IRONY AS A MECHANISM FOR CRITIQUING PRAGMATIC THEORIES

Raj Kishor Singh

Central Department of English, T.U.
drrksnp@gmail.com

This paper explores the role of irony as a powerful mechanism for critiquing key pragmatic theories, including Austin's Speech Act Theory, Grice's Cooperative Principle, Leech's Politeness Principle, and Wilson and Sperber's Relevance Theory. While these theories provide robust frameworks for understanding the dynamics of language use, they often assume a level of straightforwardness and sincerity in communication that irony subverts. Through an analysis of literary quotations, this study demonstrates how irony disrupts the expected norms of speech acts, cooperative communication, politeness, and relevance, revealing the limitations and oversights inherent in these pragmatic models.

Keywords: Irony, pragmatic theories, linguistic context, literary context, limitation of theories

1. Introduction

Irony, as a literary device, serves as a powerful tool for authors to convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words, often revealing deeper layers of understanding within a text. This research paper delves into the intricate relationship between irony and pragmatic theories, exploring how irony functions not only as a rhetorical device but also as a critical mechanism for examining and challenging established theories of communication and interaction.

Pragmatic theories, which focus on the ways in which context influences the interpretation of language, often emphasize the role of shared knowledge and cooperative principles in effective communication. However, irony, by its very nature, subverts these expectations, creating a gap between what is said and what is meant. This deliberate divergence opens a space for critique, allowing authors to question the assumptions underpinning pragmatic theories.

In literary texts, irony can be used to expose the flaws in pragmatic approaches, suggesting that communication is not always governed by straightforward, cooperative principles. Instead, irony underscores the role of ambiguity, misinterpretation, and the multiplicity of meanings in human interaction. Through this lens, authors are able to critique the idea that language operates within a fixed set of rules or that meaning is always directly accessible to all parties involved in a conversation.

This research seeks to explore the complex relationship between irony and pragmatic theories in literary texts. Pragmatic theories traditionally focus on how context, shared knowledge, and cooperative principles guide effective communication. However, irony, as a literary device, often subverts these principles, creating a dissonance between the literal and intended meanings of language. This dissonance raises questions about the validity and limitations of pragmatic theories when applied to literary contexts. The problem addressed by this research is how irony functions as a mechanism for critiquing and questioning the assumptions of pragmatic theories in literature: How do authors use irony to challenge the basic assumptions of pragmatic theories in literary texts?

The interpretation of irony can vary significantly across different cultures and contexts, affecting its analysis within a single theoretical framework. This variability may limit the generalizability of findings and complicate comparisons across different cultural or social settings. The study may be influenced by biases inherent in the theories being critiqued or the specific examples of irony examined. Such biases could skew the analysis and limit the objectivity of the critique, potentially leading to an unbalanced view of the theories.

The analysis will concentrate on literary texts and specific examples of irony, such as those found in classic literature and contemporary works. Literary texts are chosen for their rich use of irony and their ability to illustrate complex theoretical issues. However, this focus may not fully capture how irony functions in everyday spoken discourse.

2. Irony

Booth (1974) discusses irony as a deliberate rhetorical strategy used by authors to create a double layer of meaning. Booth categorizes irony into stable and unstable irony. Stable irony has a clear, intended meaning that the audience is expected to grasp, while unstable irony leaves the meaning open to interpretation. Booth's theory emphasizes the reader's role in deciphering the ironic message, suggesting that understanding irony requires a sophisticated awareness of both the context and the author's intent.

Hutcheon (1994) presents irony as a complex, multivocal phenomenon that is inherently political and context-dependent. Hutcheon argues that irony is not just a figure of speech but an attitude or stance that reflects a subversive critique of dominant ideologies. This theory highlights the fluidity of irony, pointing out that it can vary widely depending on the social and cultural contexts, as well as the interaction between the speaker, the text, and the audience.

Kierkegaard (1841) explores irony as an existential tool used to question established norms and truths. For Kierkegaard, irony is not merely a linguistic device but a way of life that challenges conventional values and prompts deeper philosophical reflection. Kierkegaard's approach situates irony within a broader existential framework, where it functions as a method of deconstructing societal norms and encouraging individual self-awareness and authenticity.

Derrida's deconstruction theory (1976) often involves the use of irony to reveal the inherent contradictions within texts. Deconstructive irony exposes how language is inherently unstable and how meaning is constantly deferred, never fully attainable. In Derrida's framework, irony is a tool that unveils the limitations of fixed meanings, questioning the reliability of language as a means of communication and understanding which the basic concern of pragmatic theories is.

3. Pragmatic theories

H.P. Grice introduced the Cooperative Principle, which suggests that speakers and listeners involved in a conversation typically adhere to a set of maxims- Quantity, Quality, Relation, Manner, to ensure effective communication. Grice's theory posits that communication is based on mutual cooperation, with the assumption that speakers are providing sufficient, truthful, relevant, and clear information. Grice's theory is foundational in pragmatics and is used to analyze how people understand implied meanings or implicatures based on what is said versus what is meant.

Speech Act Theory, developed by Austin (1962) and further elaborated by Searle, examines how utterances not only convey information but also perform actions, e.g., promising, ordering, apologizing. This theory distinguishes between locutionary acts- the actual utterance, illocutionary acts- the intention behind the utterance, and perlocutionary acts- the effect on the listener. This theory is used to analyze how communication functions on multiple levels, emphasizing the performative aspect of language.

Developed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson, Relevance Theory argues that communication is guided by the principle of relevance, where speakers provide information that is most relevant to the listener. Relevance is determined by the balance between cognitive effort and communicative payoff. Relevance Theory extends Grice's work by focusing on how individuals process information and determine what is most meaningful in a given context.

Politeness Theory, proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), examines how speakers manage face, self-image in communication, using strategies to mitigate face-threatening acts. The theory distinguishes between positive politeness,

seeking to affirm the listener's self-image and negative politeness, avoiding imposition. Politeness Theory is applied in pragmatics to understand how social norms and relationships influence communication, particularly in managing indirectness and ambiguity.

While theories of irony and pragmatics address different aspects of language, they intersect in exploring how meaning is conveyed and interpreted. Irony often challenges the assumptions of pragmatic theories, particularly those that rely on cooperative principles and shared understanding. By examining this intersection, researchers can gain deeper insights into the complexities of communication and the ways in which language can both facilitate and complicate understanding.

4. Critiques on pragmatic theories

Pragmatic theories, which focus on how context influences meaning in communication, have been widely influential in the fields of linguistics and philosophy of language. However, they have also faced several critiques, particularly regarding their assumptions, limitations, and applicability.

One of the main critiques is that pragmatic theories, especially those like Grice's Cooperative Principle, tend to oversimplify communication. They assume that speakers always aim to be cooperative, truthful, relevant, and clear, which is not always the case in real-world interactions. Human communication is often messy, ambiguous, and influenced by power dynamics, social norms, and individual intentions that are not always cooperative. For example, irony, sarcasm, and indirect speech acts often defy the straightforward principles suggested by Grice's maxims, making it difficult to neatly apply these theories to all forms of communication.

Pragmatic theories assume universal principles of communication that do not account for cultural differences. What might be considered cooperative or polite in one culture could be perceived differently in another. This criticism is particularly relevant in the application of Grice's maxims and Relevance Theory across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. High-context cultures, where much communication is implicit, may not align with the principles of directness and explicitness assumed in many pragmatic theories.

Many pragmatic theories are grounded in the assumption that communication is a rational process, where speakers and listeners act logically to achieve mutual understanding. However, this overlooks the emotional, irrational, and sometimes contradictory aspects of human communication. For example, people often communicate in ways that are not entirely rational, such as in emotional outbursts, or when employing humor or irony, where the intended message may not align with a rational interpretation of the words used.

Applying pragmatic theories to literary texts, where language is often used in highly stylized, symbolic, or non-cooperative ways, reveals their limitations. Literature frequently subverts the cooperative principles of communication, using ambiguity, irony, and metaphor to create meanings that pragmatic theories struggle to account for. For example, the use of irony in literature often deliberately flouts conversational maxims, creating layers of meaning that go beyond the straightforward exchange of information.

Pragmatism leads to a form of relativism, where truth and meaning are seen as dependent on individual or cultural perspectives (Putnam, 1981). This can be problematic for those who believe in objective truths or universal standards. The term "practical consequences" can be vague. Critics sometimes argue that it's unclear what constitutes significant or relevant consequences and how they should be measured or evaluated (Quine, 1951).

Pragmatism often challenges traditional notions of knowledge and justification. Critics may argue that pragmatism's rejection of absolute truths undermines the reliability and objectivity of knowledge. Some argue that pragmatic theories can be imprecise or too flexible, making them difficult to apply consistently or rigorously. This

can lead to issues with clarity and coherence in philosophical arguments (Rorty, 1979).

Pragmatism emerged in a specific historical context, and some critics suggest that its emphasis on practical outcomes might not adequately address contemporary issues or the complexities of modern life (McDowell, 1994). Its focus on what works can sometimes lead to ethical concerns. Critics might argue that this approach can justify actions based on their outcomes without sufficient regard for moral principles or rights.

Despite these critiques, pragmatism remains a significant and influential perspective in both philosophy and practical fields like education, law, and politics. Its emphasis on action, results, and practical applications continues to offer valuable insights.

Black (2006) explores the intersection of pragmatics and stylistics, focusing on how language use in literature can be analyzed through pragmatic theories. Black introduces the concept of pragmatic stylistics, which combines the formal analysis of stylistics with the contextual insights of pragmatics. This approach considers how readers interpret literary texts based on their understanding of language use in context.

Black emphasizes the importance of context in interpreting literary texts. She explores how context influences meaning and how readers use their pragmatic knowledge to make sense of ambiguous or complex passages. The book incorporates elements of discourse analysis to examine how language constructs social relationships and power dynamics within literary texts.

Speech Acts theory developed by philosophers like Austin and Searle, analyzes how utterances perform actions. For instance, saying "I promise to help you" is not just conveying information but also making a commitment. Deictic expressions such as "here," "there," "I," "you" rely on contextual information to convey their meaning. The interpretation of these terms depends on the speaker, listener, and situation. Introduced by

Grice, implicature refers to what is suggested in an utterance, even though it is not explicitly stated. For example, if someone says, "Can you pass the salt?" the implicature is a request, not just a question about ability. Presupposition involves assumptions that are taken for granted in communication. For example, "John stopped smoking" presupposes that John used to smoke. Pragmatics emphasizes that meaning is not fixed but can vary depending on the context in which language is used.

5. Context

Context encompasses all the surrounding factors and circumstances that influence how language is interpreted. It includes both the immediate situation of the communication and broader social, cultural, and situational factors. Linguistic Context refers to the surrounding text or discourse that provides clues about the meaning of an utterance. For example, the interpretation of a pronoun like "she" depends on the preceding mention of a specific person. Situational Context includes the physical and social setting in which communication occurs. For instance, a statement made in a formal meeting may be interpreted differently than if it were made in a casual conversation.

Cultural Context involves cultural norms and values that influence how language is used and understood. For example, indirect speech acts might be more common in certain cultures, affecting how politeness and respect are conveyed. Interpersonal context involves the relationship between the speaker and the listener which also impacts meaning. The same words can have different implications depending on whether the speaker is addressing a friend, a boss, or a stranger.

Pragmatics examines how context shapes the construction of meaning. The same sentence can have different interpretations depending on contextual factors like tone, intention, and relationship between participants. Pragmatic analysis often involves understanding how speakers use contextual clues to infer meanings

that go beyond the literal words. This includes reading between the lines and understanding implied meanings. Understanding context helps in analyzing how speakers use various communication strategies, e.g. politeness strategies, indirectness to achieve their communicative goals effectively. Pragmatics highlights that language use is dynamic and context-dependent. This means that meaning is not static but can shift based on changing contexts and interactions.

6. Research methodology

To investigate the role of irony as a mechanism for critiquing pragmatic theories in literary texts, this research employs a qualitative, interpretative approach, focusing on close reading and textual analysis. The researcher conducts a comprehensive review of existing literature on both irony and pragmatic theories. He examines key concepts in pragmatics, such as Cooperative Principle, Speech Act Theory, and Relevance Theory, to establish a theoretical foundation. He explores previous studies that have analyzed the intersection of irony and pragmatics, identifying gaps that this research aims to fill. He further identifies and selects a diverse range of literary texts that prominently feature irony. The selection includes works from different genres, periods, and cultural backgrounds to provide a broad perspective. He ensures that the chosen texts are rich in instances of ironic expression that challenge or complicate conventional interpretations of language and communication.

7. Analysis

The excerpt "Let us toss as men do (p. 93)" from Hardy's *Far from the Madding Crowd* (1874) presents a poignant example of irony which can be used to critique pragmatic theories, particularly those related to gender roles and decision-making processes. This statement is uttered during a moment when Bathsheba Everdene, the novel's protagonist, suggests that a decision be made by chance—a coin toss—rather than through careful deliberation or rational thought. The context of this scene is crucial: Bathsheba is a strong, independent woman who often challenges the traditional gender norms of her time. Yet, in this moment, she ironically resorts to an arbitrary method often associated with impulsive or masculine decision-making.

The irony in this excerpt lies in Bathsheba's invocation of a typically "masculine" approach— "as men do"—to decision-making, which is portrayed as haphazard and guided by chance rather than reason. In doing so, Hardy critiques the pragmatic theories that often underpin gender roles, suggesting that the so-called "pragmatism" of men is not always as rational or superior as it might seem.

Austin's Speech Act Theory might struggle with this quotation because the literal speech act, suggesting a coin toss, does not align with the deeper implications or intentions behind the statement. The irony of Bathsheba, a woman, invoking "as men do" could be seen as a failure to match the locutionary act, the actual words with the illocutionary act, the intended meaning, especially if one interprets the statement as both a critique and an acceptance of traditional gender roles. The statement might also violate Grice's maxim of relation, relevance, because the suggestion to toss a coin may seem irrelevant or trivial in the context of a serious decision. However, the irony is intentional, which Grice's theory would struggle to account for as it often assumes a more straightforward alignment of speech with intent.

The statement "Every harlot was a virgin once" from Blake's poem "To the Accuser (1793)" offers a sharp example of irony used to critique pragmatic theories, especially those surrounding morality, judgment, and human nature.

Blake's poem "To the Accuser" addresses themes of judgment, sin, and redemption, with a particular focus on the hypocrisy of those who accuse others of moral failings. The line "Every harlot was a virgin once" directly challenges the moral judgments that society often imposes, particularly on women who are labeled as "harlots" or prostitutes.

The irony in this statement lies in the juxtaposition of the terms "harlot" and "virgin,"

which represent opposite ends of the spectrum of female sexual morality in traditional societal views. The statement is straightforward, almost factual, yet it carries a deeper irony by highlighting the inevitable transition from innocence, virginity, to experience, harlotry, a transition that is part of the human condition.

This quotation challenges Leech's Politeness Principle (1983) because it bluntly juxtaposes "harlot" and "virgin," two loaded terms that are socially and morally charged. The statement might be considered impolite or provocative, as it confronts societal judgments directly, violating the maxim of tact by not softening the harsh truth it presents.

Wilson and Sperber's Relevance Theory could struggle here because the statement, while seemingly simple, carries a deep irony and social critique that might not be immediately apparent to all listeners. The failure lies in the potential for misunderstanding or the assumption that the audience will grasp the full implications of the irony.

The line "To lose one parent may be regarded as a misfortune; to lose both looks like carelessness (p. 80)" from Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest* (1895) is a quintessential example of irony used to critique pragmatic theories, especially those related to social norms, morality, and the absurdities of Victorian society.

In *The Importance of Being Earnest*, this line is delivered by Lady Bracknell, a character who embodies the strict social conventions and expectations of the Victorian upper class. She says this during an interview with Jack Worthing, who is seeking her approval to marry her daughter, Gwendolen. Jack reveals that he was adopted after being found in a handbag at a railway station, and Lady Bracknell responds with this remark, implying that losing both parents reflects poorly on Jack's character, as though it were a matter of personal responsibility.

The irony in this quotation is immediately apparent in the absurdity of the statement. Losing one parent is portrayed as a "misfortune," an event outside one's control and worthy of sympathy. However, losing both parents is framed as "carelessness," as if it were a result of negligence or poor judgment, something for which the individual could be held accountable. This absurd leap from misfortune to blame highlights the irrationality of certain social judgments and exposes the flaws in the logic of those who adhere rigidly to social conventions.

This statement fails according to Leech's Politeness Principle, specifically the maxims of tact and sympathy. The remark is blunt and unsympathetic, treating a tragic situation, the loss of parents, with ironic detachment, which can be seen as violating social norms of politeness and empathy.

Wilson and Sperber's Relevance Theory might struggle with this quotation because the irony and humor depend on a shared understanding of social expectations and the absurdity of Lady Bracknell's logic. If the listener doesn't catch the irony, the relevance of the statement to the conversation could be lost, leading to a failure in effective communication.

The excerpt "Multiple exclamation marks are a sure sign of a diseased mind (p. 153)" from Pratchett's *Eric Dicworld book 9* (2002) is a humorous and ironic critique of both linguistic practices and the broader pragmatic theories that govern communication and expression. Pratchett, known for his satirical and witty writing, uses this saying to playfully mock the overuse of punctuation, while simultaneously making a broader point about how pragmatic approaches can sometimes lead to absurd conclusions.

Eric is one of Pratchett's "Discworld novels", a series renowned for its satirical take on various aspects of society, culture, and human nature. The statement is typically delivered by a character who observes the world with a mixture of skepticism and wit, offering commentary on the absurdities of life. In this context, the overuse of exclamation marks becomes a symbol of excessive and irrational behavior, something that Pratchett often critiques in his work.

The irony in the extract lies in the exaggerated seriousness with which the character treats something as trivial as punctuation. That is a breach of Cooperative Principle. The statement that "multiple exclamation marks are a sure sign of a diseased mind" is clearly an overstatement, yet it is delivered with such deadpan conviction that it becomes both humorous and thought-provoking.

The character's assertion that using multiple exclamation marks signifies a "diseased mind" flouts the maxim of quantity, providing too much information about something trivial, and the maxim of quality, making an exaggerated and not entirely truthful statement. This humorous overstatement critiques the assumption that communication is always cooperative and meaningful.

In *Hamlet* (1600) by Shakespeare, the exchange between Ophelia and Hamlet—where Ophelia says, "I think nothing, my lord," and Hamlet responds, "That's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs" (Act 3, Scene 2) —is rich with irony and serves as a critique of the pragmatic, often cynical way Hamlet approaches human relationships and sexuality in this scene.

The irony in this dialogue arises from Hamlet's pun and the double meaning he ascribes to Ophelia's innocent remark. When Ophelia says, "I think nothing," she likely means she has no specific thoughts or is simply responding modestly. Hamlet, however, twists her words into a sexual innuendo, suggesting that "nothing", a word that can also refer to female genitalia in Elizabethan slang, is something that appropriately "lies between maids' legs." The sharp irony here is in the contrast between Ophelia's innocent or neutral statement and Hamlet's crude sexual interpretation.

Hamlet's response violates the maxim of relation, relevance, by interpreting Ophelia's innocent statement in a sexual manner, thus failing to maintain cooperative communication and highlighting the breakdown of expected conversational norms.

In *Pride and Prejudice* (2006) by Jane Austen, the remark "Well, my comfort is, I am sure Jane will die of a broken heart, and then he will be sorry for what he has done, (p. 252)" is a prime example of Austen's use of irony to critique societal norms and pragmatic thinking, particularly concerning matters of love, marriage, and emotional expression.

The irony in this statement stems from the incongruity between the speaker's words and the expected norms of comfort and consolation. The speaker, Mrs. Bennet, finds "comfort" in the melodramatic notion that her daughter Jane will die of a broken heart because it will supposedly evoke guilt in Mr. Bingley, the man who has wronged her. Rather than seeking genuine solace for Jane or wishing for her happiness, Mrs. Bennet's comfort comes from the idea of Bingley suffering regret. This dramatic and exaggerated response is ironic because it reflects a distorted sense of priorities and a superficial understanding of emotional and social dynamics.

Mrs. Bennet's statement is an example of irony that flouts the maxim of quality, truthfulness, as she exaggerates Jane's emotional state to an unrealistic extent. This shows a failure of cooperative communication, as the utterance is not meant to be taken literally.

In *Tipping the Velvet* (1998) by Waters, the use of irony serves as a powerful mechanism for critiquing societal norms, especially those related to sexuality, gender, and class. The quotation, "Oh you exquisite little tart, (p. 275)" is a striking example of how irony is employed to explore and critique these themes.

The irony in this phrase arises from the juxtaposition of the words "exquisite" and "tart." "Exquisite" is typically a term of high praise, associated with beauty, elegance, and refinement. On the other hand, "tart" is a derogatory term used to describe a woman who is perceived as promiscuous or of loose morals. The combination of these words creates a sharp contrast, making the phrase both surprising and impactful.

The use of the term "tart" contrasts with the polite term "exquisite," violating the principle of tact

and approbation, minimizing the expression of negative feelings. The ironic use of politeness mixed with insult critiques the effectiveness of politeness strategies in truly conveying meaning.

In *To the Lighthouse* (2006) by Woolf, the statement, "[Mrs. Ramsay] did in her own heart infinitely prefer boobies to clever men who wrote dissertations, (p. 112)" is an example of how Woolf uses irony to explore and critique societal expectations, intellectualism, and the role of women in early 20th-century society.

The irony in this quotation lies in the contrast between society's expectations and Mrs. Ramsay's private preferences. In the context of the novel, "boobies" refers to men who are less intellectually inclined or socially awkward, while "clever men who wrote dissertations" symbolizes those who are seen as intellectually superior and socially respected. Society would typically expect a woman like Mrs. Ramsay, who is deeply concerned with social conventions and the appearances of propriety, to admire and prefer the company of the latter group. However, the irony emerges from the fact that Mrs. Ramsay, in her private thoughts, prefers the simple, less intellectually pretentious "boobies" over the "clever men."

Mrs. Ramsay's preference for "boobies" over intellectuals contrasts with societal expectations, potentially violating the principle of agreement, where one is expected to conform to socially approved norms. The irony suggests that politeness norms do not always reflect true feelings or social dynamics.

In Sterne's *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1759), Gentleman, the quote "My brother Toby, quoth she, is going to be married to Mrs. Wadman. 'Then he will never,' quoth my father, 'be able to lie diagonally in his bed again as long as he lives.' (Ch 3.LXXXII)" is an excellent example of how Sterne uses irony to critique societal norms, particularly those surrounding marriage and the pragmatic expectations placed on it.

The irony in this passage emerges from the juxtaposition of the profound life change that marriage represents with the trivial, almost absurd, concern about how it will affect Toby's ability to lie diagonally in bed. The father's response to the news of Toby's impending marriage is not focused on the emotional or practical implications of such a significant life event but instead on a seemingly inconsequential detail. This ironic contrast between the gravity of marriage and the triviality of the father's concern serves to mock the way people can fixate on minor issues, even in the context of major life decisions.

The father's comment about lying diagonally in bed after marriage is seemingly irrelevant to the serious context of marriage. This ironic focus on triviality challenges Wilson and Sperber's relevance theory (1986), as the expected cognitive effect (reflection on marriage) is subverted by the trivial observation.

Dickinson's poem "A Dying Tiger — Moaned for a Drink (1896)" contains powerful imagery and irony that critique the limitations of pragmatic, or overly practical, approaches to life and death. The lines:

> "I hunted all the Sand —
> I caught the Dripping of a Rock
> And bore it in my Hand —
> His Mighty Balls — in death were thick —
> But searching — I could see"

provide a rich field for analyzing how Dickinson uses irony to challenge pragmatic theories, particularly in the face of mortality.

The irony in these lines emerges from the futility of the speaker's efforts to save the dying tiger. The speaker describes an intense and desperate search- "I hunted all the Sand", for water to quench the tiger's thirst, but the result is pitifully small—a mere "Dripping of a Rock," which is carefully "bore[d] in my Hand." Despite the speaker's earnest effort, the tiger's death is inevitable, symbolized by the "Mighty Balls" ,possibly referring to the tiger's eyes, that are "thick" in death.

The irony here lies in the contrast between the speaker's intense action and the insignificant outcome. The "dripping" of water is a feeble response to the grand, tragic image of the dying tiger. This small, almost meaningless act of compassion contrasts starkly with the reality of death's power and the ultimate futility of the speaker's effort, highlighting the limitations of a pragmatic approach in the face of profound existential realities like death.

The speech act theory could be seen as failing to capture the depth of Dickinson's irony. The speech acts- illocutionary and perlocutionary, focus on the literal meaning or intent behind utterances, which in this case, falls short of addressing the existential futility and symbolic weight of the poem.

Cooperative principle might be challenged by the poem's ironic structure, especially in how the expected "cooperative" action, searching for water, is rendered futile. The poem's meaning goes beyond simple cooperation in communication, exploring the deeper irony of action in the face of inevitable death.

Leech's Politeness principle is not directly relevant here, as the poem doesn't engage in social politeness but instead in a deeper existential critique, which the theory doesn't adequately address. Relevance theory can partly succeed in explaining the irony, as the minimal "relevance" of the speaker's actions in the face of the tiger's death is starkly highlighted. The theory could capture the disjunction between the trivial action and the profound event, but may not fully encapsulate the poem's emotional and existential depth.

In *The Portrait of a Lady* (1881) by James, the quotation "Money's a horrid thing to follow, but a charming thing to meet" (ch. 35) exemplifies irony as a mechanism for critiquing pragmatic theories, particularly in relation to the pursuit of wealth, the nature of social ambition, and the duality of money's influence on human behavior.

The irony in this quotation is rooted in the contrast between the pursuit of money and the experience of acquiring it. The statement distinguishes between "following" money, which is described as "horrid," and "meeting" money, which is described as "charming." This distinction is ironic because it reveals a fundamental contradiction in society's attitudes toward wealth. The pursuit of money—often associated with hard work, compromise, and perhaps moral sacrifice— is depicted as an unpleasant and demeaning endeavor. However, once money is obtained, it is suddenly "charming," suggesting that its presence is socially and personally gratifying despite the negativity associated with its pursuit.

Speech Act Theory could be inadequate in capturing the irony in the statement about money. The literal speech acts don't address the deeper social and cultural critique. Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) might fail as the irony lies in the contrast between the pursuit and possession of money, which the principle doesn't fully address. Leech's Politeness Principle is not directly relevant to the social and cultural irony present in the statement about money. Relevance Theory could partly explain the irony by highlighting the contrast between the pursuit and possession of money. However, it might not fully capture the social and cultural depth of the critique.

The quotation from Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922) "Shakespeare is the happy hunting ground of all minds that have lost their balance" is an example of irony used as a mechanism to critique pragmatic theories, particularly in the context of literary interpretation, intellectual obsession, and the nature of genius.

The irony in this statement arises from the juxtaposition of the high cultural status of Shakespeare with the idea that his works attract those who are mentally unbalanced. Shakespeare is often regarded as the pinnacle of literary genius, a figure whose works have been endlessly studied, analyzed, and revered. The phrase "happy hunting ground" suggests a place of abundance where one can endlessly pursue something, in this case, interpretations or meanings within Shakespeare's works. However, the statement ironically implies that those who are deeply immersed in or obsessed with Shakespeare may have "lost their balance"—that is, they might be

overly fixated, obsessive, or even irrational in their intellectual pursuits.

Speech Act Theory might not fully capture the intellectual and cultural irony in Joyce's statement. The literal speech acts don't address the deeper critique of intellectual obsession. Grice's Cooperative Principle could fail as the irony lies in the contrast between the expected reverence for Shakespeare and the suggestion of intellectual imbalance. The principle doesn't fully address this subversion. Leech's Politeness Principle is not particularly relevant to the intellectual and cultural critique present in the irony. Relevance Theory could partly explain the irony by showing how the statement challenges the relevance of intellectual obsession. However, it might not fully capture the cultural and intellectual depth of the critique.

In *Letters from a Stoic* (1969), Seneca's statement, "Drunkenness is nothing but voluntary madness," serves as a poignant example of irony used to critique pragmatic theories, particularly in the context of self-control, rationality, and the nature of human behavior. The irony in this quotation lies in the contrast between what people typically perceive as a temporary loss of control due to drunkenness and Seneca's characterization of it as "voluntary madness." The phrase "voluntary madness" is itself ironic because madness is generally seen as something involuntary and uncontrollable, a state that one does not choose. By calling drunkenness a form of "madness," Seneca highlights the irrationality and chaos that comes with it, but by qualifying it as "voluntary," he underlines the conscious choice to indulge in this behavior.

This ironic juxtaposition critiques the way people justify or excuse their indulgence in alcohol as a momentary lapse or a break from rationality. Seneca suggests that there is a deliberate, albeit irrational, choice to abandon reason and embrace chaos, which undermines the notion that such behavior is simply an unavoidable consequence of human weakness.

Speech Act Theory might not fully capture the irony in Seneca's statement, as it focuses on the literal speech acts rather than the deeper philosophical critique. Grice's Cooperative Principle could fail as the irony lies in the deliberate subversion of expected rational behavior. The principle doesn't fully address the deeper critique of human irrationality. Leech's Politeness Principle is not particularly relevant to the philosophical irony and critique of self-control and rationality. Relevance Theory could partly explain the irony by showing how the statement challenges the relevance of rational behavior in the context of drunkenness. However, it may not fully capture the depth of the philosophical critique.

The quotation, from the Bible (1611), specifically from Acts 9:5 (KJV) "And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" is an example of irony used as a mechanism for critiquing pragmatic behavior, particularly in relation to the futility of resisting divine will, the consequences of misguided actions, and the transformation of understanding through revelation.

The irony in this passage lies in the metaphorical phrase "kick against the pricks." This expression refers to an agricultural practice where an ox goaded to move forward might resist by kicking back against the sharp prods, which only results in more pain for the animal. The irony is that the more the ox resists, the more it hurts itself—this resistance is self-defeating.

In the context of Saul, later Paul, on the road to Damascus, who is persecuting Christians, the irony is profound. Saul believes he is acting pragmatically, serving God by persecuting what he sees as a heretical sect. However, the divine voice of Jesus reveals that Saul's actions are not only futile but self-destructive. By resisting the truth of Christ's message, Saul is metaphorically "kicking against the pricks," causing himself more spiritual harm. This revelation upends Saul's pragmatic approach to his religious zeal, exposing the deep irony that in attempting to serve God, he has actually been working against Him.

Speech Act Theory might miss the deeper irony in the metaphorical language of the Bible. The literal interpretation of the speech acts doesn't fully address the spiritual and existential critique. Grice's Cooperative Principle could fail as the irony lies in the futility of Saul's actions, which the principle doesn't fully address. The expected cooperative behavior is subverted by divine revelation. Leech's Politeness Principle is not directly relevant to the spiritual and existential irony present in the passage. Relevance Theory could explain the irony by highlighting how Saul's actions are rendered irrelevant in the face of divine will. However, it might not fully capture the spiritual transformation and the depth of the critique.

8. Conclusion

Irony serves as a powerful mechanism for critiquing pragmatic theories such as Austin's Speech Act Theory, Grice's Cooperative Principle, Leech's Politeness Principle, and Wilson and Sperber's Relevance Theory. Through the analysis of literary quotations, it becomes evident that irony exposes the limitations and complexities of these theories, particularly when applied to nuanced human interactions and societal norms. While pragmatic theories provide structured frameworks for understanding communication, irony reveals the gaps between theoretical models and the realities of language use, highlighting how meaning can be manipulated, subverted, or rendered ambiguous in various contexts.

The examples discussed illustrate that irony not only challenges the assumptions underlying pragmatic theories but also questions the efficacy of these models in accounting for the richness of human communication. By contrasting literal meaning with intended meaning, or by juxtaposing expected social norms with actual behavior, irony underscores the multifaceted nature of language and the inherent difficulties in fully capturing its dynamics through any singular theoretical lens.

Ultimately, the study of irony in relation to pragmatic theories invites a deeper exploration of how language functions in real-world scenarios, where the interplay of context, intention, and interpretation often defies straightforward categorization. This underscores the need for more flexible and comprehensive approaches to understanding communication, which can accommodate the complexities and contradictions that irony so effectively brings to light.

References

Austen, J. (2006). *Pride and prejudice*. CUP.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. OUP.

Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic stylistics*. Routledge.

Blake, W. (1793). To the accuser. In *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*.

Booth, W. C. (1974). *A rhetoric of irony*. University of Chicago Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. CUP.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dickinson, E. (1896). *Poems by Emily Dickinson*. Roberts Brothers.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). Academic Press.

Hardy, T. (1874). *Far from the madding crowd*. Bradbury and Evans.

Hutcheon, L. (1994). *Irony's edge: The theory and politics of irony*. Routledge.

James, H. (1881). *The portrait of a lady*. Macmillan.

Joyce, J. (1922). *Ulysses*. Sylvia Beach.

Kierkegaard, S. (1841). *The concept of irony with continual reference to Socrates* (H. V. Hong & E. H. Hong, Trans.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1841)

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. CUP.

McDowell, J. (1994). *Mind and world*. Harvard University Press.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Pratchett, T. (2002). *Eric Discworld Book 9*. Harper Collins.

Quine, W. V. (1951). Two dogmas of empiricism. *Philosophical Review*, 60(1), 20-43. https://doi.org/10.2307/2181906

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton University Press.

Seneca. (1969). *Letters from a Stoic* (R. Gummere, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 65 CE)

Shakespeare, W. (1600). *Hamlet*.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Harvard University Press.

Sterne, L. (1759). *The life and opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. R. and J. Dodsley.

The Holy Bible: King James Version. (1611).

Waters, S. (1998). *Tipping the velvet*. Virago.

Wilde, O. (1895). *The importance of being earnest*. Leonard Smithers.

Woolf, V. (2006). *To the lighthouse*. OUP.