

T.C.
ISTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME



IRONY IN IAN MCEWAN'S NOVELS

MA THESIS

MUSTAFA HAZIM TARESH KHLAIFAWI

18131306033

ISTANBUL, DECEMBER 2021

T.C.

ISTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME



IRONY IN IAN MCEWAN'S NOVELS

MA THESIS

MUSTAFA HAZIM TARESH KHLAIFAWI

18131306033

SUPERVISOR

Prof. Dr. SEDAT İŞÇİ

ISTANBUL, DECEMBER 2021



T.C.

**İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

.....

MA PROGRAMME

ETHICAL STATEMENT

In this project, I prepared my manuscript in accordance with the thesis writing rules of the Institute of Social Sciences at Istanbul Yeni Yüzyıl University and I hereby declare that;

- I have obtained the data, information and documents provided within the thesis within the framework of academic and ethical rules,
- I have submitted all information, documents, evaluations and results in accordance with the requirements of scientific ethics and moral rules,
- I have cited all works that I have used in the project by appropriately referring to my sources,
- I have not made any changes to the data used,
- The work I present here is original, and if found otherwise, I declare that I accept all loss of rights that may occur.

13/12/2021

Mustafa Khlaifawi

PREFACE

The process of writing my thesis was as fruitful as difficult but with the help and encourage of my family it was rewarding. I am grateful for my parents. The words stand mute to describe their role in this journey. I want to extend my thanks to my siblings who never stopped supporting me till I reach the peak and achieve all my dreams.

ISTANBUL, 2021

Mustafa Khlaifawi



CONTENTS

	Page Number
ETHICAL STATEMENT.....	i
PREFACE.....	ii
CONTENTS	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ABSTRACT	v

FIRST CHAPTER

1. THE LINGUISTIC THEORIES OF IRONY.....	1
1.1 Towards A Computational Model of Irony.....	1
1.2 Linguistic Theories of Irony.....	12
2.1.1 Echoic Mention Theory.....	13
1.2.2 Pretense Theory.....	15
1.2.3 Allusional Pretense Theory.....	17
1.2.4 Unified Theory.....	18
1.3 Types of Irony.....	19

SECOND CHAPTER

2. IRONIC ANALYSIS OF IAN MCEWAN'S SELECTED NOVELS.....	
2.1 A Review of the Ironic Effects on <i>Atonement, The Child in Time</i>	
2.2 A Review of the Ironic Effects on <i>The Innocent, Amsterdam and Solar</i>	

CONCLUSION.....

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....25

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın büyük bir kısmı "ironi nedir?" sorusuna bir cevap niteliğindedir.Çalışma, ironi terimini edebi bir araç, bir kavram, bir yazım yöntemi ve bir edebiyat kuramı olarak ele almaktadır. ironi-ironi-olmayan ayrımı ve ironi-ironi-olmayan ayrımının yanı sıra ironiyi oluşturan unsurlar üzerinde durulmuştur.Ayrıca ironinin süreci ve kodlarının çözülme prosedürü üzerinde durularak anlatılmıştır.Ayrıca ironinin doğası,kullanımı, özellikleri, özellikleri ve türleri bu çalışmanın merkezindedir.Çalışma, Ian McEwan'ın edebi eserlerindeki temel ironi teorileri ve kullanımları ile ilgilidir.Bu çalışmada, ironinin ana teorilerini açıklayacağım ve farklı olduklarını tartışacağım. bakış açıları ve ironinin inşasına bakış açıları Tam olarak önerilen ilk bölüm, ironinin anlamı, işlevleri, amaçları, kullanımları, kullanımı ve tanımlama bilmecelerini çözer Ian McEwa'nın etkisinde. n'in eserlerinde ironi üzerine yapılacak olan bu çalışma, edebî ifadelerin kastedilen anlamı ifade edemediği durumlarda derin bir iletişim yolu olarak ironi perspektifiyle ilişkilendirilecektir. Sonuç olarak, ilk bölüm, ironinin işlevleri ve ana türlerinin tam bir açıklaması ile ironi kavramını ele alan ana teoriler üzerine uzun bir yorumdur. İkinci bölümde, bu teoriler, ana ironik örnekleri almak ve amaçlanan anlamlarını bulmak için McEwan'ın çok yönlü eserlerine uygulanacaktır.

Mustafa KHALAIFAWI, 2021

Anahtar Kelimeler: İroni, Amaçlanan anlam, Gerçek anlam, Kod çözme.

ABSTRACT

Most of this study is an answer to this question: "what is irony?". The study deals with the term irony as a literary device, a concept, a method of writing and a literary theory. The study is meant to explain the difference and the distinguishing between irony and non-irony. Moreover, the study deals with the elements that constitute irony. Besides, it highlights and explains the process of irony and the procedure of decoding its codes. Moreover, the nature of irony, its usage, features and characteristics as well as its types are the center of this study. The study is concerning with the main theories of irony and their usage in Ian McEwan's literary works. In this study, I will explain the main theories of irony and discussed their different standpoints as well as their perspectives of the construction of irony. The first chapter proposed in full, the meaning of irony, its functions, purposes, usages, utilization and solve the riddles of description. Under the influence of Ian McEwan's works, this study will be done on irony and is associated with the perspective of irony as a way of a deep communication when the literal utterances fail to express the intended meaning. In conclusion, the first chapter is a long commentary on the main theories that have dealt with the concept of irony with a full explanation of the functions of irony and its main types. In the second chapter, these theories will be applied on McEwan's multifaceted works to pick up the main ironic examples and figure out their intended meanings.

Mustafa KHALAIFAWI, 2021

Keywords: Irony, Intended meaning, Literal meaning, Decoding.

CHAPTER ONE

THE LINGUISTIC THEORIES OF IRONY

1.1 Towards A Computational Model of Irony

The concept of irony has been an argumentative subject of study for a long time. Searchers and linguists have dealt and discussed in their writings the nature of irony and its utilization in literature. However, still, there is a gap considering its meaning, observation and illustration. According to the classical rhetoric studies, the term irony stands as the employment of a saying that is used to signify a meaning that is less than what is intended and meant. The concept of irony is used as a tent to protect the writer from the public refusal and abusing. In this respect, writers are not free to express their ideas and reveal their opinion so they tend to use irony as a cover for their hidden meanings. Irony usually a saying that is said in opposed to what is meant. Many features can be attached to irony. Among them is the tone and the intonation that are among the clues that distinguish Irony from other literary devices.

Therefore, the concept of irony is a figure of a speech and a device that is used to help the writer feeling free to reveal his intention in disguise. In the sixteenth century, the word irony entered the English language as a device or a figure of speech that makes the text richer and more meaningful. In this regard, the concept of irony as a figure of speech is kind of communication where the hidden meaning is associated with the literal meaning to produce the intended meaning proposed by the writer. Accordingly, the meaning of a literary text is based on two layers: first, the surface meaning that is easily understood and interpreted. Second, the hidden or the intended meaning that lies deeply behind the words and at the bottom of the unified meaning of the text. In many cases, the intended meaning convey a message that is understood as the opposite of the literal meaning that is found on the surface of the text. In this consideration, the ironical meaning is hard to be picked up and its intended meaning still harder to be figured out. In this sense, scanning the text, picking up the codes, decoding the codes, discovering the ironies and figuring out their meanings is only done by a critical reading. Critical reading is considered as the one kind of reading that is done to penetrate deep in the dark universe of the text and come up with the intended meanings the writer wishes to convey.

According to the above explanation, the concept of irony is regarded as literary device, a linguistic technique, a theory and a method of writing that allows the writers to reveal their ideas and opinions without fearing the public refusal through avoiding their abused words produced by their understanding of the text. In this case, the surface meaning provides a meaning that is differs radically and stands in oppose to the intended meaning, though it refers to it directly if it is understood by smart readers. Therefore, understanding irony is the job of critical readers who dig in deep into the text until they reach the unified meaning of the text. In his *The King's English*, Henry Watson Fowler claims "...any definition of irony must include this, that the surface meaning and the underlying meaning of what is said are not the same.". Therefore, the utilization of irony depends entirely on saying the opposite meaning. In this manner, it requires the concept of a double audience since it irony consists of a hearer who hears and will not understands and another one who hears what is meant and more than what meets the ear.

In this consideration, the irony lies perfectly between the rhetorical meaning and the literal meaning. The literal meaning is always clear and obvious while the intended meaning is always tricky and hard to be picked up and it's ironic reference is even harder to be figured up and interpreted. However, the literal meaning can always reflect its rhetorical meaning if it is highlighted and read carefully. Critical readers should always hold mirrors to reflect the hidden meaning that is hidden deep into the bottom of the text. The concept of irony is meant to persuade and tempt the reader to not understand its rhetorical meaning by shattering the attention to other parts and by attracting the attention to the opposite meaning that is explained clearly by the usage of the literal meanings. Therefore a central feature of irony is to criticize and shed light on some attitudes by provoking negative meanings that can stand as criticism. In this respect, Fludernik (2007) claimed that: "Irony is always critical of somebody or has denigrating effects" (p. 14). In elucidation, the method of irony is used as a way to criticize a situation or a person with a harsh kind of humiliation. The concept of irony is based mainly on negation. In elucidation, ironies are used to humiliate the one who the irony is fallen on but in a way that makes him or her never expected. In sum, Irony is a mixture and a blending of criticism and humiliation that is used in a harsh but still a hidden way. So far, the main features of irony are three: criticism, humiliation and negation.

The comprehension of irony is based entirely on the conception of three main issues: first, the definition and the meaning of the concept of irony. Second, the insight of the main functions of irony. Third, the processing of the literal meaning to produce the intended meaning or the rhetorical interpretation. However, the concept of irony is shapeless and its understanding is fuzzy. Accordingly, it is impossible to provide one semantic and rhetoric definition of irony. In this consideration, this chapter is conducted to argue for pragmatic definition of irony and semantic utilization of its functions that are mainly proposed to cover up the writers' persona and their dangerous perspectives. Therefore, the utilization of the concept of irony is the safest way that the writers attempt to use in order to reveal their ideas and criticize their situation and humiliate their objects of humiliation.

In terms of semantic definitions of irony, a number of semantic definitions of irony have been produced and proposed since the dawn of rhetorical studies and the Classical utilization of irony. However, a definition of irony should be pragmatic and attached to its ironic functions and the process of transformation of literal meaning into a rhetorical meaning. In this respect, Kumon-Nakamura (1995) claimed: "An ironic statement is an insincere speech act which is intended by the speaker to be understood as insincere and which constitutes a misfit with some aspect of the context.". Being insincere, the speaker is humiliating the hearer, criticizing the situation, and negate his words by using their opposites. The receiver should be aware of his kind of communication and should interpret it as irony since it is insincere and not honest. Since the meaning and the function of irony are clarified, its processing the literal meaning into the intended meaning should be highlighted. This process depends mainly on a conflict between the hidden or the intended meaning and the contextual meaning. This process is ended in two radically different meanings. These two shifted meanings are woven perfectly and their connection is strong. Therefore, the strong stating of the literal meaning the stronger is the intended meanings and vice versa. If the literal meaning is stated with poor words and phrases will refer to its intended meanings directly. While the strong statement of the literal meanings makes the job harder for the critical readers to discover the intended phrases and figure up their hidden meaning by turning all stones. It is said that curiosity killed the cats but in here the curiosity to figure up the hidden meanings of the text is in fact retrieve the life of the text and gives the go-ahead to the readers to get the meaning of the unified text which is the pleased thing in the process of reading.

With high frequency, irony is depicted highly in everyday language. People intentionally and unintentionally use many types of irony in their ordinary language without noticing it to be a device to convey deeper meaning or a literary device that refer to the opposite meaning. Therefore, the method of irony is an integrated and an essential part of human communication. Almost one third of human communication is colored with irony as a way to criticize the situation. Being automatically, irony is used in implicit way and include a high sense of bully. Irony is considered as a kind of cleverness and ingenuity. People who can state a quick ironic statement are regarded as having a tact and craft. Being the work of proficient people, the utilization of irony is a cunning skill that has a hard and harsh hit on its receivers. However, Irony makes the way shorter for its users as it conveys their sayings and statements in a clever and smart way. While its effects on the receivers are hard to be explained.

This nobility of the concept of irony has led many linguist and rhetorical scholars to investigate its nature, types and functions. Considering the nature of irony, it is believed that inside the meaning of the ironic statement there is an employment of a high sense of negation and a relative frequency of criticism towards the humiliated objects. Examples of irony expressing a negative mode will be depicted in Ian's works. Depends on the fact of saying something while intended something else is directly attached to the traditional meaning of Irony. Kaufer (1981) and Haverkate (1990) refused the traditional view of irony, which considered the concept of irony as a literary device, and claimed it to be a broad and ambiguous description of irony. This semantic definition does not distinguish irony as a rhetoric device from other devices and considers it as an indirect way of conveying a message. On the other hand, they claimed that irony is a pragmatic operator effect the meaning of the text while leaving the structure unattached. According to the pragmatic principles, irony has many pragmatic effects that are depicted in the ironic statement. Some effects allude to a negative rudeness while other hint at clever usage of the ironic statements that stand for the craft of their users. The blending of the literal meaning and the intended meanings is not an easy task rather it needs a high craft of using the words in their suitable situation to reveal the hidden meanings and the intended interpretation that are uncovered by critical reading.

The cognitive linguistics developed a categorization theory signify the fact that the concept of irony denotes a heterogeneous frame. This heterogeneous sense of irony is obvious through the negation and the opposition between the literal meaning and the intended meaning. Sperber and Wilson (1981) attached the concept of irony to an echo that rings a bell in the listener's mind and encourages him to discover the real meaning of statement that he has heard or uttered. This echoic form of irony stands as one of the theories of irony that will be explained in full in the next section. On the other hand, Clark and Gerrig (1984) referred to the ironic statement as involving a sense of pretense explained through the fact that the writer of irony pretends to be not rude and to proclaim his statement in a positive mode. While in fact, the statement involves a negative sense and a high relative of rudeness and bully. In all manners, ironic statements are set to remark and refer to a failed expectation that is resulted of unrealistic expectation. A variety of theories on irony argue the concept of theory to be of diverse meanings and functions that can be explained according to different ironic situations. In this respect, this study is an attempt to apply many theories of irony to the literary works of Ian McEwan.

Not living to expectation makes the situation ready to be criticized. People are always pissed off and bothered with when their unrealistic expectations come to fit no place or purpose. They express their emotions either in direct or an indirect way through the use of irony that makes the way seems safer and shorter in conveying their messages. In this respect, Irony is considered as a literary device that is utilized to reveal the opposite meaning of the literal meaning that is expressed vocally or verbally. A prototypical instance of irony is complaining about the weather which is a scene that all people are experienced and a scenario that almost all people have spoken. Claiming the beauty of a weather when it is raining cats and dogs and the speaker is wet and hate to be in such situation is perfect example of irony. The beauty of the weather is said to convey a message that the speaker is pissed off with the ugliness of the weather. Therefore, this ironic statement involves and implies a sense of negation and can be translated in a way that reflect its negative mode. The literal meaning of the statement is to be transformed into the hidden and the intended meaning. Therefore, the speaker is intended to complain the weather. In sums, to understand irony is to negate the ironic statement and figure out the hidden meaning that lies under the text and behind the words.

On this consideration, the ironic statement is processed with high relative of negation. With is negation, irony is conducted with a sense of humiliation that is one face of bully while the other side are mocking and being impolite. This kind of rudeness is stated behind the literal meaning as a way to protect the speaker or the writer's dangerous ideas and perspectives that are kept safe behind the text through the utilization of irony. However, the social backgrounds of the ironic statements are highly considered as a source where the irony is floating and where it can be only understood and interpreted. Different cultures understand irony differently. Cultures with their big remarks or trivial facts can be a great source of irony. People use irony to criticize the triviality of their culture or society. Normally the trivial situations are perfect ingredients of ironic statement claimed by that culture's holders. Therefore, the trivial situations and the silly piece of information helps in transferring the message, serves the function of communication, fulfills the ironic functions by reminding the speakers of common expectations, attitudes, or history through the attraction of the attention by the usage of non-common way of communication.

The definition and the processing of irony assume that the intended meaning is the opposite of the literal meaning that is floating on the surface. This contradiction is the epitome center of irony. The paradoxical sense of positive and negative modes as well as of literal and intended meaning is pragmatic meaning of irony that affects the hazy meaning of the text. The unrealistic expectation leads to a an endless circle of unpleased results that seem to be excellent prey for irony. Being indulged into cultural and social conditions, the ironic statements cannot be understood unless a full explanation of its context is provided. Therefore, the irony cannot be understood unless it is indulge into a situation. In sums, the meaning of the ironic statement cannot be interpreted and understood without a flaw of information where the irony is swimming and never stands alone. The receiver should always be ready to upgrade his comprehension to make the meaning of the irony clear to his ears. His comprehension of the irony that is headed towards him enables him to respond with an irony and the local exchange of irony continues. Therefore, the strongest the ironies are presented the more the situation will be charged with negative intentions capsulated in positive literal meanings. Therefore, no new informative statements will be stated; rather, a consequence of trivial information suggest deep meanings are to be depicted.

After presenting clear cut definitions of irony, it is necessary now to identify and explain the main features of irony. In this respect, three features of irony are identified. First, the concept of irony implies a double-layered or two-story phenomenon of meaning. At the surface the sayings or the utterances as the receivers receive them. While at the lower level is the utterance as presented by the ironist. Second, the concept of irony depends on a sense of negation or contradiction where the utterance is the opposite of the intended meaning. Third, the concept of irony implies a sense of bully, rudeness or humiliation. Since it is said in a way of mockery, the irony implies a relative sense of sarcasm. following these three characteristics and features of irony, the study suggest that the prototype ironic statement implies and involves the fact that the ironist mocks the situation and totally means the opposite of his utterance. Therefore, in an ironist statements, there are two levels of interpretation: the upper level that refers to the literal meaning and the lower level that hints at the intended meaning. In sums, the literal meaning can be far away from the intended meaning. In that, the literal meaning is neither the intended meaning nor the point of utterance.

Accordingly, the victim of irony should read between the sentences to grasp the intended meaning and find a way out of this mockery. Either a victim is confidently unaware of the very possibility of there being an upper level or point of view that invalidates his own, or an ironist pretends not to be aware of it. However, this study argues that the ironic statement echoes a previous situation that either the ironist or the victim of irony has gone through or both of them. Moreover, the ironic statement mocks an unfulfilled expectation since it depends highly on unrealistic expectations. Therefore, the ironic statements mocks an unfulfilled thought, intention, plan that are attributed to the victim of irony by expressing sarcasm, skeptical reaction, and over-critical attitude towards the unfulfilled attitude and its doer. Therefore, among the functions of irony is making a harsh sarcastic reaction towards an action that appears to be a fault. This sarcasm is produced by contradicting the utterance and the situation. In that, the ironist attempts to mock the situation by uttering an utterance that goes in opposition with the situation, so it seems as a padded praise. In other words, the ironic statement would always mocks the situation by showing the other way round of it, In sums, the concept of irony depends on a strong and radical contradiction between the literal meaning and the intended meaning. For the victim of irony to figure out the sarcasm, he is to negate the ironic statement and look on the antonyms of the ironic words.

Irony involves a paradoxical state and entails a juxtaposition of incompatibles. A contradiction between what is said and what is intended, a juxtaposition between what is expected and what is occurred, and a diverse stand between the literal meaning and the non-literal meaning. In other words, the concept of irony is a conflict between a direct and indirect speech. In this consideration, Irony seems a significant subject to be analyzed and stand on its nature, utilizations, functions and characteristics. Many semantic and pragmatic definition have been proposed on irony so far. Still the concept of irony is regarded hazy and fuzzy as its nature is changeable and its meaning depends on a two-storey of interpretation. Irony features a de-familiarization of the context. In other words, the victim of irony should break up the utterance and attach each word to its reference and then build up the context again to figure out its unified meaning. Irony employs a defense in the discourse of the utterance. Therefore, it resist the obvious meaning and suggest a deeper meaning lies in the depth of the utterance.

On this consideration, the concept of irony is a literary device that stands mainly on a contradiction between what is expected and what is occurred. In other words, as a figure of speech, the irony is seen as an element of linguistics that attempts mainly to add more layers of interpretation and color the meaning of an utterance by making a contradiction between the intended meaning and the literal meaning. However, the concept of irony implies a high sense of sarcasm that is directed towards a the victim of irony and is intended to criticize him with a relatively high frequency of mockery and humiliation. The employment of irony suggests the craft of the ironist and refers to a conflict between what is occurred and what is expected. However, the concept of irony does not always directed towards a victim of irony. In that, the ironic statement is sometimes directed to the ironist himself, if he does not live to expectation. Therefore, irony is a manifestation of an active self-critical faculty. In other situation, sometimes the ironic statement is directed towards a sarcastic situation. When the situation does not live up to the expectation therefore, it becomes a delicious lure for mockery and sarcasm, and finally a prey for irony. Therefore, the employment of irony could be directed towards a double audience, or the self or to a situation. In sums, irony is inherent in many aspects of conflict, ambiguity and paradox. The ironic statement involves an inevitability that cannot be able to resolution. The irony focuses on a critical examination of contradiction and paradoxical state of utterance.

An ironic statement requires a degree of contradiction between what is expected and what is occurred; also it requires a detachment from the existing reality. In this sense, the ability to employ and understand irony starts weak but it develops with the development of speech and controlling the situation. The capacity of employing and understanding irony is dated back to the anal phase of learning language. The determiners of irony are reflected by the utilization of some defense and mechanisms that are considered the basic of irony. The concept of irony is believed to deal with psychological matters described as the ego and superego. The development of the superego is described as a development of the sense of irony and mockery. The ironic statement depends highly on some elements that are considered as the corner stone in producing an ironic statement. Among these elements on which the irony is based are: first, intelligence that is considered of high importance in the production of irony. The brain where the language is formed plays an important role in forming smart ironic statement that suits the situation well.

The second element that on which the ironic statement is based is the verbal skill that are described by the amount of vocabularies the ironist knows and his ability of utilizing them in a mockery way to mean the opposite meaning. In that, the ironist should know a great deal of words and their synonymous and antonymous to criticize the situation through using some ironic statements. The third element the ironic statement implies is the capacity for joking and playing. The concept of irony implies a playing with the words and mocking the situation by celebrating the usage of the words in a way that suggests padded meanings. Finally, the comprehension of irony is attached to the theory of technique. The theory that explains the main techniques of forming ironic statements and mocking a situation by criticizing its negative sides and shows a sarcasm by bullying the faults. An ironic statement and its decoding is falls on the shoulders of the victims of irony. The understanding of irony is valuable and essential on the part of the victims of the irony. However, decoding the codes of irony is sometimes a questionable defense for the victims and is even hard to be figured out. Since the intended meaning is hard to be figured out, the victim should break up the text by the employment of the techniques that the theory of de-familiarization proposed. The breaking of the text into pieces of meaning and attaching them to their intended meaning according to the situation and finally bringing them together to come up with the unified meaning.

Sometimes, the ironists utilize the concept of irony to show polite statements. In his, *Politeness Principle*, Leech (1990) proposed: "If you must cause offence, at least do so in a way which does not overtly conflict with the *Politeness Principle*, but allows the hearer to arrive at the offensive point of your remark indirectly, by way of implicature" (p. 82). In other words, Irony is a way of conveying hidden criticism, as the positive sense of the literal meaning is utilized to express the negative sense of the intended meanings. Gibbs (2007) claims that the victim of the irony receives the ironic statements in two ways either by ignoring it and focusing mainly on the positive sense of the literal meaning or by noticing the padded meaning that lies behind the words and becomes curious to know the intended meaning that is the other face of the coin of irony. As a result, there is a "diminishment of the overall degree of negativity expressed". At the same times and in the same way, Leech established a principle of irony and called it the Irony Principle.

This principle proposed by Leach is meant to explain the phenomenon of padded criticism by asserting that an ironical statement "enables a speaker to be impolite while seeming to be polite" (Leech 1990: 142). For instance, instead of saying "stop telling me your stupid story", we might prefer the indirect version and tell a person who is obviously unable to tell stories "You are a natural-born story-teller.". This ironical utterance is less harmful than the first direct but it is still a rude version which causes negative consequences. However, the ironical utterance manages to convey a hidden criticism. Therefore, in high relative negative context, the ironic statements are rated and considered as offering a mocking and humiliated criticism towards the addressee; while in the a less negative context, the ironic statements is perceived as a polite way of expressing the attitude of the ironist towards the unfulfilled plans and the unrealistic expectations. Apparently, irony is used in less charged conditions, this involves in a highly charged situations irony is not preferred to be utilized. According to the logic of irony, the negative intended meaning is hard to be grasped since it is a feature of the human being to be able to decode the positive codes while take a longer time to respond to negative words and phrases. Since the human expectations of the world are always characterized to be positive and sometimes unrealistic; therefore, the negative statements would deviate the positive frame formed by human and resulted in a process that is hard to be applied to understand the meaning of the intended and require a more time in the processing.

Taking the theories of learning a language, during the process of learning a language. The mind follows certain scenarios and context and is occupied with the same probable predictions. Therefore, the brain struggles with figuring out the unified meaning of the ironic statement and its intended meaning as the concept of irony seems to be a shattered phenomenon that refers to unexpected predictions. In this respect, the meanings and the functions of irony differ from context to other and attached to different situations which results with diverse expectations. In other words, irony can be communicated by various expressions. Accordingly, numerous studies tried to explain and tackle the nature of irony since it seems to be fuzzy and shabby. These studies are fallen into two approaches know as the pragmatic approach and the cognitive approach. The pragmatic approach goes with the fact that the speech is understood to be a ironic statement only as the victim of irony recognize the humiliation and the violation of the rules that set the pragmatic principles and thus the victim of irony can differentiates between the literal meaning and the intended meaning.

However, it is still hard and tricky task for the victim of irony to understand irony and figure out the intended meaning. This fact can also be attached to ambiguity of language and the mysterious of the language composition. In other words, the ability to set into part the literal meaning and the intended meaning can be related to irony or to other on-literal utterances where the surface is not the same as the bottom, for instance, the concept of lie which is a padded attitude and an utterance of two-storey of meaning. Therefore, the study shows it is not easy to figure out an ironic statement and it is even hard to attach it to its intended meaning. In this respect, the theories that assert the reorganization of an ironic statement through its violation of the pragmatic principle is not always applicable. This view applies well to typical ironies but it completely fails to explain the nature of irony and its application and reorganization and what it can communicate. First, in some cases, ironic intent can be communicated under the situation where hearers are not aware of any violation. Although Haverkate (1990) extended a target of intentional violation to felicity conditions for five speech act classes, it is still incomplete for the same reasons. Secondly, the notion of “the opposite of the literal meaning” is problematic as it is applicable only to declarative assertions but many ironic utterances can take non-declarative forms. Regarding the theories that consider the concept of irony, in this chapter, different

theories of irony are reviewed. It covers the importance of the study of irony and proposes a clear fusion between the theory of Irony and the use of irony in Ian McEwan's novels.

1.2 Linguistic Theories of Irony

Semantically, an ironic statement refers to the contradiction of what is said and what is predicted. In other words, it is a state of opposition between the expected and the occurred. Pragmatically, H. P. Grice refuses the semantic view of irony, that asserts the opposition between the said and the unsaid, and believes that an ironic utterance is a method of speaking that violates the maxim of quality. The stages in the Gricean's process which help the victim of irony to recognize the humiliation and realize the intended meaning of the ironic statement are four:

- 1) The process of the literal meaning.
- 2) The victim recognizes the violation of the literal meaning as it does not suit the situation.
- 3) The victim realized the opposition between the literal meaning and the intended meaning.

Since Grice's theory of pragmatics (Grice, 1975), linguists have developed various theories of irony. In this section, I will review four different post-Gricean linguistic theories of irony. These theories try to solve problems which were inherent in Grice's theory. The main ideas, improvements on the classic approach but also prevailing problems will be analyzed. Some aspects of the theories may be helpful for the task of identifying ironic utterances automatically. Approaching the topic from different perspectives, these theories have struggled with a multitude of questions: What does it mean for an utterance to be literal or ironic? In how far is an ironic utterance different from its literal counterpart? How does a speaker / writer indicate his ironical intent? And how may it be recognized by the listener / reader? Imagine this utterance "I'm a lucky man" being uttered by a man who just lost all his money in a casino in Las Vegas. Following Grice (1975), this utterance is ironic because its literal meaning is obviously false, since losing all your money in a casino contradicts being lucky. By violating the Gricean maxim of quality, the speaker signals the listener that the literal meaning of this utterance must be rejected. By recognizing this maxim violation the listener knows he must adopt the contrary meaning for it, namely that the speaker is not a lucky man, but only speaking ironically.

2.1.1 Echoic Mention Theory

A basic question for all theories of irony is what should count as irony. Traditionally, the so-called figurative utterances are classified as stylistic devices such as e.g. irony, rhetorical questions, metonymy, hyperbole. Sperber and Wilson (1981) judge these devices to be defined quite fuzzy by some set of their representatives which are themselves defined rather fuzzy. Instead of trying to stick to this abstract historical classification, they propose to group utterances by the effects they produce and commonly underlying psychological mechanisms. All to be reviewed theories agree with Sperber and Wilson on that point of view, namely their theories of irony are not concerned with finding similarities between irony discriminated from hyperbole, rhetorical questions etc. but instead try to describe mechanisms involved in irony and deduce from that which example utterances may be called ironic and which not. That is, the upcoming theories try to describe irony instead of prescribing it.

In their paper “Irony and the use-mention distinction”, Sperber and Wilson (1981) introduce their theory of irony as an instance of echoic mention. When a speaker utters an ironical statement, the authors argue, he does not use this utterance, but mention it. The mentioned proposition is an indirect quotation of a concrete utterance or a thought. Sperber and Wilson argue that a speaker may echo a remark in order “to suggest that he finds it untrue, inappropriate or irrelevant” (Sperber and Wilson, 1981, p. 307). Thus, this theory distinguishes an ironic utterance from the opposite of a corresponding literal utterance. The use of irony here has a clear psycholinguistic function. Their approach is cognitive rather than semantic. In that, its main aim is to find the cognitive functions that the ironic statement perform in the context and the violation it causes that result in a two layers of meaning, the literal and the intended meaning. Therefore, it seems hard to attach the concept of irony to a one fixed semantic definitions rather its definition, nature, function and characteristic are different in terms of different situations that are studies pragmatically. Sperber and Wilson support the idea that assumes the necessity of the violation of truthfulness for ironic interpretation. According the mention theory of irony, the concept of irony implies a sense of reference and mentioning. In sums, the ironist is not directly mocks and humiliates the situation rather he mentions it in a sarcastic way.

Accordingly, the ironic statement is based on an echoic utterance. According to the echoic mention theory, ironic statement is considered as “making reference to some state of affairs that was predicted, expected or desired, either because of some explicit prediction or based upon a mutually shared domain of knowledge” (Gibbs & Colston 2007: 5). Therefore, in this consideration, the ironic statement has two stands: first, the ironic statement echoes a previous remark and shows an explicit echo; second, it refers to general norms, popular wisdom, received knowledge, thus, echoes an implicit irony. Producing an ironic statement, the ironist conveys a mocking attitude towards the victim of irony. According to terminology, Sperber and Wilson (1998) define the word echo in a technical and a broad manner and state that the concept of irony is a reproduction of what is already occurred, including utterances, social norms, expectation in a mocking manner. Therefore, the ironic statements are connected with ironic attitudes that refer to echoed attributed thoughts or actions.

In this consideration, the echoic statements should be attributed and directed towards a certain attitude. Sperber and Wilson (1986) note that "Sometimes, the speaker's attitude is left implicit, to be gathered only from tone of voice, context and other paralinguistic clues; at other times it may be made explicit." (p. 239). In other words, the ironist's attitude can be figured out easily as being explicit or cannot be easily figured out as being too ambiguous. Therefore, the extent to which the victim of irony can reach in decoding the ironic statement to grasp the intended meaning varies according to the explicitly of the ironist. Expanding their theory, Sperber and Wilson argue that "[Irony] invariably involves the implicit expression of an attitude, and that the relevance of an ironical utterance invariably depends, at least in part, on the information it conveys about the speaker's attitude to the opinion echoed." (Sperber and Wilson, 1986: 239). According to Sperber and Wilson, the clarity of the ironic statement is measured in terms of three factors:

1. A recognition of the ironic statement as echoic
2. Identification of the source of the opinion echoed
3. Recognition of the ironist's statement as either a rejection or disapproval. To conclude, from the echoic mention theory perspective, the irony conveys is a figurative attitude. therefore, the ironic statements are attitudes that can be expressed and attributed to thoughts, people, objects, and events.

1.2.2 Pretense Theory

As a substitute to the echoic mention theory, Clark and Gerrig (1984) state that the pretense theory of irony. When speaking ironically, the theory goes, the speaker pretends to be someone else. Since pretending to be another person is close to imitation, the pretense may be indicated by a special tone of voice for the pretended person. While noted by several theorists, the special tone of voice was empirically investigated by Gibbs (2000) and Traum and Narayanan (2006). Opposing to the echoic mention theory, in the pretense theory there does not need to be any antecedent to echo. The ironic utterance does not need to have been uttered before or reflect a common opinion or thought. The only common ground there should be, Clark and Gerrig argue, is some common knowledge in the audience. The audience may only recognize the speaker's ironic intent if they can infer which person or stereotype the pretended speaker is ought to be. At the very least, the audience has to figure out that the speaker is pretending at all. Therefore, all ironic mentioned statements can be transformed into pretense.

Moreover, Clark and Gerrig argue, the speaker does not only pretend to be some other speaker, but also to talk to a pretended audience, namely an audience who would take the pretense serious. This way, the speaker not only expresses his attitude towards the pretended speaker and his utterance but also towards the pretended audience. The authors call these, the "different types of victims" of irony. One victim is the pretended speaker of the utterance, while the other victim is the audience taking the utterance serious. The echoic mention theory does not differ between these two types of victims, Clark and Gerrig argue. Furthermore, Clark and Gerrig explain, echoic mention is just a special type since all echoic mention can be translated into pretense, namely the pretense of being that person who the antecedent originates from. The authors pronounce the game theoretic aspect of irony, namely that the speaker deceives the audience which is prompted to discover the truth behind the pretense. Since speakers pretend to be someone else, the pretense theory gives an intuitive explanation for the special tone of voice of ironic utterances. Therefore, the ironist intends the victim of irony to whom the ironic statement is directed in order to discover the attitude of the ironist and the victim of irony.

This theory rejects the traditional claim upon the concept of irony that asserts that the concept of irony is based on a contradiction between the literal meaning and the intended meaning. In other words, the traditional vision of irony viewed the concept of irony to be a description of the unrealistic expectation of the world the ironist is mocking and the realistic occurrence. According to this theory of irony, the reorganization of ironic statement is based on the victim of irony's realization of the pretense and understanding that the ironist pretends in a mocking, skeptical, contemptuous attitude. Clark and Gerrig's (1984) pretense theory takes a rather different approach to irony: "in being ironic, the theory goes, a speaker is pretending to be an injudicious person speaking to an uninitiated audience; the speaker intends the addressees of the irony to discover the pretense and thereby see his or her attitude toward the speaker, the audience and the utterance"(ibid., p.121). According to pretense theory, each and every time the speaker says irony he/she is pretending to be an mocking person, which corresponds to the victim of irony. Though pretense theory claims to be superior to the mention theory, there is a negative suggestion, which we agree with, that both theories may not differ significantly from one another. From the above discussion, we have made the following observations on a comprehensive theory of irony.

Taking the pretence statements into consideration, the ironist pretends to perform an act of speech that implies an expression of mocking and skeptical attitude to an attributed situation. The pretense theory of irony takes into accounts the object of irony and the achievement of irony as well as the process of decoding and figuring out the ironic statements. The theory suggests that the ironic utterances imply an imitation of the actual utterance or situation in a mockery way. Therefore, the actual speech or the actual situation is the object of irony that the ironist utilize to amuse themselves. In this way, the object can be a person, a thought or an event that attracts the attention since it does not live up to the expectation. The achievement of irony is done by mimicking, imitating or pretending to perform a failed utterances that stand as the object of mockery. Finally, the process of recognizing the irony and attempt to figure it out is done by realizing the violation of the ironic statement to the maximum of quality since the ironic statement does not fit into the situation. Therefore, the victim of irony should notice this violation and try quickly to decipher the intended meaning by breaking up the ironic statement and building it up again through the technique of de-familiarization.

Therefore, the ironic utterances are identified by being a state of pretending to perform. To elucidate, an action of imitating the actual occurrences in a mockery manner. Mimicking or imitating an already existing situation is in itself a kind of irony. However, ironical utterances cannot be analyzed on similar lines since they reflect and attribute to various situations. The source of irony can be a failure of hopes, expectations, wishes that are reflected in a mockery way. The pretense theory on irony suggests that ironic pretended utterances should imply two mechanisms. First, the pretence mechanism. Second is an attributive mechanism. In ironical statements, the two mechanisms are blended in order to let the ironist to pretend to perform a mocking directed towards the victim of irony.

1.2.3 Allusional Pretense Theory

This theory on irony is an explanation of the echoic theory of irony. Kumon Nakamura (1995) propose this theory which is connected to the classic Gricean theory and the one of echoic mention. However, it meant to offer a precise explanation of irony. The theory suggests two truths:

- 1) The ironic statement imply a violation of an expectation.
- 2) The ironic statement is pragmatically insincere and violates the maxim of truthfulness

The allusional pretense theory explains, how utterances of any major speech act categories can convey irony if the utterance is “used to allude to a failed expectation or violated norm” (Kumon-Nakamura et al., 1995, p. 89). An ironic utterance may be identified by an inherent pragmatic insincerity which is either a violation of a Gricean maxim or a felicity condition for speech acts. A person says “You sure know a lot.” this allusion violates the felicity condition for questions that you expect an answer when you ask something. This insincerity is inherent in all rhetorical questions. Kumon-Nakamura formulate for all major speech acts how they may be pragmatically insincere, i.e. which violations of felicity conditions may appear. They also note that their concept of allusion subsumes those of echoic mention since mentioning something is the direct way of alluding to it.

Similarly the necessity of pragmatic insincerity for ironic utterances generalizes Grice's requirement of a violation of the maxim of quality, but with their approach a violation of any maxim or felicity condition may suffice, it need not be the maxim of quality. KN give a plausible explanation for the asymmetry of the statement-meaning- relation. For example, why ironic utterances are much more likely to be formulated positively and meant negative than the other way around. This is because conventional expectations are more likely to be positive than negative. Allusional pretense theory refers to the violation of the unrealistic expectations. Therefore, this theory explains what other theories on irony cannot. However, allusional pretense theory lack of features and this lack remains as a disadvantage of this theory. Among the features that this theory miss to highlight are: the nature of allusion is ambiguous; not all ironic statement imply violation of the truthfulness maxim. They theory fails to attest to the process of recognizing and decoding the ironic statements.

1.2.4 Unified Theory

Utsumi (1996) proposes the unified theory of irony in which he formally defines an ironic utterance. He defines an ironic environment and an implicit display of ironic environment and then arranges those utterances as ironic which implicitly display an ironic environment. The ironic environment is formalized through situation theory and action theory while the implicit display is defined in terms of standard pragmatic theory. Utsumi agrees with Kumon-Nakamura et al. (1995) in that an ironic utterance alludes to a failed expectation, but Utsumi elaborates on how the speaker's expectation can fail. Either, the speaker expects to fulfil his expectation by performing an action or the expectation is fulfilled by doing nothing. In the first case, the expectation can fail if an action is performed or if the action is not performed. In the latter case the expectation can fail if an action is performed or it can fail accidentally. However, any of these ways of failed expectations creates an ironic environment. irony pragmatically violates the Gricean maxim of relevance with the ironic utterance. In the way, Utsumi elaborates on the different kinds of failing an expectation, what really sets his account apart from other theories of irony, is the intense formalism he employs.

The notions of allusion and pragmatic violation are essential to irony. However, previous theories are too general in that each of their proposed properties for being ironic also covers a part of non-ironic utterances, and at the same time, too specific in that each of them does not cover all ironic utterances. To make an adequate theory that explains both what irony is and what irony is not, we must integrate allusion, pragmatic violation, and other properties of irony into the theory. Thus the theory of irony must distinguish conditions for perceiving an utterance as ironic from those for an utterance being ironic. To the concern of this study, we will apply the four theories on the literary works of Ian McEwan.

1.3 Types of Irony

The concept of irony falls into many categories. A basic distinction is between the verbal irony that violates the linguistic principles and the situational irony that violates the clearly set principles on the world, e.g. the fire station burning down to the ground. Besides these two types, the dramatic irony is set and intended to tell an ironical event where some of the people know something while the others ignore. Socratic irony is the pretense of ignorance of a given topic, for pedagogical purposes, irony of fate is considered a situational irony. In addition to the unintended irony which is seen as an example of irony that is produced unintentionally since the ironist intends not to allow the victim to recognize, it is necessary to have a clear commentary on its types and usage. Here are the main types of irony:

1. Socratic irony:

This type of irony is produced when a dissimulation of ignorance practiced as a way to express a contradiction. In other words, Socrates used to show that he is ignorant when discussing a topic to attract the attention of his students. This kind of irony is intended to explain the way where the ironist pretend to know less than the victim of irony, but in fact he knows more. The technique is utilized to persuade the victim of irony by pretending knowing nothing so that the victim of irony can reveal and express himself further. A special kind of irony is often attached to the Socratic irony is the traditional irony that attests to the nature of irony and its functions and utilization.

2. Verbal Irony:

This sort of incongruity is regarded as a inconsistency between an utterance's expressed and expecting meaning. Verbal incongruity may be a explanation in which the meaning that the ironist employs is strongly distinctive from the meaning that's apparently communicated. An amusing articulation more often than not includes the explicit expression of one state of mind or assessment, but with indications within the generally speech-situation that the speaker extreme an awfully distinctive, and regularly inverse, state of mind or assessment. Verbal incongruity requires common information as other verbal communication does. This ordinary information, be that as it may, contrasts in many shapes from the shared foundation required for communication in common. Within the state of incongruity, this shared information got to include esteem judgment, which has got to do with the ironist's purposeful within the expression.

3. Situational Irony:

This sort of incongruity is displayed when there's a dissimilarity of deliberate and result; when the result of an activity is contrary to the required and expected. According to Lucariello (1994), situational irony is a mental term that implies two layers of meaning, the surface meaning and the bottom meaning. The external structure means "the place of the concept of situational irony in the complete knowledge base" (Lucariello 1994:143). In elucidation, a common system of information socially and culturally established about the human's vision of his surroundings. However, when this system is violated and the structure of knowledge is messed with and takes a radical turn resulted in a situational irony. Therefore, two ways of proccessing when it comes to situational irony are set: first, the activation of the expected series of actions that odes not lead to a serious violation. Second, the violation of the expectation results in the activation of the non-expected scenario that is known as the situational irony that is interpreted by breaking the situation up and attaching each and every part of the situation to its references to figure out the intended meaning by setting it apart from the literal meaning. Hence, there are two conceivable handling courses. The primary one is serial handling where information of what is anticipated to happen is enacted to begin with. In the event that the desire is damaged, at that point the information of non-expected occasion such as situational incongruity is enacted to decipher the circumstance

This process of two layers makes a detached gap between the shared knowledge of the audience and the characters. This contradiction between the truth and the expected outcome can only be understood as irony. This juxtaposition of what actually happened and what is expected to happen is processed as irony. The odd between what is said and what is meant violates and subverts the expectation and results in two kinds of meanings the overstated and the understate. Overlapping with the types of irony shows that the concept of irony in all its types is mainly known as a literary device that adds length and tension to the writing. The contrast between the things as they are supposed to be seem and what they turn out to be is the main semantic and pragmatic definition of the concept of irony.

4. Cosmic Irony:

This most fateful type of irony is directly associated with the concept of fate and destiny. It mocks the unexpected destinies of people and situations. This kind of irony alludes the fact that human are tiny creatures in this huge universe and there is nothing in their hands that they can master. They are supposed to be the master of their life but ironically they cannot decide what is next. They are supposed to control their destinies and fate but it turns out that the fate its self play with them as it wishes. The outside forces are difficult to be overcome and therefore there is no way of escaping their inimitable grasp but by mocking their harsh treatment. The uncertainty of humanity is the main reason of the huge detachment between what is expected and what is actually occurred. In sum, this kind of irony is considered with this sorts of controversial contradiction between the expected and the reality that is flying from the human's control. In sum, the cosmic irony measures and the highlight the joke that the universe played on the characters. Therefore, the conduction of this type of irony requires a contrast between what is known as the absolute and what is known as the relative. In other words, the contradiction between the general shared knowledge and the personal perspective. The term cosmic irony or corresponds to the irony of fate and believed that the destiny and the fates are ironically playing with the minds of the creatures. In sums, it produced by a radical contradiction between reality and human ideals, or between human intentions and actual results. Being a tool that adds length, width and depth to the writing, irony can reveal a violation of the opposition between what is expected and what is actually occurred.

5. Meta irony:

This type of irony is produced by being ironic about irony. In other words, this type of irony adds another layer to the irony and extend the already existed irony. Therefore, the ironic statement becomes muddled and extended into it is overlapped with another layer irony. In this respect, this kind of irony is the state of being ironic about being ironic. This type of irony is also known as the post irony as suggests using irony ironically. If I were to say something along the lines of "Humanity is an outdated, tired species whose time has come. Clearly we need to replace ourselves with robots," you might assume I am someone who is speaking out against full automation of jobs under the guise of a post-humanist (using the irony of that belief to push my actual belief). If I were to deeply explore, then, the inner workings of this post-humanist society, you would realize that I was using the irony as a cover for my beliefs (I am not an anti-automation person, I actually am a post-humanist). That would be post- ironic writing. If I were to make a statement such as "Society would be a lot better if we just killed anyone who we didn't like" that would be an example of meta-irony (because that is a legitimate belief of mine).

So if I am understanding this correctly, meta-irony involves using irony to disguise a belief that is held by someone. Meta-irony would still disguise a statement ironically but not explore the belief enough to show that it is an un-ironic belief. Meta-irony relies on the belief of a person and could never be proved un-ironic or ironic because the belief or lack of belief is never present. It would simply be a statement with no evidence to support irony or the lack of it. Because of this would that not mean that meta-irony can be overlooked if the reader sees the statement as only ironic? That would then mean that meta-irony could appear as normal irony if it was in the proper context. So I guess my final thought is to how many meta- ironic statements are seen as only ironic statements and think of the possibility that most meta-ironic examples are only a small amount of all meta-irony. Therefore, meta irony is a advanced kind of irony that is colored with personal beliefs and suggestions but still presented in disguise of a common language that hints at its commonplace truth. Using irony as a disguise to publish one's own ideas in a purpose to make it a shared knowledge.

6. Dramatic Irony:

This sort of incongruity is the foremost utilized sort by Shakespeare. Its misuses the gadget of giving the onlooker an thing of data that at slightest one of the characters within the account is unconscious of. The part of incongruity in show is originally highlighted and characterized as the confusion that's made when the importance of a character's discourse or activities is uncovered to the group of onlookers but obscure to the character concerned. A difference of mindfulness between an on-screen character and an eyewitness: when words and activities have importance that the audience or gathering of people gets it, but the speaker or character does not. It is most regularly utilized when the creator causes a character to talk or act wrongly, out of numbness of a few parcel of the truth of which the group of onlookers is mindful. Sensational incongruity included three stages: planning, suspension, and determination. Creating emotional incongruity is done by creating a strife between what the character depends and what is known by eyewitnesses. In summary, it means that the reader knows something that the characters in the piece are not aware of.

7. Tragic Irony:

This sort of incongruity could be a extraordinary category of emotional incongruity. In appalling incongruity, the utterances and the actions of the characters negate the genuine circumstance, which the onlookers completely recognize and realize. Appalling incongruity is characterized as the ambiguity made when the noteworthiness of a character's. Appalling incongruity is exemplified altogether in old dramatization. In that, old dramatization was particularly characterized by appalling incongruity since the group of onlookers observed a show unfurl, as of now knowing its predetermined result. In this manner, the groups of onlookers were recognizable with the plot of most of the plays dramatized. In Sophocles' *Oedipus the King*, for illustration, the gathering of people can see what Oedipus is daze to. The man he murders is his father, but he does not know it. Assist, Oedipus promises to discover the killer and curses him for the torment that he has caused, not knowing that the killer he has reviled and promised to discover is himself. The gathering of people knows that Oedipus himself is the killer that he is looking for whereas he himself does not know. Thus, the readers know the protagonist's faults.

8. Historical Irony:

When history is viewed through the modern perspective, there often appear sharp contrasts between the way traditional people viewed their world and life at their age by anticipating a better conditions and a prosperous future and what really happens. In certain kinds of chronicled irony, a factual truth is viewed by a person's oblivions of it or his conviction in its inverse. However, this concept of issues does not happen by human plan. Comparing the past utterances in the light of the later developments, the historical ironies float to the surface which make them radical and striking when they overviewed respectively. This type of irony mocks the history and pushes it the corner of stupidity. The present is being written, the future is unwritten yet but the past has already written with ink and no one can change it. The perspective that is taken from looking back into the past can suggest ironical utterances. Therefore, the historical irony is a mindset that provides and revive an ironic utterance or action produced in the past and attempt to mock it since it did not live to the expectation.

To conclude, most of this chapter is an answer to this question: "what is irony?". The chapter dealt with the term irony as a literary device, a concept, a method of writing and a literary theory. The chapter is meant to explain the difference and the distinguishing between irony and non-irony. Moreover, the chapter deals with the elements that constitute irony. Besides, it left a part to highlight and explain the process of irony and he procedure of decoding its codes. Moreover, the nature of irony, its usage, features and characteristics as well as its types are the center of this chapter. The chapter is concerning with the main theories of irony and their usage in Ian McEwan's literary works. In this chapter, I explained the main theories of irony and discussed their different standpoints as well as their perspectives of the construction of irony. The chapter proposed in full, the meaning of irony, its functions, purposes, usages, utilization and solve the riddles of description. Under the influence of Ian McEwan's works, this study will be done on irony and is associated with the perspective of irony as a way of a deep communication when the literal utterances fail to express the intended meaning. In conclusion, the chapter is a long commentary on the main theories that have dealt with the concept of irony with a full explanation of the functions of irony and its main types. In the chapter to follow, these theories will be applied on McEwan's multifaceted works to pick up the main ironic examples and figure out their intended meanings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Booth, Wayne C. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Childs, Peter and Nicolas Tredell. *The Fiction of Ian McEwan*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Colebrook, Claire. *Irony: The New Critical Idiom*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Hutcheon, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Malcolm, David. *Understanding Ian McEwan*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002.

McEwan, Ian. *Amsterdam*. New York: RosettaBooks LLC, 2003.

McEwan, Ian. *Atonement*. London: Vintage, 2002. McEwan, Ian. *Black Dogs*. London: Vintage, 1992.

McEwan, Ian. *Solar*. London: Vintage Books, 2011.

McEwan, Ian. *The Innocent*. New York: Bantam, 1991.