

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIGURES OF SPEECH IN IMPOLITENESS

Aytemiz Abbasova

Azerbaijan University of Languages, Baku, Azerbaijan
e-mail: aytemiz.abbasova@mail.ru

Abstract. The importance of figurative language in expressing impoliteness is studied in the article. During the conversation, the features of using figures of speech and the ways of performing them as means of impoliteness are studied. Irony and sarcasm play an important role in expressing impoliteness. The relationship between these figures of speech as means of impoliteness and their distinguishing features are analyzed.

Keywords: Impoliteness, figures of speech, irony, sarcasm, linguistic meaning, contextual meaning.

NƏZAKƏTSİZLİYİN İFADƏSİNDƏ MƏCAZLAR ARASINDA ƏLAQƏ

Aytemiz Abbasova

Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti, Bakı, Azərbaycan

Xülasə. Məqalədə nəzakətsizliyin ifadəsində obrazlı dilin əhəmiyyətindən bəhs edilir. Söhbət zamanı nitq fiqurlarından istifadənin xüsusiyyətləri və onların nəzakətsizlik vasitəsi kimi icra yolları öyrənilir. Nəzakətsizliyin ifadəsində ironiya və sarkazm mühüm rol oynayır. Bu nitq fiqurları arasında nəzakətsizlik vasitəsi kimi münasibət və onların fərqləndirici xüsusiyyətləri təhlil edilir.

Açar sözlər: Nəzakətsizlik, məcaz, ironiya, sarkazm, linqvistik məna, kontekstual məna.

ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЕ МЕЖДУ РЕЧИ В ВЫРАЖЕНИИ НЕВЕЖЛИВОСТИ

Айтемиз Аббасова

Азербайджанский Университет Языков, Баку, Азербайджан

Резюме. В статье исследуется значение образного языка в выражении невежливости. В ходе беседы изучаются особенности использования фигур речи и способы их выполнения как средств невежливости. Ирония и сарказм играют важную роль в выражении невежливости. Анализируется соотношение этих фигур речи как средств невежливости и их отличительные черты.

Ключевые слова: Невежливость, фигуры речи, ирония, сарказм, языковой смысл, контекстуальный смысл.

1. Introduction

In the first section, the distinction between irony and sarcasm is related to the first and second orders of politeness and impoliteness. In this case, academic and folk notions are used to name sarcasm and irony.

In the following section the distinctive features relating with irony and sarcasm are analyzed. The notions of irony, ironic statements, sarcasm and sarcastic statements are defined and distinguished.

In the third section, the precise differentiating border between irony and sarcasm is classified. Depending on the situation, sarcasm and irony are evaluated as impoliteness means or politeness tools.

2. The importance of figures of speech in expressing impoliteness

Language is a mass collection of information. This information is expressed in direct and indirect way. From this aspect we can see language has two meaning: linguistic meaning and speaker's meaning. To my mind, linguistic meaning is based on the denotative meaning. Speaker's meaning is used in a certain context. Therefore speaker's meaning is derived from contextual meaning. As literal meaning is a kind of linguistic meaning, figurative meaning is a type of speaker's meaning. When the opinions are expressed in indirect way, various figures of speech are used. We can come across impolite situation in the communication in which figures of speech are used. For instance, one interlocutor use irony or sarcasm to express his (her) disagreement or disapproval approach. In majority of such conversations impoliteness happens. Such impoliteness is accepted differently by interlocutors depending on their close relations. If they are friends they accept it as mock impoliteness otherwise that situation is analyzed as inherent impoliteness.

Susan R. Fussell and Mallie M. Moss classify that figurative language is one way of using indirectness. They claim that figurative language is not a form of communication that requires special or additional cognitive processes to understand, it occurs in special circumstances [16, p.2]. We don't agree with this definition completely. So, figurative language is based on the figurative meaning of the word rather than the structural form of the word. Contextual meaning form during conversation. And it is interpreted by the speakers who participate in that context. At the same time they analyze literal meaning with the help of their background knowledge. Therefore we mean that the interpretation of figures of speech requires cognitive processes to understand it. Additionally, Araya D. defines that figurative language creates new meaning while writing a poem, when speaking in any kind of interaction. He also adds that, using figurative language depends on people's background knowledge, because it is important to share internal and social framework to interpret the world [1, p.37]. We agree this classification defined by Araya D. because figurative meaning is produced with the interlocutors' internal world. Speakers' internal view include emotional, cognitive and social frameworks. When the speaker uses these (emotional, cognitive) features, the opposite side sometimes doesn't understand the speaker's utterance. In this case, misunderstanding may happen. Impoliteness takes place in the situation which has misunderstanding. As the interlocutors don't understand each other well, aggression may increase. It causes impoliteness. This case happens in not only informal situation, but also formal context. Informal situation is daily talks especially family or workplace talks. Impoliteness mainly happens in family and workplace interactions. Formal situation usually happens in political discourse. If we listen to some conversations which happen in formal and informal context we can come across irony and sarcasm as figures of speech.

Consequently, impoliteness is used in different types of figurative language but irony and sarcasm as forms of figures of speech are most frequently used. The usage of sarcasm and

irony in expressing impoliteness is similar. Therefore, there are some distinctive features between irony and sarcasm.

3. The relation between irony and sarcasm as impoliteness tools

The distinction between irony and sarcasm makes it difficult for linguists. The classifications relating to this matter are different. So, these definitions given by different authors can be grouped into two orders.

In the first order, the researchers consider that irony and sarcasm are folk concepts. For instance, Attardo S. comments that the difficulty in differentiating irony and sarcasm is due to the fact that they are folk (spontaneous) concepts. When they are mentioned as folk concepts, they are analyzed from the speech and the classification of ironic and sarcastic expressions is given [2, p.40].

In the second order, sarcasm and irony are investigated from a metalinguistic point of view. Therefore, in the second order, irony and sarcasm are called scientific concepts. According to Jorgensen J. the aim of this approach is to study how the interlocutors know and remember the instances (examples) relating to irony or sarcasm [12, p.617]. It is assumed that the interlocutors' first-order concept of sarcasm is the same as the second-order construct. If this investigative area is large, this assumption also has a gap. That's to say, when the first-order concept of sarcasm takes regional differences into account, it is hard, impossible to map onto all first-order concepts for the second-order concept. Distinguishing irony and sarcasm from the point of view of folk and academic concepts, Dynel Marta concludes that "*irony is a rhetorical figure known since ancient times, while sarcasm is a folk concept*" [8, p.229].

To sum up, the relationship between irony and sarcasm is a disputable matter in which these concepts are folk or structural ones or either of them (sarcasm) is considered folk and the other (irony) is assumed to be academic concepts. So, the disagreement regarding the connection between irony and sarcasm has led to three main approaches. In the first approach, some linguists consider these interchangeable terms and there is no reliable way to differentiate between these two means. In the second view, irony and sarcasm are classified as separate units. They include subtypes of figurative language. In the third approach, sarcasm is considered a subtype of irony. Attardo S. defines sarcasm as negative irony in which positive comments express criticism of any context (person, thing, situation) [3, p.100].

4. Distinction between irony and sarcasm: points of comparison

There are some points that evaluate the context, especially attitude within irony and sarcasm. These are evaluation, face work functions and the presence of a mismatch. Evaluation is the main part of defining irony. Linguists explain the evolution of the term irony in different ways. Dynel M. comments that evolution is the second definitional component of irony" [6, p.422]. According to Dynel M. evolution is considered the core irony. Grice H.P. mentioned that irony is the expression of feeling, attitude, or evaluation. If we intend to utter a derogatory

judgment or feeling of contempt, we usually say it ironically or in a sarcastic tone [11, p.124]. This kind of uttering an opinion is a negative evaluation, characterizing irony and sarcasm in the situation. One aspect of evaluation doesn't deal with the attitude expressed by irony or sarcasm; it is related to impoliteness or politeness. From this point, Culpeper J. notes that the term sarcasm was preferred to irony for describing mock politeness because irony has a more positive set of expressions [5, p.357].

It is important to deal with face work, as irony and sarcasm express a negative attitude. Irony makes the opponent offensive indirectly by not doing face-threat. Mitigating the face-threat irony can be viewed as a face-saving strategy. Face-saving strategy is considered a core for irony and sarcasm. So, the speaker uses strategies like face-saving and face-enhancement for both kinds (sarcasm and irony) and these strategies help the speaker firm his or her own position in political debates. From this point, Leech G. notes that irony is more complex and witty entertaining than a direct peace of impoliteness. This advantage improves ironic face more than face-attack [14, p.235]. As mentioned above, sarcasm is related to a negative attitude, but this relationship may result in negative feelings for the speaker or for the hearer. For instance, Barbe K. suggests that sarcastic utterances are more personal and their sarcastic potential is immediately obvious to all participants in a situation. Nevertheless, the utterance still has a face-saving capacity, but only for the hearer and not for the speaker. That is, a hearer should ignore the sarcasm [4, p.28]. Self-deprecating irony can also be important for face-saving. From this aspect, Dews S. comments that the conversation members use remarks that express self-deprecation and these retorts are perceived in a humorous way. Therefore, it has a less negative impact on the speaker-hearer relationship. Additionally, self-deprecating irony mitigates the situation and has a less negative effect on the interlocutors, especially on the addressee. Irony and sarcasm may also be both for face-enhancement and face-attack, depending on the forms of evaluation, i.e., positive evaluation and negative evaluation. When they express positive evaluation, irony and sarcasm function as strategies of face enhancement. It happens in two forms. According to Gibbs R.W. the first interlocutors are together through their disparagement of some other person [10, p.7]. The second form is based on solidarity, which is achieved through banter. Therefore, the second form acts as mock impoliteness. Similarly, irony and sarcasm are used for face-attacking and in this case, negative evaluation plays an important role. Irony actually strengthens the perceived criticism. In this aspect, irony is classified into different forms: sarcastic irony, irony and sarcasm. Facework has a significant role in distinguishing between irony and sarcasm. Sarcasm is considered to pose a greater face threat due to evaluations of intentionality and lack of deniability.

One of the concepts that differentiates sarcasm from irony is mismatch. Mismatch is a core aspect of understanding irony and sarcasm while analyzing the linguistic structure of ironic or sarcastic utterances and defining contextualization cues for ironic intention. The term is based on a mismatch between what is said and what is meant, the utterance that is sounded and

the speaker's approach to it. It focuses on a mismatch of evaluations. This common feature of mismatch is emphasized by Garmendia Joana, so the author Garmendia Joana comments, "Instead of trying to accommodate the strong notions of echo, opposition and pretense into the vast variety of ironic examples, let us accept that what ties together all instances of irony is something more basic-an overt clash between contents" [9, p.648]. Taking this opinion as an argument, we can note that mismatch is expressed as a shared, not distinguishing, feature of irony and sarcasm. Another approach to this concept (mismatch) belongs to Dynel M. According to him, sarcasm doesn't emphasize the features that are the hallmarks of irony. So, it doesn't express the critical evaluation via implicate or it doesn't need meaning opposition [7, p.343]. Taking this approach into consideration, we can say that sarcasm is based on explicit meaning; it is addressed directly, but irony is rooted in both explicit and implicit meaning; therefore, irony is said directly or indirectly. Thus, we try to give a definition of how the first-order approach relates to these different descriptions. So, the first-order approach clarifies two challengeable problems:

The first is the criticism of statements. So Kathoff claims that irony has rarely been analyzed in live conversation [13, p.1392]. Similarly, Dynel comments that the majority of irony examples are presented in fictional works.

The second limitation to which the first-order approach responds is explained by Partington Alan. In very many studies in the field, the examples discussed, whether invented or selected, are taken for granted as being ironic for no other reason than that others intuitively feel them to be so. Any discussion of irony based upon data that has not been previously validated as ironic runs the risk of being both overly subjective and circular [15, p.1550]. This challenge is about the identification of irony and sarcasm. In this process, we attempt to distinguish the terms irony-ironic and sarcasm-sarcastic. While expressing this matter, Partington Alan defines explicit irony", "implicit irony" and phrasal irony. Explicit irony is said in a clear, direct way. Implicit irony is echoed in an indirect way and phrasal irony is the reversal of the collocating pattern. The problem with creating a category of explicit irony is that the terms irony, ironic and ironically aren't actually irony markers; they are indicators of an evaluative judgment. If we analyze the notes relating to the notions "irony, ironic, ironically" we can conclude that irony may happen in both live interaction and any kind of writing, such as fictional works or newspaper materials. The concept of "ironic or ironically" occurs in live conversation, especially in situational irony. So the reader and the speaker use these labels (ironically or ironic) while speaking or reading. Verbal irony is the use of clear, direct words to express irony. Therefore, irony is a wider concept than the notions "ironically, ironic". Verbal irony expresses the different meanings of the utterance that the speaker made. This kind of irony is used to make humor during conversation. For instance, saying "*What a tidy room it is!*" instead of "*a messy room*" can be analyzed as verbal irony. So, verbal irony conveys meanings that contrast with their literal meaning. In this aspect, irony is considered a means of figurative language. It is mostly used in literature. Writers use this tool in order to add coloring to their

works. It is also used in daily talk or in the media. In this case, it is accepted as mock impoliteness. We can note that irony is an expressive means of impoliteness, not depending on its negative or positive meaning. When it expresses a negative or positive attitude, it functions as mock impoliteness. Sarcasm, another means of impoliteness, is explained in the above part of this article. We can add that sarcasm also expresses the opposite meaning of the opinion being expressed, which is said in an insulting, embarrassing tone. The latter feature, that is, an insulting tone, distinguishes sarcasm from irony. As it is a figurative tool, the majority of its usage is likely to occur in literature. It is also used in daily conversation and in the media. Therefore, it is used in informal speech. As mentioned above, sarcasm expressing negative meaning with an insulting tone can be considered a tool of impoliteness. It is possibly commented on as the recipient takes this expression as humor; in this case, it is evaluated as mock impoliteness. If the addressee accepts the sarcastic expressions as real ones, this situation is evaluated as inherent or mock impoliteness, depending on the form of the form of the expression.

To sum up, both of them (irony and sarcasm) have different meanings than what is said. The main difference between irony and sarcasm is that sarcasm has an insulting tone, but irony is expressed in an indirect way; it is also used as a hint. Except for this feature, all their features are the same and they are expressive means of figurative language. The situation in which irony and sarcasm are used is accepted as impoliteness.

Conclusion. Information is expressed in indirect way by means of figures of speech. In this case, contextual meaning is the key tool to interpret the speaker's utterance. Contextual meaning forms during conversation. It requires special or additional cognitive processes to understand, because it occurs in special circumstances. In such context, the speaker intends his (her) disapproval opinion he (she) uses irony and sarcasm.

As the relations between sarcasm and irony are disputable, their classifications are different. So first-order and second-order definitions happen. In the first order, the linguists Attardo S. consider these terms to be folk concepts derived from oral speech. In the second order, the researchers Jorgensen J. assume that irony and sarcasm are academic notions that can be analyzed from a meta-pragmatics point of view. Some linguists Dynel M. accept irony as an academic notion and sarcasm as a folk notion. One of the difficulties relating to irony and sarcasm is whether the term sarcasm is a separate linguistic category or not. 1) Sarcasm is studied as a subtype of irony. 2) Sarcasm and irony are independent elements of figurative language. They are expressive means both politeness and impoliteness. It is possible to differentiate irony and sarcasm in opinions using the rates of evaluation, face-work, and mismatch. Evaluation defines the thought, whether ironically or in a sarcastic tone. This rate helps to evaluate the situation as politeness or impoliteness. "Face work is the core element of impoliteness, as this criterion certainly influences impoliteness tools. Both face-saving and face-attacking can influence irony and sarcasm. If the utterance is evaluated positively by the

interlocutors, in this case, face-saving happens. When the attitude has a negative evaluation, a face-attack happens. These strategies belong to both irony and sarcasm. The differentiating aspect is mismatch, which is based on what is said and what is meant; otherwise, what is said and what is understood. Depending on the situation, this rate helps to define the opinion, whether it is positive irony, negative irony or sarcasm.

To sum up, the areas of irony can define clear borders between politeness and impoliteness with the degree of offense and power relations. Both sarcasm and irony express the opposite meaning of what is said, but contrasting with irony, sarcasm has an insulting tone. We can define this distinctive feature within the situation.

References

1. Araya D. (2008), The democratic turn: Prosumer innovation and learning in the knowledge economy. In *Open Education and Education for Openness*.
2. Attardo S. (2013), Intentionality and Irony. In *Irony and Humor*. John Benjamins, 39-58.
3. Attardo S. (2014), The evaluative palette of verbal irony. *Evaluation in context*, Vol.242, 93-116. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
4. Barbe K. (1995), *Irony in Context*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 208.
5. Culpeper J. (1996), Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol.25, 349-367.
6. Dynel M. (2013), Irony from a neo-Gricean perspective: On untruthfulness and evaluative implicature. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, Vol.10, 403-431.
7. Dynel M. (2015), The landscape of impoliteness research. *Journal of Politeness Research* Vol.11, No.2, 329-354.
8. Dynel M. (2016), Pejoration via sarcastic irony and sarcasm. In *Pejoration*, 219-239. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
9. Garmendia J. (2014), The clash: Humor and critical attitude in verbal irony. *Humor journal* Vol.27, No.4, 641-659, De Gruyter Mouton.
10. Gibbs R.W. (2000), Irony in Talk among Friends. *Metaphor and Symbol*, V.15(1-2), 5-27.
11. Grice H.P. (1978), Further notes on logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics*, 9. New York: Academic Press.
12. Jorgensen J. (1996), The functions of sarcastic irony in speech. *Journal of pragmatics*, Vol.26, No.5, 613-634.
13. Kotthoff H. (2003), Responding to irony in different contexts: On cognition in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol.35, 1387-1411. Elsevier publisher.
14. Leech G. (2014), *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Jericho: Oxford University Press
15. Partington A. (2007), Irony and reversal of evaluation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol.39, No.9, 1547-1569.
16. Fussell S.R., Moss M.M. (1988), *Figurative language in emotional communication*. Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.