Slavica Perović[1]

APOLOGISING AND THE MONTENEGRIN CULTURAL SCRIPT

Abstract: *The paper deals with the representation of the speech act of apology through cultural scripts. The research has been done on a corpus of students' responses gathered through an interview of the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) type. The speech act of apology is analysed within the politeness theory originated by Brown and Levinson (1987) and the category of 'face'. The complexity and specificity of this speech act in Montenegrin led us to establish six semantic components of apologizing for which we devised cultural scripts. Furthermore, two broad categories of apologies were identified: non-verbal and verbal which we labelled 'to do is to say' and 'to say is to do' respectively, which further resulted in the creation of two master scripts. The analysis in this paper relies heavily on the idea of cultural scripts developed by Anna Wierzbicka and Cliff Goddard, executed through the semantic primes of Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM).*

Key words: *NSM, cultural script, apologies, Montenegro, speech act, verbal, non-verbal*

1. The Speech act of apology

In this paper we deal with the speech act of apology within the theory of cultural scripts and the focus of our attention is the interlocutor who commits the verbal offence and does the harm to the other person. This kind of behaviour normally requires a compensatory phrase of apology to "grease the social wheel" (Lakoff 2003) and the acceptance of responsibility for it.

In his ground-breaking work on speech acts Searle classified apologies as expressive illocutionary acts, along with thanking, congratulating, condoling, deploring, and welcoming (1976). Norrick further elaborated on Searle's expressive illocutionary acts analysing apologies through various parameters like the factive, value judgement and role identification conditions which enabled him to discuss the social and, in particular, the emotional component of these acts (1978).

[1] Full Professor (retired), University of Montenegro.

In the field of pragmatics, Blum-Kulka and Olshtin devised a powerful methodology for the analysis of the speech act of apology in their seminal paper from 1984 introducing the category of IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device), which many subsequent researchers have adopted. Holmes' 1990 paper on apologies in New Zealand English offered a slightly different methodology, having established a corpus of 183 remedial exchanges. Holmes emphasises the function of apologies in interpersonal communication as a remedy for an offense and the restoration of social equilibrium or harmony, an idea also found in Edmondson (1981, 280) and Leech (1983, 125). She defines apologies as primarily social acts conveying affective meaning and her definition (1990, 159) recognises the restriction of the term *apology* to an expression such as *sorry* and *apologise*, and takes into account Goffman's reference to *remedy* (1971, 140) pointing out the one essential element – *remedial interchange*. Owen (1983) also selected both *sorry* and *apologise* as IFIDs of apology. Unlike the above-mentioned proponents of pragmatic theory, Spencer-Oatey, in accordance with her interpretation of apologies as rapport management strategy, qualifies them as "typically post-event speech acts", in the sense that some kind of offence or violation of social norms has taken place (Spencer-Oatey 2008, 19). The focus of her analysis is not upon remedy, it is upon *rapport* (Spencer-Oatey 2002).

Apologies constitute highly face threatening acts. Issues of controversy in politeness theory never really brought into negligence of Brown and Levinson's theory on politeness, rather, they built on it. 'Politeness' can be explained in terms of conversational maxims (Leech 1983) and it can be accounted for through Grice's Cooperative Principle (Grice 1975, 1978, 1981). In spite of the criticism that Brown and Levinson's theory has received over the years, their theory still serves as a theoretical framework for research into cross cultural pragmatics (Ogiermann 2009, 20; O'Driscoll 2007, 464).

According to the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) the key concept is that of 'face', which is also a strong motivation for those politeness strategies which fall within the domain of facework. They suggest that each person has a "public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (Brown and Levinson 1987, 61). 'Face' is of great importance because it

can be lost, maintained and enhanced, that is why some communicative, i.e. speech acts can be face threatening (FTA).

2. Cultural scripts and the NSM

To be able to execute our analysis we have relied on the postulates of Wierzbicka's (1992, 1999a, 1999b, 2003,), Goddarad's (1994, 1996, 2003, 2004) and Goddard and Wierzbicka 1995) research into Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) and cultural scripts. In their research they closely relate linguistic forms on the one hand and the cultural milieu in which these linguistic forms are used and which condition them on the other. Wierzbicka's cultural script known as 'compelling' and 'non-compelling', whose opposite category is 'personal autonomy', will serve as the wider theoretical framework within which we will explain the speech act of apology. This basic scenario is founded primarily on the mental primitive expressed by the verb *think* (Godard and Karlsson 2004), from which are derived the mental predicates *feel* and *expect*, which further suggests that the apology is cognitively based on the mental process of thought and expectation, as well as cognitively-based emotions, since our findings also indicate a direct connection between the verbal act of apology and the affective aspects of the human being. It has allowed us to acquire the perspective of a cultural insider (Wierzbicka 2003, 402), a scope of utmost generality of approach and a focus on actual norms and practices of the speech act in question. In Wierzbicka's terminology, cultural scripts are "self-explanatory semantic formulae couched in terms of universal semantic primitives" (2003, 108) and interpretative backdrop for social action in Goddard's (2002).

The cultural script model serves as a naïve axiology of what is permitted in speech and what is not and also articulates this perspective in a non-technical way. In pragmatic theory cultural script "refers to a powerful new technique for articulating cultural norms, values and practices in terms which are clear, precise, and accessible to cultural insiders and to cultural outsiders alike" (Goddard and Wierzbicka 2004, 153). It is turned into a hermetic, yet flexible metalanguage which comprises simple words and grammatical patterns that can be found in all languages. It consists of an exhaustive list of words, semantic primitives, but also allows a grammar of somewhat limited scope which at the most basic level allows the description

of the universal nature of cross-cultural phenomena (Goddard and Wierzbicka 1995).

Substantives:	I, YOU, SOMEONE, PEOPLE, SOMETHING/THING, BODY
Determiners:	THIS, THE SAME, OTHER
Quantifiers:	ONE, TWO, SOME, ALL, MUCH, MANY
Evaluators:	GOOD, BAD
Descriptors:	BIG, SMALL
Mental predicates:	THINK, KNOW, WANT, FEEL, SEE, HEAR
Speech:	SAY, WORDS, TRUE
Actions, events, movement:	DO, HAPPEN, MOVE
Existence and possession:	THERE IS, HAVE
Life and death:	LIVE, DIE
Time:	WHEN/TIME, NOW, BEFORE, AFTER, A LONG TIME, A SHORT TIME, FOR SOME TIME, MOMENT
Space:	WHERE/PLACE, HERE, ABOVE, BELOW, FAR, NEAR, SIDE, INSIDE, TOUCHING (CONTACT)
Logical concepts:	NOT, MAYBE, CAN, BECAUSE, IF
Intensifier, augmentor:	VERY, MORE
Taxonomy, partonomy:	KIND OF, PART OF
Similarity:	LIKE

Table 1. Table of semantic primes (Wierzbicka, 2003: 8)

3. Data and methodology

The paper is based on a corpus of responses to questions given by around 600 students of the University of Montenegro who were surveyed and whose ages ranged approximately between 19 and 21 years. The responses were elicited on the basis of the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) questionnaire which was devised after Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). It comprised six structured questions divided into two sets. The first set elicited responses to questions of a multiple choice type by circling the correct answer, while the second set was a discourse completion test where interviewees supplied a written answer. Three precisely outlined situations required one of the performative verbs of apology which would constitute the compensatory phrase of apology (IFID). Two such items in the test dealt with informal situations where emotional bonds were

dominant (mother and girlfriend/boyfriend), the third being entirely formal and hierarchical. We also included some control interviews which served as a tool for random checking of the obtained results.

Various types and kinds of IFIDs have best been obtained through the DCT, also called 'production questionnaire' (Ogiermann 2009, 67) which has been best put to use in large projects like CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Kasper 2000, 325; Barron 2003, 84). Despite some limitations of DTC, for example, the absence of prosodic features like pitch or intonation, or kinesic features e.g. facial expressions, posture, gestures, "data elicited with DCTs are consistent with naturally occurring data, at least in the main patters and formulas" (Billmyer and Varghese 2000, 518).

The discourse perspective of Lakoff (2003) best complements the definitions of Holmes (1990), Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) and others from the pragmatic theory. The speech act of apology is *face threatening* because of some *harm* or *wrongdoing* performed in naturally occurring interaction which leads to *admittance* of and taking *responsibility* for it. The logical consequence is *abasement* (*mortification*) produced in the form of a *compensatory phrase* (*of an apology*) usually accompanied by the *abjuration of bad behaviour* (Lakoff 2003; Sahragard 2003). *Regret* for doing it is presupposed and the actual *undoing the harm* is expected. Regarding the degree of face threat, these elements of apology can be divided into three *low face threat* and three *high face threat* pragmatic strategies. The Montenegrin cultural script of *low face threat* would comprise the following semantic components: *responsibility*, *regret*, and *abjuration of bad behaviour*. *High face threat* would encompass *admittance*, *abasement*, and *undoing the harm*. We devised individual cultural scripts for each of them.

4. The lexicon of apology

In our earlier work (Perović 2008, 2009, 2011) in creating general cultural scripts of apology in Montenegro we combined the set of empirically established semantic primes of the NSM type proposed by Wierzbicka and Goddard with the subset of lexemes (not allolexes) which gave rise to an inclusive description. This subset comprised lexemes like *harm*, *face*, *threaten*, *express,* which were all pertinent for this speech act and

which could be glossed in Montenegrin having more or less the same elements of semantic componential analysis.

The most direct manifestation of apology is IFID, which functions as a routine, formulaic expression of apology. Next, there is the statement without IFID or with it, containing mention or reference to one or more elements from the aforementioned collection of specified propositions, but not containing an explicit performative verb of apology. The third way, very common in our corpus, was the non-verbal or affective mode. Also, we had instances of non-apologising: *I never apologise.*

The following table gives the percentage of apologies in the corpus:

Type	%
1. Verbally	72%
2. Non-verbally	23%
3. The use of *lie* and *forget* as IFID	3%
4. Did not apologise	2%

Table 1. Type of apology

4.1 Low face threat

Contrary to Holmes who stated that "almost all apology exchanges involved an explicit apology" (Holmes, 1990, 155), around 30% of our respondents did not use explicit apology. The presence or absence of the performative verb in apology was in positive correlation with the level of their directness i.e. indirectness in conveying politeness in Montenegrin, which is a Slavic language. (Ogiermann (2009, 21) has a different stand springing from the claim that Polish and Russian belong to positive politeness cultures.) The degree of conventionalism is taken as a parameter of pertinence for IFID identification in speech act of apology - the greater indirectness, the lower the face threat. The tables that follow offer evidence on the existence of the direct, conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect apologies. Non-conventional indirect examples are very close to the non-verbal, i.e. indirect apologising. We identified the combination of strategies used in apologies (given in italic) and supplied their exemplification.

a) *The speech act of apology*	1. Aplogise because of my empty hands. 2. Sorry darling, didn't have time. 3. Forgive me. Won't be repeated.
b) *Intensification of illocution*	4. Pardon me, pardon me, I'm really sorry. 5. Sorry, sorry, but you are getting the present tomorrow. 6. I do, I do apologise. Tomorrow, I promise.

Table 2. Direct apologies – explicit presence of IFID

The most frequent compensatory phrase was *izvini* (apologise), then, *žao mi je* (sorry) and not so infrequently the expression *oprosti mi* (forgive me), which we interchangeably translated as *pardon me*. Oprosti mi is similar to Russian *prostite* (*prošu proščenija*), which Larina (2003, 216) associates with the linguistic repertoire of older generations. We cannot support that, we can say that forgiveness as an apology expressions were not as frequent as the others.

4.1.1 Responsibility

       a. X feels something like this:
       b. Sometimes some things happen
       c. 'I did something bad to Y
       d. I have to think about that (those things)
       e. I know that people want me to do/say something'
       f. Because of that X wants Y to know how he feels
       g. People will think well of X because of that

This script opens with the mental verb of *feeling* because responsibility (in apologies) is dominantly a feeling, a personal, not a collective one. The phrase *I feel responsible* is supported by many responses in the corpus: *I deeply apologise*; *Sorry, sorry*; *I am so very sorry* (Table 2). In NSM it can be described through the existential and possessive *have*: *to have a responsibility to somebody*. Component (b) states a fact of life, i.e. the intentional or unintentional harm or wrongdoing which in communication inevitably happen. As a consequence, an individual *feels responsible* and *has a responsibility* towards someone. When it comes to a specific interpersonal relationship, responsibility starts with admittance that something bad happened to someone in an agentive way (c), specifically, that one person did something

bad to another. In (d) we introduced the mental predicate *think* because it means taking a stand. Mental predicates *know* and *think* are employed here because responsibility leading to an apology comes as a result of both cognitive and emotional processes. *Know* in (e) is also awareness that people will react well, responsibility is observed as a positive value. One of the answers in the corpus was: *I apologise <u>when</u> I know I am wrong.* (f) is reactive, and it reveals a person who is aware of his/her actions and deeds and announces readiness to take the blame, which is a near-synonym for responsibility. (g) speaks of social values and the general attitude of expectancy that someone will take the blame when there is a reason for doing so. It is glossed in the norm: *people will think good of me.* The respondents frequently wrote that they apologise *because of their home education* and *out of solidarity*. It means that taking responsibility is a norm widely accepted and appreciated. To deserve esteem and respect one has to be responsible.

The following script of *regret* is also introduced with the mental predicate *feel*. *Regret* is defined as "a feeling of sadness about something sad or wrong or about a mistake that you have made, and a wish that it could have been different and better" (*Cambridge Dictionary online* http://dictionary.cambridge.org/). The lexicon entry includes *sadness, sad, wrong, mistake*, and the second conditional *could have been* emphasises non-factuality – in reality nothing good happened – which all falls within the lexicon of apology, i.e. *feeling of contrition* and *harm*.

4.1.2 Regret

a. X feels something like this:
b. 'Something bad happened to Y
c. I did not want that to happen
d. Because of this I feel very bad
e. Because of this I can say I feel bad'
f. X does not want Y to feel bad because of X
g. People will think well of X because of that

X regrets something done to Y. Regret is more interpersonal than responsibility (one can feel responsibility for ozone depletion, but will not regret it), that is why the semantic formula proceeds with feelings (though almost always thoughts,

too) of X towards Y (b). Components (c) and (d) elaborate on that feeling as a result of something unwanted and undesired leading to a feeling of contrition. *Regret* quite agrees with the compassionate and empathic trait of Montenegrins because they will extend proof of sorrowful feelings on any occasion, whether verbally or non-verbally, if they deem it proper. In Polish, too, the explicit expression of regret *żałuję* (*I regret*) is generally recognised to serve as an apology (Ożóg 1990; Zgółkowie 1992). In Montenegrin a similar verb, *žao mi je*, would be a more indirect apology realisation. The measure of what is 'deemed proper' is always diagnosed through the fact of whether something is seen as a threat to face or not. Component (e) specifically emphasises the possibility of *saying*, as a verbalised form, though *regret* can be shown non-verbally too, whereas (f) builds on the interpersonal dynamics. (f) again intensifies the interpersonal setting and the desire for the harm to be annulled or at least undone. The last component (g), like the last one in the previous script, is emphasis of the importance of other people's opinion, or in Freudian terms, of *super ego*. Any response from Table 2 or 3 would be suitable.

Once somebody has cultivated *responsibility* and *regret* as a kind of reaction to the harm done, it is only natural to expect *renunciation (on oath)* or *solemn rejection* which are understood to be synonymous with *abjuration of bad behaviour*. The following is a general script which encodes the cause and consequence of apologies.

4.1.3 Abjuration of bad behaviour

> [people think like this]:
> When I do something wrong
> I feel bad about it
> It is good to say
> 'It will not happen again'
> Because of that people will say good things about you

To smooth the relationship and restore it to the previous position one has to renounce bad behaviour publicly in the form of a promise (possibly accompanied by an oath) or to do whatever it takes to ease the situation and return it to the position before the harm was been done. The social norm

encourages this behaviour as it is stated in the line *it is good to say 'I will not happen again'*. Such instances were numerous in the corpus: *it won't happen again, I promise/ I promise it won't happen again, at least till next time/ After Bruce Willis you don't need a melodrama. We'll do that tomorrow*, etc. (Table 3). The last component of the script is again the general opinion *because of that people will say good things about you*. This strategy of courtesy is strongly encouraged, though, as we have seen, in some responses it may have a disingenuous note – *at least till next time*.

c) Augmentation of illocution	7. I love you. Kiss. I'm getting a big surprise ready for you tomorrow.
d) Accumulation of illocution	8. Honey, the eighth wonder of the world just happened! I didn't buy a present today, but I'll do it tomorrow
e) Explanation and promise	9. I didn't buy you anything, but tomorrow I'm taking you to dinner.
f) Command or advice	10. Never mind presents, love is what matters.
g) Promise instead of apology	11. Mother, I'm bringing you the film tomorrow. 12. Oh man, I forgot to bring you the film again. Here, I promise I'll do it tomorrow. 13. I tell her I forgot and that I'll bring it when I remember. 14. I'm bringing you the film tomorrow.
h) Excuse instead of apology	15. I say, "the shop was closed."
i) Apology and explanation	16. Pardon me, I'm in too much of a rush, the book got left on the table.
j) Apology with intensification + explanation + promise	17. I'm really sorry, I forgot. I'll definitely bring it next time.
k) Advice and promise	18. After Bruce Willis you don't need a melodrama. We'll do that tomorrow.
l) Promise	19. It won't happen again, I promise. 20. Honey, forgive me this once. 21. I promise it won't happen again, at least till next time.
m) Action and	22. I kiss her and say, "we'll do it tomorrow".

speech act	
n) Type is token	23. I'm your present. 24. I've got some red ribbons at home. I get one, tie it round my head and say, "I'm your present". 25. What better gift do you want than me!
o) Self-deprecation	26. I can't believe it! This is the most stupid thing I've done in my life! 27. I'm a real hopeless case. 28. Boy, I'm really stupid!

Table 3. Conventionally indirect apologies

4.2 High face threat

Admittance in this semantic componential analysis of apology belongs to high face threat and it is believed to be substantially different from *regret* and *responsibility* because it must be demonstrated publicly (the public and private spheres are strongly divided in Montenegrin culture). It is glossed in Montenegrin as *priznanje* and has more or less the same components of meaning as in English. *Priznanje*, like *admittance*, is a serious thing which means 'to concede as true or valid' or, to give an example, a person '*admitted* making a mistake'. It is highly face threatening, very direct, not conventionalised at all, and is an aspect of negative face-work. The greater the indirectness, the more conventionalised the phrase of apology is. The following response was highly illustrative: *I try and think of something where I won't have to apologise, and if not… ??? Man, tough question!* (cf. Tables 3 and 4) The students found it 'tough' to admit publicly that they are wrong, which is a form of admittance. One respondent wrote: *I apologise only when I am made to*.

4.2.1 Admittance

a. X thinks something like this:
b. 'I did something bad to Y
c. That is bad of me'
d. X thinks Y will think something bad about X
e. X can do something
f. X feels that X has to say/do about what happened
g. Some people will think well of X because of that

p) Self-reflection	29. I do not say anything. I forgot. What can I

	do! I'll get it for her tomorrow for sure.
q) Meta-apology	30. I feel so bad that I can't even apologise
r) Awareness of the situation	31. Mother, 'Die Hard III' is a better film. 32. Excellent film! 33. Well done, Mum! 34. What do you want melodrama for when you've got Bruce Willis!
s) Wit	35. If Bruce Willis had played in 'Titanic' he would have saved all the passengers.
t) Exclamation	36. Ooops!
u) Meta-discourse	37. I try and think of something where I won't have to apologise, and if not… ??? Man, tough question! 38. There's no apology needed there, loves understands all if it's sincere.
v) Propositional optionality	39. I lie, what else can I do?

Table 4. Non-conventionally indirect apologies

The script of *admittance* starts with the verb of mental disposition *think* (a) which proceeds with the result of that cognitive action as direct words of admittance. At the same time it is personal, with no component of *some bad things happen* like in the *regret* and *responsibility* script. Also, it is interpersonal, the offended person Y is present right away in the script (b). Element (c) is especially relevant as it augments the already stated guilt in (b) revealing the possibility of introspection and critical insight into oneself. As a result there is component (d) which again reinforces the opinion of the injured party. Component (e) is especially important for the script because it utilises one of the logical concepts from the NSM, namely, *can. Can* as a modal has the semantics of ability and possibility, but not certainty. X *can* do something and there is a high possibility he will. That is the element of the overall script of apology that accounts for a certain number of those who do not apologise at all or do it non-verbally. (f) specifies the form of admittance which, following the results of the research, must have the form of do/say as some admittance is verbalised, some not. Some elicited responses contained several speech acts: *honey, the eighth wonder of the world just happened! I didn't buy a present today, but I'll do it tomorrow (explanation and promise)* (Table 3).

As a result of all these components of admittance in the Montenegrin cultural script of apology there is this final line (g) specifying public opinion. It will not be unanimous because some people will think well of X because of it, not all. In reality there may be a lavish verbal form of admittance/abasement/apology without actual admitting, mortification or apologising. Our corpus testifies to that in abundance, for example, *forget about presents, love counts; I am your present; oooops; you'll forgive me if you love me* etc. (Tables 3 and 4).

Perhaps the most face threatening component of the apology script in Montenegro is *abasement*. It is glossed as *poniženje* in Montenegrin and it has a somewhat different meaning than in English. Namely, the root of the word in English is *base* which in this context means something low and not prestigious. *Poniženje* comes from *poniziti* which means *učiniti nižim* (*Rečnik srpskoga jezika* [Dictionary of Serbian Language], 2007, 972). It encodes not only being *low* or *at the base of something* but also comparison – *being lower than somebody else*. The comparison inherent in *poniženje* lacks true equivalency in *abasement*. In Montenegrin it would be harder to go through *poniženje* than for an Anglo person to go through *abasement*.

4.2.2 Poniženje/Abasement

a. X knows something like this:
b. 'I caused something bad to happen to Y
c. Y will feel bad because of that'
d. Because of this X knows
e. 'Y is right to feel bad because of me'
f. Because of that X feels he has to do/say something
g. X can/cannot do something about it
h. After X does it some people will/will not say some bad things about X because of this

We started this script with the verb which signifies the strongest cognitive potential of certainty of all verbs of mental predicate in NSM – *to know*. It presupposes awareness of the harm done to Y (b) which states its interpersonal nature. Abasement is only possible relative to some other person. Knowing refers to X's consciousness of the emotional state of Y who suffers harm and reveals X as a moral person (c). X does not

want his mother, girlfriend or lecturer to feel bad and he/she empathises with them. That feeling of contrition produces a reaction of further awareness (d) that Y is right to feel bad. The three last components represent the essence of the abasement script. (f) is the feeling that he/she has to undertake something, (g) states that it is possible, but not certain, represented in *can/cannot do something about it*. The corpus offered a rich repertoire of both – elaborate phrasing of actual apology: *pardon me, pardon me, I am really sorry*, and the elaborate phrasing of its absence: *if Bruce Willis had acted in the 'Titanic' he would have saved all the passengers or never mind presents, love is what matters; I know you understand me* (Tables 2, 3 and 4). Lastly, (h) intensifies or augments the public standpoint on that particular aspect of apologising leading to actual reaction. Abasement causes inhibition in behaviour, some people will certainly say some bad things about X because of his adopted strategy of apologising.

This fragmentised picture of the act of apology is rounded off with the last element of apology – *undoing the harm*. It is the final act and the most obvious in terms of public humiliation, as apologies are often regarded in the Montenegrin cultural script. That is the reason why this script is general, not broken down into its possible constituent semantic elements. The script is limited in scope, though, and its first component contains the phrase *some people*. The reason is found in figures of the corpus.

4.2.3 Undo the harm

> [some people think like this]:
> When I do/say something bad
> It is good to do/say something
> That will make things better

The script reflects the data of the research: *doing* or *saying* something bad causes *doing* or *saying* something that will make things better. But, there is no parallelism between this courteous cause and consequence. Some harm is not undone, some apologies not delivered. But if *things become better* and the *situation* is *restored* the mission of apologies is accomplished. Once the phrase of apology is uttered the abasement is sealed, admittance signed and undoing of the harm performed. Cross-

culturally, not only in Montenegro (cf. Tanaka, Spencer-Oatey, Cray 2008; Sugimoto 1998).

5. *To do is to say* **master script**

Our research showed that apologies could be divided into two groups on the basis of their ratio of occurrence. Those figures of apology in our research – roughly 30% vs. 70% - guided us to establish two master scripts of apology which we named: *to do is to say* and *to say is to do* respectively.

To do is to say master script we also call the pragmatic strategy of compensation because it excludes verbal compensation form apologies. The students surveyed raised the strategies of apology to a higher pragmatic level – many of them lacked the performative verb. The reasons for this are manifold, ranging from high face threat to the lack of necessity to produce the compensatory phrase verbally because that does not constitute an individual's norm of courtesy and intimacy does not demand it. We find the following words of conventional ethnographic description very supportive of our linguistic analysis: "The social value system is predicated on the dignity of the individual and ideally all social behaviour is regulated in such a way as to preserve one's *amour propre* and to avoid disturbing the same feeling of dignity and self-esteem in others" (Vreeland et al. 1977, 117). *To do is to say* is such a cultural script. It stands in strong opposition to Anglocentric cultural norms and values because they would require substantive apology almost exclusively. Some of the responses were: *I just approach and kiss her; Here is a kiss! There you go; I hug and kiss her; I give her a significant look; I give her a disarming smile* etc. (cf. Wierzbicka 1986, 1999a). In these examples the recipient of this affection is obviously a female person. It can be both mother and girlfriend.

5.1 To do is to say

> [people think like this]:
> When I do/say something bad
> I feel bad because of that
> It is good to do something
> Something good will happen because of that
> People will know what I feel
> People will think well of me

This master script uses the concept of *people* to open with, thus supporting both the compelling spirit cherished in the community and closeness among emotionally related people. We introduced into the linguistic analysis of the speech act cognitive categories of emotion, based on verbs of mental predication, primarily *think*, which is derived from *feel*. Students would even resort to a written mode: *I don't say anything, rather I go and buy a present the following day and write an apology on a little piece of paper.* The interpersonal component is evident in the verb of mental disposition: *people will know how I feel.*

5.2 Cognitively based emotions

A large proportion of emotions with the pragmatic use of apology in our corpus can be explained as a communication style with the purpose to harmonize the relationship. Emotions are referred to as "a minimisation of risk of confrontation" (Lakoff 1979, 102) or having the role to contribute to "smooth communication" Ide (1989, 225), whereas Leech spoke of "social equilibrium and friendly relations" (1983, 82). Goffman (1967, 6-8) went a step further and referred to the 'feelings' as a quality attached to face, such as feeling good, bad, hurt, ashamed, embarrassed and chagrined (2011, 5-6). In the dichotomy: positive politeness – negative politeness Brown and Levinson (1987, 1) ascribed emotions the positive quality and referred to them as the need to disarm potential aggression but they did not go into any further elaboration. Within pragmatic theory Spencer-Oatey has explored the nature of "rapport-sensitive" incidents and in her 2011 paper on conceptualising the relational in pragmatics she states that "an implicit thread running through nearly all this 'relational' research is the role of emotions" (2011, 5-6).

Wierzbicka deals with emotions through NSM lexicon. She suggested that the mental lexicon of the verb *think* can be applied to the cognitive domain of emotions, thus what was *thought* of became obvious through what was *shown*. The semantic prime *feel* is a cognitively based emotion (Wierzbicka 1999a, 54-55).

Our corpus supports this through many students' responses. Physically observed reactions suggesting that information is being communicated as to how a person feels in the act of apology or delivering it *was* an apology. It happens

within family, between emotionally related individuals where egalitarian status means lack of hierarchy and where love means that you do not have to apologise.

w) Tenderness - hug, kisses	40. I just approach and kiss her 41. I hug and kiss her 42. Here's a kiss. There you go!
x) Bodily reaction	43. I stand there with tears in my eyes
y) Gesture - disarming smile, slap my forehead, start to wring my hands, start pacing on the spot	44. I apologise in an endearing little voice and wring my hands 45. Slap your forehead, hug your mother/ girlfriend
z) Significant look (and statement)	46. Nothing! I would just look at her significantly and maybe (depending on my mood) say: "You're having fun, aren't you?" ('smiley' added)

Table 5. Emotions as IFID

The cultural scenario of a high level of respect toward emotions connected with apology we simply stated as follows:

5.3 Emotions as apology

[people think like this]:
When I think I have done bad to another person,
I feel something about this;
It is good if people see that I feel something
people will know what I feel

It is reciprocal – emotion for emotion. As noted by Brown and Levinson choices of communication style that people make influence interactional ethos leading to differences among sociocultural groups.

...societies, or sub-cultures within societies, differ in terms of what might be called 'ethos', the affective quality of interaction characteristic of members of a society. ... In some societies interactional ethos is generally warm, easy-going, friendly; in others it is stiff, formal, deferential (1987, 243).

As Spencer-Oatey suggested, the first group can be identified as positive-politeness societies, the other as negative-politeness societies (2008, 28). Montenegrins demonstrate a great deal of affection in interpersonal communication, though the entire society is more likely to be labelled negative-politeness society than the positive one. Obviously, participants and their relations define the sub patterns of behaviour. It is the family circle and the context of emotional ties (be it mother and a sibling or a boyfriend and a girlfriend) that is recognised by closeness and adequate power and distance management strategies. Though it was not the focus of our interest it is important to note here that apologising is gender sensitive in Montenegro. Men generally apologise less frequently and in a linguistically less marked manner.

The emotion of hurt is matched with the emotion of compensation for that bad emotion. Sometimes it is the emotion *plus* the compensatory phrase of apology, but quite frequently it is the emotion *instead* of it, i.e. *I apologise in an endearing little voice and wring my hands*. It is full of diminutives and hypocoristic expressions illustrating closeness, love and affection: <u>*Mummy*</u>, *don't break my head; ooops!* <u>*Mummy, I forgot;*</u> <u>*darling*</u>, *next time;* <u>*Little Violet*</u> *(Ljubičice), some other time; Oh, God! O.K. tomorrow*, etc.

6. *To say is to do* master script

To say is to do is another high-level or master script of apologies in our research. It was a dominant mode of apologising and the range of illocutionary forces of this speech act was immense (Tables 2, 3 and 4). The script goes like this:

6.1 To say is to do

> [people think like this]:
> When I do/say something bad
> I feel bad because of that
> It is good to say something
> Something good will happen because of that
> People will know what I feel
> People will think well of me

Like the one before, it opens with a generalised opinion, with the mental primitive *think*. The component *it is good to say something* distinguishes it from the script *to do is to say,* which does not allow the prototypical performative verb of saying. This script addresses social norms, it is at the same time an expression of good conduct and nice manners. Also, it bears a resemblance to the Anglo script where *to say* is almost *de rigueur* in apologising. The component *something good will happen because of that* establishes the cause-to-consequence relationship of someone's behaviour and the person's awareness of it. It is a kind of bidirectional obligation – an individual is supposed to obey the rules of social and cultural norms, in return the gratification is the acceptance of such behaviour. This semantic component is at the same time the central element of this cultural script. Apology is a convention. It is expected more than it is not. Give it to me and you will be pardoned. Not before that. The component *people will think well of me* shows people's judgment and emphasises the interpersonal conditioning that the offender and the offended have in the social environment. Also the component *people will know what I feel* reveals the value of self-awareness and the need to communicate the wish to others to ameliorate oneself through the act of apology. The component *people will know what I feel* means understanding and empathy.

7. Conclusion

The results of our elaboration justified the application of cultural scripts and NSM as the broadest possible framework for the analysis of apologising in Montenegro. The research using NSM led to the establishment of a specific cultural script of apologies in Montenegro. Our analysis has shown that this act threatens face to a great extent, and we believe that this general finding can be applied more or less to the whole Montenegrin population. This Montenegrin script might look extremely pessimistic and, if taken literally (and Anglocentrically), it would suggest a society full of heartless and rough-mannered individuals who were insensitive to others and who were lacking in knowledge of politeness strategies. But breaking down a single speech act into the scripts of six semantic components identified the sources of high FTA. The division into low face threat and high face threat shed light upon the core cultural and psychological mechanisms that trigger the particular form of

apology. The cultural scripts for each of the component parts of the speech act showed that the burden of rigid norms, pronounced traits of tradition, and a mentality that is in opposition to behaviour with the potential for personal humiliation result in the specific politeness strategies. The corpus provided evidence that students try to find a way of avoiding apology according to this rigid scenario but to be polite nevertheless. They demonstrated a strong consideration for the other in an attempt to undo the harm and in the desire to show respect and deference in communication.

The higher the FTA was, the higher the probability of a non-verbal apology. Since the corpus showed a lack of the verbal compensation phrase in a significant number of surveyed answers, and since something must surely perform this pragmatic function in communication, otherwise communication in Montenegro would be constantly chaotic, this function is carried out through a pragmatic strategy of compensation in the form of bodily reactions, gestures, acts, movements and emotions expressed. Very often the balance in communication is to be found between imposition on the one hand and deference on the other. The Montenegrin cultural code appreciates hierarchy, paternalism and an authoritarian attitude which do not often create a favourable ambiance for the egalitarian ethos, harmony and empathy. On the contrary, as our research shows, hierarchy will always try to establish one up and one down and every possibility for face to be endangered will lead to avoidance of apology. Equality of status will most probably be found in emotional bonds either of a sentimental nature or within the family which, by definition, lacks hierarchy.

The low level scripts are compatible with high level (master) scripts. Having departed from the criterion of low face threat and high face threat we isolated two master scripts of apologies in Montenegrin: *to do is to say* and *to say is to do*, the first being very indirect, the latter much less so. *To do is to say* saves face, and is in accordance with the cultural norm and the principles of politeness for the given cultural scenario and is equally acceptable to the listener and the speaker. *To say is to do* is shared as a cultural norm both among the Montenegrins and among all those who have apology as a universal. The illocutionary forces of the speech act demonstrated a vast array of indirectness. It is apparent that high FTA results in a high level

of indirectness, that is, a high degree of conventionalisation, which in the corpus was documented by an abundance of linguistic forms, including instances from the domain of the emotional or the ethical.

References

Barron, Anne. *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2003.

Billmyer, Kristine and Varghese, Manka. "Investigating Instrument-based Pragmatic Variability: Effects of Enhancing Discourse Completion Tests". *Applied Linguistics* 21 (2000): 517-552.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana and Elite Olshtain. "Requests and Apologies: A Cross-cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP)". *Applied Linguistics* 5 (3) (1984): 196-212.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Julian House and Gabriele Kasper (eds.) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood: Ablex, 1989.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen R. Levinson. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Edmondson, Willis. J. "On Saying you are Sorry". *Conversational routine*, ed. by F. Coulmas, 273-88. The Hague: Mouton, 1981.

Goddard, Cliff and Anna Wierzbicka. "Key Words, Culture, and Cognition". *Philosophica* 55 (1995). 37-67.

Goddard, Cliff. "The Universal Syntax of Semantic Primitives". *Language Sciences* 19 (3) (1997): 197-207.

---. "Semantic Theory and Semantic Universals", *Semantic and Lexical Universals*, ed. by A. Wierzbicka and C. Goddard, 7-29. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1994.

---. "Cultural Scripts and Communicative Style in Malay (Bahasa Melayu)". *Journal of Pragmatics* 27 (2) (1996): 183-201.

---. (ed.). "Studies in the Syntax of Universal Semantic Primitives". Special issue. *Language Sciences* 19 (3) (1997).

---. "Overcoming Terminological Ethnocentrism". IIAS Newsletter, No 27 (2002).

---. "Natural Semantic Metalanguage: Latest perspectives". *Theoretical Linguistics* 29 (3) (2003): 227-236.

---. "Cultural Scripts: A New Medium for Ethnopragmatic Instruction. Cognitive Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, and Foreign Language Teaching", ed. by Michel Achard and Susanne Niemeir, 145-165. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004.

Goddard, Cliff and Ann Wierzbicka. "Cultural Scripts: What are they and what are they Good for?" *Intercultural Pragmatics* 1-2 (2004): 153-166.

Goddard, Cliff and Karlsson, Susanna. "Re-thinking 'think': Contrastive Semantics of Swedish and English". In Christo Moskovsky (ed.), *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, 2004.

Goddard, Cliff and Anna. Wierzbicka. "Semantic Primes and Cultural Scripts in Language Learning and Intercultural Communication". In Gary Palmer and Farzad Sharifian (eds) *Applied Cultural Linguistics: Implications for second language learning and intercultural communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (2007): 105-124.

Goddard, Cliff. (ed). *Cross-Linguistic Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008.

Goffman, Erving. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.

---. *Relations in public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

Grice Paul, H. "Presupposition and Conversational Implicature". In: P. Cole (ed), *Radical Pragmatics*. Academic Press, New York, (1981): 183–198. Reprinted as ch.17 of Grice (1989): 269–282.

---. "Logic and Conversation, Syntax and Semantics", vol.3. In: P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds). *Academic Press,* 1975. Reprinted as ch.2 of Grice (1989): 22–40.

---. "Further Notes on Logic and Conversation, Syntax and Semantics", vol. 9. ed. by P. Cole, (1978): 41–57. Academic Press. Reprinted as ch. 3 of Grice, 1989.

Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes (eds). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986 [1972].

Holmes, Janet. "Apologies in New Zealand English". *Language in Society* 19 (2) (1990): 155-199.

Ide, Sachiko. "Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness". *Multilingua* 8 (2/3) (1989): 223-48.

Kasper, Gabriele. "Data collection in pragmatic research". In *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*, edited by Helen Spencer-Oatey (2000): 316-341. London: Continuum.

Lakoff, Robin T. "Stylistic Strategies within a Grammar of Style". In J. O. Orasanu, M. Slater, & L.A. Adler (eds) *Language, sex, and gender. Annals of the New York Academy of Science* (1979): 53-78.

---. "Nine Ways of Looking at Apologies: The Necessity for Interdisciplinary Theory and Method in Discourse Analysis". In D. Schiffrin, D Tannen and H. Hamilton (eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, (2003): 199-214.

Larina, Tat'jana V. *Kategorija Vežlivosti v Anglijskoj u Russkoj Kommunikativnych Kul'turach*. Moskva: Izdelatel'stvo Rossijskogo Universiteta Družby Narodov, 2003.

Leech, Geoffrey N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman, 1983.

Norrick, Neal R. "Expressive Illocutionary Acts". *Journal of Pragmatics* 2 (1978): 277-291.

O'Driscoll, Jim. "Brown & Levinson's face: How it can – and can't – Help us to Understand Interaction across Cultures". *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4 (2007): 463-492.

Ogiermann, Eva. *On Apologising in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009.

Ożóg, Kazimierz. *Zwroty Grzecznościowe Współczesnej Polszczyzny Mówionej (Na Materijale Języka Mówionego Mieszkańców Krakowa)* Kraków: PWN, 1990.

Perović, Slavica. "Apologizing and Cultural Scripts. Text Processing and Cognitive Technologies". *Cognitive Modeling in Linguistics*. Kazan: Kazan State University Press. Vol. 2 (2008): 123-140.

---. "Izvinjenja kao relativna univerzalija [Apologies as Relative Universals]". Jezik u akciji, (2009): 3-42. Podgorica: CID and Institut za strane jezike.

---. "Apologies – The Montenegrin Way of Dispreferred". *Selected Papers from the 19th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics (ISTAL 19)* (2011): 383-392.

Rečnik srpskog jezika [Dictionary of Serbian Language]. Beograd: Matica srpska, 2007.

Sahragard, Rahman. "A Cultural Script Analysis of a Politeness Feature in Persian". Presented at the *8th Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, Japan, 2003.

Searle, John R. "A Classification of Illocutionary Acts". *Language in Society* 5 (1976): 1-23.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. "Managing Interpersonal Rapport: Using Rapport Sensitive Incidents to Explore the Motivational Concerns Underlying the Management of Relations". *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (2002): 529-545.

---. "Face, (Im)Politeness and Rapport". In Spencer-Oatey, Helen (ed). *Culturally speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. London, New York: Continuum, (2008): 11-47.

---. "Conceptualising 'the relational' in Pragmatics: Insights from Metapragmatic Emotion and (im)Politeness Comments". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (2011): 3565-3578.

Sugimoto, Naomi. "'Sorry we Apologize so Much': Linguistic Factors Affecting Japanese and U.S. American Style of Apology". *Intercultural Communication Studies* VIII-1 (1998-9): 71-78.

Tanaka, Noriko, Helen Spencer-Oatey, and Ellen Cray. "Apologies in Japanese and English". In *Culturally Speaking* (ed) Helen Spencer-Oatey. Continuum, 2008.

Vreeland, Nena, et al. *Area Handbook for Malaysia, 3rd Edition*. Glen Rock N. J.: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1977.

Wierzbicka, Anna. "Human Emotions: Universal or Culture Specific?" *American Anthropologist, New Series*, Vol. 88, No. 3 (1986): 584-594.

---. *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

---. "Emotional universals". *Language Design* 2 (1999a): 23-69.

---. *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999b.

---. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interactions*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.

---. *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Zgółkowie, Halina I Tadeusz. *Językowy Savoir-Vivre*. Poznań: Kantor Wydawniczy SAWW, 1992.

APPENDIX
QUESTIONNAIRE

I Circle one answer.
1. Do you normally apologise?
a. yes   b. no   c. I never apologise   d. _____
2. a. In which situations do you apologise? b. Why?
a. _____
b. _____
3. a. How do you apologise? b. What is your phrase of apology?
a. _____
b. _____

II The following situations are examples from interpersonal behaviour. Supply your verbal reaction.
4. Your girlfriend/boyfriend has a birthday. You have not bought the anticipated present because of some urgent matter and all the shops are already closed. What do you say?
_____
_____
5. It is Saturday night. Your mother has asked you to bring her "Pretty Woman" from the video shop. You have forgotten, you come home late, and you find her watching "Die Hard III" on TV. What do you say?
_____
_____
6. A student has to meet his lecturer to return a book to him. To his horror, he realises that he has not got the book with him.
Lecturer: Marko, I hope you've brought me the book that I lent you.
Marko:
_____
_____
Professor: All right, but remember to bring it next time.