

# Explicit Verbal Irony and Means of Marking It in Journalistic Style of the Serbian and Croatian Languages

VIRNA KARLIĆ, GORAN KOLETIĆ (Zagreb)

The research topic of this paper is intentional explicit verbal irony, with a particular emphasis on determining the means of its marking in the journalistic style of standard Croatian and Serbian language. The first part of the paper presents the problem of providing a general definition of verbal irony, its characteristics and typology with regard to the means and media of its expression. The main part of the paper deals with determining irony markers in Serbian and Croatian by using content analysis of the corpus which comprises magazine articles in the respective languages. The selection of such a corpus is based on the assumption that the direction of the discourse towards a wide, and to the locutor unfamiliar audience (which s/he as an author does not make direct contact to) requires a more explicit verbal marking of irony than it is the case in a direct speech event, which opens the possibility of its marking through speech intonation, mimics, body language and other nonverbal means. The final part provides a conclusion about the results of the conducted research and about the applicability of the current interpretations of verbal irony in the corpus analysis.

## 1. Theoretical approaches to verbal irony

Until the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the attempts of defining irony were rooted in the Aristotle's interpretation, according to which it is an "[...] antiphrastic literary figure, where the speaker says A when s/he intends to convey B, and where B implies non-A" (DE SAUSSURE & SCHULZ 2009: 397–398). It was the development of stylistics and pragmatics that initiated reconsidering of the acceptability of such a definition, and questioning of the functions and methods of coding and decoding the rhetorical figure, whereas considerations of its nonverbal display also started to appear in further research.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the difference was established between: (1) intentional and unintentional verbal irony (intentional verbal irony is an irony which the locutor consciously and intentionally codes into an utterance, expecting that the recipient will detect it, whereas in the case of unintentional irony there is no such intention), and (2) explicit and non-explicit irony (explicit irony is an irony which the locutor suggests to the recipient by means of different types of verbal and nonverbal markers).

In line with the classification offered by EL RAFAIE (2005), contemporary linguistic and pragmatic interpretations of verbal irony can be divided into two basic groups: (1) the so-called (neo)-Gricean theories, according to which the ironic utterance is a non-literal type of utterance through which at least one maxim of conven-

1 "The basic nonverbal type of irony is situational irony – an unexpected or inappropriate feature of a situation or an event – [...] situations that are just not ment to be" (REYES et al. 2010: 2). In addition to this type, in literature other types are mentioned as well, e.g. musical, visual, dramatic and discourse irony.

tional cooperation among the participants in the speech act is being violated, since the literal content of the ironic utterance is opposite to the content which the locutor wishes to convey. Theories which belong to this group start with the assumption that we come to the meaning of the ironic utterance by simultaneous processing and rejecting of its literal meaning, with all possible assistance of various kinds of markers (e.g., intonation, gestures, etc.); (2) the so-called echo-theories, according to which the ironic utterance necessarily includes quoting somebody else's utterance – or in some cases – implicit norms, together with the locutor's disagreement with its literal meaning.

The foundations of the so-called echoic approach to verbal irony were laid by SPERBER & WILSON (1981) whose influential theory is based on criticizing its traditional antiphrastic interpretation, which also the so-called (neo)-Gricean ideas were based on. Sperber and Wilson see the main drawbacks of the traditional approach to verbal irony in neglecting/avoiding the question how the meaning of an ironic utterance is conveyed and how the hearer detects its irony, as well as in ignoring the fact that the antiphrastic interpretation of verbal irony is not in all cases sufficient or appropriate at all. There are three fundamental premises of Sperber and Wilson's interpretation of verbal irony: (1) the locutor recognizes the irony of the utterance on the basis of the irrelevance of its literal interpretation in the given context; (2) the ironic utterance is metarepresentational in the sense that it includes a kind of imaginary "scene" in which someone is represented as an object of ridicule (the real or imaginary person who would use the given utterance non-ironically), and the literal content of the utterance during the speech event is obviously inappropriate; (3) the ironic utterance implicitly comprises the locutor's attitude that its literal content is humorous, and therefore differs from sarcasm.

DUCROT's (1984) ideas are similar. He starts with the assumption that the ironic utterance has several competitive meanings which is the result of the locutor's split into several instances: (1) *locutor* as a person who produces the utterance; (2) *speaker* as a person who participates in the speech event; (3) *enunciator* as an existing or imaginary person placed on "the stage/scene of the utterance". Ducrot, namely, believes that the *instance of the locutor* impersonates the *instance of the enunciator* who represents the literal meaning of the utterance that contradicts the meaning which the *instance of the speaker* wants to convey.

A related, but somewhat different interpretation is offered by CLIFT (1999) who notes that irony always includes two semantic aspects simultaneously, and that by marking the *shifting frame* around what had been said enables at the same time saying and denying what had been expressed within that frame. In other words, through irony a double perspective is depicted, which simultaneously invokes what it is and what it could be or should have been, whereby the locutor provides an implicit evaluation and appeals to the hearer to recognize and accept his perspective.

In their critical review of the approaches presented here, and some other current theoretical approaches to this issue, DE SAUSSURE and SCHULZ (2009) express their disagreement with the premises which they are dominantly based on. First of all, they claim that the humorous element of the ironic utterance is not due to inappropriateness or redundancy of the proposition in the context of the speech event, but is directly related to the locutor who produces the utterance. Furthermore, the authors

argue that the ironic utterance is not just a non-literal utterance whose content is conveyed implicitly, because by converting the implicit content into the explicit content this very “intangible” and “elusive” ironic and potentially humorous element gets lost, which is reflected in the impossibility of its paraphrasing (e.g., *Hvala ti na rođendanskoj čestitci.* → *Jučer mi nisi čestitao rođendan, stoga je moja zahvala na čestitci neprikladna i smiješna.*<sup>2</sup>). With regard to that “intangibility” and “elusiveness” of the ironic element, irony – according to the authors – includes non-propositional contents which can not be verbalized and are associated with the locutor’s emotions and attitudes. Its implementation/existence depends on the ability of the hearer to identify it. In addition, the authors point out that irony does not necessarily involve putting forward the “false” proposition, but implies a mandatory presence of the locutor’s implicit attitude of disagreeing with the real or imaginary person who the locutor “puts on the scene” of the utterance and who, in a given context, would make this utterance without the ironic shift. In this sense, as stated by De Saussure and Schulz, irony always involves a certain level of discrepancy with the standard conventions, and is directly concerned with the non-propositional knowledge and is necessarily related to the notion of subjectivity.

Regardless which theoretical approach to verbal irony is considered, until today there has not been offered a definition which would, for someone who is not familiar with the term, evoke what kind of linguistic tool/effect that is, let alone establish clear boundaries with its related concepts such as sarcasm, satire and humor. The reason for that lies in the fact that irony is not only a rhetorical device which enables the locutor to express something in an indirect rather than a direct way, and that the ironic utterance can not be considered solely on the basis of the semantic reference of the utterance. Understanding the mechanism on which irony is based requires consideration of the locutor’s intention and the effects the locutor wants to achieve with the hearer, and is therefore linked to the notion of subjectivity, as well to the deictic situation in which the speech event was performed (its physical and conventional aspect, and the locutor’s and hearer’s mutual and encyclopedic knowledge, etc.). Irony is, furthermore, a linguistic tool which requires cognitive skills of abstraction and metarepresentation, and falls within the domain of the so-called figurative language which includes information that is not uttered (only) through lexical and grammatical means, but affects various levels of language (from the selection of lexemes, syntactic structures, semantics and conceptualization), which is why it is unrealistic to seek a general definition in only one technique or algorithm (REYES et al. 2012: 1–4).

Since the fundamental aim of this research is to determine the means of marking explicit verbal irony in the journalistic style of standard Serbian and Croatian language, the paper will take into consideration all existing current interpretations of verbal irony, and will finally arrive at the conclusion on its applicability, as well as its advantages and disadvantages when applied to given materials.

2 [Thank you for your birthday wishes. – Yesterday you didn’t congratulate me on my birthday, therefore is my thank you note inappropriate and ridiculous.]

## 2. Explicit verbal irony and journalistic style

Since the main focus of this paper is to determine the means of marking intentional explicit verbal irony, the research was conducted on a corpus of journalistic texts, because – according to EL RIFAIE (2005) – the journalistic irony is mainly explicitly marked for two key reasons: (1) it appears in a context in which the ironic meaning is not necessarily expected; (2) because the author wants to avoid the possibility that readers overlook it, and thus misinterpret the message of his/her text. The representation of irony in journalistic style depends also from the genre of the journalistic text. It is, for example, more represented in columns and other journalistic forms in which authors express their opinions and attitudes, and do not bring objective news. However, according to BRUCK (1989), in these forms it is more rarely marked explicitly. Furthermore, the reader's recognition of an implicit ironic utterance can also be conditioned by who the author is and, for example, what the political affiliation of the publication in which the text was published is. Thus, it can be concluded that the level of unexpectedness of verbal irony in some publication is diametrically opposite to the level of representation of its markers.<sup>3</sup>

PARTINGTON (2011) argues that the basic function of verbal irony in journalistic style is indirect and subtle expression of (mainly negative and critical) attitudes which are censored, i.e. moderated to some extent by its usage (that censorship is, of course, more subtle in case of implicit verbal irony<sup>4</sup>). Furthermore, EL RIFAIE (2005) believes that ironic utterances (which the author defines as *framed evaluations*) in journalistic style perform the function of asking the reader to embrace the author's external, critical frame of the utterance.

According to KREUZ (1996), verbal irony can be marked in different ways: (1) by means of discrepancy between the content of the utterance and reality; by using (2) hyperboles; (3) rhetorical questions; (4) neologisms; (5) malapropisms; (6) specific registers and generally unexpected linguistic elements within some form or genre, and (7) typographical markers such as quotation marks, *italics* and *bold*. For the purpose of analyzing the corpus, we added to this list lexical and phrasal irony, which is structured by combining elements within the utterance through opposing evaluative polarities, which "stirs up" the reader's expectations that the interpretation of the utterance will necessarily be direct and consistent in any part of the discourse (PARTINGTON 2011). Partington divides phrasal irony in two groups: (1) evaluative oxymora – a combination of seemingly contradictory elements; (2) replacement of elements through evaluative contrast in familiar collocations.

3 The need for explicit marking of verbal irony is generally greater in the context of indirect speech acts that are not performed "face to face", especially in cases when the participants do not know each other.

4 PARTINGTON (2011: 1786) argues that explicit verbal irony implies explicit juxtaposition of two narratives which are incongruent with each other, whereas implicit irony implies that "[...] only one of the narratives is present in the text (*the dictum*), whilst the other (*the implicatum*) remains unspoken and has to be (re-)constructed by the audience".

### 3. Analysis of the corpus

The analysis was conducted on a corpus which consisted of the Serbian weekly magazines *Vreme* and *NIN*, and the Croatian weekly magazines *Globus* and *Aktual*, published in the period between February 1 and April 1 in 2013. Examples of implicit and explicit verbal irony were, as expected, most numerous in columns, and sporadically appeared in other journalistic forms. The largest number of examples was found in *Vreme* and *Globus*, which can be interpreted by the fact that the journalistic form of column is more represented in these magazines than in the other two publications. It should also be noted that the majority of examples were taken from columns of some authors who are prone to an ironic discourse (e.g., Teofil Pančić, Tanja Torbarina, Boris Dežulović, etc.). Although in their texts implicit irony is dominant (which is consistent with BRUCK's (1989) thesis on the diametrical opposition between the level of unexpectedness of verbal irony and the level of representation of its markers), there are also examples with explicit irony.

The means of explicit markers determined in the analyzed corpus can be classified into five basic groups, and for each group their representative examples are given:

#### Example 1

- (a) Neki od Petrovićevih “naučnih” stavova govore da postoje divovi [...] (*Vreme*, 7 February 2013, Nr. 1153, p. 68)<sup>5</sup>
- (b) [...] Demokratska stranka je usput zatražila i zabranu NSP Naši, koju je Ustavni sud onomad bio “pomilovao” pod vrlo, hm, *interesantnim* okolnostima. (*Vreme*, 14 March 2013, Nr. 1158, p. 29)<sup>6</sup>

(1) The first group of means of explicit marking detected in the corpus is made of typographic markers. Thus, in Example 1a the author of the journalistic text uses quotation marks to signal to the reader that he used the lexeme *naučnih* (*scientific*) in an ironic sense, and that – in accordance with the antiphrastic definition of irony – he considers the attitudes of the Petrović in question nonscientific. In addition to quotation marks, *italics* also often have the same function in the corpus. By using such a typographic marker, the author of the column signals to the reader in Example 1b that he used the lexeme *interesantnim* (*interesting*) in a non-literal, ironic sense. However, it should be noted that this example can hardly be explained within the antiphrastic or echoic definition of irony as the author with his utterance wants to imply to his readers that the circumstances of the amnesty in question were not interesting, and that by using the given lexeme it was not his intention to put “on the scene of the utterance” someone who would in that context use it in its literal meaning. It is believed that in this case the author uses the phrase *interesantne okolnosti* (*interesting circumstances*) as a kind of a euphemism for the circumstances he considers suspicious and immoral. Since the meaning of the adjective *interesantan* (*interesting*) has a positive connotation, because it implies a desirable characteristic/feature

5 [Some of Petrović's “scientific” opinions show that giants exist (...)]

6 [(...) The Democratic Party has requested a ban for the party NSP Naši, which has recently received a pardon by the Constitutional Court under very, hhm, *interesting* circumstances.]

of human beings, things or phenomena, the meaning which the author conveys in this example can be considered as its evaluative contrast, which leads to the fact that the mechanism, which the irony of this utterance is based on, can still be reduced to an – although “loosened” – antiphrastic formula.

#### Example 2

- (a) Vučelić se za svog vaktā sigurno vozio šinobusom, a ja ga sasvim slučajno nikada nisam sreo. *Moš misliti.* (*Vreme*, 7 February 2013, Nr. 1153, p. 47)<sup>7</sup>
- (b) Kako bi građanin koji nema nijednu kolumnu, *a takvih slučajeva još uvek ima*, mogao da se suprotstavi rasipništvu vlade? (*Vreme*, 7 March 2013, Nr. 1157, p. 51)<sup>8</sup>
- (c) Jer fakat, jel ikom palo na pamet da bi Isus za nošenje križa na križnom putu tražio križ od stiropora? (*Globus*, 22 February 2013, Nr. 1159, p. 4)<sup>9</sup>

(2) Another type of verbal irony marker which was found in the corpus are *comments of framed evaluations*<sup>10</sup>, by means of which the authors, in a very explicit way, indicate to the reader the irony of the utterance to which the comment refers to (Example 2a). However, comments do not have to necessarily perform the function of marking the irony of an utterance, but can be ironic themselves. Thus, in Example 2b we have a comment whose irony is detected based on redundancy of its literal content. In such cases, comments do not perform the function of marking verbal irony, but are their holders. To this category we could also add rhetorical questions as a specific type of comment by means of which the irony of the previous discourse can be marked or which themselves are ironic as it is the case in Example 2c.

#### Example 3

- (a) A i sa sramotu od sramote će se lakše izborimo. (*Vreme*, 7 February 2013, Nr. 1153, p. 23)<sup>11</sup>
- (b) Samo se kaže *Oliv ojl Kroejša* i svi *ostaju paf*. (*Globus*, 8 March 2013, Nr. 1161, p. 6)<sup>12</sup>

(3) The analysis of the corpus, furthermore, showed that the authors of journalistic texts often, for the purpose of marking the irony of the utterance, use features or elements of unexpected and contextually inappropriate registers. Thus, in Example 3a

7 [In his time Vučelić certainly took the rail bus, and I accidentally never saw him. *Yeab, right.*]

8 [How could a citizen who does not have any column, *and there are still such cases*, stand up against the lavishness of the government?]

9 [Really now, has it occurred to anyone that Jesus would ask for a cross made of styrofoam on the Way of Cross?]

10 This term is introduced in line with EL RIFAE's (2005) interpretation who defines the ironic utterances as *framed evaluations* which in the journalistic style perform the function of asking the reader to embrace the author's external, critical frame of the utterance.

11 [This embarrassment will be easier to overcome with a new embarrassment] (in Kosovo-Resava dialect).

12 [You just say *Oliv ojl Kroejša* and that leaves everyone speechless.]

the author of the column deviates from the norm of standard Serbian language by using linguistic features of the Kosovo-Resava dialect for invoking Ivica Dačić on the “scene of the utterance” (the current Prime Minister of Serbia who was born in Prizren which is located in the area of Kosovo-Resava dialect).

In Example 3b the author of the column uses more unexpected and contextually inappropriate elements. By using the English language which is written according to the principles of phonetic spelling in the first part of the utterance, she marks its irony based on the mechanism of echoic type, whereas by using the jargon expression *ostati paf* (*be left speechless*) she marks the antiphrastic nature of the utterance as a whole.

Example 4

Eto, gospodinu Premijeru se dogodila i ta *Banana*. (*Vreme*, 7 February 2013, Nr. 1153, p. 23)<sup>13</sup>

(4) Furthermore, we found in the corpus several cases in which the author of the journalistic text uses word play as a marker of an ironic utterance. Examples of word play detected in the corpus are various, and their mechanisms are based on various principles. So, for example, in the utterance number 4 the author of the column plays with the nickname of Rodoljub Radulović (Miša Banana), a drug smuggler and an acquaintance of Serbian Prime Minister Ivica Dačić, for what Dačić was caught up in a political scandal. The author uses, namely, the proper noun *Banana* at the same time in the jargon utterance *dogodila se banana* (in jargon: *something that went wrong; something unfortunate happened*), by which he implies his ironic attitude towards the events described in the previous discourse.

Example 5

(a) [...] da sruše *prepoštenog* de Dačića. (*Vreme*, 14 February 2013, Nr. 1154, p. 17)<sup>14</sup>

(b) U poređenju s ljudskim mizerijama i krpama koje danas vučiče, dačiće i slične ležerno proglašavaju Đinđićevim političkim naslednicima, čak su i “*Našisti*” *moralne i intelektualne gromade* [...] (*Vreme*, 14 March 2013, Nr. 1158, p. 49)<sup>15</sup>

(c) Posle sat i po, nad bezrazložno gomilane prateće glasove vratila se Marina, najzad na radnoj temperaturi, i uzastopnim “Ja sam lažljiva” i najvećim YU-hitom “Program tvog kompjutera” dovela večer do *klimakterijuma – pardon, klimaksa*. (*Vreme*, 14 March 2013, Nr. 1158, p. 49)<sup>16</sup>

13 [You see! That “Banana” also happened to the Prime Minister.]

14 [(...) to bring down the too honest Dačić.]

15 [In comparison with human miseries and rags which today casually declare all the Vučićs, Dačićs and similar to be Đinđić’s political successors, even the “*Našists*” are *moral and intellectual giants* (...)].

16 [After an hour and a half Marina came back to her unreasonably large group of backup singers, and in a hot atmosphere, by singing repeatedly “I’m mendacious” and the biggest YU-hit “Your computer’s program”, brought the evening to *a climacterium – pardon, a climax*.]

(d) Najveća zvijezda budućih lokalnih izbora je don Ivan Grubišić. *Mladi talent od 77 godina*. (*Globus*, 22 February 2013, Nr. 1159, p. 4)<sup>17</sup>

(e) Samo *svađa* Srbina spasava (*NIN* 28 February 2013, Nr. 3244, p. 22); Ko čeka, *ne* dočeka (*NIN*, 28 February 2013, Nr. 3244, p. 52)<sup>18</sup>

(5) In accordance with KREUZ's (1996) and PARTINGTON's (2011) classification, lexical and phrasal means used for marking irony which were detected in the corpus can be divided into five subgroups: (a) hyperboles; (b) neologisms; (c) malapropisms; (d) evaluative oxymora; (e) replacement of elements through evaluative contrast in familiar collocations.

(a) in Example 5a the author of the column uses the hyperbole *prepošten* (*too honest*) to imply the antiphrastic, ironic use of the given lexeme; (b) in Example 5b the author of the column has created a new expression through which he implies the irony of the whole utterance – it is a coined word from the title of the *Serbian National Movement NAŠI* and the lexeme *fašisti* (*fascists*). Beside this neologism, the additional function of marking the irony of the utterance is performed by the hyperbole *moralne i intelektualne gromade* (*moral and intellectual giants*); (c) in Example 5c the journalist uses a malapropism, which he then corrects by using the “right” expression, and by doing that indicates the ironic, external frame of the utterance; (d) in Example 5d the author of the article uses the oxymoron to imply to the reader the ironic interpretation of the previous sentence; (e) in Example 5e the authors signal to the readers the irony of the utterance by replacing elements through its evaluative contrast in familiar collocations.

Since the analysis was conducted on a small corpus, the possibility of other types and subtypes of verbal irony markers is open. However, even in spite of the limitations of the analyzed materials, they demonstrated the need for supplementing KREUZ's (1996) classification. Beside PARTINGTON's (2011) phrasal means, two additional categories of verbal irony markers have been introduced: word plays and *comments of framed evaluations*. Example 4 shows only one of a number of possible ways in which the authors of journalistic articles – by using the possibility of playing with some words or expressions – suggest their ironic and critical attitude towards the content of the utterance. A particularly explicit type of irony markers are comments by means of which the authors directly indicate the irony of the utterance which the comment refers to (Example 2).

The analysis has, furthermore, shown that in numerous cases multiple verbal irony markers are used at the same time (e.g., in Example 1b the author combines the typographic marker, i.e., *italics*, and the comment *hm*), which can be explained by the fact that the majority of listed types of verbal irony markers are not maximally explicit since the mentioned typographic and linguistic means can be used in a non-ironic context. Thus, the implementation of the ironic element in the utterance, in spite of its – more or less – explicit marking by the locutor, depends partly on the lo-

17 [The biggest star of the forthcoming local elections is Don Ivan Grubišić. *A young talent of 77.*]

18 [Only *a fight* saves the Serbs (instead of *Only solidarity saves the Serbs*); All things *don't* come to him who waits (instead of *all things come to him who waits*).]



cutor's ability to detect it. Although it is not possible to determine the universal "scale of explicitness" of some types of verbal irony markers, based on the analysis of the corpus it can be concluded that the *comments of framed evaluations* and typographic markers are the most explicit types of verbal irony markers, whereas the level of explicitness of the remaining types of markers depends on the context in which they appear.

The discrepancy between the content of the utterance and the reality, which takes the first place on Partington's list of verbal irony markers, was not taken into account in this paper, since we believe that it does not fit into the definition of explicit, but implicit verbal irony. Furthermore, we believe that a possible addition to the classification of explicit verbal irony markers could be the discrepancy between the content of an utterance and the content of the remaining discourse which this utterance is part of (e.g., the title of the text *Sve za bebe* (*Everything for the babies*), in which the poor state of maternity wards in Serbia is discussed – *Vreme*, 7 February 2013, Nr. 1153, p. 39), but it is considered unnecessary, because such examples can be classified under the umbrella category of *comment of framed evaluations*.

#### 4. Conclusion

Based on the conducted analysis of the corpus comprising four magazines, three conclusions can be reached: (1) there is a series of typographic and linguistic means which in the journalistic style of standard Serbian and Croatian can perform the function of verbal irony markers. These markers are different from each other regarding the level of explicitness of the ironic element that they give to an utterance; (2) the prevailing attitude is that the division of irony between the explicit and implicit type is too rigid, and the explicitness of verbal irony should be seen as a scalar concept; (3) the examples from the analyzed corpus confirm the aforementioned attitude of some linguists that the existing definitions of verbal irony – of both (neo)-Gricean and echoic type – are insufficient, and that, as stated by REYES et al. (2010: 1–4), it is unrealistic to seek a general definition in only one algorithm. A large number of examples listed in the previous section, which were intuitively detected as ironic utterances, can not be classified as antiphrastic utterances, nor as *framed evaluations*. Thus, e.g. the underlined ironic comment in Example 2b can not be interpreted by using the antiphrastic theory of irony because it is a true one, nor can it be interpreted by the echoic theory because it is not a metarepresentational one. This leads to the conclusion that the issue of defining verbal irony is still open.

#### References

- BRUCK, Peter A. (1989): "Strategies for peace, strategies for news research". *Journal of Communication* 39. 108–129.
- CLIFT, Rebecca (1999): "Irony in conversation". *Language in Society* 28. 523–553.
- DE SAUSSURE, Louis; SCHULZ, Peter (2009): "Subjectivity out of irony". *Semiotica* 173. 397–416.
- DUCROT, Oswald (1984): *Le dire et le dit*. Paris.
- EL RAFAIE, Elisabeth (2005): "Our Purebred Ethnic Compatriots: Irony in Newspaper Journalism". *Journal of Pragmatics* 37. 781–797.
- KREUZ, Roger J. (1996): "The use of verbal irony: cues and constraints". In: Jeffery S. Mio, Albert N. Katz (eds.): *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Mahwah NJ. 23–38.

- LAGERWERF, Luuk (2007): "Effects of Relevant Inappropriateness". *Journal of Pragmatics* 39. 1702–1721.
- PARTINGTON, Alan (2011): "Phrasal irony: Its form, function and exploitation". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43. 1786–1800.
- REYES, Antonio; ROSSO, Paolo; BUSCALDI, Davide (2010): "From humor recognition to irony detection: The figurative language of social media". *Data & Knowledge Engineering* 74. 1–12.
- SPERBER, Dan; WILSON, Deidre (1981): "Irony and the use-mention distinction". In: Peter Cole (ed.): *Radical Pragmatics*. New York. 295–318.