

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Figurative Language

Figurative language is a variation style or techniques in written or oral form. “Figurative languages are words or expressions that carry more than their literal meaning” (Stanford in Aprilliawati; 2013, p.10). From this statement, it is concluded that figurative language are the tools in creating an implicit way in stating something. The literal meaning lies inside the words or language spoken or written. Figurative language is a matter of style in delivering their particular meaning.

Arp & Johnson in the *Sound and Sense, An Introduction to Poetry* Book (2002) describe that there are 12 kinds of Figurative language. There are simile, metaphor, personification, apostrophe, synecdoche, metonymy, symbol, allegory, paradox, hyperbole, understatement and irony. Sarcasm is included in the kinds of irony. The writer will explain each and every one of the figurative languages below but the kinds that will be analyse more deeply is sarcasm.

Simile is used to compare something that shows similarities between two different object. This comparing system involves with the help of dictions to make it more direct such as like, as, than, similar to, resembles, or seems. For example, she is as slow as a turtle. Metaphor is used to compare something without any addition dictions as well as simile does. The comparison of two unrelated things is done implicitly based on some common characteristics. For example, he is boiling mad.

Personification is a figure of speech that made an impression of a non-human objects that can act as a living person does. Personification is also a subtype form of metaphor because it also compares two things implicitly. The comparing form of figurative terms is always human and the literal ones are non-human objects. Example of personification is money talks in the political area. In real life situation money can't really talks but in this case it means that money has power and the ability to make something easier in the political area.

Apostrophe is used to say something to the humans or something that isn't present or imaginary. For example, calling the gods or ancestors. Apostrophe seems like personification because both is said to be giving life or acts as if god or someone that has passed away can communicate or at least can hear and understands the feelings of the poet. Oh the death! Be not proud! is an example of apostrophe which the act of talking to the death as if they can hear him.

Synecdoche is the use of some part of a word to indicate the whole meaning completely. Examples, I don't see his shadows around. Shadows is a part of a person, in this sentence it means that he doesn't see him around, not only the shadows itself but the person completely.

Metonymy is the use of word that replaces other word that is considered so close to the related meaning. For examples, let me give you a hand. Hand in this case means help, and it is close to the related meaning because when giving help, we mainly use our hands.

Symbol is something that have more meaning than it appears like explicitly. The symbol is function as literal and figurative on the same time. Symbol is the hardest part of figurative language according to Arp and Johnson (2002) because the lack of exact information about what the writer really thinks when using certain symbols. For example, red rose is the symbol of love or romance.

Allegory is narration or story that has hidden meanings inside. Even though the story has meaning explicitly, but there is a hidden meaning or ideas intended by the writer in the story. It involves the characters and events.

Paradox shows real contradiction with the expectation. Paradox is a statement or situation that contradicts but may be true in the deeper level. For example, I am nobody. Hyperbole or overstatement is a figure of speech that employs exaggeration and can cause dramatic effect such as humorous, sad, mad, or convincing. For examples, I just texted you in a million times and you didn't answer. The word "million times" is the exaggerated form of "many times".

Understatement is the opposite of hyperbole, and often called litotes. This form of figurative language is showing modesty because of the statement of something less than the actual situation or fact. For example, I am not unfamiliar with poetry. The litotes statement means that he knows about poetry.

Irony is saying something that contradicts with the real meaning implied. Kinds of irony are verbal irony as a way to say something that contradicts to the meaning, sarcasm as a way to say something inverted that is intended to hurt someone, satire which is a formal form that usually found on literature texts,

dramatic irony which is the difference between the words that the character says with the real intended meaning by the writer and lastly the irony of situation which is the moment that is hope to happen contradicts to the real situation.

From this classification of figurative language, it is seen that sarcasm is included as one of kinds of irony. Sarcasm differs with other kinds of irony in terms of the intended meaning. Sarcasm is one of the figurative languages that imply its particular meaning, which contrast to what it is said before and also intended to hurt someone. The use of figurative language is not only famous in written object such as poems and novels but in daily conversations such as in various television programs, sitcoms and also in real life situation.

Figurative language helps to emphasize certain meanings to make it more meaningful. The use of figurative language in the *Fashion Police* show reflected by the implicit words or sarcastic opinions utter by the co-hosts.

2.2. Sarcasm

Sarcasm is unique in terms of the speaker's intention, which relates to the use of its dictions. Traditionally, sarcasm has been defined as figurative language use that means the opposite of what is said (Grice in Coulson; 2005, p.1). Sarcasm is determined when Gricean maxims of quality and relation are violated. However, there are many examples of sarcasm that can't be analysed by using the Gricean account.

According to Coulson (2005) there are problems regarding the sarcasm's traditional account. One of it is sometimes sarcasm involve true statements which

does not violate the maxim of quality, and does not mean the opposite of what is said. Therefore, the standard model gives no explanation regarding other than “opposite of what it is said”.

One of the other ways to identify sarcasm is noticed by markers such as exaggerated comments or hyperbole (Attardo, 2001). Sarcasm is not always a negation or inversion meaning, but it could also be a sarcastic hyperbole with denial meanings implied implicitly inside the exaggerated utterances. Sarcasm can also be detected by the prosodic cues. According to Cheang and Pell in their journal, *The sound of sarcasm* (2007), sarcasm in speech can be identified from its specific prosodic cues which is the intonation, rhythms, and stress patterns in speech and also based on the resonance and reduction in speech rate. Listeners can also recognize emotions and certain attitudes of the speaker based on meanings within the prosodic cues. Attardo (2003) also points out another element that can be considered as to detect sarcasm that relates to certain facial expression which is, the use of eye rolling, rapid blinking, grimacing to inform the listeners that the meaning is sarcastic.

Regarding the use of sarcasm, in the studies conducted by Dews, Kaplan, and Winner (1995) found out in their research that sarcastic utterances were perceived as to be more humorous, less critical, less insulting, and makes a positive effect towards the relationship between the interlocutors. Jorgensen (1996) also argues that a sarcastic comment was less rude and more appropriate to use with friends. Bowes and Katz (2011) views that sometimes sarcastic utterances can reduce or even emphasizes negativity. By using sarcasm, it can give negative intention within the implicit words

or either can give an implicit refined comment so it would lessen the negative intention.

From different point of view, irony and sarcasm has a very close relationship but they both do have slight differences. According to Haiman (1998, p.19) situations maybe ironic, but only people that can be sarcastic, and also people may be unintentionally ironic, but sarcasm requires intention. From his description of the slight differences in sarcasm and irony, it can be concluded that sarcasm only comes from people and requires the specific intention. This intention would be the negative one.

In other views of sarcasm and irony, sarcasm is stated to have a specific victim who is the target of ridicule, while irony doesn't (Kreuz and Glucksberg in Lee and Katz; 1998, p.1). It is also stated in Lee and Katz journal that the distinction between sarcasm and irony has a long tradition.

The English words sarcasm and irony both originated as derogatory terms or offensive. The word sarcasm means to talk bitterly as to tear flesh like dogs, and the word irony is a term used to refer an unscrupulous trickery (Thomson in Lee and Katz; 1998, p.2). Irony differs from sarcasm in greater subtlety and wit. Sarcasm is presented by spoken word and vocal inflection or prosodic cues, while irony presented in literary and rhetorical forms (Singh, 2012).

Quintilian's as quoted by Camp (2011) states that sarcasm is more explicit than irony. Sarcasm is not only a simple "opposite of what it is said" as the traditional

theories claim but it can be more explicit due to a clearer intentions target of negativity towards the hearer.

In conclusion of these journal, the sarcastic utterances can determine or identify by their prosodic cues of exaggeration or emphasizing certain words, traditional theory sarcasm, the humour effect, and as a form of an inverted denial in conversation. The effect of sarcasms can make a huge impact to the listeners, whether it is humorous, mockery, insulting or less insulting, mocking or less mocking, less threatening and less critical depends on how the use of the sarcastic utterances.

Therefore, the writer has chosen side to require sarcasm as different to other kinds of irony that according to Arp and Johnson because of the negative intention, vocal inflection or prosodic cues, and victim as its target of ridicule or humour that sarcasm has.

2.3. Sarcasm and Humour

Humor is “the quality in something that makes it funny”, "amusement" or “the ability to understand and enjoy funny situations or to laugh at things.” (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, p.698). Humour relates to emotional aspect as to be happy which could provoke laughter and provide amusement. Many people from different culture, country, and ages have experienced humour in different ways.

Attardo & Giorda (2007) conclude that sarcasm is often humorous, as can be seen in humor literature. Sarcasm does relates to humour in a particular way or as to make the effect. Berger (2013, p.47) states that there are 45 techniques in humour.

One of the techniques stated is sarcasm that are classified in the category of language. The use of sarcasm relates to humour as the technique to establish the goals. It is one of the ways to gain humorous effect.

The subjectivity of humour was stated by (Refaie in Tabacaru; 2014, p.87), something can be humorous to a person, and unfunny or offensive to a different or same person in different circumstances. The writer's purpose is not to analyze the humour, but to find out the elements that help the audience in perceiving humorous jokes, which as Berger said the techniques in creating humour.

Humour has two kinds, there are verbal and non-verbal. Verbal humour is considered such as comedy talk shows, sitcoms or stand-up comedies and non-verbal such as visual art, or physical interaction. Humour is divided into three levels according to its hearer understanding. First is universal humour which can be understood by everybody regardless their ages, country, culture or background knowledge. Second, humour acts as a relief from repression, which can be related to sexual, political, or religions point of view. Third, is the kind of humour that in need of a high understanding of language and the stylistic features. (Singh, 2012)

The Fashion Police itself is a comedy talk show with the main purpose is to gain laughter from their jokes within the comments on celebrity's fashion. Their jokes are reflected in the way they attacked the victim, which is mostly the celebrities by using sarcastic words. Their comments towards the celebrity's fashion choice were made quotes in several online articles because of its offensive sarcastic jokes such as thewrap.com, independent.co.uk, and cosmopolitan.com. The comments were

hilarious to certain people but in the other side it could be offensive especially to the victim of the sarcastic jokes.

2.4. Sarcasm theory of classification

The classification of sarcasm lies in Camp's view on sarcasm. According to Camp (2011) based on the traditional theories of sarcasm, sarcasm is treated as the opposite of "what is said". Sarcasm and verbal irony differs in some respect. Sarcasm is usually more to the point, blatant, and negative. Sarcasm can be seen from two points of view, which is semanticism and expressivism.

In semanticism point of view, it argues that sarcasm 'inverts' the literal meaning of the word or clause to which it applies. In the other hand, the expressivist argues that sarcasm serves to draw attention to a disparity between actual situation and counterfactual situation and thereby expresses dissociative attitude such as skepticism, mockery, and rejection.

Sarcasm involves meaning inversion that applies in each of the four sarcasm in a completely different way. All of the classification does inverts something that the speaker pretends to mean but the difference lies in the target of sarcasm and the result of the inversion.

There are other things to considered in sarcasm view other than the traditional theories which the involvement of meaning in a speaker's reflex intention that is recognize as an attitude such as holding a true proposition, or intending to make it true, or may also be a denial, hope or scorn. One of the other ways to identify the

sarcastic utterance if not given any contextual information is by hearing the tone of voice. (Camp, 2011, p.3)

There are core of sarcastic utterances features according to Camp (2011, p.9). First, they presuppose a normative scale, second is they pretend to undertake or evoke one commitment with respect to this scale, third is in the end they communicate some sort of inversion of this pretended or evoked commitment.

According to Camp, both theorist has something right but camp concluded that to analyze sarcasm in an enhancing way, it will need to include illocutionary force and evaluative attitudes and propositional content. Camp classified sarcasm into four classes in terms of the target of the sarcastic pretense.

The first one, is perlocutionary sarcasm which the pretense encompasses the entire speech act undertaken by a sincere utterance, next is the propositional sarcasm which targets some proposition related with a sincere assertion, lexical sarcasm targets a single expression or phrase, and ‘Like’-prefixed sarcasm targets the main content of an embedded declarative sentence as a form of denial or make it as the lowest probability.

2.4.1. Perlocutionary Sarcasm

In this kind of sarcasm, sarcasm targets the entire perlocutionary act of a sincere utterances that implicates the contrary of the situation. According to Austin (1962) perlocutionary acts are expressed with the intention of producing a further effect on the addressee after hearing the speaker’s

utterances. The effect could be the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the listener. For example, a doctor tell his patient to open his mouth and the patient will open his mouth instantly. This act of the patient of opening his mouth is called perlocutionary act.

This kind of speech act could persuade, amuse, inspire and also effects the attitudes, behaviour or beliefs of the addressee. Perlocutionary is one of the three classes of speech acts. The speech acts itself is the actions that occurred through the use of words in an utterance (Austin, 1962).

Camp's perlocutionary sarcasm examples:

- (1) Thanks for holding the door.
- (2) How old did you say you were?
- (3) You sure know a lot,

These examples of perlocutionary sarcasm can be identified through the pretense of the speaker, which makes as if to do a certain speech act. The certain speech act would be appropriate to the counterfactual situation that contradicts in an extreme of scale with the actual situation. This also includes implicatures.

Disparity between the counterfactual situation and the actual situation is that the two situations are contradictive. Counterfactual situation is the situation that has not happened and it is being pretended to happen by the speaker's speech act while the actual situation is the real situation occurred.

In the example (1), the speaker pretends to do a speech act that would be appropriate if the addressee had held the door. In the real situation, the addressee didn't hold the door for him. The disparity between the counterfactual and the actual one delivers the speaker's evaluation about the addressee, which is rude to not holding the door for him. The speaker pretense that the addressee had hold the door for him as a form of perlocutionary action.

Next example in (2) the speaker pretends to ask question which would be appropriate if the addressee maturely behaves in terms of his age. In the actual situation, the addressee behaves immaturely. Therefore, the disparity between the conterfactual which he pretends to ask something that he already knows and the actual situation of immaturely behaves expresses the speaker's evaluation of the addressee's behaviour as being immature. The perlocutionary act is the behaviour of the addressee that was implicated by the speaker's pretense.

The example (3), the pretense is only on compliment implicature that depends on personal virtues. The speaker in this case pretends that knowledge is important, but the dripping tone expresses skepticism and implicates that other things are important and therefore implicates that the addressee is foolish for showing off an unimportant case and the end of result is the pretended compliment is inverted into an insult by the speaker. The speaker

pretends to undertake perlocutionary act (complimenting) in order to accomplish something close to its opposite (insulting).

In focusing of the pretense in evoked evaluative scale from expression of an attitude, then all perlocutionary sarcasm cases can be treated in terms of inversion. The speaker relying on the hearer's recognition of the speaker's intention that the speaker's utterance can be interpreted as committing the addressee to have a relevant attitude.

2.4.2. Propositional Sarcasm

Propositional sarcasm targets some contrary proposition which a sincere utterance or assertion committed by the speaker. According to Oxford Dictionaries, the word proposition itself is a statement or assertion, which expresses judgment, or opinion either is true or false and sincere utterance is an actual, honest or real utterance that will be pretended in this case. Assertion itself is placing oneself on the conversational situation as committed to a certain attitude or content (Camp, 2011, p. 22).

The main characteristic of propositional sarcasm is that the speaker pretends to assert usually an extreme positive scale of proposition that he actually means otherwise. The inversion of the proposition is mainly containing adjectives. By pretending to assert the proposition, the speaker implicates the contrary of the proposition which is the proposition's negation.

The speaker that employs propositional sarcasm, makes the addressee believe in the inverted content with the attempt of pretense, presupposition, and

implicature. Propositional sarcasm can also target an utterance's presuppositions. In order to give a clearer explanation, presupposition in this case is the implicit assumptions required to make an utterance meaningful or relevant (Fromkin et.al, 2011, p.590).

Propositional sarcasm also targets implicature in a form of a sincere utterance that genuinely asserted. Implicature is the inference based on an utterance and assumptions about what the speaker is trying to achieve (Fromkin et.al, 2011, p.582).

For example:

(4) A: I'm sorry Aunt Louisa is such a bother.

B: Oh, she never stays for more than a month at a time, and she always confines her three cats to the upper two floors of our house.

B evokes a scale of ease and burdensomeness of guest and pretends to implicate that Aunt Louisa was placing B in an easy scale but thereby implicates the contrary of the proposition which her visits was a burdensome.

Another examples of propositional sarcasm are:

(5) If you want a tasty, healthy, gourmet meal, then you should head over to *KFC*.

(6) He's a fine friend.

In (5), the counterfactual situation is the speaker gives opinion to the hearer to go to *KFC* if he wants something healthy to eat but in actual

circumstances, the *KFC* is a restaurant that serves junk-food which is not a healthy meal. The speaker pretends to assert the proposition that implicates the contrary of it which is the propositional's negation and also it inverts the adjective "healthy". This is also the explanation of the example (6), which if the conditions contradicts him as to be a fine friend, the proposition is considered as sarcastic because it pretends to state something that implicates the contrary of it and also the inversion of the adjectives "fine". Propositional sarcasm can also be determined through a metaphor, for example:

(7) She's the Taj Mahal.

The speaker's metaphor evokes the beauty of the Taj Mahal and pretends that she was as beauty as the Taj Mahal but the in the actual situation, implicates that she don't. Therefore this is also a form of propositional sarcasm which the implicature contrast with the proposition. Propositional sarcasm functions as delivering an implicature that is the contrary of a proposition that would have been expressed by a sincere utterance. Propositional sarcasm employs a normal stressing countour.

2.4.3. Lexical Sarcasm

Lexical sarcasm targets a single expression or phrase. The speaker undertakes an overall speech act with the illocutionary force. Illocutionary force is the speaker's intent in making an utterance or intended effect of a

speech act, such as warning, threatening, and making promise (Fromkin et.al, 2011, p.581).

The speaker of an utterance that contains lexical sarcasm also undertake other illocutionary act for instance:

(8) Get your witty, sophisticated friends out of here now, before they cause any more damage.

The example above is order of the speaker towards the hearer to remove his friends. It contributes of what is asserted, asked, or ordered. Lexical sarcasm specifically emphasizes in inverting utterances mostly adjectives in making the utterances sarcastic without inverting the proposition from their standard meanings. The crucial means in analyzing lexical sarcasm is to see the inversion meaning of at least one expression.

This kind of sarcasm has a tighter connection to an evoked evaluative scale that targets the expression that mostly denotes positive value, but also can be negative. The better evaluation scale of lexical sarcasm reflects from denoting the extreme end of scale such as 'brilliant', 'genius', 'inspired' so the inversion gives value at the scale's other end. It also explicitly employs allusive or comparative expression such as 'so' and 'such a'. An example of lexical sarcasm was given by Camp (2011): (9) If David is a such a genius, then he won't get better than a C in organic chemistry.

(10) Because George has turned out to be such a diplomat, we've decided to transfer him to Payroll, where he'll do less damage.

(11) If Alice is so brilliant, then she'll be the perfect dupe for our little plan.

There is also lexical indirect sarcasm the case is:

(12) Bethany said that because I'm so diplomatic, they're going to transfer me to Payroll, where I won't be able to do as much harm to their precious reputation.

The expression needs to be similarly replicated which also include the intonational contour or prosodic cues that if there is any exaggerated word. Example (12) is indirect but the sarcastic expression is directly quoted. Lexical sarcasm tends to employ an intonational contour or prosodic cues that emphasizes or stresses the target evaluation expression at the extreme end of an evoked scale. Intonational contour includes stressing, pitch range, tune, accent placement that represent crucial information that was meant to be the intentional or attentional purpose (Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg, 199, p.271) but in this context, it only involves emphasizing the stress and slow rate speech.

2.4.4. 'Like'-Prefixed Sarcasm

'Like'-prefixed sarcasm targets an entire propositions (Camp, 2011) and this kind of sarcasm is only used in declarative sentences. The prefixed

'like' is used to invert meaning in a strong sense of term or to imply the deniability. For example:

(13) Like I've talked to George in weeks.

This example is reported as having denied speaking with George recently. 'Like'-prefixed sarcasm undertake not only implicature but also illocutionary acts which to the that the combinations of 'like' only with declarative sentences. Illocutionary act itself is the act which speaker intends to do something by producing an utterances such as denying, stating, congratulating, apologizing, threatening, insulting, predicting, ordering, and requesting (Leech, 1983, p.199) but in this case of sarcasm, 'like' encodes a function from proposition to a force content with only denial as its illocutionary type.

Another example:

(14) Like that's a good idea.

The insertion of 'like' functions as a stylistic variant on sarcasm and do explain clearly on which sarcasm inverts the propositional content. The prefix 'like' can deny high possibilities by making the embedded sentence at the lowest probability and because it also serves as an the expression of denial and not negation, and the prefix should be combine with weak positive evaluation for example:

(15) Like she's coming to your party.

The embedded sentence expresses the speaker's evaluation that the content would fall to the lowest of the probability. Camp notes that 'like'-prefixed sarcasm is only used in declarative sentences, not in consequents of conditionals, and the prefix 'like' does not seem suitable to be compared by other illocutionary adverbs like 'luckily', or 'unfortunately'.

This 'like'-prefixed sarcasm can also be combined in a form of sentence with metaphor. The expression of metaphor is used to determine a content which is then inverted or denied. Therefore, metaphor can scope both of propositional and 'like'-prefixed sarcasm. For example, a metaphor that implies in 'like'-prefixed sarcasm:

(16) Like I'd ever make the beast with two backs with him.

The prefix 'like' is also used as to introduce a quotation or someone else's utterance. For example:

(17) She was like, you are totally embarrassing me right now.

Conclusion of 'like'-prefixed sarcasm is that it presupposes something by evoking previous statements with the case of the probability and thereby communicates deniability by making the content at the bottom of the probabilities.

2.5. Fashion Police

Fashion Police is a popular comedy talk show program on *E!* (entertainment) channel. The show is about commenting, critiquing, mocking or even gives an appreciation to the celebrity's fashion in a very humorous way of saying. *Fashion*

Police declares on what is to be trendy or not. The show makes a standard beauty by commenting the celebrities' choices of fashion, make up, even accessories that doesn't fit to their expectation in Hollywood fashion and beauty. The show is currently co-hosted by Melissa Rivers, Guiliana Rancic, Brad Goreski, Margaret Cho, and Nene Leakes. This show often offended huge stars in Hollywood based on their fashion appearance with the use of sarcasm as the humour technique.

Fashion Police isn't the only hit comedy talk show series, there are *Ellen DeGeneres*, and *Late late show with James Corden*. The comedy talk show differs in one and another to make a particular uniqueness to their show. *Ellen DeGeneres* invites various celebrities and sometimes plays a game with them or prank them in the show. Meanwhile, *Late late show with James Corden* has one special segments that is different from the other comedy talk show which is carpool karaoke.

Fashion Police in the other side differs in many particular things such as the topic. The topic in other talkshow is mainly talks about the guest star's recent activities, while in *Fashion Police*, their main topic is about fashion, red carpet, and trends. *Fashion Police* also invite a guest star on their show, but the purpose of inviting the guest star differs with other talk show, which is to gain fashion opinion of other celebrities from the guest.

2.6. Theoretical Framework

To analyze the use of sarcastic utterances, this research uses the theory of sarcasm proposed by Camp (2011). The writer also wants to identify the most frequent cast (co-hosts) that uses sarcastic utterances and the meaning implied.