

HAS HE APOLOGIZED OR NOT?: A CROSS-CULTURAL MISUNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UK AND JAPAN ON THE OCCASION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF VJ DAY IN BRITAIN¹

Kumiko Murata

This paper will examine the misunderstanding between the British and Japanese governments in the interpretation of the letter of apology (according to the British government)/ congratulation (according to the Japanese government) sent by the then Japanese Prime Minister to the then British Prime Minister just before the 50th anniversary of VJ Day in Britain. It will first investigate what the speech act 'apology' entails in these two different discourse communities and then explore how this speech act was differently interpreted on the special occasion of the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War by the two former enemy governments according to their respective interests and differing social and political pressures from war veterans and bereaved families.

Using a selection of newspaper articles from this period, the paper will illustrate how deeply wider social, political and historical backgrounds can affect the interpretation of linguistic meaning and how the interpretation of an utterance can vary depending on the context. It will also demonstrate how the use of vague expressions and culturally loaded styles could lead to misinterpretation or misunderstanding, referring to the letter written by the then Japanese Prime Minister. The letter was said to have originally been meant to be one of congratulation by the sender but was not interpreted in this way by the receiver. Finally, I will reemphasize the importance of taking the context into consideration in utterance interpretation.

1. Introduction

"Apology" has been extensively explored in the past thirty years as one type of speech acts of linguistic philosophical interest. Austin (1962), for example, investigated it as one type of "explicit performative[s]" in his attempt to classify illocutionary force, while Searle (1969, 1976) also refers to the act of "apology" in his investigation into various speech act types. However, although Austin mentions the importance of taking into account "the total situation in which the utterance is issued" (1962: 52) and the "context

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1996 Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics in Chicago, March 1996. The author would like to thank an anonymous referee for his/her valuable comments. She is also grateful to John Bray for his stylistic suggestion.

of the utterance" (ibid.: 89) in interpreting performatives, the context to which he refers is narrowly restricted to the circumstances in which the utterance is issued "such as the judge being a judge and in robes on a bench", when she/he says "I hold that - " (ibid.: 88-89) as opposed to the wider context, which includes interpersonal, social, economic, historical and political factors. Nor have other scholars who investigated "apology" on the basis of Austin and Searle's speech act theory paid much attention to the wider context in their investigations. They are primarily interested in decontextualized linguistic analysis of discrete speech acts.

In the 1980s, however, some scholars started to incorporate the analysis of apology in social, interactional contexts, for example, as one type of remedial work on the basis of Goffman's (1971) work (see Fraser 1981; Owen 1983), or using the framework of discourse/conversation analysis (Coulmas 1981; Edmondson 1981; Owen 1983). Still others have started investigating this speech act in cross-cultural contexts, using the framework of contrastive study (see Coulmas 1981; Blum-Kulka and Olshtain 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (eds.) 1989; Olshtain 1989). Most of their analyses however are based on data collected in well-planned discourse completion questionnaires (except for Coulmas 1981) and have not directly dealt with real life incidents which occurred as a result of lack or inappropriate use of apology².

Thus, despite their attention to contextual and social factors, these recent studies have not directly dealt with real life incidents in which apologies are due. This paper, then, is an attempt to interpret the speech act of "apology" as it occurs in its social, historical, political and economic contexts.

2. The background to the present study

2.1. The purpose of the present study

The main purpose of the present study is to explore ways to interpret the misunderstanding (or rather, different interpretations) between Japan and the UK concerning 'apologies' on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War in the summer of 1995. I will also examine the extent to which formal cross-linguistic analysis is useful in interpreting real-life incidents which involve social, historical, economic and political issues. I want to emphasize the importance of approaching this type of problem from a variety of perspectives, including linguistic, cultural, social and historical ones.

² It should be noted that Olshtain (1989) illustrates her investigation with a real political conflict between two Israeli politicians; however, her real objective in the study seems to lie in an analysis of the "interaction between sociopragmatic factors and the choice of apology realization patterns" (1989: 159) on the basis of the data (discourse completion questionnaires) collected as part of the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns) project but not in an investigation into the incident itself.

2.2. The unapologetic Japanese - A new stereotype

We may start our investigation with the following sentence, which appeared in an article in *The Independent*:

Daniel is being completely Japanese about this.

(*The Independent*, 16 August 1995)

What does "being completely Japanese" entail in this context? What kind of person do you think Daniel is if he is "being completely Japanese"? It is obvious that Daniel is not Japanese; thus, this statement is violating one of Grice's conversational maxims; that is, the Maxim of Quality (Grice 1975). It is therefore evident that this expression is a metaphor. Various stereotypical characteristics concerning the Japanese such as "dependent", "formal", "group-oriented", "regulated", "silent" might come to mind (see Barnlund 1974; Condon and Saito (eds.) 1974; Doi 1971, 1986; Lebra 1987; Lebra and Lebra (eds.) 1974; Matsumoto 1994; Nakane 1970, 1986; and Yamada 1992 among others). In this case however the following co-textual information will help you to sort out the meaning. The text continues as follows:

He won't apologise. Or at least, he has apologised but I consider his apology inadequate. Furthermore, he is not accepting responsibility for what he has done. And I am not at all sure how sorry he is. (Bridget Jones's diary, *The Independent* Section Two, 16 August 1995)

The keyword here is of course "apology"; accordingly, "being completely Japanese" means "unapologetic". However, to understand why being "unapologetic" has become connected to "Japaneseness", one needs to have what Widdowson (1990) calls "ideational" knowledge or Carrell's (1983) "content schemata" in addition to "interpersonal" knowledge (Widdowson 1990) or "formal" schemata (Carrell 1983) and systemic knowledge. Then what is the ideational knowledge in this specific case? What happened so that this cynical remark could be made on the assumption of ideational knowledge?

To understand the situation, we have to pay attention to the date when this metaphor was used.

2.3. The misunderstanding - The summer of 1995, 50 years after the end of World War II

It was the summer 50 years after the end of the Second World War. Various ceremonies were held in Britain to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the victory over Japan, known as "VJ Day". Before the VJ commemorations, British former prisoners of war (PoWs) had had high expectations of a formal apology by the Japanese government. The headline of an article in *The Guardian*, 8 August 1995, illustrates this tendency:

Japan on verge of war apology

and the article says:

The Japanese Prime Minister, Tomiichi Murayama³, may end 50 years of silence next week and formally apologise for Japan's actions in the Second World War.

(*The Guardian*, 8 August 1995)

The Guardian based its speculation of the possibility of an apology on the following:

- 1) The Mayor of Hiroshima apologized on 6 August, the fiftieth anniversary of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima.⁴
- 2) At a meeting with the former German president, Richard von Weizsaecker, Murayama said that "he was reading again a speech Mr Weizsaecker gave on Germany's war responsibilities 10 years ago."

(*The Guardian*, 8 August 1995)

Other papers also speculated on the possibility (see, for example, *The Times*, 7, 10 August). Amid these high expectations, the then British Prime Minister, John Major⁵, announced that the "Japanese Prime Minister formally apologised in writing for the first time for atrocities committed by his country during the Second World War". (*The Independent*, 12 August 1995) In the letter,

Mr Murayama expressed "profound remorse for Japan's actions in a certain period of the past which caused such unbearable suffering and sorrow for so many people". The letter reminded Mr Major that when he visited Japan two years ago, the then Prime Minister, Morihiro Hosokawa, had expressed his "profound remorse and apologies for Japan's actions in the past that inflicted such deep scars on so many people, including prisoners of war". Mr Murayama said he wished to "reiterate those sentiments". (*The Independent*, 12 August 1995)

John Major welcomed this letter and wrote to the PoW campaigners to tell them that "the Japanese Prime Minister had taken the opportunity to apologise". (*The Independent*, 12 August). However, even at this stage the campaigners were not totally happy for two reasons. First, the apology was not specifically aimed at them (the British PoWs) but rather at all PoWs; and second, they regarded Murayama's apology as a personal one rather than an official apology issued by the Japanese government.

However, worse was yet to come. Murayama, surprised at the unexpected consequences of his letter in the UK, announced that "it was not a letter of apology", and that the "main purpose of his message had been to congratulate Major on his re-election" to the party leadership after an internal power struggle (*The Sunday Times*, 13 August 1995, see also *Mainichi Shimbun*, *Nihon Keizai Simbun*, and *Yomiuri Simbun*, 13 August 1995). The letter was written two weeks before the Downing Street announcement but Mr Major released it just before VJ Day - obviously aiming at a greater impact on the

³ The then Prime Minister (August 1995). He resigned at the beginning of January 1996. The present Prime Minister is Keizou Obuchi, who replaced Ryutaro Hashimoto on 30 July 1998.

⁴ The following is part of the statement made by the Mayor of Hiroshima:
 "With the suffering of all the war's victims indelibly etched in our hearts, we want to apologize for the unbearable suffering that Japanese colonial domination and war inflicted on so many people."
 (*The Times*, 7 August 1995).

⁵ Tony Blair replaced John Major as the British Prime Minister on 2 May 1997.

VJ commemoration. According to a Kyodo news agency report in *The Sunday Times*:
Murayama acknowledged the letter had expressed *profound remorse* over Japanese treatment of British and other allied prisoners, but quoted the prime minister as saying: "The letter was designed mainly to congratulate the re-election (sic) of Mr Major as chief of the Conservative party.

(*The Sunday Times*, 13 August 1995, underlined by the present author)

Later the Kyodo agency "modified its report, saying Murayama could better be paraphrased as saying that, while the letter contained an expression of remorse, it was not solely meant as a letter of apology" (ibid.).

The Sunday Times comments that this controversy originates in the "choice of words Japanese officials use when referring to the Second World War". As they put it:

Although former prisoners seek an unequivocal "apology", Japanese statements usually avoid a word that in Japanese society would strip their own war dead of any honour. "Remorse", "regret" and "reflection", words regularly used by Japanese officials over the years, acknowledge that wrong decisions and actions were taken but defend the honour of individual soldiers. (ibid.)

However, has the problem arisen only from the vague and misleading choice of words as *The Sunday Times* points out⁶? Let us now examine the reasons why this misunderstanding occurred in more detail.

3. The reasons - Why did the misunderstanding occur?

In order to investigate the reasons for the misunderstanding, we need first to consider the following questions.

1. Why did the British government interpret the letter as one of apology at the outset?
2. Why did Mr Murayama need to deny that it was a letter of apology?

It is necessary to examine the original text of the letter carefully to answer these questions. It was however not released to the public.⁷ Thus, a detailed linguistic investigation on the

⁶ Here it is interesting to note that similar articles appeared in newspapers concerning Dutch apologies to the Indonesians on the occasion of Queen Beatrix's 10-day visit to Indonesia. Headlines of the articles read:

Dutch find it hard to say sorry to former colony (*The Independent*, 23 August 1995)
Queen speaks of Dutch regrets (*The Times*, August 23, 1995).

Both articles state that although the Queen "spoke of the 'harsh consequences' of Dutch colonial rule", she "stopped short of an explicit apology". (*The Times*, August 23, 1995). See also a comment by Inukai (1995) on the use of the word 'remorse' by the Japanese government.

⁷ According to *The Independent*, "Downing Street refused to release the text of the letter" (*The Independent*, 12 August 1995). The author herself contacted the Japanese Embassy in London to ask whether it was possible to obtain a copy of the original text but the request was rejected. The author also checked some Japanese daily newspapers issued around this time (*The Asahi*, *The Mainichi*, *The Nihon Keizai* and *The*

basis of the analysis of the text is only partially possible through the fragmented pieces of information obtained from various newspaper articles.⁸

3.1. *The misinterpretation of the letter of congratulation as a letter of apology*

In these circumstances, three main reasons may conceivably help answer the first question. These are: Misinterpretation of speech acts, lack of schematic knowledge, and sociopolitical concerns.

3.1.1. *The misinterpretation of speech acts*

Let us now turn to the first reason: Misinterpretation of speech acts. Is it possible to mistake a speech act of congratulation for that of apology? Although at the outset Mr Murayama denied that his letter was a letter of apology and restated that it was meant to be a letter of congratulation, it is unlikely that a person would mistake a letter of congratulation for one of apology in an ordinary situation.

According to Leech (1983) (see also Olshtain 1989) both "congratulating" and "apologizing" fulfil a "convivial" illocutionary function whose goal "coincides with the social goal of establishing and maintaining comity" (1983: 104) and both come under the Politeness Principle (PP) "in that they recommend the expression of polite rather than impolite beliefs" (ibid.: 132). However, they are also quite different in that "congratulations" exemplify what Leech calls the Approbation Maxim which "minimize[s] dispraise of *other*" and "maximize[s] praise of *other*" (ibid.: 132, 135-6) whereas "apologies" exemplify the Modesty Maxim which "minimize[s] praise of *self*: Maximize[s] dispraise of *self*" (ibid.: 132, 136-8).

Thus, despite having the same illocutionary function, they are located almost opposite in the bipolar scales of praise and dispraise of "self" or "other". It is therefore unlikely that these two illocutionary acts could be mistaken. Let us now look at the speech act set of apology in more detail.

Olshtain (1989) lists five strategies which make up the speech act set of apology on the basis of Olshtain and Cohen (1983), two of which are general and three are situation-specific strategies. The two general strategies are:

- 1) the IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device), which contains the formulaic, routinized forms of apology (various apology verbs); and
- 2) the expression of S's responsibility, which relates to the S's willingness to

Yomiuri, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 August 1995). However, they only referred to the contents of the text through the announcements made by the Prime Minister, the Chief Cabinet Secretary, and the Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs. The original text itself has not been published.

⁸ This paper therefore does not aim at analyzing the incident from the perspective of what Fairclough (1992) calls "Textually-Oriented Discourse Analysis" (see also Fowler 1991).

admit to fault. (1989: 157)

According to Olshtain, these two together or respectively "could realize an apology in any situation" (ibid.).

In the case of Mr Murayama's letter to Mr Major, it is obvious that he utilized the first of the above two general strategies by expressing, quoting from the former prime minister Mr Hosokawa, "his profound remorse and apologies for Japan's actions in the past that inflicted deep scars on so many people, including the prisoners of war" (*The Sunday Times*, 13 August 1995). This is an obvious expression of apology and it cannot be denied that the addressee would interpret it in this way.

Apart from these two strategies, Olshtain suggests that there are three situation-specific strategies consisting of "the explanation, the offer of repair, and the promise of forbearance, which will semantically reflect the content of the situation" (1989: 157). In addition, there are also a "number of different factors which affect the S's decision to apologize" (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain 1984: 209). The most significant is the "degree of violation or the seriousness of the offense, as perceived by S" and there may also be "cultural, personal, and contextual elements that influence the decision to apologize, and affect the strategy selection" (ibid. see also Fraser 1981). In addition to these elements, I would argue that social, political, economic and historical elements also affect the decision whether to apologize or not.

In the case of Mr Murayama's letter, it is apparent that the degree of violation is serious although the action was not taken directly and solely by him but by Japan as a nation.⁹ Judging from these factors, it seems obvious that Mr Murayama committed himself to a speech act of apology despite his denial.¹⁰ Misinterpretation of speech acts is therefore not a convincing explanation.

3.1.2. Lack of schematic knowledge

Secondly, the misinterpretation might have resulted from a lack of schematic knowledge; in this case, specifically that of interpersonal knowledge (Widdowson 1990) or "formal" schemata (Carrell 1983). The rhetorical patterns of the letter might have made the British believe that it was primarily a letter of apology even though it included an expression of congratulations as well. (see Connor 1996; Jenkins & Hinds 1987; Kaplan 1966; and Scollon & Scollon 1995 for the comparison of different rhetorical patterns). Or, as

⁹ Thomas (1995) also points out the possibility of the speech act of apologizing being performed "on behalf of someone or something else" (1995: 101) in her discussion of the speech act of apologizing on the basis of Searle's speech act rules for thanking. See also Inukai (1995).

¹⁰ After the reaction of the British media to Mr. Murayama's denial of his apology in his letter to Mr. Major, the Japanese government denied the report that Mr. Murayama has cancelled his apology. The then Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs made it clear that the phrase, 'profound remorse and apology', was used in the English version of the letter to John Major. (*Asahi Shimbun*, 15 August 1995, see also *Mainichi Shimbun* and *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 15 August 1995). Later, on 15 August 1995, the Prime Minister himself stated clearly that he had in fact apologized in the letter and that his earlier statement lacked sufficient explanation. (*Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, evening ed., 15 August 1995)

often happens in written discourse irrespective of the writer's intention, the reader (Mr Major/the British government) might have interpreted the letter as he/it wished or as his/its nation would be pleased to hear, simply taking "from the text whatever best suits his/[its] purpose" (Widdowson 1990: 108; see also Widdowson 1998; and Wilson 1990), in view of the expectations of British war veterans.

This aspect may apply to Mr Murayama as well. It is possible that he (or his script writer) followed Japanese discourse patterns in writing what he called a letter of "congratulation", not making it clear what the main purpose of the letter was according to the norm of English discourse patterns. He might have stated his profound "remorse" just as part of routine seasonal greetings, which an average Japanese letter usually contains at its beginning (see also Jenkins & Hinds 1987), since the letter was written just before the end of the war commemoration.

However, the problem was too serious to be dealt with just as part of a set of greetings or as an afterthought; and therefore this interpretation is also unlikely.

3.1.3. Socio-political reasons

The third reason is socio-political. In the preceding section, I briefly pointed out that Mr Major and his government might have interpreted the letter politically in view of the expectations of their war veterans. It is also possible that Mr Murayama strategically added an expression of apology or remorse in his letter of congratulation. In doing so, he might have been aware of the high expectations of British war veterans and, at the same time, of the pressure from the Japanese right wing politicians to save the face of Japanese war veterans and bereaved families. He might therefore have tried to balance both needs by giving a compromise solution. By combining congratulations and apology he might have thought he could avoid criticism from Japanese right-wingers while at the same time partially satisfying the British need for apology. However, if this had been the case, serious doubt would have been cast on his sincerity. In the act of "apologizing", there is a certain assumption that the apologizer is sincere in his action and not just behaving in a routine manner (Austin 1962; Searle 1969; see also Inukai 1995; Thomas 1995; and Wierzbicka 1991). Therefore, if he had adopted this strategy, he would have violated the expectation of the British.

3.2. The denial of the British interpretation

Now let us move on to the second question: "Why did Mr Murayama need to deny that his letter was one of apology" in the first place? The question has already been touched upon in the preceding section. Two reasons are conceivable. The first is political; as mentioned above he might have been under strong pressure from his right-wing colleagues.

The second reason is partly political and partly economic. In view of the reactions of the British war veterans after Mr Major's announcement, Mr Murayama needed to make clear that his letter was not a letter of apology since this might otherwise have led to a

full-blown compensation movement by British PoWs¹¹. It seems that he did not expect his letter to provoke such a big reaction in the U.K.. In that sense, it can be said again that his behavior was too naive for a national leader.

4. Has he apologized or not? - The use of apologies in Japanese from sociocultural and linguistic perspectives

Let us now look briefly at the background to the use of apologies in Japanese society from Japanese sociocultural and linguistic perspectives.

In everyday life, Japanese people quite often use ritual apologies, or apology expressions, even where "thank you" is due. For example, the apology expression *sumimasen* is often used when acknowledging indebtedness to the presenter upon receiving a gift. (see Benedict 1954; Coulmas 1981; Morita 1998; Narita and Young 1994; and Wierzbicka 1991).

There is a great variety of apology expressions which may be used according to the "seriousness of the object of regret" (Coulmas 1981: 88) and formality, starting with very casual *gomen*, *shitsurei*, and then *gomen nasai*, *shitsurei shimashita* to more formal *moushiwake arimase*, or slightly more polite *moushiwake gozaimasen*, *moushiwake gozaimasen deshita*, and to the expressions which are used specifically to admit responsibility for a serious misconduct or offence, such as *owabi shimasu*, *owabi itashimasu*, *ayamarimasu* (more casual), *shazai itashimasu* (more formal) or expressions asking for forgiveness, *oyurushi kudasai*.

These expressions are used according to the relationship between the interlocutors, e.g. social distance, power and closeness, and the situations, e.g. the seriousness of offences¹²

Owabi itashimasu with an intensifier *kokoro kara* (sincerely, heartfelt) is one of the strongest and most polite and formal apology expressions. And this is the expression Mr Murayama used on 15 August 1995 - the fiftieth anniversary of Japan's official surrender in the Second World War -, a couple of days after he denied the intention of his letter to Mr Major.¹³ The statement contains a formal apology as follows:

During a certain period in the not too distant past, Japan, pursuing a mistaken national policy, advanced along the road to war, only to ensnare the Japanese people in a fateful crisis; through its colonial rule and aggression Japan caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly in Asia. In the hope that no such mistake be made in the future, I regard, in a spirit of humility, these irrefutable facts of history, and *express here once again my*

¹¹ At the governmental level the compensation issue was settled on the basis of the San Francisco Peace Treaty in 1952. However, see the editorial in the Guardian on 16 August 1995 (also translated in *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, 21 August 1995). See also *Asahi Shimbun*, 16 August 1995 and *Mainichi Shimbun*, evening ed. 14 August 1995 concerning this matter.

¹² Tanaka (1991), comparing Australian and Japanese ways of apology, states that "the Japanese way of apologizing is more influenced by D (the social distance) of the speaker (S) and the addressee (H) and P (the relative power of S and H) than the Australian way is" (ibid.: 37, see also Hiraga 1996).

¹³ See the evening editions of *Asahi*, *Mainichi*, *Nihon Keizai*, *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 15 August 1995.

feelings of deep remorse and state my heartfelt apology. Allow me also to express my feelings of profound mourning for all victims, both at home and abroad, of that history. (Part of Mr Murayama's televised statement on the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War, *The Times*, August 16 1995, underlined by the present author)

Here Mr Murayama uses the word "apology" (*owabi*) with an intensifier "heartfelt" (*kokoro kara no*); thus, it is clear that he committed himself to a full apology.

However, this apology did not greatly impress British war veterans. According to *The Independent*, "British war veterans and former prisoners rejected the apology as inadequate." (*The Independent*, 16 August 1995)

Several reasons for this are conceivable. The first and foremost seems to be Mr Murayama's blunder in handling the letter to John Major just a few days before this statement. The denial that the letter was one of apology caused a lot of protests among British war veterans.

Secondly, the apology was not specifically aimed at the British war veterans but at war victims in general both at home and abroad although Asian victims were specifically referred to. However, in a separate press conference on the same day Mr Murayama "referred specifically to British prisoners of war and again apologised to them" (*The Independent*, 16 August 1995, see also *The Times*, August 16 1995), but the PoWs were still not satisfied. Some commented that Murayama's apology still appeared to be a personal but not an official one issued by the Japanese government although, in reality, the "carefully phrased statement, using the sensitive word 'apology' for the first time in relation to the Second World War, was approved by the coalition Cabinet shortly before it was delivered" (*The Times*, August 16, 1995); and thus, the "Japanese ambassador in London insisted that Mr Murayama's apology was therefore not just a personal statement" (*The Independent*, 16 August 1995).

Another reason for the British PoWs' resentment seems to have been Mr Murayama's rejection of the possibility of further compensation for the British prisoners of war. He was reported to have spoken as follows in his press conference:

"All individual compensation has been dealt with in the 1952 San Francisco Peace Treaty and other bilateral treaties. We have faithfully met [the] terms of those agreements."

(*The Times*, August 16 1995)

Since Mr Murayama's statement satisfies some conditions for apology, he can be said to have made an official apology, judging from the perspective of speech act theory. However, as has been illustrated, the apologizees are not necessarily convinced. They are not sure of the apologizer's sincerity. It should be emphasized again that for an apology to be accepted as an apology, not only linguistic requirements but also various other factors such as social, economic, political, historical and contextual ones need to be born in mind.

5. Conclusion

It is high time that I answered the question I raised in the title, "Has he apologized or not?" My answer is both "Yes, he has" and "No, he hasn't" or as Edward Pilkington of

The Guardian has put it, "Oh no he [has] and oh yes he [hasn't]" (*The Guardian*, August 15 1995).¹⁴

References

- Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnlund, D.C. (1974) The public self and the private self in Japan and the United States. In Condon & Saito (eds.), 1974: 27-96.
- Benedict, Ruth (1954) *The chrysanthemum and the sword*. Tokyo: Tuttle.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House and Gabriele Kasper (eds.) (1989) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana and Elite Olshtain (1984) Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics* 5.3: 196-213.
- Carrell, Patricia L. (1983) Some issues in studying the role of schemata, or background knowledge, in second language comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language* Vol.1, No.2.
- Cole, P. and J.L. Morgan (eds.) (1975) *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Condon, J.C. and M. Saito (eds.) (1974) *Intercultural encounters with Japan*. Tokyo: Simul Press.
- Connor, Ulla (1996) *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, Florian (1981) 'Poison to your soul' thanks and apologies contrastively viewed. In F. Coulmas (ed.), 1981: 69-92.
- Coulmas, Florian (ed.) (1981) *Conversational routine*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Doi, Takeo (1971) *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Doi, Takeo (1986) *Amae*: A key concept for understanding Japanese personality structure. In Lebra and Lebra (eds.), 1986: 121-129.
- Edmondson, Willis J. (1981) On saying you're sorry. In F. Coulmas (ed.), 1981: 273-288.

¹⁴ The most recent development was made by the former Japanese Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto when he (and his government) formally apologized to the present British prime minister Tony Blair on his visit to Japan in January 1998 for Japan's action during the Second World War. The British former PoWs welcomed this formal apology. (*Asahi Shimbun*, 13 January 1998, *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, 14, 19 January 1998, *The Times*, 13 January 1998).

The issue was raised again when the Emperor visited Britain in May 1998. He was reported to have spoken of "his 'deep sorrow and pain' at the 'scars of war' during a Buckingham Palace banquet in his honour", but it was widely reported that "his expression of regret fell far short of the full apology demanded by the PoWs" (*The Mirror*, May 27 1998, see also *The Evening Standard*, 26 May 1998, *The Express*, May 27 1998, *The Times*, 27 May 1998).

- Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fowler, Roger (1991) *Language in the news*. London: Routledge.
- Fraser, Bruce (1981) On apologizing. In F. Coulmas (ed.), 1981: 259-271.
- Goffman, Erving (1971) *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Grice, H.P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In Cole & Morgan (eds.), 1975: 41-58.
- Hiraga, Masako (1996) Kotoba to koui. In Shishido et al., 1996: 14-25.
- Inukai, Michiko (1995) Ningen koui: Shazai. *Sekai* 613: 136-144. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Jenkins, Susan and John Hinds (1987) Business letter writing: English, French, and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly* 21.2: 327-345.
- Kaplan, Robert B. (1966) Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning* 16.1/2: 1-20.
- Lebra, Takie Sugiyama (1987) The cultural significance of silence in Japanese communication. *Multilingua* 6.4: 343-357.
- Lebra, Takie Sugiyama and William P. Lebra (eds.) (1986) *Japanese culture and behavior* Revised Edition. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Matsumoto, Seiya (1994) *Nihon bunka no tokushitsu*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Morita, Yoshiyuki (1998) *Nihonjin no hassou, nihongo no hyogen*. Tokyo: Chuoukouronsha.
- Nakane, Chie (1970) *Japanese society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Nakane, Chie (1986) Criteria of group formation. In Lebra and Lebra (eds.), 1986: 171-187.
- Narita, Sachiko and Richard Young (1994) Apologies in English by Japanese learners. *JALT Journal* 16.1: 75-81.
- Olshtain, Elite (1989) Apologies across languages. In Blum-Kulka et al (eds.), 1989: 155-173.
- Owen, Marion (1983) *Apologies and remedial interchanges: A study of language use in social interaction*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Scollon, Ron and Suzanne Wong Scollon (1995) *Intercultural communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, John R. (1969) *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. (1975) Indirect speech acts. In Cole & Morgan (eds.), 1975: 59-82.
- Searle, John R. (1976) A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5: 1-23.
- Shishido, Michiyasu, Masako Hiraga, Morio Nishikawa and Tsutomu Sugawara (1996) *Hyogen to kotoba no rikai-gaku*. Kyoto: Minerva Shobo.

Tanaka, Noriko (1991) An investigation of apology: Japanese in comparison with Australian. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Foreign Languages Meikai University* 4: 35-53.

Thomas, Jenny (1995) *Meaning in interaction*. London: Longman.

Widdowson, Henry G. (1990) *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, Henry G. (1998) The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 19.1: 136-151.

Wierzbicka, Anna (1991) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wilson, John (1990) *Politically speaking*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Yamada, Haru (1992) *American and Japanese business discourse*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Newspapers and magazines quoted

Asahi Shimbun, 14, 15, 16 August 1995, 13 January 1998, 27 May 1998.

The Evening Standard, 26 May 1998.

The Express, 27 May 1998.

The Guardian, 8, 15 August 1995.

The Independent, 12, 16, 23 August 1995.

Mainichi Shimbun, 13, 14, 15 August 1995.

The Mirror, 27 May 1998.

Nihon Keizai Shimbun, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21 August 1995, 14, 19 January 1998.

Sekai No.613, September 1995.

The Sunday Times, 13 August 1995.

The Times, 7, 10, 16, 23 August 1995, 13 January 1998, 27 May 1998.

Yomiuri Shimbun, 13, 14, 15, 16 August 1995.