



THE MEANS OF EXPRESSING OF “APOLOGY” SPEECH ACT IN ENGLISH

Kuchkarova D. T.

The Teacher of TSPU named after Nizami

Annotation

It is well-known fact that speech act of apology has long been the focus of scholars' attention. In the last 30 years, linguistics has also become involved in this field. This is evidenced by a number of studies devoted to their study from linguistic and pragmatic points of view. This article is dedicated to the problem of the use of language units with the semantics of apology for the realization of other speech acts and formulas, as well as the problem of translation of the formulas used in the semantic situation of apology in general.

Key words: linguistics, pragmatics, apology formulas, semantics, speech act.

The etymology of “apology” and the definition of the existing dictionaries reflect the historical developments and modern concepts associated with this term and are interesting. Apologetics is derived from the Greek word for "defensive" or "defensive speech". This "defensive" meaning seems to have been the main meaning from the late 16th century to the mid-19th century. OED (The Old English Dictionary) describes the initial meaning of the term as follows: "To deny accusations or accusations as much as possible, explicitly, implicitly, or simply intentionally. Defending an individual from accusations or treatment, justifying institutions, etc." [OED, 1993:200].

It seems that the gradual shift of meaning from the institutional realm to the more personal realm occurred in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. In the 17th century, the word came to mean, at least informally, defending or justifying a particular act. "Justification, explanation and justification of Incidents and Actions" [OED, 1993].

Using this term in more detail means expressing the feeling of "regret" on behalf of the speaker for the act committed." To explain with remorse that no action has been taken against a person who has been hurt by another person's actions, or to openly admit wrongdoing and express remorse as compensation" (OED, 1993).

Other definitions of apology in the current dictionary include "an act of apology" [Cambridge International Dictionary of English, CD-ROM version, 2001], "to say or write to express the feeling of sorry for doing something wrong" [The Longman





Dictionary, Web version, 2001]. Note that in the dictionary definition above, apology and sorry are closely related.

A secondary definition of the term indicates its informal use in the sense of a poor excuse for something, such as "an apology for a particular thing is a very bad example of it" [Co Build English Language Dictionary, 1993]. In more formal usage, for example, "an apology is a formal explanation or defense of a belief or system, particularly something unpopular" [Cambridge International Dictionary of English, CD-ROM version, 2001], and so on, the element of defense is still implicitly included. The apology came to English from the Greek words APO ("away from, off") and logia (Logos, meaning "speech"). The oldest meaning of this word in English is "to speak or write to defend or justify what others consider to be wrong or possibly unpopular." For those who have read ancient Greek or read the philosopher's books, nothing will be surprising. Plato's "Apology for Socrates" is an explanation of self-defense expressed in the Socrates trial, the philosopher does not explain how he admitted his guilt.

The theory of speech acts was introduced by the philosopher John Austin, and later developed by the philosopher John Searle. According to Austin (1962), a speech act is a word that conveys the meaning of the speaker and forces the listener to perform certain actions. A speaker can do certain things with his own statement, such statements are called "performative" and can interpret things, such statements are called "constatives" [Austin, 1962: 3]. Constatives are utterances for which a truth value conceivably could be determined. Thus, one could ascertain the truth of the utterance "It's raining out" by looking out the window. Performatives (e.g. "I apologize"), on the other hand, are used in order to perform some acts (their occurrence changes the world in some way), and hence they are not amenable to a truth-conditional analysis. Austin (1962) distinguishes between explicit and implicit (primary) performatives. Explicit performatives are speech acts which contain verbs such as "promise" in the first-person singular present indicative active, describing the kind of act that is being performed: "I promise to go to Como". All other forms of utterance, such as "I'll go to Como," are implicit (primary) performatives. Austin (1962) states that there is a set of conditions to be met for any performative utterance to be "happy" or "felicitous" (i.e. the act performed successfully), otherwise it becomes "unhappy" or "infelicitous" (i.e. there is something wrong in performing the act). Such conditions can be summarized as follows:

- The existence of a conventional procedure performed by an appropriate person in an appropriate context that has a conventional effect.
- The procedure must be executed correctly and completely by all participants.





- The person performing the act should have the requisite thoughts, feelings, or intentions [Austin, 1962:14-15].

Thus, for any act to be “happy”, it should be performed correctly, completely, sincerely in an appropriate context (Austin, 1962:25-39). However, some performatives can be assessed as true or false [cf., Tawfiq, 1994:10ff; Verschueren, 1999:22; Al-Jumaily, 2006:10ff]. For example, “I apologize” is a performative utterance and at the same time it can be true or false depending on its happiness. Hence, and on the basis of this and other problems, Austin (1962:149-150) states the performative-constative distinction by a three-fold distinction:

1. Locutionary act (LA): the act of saying something.
2. Illocutionary act (IA): what is done in saying something.
3. Perlocutionary act (PA): what is done by saying something.

For example, in the utterance “Don’t go there, there is a lion”, the LA is the literal meaning “don’t go there, there is a lion”, the IA is “warning” and the PA is “obedience” or “refusal” (Austin, 1962:121). As for thanking, like “thank you for your help”, the LA is the literal meaning “thank you for your help”, the IA is “gratitude”, and the PA is “gratefulness” [cf., Verschueren, 1999:22-23] Austin (1962:150) classifies speech acts into five categories:

1. Verdictives which show expounding of views, conducting of arguments and clarifying of usages and of references, e.g. state, insist, remind, etc.
2. Exercitives which give a verdict, e.g. grade, call, rank, etc.
3. Commissives which commit the speaker to a future action, decline, refuse, promise, etc.
4. Behabitives which mean reacting toward other people’s behaviour, e.g. congratulate, thank, etc.
5. Expositives which show exercising powers, rights or influences, e.g. request, beg, dare, etc. [cf., Al-Sulaimaan, 1997:30-31]

Since the publication of the ideas on speech act theory by J. Austin (1962) and J. Searle [1969; p.28], interest in speech acts has not waned. This is evidenced by the numerous works that have since appeared. Among other things, the speech act (SA) of apologetics has become a popular object of study. Initially, researchers were mainly interested in the form and functions of apologetics [12, 14, 25, 26]. Recently, the field of research has expanded to the impact of social factors on apology, and relationships, such as power relations and subordination, as well as social distance.

In addition, in numerous articles and dissertations use an intercultural approach that compares apologetics in different communicative cultures [3, 4, 10, 19, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31]. Numerous publications testify to the great interest that researchers note this



speech act, as well as the lack of uniformity of views on the status of the apology in the system of SA classifications, its pragmatic features in terms of the success of the speech act, as well as the possibilities of expression. On these aspects we will and try to analyze the available approaches and points of view.

First of all, the speech act of apologizing involves of a group of strategies and sub-strategies and different writers have proposed frameworks to classify those strategies. Apology is defined as telling someone that you are sorry for having done something that has caused problems or unhappiness for them [Cambridge Online Dictionary, 2016].

Olshtain [1989: 156-7] defined an apology as “a speech act which is intended to provide support for the hearer who was actually or potentially affected by a violation”. In an apology, the speaker is ready to degrade himself/ herself to a degree that the apology is a face-saving act for the hearer and a face-threatening act for the speaker. Searle (1969) classified speech acts into five groups: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Apologies come under expressive speech acts. For an apology to have an impact on the hearer, the speaker should be sincere and have true and honest feelings of sadness. There are three reasons for an apology: regret, responsibility and remedy. The apologizer should take the above mentioned points into account, otherwise the apology will not be sincere and effective [Engel, 2001].

The speech act of apology has certain elements [Brown and Attardo, 2000]. These include:

1. **Expressing of an apology**, in which the speaker expresses feelings of regret, such as, “I am sorry”.
2. **Clarifying the situation**, in which the apologizer attempts to reconstruct the incident for the victim in order to show that the forgiveness is deserved.
3. **Admitting the mistake**, in which the wrongdoer admits fault as a part of the apology.
4. **Presenting repair**.
5. **Promising of** forbearance

Although the importance of the above elements was emphasized by Brown and Attardo (2000), sometimes it is enough to utter one word as an apology if it happens among close friends [Bataineh, 2004]. It means amount of words can vary sometimes according to relationship between people who are communicating.

The verbal act of apology can also be evaluated by linguists from the point of view of sincerity [1, 13, 20, 22], which, as you know, is one of the conditions for the success of SA. An utterance can be considered sincere if it corresponds to the feelings, thoughts





and/or intentions of the speaker (cf. A.Ivin's point of view on the essence of the concept of "truth" [2. pp. 123-125]). Sincerity mostly refers to mental processes that are inaccessible to linguistic observation, but signs of sincerity are reflected in language, therefore, it can be considered a semiometric value. Obviously, as well as politeness, the parameter of sincerity in the assessment of an apology is not applicable to all occasions for an apology and can vary on a graduated scale from sincere to absolutely sincere. At the same time, the assessment of an apology from the point of view of sincerity, in contrast to politeness, is especially appropriate in cases of serious misconduct and, in all likelihood, is not appropriate in ritual apologies (in cases of correcting an error, asking to show the way, etc.).

Apologies can be considered not only on the basis of the parameters of the sincerity and politeness, but also in accordance with the situation and the reasons that caused these apologies. Goffman [15] divided apologies into (1) compensating virtual or imaginary offenses, which are easily compensated with just one apology formula, and (2) apologies used in cases of real harm to the addressee and sometimes including an offer of compensation for material damage.

In short, apologies might be understood as pure tools which might serve to show respect to the hearers for having violated a particular social norm. Furthermore, it should also be taken into consideration that when the speaker apologises, the situation might be somehow restored and possibly both participants can be mutually benefited, since both might receive a positive reward. the speech act of apologies might be associated with the issue of politeness and face, either by taking into account exclusively the perspective of considering apologies as a negative politeness communicative event (Brown and Levinson, 1987) or by considering that it could also be seen as a face-supporting act in which both participants could benefit from such realization. On the one hand, if the speaker apologises, it is because he or she assumes the culpability and the hearer can appreciate that particular action. On the other hand, however, it seems that it is not only the hearer who might benefit from such an apologetic action, but also the speaker who somehow could achieve the purpose of apologizing and then he or she can restore the situation of recovering his or her self-face.

References

1. Austin, John L., A plea for excuses, «Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society»; reprinted in J.O. Urmson and G.J. Warnock (eds.), Philosophical Papers, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1956, pp.175-204.
2. Austin, John L., How to Do Things with Words, Clarendon, Oxford 1962.





3. Brown, Penelope, Levinson, Stephen C., *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1987
4. Cambridge International Dictionary (Online)
5. Grice P. *The Cooperative Principle of Speech Acts*. London, 1989.
6. Levinson S. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420p.
7. *Linguistics*. – Dordrecht: Reidel, 1977. – P. 243-258.
8. Longman dictionary (Online)
9. Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). *Apology: A speech-act set*. In: Wolfson, N., Judd, E. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 18-35.
10. *Pragmatics*. – Dordrecht: Reidel, 1980. – 317p.
11. Richards J.C. *Language and Communication*. Longman, London, New York, 1983.
12. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Searle, J. R. (1976). *A classification of illocutionary acts*. *Language in Society* 5, 1–23.
14. Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. London: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
15. Searle, John R., «How performatives work», in D. Vanderveken, S. Kubo (eds.), *Essays in Speech Act Theory*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam 2001, pp. 85-117.
16. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*, Second edition. London/New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

