features of the frame structures which represent the frame "APPEARANCE" in the belles-lettres discourse. The analyzed extracts of the literary work "Jefta and his daughter" represent interesting examples of the frame structures, which denote human appearance. The terminal elements, which represent outer features, play an important part in the verbal presentation of the frame "APPEARANCE", because this thematic group helped the author to express the nature of the main characters of the novel as well as their inner world.

Key words: appearance, frame, frame structure, terminal element.

УДК 81'42. 111

T. D. Kokoza

COGNITIVE AND STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC PARAMETERS OF POLITICAL APOLOGY IN THE MEDIA DISCOURSE

Political apology has become a prominent feature of the public relations discourse. During a public speech act of apology politicians profess to take responsibility for their own or their party / government wrongdoings [1; 2], express their sorrow or regret [3] and explain their actions. Recent famous examples of political apology include Gordon Brown's public apology to Ms. Guffy for calling her "a bigoted woman"; Tony Blair's expression of 'deep sorrow' over Britain's involvement in the slave trade and Obama's 'deep regret' over the failure of the healthcare reform. These were symbolic speech acts of public proclamation of sorrow and regret by the prominent politicians that aimed at restoring public equilibrium and were transmitted through the media.

Despite the preeminence of political apology on the public relations arena, it remains the least researched speech act of apology [4, p. 716]. The study of apology usually takes one of three forms: a taxonomy of the form [5; 6], politeness and face [1; 4] and cross-cultural aspect of apology [6; 7]. Hence, it is not clear what structural-semantic parameters constitute the salient characteristics of political apology and how it is different from other types of apology. Additionally, there is an ambiguity of taxonomy of the form of political apology [1, p. 286]. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to establish cognitive and structural-semantic parameters of the speech act of political apology by identifying its salient characteristics and pragmatic significance. To establish the diffirence between the apology as a generic speech act and the political apology as the public speech act of declaring remorse, we should

analyze epistemological definitions of the apology and the specific situated contexts of political apology.

There are two main approaches to the definition of the apology: the formal and functional. The <u>formal</u> approach is concerned with establishing the form of apology through listing lexemes and word phrases that indicate that apology is taking place [8, p. 76]. Thus, Owen [9, p. 88] identifies key strategies for apologizing: expression of apology that contains verbs to *apologize*, to *be sorry*, to *forgive*, to *excuse* and to *pardon*; verbal expressions pertaining to the explanation of the conflict; lexemes of acknowledgement of guilt, responsibility and remorse. Fraser [10, p. 247] proposes the term "illocutionary force indicating devices" to designate performative verbs indicating certain type of action (e.g. *to apologize, to promise, to request*). They communicate in a clear and concise way the intention behind a speech act.

However, some scholars [1; 4; 11] debate whether it is at all possible to assemble a list of all IFID sufficient for identifying the speech act of apology. Similarly, Cunningham [1, p. 289] argues that a performative verb can be present in the utterance without the speaker having that performative intention. Equally, the scholar posits, that the speech act of apology can be performed indirectly without the recourse to IFID.

The <u>functional</u> approach to the definition of apology stresses its communicative impact. Thus, Goffman states that apology is "a gesture through which an individual splits himself into two parts, the part that is guilty of an offense and the part that associates itself from the delinct and affirms the belief in the offended rule" [2, p. 113]. In a similar vein, Harris [4, p. 718] defines apology as a discursive act of acknowledgment of guilt, remorse, as well as communicative attempt to restore equilibrium that can take place in private or public domains.

Political apology takes place in the public domain where the apologizer is a prominent political figure and the offended is the audience at large. Given the para-social relations between the actors of the speech act of public apology [7, p. 56], political apology is highly mediated: it is transmitted through the media channels that also directly or indirectly evaluate the content of the political apology and impact the addressee. Therefore, for political apology to be clearly perceived as a valid apology and to minimize the distortions brought on by the channel of communication (the media), political apology always contains illocutionary force indicating devices (IFID) and the explicit expression of acknowledgment of guilt, blame and remorse [4, p. 721].

Let us consider the following example: "*I've just been talking to Gillian. I'm <u>mortified by what's happened</u>. I've given her my <u>sincere apologies</u>. I misunderstood what she said, and she has accepted there was a misunderstanding and has accepted my apology. If you like, I'm a <u>penitent sinner</u>. <u>Sometimes you say things you don't mean to say</u>, sometimes you say things by mistake and sometimes you say things you want to correct very quickly. So I wanted to come here and say that I <u>made a mistake</u> but to also to*

say I understood the concerns she was bringing to me and I simply misunderstood some of the words she used. I made my apology" [Guardian, 28.04. 2010].

The fragment of discourse contains an apology made by Gordon Brown, the then Prime Minster of Great Britain, to Ms. Guffy for calling her a "bigoted woman" and to the public at large. Brown clearly communicates his intention through the use of IFIDs (*I made my apology. I made my mistake*), explanation of the situation (*I misunderstood what she said*), explicit expression of guilt rendered through the emotive lexemes (*a penitent sinner*) as well as a tacit appeal to the audience to understand him amplified by the usage of personal pronoun "you" as a pragmatic focalizer (*sometimes you say things you do not mean to say*).

Given the variety of public settings and social circumstances, political apology is not a homogenous speech act. Instead, scholars [3; 5; 6] speculate over different type of political apology, such as direct and indirect, formalistic and genuine, ritualistic and explanatory. The drawback of the above-mentioned classifications is that they apply to the speech act of apology without differentiating between public and private domains, and as such neglect salient characteristics of political apology.

Drawing on the data obtained from the newspaper corpus from January 2010 to January 2014 (The Times, Guardian, The New York Times and Washington Post), we differentiate between three different types of political apology. Our categorization is based on the concept of FACE brought forward by Brown and Levinson [4, p. 718], under apology is regarded as a FACE-threatening act. Acknowledgement of the responsibility over a wrongdoing diminishes the communicative position of the apologizer and threatens the FACE, so there are attempts to redeem oneself and shift the blame. Based on this acknowledgement of responsibility in a FACE-threatening act of political apology, we differentiate between personalized political apology, institutionalized political apology and non-apology.

In the **personalized political apology**, a politician acknowledges a wrongdoing and *personally* takes responsibility for the wrongs committed. Personal responsibility of a politician is clear through the use of personal noun "I" and IFIDs related to the situated political context. Let us consider the fragment of Governer Christie apology to the people of New Jersey over the closure of the bridge that was published in New York Times: "*I come out here to this office where I've been many times before and I've come out here today to apologize to the people of New Jersey. I apologize to the people of Fort Lee and I apologize to the members of the state legislature.I am embarrassed and humiliated by the conduct of some of the people on my team. ... I cannot know what each one of them is doing at every minute.But that doesn't matter; I'm ultimately responsible for what they do. And that is why I am personally responsible*" [The New York Post, 12.04.2014]. The thematic core of the discourse fragment expressed through IFIDs (*apologize*), explicit expression

of remorse and humiliation (*embarrassed and humiliated*) underline the theme of the personal responsibility of the politician.

In **institutionalized political apologies** politicians acknowledge a wrongdoing and their responsibility but only as representatives of certain public institutions and government structures. In doing so, politicians shift the blame from the individual to the collective abstract. Similarly, politicians employ communicative tactics of mitigation and distancing. Bill Clinton's political apology over the medical experiments that were branded as racist by the majority of the public is an apt example of the institutionalized political apology. "*We can look you in the eye and say on behalf of the American people that what the United States government did was shameful and I am sorry. ...Medical people are supposed to help when we need medical care but even once a cure was discovered they were denied help and they were failed by their government. ...The United States government did something that was wrong, profoundly morally wrong... I apologize and I am sorry that your federal government orchestrated a study so clearly racist that can never be allowed to happen again. It is against everything our country stands for*" [The Washington Post, 21.11.2012].

Clinton does not personally accept responsibility for the racist medical experiments and apologizes on the behalf of the United States government. He shifts the blame and further distances himself from the wrongdoing by utilizing personal pronouns (*your* federal government, *their* government) and the definite article "the" (*the United States government*)- implying the previous administration. Thus, he dissociates himself from the government that was responsible for the injustice and further mitigates the message through the appeal to democratic values (*It is against everything our country stands for*).

We define **political non-apology** as public statements that contain the form of apology but the intent of apology is absent. Politicians often employ such IFIDs as to *be sorry*, to *regret*, as well as nouns *sorrow* and *concern* to express their empathy with the offended or to declare their regret over a wrongdoing. To pragmatic intents and purposes it is not an apology because there is no acknowledgement of responsibility either through personal admission of guilt or institutionalized, however it bears all the formalist markings of a political apology. Let us consider the following extract from The Times in which Tony Blair, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain address the subject of the UK involvement in the slave trade. "*It is hard to believe that what would now be a crime against humanity was legal at the time. Personally the bicentenary offers us a chance not just to say how profoundly shameful the slave trade was – how we condemn its existence utterly and praise those who fought for its abolition, but also to express our deep sorrow that it ever happened, that it ever could have happened and to rejoice in the different and better times we live today*" [The Times, 26.10.2011].

Tony Blair expresses his disgust over slavery and condemns its very existence but falls short of admitting the role of the British Empire in the promotion of slave trade and acknowledging public guilt. Instead, he retorts to "deep sorrow" the closest IFID of apology. Therefore, his statement is an expression of sorrow over a highly contentious public issue and can be regarded as a political non-apology.

Summing up, political apology takes place in the public domain and is transmitted through the media, it contains illocutionary force indicating devices and explicit expression of guilt, responsibility or remorse. Depending on the way a politician chooses to acknowledge responsibility, we differentiated between personalized political apology, institutionalized political apology and non-apology.

References
1. Cunningham M. Saying sorry: The politics of apology / M. Cunningham // Political Quarterly. – 1999. – Vol. 70. – P. 285 – 293. **2. Goffman E.** Relations in Public: Micro studies of the Public Order / E. Goffman. – Harmondsworth : Penguin, 1971. – 189 p. **3. Wouk F.** The language of apologizing in Lombok Indonesia / F. Wouk // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2006. – Vol. 38. – P. 1457 – 1486. **4. Harris S.** The pragmatics of political apologies / S. Harris, K. Grainger, & L. Mullany // Discourse and Society. – 2006. – Vol. 17 – P. 715 – 737. **5. Jakubowska E.** Cross-Cultural Dimensions of Politeness in the Case of Polish and English / E. Jakubowska. – Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 1999. – 345 p. **6. Trosborg A.** Apology strategies in natives and non-natives / A. Trosborg // Journal of Pragmatics. – 1987. – Vol. 11. – P. 147 – 167. **7. Márquez R**. Linguistic Politeness in Britain in Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies / R. Márquez.– Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 2006. – 236 p. **8. Deutschmann M.** Apologizing in British English / M. Deutschmann. – Umeå : UmeåUniversitet, 2003. – 156 p. **9. Owen M.** Apologies and Remedial Interchanges: A Study of Language Use in Social Interaction / M. Owen. – Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 1983. – 301 p. **10. Fraser B.** On apologizing / B. Fraser // Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech / [ed. by F. Coulmas]. – The Hague: Mouton, 1981. – P. 245 – 271. **11. Austin J.** A Plea for Excuses / J. Austin // Philosophical Papers / [ed. by J. Urmsonand G. Warnock]. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1970. – P. 145 – 204.

Кокоза Т. Д. Когнітивні та структурно-семантичні параметри політичного вибачення у медійному дискурсі
У статті розглядаються когнітивні та структурно-семантичні параметри мовленнєвого акту політичного вибачення через встановлення притаманних йому дискурсивних характеристик та визначення прагматичного навантаження. Зокрема, визначається публічна спрямованість політичного вибачення та використання в ньому мовних

одиниць на позначення іллокутивної сили повідомлення (*illocutionary force indicating devices*) та прямого вираження концепту співчуття та/або відповідальності. В залежності від того, які комунікативні стратегії і тактики використовує політичний діяч для вираження теми відповідальності у політичному вибаченні, розрізняємо: персоналізовані політичні та інституційні політичні вибачення та відсутність вибачення.

Ключові слова: мовленнєвий акт, політичне вибачення, мовні одиниці на позначення іллокутивної сили повідомлення.

Кокоза Т. Д. **Когнитивные и структурно-семантические параметры политического извинения в медийном дискурсе**

В статье рассматриваются когнитивные и структурно-семантические параметры речевого акта политического извинения путем установления его сущностных характеристик и прагматического потенциала. Детальному анализу подвергается публичная направленность политического извинения и использование в нем языковых единиц репрезентации иллокутивной силы сообщения. В зависимости от того, какие коммуникативные стратегии и тактики использует политический деятель для выражения темы ответственности в политическом извинении, нами различаются персонализованные политические извинения, институционные политические извинения и фактическое отсутствие извинения.

*Ключевые слова :*речевой акт, политическое извинение, языковые единицы обозначения иллокутивной силы сообщения.

Kokoza T. D. Cognitive and Structural-semantic Parameters of Political Apology in the Media Discourse

The article examines cognitive and structural-semantic parameters of the speech act of political apology by identifying its salient characteristics and pragmatic significance. Polotical apology takes place in the public domain and it is transmitted through the media, it is triggered by the public discontent and contains illocutionary force indicating devices and explicit expression of the acknowledgement of guilt. The difference between apology as a generic speech act of discourse and political apology as the speech act of public domain is touched upon. Drawing on the data from the newspaper corpus, the study sets out and illustrates different types of political apology in the media discourse. Depending on the way a politician chooses to acknowledge the responsibility we differentiate between personalized political apology, institutionalized political apology and politucal non- apology. In personalized apologies politician takes personal responsibility for any wrongdoings while in the institutionalized political apology they position themselves as representative of governmental structures and shift the blame from the individual to the collective. Polotucal non- apology has the form of apology but lacked expected contrition.

УДК 81'1:81'22:81'374+008

O. S. Kolesnyk

LINGUAL REPRESENTATION OF THE MYTHIC CONCEPT WAY

Present-day linguistics demonstrates tendencies towards integrative studying language and speech objects binding them to cognitive, cultural, natural and statistic phenomena [1; 2; 3]. In our recent research we have addressed the issue of myth-based and language-mediated constructing alternative realities, creating cultural and interpretational patterns, influencing language personalities and social groups [4]. We believe that a multi-dimensional description of language signs representing various aspects of modeling ethnically marked images of the world may be promising in terms of supporting the theory of myth-oriented semiosis as a universal premises of humans' rationalizing the world.

Various cognitive and interpreting practices carried out by language personalities at various stages of their linguo-communities' development result into the emergence of specific worldviews. The said worldviews correlate with alternative realities (known as alternative worlds) that we regard as possible and variable states of affairs predetermined by choices (bifurcations) in systems' development. The latter are represented by both dynamic mental structures and informational codes of diverse nature, primarily by lingual construals. Mental modeling and verbal embodiment of alternative realities is impacted by the so called basic operators – axiomatic informational quanta that constitute the framework of the mythic space (MS).

MS is defined as a verbally mediated informational continuum comprising situational hierarchies of mythic concepts united into mythic scenarios. MS is regarded as the container of interpreter-type language signs involved into the myth-oriented semiosis. The said signs as phenomena of precedent character reflect the knowledge of once primary configuration of the world. Except for providing the foundation for ethnically variable verbal images of the world, mythic concepts define the network of attractors that shape trajectories of mythic scenarios and their variations. As we have discussed [4, p. 111 – 166], both mythic concepts and mythic scenarios are paradigmatically correlated while the mythic scenarios typical sequences follow the pattern of the quest (which is, in fact, a mega-level scenario). We