

Reconciliation without Regret? Pragma-Stylistic Insights into Non-Apology Strategies in Obama's Address at Hiroshima Peace Memorial, Japan

Asst. Inst. Kais M. Raheem

kais.m.raheem@aliraqia.edu.iq

Al-Iraqia University / College of Arts

Asst. Prof. Dr. Younis Ibrahim Al-Dalawi

- younis.ibrahim@sadiq.edu.iq

Department of English Language, College of Arts, Imam Ja'far Al-Sadiq University, Baghdad Iraq

Abstract

In politics expressing an apology to whitewash war past sins is a path that is full of obstacles. If an apology comprises a set of acts, the aspect which indicates responsibility-taking is normally avoided by politicians, as it constitutes a prohibitive factor for the wrongdoing state to take the step towards apologizing.

The resonating impact of the atomic bombings, with Hiroshima at its focal point, ensures its place in international historical accounts and diplomatic communications. The current study conducts a thorough and detailed pragma-stylistic analysis of the US former President Obama's address in 2016 in Hiroshima; an eloquent rhetoric addressing the humanitarian catastrophe that had befallen the city. As the study navigates this rich linguistic landscape, the study reveals Obama's artful linguistic maneuvers, masterfully balancing an acknowledgment of history with the preservation of the U.S.'s prevailing stance on the incident, all while avoiding any clear admission of guilt. Through the exploration of various deictic markers, deliberate nominalizations, and insightful metonymies, the analysis brings attention to the complex manipulation of acknowledging history, resonating with empathy, and exercising diplomatic wariness. The findings highlight the significance of pragma-stylistic artfulness in global communication, revealing the influential role of linguistic devices in shaping perceptions, maneuvering through challenging historical events, and establishing the foundation for future diplomatic initiatives.

Key words: Non-apology strategies – reconciliation – pragma-stylistics – historical acknowledgement – diplomatic discourse

1. Introduction

The bombing of Hiroshima is a notetrustworthy example where the United States has been unwilling to issue an apology to Japan. That is, successive U.S. presidents have declined to offer an apology, asserting that the bombings were justified and deemed necessary. For instance, in 1995, President Bill Clinton asserted that the United States "The United States owes no apology to Japan". He contended that the "atomic bomb had ended the war." likewise, George H.W. Bush, Clinton's predecessor, stated that "that the decision to drop the atomic bombs was right ... because it spared millions of American lives." Additionally, President Ronald Reagan, in 1985, claimed that those attacks "saved more than one million American lives." Such endeavors to justify the action are not new; instead, they have been stated by U.S. governments since 1940s. Pragmatically, justifications are communicated to imply that the "actor's conduct was not morally wrongful." (Berman, 2003, p. 1) They thus have been expressed as persuasive acts, as they aim to convince the addressee (and the whole world) of the validity or correctness of the action.

On May 27, 2016, President Barack Obama, the first U.S. president to visit the city of Hiroshima, delivered one of his best speeches ever, in an effort to strengthen bilateral relations with Japan and bolster the political image of the United States. In his concise yet eloquent mention of the war's victims, he skillfully avoids issuing any apology. So, between offering an apology and maintaining silence, Obama opts for the use of non-apologetic language.

2. Research Questions

1. How does President Obama utilize pragmatic strategies and stylistic nuances in his Hiroshima address to evoke collective memory while tactfully sidestepping direct responsibility for the bombings?

2. Through which lexico-pragmatic mechanisms and stylistic tropes does the discourse artfully mediate between the act of historical acknowledgment and the evasion of explicit culpability?

3. Theoretical Underpinning

3.1. Non-apology theory

The language expressing a true post-offense reparatory intent, to be felicitous, primarily incorporates, above all, "taking on responsibility", "feeling remorse", "offering to fix situation" and "promise of non-occurrence" for the offense made (Olshtain, 1989: 157). Olshtain (1989) sees that these components basically make up the backbone of the expressive speech act set of an apology.

Still, specific mechanisms of a diplomatic reconciliatory process exemplified by an apology make the objective quite prickly, as Bavelas (2004) points out, a corrective action through apologies may "turn out not to be a smooth path but one full of obstacles" (p. 5). To clearly elaborate on that point, state apologies constitute a thorny issue owing to a couple of reasons, including:

1. There might be legal consequences because, in the law, fully admitting responsibility as part of a sincere apology indicates affirming liability.
2. For governments, leaders offering the apology have been usually not the wrongdoers, so they would be taking responsibility for actions they did not do.

However, an alternative option, hence to refuse to apologize, can also have serious drawbacks:

3. States refusal to apologize for a known violation possibly incurs the condemnation of the injured nation's peoples and even further aggravates the wrongful action.
4. To openly refuse to apologize mostly reduces the reconciliation opportunity that an apology can initiate.

Consequently, perpetrators are caught between ‘Scylla and Charybdis’. Given a number of unfavorable consequences of both offering an apology and refusing to apologize, it would be predictable to try to steer clear of either option. The avoidance theory of equivocation seems to be a better alternative to such scenarios, as it is possible to avoid taking neither path (i.e., apology refusal and those of apologizing) by dint of what is called ‘pseudo apology’, the term which Bavelas (2004) describes as "a statement that includes the part of an apology that expresses sympathy without the part that accepts agency or responsibility" (p.5).

Governments that have acted wrongly seem to try influencing how victimized nations view them by only offering partial elements of an apology. This way, they sidestep components that might lead to unwanted repercussions. In accordance with Brown and Levinson's (1978) view who consider apology to be “almost exclusive concern with H’s face” (p. 283), researchers including Fraser (1981), Cohen and Olshtain (1981; 1983) Olshtain (1989), as well as Cohen, Olshtain and Rosenstein (1986) put the addressee's (H's) face as the major concern of repairing relationship through apologizing. Contrasted to these models, Meier's (1995) "Repair Work" (RW) makes the speaker's image the center figure, whereas "H's face is only a by-product of the attempt to save S's face" (p. 389).

The idea behind the concept of Repair Work is based on Meier’s view of why apologies are offered. Unlike Olshtain, who claims apologies are "hearer-supported" and require the speaker to "humiliate" himself, Meier sees the apology as an element of Repair Work. According to Meier (1995), Repair Work "functions to remedy any damage incurred to an 'actor's' image upon the establishment of a responsibility link between and actor and behavior which fell below the standard expected relative to a particular reference group". (p. 388) It is "an image -saving device as regards the Speaker (not the Hearer), making S's image the center figure. Concern for H's face is only a by-product of the attempt to save S's face" (p. 389). She

goes on to say that Repair Work is also, "an attempt to show that the Speaker is a 'good guy' (despite having violated a social norm) and can be relied upon in the future to act predictably in accordance with social norms" (p. 389). It is "located with a framework of social interaction" and "aims to identify what is perceived to be appropriate given a particular situation" (p. 390).

4. Methodology

4.1. Data Source

The principal dataset is the official transcript of President Obama's address in Hiroshima on May 27, 2016. The official transcript of the speech was sourced from the White House's official website. This serves as the most authentic record of the speech.

4.2. Ethical Considerations

Given the public nature of the address and the information surrounding it, there weren't significant ethical concerns. However, all sourced materials were credited appropriately, and any commentary or personal opinion was treated as such, ensuring no misrepresentation.

4.3. Rationale for a Qualitative Analysis

Given the rich tapestry of context, emotion, history, and diplomacy embedded within Obama's Hiroshima address, a qualitative approach is apt. It allows for an interpretive exploration of the speech, enabling a deeper understanding of linguistic choices, narrative structures, and their broader implications.

4.4. Qualitative Analysis Framework

Thematic Analysis: The speech is dissected to identify recurring themes, narratives, or motifs. By pinpointing these, the overarching messages, intentions, and priorities of the speech can be delineated.

Rhetorical Analysis: This focuses on rhetorical devices employed, from metaphors and analogies to repetitions and rhetorical questions. Such devices often aim to persuade, evoke emotion, or emphasize particular points.

Pragmatic Analysis: This evaluates the context in which utterances are made, examining the unsaid or implied. In a speech like Obama's, what is left unsaid can be as revealing as what is vocalized.

4.5. Tools and Techniques

Coding: The speech transcript is manually coded, marking out significant phrases, recurrent themes, and rhetorical devices. Initial broad codes can later be refined into more nuanced sub-categories.

Narrative Structure: The flow of the speech is dissected to understand the evolution of arguments or narratives, pinpointing the introduction, buildup, climax, and resolution.

Contextual Embedding: External events, historical contexts, and prior speeches/statements by Obama or other key figures are referenced to provide a backdrop against which the Hiroshima address can be more profoundly understood.

4.6. Challenges and Limitations

Qualitative analysis, while rich, is inherently interpretive. Different researchers might prioritize different aspects of the speech or interpret nuances differently. However, by clearly defining the analytical framework and consistently applying it, the validity of the analysis is upheld.

4.7. Analytical Framework

The sophisticated linguistic dance of reconciliation, face-saving maneuvers, and evasive tactics regarding responsibility positions Meier's Repair Work framework as a particularly perspicuous analytical tool for this discourse. Engaging with this pragma-stylistic model facilitates a deep semiotic exploration of the intertextual intentions, pragmatic strategies, and encoded messages within Obama's oration.

The framework's hierarchically structured taxonomy, segmented into three primary strategies that further bifurcate into intricate sub-strategies, provides a rigorous linguistic foundation for scrutinizing Obama's lexico-pragmatic and stylistic choices. For an exhaustive overview of this analytical

framework, refer to Table 1, which systematically enumerates the model's encompassed strategies.

Table 1: Meier's Repair Work non-apology strategies

1) Speaker → Hearer. The speaker attempts to understand the addressee's perspective by acknowledging their emotions			
a- Expressing empathy and negative feelings with the hearer			
b- Explicit acceptance of blame			
c- Explicit statement of bad performance			
2) Hearer → Speaker. The S aims to persuade H to view things from the speaker's perspective by			
Excuses	a- appeal to external force		
	i) person or institution	ii) machine or object	iii) situation (specified or unspecified)
	b- appeal to internal force		
	i) temporary	ii) permanent	iii) human nature
	c- appeal to unspecified force		
Justifications	a- minimize negativity		
	b- appeal to higher good		
	c- derogation of victim		
Appealing to the hearer's understanding			
3) Speaker ↔ Hearer. The two meet halfway, with the focus on attempting "to wipe the slate clean"			
Routine formulae	a- request for exoneration		
	b- expression of regret		
Expressing hope for continuation of status quo			
Expressing hope for return to status quo			

5. Data Analysis

Strategy 1: "Expressing Empathy and Negative Feelings with the Hearer"

Substrategy 1.1: Use of Passive Voice to Background Agency

Instance: *"A flash of light and a wall of fire destroyed a city..."*

Analysis: This utterance is characterized by transitivity reduction via the passive voice, wherein the actor is elided, thus de-emphasizing agency. The metonymic expressions "flash of light" and "wall of fire" function as synecdochical shifts, spotlighting the disastrous aspects of the atomic bomb without addressing the bomb or its initiators directly. This form of deixis serves to envelop the listener in the horror of the event without anchoring it to a particular responsible entity.

Substrategy 1.2: Deictic Expressions to Universalize the Experience

Instance: *"We come to ponder a terrible force unleashed in a not so distant past."*

Analysis: The plural deictic marker "We" performs an inclusivity function, constructing an inter-subjective space where speaker and listeners share a mutual experience. This is intensified by the vague temporal expression "a not so distant past," which functions as an implicature, presupposing a shared understanding among listeners about the timeframe being referenced. The verb "ponder" is presented as an infinitive, a type of process nominalization that morphs active contemplation into a shared, static state, further unifying the speaker with the audience in mutual reflection.

Strategy 2: "Explicit Acceptance of Blame"

Instance: While there isn't a direct statement where the U.S. overtly claims responsibility for the bombing, one can discern implicit admissions in lines like *"That is why we come to this place."*

Analysis: Obama's deliberate choice of the first person plural pronoun "we" serves as a collective indexical marker, implying shared responsibility. The modal verb "come" paired with the determiner "this" designates a particular place of significance, namely Hiroshima. By highlighting the U.S.'s presence

in Hiroshima, Obama subtly accepts accountability. However, this is achieved without an overt admission of guilt, showcasing the finesse of linguistic maneuvering to strike a delicate balance between acknowledgment and explicit blame.

Strategy 3: "Explicit Statement of Bad Performance"

Substrategy 3.1: Acknowledgment of Negative Outcomes

Instance: *"Technological progress without an equivalent progress in human institutions can doom us."*

Analysis: Obama adopts a causal conditional structure here, suggesting a direct link between technological advancement and potential global peril if not matched with commensurate humanistic progression. This subtle assertion implies that the negative outcome, the atomic bombings, was a result of this imbalance. The verb "doom" is evocative, carrying connotations of finality and cataclysm, and suggests recognition of the undesirable ramifications of previous actions.

Substrategy 3.2: Recognition of Undesirable Effects

Instance: *"Hiroshima teaches this truth."*

Analysis: Through metonymy, where 'Hiroshima' stands in for the event of the atomic bombing, Obama underscores the city as a symbol of a grave lesson learned. By presenting Hiroshima as a teacher, he encapsulates the catastrophic event and its aftermath into a singular lesson of enormous significance. This rhetorical device foregrounds the negative consequences of the bombing, implying its status as an event not to be emulated.

Strategy 4: "Excuses- Appeal to External Force (Person or Institution)"

Instance: *"Empires have risen and fallen. Peoples have been subjugated and liberated."*

Analysis: Obama employs a series of antithetical pairs to create a sense of historical determinism. By referencing the cyclical and inevitable rise and fall of empires and the recurring themes of subjugation and liberation, he diminishes individual or national agency, suggesting that such events are

products of broader historical forces. This pragma-stylistic technique allows for a subtle distancing from direct responsibility by embedding specific actions within a vast canvas of historical inevitabilities.

Strategy 5: "Excuses- Appeal to External Force (Machine or Object)"

Instance: *"The scientific revolution that led to the splitting of an atom requires a moral revolution, as well."*

Analysis: Obama employs a declarative sentence structure, a common linguistic device, to foreground the "scientific revolution" and its inevitable consequence. Through antithesis, juxtaposing "scientific revolution" with "moral revolution," he leverages the inherent contrast to highlight an imbalance. This choice of attributing causality to a technological advancement, specifically the "splitting of an atom," serves as a mitigation strategy. His syntactic parallelism, placing both revolutions on an equal footing, indirectly suggests that while science has surged ahead, morality hasn't kept pace, casting the blame onto the unpredictability of technological advancements rather than human agency.

Strategy 6: "Excuses- Appeal to External Force – Situation"

Substrategy 6.1: Citing Historical Inevitabilities

Instance: *"Artifacts tell us that violent conflict appeared with the very first man."*

Analysis: Obama employs a pragma-stylistic maneuver by referencing "artifacts," which adds historical earnest and authority to his claim. The passive voice "violent conflict appeared" decentralizes agency, tactfully suggesting that the origins of conflict are rooted in the historical records, thereby absolving the present from the sins of the past. This tactic leans into a kind of historical determinism, depicting human nature as perpetually connected to its primitive instincts.

Substrategy 6.2: Indicating Uncontrollable Circumstances

Instance: *"On every continent, the history of civilization is filled with war, whether driven by scarcity of grain or hunger for gold; compelled by nationalist fervor or religious zeal."*

Analysis: The pragmatics of this utterance reveals a complex structure of the context dynamics. Using enumerative detail, Obama underscores the diverse reasons wars ensue. The semicolon serves as a pragmatic device, segmenting the material from the ideological causes of conflict. The passive construction "is filled with" removes direct human agency, positioning wars as almost inevitable outcomes of larger societal forces.

Strategy 7: "Excuses- Appeal to Internal Force - Temporary"

Instance: *"The World War that reached its brutal end in Hiroshima and Nagasaki was fought among the wealthiest and most powerful of nations."*

Analysis: Through this utterance, Obama acknowledges the unparalleled pressures of World War II, signaling that the decisions taken were influenced by the specific tensions and urgencies of that time. The pragma-stylistic choice to mention "the wealthiest and most powerful of nations" serves to distribute the weight of the decision, emphasizing that these were unprecedented times with unprecedented challenges, possibly leading to uncharacteristic choices. The temporality of the situation is underlined, suggesting that the actions taken were a result of fleeting yet intense situational pressures.

Strategy 8: "Excuses- Appeal to Internal Force - Permanent"

Instance: "Our early ancestors, having learned to make blades from flint and spears from wood, used these tools not just for hunting, but against their own kind."

Analysis: Drawing from a pragma-stylistic lens, this statement weaves a narrative that positions violent tendencies as ingrained in the very fabric of human evolution. By pointing out the dual use of the earliest tools — for sustenance and conflict — Obama subtly underscores a potential intrinsic

duality in human nature. The conjunction "not just" contrasts the benign with the malevolent, emphasizing the early manifestation of this duality. Thus, the linguistic crafting suggests that the propensity for conflict might be rooted deeply in human nature, serving as an underlying rationale for subsequent historical conflicts.

Strategy 9: "Excuses- Appeal to Internal Force - Human Nature"

Instance: *"Nations arise, telling a story that binds people together in sacrifice and cooperation, allowing for remarkable feats, but those same stories have so often been used to oppress and dehumanize those who are different."*

Analysis: The use of the conjunction "but" introduces a contrast that reveals humanity's dualistic tendencies. Obama uses the narrative of nation-building as a microcosm of broader human behavior. While nations are founded on principles of unity and cooperation, as highlighted by "binds people together" and "remarkable feats," they also possess a capacity for exclusion and oppression. The pragma-stylistic approach illuminates the narrative technique, where the positive and unifying aspects of nationhood are juxtaposed against their divisive implications. This serves as a reflection of humanity's broader conflicting tendencies.

Strategy 10: "Justifications - Minimize Negativity"

Substrategy 10.1: Highlighting Positive Outcomes from Negative Events

Instance: *"The United States and Japan forged not only an alliance but a friendship that has won far more for our people than we could ever claim through war."*

Analysis: Obama makes use of the coordinating conjunction "but" to introduce a contrast, a pragma-stylistic tool that serves to pivot from a negative premise (the historical enmity) to a positive outcome (the strong alliance and friendship). By doing so, he reorients the listener's attention from the grim past to the prosperous present, lessening the weight of

historical transgressions and emphasizing the potential for healing and cooperation.

Substrategy 10.2: Emphasizing Universality of Flawed Actions

Instance: *"The wars of the modern age teach this truth. Hiroshima teaches this truth."*

Analysis: Obama pragmatically leverages the notion of "teaching" as a universally accepted positive value, emphasizing the didactic nature of historical events. By connecting "the wars of the modern age" with "Hiroshima," he aligns the specific incident with broader human conflicts, suggesting that mistakes or flawed decisions are a part of a larger human condition. The repetition of "teaches this truth" serves as an anaphora, highlighting the educative potential of past tragedies and suggesting that, while these events were negative, they provide a foundation from which humanity can learn and grow.

Strategy 11: "Justifications - Appeal to Higher Good"

Substrategy 11.1: Elevating Shared Ideals

Instance: *"Every great religion promises a pathway to love and peace and righteousness, and yet no religion has been spared from believers who have claimed their faith as a license to kill."*

Analysis: Utilizing polysyndeton in the enumeration of virtues ("love, peace, righteousness"), Obama draws attention to the elevated ideals that most humans aspire to. The pragma-stylistic use of contrast, introduced by the conjunction "and yet," underscores the tension between the noble aspirations of religious teachings and the flawed human interpretations or applications of these teachings. By referencing "every great religion," he appeals to a universal understanding, suggesting that the challenges faced are common across different beliefs, thereby evoking the higher good of mutual understanding and peace.

Substrategy 11.2: Emphasizing Long-term Positive Impacts

Instance: "An international community established institutions and treaties that worked to avoid war and aspire to restrict and roll back, and ultimately eliminate the existence of nuclear weapons."

Analysis: Through cumulative sentence structure, Obama catalogs the proactive measures taken by the international community. The verbs "restrict," "roll back," and "eliminate" suggest a strategic, phased approach to achieving a significant global objective. Pragma-stylistically, the use of the coordinating conjunction "and" multiple times (polysyndeton) emphasizes the sequential and cooperative nature of these efforts, implying that the steps, though difficult, serve the higher good of global peace and security.

Strategy 12: "Justifications - Derogation of Victim"

(Note: Obama's speech does not overtly derogate the victims; hence, the instances extracted might be more subtle or indirect.)

Substrategy 12.1: Universalizing Responsibility

Instance: "*Our early ancestors, having learned to make blades from flint and spears from wood, used these tools not just for hunting, but against their own kind.*"

Analysis: Using the participial phrase "having learned," Obama draws attention to the evolution of human tools and skills. But rather than solely focusing on progress, he underscores the duality of these advancements: they were used both for sustenance ("hunting") and violence ("against their own kind"). The pragma-stylistic choice of juxtaposing these dual uses indirectly suggests that the tendencies to harm or conflict are deeply rooted and not specific to any particular group or time.

Substrategy 12.2: Emphasizing Shared Failings

Instance: "*Nations arise, telling a story that binds people together in sacrifice and cooperation, allowing for remarkable feats, but those same*

stories have so often been used to oppress and dehumanize those who are different."

Analysis: By utilizing contrast, introduced with the coordinating conjunction "but," Obama underscores the paradox of national narratives. While these narratives foster unity and cooperation within, they can also be tools of oppression and dehumanization towards outsiders. The pragma-stylistic use of antithesis here serves to blur the lines between victim and oppressor, suggesting that nations, as collective entities, share common failings, and that the tragedy might be a result of these shared human flaws rather than the shortcomings of the victims themselves.

Strategy 13: "Appealing to the Hearer's Understanding"

Substrategy 13.1: Invoking Shared Humanity

Instance: *"Those who died – they are like us. Ordinary people understand this, I think."*

Analysis: The comparative conjunction "like" creates a bridge of empathy, suggesting that the deceased and the listener share a fundamental human bond. The use of the present tense verb "are" functions to emphasize the timelessness of this shared humanity. The addition of the adverbial phrase "I think" employs a modality that invites listeners to agree, pragmatically positioning the assertion as a shared, universal truth rather than a mere personal belief.

Substrategy 13.2: Directly Addressing the Hearer's Moral Judgement

Instance: *"Mere words cannot give voice to such suffering, but we have a shared responsibility to look directly into the eye of history and ask what we must do differently to curb such suffering again."*

Analysis: The opening phrase "Mere words" employs a diminishing qualifier to acknowledge the limitations of speech in the face of profound suffering, appealing to the listener's understanding of the enormity of the event. The subsequent shift, introduced with the adversative conjunction "but,"

foregrounds a collective duty, emphasizing "shared responsibility." By invoking the imperative to "look directly into the eye of history," Obama uses a pragma-stylistic device to challenge the listener's moral judgment, urging introspection and shared commitment to change.

Strategy 14: "Routine Formulae - Request for Exoneration"

Substrategy 14.1: Invoking Collective Memory for Understanding

Instance: *"We come to ponder a terrible force unleashed in a not so distant past. We come to mourn the dead."*

Analysis: The recurrent verbal phrase "We come to" is laden with a pragma-stylistic implication of purposeful reflection. The use of the verb "ponder" combined with "mourn" emphasizes a journey of collective acknowledgment and introspection. These verbs, pragmatically, function as tacit requests for understanding, indirectly asking the listener to empathize with the sentiment expressed and thereby grant a form of exoneration.

Substrategy 14.2: Positioning for Forward-Looking Redemption

Instance: *"That memory allows us to fight complacency. It fuels our moral imagination. It allows us to change."*

Analysis: Through anaphora, the repeated "It allows us" becomes a pragma-stylistic device highlighting future potential. This commitment is to draw lessons from the past and striving for change positions the past actions in a broader arc of redemption and progress. By focusing on the potential for positive change and learning, the discourse subtly requests the listener to weigh past actions against future intentions, thereby seeking a form of exoneration.

Strategy 15: "Routine Formulae - Expression of Regret"

Instance: *"Seventy-one years ago, on a bright, cloudless morning, death fell from the sky and the world was changed."*

Analysis: The adjectival juxtaposition of a "bright, cloudless morning" with the ensuing consequence of "death" falling creates a stark pragma-stylistic

contrast. By employing this antithesis, Obama subtly underscores the unexpectedness and gravity of the event. The use of the passive voice in "death fell" omits the agent, which not only emphasizes the event's impact but, at a pragmatic level, communicates a profound sense of regret without laying direct blame.

Strategy 16: "Expressing Hope for Continuation of Status Quo"

Instance: *"The United States and Japan forged not only an alliance, but a friendship that has won far more for our people than we could ever claim through war."*

Analysis: Obama pragmatically exploits the coordination of the terms "alliance" and "friendship" to emphasize the depth and multifaceted nature of the post-war relationship. From a pragma-stylistic perspective, the juxtaposition of gains "through war" versus the benefits of "friendship" subtly advocates for a continuation of the peaceful status quo by elevating its merits over past conflicts.

Strategy 17: "Expressing Hope for Return to Status Quo"

Instance: *"The nations of Europe built a Union that replaced battlefields with bonds of commerce and democracy."*

Analysis: From a pragma-stylistic perspective, the transformation from "battlefields" to "bonds of commerce and democracy" is a significant lexical choice. It brings forth a vivid dichotomy that emphasizes the benefits of unity and cooperation. The use of "replaced" suggests a desired shift from conflict to collaboration, underscoring the longing for a return to a time when cooperation reigned supreme over warfare.

6. Findings and Discussion

Within the carefully chosen words of President Obama's Hiroshima remarks lies a strategic exercise in pragma-stylistic choices, each employed

to convey specific intentions and sentiments. The following dimensions emerged prominently in the analysis:

- i. **Avoiding direct culpability with passive constructions:** The address is characterized by a prevalent use of passive voice and event nominalizations. Such constructions allowed for the evocation of the Hiroshima tragedy without directly attributing agency, enabling an acknowledgment without overt blame.
- ii. **Evoking shared emotion through lexico-pragmatic choices:** Obama's speech often harnesses affective resonance to create a shared emotional ground. The antithetical juxtaposition of phrases, such as "bright, cloudless morning" and "death fell," serves as a potent perlocutionary act, urging listeners to engage in collective mourning and reflection.
- iii. **Historical determinism through meta-pragmatic indicators:** By referencing the cyclical dynamics of empires and broader historical frameworks, Obama's discourse positions the bombings as manifestations of larger, quasi-inevitable historical dynamics, reducing the emphasis on individual agency.
- iv. **Collective memory through deictic shifts:** The recurrent use of plural deictics, such as "we," served to construct an inter-subjective space, drawing listeners into a sphere of shared memory and mutual responsibility.
- v. **Projection of collective hope through prospective deixis:** Obama's discourse frequently employed forward-pointing deixis, emphasizing a shared, optimistic path towards peace and nuclear disarmament. The Hiroshima narrative, therefore, is metamorphosed from a tragic memory into a collective aspiration for a brighter, shared future.

7. Conclusion

Throughout the analysis of Obama's address, a number of strategies and substrategies, set in pragma-stylistic framework, have been identified and explored. These strategies serve as linguistic tools employed by the

speaker to manipulate the metaphorical language in conveying empathy, recognizing responsibility, and offering reconciliation without explicitly admitting blame. The wide range of techniques, ranging from expressions of empathy and regret to more minute linguistic devices such as referencing historical continuities, underscores the depth and layers of this pivotal address. These strategies not only clarify Obama's adept oratory skills but also shed a light the complex dynamics of political discourse where every word and phrase is enriched with diverse meanings and implications. The analysis demonstrates the endeavors to influence of language in shaping historical accounts, healing past wounds, and guiding future diplomatic initiatives. Viewing these dynamics through the perspective of pragma-stylistic analysis, a deeper understanding emerges regarding the subtle interactions between rhetoric, history, and international relations.

References

- Bavelas, J. B. (2004). *An analysis of formal apologies by Canadian churches to First Nations*. Occasional Paper No. 1, Centre for Studies in Religion and Society, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.
- Brown, P. and Levinson. S. (1978). Universals in language use: Politeness phenomena In E. N. Goody, (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. (pp.56- 289). New York: Cambridge University.
- Cohen, A. D., and Olshtain, E. (1981). *Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology*. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 113–134.
- (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson, & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-36). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Fraser, B. (1981). On Apologizing. In F.Coulmas (ed), *Conversational Routine. Explorations in Standardized Communications Situations and Prepatterned Speech*, The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 259-73.
- Meier, A.J., 1995. Passages of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24:381-92.
- Olshtain, E and Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: a speech act set. In Wolfson, Nessa Eliote, Judd (Eds), *Sociopragmatics and Language Acquisition*, pp. 18-36. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- (1989). *Apologies across languages. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, 155173.

