness and practical life problems.

In general, Austin's Linguistic phenomenology and Husserl's phenomenology have the following four points in common.

1. They are all influenced by Frege's analytical philosophy. In 1894, Frege criticized Husserl's psychologism interpretation of arithmetic problems, which led directly to Husserl's turn to critical psychologism in *Logical Investigations*. But unlike Frege, Husserl put the problem of psychologism "into the intuitive inspection of phenomenology, trying to solve many problems related to it through the inspection of phenomenology."<sup>[12]</sup>

Austin was more indirectly influenced by Frege because they were not contemporaries. Frege is the founder of analytic philosophy, and after the 1930s, although philosophers still focus on language, they have shifted from focusing on artificial language/semantics to focusing on ordinary language/pragmatics. The former is related to the latter. There are also differences, but their attitude towards metaphysics is relatively consistent; they think that metaphysics cannot provide effective knowledge, and in terms of language analysis methods, they reach the same goal in different ways. At the "Saturday Morning Meeting" hosted by Austin at Oxford University, Austin discussed Frege's *Fundamentals of Arithmetic* with his colleagues and students, which Austin translated into English in 1950.<sup>[13]</sup>

2. They all work as a fixed method. In *The Idea of Phenomenology*, Husserl pointed out: "Phenomenology is the doctrine of essence; therefore, the science of cognition's essence should also be included in phenomenology, and the method of cognition criticism is the method of phenomenology. It can provide a kind of consistent view ultimately from the essence of knowledge and the possibility of effectiveness, from this way, the critique of knowledge was the condition for the possibility of metaphysics."<sup>[14]</sup> That is to say, epistemic critique is the source of the phenomenological method.

Austin was also very focused on the phenomenological approach to language, although he did not think it was the only one. He advocated critical discussion, "that is, a group of people working collaboratively and criticizing each other, correcting each other, and finally reaching a consensus on some point, however small,

but in Austin's view, reaching a consensus always means progress." <sup>[6]</sup> This method has definite steps and can achieve certain results, so it is also a positive method.

3. They all wanted to establish a philosophy of rigorous science. "Husserl believed that, from the perspective of the history of philosophy, the development of philosophy has always had such a requirement: it required to become a strict and precise science, a universally valid science based on principles. At the same time, it had become a science with demonstrable evidence... A strictly scientific philosophy must be a philosophy that seeks thoroughness, and it needs to use the essential research and phenomenological methods of phenomenology to lead to a path of scientific theoretical rationality." <sup>[15]</sup>

Similarly, Austin also believes that there are many confusions and problems in traditional philosophy. "He hopes that the study of language will be independent of philosophy, get rid of chaos, and become an orderly science. This is his long-term goal, and his Speech act theory may be said to be his preliminary attempt in this field." <sup>[6]</sup>

4. They all pay attention to the importance of language. Husserl started with arithmetic and logic, but he discovered the importance of language studies later. In *The Origin of Geometry*, he elevated the status of language to the foundational status of phenomenology. "Husserl regarded language reduction as an important part of phenomenology, and its eidetic reduction needs to be finally transformed into language reduction." <sup>[16]</sup>

The focus on returning to the facts indicates the relation between Austin's Linguistic phenomenology to Husserl's phenomenology. Saif pointed out: "His linguistic phenomenology is different from the usual logical analysis or linguistic analysis, and has a coherence with the existential analysis, because language is unique to human beings, and the use of language is an essential feature that distinguishes human beings from animals." <sup>[4]</sup> Through the above clues, the connection between Austin's linguistic phenomenology and Husserl's phenomenology can be initially explained.

#### 4. Analysis of the Concept of Commitment with Linguistic Phenomenology Method

After studying Austin's linguistic phenomenology, I still have not given full expression to discuss it, that only analyzing the word "excuses" can not well reflect the great charm of the method of linguistic phenomenology. Based on the discussion of "commitment" in Austin's correspondence with teacher H.A. Prichard, there is much to be said about it. "Prichard was puzzled by the use of the word: how can be created a constraint by just saying something? He tried to figure out how the constraints created by speech relate to reality, and maybe that's the reason why the 'commitment' was considered by Prichard it aroused Austin's interest and reflection on this kind of language problem." <sup>[17]</sup>

The concept of "commitment" as my research object is no accident. First, it is in line with Austin's consistent style, "the linguistic phenomenology focuses on the rich, subtle and less polluted areas of ordinary language" <sup>[6]</sup> People often make promises on weekdays, so people should use it correctly. Secondly, "commitment" and "excuses" are also closely related. When people's commitments are not fulfilled, they need to use excuses, and the two come one after another. So after studying excuses, it is important to see what kind of commitment people have made before that.

##### (1) Usage of commitment in contemporary society

Many words can mean "commitment", such as promise, commitment, undertake, guarantee, warrant, ensure, assure, pledge, give one's word. Those words are used as a corpus for further study.

1) Promises. In addition to agreeing to someone's opinion, it can also mean making a prediction or giving grounds for expectations.

Example 1: I did not keep my promise to go home early.

Example 2: He showed great promise even as a junior officer.

Analysis: In the above two examples of promises, it can be found that their semantics are not the same. Example 1 refers to the promise made by "I" in the past, while example 2 is a kind of expectation for the future. What hasn't happened, both usages are correct.

2) Commitment. The verb is "commit". In addition to the basic meaning, it can also mean the official act of consigning a person to confinement, or the act of binding yourself (intellectually or emotionally) to a course of action, or an engagement by contract involving financial obligation.

Example 3: The government reaffirmed its commitment to the peace process.

Example 4: I could not fault my players for commitment.

Analysis: The commitment in example 3 is a positive commitment, so it can also be considered a support. In example 4, it is not very appropriate to understand commitment directly, but should be combined with context, and commitment should be understood as trust. Therefore, when people understand or use a word, they do not memorize the various meanings of a word but use them in different emotional colors.

3) Undertake. Similar to commitment, there is also a synonym for a contractual arrangement. In addition, undertake also means enter upon an activity or enterprise, or accept as a charge and accept as a challenge. The last paraphrase is interesting because sometimes people have to make promises that are difficult to fulfill, and that is a kind of challenge to people.

Example 5: These philosophers undertook pioneering research into Greek philosophy.

Example 6: This will be the most dangerous voyage he will ever undertake.

Analysis: The undertook in example 5 means to carry out, not just a verbal promise, but a real action, which can be said to be a further development of the promise because people are often accompanied by their promises when they act. Undertake in example 6 is similar to the meaning of "meet", but because of the contextual challenge of facing danger, it is better to use under than to use "meet".

4) Guarantee. In particular, there is a change from a verbal "promise" to "a written agreement". Of course, this is also similar to the contractual agreement of the commitment. It can also mean unconditional commitment. Also, it can mean guaranteeing/mortgaging something. In addition, it also means making certain of sth.

Example 7: This guarantee is valid for one year.

Example 8: This is our most important attester, we must guarantee his safety!

Analysis: Example 7 is a written guarantee, it has a stricter effect, and the timing will be more obvious, such as the one-year validity period in the example, then one more day, this guarantee can no longer take effect, unless a new one is made. New Written Warranty. Example 8 is an unconditional commitment, which is somewhat heavier, and generally points to some more important objects such as security and freedom.

5) Warrant. This one has a similar meaning to the word above, and it also means "official approval", which of course is also a commitment. A warrant can also directly represent the meaning of a bond. In addition, it can also express show to be reasonable or provide adequate ground for sth., which is close to the meaning of "defense".

Example 9: You had no warrant for doing that.

Example 10: Interpol has issued arrest warrants for them.

Analysis: Warrant in Example 9 is close to the meaning of reason, but it does not mean that the speaker



wants the other party to give reasons for doing so, but rather that the other party does not do it. This is a euphemistic way of speaking. Example 10 refers to a document for searching a certain location, which can be understood as a license for searching.

6) Ensure. It focuses on making people believe in the results of an action or force. The word is simpler and has no other complicated meaning. This can be studied together with the eighth word.

7) Assure. It focuses on removing doubts or worries in someone's mind, to have a sense of assurance that the purpose has been achieved.

Example 11: No one can ensure/assure you from failure.

Example 12: My job is to ensure that we have the resources we need to succeed.

Analysis: ensure and assert are almost interchangeable, with the latter being more formal. Of course, there are differences between them. Assure emphasizes ensuring that something makes him feel at ease, and the object is the person; ensure emphasizes ensuring that something makes it happen, and the object is the thing.

8) Pledge. It can be understood as a deposit of personal property as security for a debt or as a solemn and formal oath.

Example 13: His saxophone was in pledge.

Example 14: They pledged themselves never to tell the secrets.

Analysis: Beginning in the ancient Greek period, to reflect the validity of the oath, people generally took something they thought was very important as a token of the oath. And deceiving the Gods is the greatest disrespect. Later, people reduced their worship of Gods, and they used the internal organs of animals as tokens of oath, which reflected people's emphasis on life. Therefore, the word pledge can mean collateral or oath, which is very reasonable.

9) Give one's word. This is a fixed phrase, so there is not much special usage. It is always used in our daily life.

Example 15: I will give you my word I'll do what I can.

Example 16: I'll take your word for it.

Analysis: give sb one's word means "agreement" and is mainly used in the form of I give you my word. In other words, it can be understood as I'll promise you, and for the promised party, it is to take one's word.

In fact, there are many words about promises, and their respective usages are very flexible, so it is impossible to list them all here. This paper only needs to summarize and summarize these commonly used words to get the desired conclusion: promises have rich applications in people's various situations, so people should try to use them correctly to avoid misunderstandings.

## **(2) Misuse and amendment of commitment**

In addition to the above words related to "promise", Austin believes that "know" is also a kind of commitment. "Austin disagrees with the previous view that words can only be used to "describe" or "express," criticizing that as a "descriptive fallacy." He uses ritual language as an example to illustrate that, in successful situations, ritual language does not describe a certain behavior but carries out this kind of behavior. For example, in a Western wedding, the bride and groom face questions from the godfather and answer "I do."<sup>[18]</sup>

The oath mentioned above is also a commitment. In a postmodern society where morals are becoming increasingly corrupt and oaths are declining, people sometimes swear more casually. This kind of oath does not need to appear as "commitment" or the synonym of commitment, but a very special punishment to explain that his oath is valid.

Example 17: If I tell a lie, the sky will be thundered.

Analysis: There is no causal relationship between lying and thundering. This kind of thing is a very unlikely event, and it does not depend on human will. Therefore, the effectiveness of this oath varies from person to person, and if it is an oath of a dishonest person, it is generally not worth believing.

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that people have at least three situations that cause language misuse. One is the lack of understanding of the situation of polysemy and unfamiliar words, which is caused by the lack of personal knowledge. The solution to this situation is to do more analysis and comparison of words. For example, this paper has sorted out the words related to commitments one by one, to help people try to avoid misuse.

Example 18:

I sprayed the rat's private places with insecticide. (×)

I sprayed the rat's hiding places with insecticide. (√)

Analysis: private usually means a person's private territory, which is not appropriate for rats, and the word does not mean a hiding place, so it is more appropriate to use hiding in the above sentence.

The second is to use a certain language on inappropriate occasions. If someone does not use honorifics in the palace but uses slang on formal occasions, these will bring him unnecessary trouble.

Example 19: (said when caught by police)

Sorry, traffic cop, I accidentally sped. (×)

Sorry, traffic police, I accidentally sped. (√)

Analysis: cop does mean police in American slang, but it is not as formal as police. Although it can be used, it may bring a sense of lack of respect to the police, so the cop is more suitable for informal occasions.

The third is the use of inappropriate languages, such as a promise between friends, without the need to use the term "warrant".

Example 20:

I warrant to take you out tomorrow. (×)

I promise to take you out tomorrow. (√)

Analysis: This is just a verbal guarantee between friends, so there is no need to use too formal words like warrant.

All in all, words themselves are infallible, and good results can only be achieved by using them according to local conditions. In addition, the identity of the user is also worth paying attention to, which can help people judge the choice of words.

### **(3) Compare with ontological commitment**

There is a classic case for discussing commitment in philosophy proposition. "Ontological commitment" is a theory put forward by the American philosopher W.V.O. Quine when he used language to study ontology. Regarding "existence", he raised a famous question: "What is there?"<sup>[19]</sup> and ontological commitment is different from previous ontological theories in that it does not think that there really exists, but "What is the problem with this theory?"<sup>[20]</sup> Zhou Dong pointed out: "These two problems are at different levels, the former is related to facts, and the latter is related to language and concepts."<sup>[21]</sup>

When people usually use promises, just means they are guaranteeing something, it doesn't mean that the commitment they made is what it actually is. How to tell if a promise is true? Austin himself also holds the



conformity theory in terms of the concept of truth. He claims: "In the case where the historical state of affairs to which the statement is related by convention is of the type to which the sentence used to make the statement is related by the convention of description, this statement is said to be true."<sup>[6]</sup> In short, a true statement must not only have a contrasting situation, but also meet linguistic conventions or conventions, and its referent must be the meanings of the sentences are the same. Quine's "ontological commitment" can only guarantee that the language agreement is satisfied, but not the situation in which it is compared.

Quine believes that the use of names and predicates cannot be used as an ontological commitment, and his principle is: "To be is to be the value of a bound variable."<sup>[19]</sup> It means that when people discuss the nature of a thing, they must affirm the existence of the thing, and this kind of agreement only depends on people's use of language, and it is impossible to judge which kind of commitment is better. This leads to problems of ontological relativism and arbitrariness. In addition, because Quine overemphasized the logical analysis of ontology and neglected the attention to the substantive issues, ontological commitment eventually became a mathematical and logical method, detached from the concept of commitment in daily life, so the ontological issue remained unresolved.

## 5. Conclusion

Standing on the shoulders of the predecessors, this paper deeply explores Austin's *A Plea for Excuses* and the linguistic phenomenology he focused on in this paper, and uses Austin's text as a reference and "commitment" as an example to apply the method of linguistic phenomenology carries out the analysis and practical application of words.

In Chapter 3, this paper clarifies why Austin uses "excuses" as an entry point for linguistic phenomenology because it is a less-studied term that deserves to be explored in depth. This paper also found various connections between language and action, which have important relevance to his later speech act theory. This paper also found that Austin had a unique view of ordinary language, which was in some cases better than domain terms or some artificial language because It carries the experience and acumen of many generations. In the end, Austin gives some advice on how scholars should study words, as well as important conclusions from his study of "excuses."

Regarding linguistic phenomenology, this paper not only explores the method itself but also introduces the content related to the method, such as pragmatics, phenomenology, and speech act theory, which are closely related to linguistic phenomenology. Predecessor's work is still relatively lacking. There are several important conclusions: the method of linguistic phenomenology is a feasible method for the rigorous study of language use within the framework of pragmatics; Scientifically and linguistically, there are many similarities; language phenomenology and speech act theory complement each other and can solve language problems together.

Regarding the application, because Austin himself died at an early age, the work he did was not comprehensive enough, including the commitment issue he paid attention to in his early years, and he did not give a very complete analysis. Because of this, this paper continues Austin's research and analyzes the term "commitment" using linguistic phenomenology. In the end, this paper can conclude that people may misuse words when they do not know enough words, or in different situations and different identities. This paper also tests Quine's "ontological commitment" using linguistic phenomenology and finds that the ontological commitment does not solve the ontological problem. The above is the main work done in this paper.

## References

- [1] J.O.Urmson. J.L.Austin[J]. Philosophical Journal.The British Society of the Philosophy of Science. vol. 62 1965:499.

- [2] G.J.Warnock. English Philosophy Since 1900[M].Oxford: Oxford University Press,1958.
- [3] J.R.Searle.The Philosophy of Language[M].London:Oxford University Press,1971.
- [4] Edited by K.T.Fann.J.L.Austin Discussion Collection[M]. London, Routledge and Keegan Paul Publishing Company,1969.
- [5] Chen Jiaying. A word for excuses[J]. Reading,1998(03):54-62.
- [6] Yang Yucheng.Austin: Linguistics Phenomenology and Philosophy[M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press.2002.
- [7] Jiang Yi.A brief discussion on Austin's Method of Language Analysis[J]. Jinyang Journal,2010(02):22-25.
- [8] J.L.Austin. Philosophical Papers[M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press,1970.
- [9] S.C.Levinson. Pragmatics[M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1983.
- [10] J.L.Austin.How to Talk:Some Simple Ways[J].Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society,1953:134.
- [11] E.Husserl.Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy[M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press.1992.
- [12] He Tao. Introduction to Phenomenology[M]. Beijing. Social Sciences Academic Press.2019.
- [13] G.J.Warnock. Saturday Mornings[M].Oxford: Oxford University Press,1973.
- [14] E.Husserl. The Idea of Phenomenology[M].Translated by Ni Liangkang. Beijing. The Commercial Press.2017.
- [15] E.Husserl. Philosophy as rigorous science[M].Translated by Ni Liangkang. Beijing. The Commercial Press.2007.
- [16] Wang Xiaofeng. Husserl's Phenomenology and Language Research[J]. Journal of Social Sciences, Harbin Normal University,2013(04):80-82.
- [17] G.J.Warnock. Geoffrey J.J.L.Austin[J]. London: Routledge,1999:80.
- [18] Zheng Honglian.The academic background and formation of Austin's Speech Act Theory[J].Nanchang. Journal of Nanchang Institute of Technology.2019(04):72-77.
- [19] W.V.Quine. Quine's Works. Volume 4[M]. Compiled by Tu Jiliang, Chen Bo. Beijing: China Renmin University Press,2007.
- [20] W.V.Quine. The Ways of Paradox and Other Essays[J]. New York: Random House,1996:203.
- [21] Zhou Dong. A Review of Quine's "Ontological Commitment" theory[J]. Xi 'an.Western Journal 2020(10):146-150.