Nare TAMOYAN
Yerevan State University

TAXONOMY OF APOLOGY SPEECH SITUATIONS

As one of the vital means of regulating interpersonal relations, apology helps to restore and maintain harmonious relations between interlocutors. Apology is often viewed as a hybrid speech act that encompasses various communicative intentions. In the present paper an attempt is made to classify the main apology speech situations, as well as to present some of the structural, functional and communicative-pragmatic peculiarities of these situations.

Key words: *apology, communicative harmony, speech act, prototypical speech situation, sincerity condition, interactional rituals, politeness principle*

We, human beings, use language to make sense of the world. It is in the process of communication that we reveal what we think and, to certain extent, who we are. As stated by Sh. Paronyan: "... communication is a social action which is used as a vehicle of mind: expression of one's inner conscious interpretations (cognitive processes) – ideas, feelings, attitudes, and so on… It is indisputable that in some cases verbal interactions bring about cooperation and increase social ties among speaking partners. On the other hand, in certain cases communication results breakdown and disruption of social ties. You don't do anything, actually, you just say something, and the world changes substantially and instantly as a result of your verbal behaviour!" /Paronyan, 2012: 3-4/.

We cannot but agree that the act of apologizing is a kind of verbal behavior that "can change the world", too. A whole host of cross-cultural studies of this speech act bears witness to its importance /Goffman, 1971; Coulmas, 1981; Fraser, 1981; Cohen, Olshtain, 1981; Mir, 1992; Bergman, Kasper, 1993; Owen, 1983; Holmes, 1990; Mattson Bean, Johnstone, 1994; Trosborg, 1995; Aijmer, 1996; Meier, 1998; Rathmayr, 2003; Deutschmann, 2003; Lazare, 2004; Трофимова, 2008; Ogiermann, 2009; Плетнева, 2009/. Apology plays a paramount role in the process of human interaction. The speech situation, in which the act of apologizing is realized, is endowed with the power to heal humiliations, free one's mind of deep-rooted guilt, and remove every desire of reprisal and revenge. Furthermore, apology resolves conflicts, restores and enhances strained or broken relations and helps maintain social harmony. In terms of pragmatics, apology is an expressive speech act, which is inherently convivial, and its goal coincides with the social goal of maintaining harmony between speaker and hearer /Leech, 1983: 104-105/. We should go one step further by defining apologies as one of the most complex communicative acts. In the process of communication apology changes its masks: it may wear the mask of a social rite or the mask of a very sincere remedial act, it may mask itself as a face-saving act or as a face-threatening one.

The present paper aims to introduce a kind of taxonomy – a systematized classification of those speech situations that unveil the many facets of apology. We make an attempt to differentiate the mentioned apology situations trying to depict the changes that occur in the "organic unity" of this speech act. So, let us begin our "journey".

The situation of apology as a widely occurring social and communicative phenomenon has its prototypical structure that presents the following basic components – "actors of this play":

1. "offender"[1], who takes responsibility for the offence,

2. "offended"[2], who perceives her/himself as affected by the offence or is just perceived as such by offender,

3. "offence", which may be real, potential or only perceived as such by the offender or offended,

4. "remedy", which presupposes recognition of the offence, acceptance of responsibility and a display of regret /Deutschmann, 2003: 44-46/.

The prototypical structure of this speech situation leads us to the idea that it has also certain prototypical scenario – plan of fixed succession of actions or events. And the prototypical scenario represents nothing else but the well-known set of felicity conditions which are necessary for the act of apologizing to have been performed. Let us present the scenario of the prototypical situation of apology through the Searlean kaleidoscope of felicity conditions, which are as follows:

Propositional content: Past A (act) done by S (speaker),
Preparatory: A displeases or harms H (hearer) and S believes A displeases or harms H,
Sincerity: S feels sorry for A,
Essential: Counts as an expression of regret and remorse by S for A /Searle, 1969: 66-67/.

Thus, the act of apologizing is called for when there is a violation of social norms, i.e., when an action or utterance results in offence, when one or more persons perceive themselves as offended, and the culpable person(s), i.e. the offender, needs to make amendments. A well-devised wording of the prototypical situation of apologizing is presented by A. Trosborg: "It is assumed that there are two participants: an apologizer and a recipient of the apology. When a person has performed an act (action or utterance) or failed to do so, which has offended another person, and for which he/she can be held responsible, the offender needs to apologize. The act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to "set things right" /Trosborg, 1995: 373/.

It should be mentioned at the outset that almost in all classifications of apologies a decisive factor is the offence or the "object of regret" /Coulmas, 1981: 75/ as it is mainly the offence that obliges the wrongdoer to apologize. The nature

and severity of the offence strongly affect the form of the subsequent apology situation. As apologies are provided for a wide variety of wrongs from minor infractions to serious harm and criminal actions, the interplay between the offence and the felicity conditions mentioned above may be differently manifested giving rise to various apology situations. Thus, based on the type and intensity of the offence as well as on some other accompanying linguistic and extralinguistic factors[3], the prototypical scenario of apology may take different routes to evolve. Consequently, we suggest classifying apology situations into the following groups: *prototypical apology situations*, *semi-prototypical apology situations* and *non-prototypical apology situations*[4]. Prototypical apology situations are characterized by the prototypical structure and scenario described above. Semi-prototypical and non-prototypical apology situations are engendered when some of the felicity conditions are met partially and unequally, that is, these situations, as M. Deutschmann mentions, fall partly outside of the prototypical view of this speech act /Deutschmann, 2003: 46/. The differentiation between semi-prototypical apology situations and non-prototypical apology situations is based on the fact that although in both cases there are deviations from the expected scenario – "boundaries and laws of prototypical apology situations are trespassed and violated", however, semi-prototypical situations perform remedial function peculiar to prototypical apology situations, while non-prototypical situations do not perform any repair work and may be viewed as offensive acts.

Now let us present the main apology situations that we have differentiated and categorized on the basis of the above mentioned classification.

Apology Situations as a Part of Conversational Routine

We shall begin this part of our paper by introducing apology situations which are named differently by different researchers. These situations are known as **ritual**, **conventional**, **formulaic**, **situational**, **phatic** or **stereotypical** apology situations. Very often than not formulaic apologies are viewed as strategies of linguistic politeness and social etiquette. In formulaic apology situations we witness the ritual work of apologizing, which, according to E. Goffman, "allows the participants to go on their way, if not with satisfaction that matters are closed, then at least with the right to act as if they feel that ritual equilibrium has been restored" /Goffman, 1976: 68/. Here the apologizer acts according to the existing rules of verbal behaviour and norms of social interaction, which, in their turn, are conditioned by the conventions of the given society. A situation of this kind may be developed, for example, when one hurts someone unintentionally, bumps into a person, forgets a name, is late, interrupts a conversation and so forth.

*"**I'm sorry I couldn't get here earlier**, sweetheart," Desi says.*

"I know how full Jacqueline keeps your schedule," I demur. Desi's mom is a touchy   subject in our relationship (Flynn, 2012: 493).

In the above adduced example the speakers are friends. The situation is a typically formulaic apology situation where one of the interlocutors apologizes for being late.

It is our firm belief that in the speech situations falling under the formulaic or ritual category the sincerity of the apologizer is not a relevant factor for the successful realization of the speech act of apology. Here, the apologizer acknowledges the fact that he/she is responsible for some unwelcome, unpleasant, inappropriate turning in the course of communication, however, he/she is certain that the offence (if there is any offence) is minimal and there is no need for forgiveness, thus, there is no need for demonstration of deep and real feelings and emotions. In such situations, the major task of the apologizer is to implement the rules of social etiquette in order to maintain the required communicative balance. Thus, it goes without saying that formulaic apology situations breach some of the laws of prototypical apology scenario (i.e. offence is minimal or almost non-existent, sincerity is not a necessary condition), however, we categorize them as semi-prototypical apology situations and not as non-prototypical situations, as they perform prosocial functions (restoration of social harmony, maintenance of communicative equilibrium) peculiar to prototypical apology situations.

It is important to note that some researchers go even deeper into their studies and present subgroups of ritual or formulaic apology situations. M. Deutschmann distinguishes "apologies with added functions". In these cases the offence is minimal and even non-existent, and the apology performs some other functions in addition to its main function – repair and remedial work. M. Deutschmann calls these apologetic forms "request cues". Request cues realize two types of additional functions: request for repetition and request for attention /Deutschmann, 2003: 72/. To elucidate the mentioned point let us present the following situation:

> "Where did you go, Nick – I need to know."
> "It's not relevant."
> "Nick!" Go snapped.
> "I just did what I do some mornings. I pretended to leave, then I drove to the most deserted part of our complex, and I … one of the houses there has an unlocked garage."
> "And?" Tanner said.
> "And I read magazines."
> **"Excuse me?"**
> "I read back issues of my old magazine." (Flynn, 2012: 417)

In this situation the participants of the conversation are Nick and his lawyer Tanner Bolt. Nick's wife has disappeared, and as he is the main suspect in her disappearance, he has hired Tanner. Tanner tries to analyze the case asking his defendant to go into detail about the situation under investigation. Here the

apologetic structure *"Excuse me?"* acts as a request to the interlocutor to repeat and clarify the information.

R. Rathmayr and some other linguists put forward the idea that the formulaic apology situations where transgressions of Gricean maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner[5] are registered should be classified under the head **metacommunicative apology situations**. So, the above mentioned apology situation (and similar situations) may be called also metacommunicative apology situation(s), as there are violations of quantity, manner and relation maxims, i.e., the speaker's statement (**"And I read magazines."**) is not as informative as it is expected, it gives rise to vagueness and it is not relevant to the flow of speech.

Genuine Apology Situations

The pragmatic goals and communicative aims of the apologizer are entirely different when what we deal with are the apology situations known by the following names: **real**, **emphatic, genuine**, **substantial**, **substantive, essential** or **personal apology situations**. We have sufficient ground to believe that these situations are nothing else but prototypical apology situations.

According to sociologist Nicholas Tavuchis, the real apology has two fundamental requirements: "the offender has to be sorry and has to say so" /Tavuchis, 1991: 36/. Here, the main aim of the speaker is to make the addressee believe in his or her remorse and regret, stress clearly the idea that he/she admits his/her fault, takes the full responsibility for the action and is ready to compensate for the damage if it is possible. The ultimate goal of these situations is not only to re-establish the social harmony but also to attain forgiveness. In these situations the communicative focus is on the sincerity condition as opposed to formulaic or ritual apology situations where the communicative focus is on the essential condition. This stems from the fact that in genuine apology situations offences and damages are real and serious.

It stands to reason that the above mentioned differences between formulaic and genuine apology situations underlie the choice of linguistic units to construct apologetic speech.

In ritual or phatic apology situations the apologizer makes use of fixed set of easily identifiable units (*apologies, sorry, excuse, forgive, pardon, excuse me, I'm sorry; I beg your pardon; I offer my apologies; I owe you an apology; I do apologize for…; Please, accept my apologies and so on*) which are accepted as conventional ready-made formulae used in similar speech situations by the given speech community.

In real apology situations the speaker turns not only to clichéd and conventional means of expressing apology but also provides explanations or accounts of the situation, acknowledges his/her responsibility, offers repair and compensation, makes promises of forbearance. We would also like to make a further point about the fact that in real apology situations the apologizer more often

than not makes abundant use of intensifying adverbs (***very, really, so, sincerely, honestly, terribly, extremely, awfully, truly, etc***.) that strengthen the impact of the speech by adding some attitudinal or emotive meanings.

> *Go phoned while I was still staring at the clue.*
> *"Are we okay?"she asked immediately.*
> *My sister thought I was possibly a wife killer.*
> *"We're as okay as I think we can ever be again, considering."*
> *"Nick. **I'm sorry.** I called to say **I'm sorry**," Go said. "I woke up and felt totally insane. And awful. I lost my head. It was a momentary freakout. I **really, truly apologize**."*
> *I remained silent.*
> *"You got to give me this, Nick: exhaustion and stress and ... **I'm sorry … truly.***"
> *"Okay," I lied.*
>   (Flynn, 2012: 331)

We present the above mentioned example as a case of real or substantial apology situation. The interlocutors are Go (Margo) and Nick who are twins. The relationship between them is described as unique: they have always acted as a team against the world. However, Go's momentary doubt about Nick's innocence - her suspicion that her brother may have killed his wife, deeply insults Nick. In the above adduced situation Go tries to apologize for her doubts and demeanor. This example illustrates well enough the peculiarities of real apology situations. Go's apologetic speech represents a combination of explanations for her thoughts and conduct (**…It was a momentary freakout…, You got to give me this, Nick: exhaustion and stress and …**), apologetic formulae (**I'm sorry; … apologize**) and intensifying adverbs (**really, truly**). Let us observe the fact that Nick does not actually forgive her sister ("Okay," **I lied.**), despite his sister's regret and apology. This leads us to the idea that in some cases even the most sincere and heartfelt apology may fail.

Hidden Side of Human Nature: Pseudo-apologies

Lynn Johnston – a Canadian cartoonist, writes metaphorically that: "An apology is the superglue of life. It can repair just about anything." An interesting interpretation of this idea is given by L. Macleod: "If we follow Johnston's metaphor, we are reminded that even though an apology can be a powerful life tool, things can go wrong. If the ingredients of the glue are not properly measured and mixed it doesn't stick; and even if it does set, often the pieces don't always fit together" /Macleod, 2008: i/. While doing our research we have come across such deviant types of apology situations (pseudo-apologies, "face attack" apologies, sarcastic apologies) where "the ingredients of the glue are not properly measured"

and which come to fall under the category of non-prototypical apology situations mentioned in the beginning.

The most "treacherous" and deviant non-prototypical apology situations are known as pseudo-apologies. In these cases apologies may be viewed as either efforts to manipulate others or as shallow attempts by the offenders to free themselves from guilt. Aaron Lazare writes in his book "On Apology": "With pseudo-apology, the offender is trying to reap the benefits of apologizing without having actually earned them. People who offer a pseudo-apology are unwilling to take the steps necessary for genuine apology; that is, they do not acknowledge the offense adequately, or express genuine remorse, or offer appropriate reparations, including a commitment to make changes in future. These three actions are the price of an effective apology. To undertake them requires honesty, generosity, humility, commitment, courage, and sacrifice. In other words, the rewards of an effective apology can only be earned. They cannot be stolen" /Lazare, 2004: 9-10/.

It goes without saying that it is very difficult, sometimes even impossible, to identify and discern pseudo-apologies. Some researchers suggest deciphering pseudo-apologies with the help of the intonation and structure of the apologetic speech. It is assumed that when guilty people – the offenders, are not really sorry, they do not want to directly admit their faults, their speech rings markedly false being decorated with "garments" such as *ifs, buts, hedges, euphemisms*, *the agentless passive voice* ("Mistakes were made." "Damage is caused."), etc. However, this is not a definitive hypothesis conditioned by the impossibility of fully decoding the complex psychology of human being as one can say "I'm very sorry…, I apologize…" and not mean it, and on the contrary, one can apologize indirectly, better to say, implicitly, in an excessively lengthy and complex manner but with heartfelt intent.

It should be mentioned that there is a range of other words that have emerged as equivalents to the term pseudo-apology: ***non-apology, nonpology, notpology, nopology, fauxpology, unapology, unpology, if apology, false apology*** /http://goo.gl/OaV1we/.

Non-Remedial Apologies: "Face Attack" and Sarcastic Apology Situations

"Face attack" apologies form another set of non-prototypical apologies which are "uttered in situations where the remedial nature of apology is questionable" /Deutschmann, 2003: 46/. It is important to note that many researchers identify "face attack" apologies with pseudo-apologies taking into consideration the fact that in both cases one of the fundamental conditions of the prototypical apology situation – the sincerity condition is "devalued" and not fulfilled. In our opinion, however, it is essential to make a distinction between pseudo-apologies and "face attack" apologies. We suggest this differentiation based on the assumption that the intentions of the apologizers are different in the

mentioned apology situations. In case of pseudo-apologies the speaker acts as if he/she regrets and wants his/her words to sound sincere, real and genuine, while in "face attack" apology situations the speaker intentionally does not want to play the role of the real apologizer. Here, it is clearly indicated that the so-called apologizer "doesn't like/want one or more of H's wants, acts, personal characteristics, goods, beliefs or values" /Brown and Levinson, 1987: 66/. In these apology situations apologetic speech is used as a kind of preface to disapproval, disagreement, complaint, reprimand, accusation, criticism, refusal, etc.

> *I jammed it all into a bag and turned back around, looking at the gift box on the floor. "Could I look inside?" I asked her.*
>
> *She hesitated, then played it safe. "No, **I'm sorry**, sir. Better not right now."* (Flynn, 2012: 97-98)

In the situation presented above we witness violation of Tact Maxim. The request to look inside his own gift box in his own room is refused by the police officer. The "apologizer" uses the phrase "I'm sorry" as a polite channel to "serve" the refusal, which is an act directed against the hearer's negative face wants.

After presenting the main features of the "face attack" apology situation we are ready to make a move towards introducing its special subtype – **sarcastic apology situation**. In situations of this kind, the speaker may express disapproval, disagreement, complaint, reprimand, criticism or refusal "seasoned with certain amount of contempt and ridicule".

However, it should be marked that we are given tangible facts to admit that not all cases of sarcastic apology situations are instances of face-threatening acts. Let us clarify the point.

G. Leech and J. Culpeper distinguish "mock politeness" and "mock impoliteness" strategies in the domain of "sarcastic politeness". Based on this distinction they single out sarcastic remark /Culpeper, 1996/ or conversation irony (sarcasm) /Leech, 2014/ and ironic remark /Culpeper, 1996/ or banter /Leech, 2014/. Conversational irony (sarcastic remark, sarcasm) is mock politeness which is directed towards social disharmony, while ironic remark or banter is mock impoliteness which is meant to enhance social harmony /Culpeper, 1996: 352-358; Leech, 2014: 100-101/.

According to G. Leech: "Irony maintains courtesy on the surface level of what is said, but at a deeper level is calculated to imply a negative evaluation. Banter is offensive on the surface but at a deeper level is intended to maintain comity. […] Irony is associated with an unfriendly demeanor, whereas banter is associated with a friendly demeanor, including laughter, prosodic markedness, etc." /Leech, 2014: 100-101/.

Thus, sarcastic apology situations may be subdivided further into mock politeness and mock impoliteness situations. Mock politeness apology situations

are really sarcastic, unfriendly and confrontational situations. In these situations various face-threatening acts (complaint, reprimand, accusation, insult, etc.) may be realized. Here is an instance of mock politeness sarcastic apology situation with its original interpretation:

> *"I **apologize for** not e-mailing the meeting agenda to everyone ahead of time. Bill, Jean — did you have something you were particularly interested in having on there? Was there something you're not prepared to discuss because you didn't see this ahead of time? If so, we can postpone the meeting and reconvene tomorrow when you're more prepared."*

> *Translation: "You people are making a big deal out of every trivial issue undeserving of an apology. Why are you trying to embarrass me? I can make you feel very small for bringing this up."*
> (http://www.profitguide.com/manage-grow/leadership/great-ideas-apologies-that-arent-really-apologies-29482)

Sarcastic apologies uttered in friendly situations are mock impoliteness manifestations. They foster the intimacy and reflect the closeness of social distance between interlocutors. This type of sarcastic apology is regarded as a banter, and as G. Leech mentions: "it is a way of saying "We do not need to be polite to one another: I can insult you, and you will respond to it as a joke. This proves what good buddies we are" /Leech 2014: 101/.

> *Finally, we watched ANTM. Dad tried really hard not to die of boredom, and he kept messing up which girl was which, saying, "We like her?"*

> *"No, no. We revile Anastasia. We like Antonia, the other blonde," Mom explained.*

> *"They're all tall and horrible," Dad responded. "**Forgive me for failing to tell the difference.**" Dad reached across me for Mom's hand.* (Green, 2012: 83)

In the example the expression "***Forgive me for failing to tell the difference.***" is not a sarcastic and offensive remark. In this case we deal with a mock impoliteness situation and the mentioned phrase is a banter that highlights the close relations between the interactants and "flavours the family talk with humour".

General Categories of Apology Situations
Our study of the linguistic data concerning apologies reveals that the above presented prototypical, semi-prototypical and non-prototypical apology situations may be categorized further into interpersonal and collective, as well as retrospective and anticipatory apology situations.

A demarcation line is drawn between **interpersonal** and **collective** apology situations taking into consideration the number of interlocutors involved in the process of communication. Interpersonal apologies are exchanged between individuals (friends, family members, colleagues, neighbours, just strangers, etc.), while the communication partners of collective apology situations are groups or a group and an individual. Interpersonal and collective apology situations may be referred to as "**one to one**", "**one to many**", "**many to one**," or "**many to many**" apology situations /http://www.iep.utm.edu/apology/#H3/. We would like to analyze as a case of collective apology situation Australian government's apology to the indigenous Aboriginal population. Here is the BBC News coverage of the event: "In 2008 then Prime Minister of Australia Kevin Rudd apologized publicly to all Aborigines "for laws and policies that "inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss". He singled out the "Stolen Generations"[6] of thousands of children forcibly removed from their families. The apology, beamed live around the country on TV, was met with cheers" /http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7241965.stm/. Now, let us present an extract from K. Rudd's speech:

*"We come together today to deal with an ugly chapter in our nation's history. And we come together today to offer our nation's apology. To say to you, the Forgotten Australians, and those who were sent to our shores as children without your consent, that **we are sorry**.*

***Sorry** – that as children you were taken from your families and placed in institutions where so often you were abused.*

***Sorry** – for the physical suffering, the emotional starvation and the cold absence of love, of tenderness, of care.*

***Sorry** – for the tragedy, the absolute tragedy, of childhoods lost,– childhoods spent instead in austere and authoritarian places, where names were replaced by numbers, spontaneous play by regimented routine, the joy of learning by the repetitive drudgery of menial work. **Sorry** – for all these injustices to you, as children, who were placed in our care.*

As a nation, we must now reflect on those who did not receive proper care..."

/http://www.dhs.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/582187/Transcript-of-PM-Kevin-Rudd-Forgotten-Australians-apology.pdf/

The above mentioned situation is a special case of collective apology. According to E. Sanz such apologies may be defined as **national apologies** which are *collective, political, intra-state* actions or set of actions and may also be called by one of the following terms: "state apologies", "community-focused apologies", "political apologies", "reconciliation apologies", "many-to-many apologies", "historical apologies", "public apologies", "collective apologies" /Sanz, 2012: 10/. Thus, based on E. Sanz's definition, the above adduced example is a collective

apology situation as it is both made on behalf of and directed to identifiable communities. It is political because it is made by a political institution – Australian government, and for past wrongdoings of political character. This apology situation may be described as intra-state because it is intended for the Aboriginal population – a community from the same country, instead of being made amongst states.

Now let us pass on to the brief introduction of retrospective and anticipatory apologies.

The classification representing **retrospective** and **anticipatory**[7] apology situations is bound up with temporal aspects of apologizing, that is whether apologies are uttered in anticipation of an offence or after an offence has taken place. This distinction between pre-event and post-event apology situations may be helpful in defining the discourse functions of apologies. The retrospective apology is a response to an offence, whereas the anticipatory apology anticipates an offence[8]. In effect, retrospective apologies are remedial, supportive (face-saving) and self-demeaning. Anticipatory apologies are disarming or softening /Aijmer, 1996: 99/. It should be mentioned that in anticipatory apology situations the propositional content condition can be partially waived as in these cases the offending acts are located in the future or present and not in the past. So, it is possible to assume that prototypical apology situations are mainly retrospective, while semi-prototypical and non-prototypical apology situations can be both retrospective and future-pointing – anticipatory.

Thus, it is deducible from what has been presented and discussed in the paper that the phenomenon of apologizing is not as simple as it may seem. The study of apology reveals a whole bunch of semantic and functional subtleties that unfold its poly-intentional nature. Our attempts to analyze and systematize various classifications devoted to apologies enable us to infer that there is a functional continuum for apologies representing the sequence of prototypical, semi-prototypical and non-prototypical apology situations. Conditioned by a wide variety of linguistic and extralinguistic factors these situations gain specific situational colouring and perform specific communicative-pragmatic functions. Through the observation of these various manifestations of apology situations (formulaic, real, sarcastic, etc.) it may well be concluded that sometimes it becomes increasingly difficult to draw any clear line between some of these situations. This fact leads us to the idea that the available taxonomies of apologies are still open to dispute as they are not all-inclusive and definitive.

Notes

1. It should be stated that the offender does not necessarily have to play an active role in the transgression, i.e., he/she does not necessarily have to have caused the offence. Such situations include those cases when adults apologize for their

children or pets, or individuals apologize on behalf of organizations as representatives.

2. We should not exclude those cases when the person, who is considered to be the victim of the offence, does not perceive her/himself as offended.

3. It should be always kept in mind that the uniqueness and oneness of each speech situation is conditioned also by factors of demographic nature (interlocutors' gender, age, education, and occupation), by contextual details (where, when, who apologized to whom, and why), by the exact words of the actual conversations, by the tone of voice of interlocutors, by non-verbal behaviour.

4. It seems essential to note that in the linguistic data devoted to the study of apologies only prototypical and non-prototypical apologies are differentiated. The term semi-prototypical apology and its definition is suggested by us, as we think it will make the classification more comprehensive.

5. P. Grice's Cooperative Principle says: "Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." Four conversational maxims proposed by P. Grice are: 1. Maxim of Quantity – "Make your contribution as informative as is required", "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required", 2. Maxim of Quality – "Do not say what you believe to be false", "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence", 3. Maxim of Relation – "Be relevant", 4. Maxim of Manner – "Avoid obscurity of expression", "Avoid ambiguity", "Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)", "Be orderly" /Grice, 1975: 45-46/.

6. It should be mentioned that in Australia there is a National Sorry Day which is an annual event held on 26 May, since 1998, to remember and commemorate the mistreatment of the country's indigenous population. During the 20th century, Australian governments' policies resulted in a "Stolen Generation" – described by John Torpey as "Aboriginal children separated, often forcibly, from their families in the interest of turning them into white Australians". The date 26 May carries great significance for the Stolen Generations, as well as for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, and non-indigenous Australians. On 26 May 1997, the Bringing Then Home report was tabled in Parliament. The annual National Sorry Day commemorations remind and raise awareness among politicians, policy makers, and the wider public about the significance of the forcible removal policies and their impact on the children that were taken, but also on their families and communities /https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_ Sorry_ Day/.

7. Anticipatory apologies are also known as prospective and preventive apologies.

8. The idea that speakers apologize not only for a fact but also for an intention or for the need to perform a particular speech act was suggested by W. Edmondson /Edmondson, 1981: 282-283/.

REFERENCE

1. Aijmer K. Conversational Routines in English. London: Longman, 1996.

2. Australia Apology to Aborigines, 13 February 2008 // URL: http:// news.bbc.co.uk /2/hi/ 7241965.stm/ (Retrieved February 5, 2016)

3. Bergman M. L., Kasper G. Perception and Performance in Native And Nonnative Apology // *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, Kasper G. and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

4. Brown P., Levinson S. Politeness: Some Language Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

5. Carey S. Sorry Not Sorry: The Many Names for Non-Apologies // URL: http://www.slate.com/blogs/lexicon_valley/2014/11/20/sorry_not_sorry_non_a pology_fauxpology_unpology_and_other_names_for_hollow.html/ (Retrieved March 5, 2016)

6. Cohen A. D. and Olshtain E. Developing a Measure of Sociocultural Competence: The Case of Apology // *Language Learning* 31(1), 1981.

7. Coulmas F. Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech. The Hague: Mouton, 1981.

8. Culpeper J. Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness // *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 1996.

9. Deutschmann M. Apologising in British English. Umeå: Umeå University, 2003.

10. Edmondson W. On Saying You're Sorry // *Conversational Routine. Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*, ed. by F. Coulmas. The Hague: Mouton, 1981.

11. Flynn G. Gone Girl. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2012.

12. Fraser B. On Apologizing // *Conversational Routine. Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*, ed. by F. Coulmas. The Hague: Mouton, 1981.

13. Great Ideas: Apologies that aren't Really Apologies, 4 November 2008 // URL: http://www.profitguide.com/manage-grow/leadership/great-ideas-apologies-that-arent-really-apologies-29482/ (Retrieved January 17, 2016)

14. Green J. The Fault in Our Stars. New York: Dutton Books, 2012.

15. Grice H. P. Logic and Conversation // *Syntax and Semantics*, ed. by Cole P. and J. Morgan, vol. 3. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

16. Goffman E. Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order. London: Penguin, 1971.

17. Holmes J. Apologies in New Zealand English // *Language in Society* 19 (2), 1990.

18. Lakoff R. Nine Ways of Looking at Apologies // *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis,* (eds.) by Schiffrin D., Tannen D. and H. E. Hamilton. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003.

19. Lazare A. On Apology. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

20. Leech G. Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman, 1983.

21. Leech G. The Pragmatics of Politeness. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

22. Macleod L. H. A Time for Apologies: the Legal and Ethical Implications of Apologies in Civil Cases. Toronto, Ontario, 2008.

23. Mattson Bean J., Johnstone B. Workplace Reasons for Saying You're Sorry: Discourse Task Management and Apology in Telephone Interviews // *Discourse processes 17*, 1994.

24. Meier A. J. Apologies: What do We Know? // *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1998.

25. Mihai M. Apology // URL: http://www.iep.utm.edu/apology/ (Retrieved July 30, 2015)

26. Mir M. Do We All Apologize the Same? An Empirical Study on the Act of Apologizing by Spanish Speakers Learning English // *Pragmatics and Language Learning 3*, 1992.

27. Ogiermann E. An Apologising in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009.

28. Olshtain E. Apologies across Languages // *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies,* (eds.) Blum-Kulka S., House J. and G. Kasper. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1989.

29. Owen M. Apologies and Remedial Interchanges. A Study of Language Use in Social Interaction. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton, 1983.

30. Paronyan Sh. Pragmatics. Yerevan, 2012.

31. Sanz E. National Apology: Mapping the Complexities of Validity, ed. by Tomlinson J. Siem Reap: Centre for Peace and Conflict studies, 2012.

32. Searle J. R. Speech Acts. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

33. Tavuchis N. Mea Culpa: A Sociology of Apology and Reconciliation, Stanford, *CA:* Stanford University Press, 1991.

34. Transcript of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's Apology to the Forgotten Australians and Former Child Migrants // URL: http://www.dhs. vic.gov.au/__data /assets/pdf_ file/0004/ 582187/Transcript-of-PM-Kevin-Rudd-Forgotten-Australians-apology.pdf/ (Retrieved January 17, 2016)

35. Trosborg A. Interlanguage Pragmatics. Requests, Complaints and Apologies (Studies in Anthropological Linguistics). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995.

36. Плетнева Е. А. Коммуникативно-прагматический диапазон формул извинения в британской языковой культуре: *Автореф. ... канд. дис.*, Воронеж, 2009 // Электр. ресурс: http://www.aspirant. vsu. ru/ref. php?cand=1361

37. Ратмайр Р. Прагматика извинения: сравнительное исследование на материале русского языка и русской культуры, пер. Е. Араловой. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2003.

38. Трофимова Н. А. Экспрессивные речевые акты: Семантический, прагматический, грамматический анализ. СПб.: Изд-во ВВМ, 2008.

Ն. ԹԱՄՈՅԱՆ – *Ներողություն հայցում արտահայտող իրադրությունների դասակարգում.* – Ներողություն հայցումը, հանդիսանալով միջանձնային հարաբերությունների կարգավորման կարևոր միջոց, նպաստում է հաղորդակիցների միջև ներդաշնակ հարաբերությունների վերականգնմանը և պահպանմանը: Ներողություն հայցումը հաճախ դիտվում է որպես հիբրիդային խոսքային ակտ, որն իր մեջ ներառում է տարբեր հաղորդակցական մտադրություններ: Սույն հոդվածում փորձ է արվում դասակարգել ներողություն հայցում պարունակող հիմնական խոսքային իրադրությունները, ինչպես նաև ներկայացնել այս իրադրությունների կառուցվածքային, գործառութային, հաղորդակցական և գործաբանական որոշ առանձնահատկություններ:

Բանալի բառեր. ներողություն հայցում, հաղորդակցական ներդաշնակություն, խոսքային ակտ, նախատիպային խոսքային իրադրություն, անկեղծության նախապայման, հաղորդակցական ծիսակարգեր, խոսքային քաղաքավարության սկզբունք

Н. ТАМОЯН – *Таксономия речевых ситуаций извинения.* – Извинение, являясь важным способом регулирования межличностных отношений, способствует восстановлению и сохранению гармоничных отношений между собеседниками. Извинение часто рассматривается как гибридный речевой акт, интегрирующий ряд разных коммуникативных интенций. В данной статье делается попытка классифицировать основные ситуации извинения, а также представить некоторые структурные, функциональные и коммуникативно-прагматические особенности этих ситуаций.

Ключевые слова: извинение, коммуникативная гармония, речевой акт, прототипическая речевая ситуация, условие искренности, коммуникативные ритуалы, принцип вежливости