

**Pragmatics Analysis of Sarcasm
in English Literature**

Instructor. Alaa Khaled Nsaif

University of Al-Mustansiriyah/

College of Arts

Department of French language

Abstract

This study is a textual investigation of various kinds and functions of sarcasm in George Bernard Shaw work "Arm and the Man". The concept sarcasm is synonymous with words like satire and humor. This study tackles the subject from a pragmatic point of view. It consist of six sections; section one is an introduction, section two explains sarcasm theories, section three is about social and rhetorical functions of sarcasm, section four illustrates the model which is adapted to analyze the data, section five is an analysis of the selected data and section six sums up the conclusions.

This study attempt to identifies sarcasm stages, strategies, the probability of realizing sarcasm by the listener (understanding the intended meaning of the speaker) and explaining sarcasm insincerity when there isn't enough contextual clues in the context of the situation. To accomplish such goals, a model is developed to analyze sarcasm in the selected data. The findings of the study verify the hypotheses which represented by the process of sarcasm stages, strategies, sarcasm insincerity of the speaker, and conveying sarcasm when sufficient contextual clues exist. On the contrary, it rejects the hypothesis of considering sarcasm as an ostensible speech act .

This study also, shows that, George Bernard Shaw used "sarcasm" as a tool to persuade the readers to adopt his viewpoint. He expresses his romantic conceptions. Specifically, the romanticized perception of battle, soldiering, romantic love, and nobility in society.

Key words: Sarcasm, functions, theories, analysis, Issuance

دراسة تداولية للتهكم في الادب الانكليزي

م. الاء خالد نصيف

الجامعة المستنصرية/كلية الاداب/قسم اللغة الفرنسية

الملخص

يعتبر هذا البحث دراسة لغوية لأنواع ووظيفة التهكم في مسرحية برناردشو "الانسان والحرب"، حيث تعتبر كلمة التهكم مرادف لكلمات أخرى مثل السخرية والفكاهة. يدرس البحث موضوع التهكم من وجهة نظر تداولية. يتكون البحث من ستة أقسام؛ القسم الأول هو مقدمة، القسم الثاني يشرح نظريات التهكم، القسم الثالث حول الوظائف الاجتماعية والبلاغية للتهكم، القسم الرابع يوضح النموذج الذي تم وضعه لتحليل البيانات، القسم الخامس هو تحليل للنصوص المختارة وأخيراً القسم السادس يلخص الاستنتاجات.

تروم هذه الدراسة تحديد مراحل واستراتيجيات التهكم واحتمالية إدراك المستمع للتهكم (فهم المعنى الضمني للمتحدث). حيث بين البحث عدم فهم المعنى المقصود غالباً من قبل المستمع في حالة عدم توفر أدلة سياقية كافية للموقف ولغرض تحقيق أهداف البحث، تم انشاء نموذج لتحليل التهكم في النصوص المختارة.

نتائج الدراسة حققت الفرضيات المتمثلة بان التهكم يتم على مراحل وله عدة استراتيجيات ويجب توفر ادلة سياقية كافية لتحقيق التهكم وعلى العكس من ذلك تدحض الدراسة اعتبار التهكم فعل كلامي واضح. تبين هذه الدراسة ايضاً بأن جورج برنارد شو استخدم "التهكم" كأداة لإقناع القراء بتبني وجهة نظره و ليعبر عن مفهومه في الرومانسية تحديداً، المفهوم الرومانسي للمعركة والتجديد والنبيل في المجتمع.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التهكم، وظائف، النظريات، التحليل، الإصدار

1.Introduction

In Webster dictionaries the term sarcasm is described as the utilization of the words in a way which show the opposite of "the literal meaning"(1969:448), while in The New Encyclopedia Britannica (1983:432) sarcasm is classified to either dramatic or situational sarcasm or verbal sarcasm where the true meaning is obscured or contradicted by the literal meaning of the words. Muecke (1970:10) adds that a complete definition of sarcasm would only be possible if we could include every facet of sarcasm. Moreover, Sperber and Wilson (1981: 310), states that sarcasm is described as echoic statements of a proposal with the addition of the S's assessment of the latter. Moreover, Leech (1983: 82) finds that

sarcasm considers as a second-order principle, following the cooperative principles and the politeness principle.

This study attempts to answer the following question: What are kinds and functions of sarcasm utilized in the play. To answer this question, it is hypothesized that:

1. Issuance stages, inappropriate and relevant stage, and interpretation and evaluation stage are required to convey and express sarcasm.
2. Sarcasm considered as direct speech act.
3. George Bernard Shaw prefers to utilize specific types of Sarcasm more than others to express his thoughts.
4. Suitable contextual factors are necessary in realizing Sarcasm.

1.2 Theoretical background of Sarcasm

The act of replacing an utterance's figurative meaning with its semantic meaning and then taking into account both meanings for the purpose of identification is required in order to determine if a statement is sarcasm . However, Sarcasm is defined as "saying one thing while really meaning another thing." Communication process is perfect, according to Brown and Levinson (1987: 221), if anything is said or done in a way that makes it difficult.

It's worth mentioning that, due to the indirectness of Sarcasm, Pexman et al. (2002: 215) come to the conclusion that the speaker's implied meaning consist of communicative beliefs and attitudes. Thus, the essence of pragmatics is a communicative and/or inferred meaning. Moreover, sarcasm is treated as violating the principle of quality (Grice 1975; Searle 1979)

Pragmatically speaking, it appears that sarcasm needs several approaches and treatments, which vary depending on the sort of pragmatic view concerned. For instance, Grice (1975: 312) defines Sarcasm as violating the first cooperative principle (CP), which is the maxim of quality, that is, the speaker's intended meaning is constructed by this flouting. According to Grice, every type of sarcasm contains a conflict or combination of incompatibles.

1.3 Types of Sarcasm

Sarcasm is a very complex phenomenon that encompasses several interrelated concepts. That is, the intricacy of the concept is the main obstacle to its succinct explanation. Sarcasm today has a variety of interpretations as a result of diverse realizations. This point, according to Muecke (1970: 10), is brought on by the fact that sarcasm not only manifests itself in a wide variety of ways but also changes through time.

According to Gibbs (1994: 362), situational Sarcasm uses actual events to indicate something sardonic (verbal Sarcasm), even if one cannot intentionally do something sarcastic. That is, verbal sarcasm refers to the employment of a method deliberately and purposely (situational Sarcasm), distinguishes between the two, situational Sarcasm may be regarded from the perspective of the sarcastic observer, but verbal Sarcasm can be viewed from the standpoint of the ironist (Muecke, 1970: 51). Additionally, verbal sarcasm tends to be satiric whereas situational Sarcasm tends to be more fundamentally comic, tragic, or philosophic.

1.2.1 Dramatic Sarcasm

A sort of situational sarcasm called dramatic sarcasm which can be seen in drama. When the audience is aware more about the setting or upcoming events than the story's protagonist. Here, a narrative creates an sarcastic aspect. There is a discrepancy between the character's actions or the status of both the audience's prior knowledge of the issue and its ignorance; (Clarke, 2008:40).

For example, in the Bible and the Holy Quran, there are stories of Joseph entertaining his brothers in Egypt in a regal manner while they are unaware that this wonderful man is the brother they sold into slavery. That is, in this form of Sarcasm, the victim is ignorant that the situation is actually very different from what he believes it to be. Although it is a hallmark of theater, this sarcasm is not exclusive to drama (Muecke ,1970: 64).Contrarily, dramatic Sarcasm is connected to sarcasm of events since the victim also exhibits self-ignorance. The victim expresses confidence in the future, but "some unexpected turn of circumstances reverses and destroys his plans, expectations, aspirations, anxieties, or wishes" (ibid: 66).

1.2.2 Romantic Sarcasm

Romantic Sarcasm is that a writer must acknowledge the readers the contradictory, conflicting nature of his work (Muecke,1970:78). That is, when the author write a novel or any kind of drama, he can, for instance, reveal that one of the characters is going to start writing the entire story from beginning to end ,the writer's "presence of mind" must be a key component of his writing. By abruptly inserting himself or the reader into the work. So, the author conveys in his writing his own ideas and knowledge (ibid:72).

1.2.3 Sarcastical Sarcasm

Irony is another debatable form of sarcasm. According to some linguists, it is a specific type of humor, yet sarcasm is typically seen as a comment spiced up with humor. It is often a taunting comment that is harsh or bitter. Sarcasm, similar to the "fundamental pattern of reversal, a translational recurrence in opposites," is the hallmark of Sarcasm. To recognize opposition, both conflicting words must be acknowledged. The possibility for humor is created by the realization that they are the opposite of one another (Clarke, 2008:40). The only likely distinction is that sarcasm has a larger scope and more applications than irony. Sarcasm is not just appropriate in comedic situations, but there may also be severe circumstances in which sarcasm would not be appropriate.

1.2.4 Sarcasm of Self- Betrayal

This kind of Sarcasm is similar to dramatic one, where the victim is unaware of the truth, and to the sarcasm of events, when what happen is not what is expected. (ibid.:58).

1.2.5 General Sarcasm

In this sort of sarcasm, the writer sees all of humanity as the victims of sarcasm and as a part of the human situation, one shouldn't confuse this kind of Sarcasm with irony. (Clarke, 2008:75).

1.2.6 Impersonal Sarcasm

Here, the writer uses just his words and hides behind a mask, to create sarcasm. This type of sarcasm is genuinely distinguished by a heaviness or dryness of manner; the speaker's tone is rational, casual, modest, and unemotional. As a result, understatement is a common example of this approach.

1.2.7 Situational Sarcasm

Situational Sarcasm demands the ability to being a part of the specific circumstance, as it cannot be not just by comprehending their words but

also by their gestures and tones of voice, voice is the discrepancy between what is anticipated and what actually occurs, which considers as an important element and takes place in the circumstance. (Clarke, 2008:52)

2. Sarcasm theories

2.1 The 1975 Grice Theory

Grice claims that individuals recognize Sarcasm by noticing when a statement deviates from a dialogue rule and then drawing an inference that is in line with the presumption of the communication cooperative principle (Grice, 1975:53). According to Paul Simpson's analysis of the discourse of Sarcasm, Grice's idea of the Cooperative Principle and his four maxims (1975), which go hand in hand with the idea of conversational implicature, serve as the basis for linguistic and pragmatics (Simpson 2011: 36). This idea basically explains sarcasm as the inferred meaning while violating the quality maxim (Kapogianni 2011:52). Here, "Sarcasm is understood as inference of a non-conventional form" and is seen as resistance produced by neglecting fundamental conversational techniques (Simpson, 2011:33).

Grice's idea has received a lot of criticism, yet it must be acknowledged that made significant progress in locating a fix for the issue of seeing sarcastic statements as metaphorical clichés, which is related to truth-condition analysis. In a practical sense, Grice's The important handling of Sarcasm by the theory of Sarcasm is considering it to be a practical idea that should be considered in the adage of discourse and context suitability

2.2. Echoic-Mention Theory

Sperber and Wilson's (1981) popular theory handles an sarcastic model as an echoic mention. The relevance hypothesis, which contends that the way the human mind responds to encoded signals is by taking into account information it perceives as pertinent to those messages, gave rise to this paradigm. According to this explanation, the distinction between use and mention is logical, this theory is a response to objections made to Grice's method of Sarcasm. This idea disagrees with the conventional interpretation of Grice, who said that Sarcasm always conveys the polar opposite of its true meaning. To support this hypothesis even further,

sardonic remarks are made on purpose to suggest a mismatch between the S's disruption of reality and how things truly are (Wilson, 2006: 4). The speech must only have one interpretation that follows the rule of relevance in order for it to be understood, and that interpretation must satisfy the requirements of effort and contextual consequences. With the least amount of work necessary, an ideally applicable interpretation either supports or refutes an existing premise. As a result, the principle of relevance describes how background information and language form interact to facilitate verbal comprehension (ibid: 268-274).

For example, after a challenging meeting, someone may say, "That went well" and we notice what appears to be sarcasm. The speaker does not presume that the meeting was successful; instead, they share their own response to a comparable concept that they quietly attribute to another person and that they believe is ludicrously unsuitable (Wilson 2006: 1724). Additionally, this approach shows that sarcastic expression carry not only assumption, but furthermore hints of pictures and ideas that may be investigated.

Sperber and Wilson (1981: 296) make an effort to establish "Echoic-Mention Theory," which they refer to as a better formulation of this idea from a more pragmatic viewpoint. According to them, their theory of Sarcasm expresses why sarcastic statements are stated and why they occasionally imply the reverse of what they actually say. Furthermore, neither a semantic nor a pragmatic replacement mechanism is used in this account. It presupposes that a semantic condition must exist for a statement to be sarcastic, yet that requirement is insufficient. The idea of "mention" has been abandoned as being too restrictive, and it has been replaced by the idea of "interpretative resemblance," which is defined as the usage of a declarative expression to more or less, nearly resemble another declarative expression rather than the form itself (Sperber and Wilson,1986: 264).

2.3. Pretence Theory by Clark and Gerrig (1984)

Pretence Theory by Clark and Gerrig (1984) asserts that someone who uses an sarcastic speech plays a role and subsequently borrows an sarcastic voice. This idea was first put out by Grice in his later work (1967), when he interpreted sarcasm to be the act of "creating as though

to speak," which is the pretense itself. (Wilson, 2006: 1740). According to pretence theory, pretense is a form of simulation that takes use of similarities, Wilson (2006: 1724) points out that relying solely on pretense might be quite taxing. However, occasionally sarcastic consequences might result from the combination of echoic and pretense. Thus, the main idea of this strategy is that the speaker, in an sarcastic speech, claims to be adopting a different mindset than their own (Kapogianni 2011: 52).

3. Social and rhetorical functions of Sarcasm

There are some social and rhetorical functions of sarcasm listed by Attardo (2001:173), which helps to understand how sarcasm works in different circumstances, starting with "Sophistication" which considers as one of the aims of sarcasm which seems that it demonstrate the speaker's superiority to/from the circumstance and their ability to play with words (saying one thing while meaning another). Speakers employ sarcasm to "present themselves to be in control of their emotions," (Dews et al. ,1995:347). The second function is "Persuasive Aspect" in this respect Giora (1995:66) finds that Sarcasm is a very instructive statement and all these features of sarcastic speech can be employed effectively. The third function is "Evaluation" which illustrates that sarcasm is "intimately related with the articulation of a sentiment, attitude, or assessment," here, Dews et al. (1995:349) explain that sarcasm does blunt both the impact of sarcastic criticism and the impact of sarcastic praise. Grice (1989:53) adds that many people, like Sperber and Wilson (1986:239), have said that sarcasm invariably conveys a negative attitude. Others assert that it's also feasible to have a humorous sarcasm. The fourth function is "Retractibility" which is explained by Berrendonner (1981:238), who states that sarcasm enables speakers to escape any consequences that may result from presenting their opinions explicitly by allowing them to say both the contrary and the opposite at the same time. Thus, sarcasm enables the speaker to be ambivalent about what they are saying. The other function of sarcasm is "Sophistication" which is explained by Dews et al. (1995:347) they state that, one of the aims of sarcasm seems to be to demonstrate the speaker's superiority to/from the circumstance and their ability to play with words (saying one thing while meaning another). Actually, Speakers employ sarcasm to "present

themselves to be in control of their emotions,". The last function is "Politeness" the employment of sarcasm as a way for politeness has received a lot of attention because, sarcasm appears to be violent in and of itself, but less overtly so than true hostility. In addition, sarcasm provides the choice of retractibility, which encourages its application in politeness.

It's worth mentioning that, Attardo (2001:173) also identifies some features or characteristic of sarcasm such as "Morphological Techniques". In this concern, Haiman (1998:33) states that sarcasm may be implied by phrases like "so to speak," "one may say as well as," and "as everyone knows." That is, numerous quotative and evidential moods as well as lexicalized quotative particles are used. Another feature is "Intonation" which is the most typical indicator of sarcastic intent. It has been said that the contour of sarcastic intonation is flat (i.e., neither rising nor falling). Other intonational patterns that can be employed to convey sarcasm are discussed by Haiman (1998:30-41) who include decreasing the pitch on the typically emphasized syllable, exaggerated intonational patterns, singsong melody, falsetto, etc. the last feature is "Typographical" which means Typographic norms are a poor substitute for the sarcastic purpose since they represent a crude approximation of spoken language in writing. Indicators include [sic!], [!?!], and [?] as well as combinations of these. Also, to emphasize something, the exclamation mark could be utilized. It can underline various ways to express sarcasm in the appropriate setting. Moreover, "Scare quotes" are employed to add sarcasm and a sense of detachment to written expressions. Dots ('...') indicate a halted speech, alerting the reader to any possible further meanings that may have been omitted (Haiman ,1998:30-31).

4. Adopted model

As far as this research in concerned, the following model is constructed depending on the basis of what is adapted from other models. In addition to the remarks of the researcher the model is explained pragmatically with their strategies.

4.1 The first step: Issuance

This step consist of echo and pretense, these two components employ PP and pragma-rhetorical speech actions. Echo is realized by using

additional techniques (viz. rhetorical questions, ambiguity, and quotations). The second sub stage Pretense is a part of the issuing stage where the speaker employs a variety of tactics, including sarcasm, off-the-record tactics, banter and humor, jocularly and similes.

a. Echo-Resemblance, Mention, Interpretation

In this step, Sperber and Wilson's (1986) theory is used as a tool to employ various sarcastic techniques. The speaker utilizes expressions which illustrates the speaker ideas (i.e., the implied meaning of the sender), to refer to other idea, or to interpret other idea or expression; these expressions only become sarcastic when they are expressed with the situation of the speaking or the context. This step contains three strategies: ambiguity, a rhetorical question, and quotes.

Considering ambiguity two factors are used in this method. The first component is PP, which states that it is ambiguous to be sarcastic while being polite (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The second component of sarcasm is the employment of other expressions through such ambiguity. other strategy is using rhetorical question, in this respect, Hicks (2007: 92) asserts that rhetorical inquiries expressing other intents by utilizing expressions that are comparable to those goals. As was already explained, this is the essence of echo theory. Therefore, it can be claimed that *using rhetorical questions as a way to achieve any sarcastic objective is possible. Talking about politeness, rhetorical questions can be used indirectly as a way of expressing sarcasm through expressing some other intentions.*

Regarding the quotes, the hearer uses them as a sarcastic reiteration of the speaker's earlier statements. This method draws on what has already been said and adds contextual elements, such as a different tone or the awkward use of quotations (Sperber and Wilson 1986). The statements that have already been made are still not entirely plain as sarcastic now that the two sub-stages of the first stages are addressed together with the pragmatic components that regulate these strategies. In other words, it is still unclear what the speaker's intended meaning is. Therefore, there should be something that correctly communicates sarcastic statements.

b. Pretense step

Brown and Levinson,(1987: 66) states that in this step, there has been a breaking or violation of PP, and the S is attempting to preserve PP by acting as someone else. This pretense is achieved through one or more of a variety of approaches starting with sarcasm, it is utilized to express sarcastic meaning by engaging in any speech act with the goal of flouting the sincerity condition while maintain PP. However, praise to criticize or criticize to praise is two speech actions that are frequently performed in a sarcastic manner.

Regarding off-the-record method, the speaker should utilize statements that make it appear as though they are so polite or so innocent in order to be sarcastic. To be so kind, one must employ the associative clues. In other words, by using polite expressions or utterances , On the other hand, to be naive is to use the pragma-rhetorical speech act of understatement in order to violate the maxim of quantity. Such use suggests that the speaker is being sarcastic by understating the circumstance (ibid:55).

Furthermore, Simile can be used directly or indirectly to convey sarcasm. When applied directly, one or more CP maxims are flouted. However, the indirect use of similes is dependent on the speaker to be speaker's pretension, yet the alternative sense suggested by the context suggests the contrary. In order to portray sarcasm, the speaker employs these techniques as though they were being utilized by a different individual. However, Sarcasm can also be expressed through other means, with sarcastic expressions serving as the realizations of other ideas. Over politeness is the final pragma-rhetorical methods ,which is one of the guidelines. This shows how employing exaggerations or inconsistencies to violate the quality maxim are done. Once more the speaker is being sarcastic by seeming to be so nice in a situation where it is not necessary to, in terms of overstatement (hyperbole), which is used to magnify or exaggerate the circumstance with a specific goal. The third way the quality standard is flouted is by utilizing contradictions, in which the speaker tries to be polite by using the opposite of what s/he intends. (Haiman,1998:43).

4.2 The second step: Inappropriate and Relevant

Two crucial components are involved in this step: allusion and maintaining sarcasm. Attardo and Colston (1978) present these two aspects in contrasting ways. According to Attardo, sarcastic expressions can result from the violation of the appropriateness and felicity condition even if they are unsuitable and relevant to their context. According to Colston, in issuance stage, the speaker must make references to predictions, expectations, previously expressed comments, etc.

These allusions must be made using one of three basic pragmatic devices: pragmatic insincerity (specifically, the sincerity of the felicity requirement of sarcastic acts), flouting of the CP maxims, or a mix of both. According to Attardo's rule for issuing and interpreting sarcasm, the intentional infractions make the statement improper for the situation. That is, the second pragmatic element of this strategy links pragmatic insincerity, CP maxim flouting, and the mixture of the two to PP in order to sustain sarcasm. Consequently, employing the incorrect, disregarded and alluded statements should only be made in accordance with FSA and FTA rules (Hicks, 2007: 89).

It may be inferred from these contrasting views on allusion and inappropriateness, as well as the preservation of sarcasm through PP, that both researchers implicitly employ the two notions of flouting and relevancy. CP maxims and the sincerity condition are both flouted while making sarcastic statements, therefore it makes sense to use the term flouting to describe the ostensibility of sarcasm. Also, the term relevance may be used to describe the disregard for one or more CP maxims that caused the inappropriateness. Thus, it is clear that using the phrase "pragmatic competence" can help solve this difficulty. Both the speaker and the hearer must possess "sarcastic competence" since sarcasm is considered as one of the pragmatic tactics with which everyone must be pragmatically skilled (Attardo, 2001:155). Which means, the person which uses allusions, inappropriateness, and pragmatic insincerity (ostensibility) must have sarcasm competence. When relating, interpreting, and assessing such statements as sarcastic, the hearer should, on the other hand, likewise must have sarcastic competence.

Because of this, the speaker employs several techniques to hint at the ostensibility and inappropriateness of the statements through sarcastic competence. For the hearer, making such a statement relevant through sarcastic competence leads to the hearer starting to understand it as sarcastic. Therefore, sarcastic competence is a crucial component in issuing, understanding, and judging statements as sarcastic.

It may be inferred that the two notions of flouting and relevancy based on these divergent viewpoints on allusion and inappropriateness, together with sustaining Sarcasm through PP. CP maxims and the sincerity condition are both flouted while making sarcastic statements, therefore it makes sense to use the term flouting to describe the apparent use of sarcasm. Additionally, the term relevance could be used to describe the violation of one or more CP maxims that caused the inappropriateness. So it stands to reason that the word "pragmatic competence" may be used to address this issue.

4.3 The third step: Interpretation and Evaluation

Colston and Happe's (1993) Sarcasm theory illustrates that, by following references and pertinent inappropriateness, it is the hearer's job to interpret statements as sarcastic. This is the primary issue. How the hearer reaches the desired sarcastic connotation at this level, transmitted by the speaker. According to Gibbs' (2007) definition of the interpretation step, three sub-stage requirements to the interpretation of sarcastic statements. It's important to note that these three conditions are evaluated by the hearer using his sarcastic competency, that is he is depending on using the stage of inappropriateness and relevance as foundation; the hearer utilizes the following subdivisions:

1. Satisfaction of the speaker's Allusions to Expectation

Happe, (1993:68) express that in order for the hearer to start identify statements as sarcastic he should understand the expectation implied by the speaker and the incongruity between what was expected and what really happened. This could take place through the references and the setting. Knowing these facts enables the listener to establish the foundation of sarcastic interpretation sub-stages. In other words, the most crucial element is speaker's allusion since the other two component

identification is impossible to recognize without the speaker's allusion and expectation.

2. Inferences from Context and Utterances

The reference should be understood from the speech or the contextual situation when the hearers are unaware of the speaker's expectation or fail to perceive any allusion to the known expectation (ibid:56) As a result of the planned breach of one of the pragmatic principles, speech and context are the prototype circumstances that point to the S's expectation, which also involves pragmatic insincerity, and is supported by a number of verbal and non-verbal cues.

3. Identification of the two Conditions

In this step, the hearer evaluate if the speaker expectation is alluded to, the known expectation is inconsistent with what is known, and the negative attitude is easily discernible. The hearers then identifies the utterance as sarcastic and become aware of the speaker's sarcastic aim if they are successful in detecting the sarcastic scenario.

5. Data Analysis

This part of the paper deals with the practical aspects of data collection, description, and analysis techniques. Next, some selected samples from the play will be analyzed in details. The elected model (which explained in the previous section) is used for analyzing sarcastic utterances in the play. The researcher adapts descriptive qualitative method to analyze the data. A data for analysis of this research is each and every line in “Arms and the Man” by Bernard Shaw.

The percentage equation (statistical tool) will be the statistical technique utilized to calculate the analysis' findings. The researcher collects the data by documentation. The script of the play is taken from the internet. The procedures, adapted to analyze the data are; reading the script, specifying the sarcastic utterances and classifying their kinds. Then, expressing their pragmatic functions.

Text -1-

The Man: Yes; but when the sergeant ran up as white as sheet...And there was Don Quixote flourishing like a drum major, thinking had done the cleverest thing ever known, where as he ought to be court martialled for it. Of all the fools ever let loose on a field of battle, the man must be the very maddest. He and his regiment simply committed suicide; only the pistol missed fire that's all. P.14-15.

The analysis:

In this text, Bluntschli is questioned by Raina on the charge's commander by the cavalry. Raina was aware that Sergius was in charge and believed him to be the bravest person. However, Bluntschli refers to him as a fool and a coward while describing his actions on the battlefield. He made a stupid decision to engage the Serbian army, and he told her that he is just Don Quixote's attack on the windmills. The protagonist Don Quixote sets off in quest of adventure in the Spanish author Cervantes' novel *Von Quixote*. Although he told her that what he had done was really illegal, and a military court should prosecute him for the offense. Because, he behaved in a senseless manner. His bad decisions appeared as he and his troop intended to end their lives. The whole context reflect a dramatic sarcasm, that is, listeners are aware that the leader was Raina's fiancé Sergius. Bluntschli doesn't realize this, but he criticizes him.

In this text, the issuance step is triggered by pretence by the employment of simile strategy represented by "as white as sheet" and "He and his regiment simply committed suicide" that he describe Sergius' mind empty and fool as a white sheet as if lead the war without any plan. the other example of simile is that Sergius was as if he and his regiment wanted to commit suicide. Simile is utilized in two ways, the first one deals with identifying and inferring the speaker intended meaning, while the other way is utilizing this inferred meaning to show what is the speaker intended sarcastic message.

The second step, the speaker breaks or flouts the maxim of manner by giving such kind of simile or being a kind of vague. Regarding the background knowledge, it is clear that the speech is relevant and appropriate, that is the speaker utilizes simile to be more effective in describing the intended meaning and to make it easier for the receivers to identify the message conveyed by the speaker. Concerning the attitude of the addressee, the speaker alludes to the receivers or listeners about the inappropriateness of the utterance. In the step of evaluation and

interpretation, the listener identify and evaluate the speech, they consider the allusion and relates them with the context and the speaker intention by background knowledge. All these factors leads the listeners to be satisfied and identify the implied meaning and understand the speaker utterance as sarcastic.

Text-2-

Catherine: - A Cavalry charge! Think of that! He defied our Russian Commanders-acted without orders-lead a charge on his own responsibility-headed it himself-was the first man to sweep through their guns. Can't you see it,

Raina: our gallant splendid Bulgarians, with their swords and eyes flashing, thundering down like an avalanche and scattering the wretched Serbs and their dandified Austrian officers like Chaff. And you! You kept Sergius waiting a year before you would be betrothed to him. Oh, if you have a drop of Bulgarian blood in your veins, you will worship him when he comes back. P:2-3.

The analysis:

In this text, Catherine tells Raina that her fiancé Sergius has succeeded in the 1885 battle of Slivnitsa, held between both the Serbs and the Bulgarians. Sergius led his army as a hero and successfully carried out the mission. She contrasts the Bulgarian cavalry to a storm of ice and snow sweeping down a slope and dragging everything before it in order to get the point through to Raina. Even the arrogant and haughty Austrian commanders serving with the Serbs were powerless to stop him. Catherine and Rania both think highly of Sergius's army attack. When Bluntschli refers to Sergius' action as a stupid deed in the later half, it is theatrical Sarcasm and the idea of a war is dispersed.

Concerning the first stage of Sarcasm, the issuance stage is triggered by pretense. the speaker uses very effective device to convey his sarcastical intended meaning which is “sarcasm” by using any speech act and breaching the sincerity condition, in this situation the writer uses sarcastically the speech act: praise for the purpose of criticizing .through utilizing “He defied our Russian Commanders..... sweep through their guns” and “Raina: our gallant splendid and their dandified Austrian officers like Chaff” .Here we found that Catherine is praising Sergius, while both the audience and Rania have a previous information about Sergius weakness in leading the army. That is,the purpose of this speech act of praising implicates sarcastical intended meaning.

The next step or stage of Sarcasm the sender's allusion to the listeners that his speech is relevant but inappropriate, through utilizing "sarcastic

criticism" strategy, the speaker violates the quality maxim of the speech "gallant splendid Bulgarians, with their swords and eyes flashing, thundering down" and "He defied our Russian Commanders-acted without orders", the purpose of presenting such hints to the audience is to relate and associate with the context of the situation. These associations with the contextual elements works by utilizing the speech act "sarcastic criticism", which means that the speaker's speech implicate sarcastic attitude concerning praising Sergius. Relating the shared knowledge and the contextual factors between the speaker and the audience makes the utterance related or relevant even if it is not inappropriate. Thus, violating sincerity condition of the speech convey inappropriateness of praising is this situation.

Concerning, interpretation and evaluation step the receivers identify the inappropriateness and relevance of the speech which against the listener expectations. by the shared background knowledge of the speakers and the listeners, they satisfied in the allusions and at the end the listeners can realize the sarcasm or the intended meaning of the utterance.

Text-3-

Sergius: I am no longer a soldier. Soldiering, my dear madam is the coward's art of attacking mercilessly when you are strong, and keeping out of harms way when you are weak. That is the whole secret of successful fighting. P:30.

The analysis:

In this text, Shaw satirizes the romantic ideals of the glory of battle and the bravery of soldiers, war should never be praised, yet it may occasionally become necessary. The writer shows this idea through the conversation between Sergius and Raina. In this conversation Sergius tells Raina that, despite having achieved a glorious victory, he is disappointed and resigns from his position since he did not obey the rules of war. He informs Catherine that the work of a soldier is one for a coward and not for a person like him, which is why he retired from it. A soldier should not engage the enemy while fighting with his regiment, according to the laws of warfare. He ought to go after the adversary when they were helpless. The folks who serve in the military are not heroes. The strategy for pushing the enemy into a position that is both beneficial and harmful to the soldiers as they attempt to win the battle. Shaw

satirizes the romantic ideals of the glory of battle and the bravery of soldiers in this passage. War should never be praised, yet it may occasionally become necessary.

In this text, the issuance step is triggered by echoing the idea of the speaker, through using the ambiguity device which means using ambiguous utterance, in this device the speaker echoing his intended meaning his thoughts this disconnect the speaker from the utterance he utter. The next step of the sarcasm, which is inappropriateness and relevance, is started by the speaker's allusion to the listeners (audience) about the inappropriateness and relevance. Utilizing ambiguity by violating manner maxim makes the speaker allude to the listeners (audience) to his sarcastic utterance. In the part "I am no longer a soldier" there is a violation of the manner maxim to allude to the listeners his implied or intended meaning, therefore he uses over generalization. The speaker emphasizes those allusion as being sarcasm when he employs ambiguity another time in "Soldiering, my is the coward's art" such violation makes the utterance relevance but inappropriate. Thus, the speaker utilizing sarcastic attitude to disconnect the intended meaning from the utterance for the purpose of maintaining the sarcastic attitude.

Moreover, The step of interpretation and evaluation begins in experimenting the speaker's allusion with the cultural background and the context for the purpose to be satisfied. Concerning the contextual factors as in "attacking mercilessly keeping out of harm's way when you are weak", the listeners identify from the speaker's allusion and the context the sender sarcastic attitude.

Text-4-

Louka: (Retreating) oh, I mean no harm: youve no right to take up my words like that. The mistress knows all about it. And I tell you that if that gentleman even comes here again, Miss Raina will marry him, whether he likes it or not. I know the difference between the sort of manner you and she put on before one another and the real manner. P:36.

The analysis:

In this text, Louka makes a satirical comment regarding the relation between Raina and Sergius as she explains the way in which they interact with one another and what they truly are. Louka comments this in a sarcastic manner about their true nature and what they are actually doing,

the sense and purpose having been effectively changed despite Louka being aware of the flattery of their love. While Sarcasm indicates that the literal meaning is completely different from metaphorical expressions. We can observe the contrast in their actions and the words they used to talk about their love.

The issuance step is started by pretence, which as we know the speaker pretends to tackle with the speech acts to convey the intended meaning . The strategies used in this text are to some degree complicated. The speaker begins with “over politeness” device in “oh, I mean no harm” in the first utterance, then the speaker employs “off-recorde “strategy to give associated clues here the speaker hints his intended sarcastic attitude by being so polite in the begging of the speech then, she conveys her thought and intentions.

In the next stage of sarcasm, the speaker relay on the listener or the audience to identify his sarcastic intention, to comprehend the sarcasm in his speech it should be relevant and inappropriate to the co-text.. Thus the speaker uses “off-recorde” strategy which violate manner maxim in such situation just means the opposite of the literal meaning. In the third step of the sarcastic process, i.e. interpretation and evaluation, the listener identify the sarcastic attitude in utterances ,and the intended meaning of the speaker.

Text -5-

Raina: (with cool impertinence), oh, I know Sergius is your pet. I sometimes wish you could marry him instead of me. You would just suit him you would pet him, and spoil him, and mother him to perfection. P:39

The analysis:

This text is a conversation between Raina and her mother she tells her that, If Sergius knows about the Swiss soldier's stay in Raina's rome , he will cancel their engagement. Raina express her feeling to her mother. She told her that she actually doesn't like him; rather, it's her mother likes him. She also tells her mother that she is more suitable to marry Sergius rather than her. She would care for Sergius like a pet and treat him with tenderness since a man like Sergius is more her type. Both Raina's character and her emotional condition are clearly expressed in her statements. In the speech above, Raina's statements to her mother indicate

her mental and emotional state. We can see how the author mocks her mindset and approach to marriage, as well as the emptiness of romantic love.

Concerning, The issuance stage, it is triggered by pretence employing “simile” device which is used to show the speaker’s intended meaning ,it also employs the intended meaning to show the speaker’s sarcastic attitude . As we can see in this text Raina compares Sergius to a pet and her mother is the most suitable person to take care of him,as in “sergius is your pet. marry him instead of me”.In the next step of sarcasm, the speaker violates the maxim of manner through using various ideas to express her attitude about Sergius that at first she compares him to a pet the she use “a bantering device” which is used among people who have close relationship. Moreover,the following step which deals with background knowledge and contextual element, the listener can identify clearly that the speech or the utterance in this situation is inappropriate and relevant.

Accordingly, the inappropriateness presented here through the ideas of the speaker , it is not appropriate because, Raina talks and critic her fiancé in this way, this expressed through violating cultural rules by this association as employing simile. In the third step, the listener cannot be satisfied with the allusion of the speaker’s expectations. The speaker here alludes to the listener in many ways, i.e. he relays on the listeners or audience (sarcastic interpretation) in expressing and identifying the implied meaning of the simile

Results and Discussion

Table (1) Frequency and percentage of steps and types of sarcasm in Shaw’s “Arms and the man”

in English Literature Pragmatics Analysis of Sarcasm

Steps of irony	Strategies of irony	Frequency	Average
Issuance Stage	Overstatement	14	4.8%
	Contradictions	22	7.5%
	Rhetorical Questions	35	12%
	Ambiguity	24	8.2%
	Humour and Bantering	17	5.8%
	Jouclarity	15	5.1%
	Quotations	26	8.9%
	Simile	42	14.4%
	Sarcastic Praise	20	6.8%
	Sarcastic Criticism	16	5.4%
	Give Association Clues	48	16.4%
	Understatement	12	4.1%
	Total	291	
Appropriate and Relevant Stage	Allusion	Clear speech act	41 31.2%
		Floating CP maxims	62 47.3%
		Combination of both	28 21.3%
		Total	131
Interpretation and Evaluation Stage	Satisfaction	95%	
	inferences	94%	
	Identification	98%	

These results are illustrated in Table (1) above:

1. The strategies “Giving association clues”, “Simile” and “rhetorical question” in “issuance stage” get the highest percentages. (Give Association Clues 16.4%, simile 14% then rhetorical question 12%). Thus, the first and third hypothesis in this research is verified.
2. In “the inappropriate and relevant stage”, “Floating cooperating principles” have the largest percentage 47.3% ,then “ostensible speech act” 31.2% . This rejects the second hypothesis
3. In regards to “interpretation and evaluation” stage, “identification” stage got the highest percentage 98%, “satisfaction”stage 95% then “inferences”stage 94%, accordingly this verify the forth hypothesis.

6. Conclusions

The study has come up with the following conclusions:

Theoretical background and the pragmatics analysis presents an updated definition of the concept sarcasm, which is a pragmatic phenomenon

through which the speaker utters specific expression but intended the opposite thing, in other word, it is the replacement of the literal meaning by the figurative meaning. The listener can identify sarcasm if he is aware of the violation of the cooperation principles. The study also shows that, the contextual factor and the shared knowledge of the speaker and the listener is very important element in the process of identifying of sarcasm. Moreover, sarcasm process is arranged in three steps: issuance, inappropriateness and relevance, and evaluation and interpretation. In the analyzed speeches, especially in the issuance step, the most common pragmatic strategies are give association clues, Simile and rhetorical question they have the highest percentage (Give Association Clues 16.4, simile 14% then rhetorical question 12%). Moreover, it is important for the listener and the hearer, to interpret the utterance as sarcasm to have sarcastic competence, this is shown in the evaluation step which is proofed in the percentages of its utilization in the analyzed texts. As we can see from the above table that is the identification percentage is 98% this emphasis that there should be sarcastic competence which allow the addresser to produce sarcastic utterances and for the listener to realize the speech or the utterances as sarcastic. Furthermore, it is important to mention that in any situation which includes sarcasm there must be violating to the sincerity condition, a suitable contextual elements and a change in the tone of the sound of the speaker.

References

- Attardo, S(2001). "Humor and irony in Interaction: From Mode Adoption to Failure of Detection" .In: Say not to Say: New Perspective on Miscommunication. L. Anolli, R. Ciceri and G. Riva (eds.) IOS Press.
- Barbe, K. (1995). Irony in context. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Berrendonner , A. (1981). Elements de Pragmatique Linguistique. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson. (1987). Universals in Language Use: Politeness London: Routledge.

- Clark, H. and J. Gerrig. (1984) " On The Pretence Theory of Irony ".
In Raymond Gibbs and Herbert Colston. (eds.). Irony in Language
and Thought, pp. 25-35. York: Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.
- Clarke, A 2008 .the pattern recognition theory of humour.pyrrhic
house.
- Colston, H. (2007). On necessary conditions for verbal irony
comprehension. in. R. Gibbs and H. Colston, Irony in Language
and Thought (pp. 97-134).
- Culter, A. (1996). "On Saying What You Mean with Meaning What
You Say".Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 117 – 127.
- Dews, S. and E. Winner. (2011). "Obligatory Processing of Literal
and Nonliterak Meaing in Verbal Irony". Journal of Pragmatics,
pp. 1579 –1599.
- Gibbs, R, W. (1994). The Poetics of Minds: Figurative thought,
Language, and Understanding. Cambridge : Cambridge
University Press.
- (2007). Irony in talk among friends. Metaphor and
Symbol. in. In R. Gibbs and H. Colston, Irony in Language and
Thought (pp.339-360). Taylor and Francis Group.
- Giora, R.(1995). Irony aptness. Walter de Gruyter Co.
- Giora, R., Federman,Kehat, S .(2005). Irony aptness. Walter de
Gruyter Co.
- Grice, H.P. (1975): "Logic and Conversation". In: Cole and Morgan
(eds.), Syntax and Semantics.Vol.3.New York: Academic Press.
- (1978). "Further Notes on Logic and Conversation". In:
Cole and Morgan
- 1989. Studies in the Way of Words. Massachusetts:
Harvard University Press.
- Haiman, (1998) J. Sarcasm and Its Neighbours. Talk Is Cheap:
Sarcasm, Alienation, and the Evolution of Language . Oxford:
Oxford University Press.
- Happe, F. (1993). "Communicative Competence and Theory of Mind
Autism: A Test of Relevance Theory". London: Routlege.
Cognition, pp. 101-119.
- Hicks, W. (2007). English for Journalists (3rd ed.). London: Routlege.

- Hutcheon, L. (1995). Irony's edge: The theory and politics of irony. New York: Routledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kapogianni, Eleni (2011). "Irony via surrealism". In: Marta Dynel (Ed.), The Pragmatics of Humour across Discourse Domains. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 51- 68.
- Leech, G. (1983). The Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Marino, M. (1997). "Irony". In Concise Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Language. (ed.). London: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Merriam, W. 1969. WEBSTER'S GEOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY, Springfield: G. & C.
- Muecke, D.C. (1982). Irony and the Sarcastic. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- (1970). Irony. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- Niazi, N (2004). Novel and Interpretation. A Pragmatic Approach. Usha Manor: Forum for Culture Studies.
- Pexman, P., et al (2002) Context Incongruity and Irony Processing. Discourse Processes 35:3, pages 241-279.
- Searle, John (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simpson, Paul (2011). "That's not sarcastic, that's just stupid: Towards an eclectic account of the discourse of irony." In: Marta Dynel (Ed.), The Pragmatics of Humour across Discourse Domains. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 33-50.
- Smith, J. 2009: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 8th ed., s.v. "Internet." Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (1981). "Irony and the Use Mention Distinction". In: Cole, P. (ed.). Radical Pragmatics, pp. 295-318. Academic Press.
- (1986). Relevance: Communication and Cognition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. (eds.), Syntax and Semantics. Vol.9. New York: Academic Press
- Wilson, Deidre (2006). "The pragmatics of verbal irony: Echo or pretence?" *Lingua*, 116, 1722–1743.

- Ziv, A. (1988). National styles of humor. Westport, Connecticut: Geenwood Press.

معلومات الباحث:

1. الاسم : الاء خالد نصيف (Instructor. Alaa khaled Nsaif)
 2. اللقب العلمي : مدرس
 3. الكلية : الجامعة المستنصرية/كلية الاداب/قسم اللغة الفرنسية
 4. الاختصاص : لغة انكليزية – الاختصاص الدقيق – لغة / تداولية
- University of Al-Mustansiriyah/College of Arts/Department of French language
5. الايميل : alaakhalednsaif@gmail.com
 6. رقم الهاتف : 07717726245