

**A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN
POLITICAL ELECTORAL SPEECHES**

**دراسة تداولية للتهكم في خطب الانتخابات
السياسية**

**Prof. Dr.
Fareed H. H. Al-Hindawi,
Researcher
Basim Jubair Kadhim
University OF Babylon**

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN POLITICAL.....(10)

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN POLITICAL ELECTORAL SPEECHES

دراسة تداولية للتهكم في خطب الانتخابات السياسية

Prof. Dr.
Fareed H. H. Al-Hindawi,
Researcher
Basim Jubair Kadhim
University OF Babylon

Abstract

This paper deals with irony in electoral political speeches from pragmatic point of view represented by two American candidates: Barack Obama and George W. Bush. It has set itself to deal with this issue in particular because it has not been given due attention. It falls in five sections; section one is an introduction, section two provides a literature review on irony, section three is to develop a model for ironic analysis, section four is about the analysis of the data, and section five sums up the conclusions. The paper attempts to investigate ironic strategies, stages, the possibility of understanding irony from the speaker's illocutionary force, and explicating the gradualness of the ironic insincerity where insufficient contextual clues exist. To achieve such aims, a model is developed for the analysis of irony in political electoral speeches. The findings of the analysis verify the hypotheses represented by the process of ironic stages, strategies, ironic insincerity of the speaker, and irony is an ostensible speech act. On the contrary, it rejects the hypothesis of not conveying irony where insufficient contextual clues exist.

1. Introduction

Pragmatics is defined as the study of actual utterances; the study of use rather than meaning (Lyons, 1977:171). It is also defined as the study of that part of meaning which is not purely truth-conditional or the study of performance rather than competence (Levinson, 1983: 32). Yule (1996: 3) introduced yet another

definition to pragmatics; it is the study of the intended meaning of speech acts or the study of the speaker's meaning.

Accordingly, such a hybrid field has become a lively and interesting area for research. Though many left out issues concerning meaning and use of language have been settled through its methodology, many other intricate phenomena are still in need to be given due attention. One of such a kind of phenomena is "Irony". Despite the fact that it has been dealt with from different perspectives, it seems that there has been no comprehensive approach to it so far (See Gibbs & Colston: 2001; Sperber & Wilson: 2006; Qadir: 2006; Fakhry: 2009; Ajtony:2010;). From the literary point of view, irony is defined as a literary or rhetorical device or mode of thinking, feeling and expression (Cuddon, 1999:430). In the same vein, Muecke (1978:19) defines irony as the bringing in of the opposite, the complementary impulses in order to achieve a "balanced poise". Stylistically, Fowler (1965:295) defines irony as "a mode of expression which postulates a double audience, one of which is 'in the know' and aware of the speaker's intention, while the other is naive enough to take the utterance at its face value". Pragmatically, as far as writing and reading are concerned, Leech and Short (1981:277-8) see irony as the "secret communion" between the author and the reader. This communion, as they see it, is the basis of irony. It is the communicative intent conveyed by the author, which should be understood by the reader through oppositeness or inappropriateness. As far as speech is concerned, Leech (1983: 142) defines irony more precisely as a pragmatic principle which enables the speaker, through breaking one or more of the cooperative principle maxims, to be impolite while seeming to be polite.

On the basis of the aforementioned pragmatic definitions and previous studies which have dealt with irony from communicative viewpoint, one of the main assets of pragmatics, there is still a lack of important concerns. These concerns are used through irony to convey pragmatic intents such as the pragmatic elements used by the speaker and the receiver to express and interpret irony and the pragmatic ostensibility of irony. Such use is employed differently

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN POLITICAL.....(13)

in various contexts of English. Addressing this problem requires due attention. Thus, this study has set itself to fill the gap mentioned above through incorporating the phenomenon in question in the field of electoral political speeches. More precisely, this study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What is the pragmatic structure of irony used in electoral political speeches?
2. What are the most common pragmatic strategies used to issue irony in electoral political speeches?
3. Can irony be conveyed when there are insufficient contextual clues?
4. Is irony an ostensible speech act when used in electoral political speeches as?

The present study aims at finding out: the pragmatic structure of irony, i.e., processing stages when dealing with it in the electoral political speeches; the most common pragmatic strategies used to issue irony in the electoral political speeches; explicating the insincerity of irony when there are insufficient contextual clues; and whether irony is an ostensible speech act when used in political electoral speeches.

To achieve the above mentioned aims, it is hypothesized that: Irony is a process structured of three stages: issuance, relevance, and evaluation stages; politicians tend to use particular strategies more than others to express irony in electoral political speeches; irony sub-acts cannot be recognized when there are insufficient contextual clues; and at the level of speech acts, irony is an ostensible speech act that depends on cultural norms.

Some procedures are introduced to establish a general view of the phenomenon in question: Reviewing the literature about irony, its definitions, types, related theories, etc., collecting data from political American presidential candidates, analyzing the ironic situations in the political speeches of presidential elections by means of the model which is developed for this purpose, and using a mathematical statistical method, represented by the percentage equation, to calculate the results of the analysis and statistically verify or reject findings of the analysis.

This study is limited to Investigating irony in terms of certain pragmatic theories, i.e., speech act theory, implicature theory, relevance theory, and politeness theory. It seeks its aims in all the ironic situations in a number of randomly selected political speeches of presidential elections from the last two decades. Speeches are taken from different native speaker politicians, (viz. Barak Obama and George W. Bush). They have been found representative to what is required by the data of the work.

2. Irony: Literature Review

This section is concerned with reviewing the literature related to irony. It provides a theoretical background of irony as a concept in general, and demonstrates its pragmatic utilization in particular. The pragmatic theories and domains within which irony is included are summarized. It also investigates some details defining irony and concentrating on verbal irony which is involved in the current study.

2.1. Definition of Irony

Irony is considered a bisociative, in that it involves some form of duality in terms of incongruence, incompatibility, and opposition (Barbe, 1993: 589). This justifies why irony is defined as a general concept, i.e., in terms of literature and linguistics before defining it pragmatically.

In dictionaries, like Webster (1969:448) irony is defined as "the use of words to express something other than and especially the opposite of the literal meaning". In a similar way, The New Encyclopedia Britannica (1983:432) deals with irony as "either speech (verbal irony) in which the real meaning is concealed or contradicted by the literal meaning of the words, or a situation (dramatic irony), in which there is incongruity between what is expected and what occurs".

Linguistically speaking, verbal irony is the type which is mostly concerned with, as Gibbs (1994: 263) and Culter (1996: 59) maintain that almost all types of irony involve a confrontation or juxtaposition of incompatibles, however in verbal irony, an individual presents or evokes such a confrontation by his or her

utterance(s). This leads Pexman et al (2002: 215) to conclude that there are communicative beliefs and attitudes, through indirectness of irony, constituting the speaker's implied meaning. Such a communicative and/or implied meaning is the essence of pragmatics.

From pragmatic point of view, it seems that irony requires different tackling and treatment which differ according to the type of pragmatic theory involved. Grice (1975: 312), for example, describes irony as flouting the first maxim of cooperative principle (Henceforth, CP), that is of quality. Through this flouting, the intended meaning of the speaker (Henceforth, S) is produced. For Sperber and Wilson (1981: 310), through which it is defined as echoic mentions of a proposition, adding the S's evaluation of the latter. Leech (1983: 82) considers irony as a second order principle, which comes after CP and politeness principle

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 221), "a communicative act is done off-record, if it is done in such a way that is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act". Therefore, irony is defined as an off-record politeness strategy which gives face-saving function (ibid.).

2.2. Verbal Irony

Stated very crudely, the mechanism by which irony works is that the utterance, if taken literally, is obviously grossly inappropriate to the situation. Since it is grossly inappropriate, the hearer (Henceforth, H) is compelled to reinterpret it in such a way as to render it appropriate, and the most natural way to interpret it is as meaning the opposite of its literal form (Bollobás, 1981: 327; Brown & Levinson, 1987:226; Searle 1991:536).

Intentionality of the utterances is the distinguishing feature of verbal irony from other types, i.e., the S makes the ironic statement deliberately in order to communicate a proposition that is contradictory to what s/he states (Abrams, 1999: 135).

The traditional view of verbal irony, originating in classical rhetoric and emerging by way of the philosophy of language, holds that the ironic utterance means the opposite of its literal form,

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN POLITICAL.....(16)

which is a semantic approach. This becomes the job of the language philosophers later on (Wilson and Sperber, 2004: 31).

They (ibid) stress the role of the context when there are no such paralinguistic cues:

When there is no distinctive intonation, it is clear that the choice between literal and ironic interpretation must be based on the information external to the utterance, i.e. contextual knowledge and other background assumption rather than the form or the content of the utterance itself.

Verbal Irony is defined as a species of figurative language, in which the intended meaning of an expression is usually some kind of opposite of the literal meaning, as, for instance, when someone says 'You've been a great help!' to a person whose actions or words have just precipitated a disaster. The literal meaning of an ironic expression typically echoes the words or assumed opinions of someone else, and is intended to mock or ridicule (Cruse, 2006: 90).

Linguistically speaking, most studies about irony are concerned with verbal and situational irony, for they have some peculiar characteristics that distinguish them from other types, like intentionality, indirect negation, and context (Reyes et al, 2006: 2-3). More precisely, verbal irony is characterized by two dimensions: the pragmatic strategies used in the issuance of irony and the type of the H or receiver, whether the victim – who receives the ironic utterance – or the target - whom the implied meaning of irony is addressed to (ibid: 3).

However, some para-linguistic cues often accompany the utterance to be indicators of irony; they are peculiar to the spoken irony like intonation (Gibbs, 2008: 136).

In the same regard, many scholars (Levison, 1983: 226; Leech, 1983: 142; Clark and Gerrig, 1984:121; Wilson and Sperber, 1992; Hutcheon, 1995:12–13; Sperber and Wilson, 1998; Giora et al., 2005: 34;) focus on the idea that the implicit meaning neglects the literal one, and then unsaid exists. This means that the ironic meaning. On the other hand, the unsaid is not always a simple

inversion or the opposite of the said. So, here comes the pragmatics of irony.

Colston and Gibbs (2007: 22-24) maintain that there are some other concepts like sarcasm and satire which can be considered as types of irony "sarcasm as a term that is commonly used to describe an expression of verbal irony". Contrary to this, Dews et al. (2011: 1574) point out that sarcasm, combined with devices such as jocularity, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, and understatement, are linguistic constructions that can help produce irony. This means that such types of means are strategies by which irony is expressed.

Context is one of the main pragmatic factors in determining the intended meaning of the ironic utterances (Hartung, 2011: 167-8). There is the famous example "you are a find friend" which can be interpreted as an ostensible utterance (i.e. irony) or a true statement. This depends on the situational context in which the utterance is issued (Thibodeau and Boroditsky, 2012: 190).

To summarize and adopt an operational definition working out with the current study, irony is a contrast between two elements: face utterance and the intended meaning. This phenomenon is allusive and has wide perspectives; it could be a policy, a strategy, a criticism, and a wit, but it could also be a humorous comment, a friendly talk and a spontaneous funny situation. It could have depth in its meaning, and it could be a simple reaction. It is a hidden truth and a communion which may fail to be recognized by some. It could be a frustrated comment to a disappointing situation.

2.3. Theories of Irony

Scholars have discussed irony from different points of view. Many of their studies, however, have been linguistically introduced. This section tries to cover the most prominent ones.

2.3.1. Grice's 1975 Theory

The standard treatment of irony in pragmatics goes back to Grice (1975). He (ibid: 53) states that people understand irony by recognizing that an utterance violates a conversational maxim and then deriving an interpretation that is consistent with the assumption of cooperative principle in communication.

The intention conveyed by the ironist's implicature urges the H to look for an additional meaning. Having identified the non-observance of the quality maxim, the addressee feels inclined to reject the literal meaning and subsequently decipher the implied meaning, highly likely to be some obviously related proposition (ibid),

e.g. X with whom A has been on close terms until now, has betrayed a secret of A's to a business rival. A and his audience both know this. A says: 1) X is a fine friend.

Grice (ibid) argues that it is clear to A and his audience that what A has said, or has made as if to say is an opinion. He does not entertain himself, and that the audience knows that A knows that his opinion is known by his audience. So, either A's utterance is entirely pointless, or A must be trying to get across some other proposition than the one he expresses. The related proposition would be then the contradictory to the one he expresses.

According to Grice, Hs assume that Ss will be truthful and informative. When an S says something that is patently untrue, and the listener can make one or two interpretations, either the S is violating the CP or s/he is deliberately trying to communicate something by appearing to violate the CP. In doing so, he implicitly invites the H to make an inference and to look for a communicative intent behind the apparent violation (ibid: 49-50).

This account has been criticized by many scholars (Wilson (1981: 296), Kaufer (1981:499), and Attardo (2007:139)). Despite all kinds of criticism, it should be admitted that Grice's theory has made a big move towards finding a solution to the problem of ironic utterances, being considered as figurative trope that cannot be analyzed by truth-conditions. Pragmatically speaking, Grice's theory of irony introduces the significant treatment of irony by regarding it as a pragmatic concept that should be discussed within the conversational maxim and context appropriateness.

2.3.2. Echoic-Mention Theory

After the criticisms which are directed to Grice's approach of irony, Sperber and Wilson (19981) introduce another account of

irony represented by the Echoic Mention Theory. This theory rejects the standard account of Grice, in which the hallmark of irony is to communicate the opposite of the literal meaning. Adding to this theory, ironic utterances are used intentionally to indicate some discrepancy between a disruption of the world that the S is using and the way things actually are (Wilson, 2006: 4).

They (1981: 296) attempt to introduce a better treatment of this concept from a more pragmatic view through what they call "Echoic-Mention Theory". They (ibid) believe that their account of irony explains why ironic utterances are made, and why they sometimes implicate the opposite of what they literally say. In addition, this account involves no substitution mechanism whether semantic or pragmatic. It assumes the necessity of a semantic condition for an utterance to be ironic, but it is not a sufficient one. Furthermore, this account indicates that ironic utterances do not convey only propositions, but also suggestions of images and attitudes which can be studied pragmatically.

This theory of irony is revised by Sperber and Wilson in (1986). They have abandoned the notion of "mention" as too limited, and it is replaced by the notion of 'interpretative resemblance', i.e., "the use of the propositional form to represent not itself but some other propositional form which it more or less closely resembles"(1986: 264).

To be understood, an utterance must have one and only one interpretation consistent with the principle of relevance and that interpretation must be satisfactory both in terms of contextual effects and in terms of effort. An optimally relevant interpretation either strengthens or rejects an existing assumption against the minimal effort possible. Thus, the principle of relevance explains how linguistic form and background knowledge interact in order to smooth verbal comprehension (ibid: 268-274). Otherwise formulated, ironic utterances will be interpreted as such if they are the first to be consistent with the principle of relevance and acknowledged as consistent by the H (ibid).

Consequently, Maximal relevance implies maximal contextual effect for minimal processing effort; any utterance addressed to

someone automatically conveys a presumption of its own relevance. This fact, we call the principle of relevance (ibid: 272). Consider the following example provided by Sperber and Wilson (ibid):

Peter has given Bill some money and is reassuring Mary that Bill will return it in due time. Peter says:

(5) 'Bill is an officer and a gentleman'.

Bill fails to return it as promised and Mary comments:

(6) An officer and a gentleman, indeed',

Thus, she is expressing not only her belief that the expressed opinion is false, but also that under the given circumstances, it sounds patently absurd.

2.3.4. Clark and Gerrig's (1984) 'Pretence Theory

Inspired by Fowler (1965) and Grice (1978), Clark and Gerrig's Pretence Theory (1984) claims that a person who uses an ironic utterance assumes a role and consequently borrows an ironic voice. Whenever an S is being ironic, s/he pretends to be someone else, addressing somebody other than the actual H. An S pretends to be an injudicious person, speaking to an uninitiated audience; the S intends the addressee of the irony to discover the pretence and thereby see his or her attitude toward the S, the audience and the utterance (Clark and Gerrig 1984: 12).

Based on Grice (1978: 124), they express their theory supposing that S is speaking to A, the primary addressee, and to A, who may be present or absent, real or imaginary. In speaking ironically, S is pretending to be S speaking to A. What S is saying is, in one way or another patently uninformed or injudicious, worthy of a hostile or derogatory judgment or a feeling such as indignation or contempt (A in ignorance, is intended to miss this pretence, to take S as speaking sincerely (the victim (See below)). But A, as part of the "inner circle", (the target (See below)) is intended to see everything—the pretence, S's injudiciousness, A's ignorance, and hence S's attitude toward S, A, and what S said. S and A may be recognizable individuals.

Wilson (2006: 1724) remarks that pretence alone could stretch incredibly thin. However, echoic and pretence can combine together to produce occasional ironic effects. Moreover, she (ibid: 19) criticizes the pretence theory of irony in that non-echoic versions of pretence account do not explain why a S cannot produce any blatantly false or inappropriate utterance and expected it to be understood as ironic.

2.3.5. Attardo's (2000) Relevant Inappropriateness Theory

Attardo is not convinced with all the aforementioned theories about irony. Thus, he proposes a theory of irony which claims that ironic utterances are both inappropriate and relevant to their context (Attardo, 2000a: 793). In this theory, Attardo thinks that all cases of irony can be handled; those derived from violation of appropriateness or felicity conditions.

He (ibid: 795) maintains that his theory is Gricean at the core, but includes several significant differences from Grice's model of irony. It involves the notion of inappropriateness which has made this theory broader and completely context dependent. Based on Grice's maxims, Attardo (ibid) rejects Colston's account (See 2.4.6) which depends on felicity conditions only.

However, it can be said that both Grice's maxims and the felicity conditions are complementing each other in their related roles to irony. Felicity conditions cannot be considered unless the CP is considered and vice-versa.

Attardo (ibid: 817) describes his theory of irony as follows: an utterance (U) is ironic if:

1. U is contextually inappropriate;
2. U is (at the same time) relevant;
3. U is constructed as having been uttered intentionally and with awareness of contextual appropriateness by Ss;
4. The S intends that part of his or her audience recognizing points 1-3;
5. Unless the H construes U as being unintended in which cases 3-4 do not apply.

3. The Eclectic Model

As far as the current study is concerned, the target model is developed on the basis of what is adopted from other models, in addition to the observations made by the researcher himself. The model is illustrated at the pragmatic stages with their strategies. The process of irony which is used by the eclectic model developed by the current study has four pragmatic elements in three stages, namely: speech acts (pragma-rhetorical and ostensible), PP, conversational implicature, and pragmatic insincerity.

3.1. Stages of Irony

With reference to the three stages of irony, each stage has its own devices. Although some of them are adopted by other scholars (See Colston and Gibbs, 2007), some other details need be shed light on.

3.1.1. Issuance Stage

This stage is based on two pragmatic theories, namely: pretense and echo. These two elements use pragma-rhetorical speech acts and PP. As for pretense, it is one sub-stage of issuance stage where the S uses different strategies (viz. sarcasm, off-record strategies, humour and bantering, jocularly, and similes). The second sub-stage is echo which is actualized through the employment of other strategies (viz. rhetorical questions, ambiguity, and quotations).

3.1.1.1. Pretense Strategies

In this sub-stage, there is a violation to PP, and the S wants to maintain PP (See Brown and Levinson, 1978: 66) through pretending to be someone else. This pretense is attained by one or more of different strategies which are by no means exhaustive as the data of the work show.

Beginning with sarcasm, it is used to convey ironical intention through using any speech act with the intended violation of sincerity condition but with maintaining PP. However, there are two speech acts often used sarcastically: praise to criticize or ridicule and criticism to praise.

As regards off-record strategies, for the S to be ironic, s/he should use utterances through which s/he pretends to be so polite or so naïve. To be so polite is to use the strategy of giving associative

clues. In other words, the S only hints at the ironic intention through the pretended polite utterances. In this device, the maxim of manner is flouted. On the other hand, to be naïve means to flout the maxim of quantity through using the pragma-rhetorical speech act of understatement. Such use indicates that the S is being ironic because of understating the situation or the pretense of being naïve in a context where both the S and the H are well-acquainted with.

Over-politeness is one of the blueprints of being ironic. This explains the flouting of quality maxim through using overstatements or contradictions. Once again, to pretend to be so polite, in a context where it is not needed to do so, means that the S is being ironic. Concerning overstatement (hyperbole), it is used to exaggerate or oversize the situation for particular intention such as ironic. The other flouting to the quality maxim occurs via contradictions through which the S pretends to be polite in using contradictions of what s/he means. This is complete ironic.

Based on Leech, humour and bantering can be used to convey ironic utterances among people who have close relationships. The S, in this strategy, pretends to be either friendly or humourous in order to convey ironic attitudes, a strategy which depends on the intimate relationship between the interlocutors. Thus, even though the S says something impolite, s/he could be considered polite because of the contextual factors, i.e. having a strong relationship.

In the same stream of pretense, Ss sometimes pretend to have positive and polite attitude through using some utterances, but they intend to convey other attitudes. This can be actualized via the employment of jocularly in this device, it is either the quality maxim of CP is flouted or the sincerity condition of the speech act is intentionally violated. According to this strategy, the intended utterance is not easily recognized unless there are contextual factors are known by both the S and the H.

The last pragma-rhetorical speech act is simile. Conveying irony, similes could be used directly or indirectly. When used directly, there is a flouting to one or more of CP maxims. However, using similes indirectly depends on the pretense of the S to be

completely polite, but the context indicates the opposite in the different meaning.

All in all, the strategies mentioned above rely strongly on the pretense and PP in order to convey irony. In other words, such strategies are used by the S as if another person is using them. Yet, sometimes irony is conveyed through other devices in which ironic utterances are the realizations to different thought. This is to be discussed in the next section.

3.1.1.2. Echo-Resemblance, Mention, Interpretation

In this sub-stage, the researcher adopts Sperber and Wilson's Echo-Resemblance, Mention, Interpretation theory (1986: 264) as a device through which some strategies of irony are used. According to this modified theory, the S uses utterances that resemble the thought (viz. the intended meaning of the S), mention another thought, or interpret another thought or utterance, which only become ironic when they are combined with the context. There are three strategies utilized under this device: rhetorical question, ambiguity, and quotations.

As regards rhetorical questions, Hicks (2007: 92) maintains that such questions echo other intentions through using utterances similar to these intentions. This is the core of echo theory as mentioned above. Accordingly, it can be said that to echo any ironic intention, rhetorical questions can be used as a strategy to this end. In terms of politeness, rhetorical questions are used indirectly as a means of conveying irony via echoing some other intentions which might have FTAs. Hence, to do the FSAs is to keep using such indirect rhetorical means as rhetorical questions.

Ambiguity is the other strategy when the S ironize the H through echoing the intentions by means of using impersonalized utterances. In this strategy, there are two elements taken into consideration. The first element is PP, i.e. to be polite while being ironic is to be ambiguous (See Brown and Levinson, 1978). The other element is that to be ironic is use other utterances through such ambiguity.

As far as the quotations are concerned, they are used as echo of the S's utterances to be converted into ironic by the H. This strategy is to take from what has been mentioned and combined it with the contextual factors, like different tone or using the quotes inconveniently (See Sperber and Wilson 1986).

Now that the two sub-stages of the first stages strategies are discussed along with the pragmatic elements that govern these strategies, utterances that have already issued are still not quite clear ironic. In other words, the intended meaning of the S is not yet grasped. Thus, there should be something that signals the ironic utterances properly. This leads to a second stage of irony.

3.1.2. Inappropriate and Relevant Stage

This second stage involves two important elements: allusion and maintaining irony acts. These two elements are introduced differently by Attardo and Colston. Attardo argues that ironic utterances are both inappropriate and relevant to their context, but they can be derived from the violation of the appropriateness and felicity conditions. As for Colston, he remarks, through the two stage model, that in issuance stage, the S must allude to prediction, expectations, previously made comment...etc. Accordingly, the question of allusion and the strategies presented by Colston and Gibbs (2007) go hand in hand with the strategies mentioned in stage one. More precisely, the strategies introduced by Colston govern all the strategies of the issuance stage.

These allusions must occur through three main pragmatic devices: pragmatic insincerity (viz. the sincerity of the felicity condition of ironic acts), the flouting of the CP maxims and a combination of insincere (ostensible) speech acts and flouting of the CP maxims. These intended violations render the utterance inappropriate in the context, a maxim proposed by Attardo to issue and interpret irony.

The second pragmatic element in this strategy is maintaining irony through relating the pragmatic insincerity, CP maxim flouting and the combination of both to PP as observed by Brown and Levinson (1978). Hence, using the inappropriate, flouted and

alluded utterances should be confined to the terms of FSA and FTA.

Based on these different points of view concerning allusion and inappropriateness and along with maintaining irony through PP, it can be concluded that both scholars indirectly use the two concepts: flouting and relevance. Convincingly, the term flouting can be applied to the ostensibility of irony, for issuing ironic utterances is a matter of being flouted both CP maxims and sincerity condition. As well, the term relevance can be applied to the flouting of one or more of the CP maxims which lead to the inappropriateness.

Thus, obviously, such problem can be addressed through the employment of the term "pragmatic competence" (See above). Since irony is one of the pragmatic strategies that one should be pragmatically competent with, it is required that both the S and the H have "ironic competence". In other words, the S who makes allusions, inappropriateness, and pragmatic insincerity (ostensibility) should be ironically competent. The H, on the other hand, should also be ironically competent, when relating, interpreting and evaluating such utterances as ironic.

Consequently, through ironic competence, the S uses some strategies to allude to the ostensibility and the inappropriateness of the utterances. As for the H, s/he begins, via ironic competence, to make such utterance relevant, and then the H starts interpreting the utterance as ironic. Therefore, ironic competence is a very essential element in issuing, interpreting and evaluating utterances as ironic.

3.1.3. Interpretation and Evaluation Stage

After making allusions and relevant inappropriateness, it is the role of the H to take utterances as ironic. This is the main concern of this stage, i.e. how the H reaches to the intended ironic meaning conveyed by the S.

Adopting Happe's (1993) ironic interpretation and Colston and Gibbs' (2007) explanation about the interpretation stage, there could be concluded three sub-stage conditions to the interpretation of utterances as ironic. It is worth mentioning that these three conditions are evaluated via the ironic competence by the H.

relying on the inappropriateness and relevance stage, the H employs the following sub-stages:

1. Satisfaction of the S's Allusions to Expectation

For the H to start interpreting utterances as ironic, there must be satisfaction of the S's allusion to the expectation, incongruity between the expectation and the reality, and the S's negative attitude toward the incongruity. This could occur through the allusions and the context. Knowing these elements leads to set the cornerstone of sub-stages of interpreting irony. Put another way, the S's allusion is the most essential component because the other two components cannot be identified unless the S's allusion and expectation are known (See Happe, 1993).

2. Inferences from Context and Utterances

When Hs do not know the S's expectation or do not recognize any allusion to the known expectation, the allusion or expectation must be inferred from the utterance and /or the context. In other words, utterances and the context are the prototypical conditions that allude to the S's expectation which includes pragmatic insincerity by the intended violation of one of the pragmatic principles and is accompanied by a variety of verbal/ non-verbal clues.

As regards allusion, it can be captured by the pragmatic coherence relations which hold between what is said and what is expected. Pragmatic principles flouted by ironic utterances include one or more of CP maxims and felicity conditions for speech acts (i.e. sincerity). Concerning the clues for indirect expressions of the S's negative attitude, they include hyperbolic words and phrases and prosodic clues like ironic tone (See 3.1).

3. Identification of the two Conditions

In this stage, Hs check on the two aforementioned sub-stage conditions; whether the allusion to the S's expectation, the incongruity of the known expectation, and the negative attitude are readily recognized. Then, if Hs are successful in recognizing ironic situation, they evaluate the utterance as ironic and become aware of the S's ironic intention.

These three sub-stages of the interpretation stage are based on the consecutive success. That is, there should be evaluation to each of which during the interpretation stage. More precisely, the evaluation of the sub-stage conditions can be clarified as follows:

- If the S's allusion to the expectation is satisfied, the utterance could lead to the next evaluation.
- If the Hs do not know the S's expectation, they must infer the ironic meaning from the context and utterance.
- If these two sub-stages are fulfilled, then the H reaches out to the final ironic meaning (i.e. through the illocutionary force as an ostensible speech act).

However, one of the first two conditions above combined with the intonation clues can be enough to recognize and evaluate an utterance as ironic.

4. 4. Data Analysis

This section deals with the practical side in this work, namely: data collection, description and methods of analysis. Then, there will be some selected examples from the data to be analyzed.

5. 4.1.1. Methods of Analysis

The developed model presented in Section Three is used for analyzing ironic utterances in the selected electoral speeches under study.

The data collected for analysis are represented by (24) ironic situations chosen from the twenty two speeches as a whole. Because the candidates whose speeches are chosen run in different election periods, they are chronologically ordered. The statistical tool that will be used for calculating the results of the analysis is the percentage equation.

The texts of the speeches take the following symbols through the analysis:

- T1 = George W. Bush's Speeches
- T2 = Barak Obama's Speeches

4.1.2. Selected Examples for Pragmatic Analysis

Due to the fact that the situations representing the data are too many, and analyzing all of them will occupy a large space in this

work; only some illustrative examples will be presented (viz. five examples from T1 and five examples from T2). The choice of the examples for analysis depends on the number of the situations found in the text. This is done for the sake of two things: first, just to reveal what kind of analysis is conducted; and second, to shed light on the findings of the analysis.

Situation (1): Now, my opponent, he's got a plan, too. But as President Clinton pointed out, there's the most complex math in it. (Laughter.) There is the most sophisticated arithmetic that can do nothing to reduce our deficit. (Applause.) (T1: S2)

The issuance stage is started by pretence in which the strategy of overstatement (hyperbole) is employed. The addresser pretends to say things as if he didn't believe in them. He uses overstatement to indicate his non-serious use of his utterance which can be figured out through the last part of the second utterance (See 3.1.5). Simultaneously, the addresser employs an off-record strategy represented by overstatement (hyperbole) through the expressions "most complex" and "most sophisticated". Such utterances could lead the audience to two different interpretations; either positive or negative interpretation.

The intended meaning of the addresser's utterances can only be manifested through his allusion to the audience. In this example, the addresser's allusion is clarified through the stage of inappropriateness and relevance. The addresser utilizes these two strategies in such context specifically in order to convey an intention more than the normal one. Using humour within overstatement, the addresser renders his utterances inappropriate. The contextual factors (i.e. criticizing the poor plans of the opponent) do not go hand in hand with the utterances. The reason why the addresser flouts the quality maxim is to allude to the audience about his ironic utterances. Here, comes the role of the audience to make these inappropriate utterances relevant to the context. Since the contextual factors, the shared knowledge, intonation clues and ironic competence concerning praising the opponent are dropped off, the audience come to know that they only strengthen the contextual factors that can make these

inappropriate utterances relevant. Accordingly, the second stage ends up with the utterances inappropriate and relevant and with keeping to the PP through the humorous attitude.

As far as the interpretation and evaluation stage is concerned, the audience test the allusion of the addresser (i.e. inappropriateness and relevance of the utterances) with the expectations he wants them to recognize. Considering the relevance of these utterances, the audience become satisfied with the addresser's allusion. Then, through the contextual factors and the shared knowledge, the audience infer the addresser's irony of this situation. That is, the addresser ironizes the poor plans of the opponent by describing them "most complex" and "most sophisticated", while what he really wants to say is the opposite or so of the plans, but he cannot say it just directly and keep the PP.

Situation (2): For some reason my opponent got really excited. He rewrote his speech real quick. (Laughter.) He stood up at a rally, proudly declared, "I'll get the job done from the inside." (Laughter.) What kind of inside job is he talking about? (Applause.) Is it the job of rubberstamping the top-down, you're-on-your-own agenda of this Republican Congress? Because if it is, we don't want it. (Applause.) If it's the job of letting oil companies run our energy policy, we don't want it. (T1: S3)

The issuance stage is triggered by echo-interpretation. It is triggered by echo-interpretation through using rhetorical question "What kind of inside job is he talking about? Is it the job of rubberstamping the top-down, you're-on-your-own agenda of this Republican Congress?". The use of this strategy is completing to the addresser's intention in the sense that the other utterances of situation support the intended ironic meaning expressed by the rhetorical questions in the second part of the example.

The stage of inappropriateness and relevance begins with flouting the sincerity condition of the speech act of questioning when using rhetorical questions (3.1.3). The flouting of sincerity condition of the speech act is used to allude to the audience that the addresser intends to make his utterances inappropriate. The audience take the inappropriate utterances to combine them with

situation (i.e. speaking to a university rally, which is overwhelmingly constituted of students, about the addressee's plans in creating jobs. Such plans are only on papers). This combination makes the inappropriate utterances and relevant to the context with maintaining the ironic acts through committing to PP by means of using indirect ostensible speech acts of questioning represented by rhetorical questions.

The third stage of this example is manifested through the allusion of the inappropriate and relevant utterance to test them with the addresser's expectations. Contextual factors, intonation clues and the shared knowledge between the addresser and the audience satisfy the audience about the addresser's allusion. In other words, the audience become satisfied that the addresser means another criticizing meaning in such utterances. Then, the audience come to evaluate the addresser's utterances as ironic. He wants to convey ironically that the addressee's plans on creating jobs are to be criticized for they are only on papers; there is no action to fulfill them. In order to save his face, the addresser uses such ironic utterances to criticize the addressee severely.

Situation (3): All they've got to offer is the same prescription they've been offering for 30 years -- tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts -- (applause) -- gut a few regulations here and there, oh, and more tax cuts. (Laughter.) Tax cuts when times are good; tax cuts when times are bad. Tax cuts to help you lose a lot of pounds. (Laughter.) Tax cuts to improve your great love life. (Laughter.). (T1: S4)

The issuance stage of this example is initiated by pretence, i.e. the addresser pretends to issue all these speech acts in order to give other implicatures. The devices used in this example are complicated to some extent. The addresser starts with using understatement as "gut a few regulations here and there, oh, and more tax cuts" in the first utterance (See 3.1.8.) and the repetition of particular structures as in "tax cuts". Then, the addresser employs humour, "Tax cuts to help you lose a lot of pounds. Tax cuts to improve your great love life.", as a kind of backup to the aforementioned device "understatement". Humour is used to

implicate the addresser's attitude. However, humour per se is implicated by the employment of overstatement (hyperbole).

In the second stage, the addresser depends on the audience in recognizing the humourous attitude and understatement (i.e., the audience's ironic competence). Yet, to make his utterance ironic, he should make them inappropriate and relevant to the context. Accordingly, the addresser uses such understatement through flouting quantity maxim. This device is to introduce the real ironic attitude which is yet to come. The more effective irony which is to be conveyed is used through the use of humour. More precisely, humour is used through flouting the quality maxim. Using "help lose" and "improve your great love life" in such contextual factors only implicates the opposite. The addresser is pragmatically insincere and alludes to the audience that his utterances are inappropriate but relevant to the context. He uses humour as FSA in order to support the understatement that conveys the ironic meaning.

In the third stage of the process, i.e. interpretation and evaluation, the audience find such utterances difficult to be interpreted as whether ironic or humourous. Nevertheless, such utterances need deep consideration from the audience in order to correctly interpret them as ironic. The audience, here, go through the stages of interpreting of both understatement and humour. Afterwards, they start testing the understating and humourous utterances with the addresser's allusions that are combined with the shared knowledge and contextual factors. Having tested these allusions, the audience get satisfied that the addresser alludes to particular expectations (i.e. criticizing the economic policies of his opponents). Thus, the audience come to evaluate that the contextual factors and the utterances are used to ironize the addressee. The addresser makes his criticism more effective by using irony, for he criticizes the addressee with committing to PP through the use of "help" and "improve" pragmatically.

Situation (5): Governor Romney and his allies in Congress tell us that somehow we can lower our deficits -- they say that the deficit is the most important thing. They say this is vital for our future. But when you ask them, all right, what's your plan -- they

say, well, we're first going to start by taking \$5 trillion out of the economy and giving it to folks like me and Mr. Romney -- taking it out of Treasury, rather -- and giving it to me and Mr. Romney, and then, somehow, it's all going to create prosperity for the rest of you (woo woo woo). (T1: S4)

In the example above, the issuance stage is triggered by pretence. One device is used in this situation; the addresser uses one of the sarcastic strategies represented by criticism which is conveyed through the ostensible speech act of asserting "we're first going to start by taking \$5 trillion out of the economy and giving it to folks like me.."

The second stage starts with the addresser's allusion to the audience that his utterances are inappropriate but relevant. By using the strategy "sarcastic criticism", the addresser flouts the quality maxim of the utterance "lower our deficit... deficit is the most important.. taking \$5 trillion out of the economy and giving it to folks like me." in order to give some clues to the audience about making associations with the contextual factors, a matter that renders the utterances inappropriate. On the other hand, employing the ostensible speech act of asserting here implicates that the addresser is criticizing himself ironically in order to demonstrate praising attitude as in the utterance "and giving it to me..". Given the context and the shared knowledge between the addresser and the audience as well as the intonation clues, these utterances are taken as relevant to the context through strengthening the contextual factors that make the utterance relevant though inappropriate. Therefore, the allusion to the inappropriateness and relevance is conveyed through the flouting of sincerity condition of the speech acts of asserting used in the utterance above. The addresser uses such inappropriateness of praising just to keep to PP through using FSA when conveying irony.

As far as the stage of interpretation and evaluation is concerned, the audience test the inappropriateness and relevance of the utterances against the addresser's expectations. Through the shared knowledge of the addresser and the audience, they get satisfied about the allusions. Then, from the context and the utterance, the

audience are able to evaluate that the criticizing attitude is conveyed through the ironic utterances. The use of irony is to maintain the PP of the addresser's utterances.

Situation (7): Governor Romney wants to take us to policies more suited to the 1950s. Even his own running mate said he's "kind of a throwback to the '50s." That's one thing we agree on. (Laughter.) (T1: S6)

The issuance stage, in this example, begins with echo-interpretation through the employment of quotation. The addresser uses the direct quotation in order to give strong assertion to his intended meaning that he wants to convey.

In the second stage, the addresser gives hints in the utterances before and after the quoted one. The hints go well with the shared knowledge and the contextual factors (i.e. the attendants are in electoral days and they want to vote for a president who can take them forward not backward). These factors make the addresser's quotation "kind of a throwback to the '50s." and his speech act of asserting "That's one thing we agree on" inappropriate to the context. The addresser flouts the maxim of manner (viz. avoid ambiguity or obscurity) and also there is the intentional violation of sincerity condition of the speech act of asserting. Such flouting alludes to the audience about the inappropriateness of the addresser's utterances. Concerning the relevance, the audience eliminate all the contextual factors that give positive attitude to Mr. Romney and strengthen the factors that demonstrate the negative attitude of the addresser. Thus, the addresser echoes to the audience about the inappropriateness and relevance. Through the use of titles "Mr. Romney", the addresser saves his face and keeps the PP.

In the third stage of the process, the audience interpret and evaluate the utterances. They take the allusion of the inappropriateness and relevance and combine them with the contextual factors and the addresser's expectations they have through the shared knowledge. Once the audience get satisfied, they only infer that the addresser uses the speech act of asserting in the last utterance in order to allude more about his ironic attitude. Hence, the audience evaluate the addresser's utterances as ironic. In

other words, the addresser ironizes Mr. Romney so that the audience support him to criticize the plans of Mr. Romney, a goal that the addresser aims at to win the elections.

Situation (10): I mean, people, at the moments, are changing up so much and backtracking and sidestepping -- (laughter) -- we've got to name this condition that the candidates are going through. I think it's called "Romnesia." (T1: S6)

In this example, the issuance stage is triggered by echoing particular state of thought or utterance. The device used here is ambiguity (using ambiguous utterances) that disassociates the addresser from the utterances he is issuing, and echoing his thoughts (intended utterances).

The second stage of the process, inappropriateness and relevance, is initiated by the addresser's allusion to the audience about the inappropriateness and relevance. The use of ambiguity through flouting manner maxim (viz. avoid ambiguity or obscurity) helps the addresser allude to the audience about his ironic attitude (See 3.1.4: examples 37 and 38). In the utterances "people, at the moments, are changing up so much and backtracking and sidestepping", the addresser over generalizes his utterance by flouting the manner maxim so as to allude to the audience about his intended meaning. Such allusion becomes clearer as ironic when the addresser utilizes ambiguity once again through the process of coinage derived from his opponent's name "Romnesia". Such flouting renders the utterances inappropriate and relevance. At the same time, the addresser employs humorous attitude to disassociate himself from his utterances for the reason of keeping the ironic acts.

The stage of interpretation and evaluation starts by testing the addresser's allusion with the contextual factors and the shared knowledge in order to be satisfied. Considering the context (election speech and the addresser is trying to show the drawbacks of his opponent through stating the opponents backtracking), the audience infer from the context and the addresser's allusion that the he is ironic. That is, he ironizes his opponent in a way that shows his criticizing attitude in the best polite way possible.

Situation (11): I feel happy for the state of Wisconsin -- you've had a lot of commercials about Governor Romney's sales pitch. (T1: S6)

The issuance stage of this example begins with pretence. The addresser pretends to have an attitude represented by the face meaning of the utterance. In order to convey his ironic attitude, the addresser employs the device of jocularity.

The second stage is initiated by the addresser's allusion to the audience about the inappropriateness of the utterance "I feel happy for the state of Wisconsin". The audience combine what the addresser utters with the contextual factors to find that the addresser flouts quality maxim of CP. Here, these devices are used in order to allude to the audience that his utterances are inappropriate to the situation. However, the audience can make the inappropriate utterances relevant through the shared knowledge between the addresser and them. In other words, the audience can specify the implicature of the addresser through figuring out the contradiction between the addresser utterance and the implicature (See examples in 3.1.6). Thus, the addresser alludes to the audience that his utterances are, for ironic reasons, inappropriate and relevant. The addresser, however, disassociates himself from the utterances he utters in order to maintain the PP.

In the third stage, the audience take the addresser's allusion to test it with the contextual factors and the shared knowledge. Considering the context and the shared knowledge, the audience come to know that the addresser implicates the opposite of the literal meaning of his utterances. They also find out that the addresser uses jocularity in "I feel happy for the state of Wisconsin" and contradictions in "happy" in order to strengthen his attitude through using ironic utterances. Consequently, the audience evaluate that the addresser employs ironic utterance and attitude so as to criticize his opponent's longstanding appearance on commercials.

Situation (12): "Fine, I'll marry you, so long as I never have to give a political speech." I said, "Okay." (laughter). (T2: S1)

In this example, the issuance stage begins with pretence. The addresser employs the strategy of humour and bantering (See 3.1.5). The addresser pretends that his wife does not like political speeches at all, for they have no influence. Here, he wants to convey that his utterances are few but influential. Through this humorous marriage proposal utterance, the addresser alludes to the inappropriateness and relevance of his utterances.

In the second stage, the addresser uses bantering to allude that political speeches are usually long and useless but his speeches are short and useful "I never have to give a political speech". The addresser also flouts the maxim of quality to allude to the other side of the situation. However, though the addresser uses humorous utterances and intonation, he keeps up with polite attitude according to the context. This ends the stage with inappropriate and relevant utterances.

The stage of interpretation and evaluation is the stage that greatly depends on relating flouting the maxim and the sincerity condition to the contextual factors. The audience, in this example, are confused to some extent, for the utterances can be interpreted as humorous as well. Thus, they have to activate more contextual factors and much of the common knowledge they share with the addresser, not to mention the ironic competence, in order to be satisfied with allusion of the addresser's expectations. Given the utterance "I never have to give a political speech.", the audience become satisfied that it is not about humour, but it is about another attitude that the addresser wants to disassociate himself from. Then, tested with the contextual clues (i.e. electoral speech to a rally), the audience come to know that the addresser uses humor and bantering of his marriage proposal just to ironize and ridicule the long useless political speeches. Hence, the audience finally evaluate the addresser's utterances as ironic.

Situation (13): They take into account things like the number of crimes each force detects and clears up, and bonuses can be awarded accordingly. It sounds like a good idea. (T2: S3)

In this example, the addresser uses an utterance triggered by pretence to begin the issuance stage. The pretence is conveyed by

the strategy "use contradictions". Given the utterance, it is a combination of both flouting of Gricean's maxim of quality and sincerity condition of speech act. Based on the context, this gives allusion to the audience that there is either praise or criticism to the addressee. As for the off-record strategy (i.e. use contradictions), the addresser flouts the quality maxim to pretend that he has a very positive attitude toward this negative situation. However, it is obvious that what the addresser believes (the opposite) alludes to different expectations that render the utterance inappropriate in such contextual factors.

Now that the addresser makes allusions to the inappropriateness of the situation through flouting one of the CP maxims and sincerity condition, the second stage of the ironic process is unfold by relating the inappropriateness to the context. It is already known that the contextual factors are the election days and addressers are criticizing the current situation. Thus, they wouldn't use praising language (specially among candidates) unless they have hidden intended meaning. Accordingly, the addresser flouts the quality maxim and issues speech acts which intentionally lack sincerity condition as in "It sounds like a good idea"; a matter which renders the utterances inappropriate but relevant. The flouting and ostensibility leads to allusion to the addresser's expectations.

In the third stage, the audience take into account the contextual factors above and rely on allusion. Here, allusion is tested with the expectation the addresser has to see whether he really wants to give the addressee credit for this idea, an idea that all the audience don't like, or he wants to convey otherwise. Then, the audience infer from the context and the overstated and contradictory utterance that the addresser wants to convey his negative attitude towards such idea. He wants to express his disapproval and discontent, and subsequently disassociates himself from the idea with polite language. Identifying both audience's satisfaction of allusion and context and utterance inferences, they now come to evaluate the utterance used by the addresser. Accordingly, the utterance can be interpreted by the audience as ironic which expresses the addresser's ironic attitude towards the addressee.

Situation (14): The President's campaign has a slogan: it is "forward." I praise him for that. But to the 23 million Americans struggling to find a good job, these last four years feel a lot more like "backward." I praise him for that too. (laughter.) (T2: S4)

The issuance stage of this example is motivated by pretence, i.e. the addresser pretends to say something in which he doesn't actually believe. The strategy used here is sarcastic praise (See 3.1.1.1). This type of speech act is used twice in this example to convey two different implicatures. The implicature of these two direct speech acts "I praise him for that" is the main concern to the analysis.

This makes the second stage, inappropriate and relevance, need more consideration. The ironic intended meaning cannot be easily shown. Given these two utterances, the addresser employs the same utterance to different implicature in different situations. The first one seems to have the direct illocutionary force of speech act which is the direct praising (though it will appear to be criticism in the end). As for the second speech act, its illocutionary force is different from the previous one. The first one seems to have no intended violation to the sincerity condition, while the intended violation happens with the second one. When dealing with it from the CP maxims, it shows that this utterance per se shows the opposite implicature through flouting the quality maxim (viz. Do not say what you believe to be false).

Thus, flouting of quality maxim of the CP and the sincerity condition of the second speech act of praising renders the utterance inappropriate. The very utterance becomes relevant when combining the contextual factors (i.e. electoral speech in which the addresser tries to clarify that the issue of spending money on such programs that people cannot afford can be exploited in other things that the people in desperate need for). The addresser maintains the PP through committing to his utterances as in the ostensible speech act of praise above.

This brings the audience to the third stage, i.e. interpretation and evaluation stage of the process. The audience, here, process both utterances, but they take the second one to find out the first. The addresser uses inappropriate and ostensible speech act in order to allude to the audience about his ironic attitude towards the addressee. The audience take the utterance "I praise him for that" to find out that it is inappropriate in such situation, but at the same time, it is relevant to the context. Here, through ironic competence, the audience get satisfied with the addresser's allusion to his expectations. Afterwards, the audience only infer from the contextual factors that the addresser ironizes and criticizes the addressee by uttering praising speech act. Back to the first speech act, it can be shown that it is used insincerely though there is no flouting to any of the maxims of the CP. Therefore, both utterances of the speech act of praising are used sarcastically in order to make irony on the addressee's plans.

Situation (17): And the type of society we have - what kind of world is it where fathers who do not work have sons who do not work and they stand as king, where the young take to drugs and the debased culture of despair because no job beckons on leaving school and they stand as angels? What kind of world is it where there are more second homes but more homeless and the streets paved with fear and the society is of Plato? (Applause) It is a world in which some can succeed. But I ask you, is it a world of which anyone can be proud? That, Mr Major, is the moral question of our times. (T2: S1)

In this example, the issuance stage is triggered by pretence through the employment of one of the off-record strategies represented by "give association clues". The addresser uses questions to start issuance stage. These questions are used together due to the difficulty and rudeness of the situation. So, the addresser tries to commit to PP and convey the intended meaning through such devices.

The second stage of the process is started by the addresser's allusion to the audience that his utterances are inappropriate and relevant to the context. Considering the question "what kind of .." used repeatedly, the addresser uses it with giving some descriptions about the world (the real world or the ironic one). The harsh reality of the world under the present government compels the addresser to use some associative clues as "and they stand as king... stand as angels... and the society is of Plato" within the questions. Such contradictions as in the clues and even the question used in such situation are inappropriate, a matter that the addresser intentionally wants to allude. On the other hand, the addresser depends on the audience (ironic competence) in making these inappropriate utterances relevant to the situation, for they are all members of one party and in one place, i.e. members of Labour party in Blackpool.

The third stage begins with testing the addresser's allusion with the contextual factors and the expectations that the audience have about the addresser in order to figure out the intended meaning of the addresser. Having put together the context, the shared knowledge, and the addresser's inappropriate and relevant utterance, the audience come to evaluate the addresser utterances as ironic. Thus, the addresser uses irony to criticize the present government and to show that the society is getting debased and eventually there is no chance to be re-elected.

Situation (19): There is a mainstream in American politics, and my opponent is as the one sits on the far left bank. (Laughter.) (T2: S6)

Before analyzing this example, a possible interpretation of the simile in the example is given by the researcher. This type of simile is used when one who's far way from the issue being tackled. It is a cultural norm to use the simile above when one has nothing to do with what one is arguing for.

The issuance stage, here, needs some deep consideration. It is triggered by pretence using the strategy of simile. Simile is used here at two levels: the level of implicating the addresser's intended

meaning (the addressee has no relation in what is going on in the stream of American politics), and the level of using such intended meaning as a way of conveying the addresser's ironic attitude (See 3.1.8: example 45).

In the second stage, the addresser flouts the maxim of manner through being vague in using such simile. Concerning the contextual factors and the shared knowledge, it is obvious that utterance is appropriate and relevant. That is, the addresser uses simile to be more influential in describing the weakness of the addressee. The task would be even harder to the audience to recognize the expectations of the addresser. Indicating the weaknesses of the addressee, the addresser alludes to the audience about the inappropriateness of the situation, but still relative in terms of the addresser's disassociation attitude. Accordingly, the inappropriateness represented by the attitude of the addressee being irrelevant to the American politics and he intends to win the presidency. As for relevance, it is indicated by maximizing the cultural norms of criticizing someone through such likening as using simile.

In the third stage, the audience find some difficulty in satisfying with the allusion of the addresser's expectations. The addresser here alludes to the audience indirectly, i.e. he depends on the audience (ironic competence) in taking for granted the meaning of the simile and the utterance implication. The audience find out that the utterance means that the addressee knows nothing about American politics, for he's out of the general stream of politics. Having the implicatures concluded, the audience come to be satisfied that the addresser has an attitude towards the addressee through such implicatures. With the context and the utterance of this situation, the addresser fulfills his ironic attitude by means of the audience interpretation of the ironic utterance. Eventually, the utterance is understood as irony to show the weaknesses of the addressee's policy.

Table (1) Analysis of the Remaining Situations

Situation No.	Issuance Stage Strategy	Inappropriate and Relevance Stage		Interpretation and Evaluation Stage
		Abandon	Maintaining Iron	
4	Simile	Flouting the quantity maxim of CP	Humour as face saving acts	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
6	Overstatement	Flouting the quality maxim of CP	Using indirect hints	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
8	Understatement	Flouting the quantity maxim	Decommitting of the addresser's utterance	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
9	Jocularity	Flouting the quality maxim of CP	The addresser's ostensible agreement	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
15	Give association clues	Flouting manner maxim of CP	Decommitting of the addresser's utterance	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
16	Give association clues	Flouting manner maxim of CP	Humour as face saving acts	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
18	Quotation	Flouting sincerity condition of speech act of asserting	Humour as face saving acts	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
20	Sarcastic praise	Flouting sincerity condition of speech act of praising	The addresser's direct praise	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
21	Rhetorical question	Flouting sincerity condition of speech act of questioning	Disassociating the addresser from the utterance	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
22	Quotation	Flouting sincerity condition of speech act of asserting and quality maxim of CP	Disassociating the addresser from the utterance	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
23	Rhetorical question	Flouting sincerity condition of speech act of questioning	Disassociating the addresser from the utterance	Interpreted and evaluated as irony
24	Rhetorical question	Flouting sincerity condition of speech act of questioning and the manner maxim of CP	Using indirect hints	Interpreted and evaluated as irony

4.2.3. Findings and Discussions

After analyzing the selected situations in the data, the findings of the analysis are to be tested in order to meet the aims and to verify or reject the hypotheses of this study.

In the first stage, the findings in situations 2 in the examples analyzed are compatible with findings of the situations listed in

Table (1) 21, 23, 24. Together, they fulfill part of the second aim in this study (i.e. the pragmatic structure of irony, i.e., processing stages when dealing with it in the electoral political speeches.). These findings also verify the second hypothesis (i.e. politicians tend to use particular strategies more than other strategies). In this stage, it has been found that addressers more often use one strategy per situation with different tones in order to convey irony acceptably as shown in almost all the situations.

As for stage two (i.e. inappropriateness and relevance), all situations analyzed in the selected examples and in Table (1) rely on both the addresser and the addressee to be taken as irony. This is clarified through the model developed by this study; more precisely, by the allusion of the addresser to flouting CP maxims or sincerity condition of speech acts, not to mention the intonation changes. The aforementioned findings achieve aims three (i.e., explicating the insincerity of irony when there are insufficient contextual clues), and four (Whether irony is an ostensible speech act when used in political electoral speeches). They verify the third hypothesis in the study which is Irony sub-acts cannot be recognized when there are insufficient contextual clues.

In the third stage, it is found that the whole matter depends on the addressee to interpret the addresser's utterances as ironic. Although some situations as 5, 13, and 21 are difficult to be interpreted as ironic, for the contextual factors are not well presented, the addressee can interpret all the situations as ironic (the addresser's intended meaning) through having ironic competence. Such difficulty in interpreting the ironic situation fulfills the third aim of the study which rejects the third hypothesis (i.e. irony cannot be recognized with insufficient contextual factors). Additionally, the addresser, in all the situations, uses pragmatic insincerity through either flouting one of CP maxim or sincerity condition of the speech acts as well as the paralinguistic clues represented by tone differences. This fulfills the main aim of the study which is concerned with irony as an ostensible speech act and verifies the fourth hypothesis (i.e. at the level of speech acts, irony is an ostensible speech act).

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN POLITICAL.....(45)

Furthermore, throughout all the situations analyzed and listed in Table (1), irony is processed in three stages, namely: issuance stage, inappropriate and relevant stage, and interpretation and evaluation stage. This finding fulfills the first aim represented by the pragmatic structure of irony, i.e., processing stages when dealing with it in the electoral political speeches.

4.2.4. Statistical Analysis of the Speeches

The aim of this sub-section is to verify, in a mathematical statistical method, the findings which accord with the aims and hypotheses of this study, as in the following formula (Cited in Wikipedia.org):

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{occurrence of each strategy}}{\text{Total number of situations}} \times 100$$

Thus, the occurrence of each strategy in the process of irony in the two texts Whole Speeches, which are (24) in number, is represented in the following Table:

Table (2) the Three Stages of Irony Calculated in Percentages in the Texts

IS	SP	SC	GAC	U.	O.	UC	H&B	J.	S.	RQ	A.	Q.
	8.3	4.2	12.5	8.3	8.3	4.2	4.2	8.3	8.3	16.7	4.2	12.5
A&R	Allusion									Maintaining irony acts		
	Ostensible speech act			Flouting CP maxim		Combination of both						
	12.5			54.17		33.3					100	
I&ES	Satisfaction			Inferences						Identification		
	91.6			91.6						100		

Key: IS = Issuance Stage, A&RS = Appropriate and Relevant Satge, I&ES = Interpretation and Evaluation Stage, SP = Sarcastic Praise, SC = Sarcastic Criticism, GAC = Give Association Clues, U. = Understatement, O. = Overstatement, UC = Use Contradictions, RQ = Rhetorical Questions, A. = Ambiguity, H&B = humour and Bantering, J. = Jouclarity, Q. = Quotations, and S. = Simile.

The following results in the speeches are demonstrated in Table (2) above:

1. In the issuance stage, rhetorical question, give association clues, and quotation have the highest percentage (that is, rhetorical question 16.7%, Give association clues and Quotation 12.5 % each. Thus, they have the highest rate among other strategies. Accordingly, the second hypothesis in this study is verified.

2. In the inappropriate and relevant stage, flouting CP maxim has the highest percentage (that is, 54.17%) among allusion strategies. There is also a considerable rate of percentage of ostensible speech acts (that is, 12.5 % separated and 33.3 % combined with flouting CP maxim). On the other hand, committing to the PP is at the highest rate ever (that is 100%). Accordingly, this verifies the fourth hypothesis.
3. In the interpretation and evaluation stage, the three consecutive strategies have high percentage (that is satisfaction 91.6%, inferences 94 % and identification 100%). This rejects the forth hypothesis and verifies the second and part of the second ones.

Given all the percentages of these three stages, one can say that the process of irony can only be conveyed through stages represented by the three stages of issuance , inappropriate and relevant, and interpretation and evaluation. Accordingly, this verifies the first hypothesis.

5. Conclusions

The study has come up with the following conclusions:

1. Irony is structured in three stages: issuance, inappropriateness and relevance, and evaluation and interpretation.
2. Rhetorical question, give association clues, and quotation are the most common pragmatic strategies of issuing irony in the analyzed speeches.
3. Irony can be triggered through almost all kinds of speech acts; however, for this to take place, there should be particular contextual factors, intonation changes, and flouting to the sincerity condition.
4. The developed model has been found to be workable for pragmatically analyzing irony in electoral political speeches.
5. Irony is an ostensible speech act that has no explicit performative devices. In other words, it is a non-serious speech act that has serious illocutionary force and perlocutions.
6. Irony can be taken under two pragmatic elements: speech act and implicature. All speech acts used in issuing irony lack sincerity condition at the level of pragmatics (i.e. ostensibly issued). As for implicature, at least, one of the CP maxims should be flouted.
7. The notion of ironic competence as developed in this study has proved its correctness and adequacy. This is evident in the

percentages of its employment throughout all the analyzed speeches respectively. In other words, it is clearly shown in the last strategy of evaluation of ironic utterances whereby all the utterances are evaluated as ironic (i.e., the percentage of identification is 100%). That means there must be ironic competence in order for the addresser to be ironic and for the addressee to interpret the utterances as ironic.

8. Two types of irony can be identified: Global irony that can be applied to all cultures and local irony which can be applied to particular cultures rather than others.
9. Irony is pragmatically used for both reasons: communicative intention when used in daily interactional situations, and persuasive intention when used in rhetoric.
10. Echo and pretence theories are so close to each other to the extent that the border between them is sometimes too blurry. Sometimes, the ironist pretends something in order to be ironic. On the other hand, s/he can echo the same thought or utterance with the same ironic attitude.
11. Irony is politically used for two major purposes: defense as face saving acts and attack within face saving acts. It is also exploited as a strategic means in political speeches of presidential elections, reflecting permanent strategies for dominance.
14. Politicians prefer to use the indirect ostensible speech acts such as irony due to:
 - a. political and social considerations related to Ss.
 - b. establish and maintain a constant communication between the politicians and the addressees (the nation, the congress and even the enemies).
 - c. to accomplish persuading an audience to support their political opinion.
 - d. to reflect the real intended politician's message.

دراسة تداولية للتهكم في خطب الانتخابات السياسية

ملخص البحث

يعنى هذا البحث بدراسة التهكم في خطب الانتخابات السياسية من الناحية التداولية. وتتمثل الدراسة باختيار خطب من المرشحين الامريكيين باراك اوباما

وجورج بوش. ويعالج البحث هذا الموضوع خصوصاً لأنه لم يعطى اهتماماً كافياً حيث يتألف البحث من خمسة مباحث. يعطي المبحث الأول مقدمة حول البحث، بينما يعرض المبحث الثاني مفهوم التهكم من الناحية التداولية وأهم النظريات حوله. ويختص المبحث الثالث بتطوير نموذج لتحليل التهكم تداولياً الذي يناقشه المبحث الرابع من خلال تحليل البيانات. ويأتي المبحث الخامس ببعض النتائج. ويحاول البحث تقصي ستراتيجيات ومراحل التهكم فضلاً عن إمكانية فهم المتلقي للتهكم من ناحية ما يعنيه المتكلم واستخدام التهكم في سياقات ضعيفة. ووجد تحليل بيانات البحث أن التهكم هو فعل كلامي مزعوم ينتج ضمن مراحل ومن خلال ستراتيجيات معينة مثل الاسألة البلاغية والنقد والمدح. إلا أنه فند فرضية إنتاج التهكم في عوامل السياق الضعيفة.

Bibliography

A. References

- Abrams, M. H. (1999). *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (7th ed.). Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.
- Ajtony, Z. (2010). "Humour and Verbal Irony in G. B. Shaw's *John Bull's Other Island*". *Philologica*, pp. 246 – 258.
- Attardo, S. (2000a) "Irony as relevant inappropriateness". *Journal of Pragmatics*, pp. 793–826.
- _____. (2007). "On the Pragmatic Nature of Irony and Its Rhetorical Aspects". *Journal of Pragmatics*, pp. 139 – 190.
- Barbe, K. (1995). *Irony in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bollobas, E. (1981). "Who is Afraid of Irony? An Analysis of Uncooperative Behavior in Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*". *Journal of Pragmatics*, pp. 323 – 334.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson. (1987). *Universals in Language Use: Politeness Phenomena*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Clark, H. and E. Issac. (1990). "Ostensible invitations". *Language and Society*, pp. 493 – 509.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cuddon, J. (1998). *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin Books

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN POLITICAL.....(49)

- 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 Nonliteral Meaning in Verbal Irony". Journal of Pragmatics, pp. 1579 – 1599.
- Fakhry, B. (2009). "Irony in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*" Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Baghdad.
- Fowler, H. (1965). *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gibbs, R. and H. Colston. (2001). "The Risks and Rewards of Ironic Communication". *Say not to Say: New Perspectives on Communication*, pp. 188 – 201.
- Giora, R., E. Zaidel, N. Soroker, and A. Kashner. (2005). "Differential Effects of the Right and Left Hemisphere Damage on Understanding Sarcasm and Metaphore". *Metaphor and Symbol*, pp. 20 – 85.
- Grice, P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation". In Cole P. and Morgan, J. (eds.): *Syntax and Semantics Vol. III*, pp. 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Happe, F. (1993). "Communicative Competence and Theory of Mind Autism: A Test of Relevance Theory". *Cognition*, pp. 101-119.
- Harris, M. and P. Pexman. (2003). "Children's Perceptions of Social Functions of Verbal Irony". *Discourse Processes*, pp. 147 – 165.
- Hartung, M. (2011). *Ironie in der Alltagssprache*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Press.
- Hicks, W. (2007). *English for Journalists* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hutcheon, L. (1995). *Irony's Edge: The Theory of Politics and Irony*. New York: Routledge.
- Kaufer, D. S. (1981). "Understanding Ironic Communication". *Journal of Pragmatics*, pp. 495-509.
- Kumon-Nakamura, S. (1995). "The Allusion Pretence Theory of Irony". *Journal of Pragmatics*, pp. 20 - 46.
- Kumon-Nakamura, S., S. Glucksberg, and M. Brown. (1995). "How about Another Piece of Pie: The Allusional Pretence Theory of Discourse Irony". *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, pp. 3-12.
- Leech, G. and M. Short. (1981). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Vol. I & II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muecke, D. (1970). *Critical Idiom Series*. London: Methuen.
- Qadir, J. (2006). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Irony in Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Al-Mustansiriyah University.
- Reyes, A., P. Rosso, and D. Buscaldi. (2006). "From Humour Recognition to Irony Detection: The Figurative Language of Social Media". *Data and Knowledge Engineering*, pp. 1 – 12.
- Searle, J. (1991). "Metaphor". In Steven, D. (ed.). *Pragmatics: A Reader*, pp. 519 – 539. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF IRONY IN POLITICAL.....(50)

- _____. (1993). "Metaphor". In *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 83 – 111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. (1981). "Irony and the Use – Mention Distinction". *Radical Pragmatics*, pp. 295 – 318.
- _____. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- _____. (1992). "Rhetoric and Relevance". In Wellbery, D. and Bender, J. (eds.). *The Ends of Rhetoric: History, Theory, Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- _____. (1995). *Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell Press.
- _____. (1998). "Irony and Relevance: A Reply to Drs Seto, Hamamoto and Yamanashi". In Carston, R. and Uchida, S. (eds). *Relevance Theory: Applications and Implications*, pp. 93 - 283. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- _____. (2003). "Pragmatics". In Jackson, F., and Smith, M. (eds.). *Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Analytic Philosophy*, pp. 54- 70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (2007). "Irony and the Resemblance- Mention". In Cole, P. (ed.). *Radical Pragmatics*, pp. 295 - 318. New York: Academic Press.
- The New Encyclopedia Britannica. (1983). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thibodeau, R. and L. Boroditsky. (2011). "Metaphors We Think with: The Role of Metaphor in Reasoning". *Journal of Plo Son*, pp. 1- 17.
- Wilson, D. (2006). "The Pragmatics of Verbal Irony: Echo or Pretence?". *Lingua*, pp. 1722 – 1743.
- Wilson, D. and D. Sperber. (1992). "On Verbal Irony". In Raymond Gibbs and Herbert Coslton. (eds.) *Irony in Language and Thought*, pp. 35 - 57. New York: Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.
- _____. (2004). "Relevance Theory". In Horn, L. and Ward, G. (eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2000). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (2006). *The Study of Language*. (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- B. Web Sources**
- Britanica Concise Encyclopedia. Retrieved, 2012 November 6, from Britanica Concise Encyclopedia:
<http://www.britanicaconciseencyclopedia.com/irony/types>
- Presidential Rhetoric. Retrieved, 2013 April 7, from Presidential Rhetoric Speech Archive:
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.org/speech-archive/election/barakobama>
- Presidential Rhetoric. Retrieved, 2013 April 14, from Presidential Rhetoric Speech Archive:
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.org/speecharchive/election/georgewbuhs>
- Wikipedia. Retrieved, 2013 July 28, from Wikipedia Encyclopedia:
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Percentage>