

THE ANALYSIS OF APOLOGY SPEECH ACT IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERARY WORKS

Sherimbetova Nargiza Nietbay qizi

**Karakalpak State University English language and literature department
assistant teacher**

shinnara1717@icloud.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17839139>

The speech act of apology is a crucial component of human communication, allowing a speaker to acknowledge wrongdoing, express regret, and repair social relations. According to Austin (1962), apologies are performative utterances where the speaker's intention is to convey remorse, often accompanied by a commitment to amend the situation. Searle (1969) classifies apologies as expressive speech acts, expressing psychological states such as regret, guilt, or sympathy. Trosborg (1995) provides a detailed framework for analyzing apology strategies, distinguishing between explicit and implicit, direct and indirect, and mitigated forms. [3,4,5]

This chapter examines five English examples from "*The Catcher in the Rye*" (Salinger, 1951) and five Uzbek examples from "*Tushda kechgan umrlar*" (O'tkir Hoshimov, 2019), focusing on their linguistic form, illocutionary force, and cultural nuances. The comparative analysis highlights how cultural and social norms shape the realization of apologies in literary discourse.

English Apologies: "*The Catcher in the Rye*" by Salinger [2]

The first example, "Look, sir. Don't worry about me. I mean it. I'll be all right. I'm just going through a phase right now. Everybody goes through phases and all, don't they?" (p. 8), combines offer of explanation with minimizing responsibility. Holden attempts to mitigate the perceived offense, indirectly apologizing while reassuring the hearer. Trosborg (1995) classifies this as an indirect, mitigated apology, while Searle (1969) interprets it as expressive of regret. Austin (1962) notes that it also functions partly as a commissive, promising future well-being.

The second example, "I would, I really would, but the thing is, I have to get going. I have to go right to the gym. Thanks, though. Thanks a lot, sir." (p. 9), demonstrates justification for inability to comply. The speaker acknowledges social expectation and provides a reason, softening the refusal.

The third example, "We got on the wrong subway. I had to keep getting up to look at a goddam map on the wall" (p. 11), is an explanatory apology. Holden acknowledges responsibility while contextualizing the fault, reflecting Trosborg's reason-giving strategy.

The fourth example, "I think I'm going blind... Mother darling, everything's getting so dark in here" (p. 12), is an implicit apology. Humor and exaggeration convey regret without a direct admission, a technique common in English literary pragmatics to soften social tension.

The fifth example, "He didn't mean to insult you... He didn't say it right or anything, but he didn't mean anything insulting" (p. 13), is apology by explanation, mitigating potential offense by attributing it to misunderstanding.

Observation: English apologies often rely on indirectness, explanation, and minimization rather than explicit verbal markers like "I'm sorry," reflecting a culture of subtle social negotiation.

Uzbek Apologies: "*Tushda kechgan umrlar*" by O'tkir Hoshimov [1]

The first Uzbek example, “Kechirasiz, grajdanin... o’rtoq Komissar... Bu gaplarni siz qayoqdan bilasiz?” (p. 22), is a direct apology combined with a question. The speaker uses the honorific “Kechirasiz” to express politeness, signaling regret while mitigating imposition.

The second example, “Kechirim so’ra!” (p. 20), functions as a directive speech act, instructing another to apologize. Trosborg (1995) highlights that such directives enforce social norms, showing a culturally embedded mechanism for regulating interpersonal behavior.

The third example, “Kechirasan... - Barzangi xirillab, yuzini o’girdi” (p. 20), is an explicit apology accompanied by a gesture, emphasizing expressive force. Non-verbal elements enhance sincerity and convey deference.

The fourth example, “Kechirasiz-ku, qanday qilib marhumning o’zidan...” (p. 29), demonstrates hesitant or mitigated apology, acknowledging responsibility in a sensitive context. Such indirectness balances social propriety with expression of regret.

The fifth example, “Ey poki parvardigor! Yakka-yu yagona bolam haqqi, iltijo qilaman. Otasining gunohidan o’t. Mahshar kunida do’zax azobidan o’zing xalos et!” (p. 29), is a ritualized, religiously framed apology. Cultural norms allow appeals to divine authority, combining deep regret with moral and spiritual persuasion.

Uzbek apologies tend to be explicit, culturally grounded, and often reinforced by gestures or ritual language, reflecting hierarchical and religiously informed social norms.

Comparative Analysis

Feature	English	Uzbek
Directness	Mostly indirect, mitigated	Mix of direct, explicit, and directive forms
Politeness Strategies	Explanation, minimization, humor	Honorifics, gestures, hesitation, religious appeal
Illocutionary Force	Expressive; sometimes commissive	Expressive; sometimes directive
Cultural Function	Softens social tension, maintains intimacy	Enforces moral/religious norms, conveys respect
Lexical Markers	“I’m sorry”, “I didn’t mean...”	“Kechirasiz”, “iltijo qilaman”, honorifics

Both languages use apology to repair social relations, but strategies differ. English emphasizes indirectness and relational softening, while Uzbek incorporates explicit apology, social hierarchy, and ritualized or religious appeals.

The analysis demonstrates that the speech act of apology is universally expressive, yet its linguistic realization is culturally mediated. English literary apologies often employ indirectness, humor, and explanations, softening social impact and maintaining relational balance. Uzbek apologies rely on explicit acknowledgment, politeness markers, gestures, and religious appeals, reflecting hierarchical and culturally sanctioned modes of expressing regret.

Understanding these patterns highlights the interplay of pragmatics, culture, and social norms, emphasizing that illocutionary force, mitigation, and relational strategies are shaped by both language conventions and the values of the speech community.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Hoshimov, O. *Tushda kechgan umrlar*. Toshkent: Ilm-Ziyo Zakovat, - 2019. - 20-29p.
2. Salinger, J. D. *The Catcher in the Rye*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, - 1951. - 8-13p.
3. Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, - 1962. - 14-25p.
4. Searle, J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, - 1969. - 33-110p.
5. Trosborg, A. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, - 1995. - 11-60p.
6. Grice, H. P. Logic and conversation. In Cole, P., & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, - 1975. - 41-58p.
7. Leech, G. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, - 1983. - 87-105p.
8. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. *Investigating Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, - 1989. - 12-80p.
9. Hofstede, G. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, - 2001. - 35-60p.
10. Triandis, H. C. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, - 1995. - 20-45p.