

Werk

Titel: Apology in Turkish: A functional approach

Autor: Erden , Aysu; Özyıldırım , Işıl

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2000

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0004 | LOG_0016

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Apology in Turkish: A functional approach

Aysu Erden & Işıl Özyıldırım

Erden, Aysu & Özyıldırım, Işıl 2000. Apology in Turkish: A functional approach. *Turkic Languages* 4, 31-44.

Apology forms which can be defined as “regretful acknowledgement of fault or failure; assurance that no offence was intended” have complex functional properties.

The functional approach carried out in the study of Turkish apology forms covers two main aspects of the communicative effects of the sentences and texts denoting indirect apology: (1) The *formation* in which the importance of the implications and conversational implicatures is undeniable and (2) the *interpretation* of communicative effects of sentences and texts in which two related phases become important: *Decoding* and *inferential* phases.

In this study, functions of the forms of apology having non-directive force are also explained through examples taken from various Turkish literary texts.

Aysu Erden & Işıl Özyıldırım, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Linguistics, Beytepe – Ankara, Turkey.

I. Introduction

Language is a complex and multidimensional concept. How language is organized in the human mind is still a matter of debate among many linguists. As Finegan & Besnier state “Language has been a focus of people’s curiosity and intellectual probing for millennia. Like other inquiries that are central to human experience, questions about language and how it functions are not new to the twentieth century” (1989:1).

However, it is clear that language is not only a grammatical or abstract system consisting of rules but also a tool for communication. People exchange their ideas, feelings, wishes, desires by using language. They communicate with others in society. Thus, it is possible to analyze language in different ways. Studies that are concerned with structural or formal properties of languages are generally known as formal or structural studies. On the other hand, those that are based on how language is used in a certain context are regarded as functional studies.

“Apology” can be defined as “regretful acknowledgement of fault or failure; assurance that no offence was intended.” (*The concise Oxford dictionary*, 1980: 43-44) Therefore, apology always carries with it the will to be forgiven and is expressed by different but limited linguistic forms. These are namely: *affet* ‘forgive me’; *kusura bakma* ‘forgive me / I’m sorry’; *bağışla* ‘forgive me’; *affedersin* ‘I’m sorry / excuse me / I beg your pardon / sorry’; *kusura kalma* ‘forgive me / I’m sorry’; *hoşgör* ‘be tolerant’; *pardon* ‘pardon me / excuse me’; *özür dilerim* ‘I apologize / I’m sorry’; *af*

dilerim 'I ask your pardon'; *affeyle* 'forgive me'; *affinızı istiyorum* 'I ask your pardon'; *affınıza sığınyorum* 'I beg to be excused'; *af buyur* 'excuse me'. This study deals with the forms of "apology" used in Turkish. In other words the aim will be to state the forms of apology in terms of their use.

The data have been collected from the different works of contemporary Turkish writers and are sometimes formed by our intuition as native speakers. In this way, the collected sentences are examined and evaluated in terms of their functional properties. The selected sentences are translated literally throughout the study.

II. A functional approach to the study of apology

1. Functionalism

Language is a social, more than an individual entity. Thus, it is not sufficient to study linguistic units structurally, as ends in themselves. It is necessary to consider linguistic as well as non-linguistic context to appreciate their communicative function. It is a fact that formal approaches did not attach importance to the meaning and functions of utterance. They were basically concerned with abstract grammatical items. Since language is used for communication, it is necessary to go beyond forms. It is not possible to understand what any speaker means without doing a functional study. Thus, a functional study of a language aims to find out the purpose for which an utterance or unit of language is used. Leech (1983: 48) expresses what is meant by a functional explanation as follows:

"It means explaining why a given phenomenon occurs by showing what its contribution is to a larger system of which it is itself a sub-system. As far as language is concerned, a functional theory is one which defines language as a form of communication, and therefore is concerned with showing how language works within the larger system of human society. Talk of purposes, ends, goals, plans also presupposes functionalism. When we discuss illocutions or meanings in terms of intentions or in terms of goals, we are indulging in a functional explanation."

The interpretation of sentences cannot be restricted to the linguistic forms alone but should also be considered in terms of psychological and social functions outside the ongoing discourse. In other words, the fact that sentences have speech act values could best be understood within a universe of discourse.

Austin stated that in issuing an utterance a speaker can perform three acts simultaneously: (1) The *locutionary act* is the act of saying something: Producing a series of sounds which mean something. This is the aspect of language which has been the traditional concern of linguistics. (2) The *illocutionary act*, which is an act performed in saying something and is identified by the explicit performative (e.g.: "I bid", "I apologize", etc.), includes acts such as promising, apologizing, criticizing or denying. (3) The *perlocutionary act*, on the other hand, is performed by or as a result of saying something. The perlocutionary act produces some effects on the hearers. Persuasion, for example, is a perlocutionary act: One cannot persuade someone to do

something just by saying “I persuade you”. Comparable examples are the acts of convincing, annoying, frightening and amusing. It can be summarized that all utterances perform specific actions since they have specific forces and specific meanings occurring side by side. This fact is best explained by the above-mentioned distinction between three basic senses in which one does something by saying something, namely locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The following examples can be given to illustrate these three types of acts (Coulthard 1977: 17-18):

Act A or locution

He said to me: “Shoot her”.

Act B or illocution

He urged me to shoot her.

Act C or perlocution

He persuaded me to shoot her.

As Searle puts forward, the locutionary act being achieved through the uttering of certain words is potentially under the control of the speaker, provided he uses the correct explicit performative in the appropriate circumstances. No one, for example, can prevent someone from warning or advising the other except by refusing to listen (1980: VIII).

Searle (1975) introduced a distinction between direct and indirect speech acts which depends on a recognition of the intended effect of an utterance on a particular occasion. Indirect speech acts are cases in which one act is performed indirectly by way of performing another. Thus, the example “Can you speak a little louder?” can be seen as, at one level, a question about the hearer’s ability, but at another level, a request for action (Brown & Yule 1983: 232). This fact leads to another distinction: The distinction between direct and indirect apology. Such a distinction between these two main types of apology requires a further distinction. Thus, it is possible to distinguish three main groups of linguistic units denoting apology:

1. Sentences denoting direct apology
2. Sentences and texts denoting indirect apology
3. Functions of the forms of apology having non-directive force

This study deals with three main topics: Direct apology and sentences denoting direct apology, indirect apology and sentences as well as texts denoting indirect apology, and the functions of indirect apology, which further deals with the forms of apologizing having non-directive force. The method of analysis used in this study is developed in the light of the approaches put forward by Austin (1962), Grice (1975), Coulthard (1977), Searle (1975, 1980), Brown & Yule (1983), Levinson (1992), Pilkington (1996), Clark (1996), and Langacker (1996).

2. Direct and indirect apology and functions

2.1. Sentences denoting direct apology

In the light of the “Speech Act Theory” discussed so far, it can be said that to apologize is an illocutionary act, which is achieved through the uttering of performative verbs such as *özür dilerim*, *bağışla*, *hoşgör* and *affet*, carrying the act of apologizing in themselves. Such utterances are used to perform actions rather than to say something is or is not the case. Such verbs carry an action in themselves, in our case, the act of apologizing. Whenever the verb *özür dilerim* or *bağışla* is used, the speaker automatically performs the act of apologizing. No one can prevent someone from apologizing except by refusing to listen. These are in fact forms of apology having directive force. As Levinson defines them, directives are “attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something” (1992: 240). In the case of apologizing, the attempt by the speaker to get the addressee to do something is the addressee’s asking for forgiveness and his expectancy of being forgiven by the addressee.

2.2. Sentences and texts denoting indirect apology

Sentences of indirect apology consist of linguistic forms which include verbs other than the performative ones and which suggest indirect apology. It is not the order and the inner structure of such sentences but the verbs in their verb phrases that contribute to the indirect apology. Such forms of apology have non-directive force.

However, there are also cases where the speech act of apologizing is achieved indirectly. As Searle (1980) also expresses, “in a theory of speech acts there is a customary distinction between direct speech acts where the speaker says what he means, and indirect speech acts where he means something more than what he says”. He further states that:

“In indirect speech acts, the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer.” (1980: 226)

It is clear from the extract above that the hearers can understand indirect speech acts by relying upon their knowledge of speech acts, along with the general principles of cooperative conversation, mutually shared factual information and a general ability to draw inferences.

2.2.1. Sentences denoting indirect apology

At this stage it is necessary to mention J. L. Austin and his functional view of language as action in social contexts once again. As already discussed under the heading “functionalism”, there are many different things which speakers can do with words. Austin’s most basic insight was that some utterances are not statements or questions about some piece of information, but are actions. Thus, according to his “Speech Act

Theory” language as action serves a range of different functions such as promising, asserting, describing, impressing, complaining, persuading and apologizing (Coulthard 1977: 17).

But in the case of apologizing, both the performative verbs such as *bağışla* and *affet* ‘forgive me / us’, *özür dilerim* ‘I apologize’ and other verbs which carry an indirect meaning of apologizing and which produce some effect on the addressee can optionally and interchangeably be used due to the situational context, the style and varying degrees of emphatic usage employed by the speaker.

The following extracts can be taken as cases of when and how direct and indirect forms of apology can be used interchangeably and optionally due to stylistic and possibly emphatic reasons. In the following cases, both the direct and indirect forms are used to perform illocutionary acts and can be used in one another’s place.

- (1) *Kızma bey, kızma bey kurban olayım ... dedi, kızma sen haklısın ...*
(Nesin 1975: 82)
“‘Don’t get angry dear, don’t get angry dear ...’ said she. “Let me sacrifice myself for your sake. Don’t get angry, you are right ...”
- (2) *Kuzum dadıcığım, canım dadıcığım, etme eyleme!*
(Karaosmanoğlu 1980: 99)
‘Dear nanny, dearest nanny, please don’t do it, don’t get angry!’
- (3) “*Babacığım*” diyor, “beni affet”. (Faik 1970: 25)
“‘Dearest father’ says he ... “do forgive me!”

The imperative verbs *kızma* ‘don’t get angry’ and *etme eyleme* ‘don’t do it’ can easily be replaced by *affet* or *bağışla*, although they produce an indirect effect of apology on the addressee. Similarly, *beni affet* ‘do forgive me’ in the third example can also be replaced by one of the imperative verbs *kızma*, *etme* and *eyleme* that produce indirect effects. Hence it is possible to rewrite and translate the three examples above as follows:

- (4) *Affet / bağışla bey, Affet / bağışla bey, kurban olayım ... dedi,*
Affet / bağışla sen haklısın ...
“‘Forgive me dear, forgive me dear ...’ said she. “Let me sacrifice myself for your sake. Forgive me, you are right ...”
- (5) *Kuzum dadıcığım, canım dadıcığım, affet / bağışla.*
‘Dear nanny, dearest nanny, please do forgive me!’
- (6) “*Babacığım*” diyor, “kızma / etme eyleme!”
“‘Dearest father’ says he ... “don’t get angry / Please don’t do it.”

Thus, as Searle puts forward, “the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such

as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologizing, thanking, congratulating” (1980: VII).

2.2.2. Texts denoting indirect apology

Speakers and listeners have the ability to assign interpretations to certain sentences or groups of sentences in certain contexts and draw inferences from them because what is conveyed by a certain message may be richer than what is written. In such cases the listeners have to search extensively for hints within the context in order to assign appropriate interpretations to certain utterances. In fact, “the relative accessibility of assumptions” is an important factor which guides the interpretation not only of individual sentences but of texts as well. Pilkington (1996: 158) explains this fact as follows:

“The addresser in fashioning his or her utterance takes into account what he or she considers to be the concepts and assumptions that are most accessible to the addressee. The addressee follows a route of least effort in using the most accessible concepts and assumptions until a range of contextual effects that the addresser could rationally have intended is derived. Context is extended until such effects are achieved. These effects then constitute the interpretation.”

Thus, it is necessary to distinguish what is implied, suggested or meant by a sentence or group of sentences and what is actually said. As sentences and texts are means of communication, the participants in this communicative exchange are either the writer and the reader or the characters created in a literary text. The reader has to distinguish what the writer tries to imply, and the characters in a narrative text have to assign interpretations to what one says to the other throughout the text.

Whether the participants are the writer and the reader or the characters created by the writer himself in the text, they are expected to observe the cooperative principle formulated by Grice (1967, 1975). He explains this principle in the following way: The participants should make their conversational contribution “such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which they are exchanged. If the speaker’s words convey other ... than their literal meaning, and the situation characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature” (*Encyclopedic dictionary of semiotics*, 1986: 338-339).

There are two main types of implicature (implicit content): (1) Conventional implicatures are “determined by particular lexical items or linguistic constructions” in the sentence. They are “arbitrarily stipulated”. (2) Conversational implicatures “follow from general maxims of truthfulness, informativeness, relativeness and clarity” and should be recoverable by an argument. Otherwise they cannot be considered conversational implicature (Grice 1975: 42-43).

Grice makes a distinction between two types of conversational implicatures (*Encyclopedic dictionary of semiotics*, 1986: 339-340):

(a) Particularized conversational implicatures: Grice explains certain rhetorical effects such as irony, metaphor and hyperbole via implicature because they occur in

particular occasions due to the special features of the situational context of the text. These can be taken as a “set of non-logical and context dependent inferences that comprise conveyed meaning: that which is meant without being said”.

(b) Generalized conversational implicatures: They are independent of context and are always associated with a particular linguistic form.

Searle (1975), on the other hand, makes a distinction between two cases of meaning: (a) The case when “the speaker utters a sentence and means exactly and literally what he says”. In this case what the speaker intends is to produce an illocutionary effect in the hearer. This effect is produced when the hearer recognizes (with the help of his own “knowledge of the rules that govern the utterance of the sentence”) the intention of the speaker. (b) The case when “the speaker’s utterance meaning and the sentence meaning” diverge “in hints such as insinuations, irony and metaphor”. In such cases, “the speaker utters a sentence, means what he says, but also means something more”. Thus, two different types of illocutionary acts are intended to be performed by one sentence: One sentence which contains an illocutionary force indicator and is uttered to perform one kind of illocutionary act may additionally perform another type of illocutionary act (Searle 1975: 59).

On the other hand, Clark (1996: 164) mentions two phases in the interpretations of sentences and texts: The *decoding* and *inferential* phases. In the decoding phase, linguistic expressions (words and syntactic structures) “automatically cause readers” to access particular conceptual representations. The readers manipulate those representations in particular ways. The inferential phase “builds more complex representations on the basis of what is decoded and derives implications and implicatures through their interaction with contextual assumptions”. That is, the reader works out the implications of the sentence or the text and decides which of these implications are the *intentionally conveyed implications* (implicatures). He does this with his knowledge of how particular linguistic forms are typically used in certain contexts. The particular communicative effects that texts give rise to result from the interaction of the reader’s knowledge of the meanings of particular linguistic forms with his knowledge of how these forms are typically used in certain contexts. In short, texts have communicative effects which result both from implicatures and implications.

The method of analysis used in the study of texts denoting indirect apology in Turkish is developed in the light of the approaches formulated by three linguists: Grice, who distinguished particularized conversational implicatures from generalized ones and who emphasized their role in the formation of the communicative effects of the texts, Searle, who distinguished sentences and texts performing more than one illocutionary act from those having one literal meaning only, and finally Clark, who emphasized the role of the decoding and inferential phases in the interpretation of sentences and texts as well as the importance of implications and implicatures in the formation of the communicative effects that texts give rise to.

In this framework, it is possible to give the following examples for indirect apologizing acts:

- (7) *Ooo, bana darılmayınız, dedim. Siz benim herşeyimsiniz. Gelin barışalım dedim.* (Karaosmanoğlu 1980: 94)
 “‘Oh, don’t get angry,” said I. “You are my everything. Come on, let’s be friends again,” said I.’
- (8) *... Döneceğime inanmış olduğumu söyledin ama evde bana ait tek şey bırakmamışsın. Görmeye dayanamıyordum, dedi Ayfer. Anlamalısın. Hem moda değişiyor durmadan. Saklasaydım bile beğenmezdin onları. Çok titizdin giyimine.* (Aral 1986b: 95)
 ‘... You told me that you had believed I would return, but you haven’t left anything in the house that belongs to me.” “I couldn’t bear to see,” said Ayfer. “You have to understand. Besides, the fashion is continuously changing. Even if I had kept them, I bet, you wouldn’t like them now. You were too difficult to please with the way you dressed.’
- (9) *... Sokağın başında indik. İkinci apartmanın önüne gelince: “Çok geç olmasaydı size birer kahve içelim diyecektim. Başka zaman beklerim. Ben üst katta oturuyorum ...”* (Toprak 1975: 83)
 ‘... We got off at the corner of the street. When we arrived in front of the second building: “If it weren’t late, I would offer you a cup of coffee. I expect you to come some other time. I live on the top floor ...”’
- (10) *... Valla olmaz. Darılmayın çocuklar. Başka şey olsa vereyim.* (Nesin, 1995: 55)
 ‘... By God, no. Don’t get angry guys. If it were something else, I would give it to you.’

In the above extracts, although there are no apology forms, the global speech act is apologizing. They are not as strong as direct apologies, however, the hearers can understand the indirect apologies by relying upon their knowledge of speech acts, along with the general principles of cooperative conversation, mutually shared factual information and the ability on the part of the hearer to make inferences.

In example 7 the indirect apology starts with the speaker’s trying to calm down the addressee and then his making use of the art of flattery when he says *siz benim herşeyimsiniz* ‘you are my everything’. Finally he offers the addressee friendship. Thus, the process of apologizing appears in the sentences as follows:

[S1 calming down] + [S2 flattery] + [S3 offering friendship]

In example 8, Ayfer apologizes by offering three logical and valid reasons to make her husband understand why she threw his clothes away as soon as they were divorced: (1) The fact that she couldn’t bear to see his clothes, as they reminded her of her ex-husband, (2) he must accept the fact that the fashion has changed since then, (3) it is an obvious fact that his likes are changeable and that it is very difficult to please him. Thus, these three psychological and social facts constitute the whole process of apology and this process in the sentences is seen as follows:

[S1 [S2 Positive reasoning] but [S3 Disappointment]] + [S4 Progressive disability in the past] + [S5 Necessity/obligation at the moment of speaking] + [S6 Giving information] + [S7 [S8 Conditional] even if [S9 Conditional]] + [S10 Giving information about the apologized person]

In example 9 the speaker starts her apology with a conditional sentence. But in this case, it is not very clear whether the speaker really seeks the addressee's company or not. Had the speaker really wanted the addressee's company, then the reason why she made use of such a conditional introduction would be the hidden fact that she was afraid of being refused by the addressee if she had directly invited him to her apartment. On the other hand, if the speaker had not desired the addressee's company, the reason for using the conditional sentence would be that what she really wanted was to refuse him kindly, in an indirect way.

In example 10, the speaker apologizes for not giving something that he really wants to keep for himself, but stating another reason. He doesn't directly refuse to give it to the addressees, and the process of apology indicated by the text itself appears in the sentences as follows:

[S1Negation] + [S2 Negative Imperative] + [S3 Conditional]

In this case, the conditional sentence does not constitute the introductory part of the process of apology but its concluding part.

- (11) *Hamal tutmuyorum. Ardımca gezen bu çocuklar adına onur kırıklığı duy-dum hep. Çocuklarım karnımdayken gereksindim onlara ama gereğinden çok verdim. Kazak, gömlek, pabuç verdim. Islandıklarında soba başında kuruttum giysilerini. Kaynanam söylendi.* (Aral, 1986a: 7)

'I don't ask for a porter. I've always felt my pride hurt on behalf of these children who were walking right behind me. I needed them when I was pregnant but I paid them more than they needed. I gave them pullovers, shirts and shoes. When they were wet all over, I let their clothes get dried before the stove. My mother-in-law grumbled.'

As can be seen in the above example, the sentences seem to be uttered by the speaker in order to perform only one kind of illocutionary act, which is the act of refusing to hire or use children who try to earn their livelihoods working as porters at the bazaar. The speaker feels extremely guilty, especially when she is pregnant. That is the reason why she gives these children some clothes together with the payment and lets their wet garments dry in her house in spite of her mother-in-law's objections. In the sentences indicating the above-mentioned actions there is another, additional type of illocutionary act, which is the speaker's act of apologizing to those children for making them work. She makes an apology to the children both for making them work for the sake of her own unborn baby and for society's way of forcing these children to work hard in bad conditions at the bazaar. In this case, it is the order and the inner

structure of each sentence that contribute to the overall effect produced by the text as a whole: The indirect apology.

This fact can also be illustrated by the following example:

- (12) (1) *Evladım, aslan evladım!* (2) *Ne kötülüğümü gördünüz?* (3) *Elimden geldikçe iyilik ettim.* (4) *Söyle güzel evladım!* (5) *Ne kötülük ettim?* (6) *Cemile Kariyi bilmez misin?* (7) *İftira ediyor ...* (Kemal, 1981: 75)
 '(1) Son, oh brave son! (2) Have you ever seen me doing a dirty deed? (3) I have done good with all my might. (4) Tell me dear child! (5) Have I done anything bad? (6) Don't you know that bitch Cemile? (7) She's telling lies...'

As shown in the above example, sentences 2 and 5 can be seen as questions about the speaker's ability and 6 as a question about the addressee's ability at one level, but at another level an apology for something wrong that the speaker has done. On the other hand, sentence 4 can be seen as an imperative, but in this context of situation it is used to support and emphasize the speaker's style when he apologizes for what he has done. Sentence 1 is vocative and functions as an introduction to the speaker's apology. Thus, the sentence types successively used in the apology are: vocative + question + statement + imperative + question + negative question + statement.

2.3. Functions of the forms of apology having nondirective force

Forms of apology may reflect a number of functions. Sentences containing forms of apology may bring about different kinds of meanings which cannot be explained by merely looking at the grammatical form or structure. Such sentences can be understood fully only when such concepts as discourse and context of situation are taken into account. Although sentences having apology forms are normally used with a directive force, there are a number of cases where forms of apologizing are not regarded as an attempt by the speaker to get the addressee to forgive him. In what follows, forms of apology having nondirective force will be explained by means of examples taken from various literary texts.

- (a) As God's blessing
Allah bağışlasın Ceylan yavrusu ... Kimin kızı a canım! (Taner 1983: 83)
 'God bless her. A baby deer ... Whose daughter is she, dear?'
Çok şirin şey, Allah bağışlasın.
 'What a pretty thing. God bless her.'
- (b) As a parenthetical expression of kindness
Aptalca yaşamamış olduğunuz belli dedim. Üstelik de hala – bağışlayın – çekici bir kadınsınız. (Aral 1986 b: 77)
 'It is evident that you haven't lived like a fool. Besides, you are still—forgive me—an attractive woman.'

Çok zayıf, affedersiniz, biraz kambur bir ihtiyar. (Güntekin 1983: 249)
'A very lean, *excuse me*, and a little, old hunchback.'

"Bir de Niçe'nin sözü olacak" dedi. "Aklım evet der, gururum hayır, yo pardon, aklım hayır der, gururum evet". (Taner, 1983: 60)
'Besides there should be the quotation taken from Nietzsche. My mind says yes, my pride no, oh no, *pardon me*, my mind says no, but my pride yes.'

- (c) As an introduction to an unpleasant subject

"Affedersiniz" dedi. "Dertlerinizin tazelenmesine sebep oldum."
(Karaosmanoğlu 1980: 96)

"I'm sorry" said he. "I made you remember your troubles".'

Affedersiniz tuhaf bir teşbih ama ... Kayakların buzdan aldığı o hızlı lezzeti alır. Korkmayın! ... (Faik 1977: 26)

'... Excuse me, this may be a strange metaphor but ... It's like the speedy taste which the skates develop on ice. Don't be afraid.'

- (d) As a protest

Hah hah haay ... Güleyim bari ... Ya senin zenaatin ne? Muhabbet tellallığı daha mı şerefli bir iş? Affetmişsin sen onu. Ben sekreter ve daktilo kursu işletiyorum! (Verel 1982: 174)

'Ha ha ha ... Let me laugh at it. Well, what is your job? Is prostitution a more honorable job? You don't have the right to say such a thing. I have a private school for training people to become secretaries and typists.'

Affetmişsin sen onu. Şu bir damlacık yerde yatıyorum, utanmadan kalkıp dil uzatıyorsun. Seninki hem kellik hem fodulluk. (Oran 1982: 138)

'You don't have the right to say such a thing. It's me who is sleeping at such a small place as this one. And now what you are doing is just objecting without feeling any shame at all. What you are doing is rudeness but nothing else.'

- (e) As an objection

Affedersin ama benim senin dualarına hiç de itimadım yok. (Verel, 1982: 173)

'Excuse me, but I don't trust in your prayers, never at all.'

Yoo Hacı Bey ... Affedersin ama biz medrese açmadık. (Güntekin 1983: 147)

'Oh no, Mr. Hadji. Excuse me, but we didn't build a religious school.'

Beyefendi, Affedersiniz. Ben denizi tanırım. İstanbul'da doğup büyüdüm ... (Nesin 1995: 44)

'Sir, excuse me. I know the sea. I was born in Istanbul and lived in Istanbul ...'

- (f) As a device to draw attention, to start a conversation with a stranger or to ask a stranger a question

Affedersiniz sizi birisine benzetmiştim de diyerek kazasız belasız sıyrılabilir misiniz? (Tığlı 1982: 256)

'Is it possible to get rid of the burden of such behaviour by saying "Excuse me, I thought you were somebody that I knew so well" to somebody that you don't know at all.'

"Evet" dedi "affedersiniz, rahatsız ettim. Lakin vazife icabı ..." (Talu 1982: 42)

"Yes" said he, "excuse me, I disturbed you. But it's my duty."

Bir kadın yanıma sokuldu, "affedersiniz, şuraya nereden gidilir" diye bir yer sordu. (Nesin 1975: 150)

'A woman, coming close to me, asked me a question. "Excuse me, how can I get to this address?'"

- (g) As a device in prayers or in religious communication
... *Tövbe Yarabbi ... sen bizi affet Yarabbi.* (Kanık 1982: 198)
'We won't do it again! oh God. Please, do forgive us.'

Dilediğini bağışlar ... Bizi bağışla, bize acı. (Kur'an-ı Kerim 1986: 48)
'He forgives whoever he wants ... Forgive us, pity us.'

Ya Rab, bağışla suçlarımızı. (Kur'an-ı Kerim 1986: 66)
'Oh God, do forgive our sins.'

- (h) As a device to express a pessimistic approach towards life
Sürekli bir güceniklik içindeydi insanlar, güceniklikleri daim kılındı. Bağışlamayıcıydılar ... (Hepçilingirler 1990: 101)
'They were in a state of continuous vexation. Their resentment was lifelong. They were those who were unforgiving.'

Gücenmelerin ve bağışlamamaların perçinlediği hüznün: Tanıdık ve olgun. (Hepçilingirler 1990: 103)

'A sorrow which became riveted as a result of a state of being offended, and a state of not forgiving: A well known and mature state.'

- (i) As a device to indicate a so-called politeness or formal kindness.
Madam ... Pardon ... Yani sen arıyor burda hela. (Nesin 1995: 71)
'Madam ... Pardon me ... You mean, you are looking for a WC.'

Hikmet Bey, dikkatle bakıyordu adamın yüzüne. Ağzındaki lokmayı gürk diye yuttu. "Çok özür dilerim ... Tanıyamadım pek ..." (Korkmazgil 1982: 164)

'Hikmet Bey was looking at the man's face carefully. He gulped the piece of food in his mouth. "I'm really very sorry ... I couldn't remember you."'

... Ama gözlerindeki acı geçmemiştir. Evde arama yapanları konuk sayıyordu bir bakıma. "Sen insan ol, karşındakiler kaba davransalar da, insandırlar onlar da ..." düşüncesi geçti aklından. Yüzbaşıya döndü: "Özür dilerim, birşey ikram edemedim. Bu gecenin anısı olarak, sizlere birer kitap imzalayayım." (Toprak 1975: 157)

'... But a look of sorrow still rested in his eyes. He accepted those who were making a search in his house as his guests. "You have to behave kindly even if they don't, because they are also human beings" thought he. He turned to

the lieutenant and said "I'm sorry, I could not offer you anything. But let me sign a book of mine for you as a souvenir".'

III. Conclusion

As a result, it can be said that Turkish apology forms are worth studying in the sense that they have more complex functional properties than meets the eye.

In this study, a functional approach has been carried out. As is known, texts give rise to communicative effects in the functional approach. The study of both the formation and interpretation of the communicative effects of sentences and texts becomes important in terms of their psychological and social functions in certain situational contexts.

In the formation of the communicative effects of sentences and texts which denote indirect apology, the importance of the implications and conversational implicatures is undeniable as any sentence or text can be considered as a medium of communication between the writer and his reader. Conversational implicatures are of two types: Generalized and particularized. It is possible to analyze sentences and texts denoting indirect apology mostly from the point of view of particularized conversational implicatures because such sentences and texts perform different functions when they occur in particular occasions. In this case, their apology function can only be drawn from the special features of the situational context in which they take place.

In the interpretation of the communicative effects of sentences and texts denoting indirect apology, two different but closely related phases become important: Decoding and inferential phases. First comes the decoding phase, which requires the reader to manipulate the linguistic representations (morphological and syntactic) in particular ways. Then comes the inferential phase, which makes it possible for the readers to derive implications and implicatures on the basis of what they have decoded previously. In the inferential phase, when the implications and implicatures interact with the contextual assumptions, the reader is able to work out the implications in the sentence or the text and to decide which of these implications the writer is intentionally conveying. That is possible because the reader already has the knowledge of how particular linguistic expressions are typically used in certain contexts.

And finally, sentences with forms of apology may have different kinds of meaning which cannot be explained by looking at their grammatical forms or structures only. This is because such sentences reflect a number of different functions.

References

- Austin, I. L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Clark, B. 1996. Stylistic analysis and relevance theory. *Language and Literature* 5/3, 163-178.
The concise Oxford dictionary of current English. London: Book Club Associates. 1980.
 Coulthard, M. 1977. *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
Encyclopedic dictionary of semiotics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1986.

- Finegan, E. & Besnier, N. 1989. *Language: Its structure and use*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovic Publishers.
- Grice, H. P. 1967. Logic and conversation. [Unpublished manuscript of the William James lectures.]
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In: Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic Press. 41-58.
- Kuran-ı Kerim ve Türkçe anlamı*. İstanbul: Güneş Halkalı Tesisleri. 1986.
- Langacker, R. W. 1996. Conceptual grouping and pronominal anaphora. In: Fox, B. (ed.) *Studies in anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, C. S. 1992. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pilkington, A. 1986. Introduction: Relevance theory and literary style. *Language and Literature* 5/3, 157-162.
- Searle, J. R. 1975. Indirect speech acts. In: Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic Press. 59-77.
- Searle, J. R. & Kiefer, F. & Bierwisch, M. 1980. *Speech act theory and pragmatics*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Bibliography for literary texts

- Aral, İnci 1986a. *Ağda zamanı*. İstanbul: Kaynak yayınları.
- Aral, İnci 1986b. *Sevginin eşsiz kısı*. İstanbul: Özgür yayım dağıtım.
- Faik, Sait 1970. *Bütün eserleri 6: Havuz başı, Son kuşlar*. Ankara: Bilgi basımevi.
- Faik, Sait 1977. *Bütün eserleri 4: Mahalle kahvesi, Havada bulut*. Ankara: Bilgi basımevi.
- Güntekin, Reşat Nuri 1983. *Kavak yelleri*. İstanbul: İnkılâp ve Aka kitabeveleri.
- Heçilingirler, Feyza 1990. *Kırlangıçsız geçti yaz*. İstanbul: Cem yayınevi.
- Kanık, Adnan Veli 1982. İyi bir kısmet için. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 125-132.
- Karaoşmanoğlu, Yakup Kadri 1980. *Hep o şarkı*. İstanbul: Birikim yayınları.
- Kemal, Yaşar 1981. *Sarı sıcak*. İstanbul: Karacan yayınları.
- Korkmazgil, Hasan Hüseyin 1982. Neyiniz var Süleyman Bey. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 241-248.
- Nesin, Aziz 1995. *Sizin memlekette eşek yok mu?* İstanbul: Doğan yayım holding, A. Ş.
- Nesin, Aziz 1975. *Vatan sağolsun*. İstanbul: Doğan yayım holding, A. Ş.
- Oran, Bülent. 1982. Sınır. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 138-143.
- Talu, Ercüment Ekrem 1982. Yine parasızlık. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 38-44.
- Taner, Haldun 1983. *Onikiye bir var*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınevi.
- Tıgılı, Erhan 1982. Benzetmek. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 256-262.
- Toprak, Ömer Faruk 1975. *Karşı pencere*. İstanbul: Cem yayınevi.
- Verel, Oktay 1982. Esnekbil ile alkışlar. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 171-177.