



Sarcasm in selected modern short stories: A pragmatic Analysis

Researcher: Nora Swadi Yasir

Supervised by: Ass. Prof. Dr. Angham Abd Al-Khadim Alrikabi

Qadisiya University/ College of Education/ English Department

Email: noneeka50@gmail.com

Abstract

There is no doubt that ‘Impoliteness theory’ has been given much attention by many linguists, and recently there has been an increasing amount of literature in this field. Culpeper is a pioneer linguist who extensively investigates the concept of impoliteness, in his impoliteness theory; he relies on Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Theory, in accordance with Goffman’s concept of face. Culpeper has referred to a number of impoliteness superstrategies. The present study is on ‘sarcasm’ super strategy. Sarcasm was not given much attention by linguists. It was imbedded under different labels, it was merged within Brown and Levinson’s off-record politeness. This study aims to review ‘ Impoliteness Theory’ with reference to Brown and Levinson’s conception of ‘face’. Besides, it investigates the concept of sarcasm as one of impoliteness superstrategies. The study also refers to some concepts that are used interchangeably with sarcasm, but differs in certain points. The study adopts Jonathan Culpeper’s theory of impoliteness, for its importance in distinguishing sarcasm as being an independent superstrategy and not imbedded within another label. The data for analyses are chosen from different modern short stories. The pragmatic analyses of the data shows that sarcasm intersects with certain labels but at the same time has its own features that make it differs from these labels. Moreover, sheds the light on a number of elements that assist in raising any sarcastic utterance.

Key words: impoliteness, face, sarcasm, mock politeness, irony.

الخلاصة:

ليس هناك شك في أن "نظرية عدم التهذيب" قد حظيت باهتمام كبير من قبل العديد من اللغويين، ومؤخراً كان هناك قدر متزايد من الدراسات في هذا المجال. البروفيسور جوناثان كولبير هو عالم لغوي رائد يبحث على نطاق واسع في مفهوم عدم الأدب ، في نظريته عن عدم التهذيب. اعتمد كولبير على نظرية التهذيب لبراون وليفينسون ، وفقاً لمفهوم جوفمان للوجه. أشار كولبير إلى عدد من الاستراتيجيات الفوقية غير المهذبة. الدراسة الحالية حول استراتيجية "التهكم" الفاتحة. لم يحظى التهكم باهتمام كبير من قبل اللغويين. تم تضمينه تحت تسميات مختلفة ، وتم دمجها في نظرية التهذيب لبراون وليفينسون غير الرسمي. تسلط هذه الدراسة الضوء على تعريفات التهكم ، وملامح التهكم ، وعلاقته بوسائل بلاغية أخرى مثل السخرية ، إلى جانب تحليل التهكم عملياً في أقوال مختارة مأخوذة من القصص القصيرة الحديثة.

1-Introduction

There is a considerable number of linguistic studies which give notable attention on politeness and impoliteness as regard their relation as well as their impact on social interaction. For Culpeper (1996) whose model of impoliteness is basically inspired by Brown and Levinson (1987) model of politeness, impoliteness cannot be comprehended without understanding politeness. His model has been extracted from the data of real life, it discusses various kinds of discourses in the U.S. military training discourse, starting with impolite and contradictory illocutions, and ends with impolite engagement in the discourse of bilingual Spanish / English children. Culpeper (1996) states that impoliteness occurs when: (1) the speaker intends previously to attack face or (2) the listener interprets the act as face-attacking purposefully or a combination of (1) and (2)." (Culpeper, 2005:38).

This study presents an explanation of Culpeper's 'impoliteness superstrategies', specifically sarcasm superstrategy, to illuminate the prominent factors that are found in a sarcastic environment. It examines the interaction within speech situations, that highlights the effect of context in the production and perception of sarcastic utterances. The study, also, presents a description of politeness and impoliteness depending on the main conception of 'face' by Goffman (1975). Moreover, it investigates, briefly, the role of prosodic features in impoliteness.

In accordance with Culpeper's conception of impoliteness, it encompasses both the speaker's purpose and the addressee's understanding, this means that intentionality governs the perception and understanding of impoliteness. It is a key factor in the determination of the degree of politeness. Besides, impoliteness can be noticed and expresses itself in a violation of Grice's conversational maxims, in particular Quality Maxim.

Impoliteness clearly represents the superstrategies of Brown and Levinson's model of politeness by conducting the FTA (face threatening act) with negative politeness, positive politeness, off-record, baldness or not at all. Culpeper (1996) classified impoliteness superstrategies as follows:

1. Positive impoliteness implies harming the positive face of the addressee by using tactics such as 'ignore', 'exclude the other from an operation', 'being unconcerned, disinterested, unsympathetic', 'snub the other', 'use hidden or ambiguous language', 'use unacceptable identification marker', 'use forbidden terms' etc. This super strategy is directly related by Culpeper (2005) to Spencer-Oatey's (2002) social face and quality face components.
2. Bald on record impoliteness: this super strategy includes direct face-attack, where the speaker aims to attack the listener or listener who has no opportunity to utter an impolite utterance (safely). Therefore, the utterance is used explicitly, simply and in an unambiguous manner.
3. Sarcasm or mock politeness- by using techniques of insincere politeness when carrying out the FTA. Later on, Culpeper (2005) replaced this super strategy into off-record impoliteness at which offense is implicitly accomplished by using consequences that can be rejected or cancelled.
4. Negative impoliteness (an attack on your equality of conduct, which Culpeper correlates with Spencer-Oatey's Equity Rights, in addition to implying that the negative face overlaps with Association Rights to some degree), as the instances of this tactic are 'ridicule, disdain, or condescension,' 'put the other's commitment on record,' 'feared,' etc.
5. Withhold politeness: to remain silent or unable to act when acts of politeness are required, for example by failing to thank someone for a gift and which may be interpreted as deliberate impoliteness (Leech, 2014: 222).

These super strategies of impoliteness are rarely occurring by their own, but instead they are combined together. Because of this, one-face

orientation can have consequences for another and thus, in particular sense, an interruption can attack a negative face when obstructing someone, this means attacking face may, in some contexts, imply another interpretation, which brings into consideration more than one interpretation for the type of face. Each of Culpeper's strategies is modeled as a counterpart to one of Brown and Levinson's strategies, except for mock politeness or sarcasm, which is not really the equivalent of off-record politeness (Culpeper, 2005: 42).

2- Face

The word denotes a specific thing, but it refers to an abstract notion for specialists in politeness studies. The definition of the face is significant in the study of phenomena of great significance in human experiences and relationships. For many classical and postmodern studies approaching politeness and impoliteness, the notion of 'face' is fundamental, how face is conceptualized is considered a critical matter in debating approaches to human interaction. It includes how individuals view and present themselves to each other, and this is linked to appearances, especially those appearances that not only convey surface things, but also infer much deeper things (Culpeper, Haugh, Kadar, 2017:90).

Brown and Levinson developed their theory of the face based on Goffman's notion of face. Goffman (1955) described face as "the positive public image that you are trying to build in social interactions" (Redmond, 2015: 4-5). Goffman (1967:5) adds that face is "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" concentrating on the social context. Some other linguists, as Tracy, Spidak and Craig (1986: 440) have defined the concept of face suggesting that it is: "the self-image they present to others, and that they recognize that other persons have similar face wants". Metts and Cupach (1994) also give the definition that face is: "The self-image that each individual shows specific interactions with others interaction" focuses on the social context (Ibid.).

Brown and Levinson's concept of face is not denoting the physical facial form, but it denotes one's public image or self-respect (Diby et al., 2019). They defined face as "the want to be unimpeded and the want to be

approved of in certain respects” (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 62), this face contains two related parts:



3- Impoliteness and context

Whether explicitly or implicitly assumed, context is not a matter of choice if a given utterance is to be understood. Context is assumed to be specified in advance of the understanding process. The understanding of an utterance is associated with the context and this is seen by the mind of the listener or listeners at the beginning of the utterance when begin the speech act (Sperber, & Wilson, 1986: 132-133). Context is defined as a psychological construct, and a subcategory of the world's assumptions of the listener, which implies that context helps maximize meaning and minimize inflection attempts and possible interpretations for an utterance at the same time (Ibid. :15).

Culpeper (2011: 195) emphasizes that impoliteness is context-dependent, claims claiming that "impoliteness is a negative assessment attitude towards contextual behaviors," but context is not the only thing accompanying the text, because participants in the same impolite event may have different understandings for it since they have different schematic knowledge. Consequently, context is not the only element the accompany the text. The importance of context is significant in realizing whether an expression is intended to reflect a polite attitude or it covers an impolite intention, which enhances the recognition of face- threatening.

Researchers have argued that there is no inherently impolite act (e.g. Culpeper, 2005; Watts, 2003) and such interpretations of the impolite act depend on the situation or context of speech that affects interpretation (Kecskes, 2017: 8). It is widely accepted in current studies on impoliteness that decisions depend on context, which implies that there is no inherently (im)polite sentence. There is also a great deal of variation in what is considered to be impolite or polite behavior within one language, and this variation increases especially when intercultural communication is taken into account (Culpeper, Haugh and Kadar, 2017: 34-35).

In addition to the interpretation that the receiver within the context of speech creates of the situation , context is an important aspect for assessing why impoliteness can be entertaining. The context can also be determined by the type of activity being performed, so any expression can be described as polite or impolite according to the type of activity that the participants perform or engage in (Bernal,2008: 287).

4- Impoliteness and Paralinguistic feature

There are different ways of conveying im / politeness, such as using words that usually associate with the use of certain facial expressions, bodily gestures and the tone of voice. A suitable verbal expression accompanied by a suitable tone of voice with attention to facial expressions and body position to convey im / polite utterance is helpful. Prosody is a communication channel which might be investigated in different ways. Brown and Levinson (1987) mention gesture and prosody or (kinesics) in their work on the study of politeness, but despite that, in the studies of im / politeness, the analysis of prosody and gestures is rarely addressed. Culpeper (2011) noticed that the large amount of politeness and impoliteness studies have paid little attention to prosody and gestures and their significance in the production and realization of im/politeness. He made a representative study concerning prosody and impoliteness rather than politeness , yet, even the results are related to politeness too (Culpeper, Haugh, Kadar, 2017: 357-358).

Culpeper (2011) has examined the prosody of impoliteness more often than politeness, he claims that prosody is a significant tool for creating im / politeness, so this is crucial to examining the prosodic characteristics of interaction. Prosody is a "communication channel that can be studied in other ways" by mentioning other relevant components of the interaction (Kadar & Haugh, 2013: 54).

Culpeper conducted an investigation on the prosody of impoliteness more than that on politeness, he claims that prosody is a significant tool to identify and rise im/politeness, as a result this is important for testing the prosodic features of an interaction. Culpeper presents instrumental approaches to investigate and examine prosody, but prosody is a

“communication channel that can be studied in other ways” by mentioning other relevant parts in the interaction.

Any utterance is produced with some prosody, that factor makes it necessary to include prosodic features when trying to perform a pragmatic analysis. Prosody has a major role in analyzing utterances pragmatically and in investigating the strategies of impoliteness, especially when dealing with sarcastic utterances, when individuals express their sarcastic intentions in various ways. Analysis of what is said and how it is said and how prosody conveys impoliteness is pragmatically significant (Culpeper, Bousfield, Wichmann, 2003: 1568).

5- Gestures and Facial Expressions

To express an impolite act there are various behaviors, for instance using words accompanied by certain facial and bodily gestures, or even using the tone of voice. In defining gestures, Kendon (2004) states gestures “refers to visible bodily actions that is used as an utterance or as part of an utterance”. In certain contexts where communication might be difficult to achieve gestures would be a good means that permits people to be part of a meaningful communication, this means communication is not necessarily achieved via using speech only, because there are contexts where speech is not allowed or cannot be performed. However, gestures are most often accompanied by speech, especially when interaction occurs face to face, as nodding head or beating fingers. In human interaction, gestures develop an intimate connection with speech (Culpeper, Haugh, Kadar, 2017:361).

Gestures are not considered to be normal body actions or refer to certain points such as the description of the interlocutor's body's orientation when fronting the other or not, or even the distance between the interlocutors, although these movements are sometimes socially meaningful, these movements can be investigated in terms of non-verbal behavior (Ibid.).

Studies clearly note that prosody and gesture interact very closely while communicating im / politeness, as well as the significance of context in understanding and recognizing sarcasm.

6- Mock politeness and mock impoliteness

In determining whether impoliteness is genuine or mock politeness or banter, context and social relations have an essential role. In a society, the same conventionalized expressions can be considered harmful or of negative impact, while they may lack a harmful and negative nature if these expressions are less conventionalized. Impoliteness is therefore not supposed to be inherent in any linguistic or non-linguistic expression (Bernal, 2008: 782).

Mock impoliteness is not exclusively impolite; it involves interpersonal relationships where the interlocutors' faces are not affected and there is a tendency to reinforce trust and affiliative moods among them. There is no sense of offense or intention in this form of impoliteness. Some expressions appear to be literally impolite, but the purpose is not to offend others, it is rather intended to reduce the social distance between the interlocutors (Ibid.: 783).

Leech (1983) attempts to capture the phenomena of mock impoliteness or banter with 'Banter Principle' which says: "In order to show solidarity with h, say something which is (i) obviously untrue, and (ii) obviously impolite to h" [and this will give rise to an interpretation such that] "what S says is impolite to h and is clearly untrue. Therefore, what really means is polite to h and true." (p.144). He argues that banter raises and reflects social intimacy, this means the closer and intimate a relation is the less important and necessary politeness is. But if lacking of politeness is connected with intimacy, then super impoliteness is more probably interpreted as banter in contexts where there is no intimacy. Leech argues that uttering something that is noticeably incorrect involves banter. Banter frequently includes insults, which are more probably interpreted as banter particularly when the interlocutors like each other (Culpeper, 1996: 252).

Mock politeness has a notable function in analyzing utterances communicated among interlocutors, unlike mock impoliteness, which is also referred to as banter. Typically, banter is mock impoliteness and is the result of un-offensive intentions, but with an offensive intention, mock politeness is generated that it can be analogous to irony and sarcasm. To clarify the connection between banter and irony, Leech (1983: 144) states that irony (a

verbal behavior) is a friendly way of being offensive (mock politeness), while banter is an offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness) (Taylor, 2015: 128).

The field of studying mock politeness is difficult, because researchers talk about similar concepts, even within the same field, or they use different terms and use the same term for other unlike concepts. This is the reason for creating difficulties. Mock politeness has been studied by researchers under distinct terminologies. Taylor (2016: 6-7) states that there are many meta pragmatic labels that are used to characterize the behavior of mock politeness. Therefore, terms like: biting, passive aggression, teasing, cutting, overly polite, putting down, bitchy, mock, making fun, patronizing, can all describe mock politeness.

Despite the fact that they are separate concepts (sarcasm and irony) but are overlapping. Most research on mock politeness is carried out under the concepts of 'sarcasm' and 'irony'. Within the im / politeness framework, mock politeness is theorized. In Leech's Irony Principle (1983), the notion of mock politeness is embedded. As a friendly way to be offensive, Leech (1983) refers to irony. In Culpeper's modal of impoliteness, this concept of mock politeness is developed, but instead the term 'sarcasm' is favored. In terms of 'attitude clashes,' Leech (2014) describes mock politeness because he suggests that both the overt meaning of politeness and the covert meaning of impoliteness occur together in the same language portion of (Leech, 2014: 238).

Taylor (2016:2) suggests that mock impoliteness is, depending on Culpeper's (2011a) model, a form of "implicational impoliteness.",i.e., there is a mismatch between what is uttered and what is intended . This is also reinforced in Taylor's definition in her study of mock politeness, she says "mock politeness occurs when there is an im / politeness mismatch that leads to an implication of impoliteness". It can be well noted that the idea of mismatching as well as the assessment of impoliteness are the main elements of this definition.

In the definition proposed by Haugh (2014), which mentions the occurrence of implications related to mock impoliteness, this also has some similar aspects, mentioning that the presence of certain linguistic or non-

linguistic polite forms in certain circumstances may imply the presence of impoliteness in other circumstances. In addition, he mentions certain points that add a wider scope for interpreting impoliteness by mentioning masking and disguise as part of the mismatch between polite forms and impolite interpretation, and these points are important because contextual factors usually interpret impoliteness (Taylor, 2016: 3).

Culpeper (1996) lists 'mock politeness or sarcasm' in his modal of impoliteness as a counterpart to the super off-record strategy that performs a face-threatening act proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) (Dyner, 2018: 153). Culpeper (2005: 42), however, does not classify it as a sub-type in his conceptualization, but he considers it as a meta strategy that is separated from others as it conveys impoliteness through the use of politeness. Besides, Culpeper does not even associate mock politeness with the implications of Grice implicatures.

7- Sarcasm and Irony

The Concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms gives 'sarcasm' the definition which proposes that it "involves a discrepancy between what is said and what is really meant in its crude form" (Baldick, 2001: 130), which means that sarcasm is intended to offend the other part or the victim, unlike irony. Another definition in the Penguin Dictionary of American English Usage and Style says that sarcasm is "similar to irony in the contrast between literal and intended meaning, but sarcasm implies overt ridicule or taunting; irony is milder and subtler", this definition is supporting the previous one in stating that sarcasm is offending and ridiculing the target (Lovingier, 2000:194). Macmillan English dictionary describes sarcasm as "using words to hurt feelings, particularly by using tone of voice to show you mean the opposite of what you say" (Manser, 1996: 372). Toplak and Katz (2000) define sarcasm as "perceived as being more insincere, impolite, humorous, mocking, offensive, aggressive, anger- provoking, non-instructional, unclear, and projecting a sense of self-indulgence on the part of the speaker". For Colston (1997), "irony enhances the condemnation", while for Dews and Winner (1995) "mutes the criticism" (Drucker et al., 2014: 553). The definitions of sarcasm reveal one feature that differentiate it linguistically from irony and other rhetorical devices.

In Culpeper's model of impoliteness (1996), the label of sarcasm is equated with mock politeness when FTA (face- threatening act) is carried out by using politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, as a result remain surface realizations. In his modified model of impoliteness, Culpeper (2005) substituted sarcasm super strategy with 'off- record impoliteness'. However, sarcasm is recognized from other strategies and given its meta strategic nature which means using politeness for impolite intentions (Taylor, 2015: 59-61).

Culpeper (1996 ,2005) treats sarcasm as a form of impoliteness and it is also a form of face-attack, and in the light of irony, he tends to use sarcasm. Yet, Leech (2014: 233) continues to regard mock politeness and irony as separate categories attributing this to the different interpretative mechanisms involved, maintaining that irony is nonverbal phenomenon that are commonly used in various ways, such as the irony of destiny and dramatic irony.

Taylor (2015: 129) notes in her analysis that Culpeper prefers to use Leech's irony with the word sarcasm, since irony can be manipulated for humor and enjoyment. So the full opposite of banter (used for social peace, mock impoliteness) is sarcasm (used for social disharmony, mock politeness).The term 'sarcasm' is eventually replaced by other words. Sarcasm has been replaced by another wider category of off-record politeness by Culpeper (2005) and Bousfield (2008), and implicational impoliteness by Culpeper (2011).

In an experiment, Toplak and Katz (2000) found that the 'person who utters an indirect, sarcastic utterance is considered to be more offensive, verbally hostile, anger-provoking, and mocking'. The satirical message, however, is understood as being more non- instructional, insincere, ironic and bearing an unambiguous or vague message. Sarcasm is commonly understood as a form of verbal violence (Campbell, 2012: 8).

As noticed above there is a rather close link between irony and sarcasm, but literary scholars, besides being the crudest form of irony, explicitly dealt with sarcasm as the least interesting form of irony. Yet in mainly two points, the two definitions are different, first; its only people who are sarcastic and circumstances are the ironic, second; regarding the

intention, people may unintentionally be ironic, but intention is used with sarcasm. The main point of sarcasm is that it is 'clear irony deliberately used as a means of verbal abuse by the speaker' and this may make it contrast with other offensive speech mechanisms acting as vituperation, direct insults, condescension, nagging and put-ons (Haiman, 1998: 18-20).

Legit and Gibbs (2000)) conducted a study that provide operational definitions to both of sarcasm and irony. It clarifies that sarcasm is a statement which carries a contradiction of certain knowable status, this leads to a harsh criticism directed to the addressee, while irony refers to observing a contradictory status that carries no direct criticism to the addressee (Wilson, 2013: 52).

Sarcasm is an offensive form of irony that carries specific victims (an individual who is the target of the speaker's aggressive and hostile behavior) and explicit markers / signs. There is no agreement between sarcasm and irony, so some researchers try to differentiate irony from sarcasm. Haiman (1998,1990) cited in (Gibbs, Gibbs and Colston,2007: 137) said that the meaning of the speaker is not needed by sarcasm, though irony requires it. In addition to the fact that Schaffer (1982) offered numerous clues to sarcasm and irony, Sperber and Wilson (1986) made a distinction between echoing another person's utterance (or sarcasm) and echoing one's own utterance (or irony). Schaffer (1982) offered numerous clues to sarcasm and irony in addition to that.

Brown (1980:111-124) cited in (Ibid.) also drew a distinction between irony and sarcasm, saying that if the teacher writes "Nice cover-F" on a student's paper and actually he/ she does not really mean it is being rather sarcastic and not ironical one.

Ironical utterance is different from sarcastic one in many points,
1) the sarcastic potentials of the utterance are apparent to the contributors in a certain situation, and
2) sarcastic utterance is more personal, and
3) the utterance may still have the capacity of face-saving act, but this is applicable for the hearer only and not for the speaker, which means that the listener or hearer is able to decide to disregard sarcasm (Barbe,1995: 22).

Sarcasm and irony share some similar methods, but with different ends and in different contexts. There is a blur line between sarcasm and irony. Muecke (1969:54) states that there are diverse forms and functions of irony, that it functions as “a weapon in a satirical attack”. While he defines sarcasm which is existed in the Impersonal irony mode is representing just a form of irony, and it has been called “the crudest form of irony” .

Sarcasm and irony share many similar methods, albeit with different purposes and in varied contexts. There is a blurred line between sarcasm and irony. Muecke (1969:54) maintains that there are numerous ways and functions of irony, that it works as "a weapon in a satirical attack." Although he describes sarcasm that occurs in the Impersonal Irony mode, it represents only a form of irony, and is referred to as "the crudest form of irony

Barbe (1995: 29) agrees with Gibbs (1986) that sarcasm has a place under the heading of irony. Therefore, the sarcastic utterance is meant to be ironic-sarcastic. As a consequence, sarcasm leaves no chance of doubting or wondering, because a speaker cannot withdraw by claiming that he / she does not mean it for the sake of protecting his / her face.

8- Sarcasm and lying

The liar is somebody who has the intent to deceive, unlike the sarcastic who has no intention or willingness to deceive, so that sarcasm is known by the manifestation of the sincerity of the meta-message, and that makes it distinct from falsehood. The distinction between these two points is quite obvious, for the mere utterance of the liar is a message and a meta-message, while the sarcasm 's utterance simply makes two different statements in one time (Haiman, 1998: 21).

According to Goffman 's words (1974), "sarcasm is keyed and compares with manufacturing." Among the lies, sarcasm is very similar to 'self-referential contradictory utterances,' like 'Be spontaneous', 'Inflexible rule that,' 'This argument is wrong,' 'Act natural,' or two-sided injunction,' never tell 'never' (Ibid.).

It is obvious that falsehood and covert honesty are the borderlines between the liar and the sarcastic, because the liar, most of the times, utters false statements not for the sake of offending or causing harm nor social

disharmony, on the contrary to the sarcastic who utters statements which appear to be honest but in fact carry different meanings and implicitly offend and harm the other side or listener.

9- Sarcasm and Gender

In the fields of linguistic pragmatics and sociolinguistics, a significant number of studies have been conducted concerning the complex relationship between im / politeness and gender. Lakoff (1975) did the most important and 'ground-breaking' work on this subject, preceding the works on politeness achieved by Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987). The study by Lakoff on language and gender is considered to be a pioneering one that emphasizes the usefulness and significance of linguistic politeness research (Culpeper, Haugh, Kadar, 2017: 517).

The study by Lakoff explored feminist language and the impact of social and political oppression on the formation of the language of women and their group role. Lakoff described female language as a subservient language because of the circumstances of her time, while male language is the dominant one. She says that women's talk differs from men 's talk, which in their studies of im / politeness and gender paved the way for similar claims by Brown and Levinson (1980) and Holmes (1993) (Ibid.).

As a reasonably strong indicator of several non-literal-language effects, gender has been identified. Females often perceive comments as indirect and use polite language as a feature of the relationship of closeness and power with the addressee. Katz et. al. (2001) revealed that any sarcastic comment that is uttered without a clear intention of sarcasm, whether by females or males, is often interpreted as more sarcastic by males, while females are judged to be more sarcastic if the intentions are obvious (Colston & Lee, 2004: 290).

Ivanko (2004) confirmed that sarcasm is used more by males than by females. Dress et al. (2008) also share the same idea, but they claim that there are no differences in the use of sarcasm between males and females. It could come to mind, however, to ask why women use sarcasm less than men do? Giora (2004) argued that they do this in order to be indirect, since indirectness is a form of politeness and deference, as suggested by Brown

and Levinson (1987), and women tend to be politer in their speech and style (Gaucci & Kreuz, 2012: 4).

"A study conducted by Colston and Lee (2000, 2004) stated that the reason why males use sarcasm more than females is due to the" increased risk of using nonliteral language, "apart from the fact that males produce sarcastic comments twice as often as females, the results of these studies have shown the complicated relationship between sarcasm and gender, and it is often not clarified (Ibid.).

10- Sarcasm and Power

The concept of power, superiority and inferiority in relationships are often governed by relationships and im / politeness. Brown and Gillman (1972) refer to power as controlling one person's behavior over another, and both of whom are in a type of relationship, they also state that power is a relationship that cannot be mutual between two people (Fishman, 2012:254-255).

Alrikabi circulated a study and tackled the issue of power and impoliteness. As she claims, in order to practice power such as lying, denial, rationalization, minimization, diversion, evasion and shaming, power has many forms or types of manipulative techniques. Shaming methods involve the use of sarcasm. For the sake of increasing doubt and fear in the victim, the manipulative effectively uses sarcasm, as well as making the victim feel unworthy and ashamed. Subtle sarcasm can be used by the manipulative as one type of technique to ridicule the victim (2014: 413-415).

Locher and Watts (2008: 86) cited in (Alrikabi, 2014: 428) discussed the link between power and impoliteness, claiming that the point of similarity lies in the presence of power in all social practices and is very closely linked to the reception of impolite behavior by individuals. A covert relationship and association between impolite behavior and power appears to exist. Therefore, power does not refer to any harmony between interlocutors and thus leads to impolite manner.

11. Methodology Analysis

In this study the data are extracted from a number of modern short stories. These short stories are “The Snows of Kalimanjaro” by Ernest Hemingway, “The Remarkable Rocket” by Oscar Wilde, “Copy Cats “, “Code” by David Crouse and “Runaway “ by Alice Munro.

The collected data will be analyzed pragmatically according to Culpeper’s (1996) model of impoliteness super strategies, in particular, sarcasm super strategy. This super strategy is being chosen due to its crucial significant in interpreting offensive, face- aggravating and ridiculing utterances that are wrapped by a polite form utterance. The extracted utterances are selected according to certain elements that are mentioned in this study and will be analyzed to show their importance in constructing and identifying a sarcastic utterance. Such elements are like gender and its role in releasing sarcastic utterance, also the prosodic features are mainly important because sarcasm is recognized by tone of voice when conversing with others. These and other factors will be applied in the chosen extracts.

12. Analysis of the Data

Extract 1: “You can take the leg off and that might stop it, though I doubt it. Or you can shoot me. You’re a good shot now. I taught you to shoot, didn’t I?”

This extract is taken from Ernest Hemingway's short story entitled “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” (1936). The sarcastic utterance by Harry who was injured and had his leg infected with gangrene, he was in a rather struggled relation with his wife Helen whom he directed this sarcastic utterance for, he ridicules her and underestimate her effort to help him. Along with Culpeper’s model, the speaker is intending to make fun and be aggressive with the listener. However, this is one sign that make a distinction for sarcasm from irony.

According to Lakoff (1975), she stated that men are using aggressive, sarcastic and impolite language more than women do. Clark’s utterance sheds light on an important aspect of impoliteness investigation which is the relation between gender and impoliteness. The study by Lakoff concerning this issue is very remarkable one as she states that men are more sarcastic

than women who are most of the time are trying to use a polite language in their interactions, yet this does not mean that women always use a polite language, they are also sometimes using sarcastic utterances and tone of voice.

Extract 2: “Come back! come back!” screamed the Rocket, “I have a great deal to say to you”; but the Duck paid no attention to him. “I am glad that she has gone,” he said to himself, “she has a decidedly middle-class mind”; and he sank a little deeper still into the mud.”

This extract is taken from Oscar Wilde’s short story “the Remarkable Rocket” (1888). This tale revolves around an arrogant firework that sees itself as the centerpiece of an elegant marriage. It is a narcissistic, arrogant character that, by breaking down in tears to prove his sensitivity, believes itself to be superior to his peers and shows this sophistication. It becomes damp and useless in doing so and is consequently thrown the following day into a ditch.

It is then found and tossed into a campfire by some passing children. It considers itself to have been an incredible success despite being seen by no one. Wilde deals in a playful manner with the mature themes of self-perception and the notion of reality, allowing readers of all ages to draw insight from this whimsical story.

The Rocket puts itself in a state of power, it has an arrogant character that makes it think it is more powerful and in a higher social status than other objects in the fable, so it uttered such a sarcastic utterance which is interpreted as impolite in the second-order level of analysis.

Power and sarcasm have a strong tight. Brown and Levinson had asserted the importance of power in determining the level of politeness the concept of face. An important point in the sarcastic utterance of the Rocket is that it shows the social distance between the interlocutors in an impolite way. The Rocket used an indirect act verb to express his humiliation for the Rocket, and uses his powerful place to offend the Duck. The Rocket wanted to deliver an aggressive message using the social distance as a tool to achieve his criticism. The concept of power in this utterance is represented in the superiority of the Rocket who treats the Duck and other creatures as lower in social status than him.

Power takes different forms as denial, lying, minimisation, rationalization and shaming (Al- Rikabi: 2014: 314- 315). Shaming is connected with sarcasm. In this utterance the criticism is directed toward the social level of the Duck whom the Rocket tries to make feel unworthy and ashamed. The Rocket wanted to ridicule his victim by manipulating sarcasm as a technique. Consequently, power and impoliteness are connected. With the presence of social disharmony and power, there will be an impolite behaviour. There is a covert relation between power and impolite behaviour, that means there is no harmony between the interlocutors. Culpeper (1996) stated that the more powerful a person is the more impolite he is (Alrikabi, 2014: 428).

Extract 3: “I took a pad of paper and wrote, “It’s like he’s visiting his grandfather in the rest home.” I slid it over so Guldeck could read it. He smiled and nodded”.

The extract is taken from David Crouse collection of short stories which is entitled “Copy Cats” (2005). The conversation took place between a number of employees in the company, they are the speaker (the narrator of the story), Cranlan, Guldeck, Barnes and Wassermann. There was a meeting held in the company, some issues were not fixed and Wassermann was arguing about that, but he got no attention from both Guldeck and the speaker. They were uncurious about completing their tasks, that made Wassermann asking them many times about finishing the task but they were making fun of him and Barnes. This utterance by the speaker is a sarcastic reply written to Guldeck when Wassermann asked them about certain e-mail, but they paid no attention to that task which made him ask many times.

The utterance contains an implicational impoliteness according to the impoliteness theory, it belongs to context-driven categorization that is classified by Culpeper. It is unmarked behaviour of impoliteness that mismatches the context. An experiment that is conducted by Tolpak and Kats (2000) claims that the speaker who uses an indirect sarcasm is regarded as an aggressive and more offensive, besides, the sarcastic utterance is perceived as humorous, indirect, insincere and holding an ambiguous message.

An important phenomenon can be noticed in sarcastic utterances, which is that males are using sarcastic language more than women do. Gender and

language usage is a critical topic that have been tackled by Lakoff (1975), so gender realization is very important in investigating impoliteness. Moreover, gender is considered as an indicator for certain non-literal language properties. Some body movements and gestures are indicators of sarcasm and sarcastic situations. In this speech situation the speaker and Carnlan made certain movements that reveal their sarcastic reaction towards Wassermann, their reciprocal notes and smiles are indicating their view point. As can be seen here, men are the ones who usually make sarcastic comments and utterances.

Extract 4:” You look great,” the security guard at the front desk said as I signed in. The day before, I had sprawled out on a lawn chair in the yard for a couple of hours so I’d have a healthy glow. “Where did you go?” he asked. I wondered if I had just returned from a better vacation than I had imagined. “Europe,” I said in an attempt to be impressive and ambiguous at the same time. “Europe,” he said thoughtfully. With one word I had opened”.

This extract is taken from David Crouse's short story “Code” which is part of his collection ‘Copy Cats’. The story about a corporate who tries to understand certain signals that give predictions for the bankruptcy of his company and the layoffs of his employees. Such circumstances create an emotionally disturbed character. What is special about this piece of conversation is that it carries a mixture of the two neighbors lying and sarcasm.

An important point to shed light on is that intention is very crucial factor in any pragmatic analysis. Intentionality is significant in defining impoliteness. Intention to be impolite may be done on purpose to cause offense or it is accidentally done without planning to cause offense. Bousfield (2008) defines impoliteness in relation to intention as a communication of verbal threatening acts deliberately delivered by purposefully contradictory verbal faces.

In the above utterance a mixture of lying and sarcasm is used. The speaker lied to the listener, yet at the same time he intended to reply sarcastically not only to the guard’s question but to the whole circumstances that he lived. The critical situation that he passes through makes him in a

disturbed mood, consequently he lied and his intention was sarcastic towards the guard (the listener).

Extract 5: “Shortly afterward, Clark said, “We could’ve made him pay. “Carla knew at once what he was talking about, but she took it as a joke.” Too late now,” she said. “You can’t pay once you’re dead”. “He can’t. She could”.

This extract is taken from Alice Munro's short story “Runaway”. The conversation takes place between two characters whom are Clark and his wife Carla. The story contains a number of relations, surprises and betrayals, the couple are engaged in an unsuccessful marriage which make Clara in a position that makes her ready for running away from her husband with the help of a woman named Sylvia who is suspected to be in a relation with Clark.

The context of the conversation is paving the way for a sort of predicted sarcastic utterances due to the conflicted relations and insincere bonds between the characters. The character of Clark is carrying an abusive emotion, so due to this undesired feature by Clara it is expected to hear a sarcastic reaction toward his speech. In this utterance, Clark is talking about taking money in a cunning way from a man who is now dead and Clara is not accepting such a bad idea, so she replied with a sarcastic utterance. Herein, it can be noticed that Clara is using a polite utterance to communicate with her husband but actually, she is carrying an impolite message.

To identify the sarcastic utterance in this short story, it is very important to recognize the language and the context. According to Levinson’s definition where he stressed that to study pragmatic it is very beneficial to be well acquainted with the language and the context. Moreover, it is important to have an overview of the speaker, the hearer and the speech situation where the speech act happens. The context of the utterance assists to evaluate the utterance as sarcastic, and this evaluation contains certain points that should be taken in consideration regarding any sarcastic impolite utterance, these points are the speaker and the hearer, the purpose behind the utterance, the utterance, the context of that utterance and the resulted act of that utterance.

Conclusions

This study concludes the following points:

- 1-Impoliteness is not inherent in linguistic expression, yet it is governed by many linguistic factors, such as prosody and the context of speech situation.
- 2-Though it is a subtype of irony, sarcasm is different in certain factors that make it an independent strategy by its own. Sarcasm differs linguistically and literary speaking from irony
- 3-Sarcasm and intention are tightly connected, and this is the major point that differentiate it from irony. Beside the importance of intention in evaluating and categorizing sarcastic utterances, other elements such as context and paralinguistic features are serving as supported factors to recognize sarcasm.
- 4-Sarcasm is not requiring the physical presence of the victim to be part of the speech situation, yet the victim might be ridiculed or offended by the speaker.
- 5-A sarcastic utterance can be manifested by using metaphor or simile, which raises the importance of context to realize the real intention behind the utterance.

REFERENCES

- Alrikabi, Angham. (2014). Political Power and Impoliteness: A Pragmatic Analysis of some Iraqi Political Exchanges.
- Baldick, Chris (2001). The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Barbe, K. (1995). Irony in context (Vol. 34). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Bernal, M. (2008). Do insults always insult? Genuine impoliteness versus non-genuine impoliteness in colloquial Spanish. Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA), 18(4), 775-802.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Campbell, J. D. (2012). Investigating the Necessary Components of a Sarcastic Context (Spine title: Investigating Components of Sarcastic Context) (Doctoral dissertation, Thesis format: Monograph [Electronic resource]/John D. Campbell.–2012.–Режим доступу: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi>).
- Colston, H. L., & Lee, S. Y. (2004). Gender Differences in Verbal Irony Use. Metaphor and Symbol, 19(4), 289–306.doi:10.1207/s15327868ms1904_3.
- Craig, R. T., Tracy, K., & Spisak, F. (1986). The discourse of requests: Assessment of a politeness approach. Human Communication Research, 12(4), 437-468.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of pragmatics, 25(3), 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture, 1(1), 35-72.

- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1545-1579.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. university Press: Cambridge.
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Kádár, D. Z. (Eds.). (2017). *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im) politeness*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dibyó, K., Maskuri, S., Tarjana, S., Purnanto, D., Candidate, D., Program, P., & Maret, S. (2019). Politeness Strategies in Directive Speech Acts in Local Indonesian Parliament Assembly Proceedings, 9(3), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n3p85>.
- Drucker, A., Fein, O., Bergerbest, D., & Giora, R. (2014). On sarcasm, social awareness, and gender. *Humor*, 27(4), 551-573.
- Dynel, M. (2018). Theoretically on Mock Politeness in English and Italian. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 6(1), 149–165. doi:10.1075/jlac.00007.dyn
- Caucci, G. M., & Kreuz, R. J. (2012). Social and paralinguistic cues to sarcasm.
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (2012). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Gibbs Jr, R. W., Gibbs, R. W., & Colston, H. L. (Eds.). (2007). *Irony in language and thought: A cognitive science reader*. Psychology Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). Where the action is. In E. Goffman, *Interaction ritual: Essays on face to face behaviour* (pp. 149-270). Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Haiman, Jhon (1998). *Talk is cheap: Sarcasm, Alienation and the Evolution of Language*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Kadar, Daniel Z, Haugh, Michael, (2013). *Understanding Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Kecskes, Istvan. (2017). Context-dependency and impoliteness in intercultural communication. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 13. 10.1515/pr-2015-0019.
- Leech, G. 1983. *The Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Locher, M. A., & Bousfield, D. (2008). Introduction: Impoliteness and power in language (No. 21, pp. 1-13). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lovinger, W., Paul (2000). *The Penguin Dictionary of American English Usage and Style*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Manser, H., Martin (1996). *Macmillan Student's Dictionary*. London: Macmillan Education limited.
- Muecke, D.C. (1969) *The Compass of Irony*, London: Methuen.
- Redmond, M. V. (2015). *Face and Politeness Theories*.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (Vol. 142). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, C. (2015). Beyond sarcasm: The metalanguage and structures of mock politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 87, 127-141.
- Taylor, C. (2016). *Mock Politeness in English and Italian*. Pragmatics.
- Wilson, D. (2013). Irony comprehension: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59, 40-56.