# A Pragmatic Study of Irony in TV Shows

## Abdulkarim Fadhil Jameel
## University of Baghdad
## College of Education for Humanities
## abdulkarim.fadhil@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

**Abstract:**
The study of verbal irony is a complex form of communication that relies on a variety of contextual, implied, and intention-based aspects. The linguistic-based model provides a structured framework for dissecting the show's use of irony, allowing viewers to appreciate the nuanced interplay between language, context, and character dynamics that makes "Friends" a timeless and beloved sitcom. The study found that pragmatics and irony are interconnected through concepts like contextual interpretation, implicature, flouting maxims, tone and intonation, presuppositions, and politeness strategies. Understanding irony often relies on pragmatics because it involves context, implied meanings, and speaker intentions. The study concludes that "Friends" effectively uses verbal irony to enhance humor, deepen character dynamics, and convey underlying emotions. The linguistic-based model provides a structured framework for appreciating the show's use of irony.
Keywords: pragmatic study. the irony . TV programs

دراسة تداولية للسخرية في البرامج التلفزيونية

عبد الكريم فاضل جميل

جامعة بغداد

كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الإنسانية

abdulkarim.fadhil@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

الملخص

تعتبر دراسة السخرية اللفظية شكلاً معقدًا من أشكال التواصل الذي يعتمد على مجموعة متنوعة من الجوانب السياقية والضمنية والقائمة على النية. يوفر النموذج القائم على اللغة إطارًا منظمًا لتشريح استخدام العرض للسخرية، مما يسمح للمشاهدين بتقدير التفاعل الدقيق بين اللغة والسياق وديناميكيات الشخصية التي تجعل من "الأصدقاء" مسلسلًا هزليًا خالدًا ومحبوبًا. وجدت الدراسة أن البراغماتية والسخرية مترابطتان من خلال مفاهيم مثل التفسير السياقي، والتضمين، والاستهزاء بالقواعد، والنبرة والتجويد، والافتراضات، واستراتيجيات المداراة. غالبًا ما يعتمد فهم السخرية على البراغماتية لأنها تتضمن السياق والمعاني الضمنية ونوايا المتحدث. وخلصت الدراسة إلى أن مسلسل "الأصدقاء" يستخدم بشكل فعال السخرية اللفظية لتعزيز الفكاهة وتعميق ديناميكيات الشخصية ونقل المشاعر الكامنة. يوفر النموذج القائم على اللغة إطارًا منظمًا لتقدير استخدام العرض للسخرية.

الكلمات المفتاحية : دراسة تداولية . السخرية . البرامج التلفزيونية

## Statement of the problem

Verbal irony is a rhetorical device that involves saying something different from or opposite to what is meant, often for humorous or sarcastic effect. Verbal irony is widely used in various forms of media, such as literature, film, and television, to create meaning and engage the audience. However, verbal irony is not always easy to identify and interpret, as it depends on various factors, such as the speaker's intention, the listener's expectation, the context of the situation, and the linguistic cues that signal irony. Therefore, there is a need for a systematic and comprehensive analysis of verbal irony in different media genres, especially in popular TV shows that have a large and diverse audience.

One of the most successful and influential TV shows of all time is "Friends", an American sitcom that ran for ten seasons from 1994 to 2004. The show revolves around the lives of six friends living in New York City, who often face humorous and dramatic situations in their personal and professional lives. The show is known for its witty and clever dialogue, which frequently employs verbal irony to create humor, develop characters, and express emotions. However, despite the popularity and cultural impact of "Friends", there has been little academic research on the use and function of verbal irony in the show. Most of the existing studies on verbal irony in TV shows focus on other genres, such as drama, crime,

or science fiction, or use different theoretical frameworks, such as cognitive, pragmatic, or sociolinguistic approaches. Therefore, there is a gap in the literature on how verbal irony is used and understood in sitcoms, particularly in "Friends".

**Significance**

This study is twofold. First, it contributes to the field of pragmatics, which is the study of how language is used and interpreted in context. Pragmatics is an important branch of linguistics, as it helps to explain how people communicate effectively and appropriately in various situations. By applying a pragmatic model to analyze verbal irony in "Friends", this study demonstrates how pragmatics can be used to understand and appreciate the complexity and richness of verbal irony as a form of communication. This study also shows how pragmatics and irony are interconnected through concepts such as contextual interpretation, implicature, flouting maxims, tone and intonation, presuppositions, and politeness strategies. These concepts are essential for explaining how verbal irony works and what effects it has on the speaker, the listener, and the message.

Second, this study contributes to the field of media studies, which is the study of how media influences and reflects society and culture. Media studies is an interdisciplinary field that examines various aspects of media, such as production, content, representation, reception, and impact. By analyzing verbal irony in "Friends", this study reveals how media uses language to create meaning and engage the audience. This study also explores how verbal irony in "Friends" reflects and shapes the social and cultural values and norms of the time and place of the show, such as friendship, love, gender, sexuality, and identity. Furthermore, this study examines how verbal irony in "Friends" affects and appeals to the audience's emotions, attitudes, and preferences, and how it influences their perception and interpretation of the show and its characters.

**Objectives**

The main objective of this study is to analyze verbal irony in "Friends" using a pragmatic model. The specific objectives are:

- To identify and classify the types and examples of verbal irony in "Friends", such as sarcasm, hyperbole, understatement, rhetorical questions, irony of situation, and irony of fate.
- To explain and illustrate how verbal irony in "Friends" is signaled and recognized by the linguistic cues, such as lexical, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic markers.
- To explore and evaluate how verbal irony in "Friends" is influenced and constrained by the context of the situation, such as the setting, the topic, the relationship, and the intention of the speaker and the listener.

- To discuss and demonstrate how verbal irony in "Friends" serves various functions and purposes, such as creating humor, developing character, expressing emotion, criticizing, complimenting, or persuading.
- To compare and contrast how verbal irony in "Friends" differs or resembles verbal irony in other TV shows or media genres, such as drama, crime, or science fiction.

**Methodology**

The methodology of this study is based on a qualitative and descriptive approach. The data for this study consists of 20 episodes of "Friends", selected randomly from the ten seasons of the show. The episodes are transcribed and annotated using a software program that allows for the identification and coding of verbal irony and its linguistic and contextual features. The data analysis is conducted using a pragmatic model that consists of four steps: identification, recognition, interpretation, and evaluation of verbal irony. The model is adapted from previous studies on verbal irony in TV shows, such as Attardo et al. (2003), Burgers et al. (2012), and Dynel (2014). The results of the data analysis are presented and discussed using descriptive statistics, tables, charts, and examples. The results are also compared and contrasted with the findings of other studies on verbal irony in TV shows or media genres. The limitations and implications of the study are also addressed.

**Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is one of the main branches of linguistics, and it focuses on the study of language in context. It explores how people use language to communicate effectively, considering not only the literal meaning of words and sentences but also the implied meanings, intentions, and social aspects of communication. Pragmatics is concerned with understanding how language is used in real-world situations, taking into account the speaker's goals, the listener's interpretation, and the broader cultural and social context (Asher & Lascarides, 1998).

As a branch of linguistics, pragmatics is mainly concerned with the study of the following concepts:

**Speech Acts:** Pragmatics examines the idea of speech acts, which are the actions performed through language. Utterances are not just a string of words but can also be requests, commands, promises, questions, and more (Back, 1994). Pragmatic analysis helps identify the function and intention behind these speech acts.

**Implicature:** Implicature is a central concept in pragmatics. It refers to the information that is conveyed indirectly or implied in a conversation. For example, when someone says, "It's getting late," they might imply that it's time to leave

without explicitly stating it. Pragmatics helps unravel such implied meanings (Grice, 1975).

**Presupposition:** Pragmatics also deals with presuppositions, which are background assumptions or information that speakers assume their listeners already know or accept. Understanding presuppositions is crucial for interpreting meaning in context (Asher & Lascarides, (1998).

**Context:** Context plays a vital role in pragmatic analysis. Pragmatists consider the context of a conversation, including the physical setting, participants' identities, shared knowledge, and the broader social and cultural environment. Context helps in interpreting ambiguous or incomplete utterances (Hyland, 1998).

**Conversational Maxims:** Philosopher Paul Grice introduced the cooperative principle and its associated maxims, which are guidelines that speakers and listeners follow to ensure effective communication. These maxims include maxim of relevance, maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, and maxim of manner. Pragmatics studies how these maxims are used or flouted in conversation (Thomas, 1997).

**Politeness and Face:** Pragmatics also explores politeness strategies and how people manage their "face," which refers to one's public self-image or identity in interaction. Politeness theory, developed by sociolinguists Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, is a significant framework in this regard.

**Speech Act Theory:** Developed by philosophers like J.L. Austin and John Searle, speech act theory is a foundational concept in pragmatics. It categorizes utterances into illocutionary acts (the intended action) and perlocutionary acts (the effect on the listener) Searle, Kiefer, & Bierwisch, (1980).

**Cross-Cultural Pragmatics:** Pragmatics also explores how linguistic norms and conventions can vary across different cultures and languages, leading to different communication styles and expectations (Wierzbicka, 2003).

In essence, pragmatics helps in understanding how language users navigate the complexities of everyday communication. It goes beyond the study of sentence structure and grammar to investigate the dynamics of effective, contextually appropriate, and culturally sensitive communication. Pragmatics is particularly relevant in fields such as sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and the study of language in real-world situations.

**Irony**

Irony is a complex and nuanced form of expression in language that often involves saying one thing while meaning another. There are several different types of

irony, and linguistic analysis can help identify them. Here are some common types of irony and how they can be analyzed linguistically (Wilson, 2006):

**Verbal Irony:** Verbal irony occurs when a speaker says something but means the opposite. Linguistic analysis of verbal irony involves examining the words and phrases used in a statement and identifying any cues that suggest the opposite meaning. For example, if someone says, "What a beautiful day" when it's actually raining heavily, the irony can be detected by analyzing the discrepancy between the statement and the actual weather conditions (Wilson, 2006).

**Dramatic Irony:** Dramatic irony occurs when the audience or reader knows something that the characters in a story do not. In literature, this can be analyzed by looking at the information provided to the audience and comparing it to what the characters know or believe. Linguistic analysis may involve examining narrative elements and dialogue to identify instances of dramatic irony ( Garmendia, 2018).

**Situational Irony:** Situational irony involves a situation where the outcome is the opposite of what was expected. Linguistic analysis of situational irony often focuses on the context and the expectations set by the language used. For example, if someone says, "What a convenient time for my car to break down!" when they are already running late for an important meeting, the irony lies in the unexpected inconvenience of the situation ( Garmendia, 2018).

**Sarcasm:** Sarcasm is a form of verbal irony that is often used to mock or convey contempt. Linguistic analysis of sarcasm includes examining tone, intonation, and context to identify the speaker's true meaning. Sarcasm is often characterized by a mocking or insincere tone that contrasts with the literal meaning of the words spoken.

**Ironic Juxtaposition:** Sometimes, irony is created by placing two contrasting ideas or elements side by side. Linguistic analysis in such cases involves identifying the opposing elements and understanding how they create irony through their juxtaposition. For example, a headline like "World's Greatest Chef Burns Toast" creates irony by contrasting the high expectation of a "world's greatest chef" with the mundane act of burning toast (Wilson, 2006).

**Hyperbole and Understatement:** Irony can also be expressed through exaggeration (hyperbole) or understatement. Linguistic analysis involves identifying instances of hyperbolic or understated language and understanding how they convey irony by overstating or understating a situation or emotion (Colston & O'Brien, 2000).

The analysis in this study will be focused on verbal irony since it is mainly related to and detected by linguistic tools and apparatuses.

**The Study of Irony in Pragmatics**

Pragmatics plays a crucial role in understanding and analyzing irony because irony often relies on context, implied meanings, and the speaker's intentions—all of which are central to pragmatic analysis. Pragmatics and irony are connected within the following criteria:

**Contextual Interpretation:** Irony often involves saying something but meaning something else. To decipher the intended meaning of an ironic statement, one must consider the context in which it is uttered. Pragmatics helps in understanding how the context influences the interpretation of irony. This includes taking into account the speaker's tone, the situation, the relationship between the participants, and the shared knowledge between them.

**Implicature:** Irony frequently relies on implicature, which is a concept studied in pragmatics. Implicature involves deriving implied meanings from an utterance. In ironic statements, the speaker may imply the opposite of what is said, and understanding this implicature is essential to grasping the irony.

**Flouting Maxims:** Irony often involves flouting one or more of Grice's conversational maxims, which are part of pragmatic theory. For instance, a speaker may violate the maxim of quality (saying something false or misleading) to create irony. Pragmatics helps in identifying these violations and the intended ironic effect.

**Tone and Intonation:** Pragmatics considers the speaker's tone, intonation, and non-verbal cues in communication. These factors are instrumental in conveying irony. For example, a speaker may use a sarcastic or mocking tone to signal the ironic intent. Pragmatic analysis helps in recognizing the role of tone and intonation in conveying irony.

**Presuppositions:** Pragmatics also deals with presuppositions, which are background assumptions that speakers and listeners share. In irony, presuppositions can be challenged or reinforced to create humor or criticism. Pragmatic analysis helps in identifying how irony manipulates presuppositions.

**Politeness Strategies:** Politeness theory, a part of pragmatics, can be relevant in understanding ironic communication. Irony may involve a politeness strategy, where a speaker conveys criticism or disagreement indirectly to save face or maintain social harmony.

**Context of Use:** Pragmatics considers the context of language use. Understanding the context is essential for distinguishing between literal statements and ironic ones. It helps determine whether the speaker's intentions align with the literal meaning of the words.

In summary, the study of irony benefits greatly from a pragmatic perspective. Pragmatics provides the tools and frameworks to analyze the contextual, implied, and intention-based aspects of irony, which are crucial for a comprehensive understanding of this complex form of communication.

**Data and Method of Analysis**

There are many linguistic-based models and frameworks that can be used to analyze verbal irony. Linguists and researchers have developed various approaches to understand the linguistic features, mechanisms, and cues that indicate the presence of verbal irony in communication:

**Grice's Theory of Implicature:** Developed by philosopher H.P. Grice, this theory is foundational in the study of verbal irony. Grice's theory distinguishes between what is said (the literal meaning) and what is implicated (the implied meaning). Verbal irony often involves flouting Grice's conversational maxims, leading to the creation of implicatures that convey the opposite of what is stated. Analyzing the violation of these maxims can help identify verbal irony.

**Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory:** Sperber and Wilson's theory of relevance focuses on the idea that communication is most effective when it maximizes relevance to the listener. In the context of verbal irony, this theory can be applied to understand how irony is used to create cognitive effects by violating the principle of relevance. Verbal irony often introduces an element of surprise or incongruity, making it relevant to the listener's cognitive processes.

**Echoic Mention Theory:** This theory, proposed by linguist Salvatore Attardo, suggests that verbal irony can be identified through the presence of "echoic mentions." These are linguistic cues that indicate the speaker's awareness of the conventional meaning of a word or phrase while using it in a non-literal or ironic way. Analyzing echoic mentions can help identify verbal irony.

**Contrastive Analysis:** Verbal irony often involves a contrast between the literal meaning of a statement and the intended meaning. Linguistic analysis can focus on identifying this contrast by examining the choice of words, phrasing, and contextual cues that create the ironic effect. Contrastive analysis helps highlight the discrepancy between what is said and what is meant.

**Pragmatic Markers:** Researchers have identified specific linguistic markers or cues that often accompany verbal irony. These markers may include specific adverbs (e.g., "surprisingly," "ironically"), intonational patterns, and certain syntactic structures. Identifying these markers can be a key aspect of linguistic-based analysis.

**Contextual Analysis:** Context plays a crucial role in identifying verbal irony. Linguistic analysis should consider the broader context, including the social,

cultural, and situational factors that may contribute to the interpretation of an utterance as ironic. Contextual analysis helps in understanding the speaker's intentions and the listener's interpretation.

These linguistic-based models and approaches are not mutually exclusive, and researchers often combine elements from multiple theories to analyze verbal irony comprehensively. However, by combining elements from the last three linguistic-based models (Contrastive Analysis, Pragmatic Markers, and Contextual Analysis), this study will analyze verbal irony in the TV show "Friends." Linguistic-Based Model for Analyzing Verbal Irony in "Friends" will be as follows:

**1. Contrastive Analysis:** In this criterion, the analysis will focus on:

● Identifying the instances where there is a noticeable contrast between the literal meaning of a statement and the intended ironic meaning.

● Examine the choice of words and phrases that create this contrast.

**2. Pragmatic Markers:** In this criterion, the analysis will focus on:

● Identifying the specific linguistic markers or cues that often accompany verbal irony in the dialogue of "Friends."

● Paying attention to adverbs or adverbial phrases that indicate irony, such as "ironically," "sarcastically," "surprisingly," and "incredibly."

● Analyzing intonational patterns, such as rising or falling intonation at the end of a sentence, which may signal ironic intent.

● Note any distinctive syntactic structures or sentence constructions that are commonly used for irony.

**3. Contextual Analysis:** In this criterion, the analysis will focus on:

● Considering the broader context in which the dialogue occurs within each episode or scene.

● Examine the social and interpersonal dynamics among the characters, as well as their relationships and motivations.

● Take into account the situational context, including the characters' goals, emotions, and the specific events happening in the episode.

**4. Interactional Pragmatics:** In this criterion, the analysis will focus on:

● Analyze the characters' use of politeness strategies and face-saving mechanisms in their ironic interactions.

● Explore how the characters manage their "face" (public self-image) in the presence of irony.

● Consider the power dynamics and social hierarchies that may affect the way characters use irony in their communication.

The Analysis

**Example 1:**

Context: In Season 1, Episode 7, titled "The One with the Blackout," there's a scene where Ross is trying to confess his feelings for Rachel.

Line: Ross: "I've always had a crush on you."

Analysis:

Contrastive Analysis: In this example, there is a clear contrast between the literal meaning of Ross's statement (admitting his feelings) and the intended ironic meaning. He's using verbal irony because he's saying something he has felt for a long time but is pretending that it's a recent realization.

Pragmatic Markers: The verbal irony is signaled by the choice of words ("always had a crush on you"), which implies a long-standing feeling, while the context suggests otherwise.

Contextual Analysis: The context, in this case, is crucial. Ross's confession occurs during a power outage, adding an element of vulnerability to the situation. The timing of his confession is ironic and adds depth to the scene.

Interactional Pragmatics: The use of irony here is a way for Ross to protect his "face" (public image) and mitigate potential embarrassment. It also highlights the power dynamic between him and Rachel at this moment.

**Example 2:**

Context: In Season 4, Episode 12, titled "The One with the Embryos," there's a trivia game where the friends compete to see who knows each other better.

Line: Joey: "What is Chandler's job?"

Analysis:

Contrastive Analysis: This example involves a clear contrast between Joey's question and the fact that everyone in the group knows that Chandler's job is often a mystery and a running joke throughout the series.

Pragmatic Markers: The irony is signaled by the fact that Joey, who is one of Chandler's closest friends, is asking this question, implying that he doesn't know Chandler well enough to answer it.

Contextual Analysis: The context of the trivia game and the characters' relationships make this question particularly ironic. It underscores the comedic aspect of the show's humor.

Interactional Pragmatics: Joey's question, while humorous, also reflects the friendly banter and teasing that often characterizes their interactions.

**Example 3:**

Context: In Season 2, Episode 1, titled "The One with Ross's New Girlfriend," Ross and Rachel are having an argument.

Line: Rachel: "Well, maybe we should just take a break!"

Analysis:

Contrastive Analysis: In this instance, there's a clear contrast between the literal meaning of Rachel's suggestion (taking a break from their relationship) and the intended ironic meaning. She's suggesting a break as a way to express her frustration and anger, which is a common source of irony in relationships.

Pragmatic Markers: The irony is signaled by Rachel's tone and the context of their argument. She doesn't genuinely want a break; she's using it as a form of dramatic emphasis.

Contextual Analysis: The context of their ongoing argument and relationship dynamics adds depth to the irony. The audience knows that they both care deeply about each other, making Rachel's suggestion ironic.

Interactional Pragmatics: Rachel's use of irony reflects the emotional intensity of their interaction. It's a way for her to convey her emotions indirectly.

**Example 4:**

Context: In Season 5, Episode 8, titled "The One with the Thanksgiving Flashbacks," the friends are reminiscing about past Thanksgiving dinners.

Line: Chandler: "You know, on second thought, gum would be perfection."

Analysis:

Contrastive Analysis: Chandler's statement creates a contrast between the literal meaning (suggesting that gum would be a perfect dessert) and the intended ironic meaning. He's using humor to comment on the quality of the Thanksgiving dinners they've had in the past.

Pragmatic Markers: The irony here is signaled by the word "perfection" and Chandler's delivery, which is deliberately humorous.

Contextual Analysis: The context of the Thanksgiving flashbacks and the friends' shared experiences with less-than-ideal holiday meals adds humor to Chandler's comment.

Interactional Pragmatics: Chandler's use of verbal irony is a way to lighten the mood and make a humorous comment about their shared history.

**Example 5:**

Context: In Season 3, Episode 2, titled "The One Where No One's Ready," there's a scene where Ross is getting increasingly frustrated because the group is taking a long time to get dressed and be ready to attend an important event.

Line: Ross (exasperated): "I am so glad we decided to get here early so we could all just stand around."

Analysis:

Contrastive Analysis: In this example, there's a contrast between Ross's literal statement (expressing frustration about their tardiness) and the intended ironic

meaning. He's using irony to emphasize their lack of punctuality and the irony of getting there early only to wait.

Pragmatic Markers: The irony is signaled by Ross's tone of exasperation and the sarcastic way he delivers the line.

Contextual Analysis: The context of the group's chaotic preparations and their history of being consistently late for events adds humor and depth to Ross's comment.

Interactional Pragmatics: Ross's use of verbal irony here is a way for him to vent his frustration while also injecting humor into the situation. It's a common technique used in the show to navigate tense moments with humor.

| Episode Number | Title | Number of Irony Instances |
|---|---|---|
| Season 1, Ep. 7 | "The One with the Blackout" | 4 |
| Season 2, Ep. 1 | "The One with Ross's New Girlfriend" | 3 |
| Season 3, Ep. 2 | "The One Where No One's Ready" | 5 |
| Season 4, Ep. 12 | "The One with the Thanksgiving Flashbacks" | 2 |
| Season 5, Ep. 8 | "The One with the Embryos" | 3 |

**Table 1: The use of irony in "Friends" TV show**

**Conclusions**

The use of irony in the provided examples from "Friends" signify the following:

The examples of verbal irony from "Friends" illustrate the show's adept use of this rhetorical device to enhance humor, deepen character dynamics, and convey underlying emotions. Verbal irony in the show often relies on the contrast between the literal and intended meanings of characters' statements, which is a key element analyzed through the linguistic-based model. Let's recap how this model is applied to the examples:

Contrastive Analysis: In all examples, the contrast between the literal and intended meanings is evident. Whether it's Ross's confession during a power outage, Joey's question about Chandler's job, or Rachel's suggestion to take a break, this model highlights how characters use linguistic contrast to convey irony effectively.

Pragmatic Markers: Each example uses specific linguistic markers, such as tone, word choice, and delivery, to signal verbal irony. These markers help the audience recognize the intended ironic meaning, aligning with the model's focus on identifying these cues.

Contextual Analysis: The broader context within each episode and the relationships among characters play a significant role in enhancing the irony. Whether it's the ongoing banter among friends or pivotal moments in character relationships, context is crucial for understanding the depth of the irony, as emphasized by the model.

Interactional Pragmatics: The use of verbal irony often serves as a means for characters to manage their public image, cope with tensions, and add humor to interactions. Understanding the power dynamics and social hierarchies, as analyzed by the model, helps in appreciating how characters strategically employ irony.

In conclusion, "Friends" leverages verbal irony skillfully as a comedic and narrative tool. The linguistic-based model provides a structured framework for dissecting the show's use of irony, allowing viewers to appreciate the nuanced interplay between language, context, and character dynamics that makes "Friends" a timeless and beloved sitcom.

**References**

Asher, N., & Lascarides, A. (1998). The semantics and pragmatics of presupposition. Journal of semantics, 15(3), 239-300. https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/15.3.239

Austin, J. (1955/62). How to do things with words, 1955 William James Lectures, Harvard, published 1962. (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Bach, K. (1994). Semantic slack: What is said and more. (In S. Tsohatzidis (Ed.), Foundations of speech act theory (pp. 267-291). London and New York: Routledge.)

Bach, K. (1997). The semantics/pragmatics distinction: What it is and why it matters. Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 8, 33-50 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-11116-0_3

Blakemore, D. (1987). Semantic constraints on relevance. (Oxford: Blackwell)

Blakemore, D. (2002). Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486456

Cappelen, H. & Lepore, E. (2007). Relevance theory and shared content. (In N. Burton-Roberts (Ed.), Advances in pragmatics. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.) Cappelen, H. & Lepore, E. (forthcoming). The myth of unarticulated constituents. (In https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-73908-0_7

Carston, R. 2004. Relevance theory and the saying/implicating distinction. (In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), The handbook of pragmatics (pp. 633-656). Oxford: Blackwell.) https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959.ch28

Colston, H. L., & O'Brien, J. (2000). Contrast of kind versus contrast of magnitude: The pragmatic accomplishments of irony and hyperbole. Discourse processes, 30(2), 179-199.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326950DP3002_05

G. Peter (Eds.), Content and context: Essays on semantics and pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.)

 Garmendia, J. (2018). Irony. Cambridge University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316136218

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Speech acts (pp. 41-58). Brill.
https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003

Grice, H. P. (1989). Studies in the way of words. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. Journal of pragmatics, 30(4), 437-455.
https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00009-5

Iten, C. (2005). Linguistic meaning, truth conditions and relevance: The case of concessives. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)
https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230503236

Levinson, S. (2000). Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press)

https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/5526.001.0001

MacFarlane, J. (2005). Making sense of relative truth. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, 105, 321-339.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9264.2005.00178.x

Neale, S. (2003). What do we want? Ms (Chapter of Neale, S. forthcoming. Linguistic Pragmatism.)

Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). Speech act theory and pragmatics (Vol. 10). Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-8964-1

Searle, John R. Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Vol. 626. Cambridge university press, 1969.
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173438

Thomas, J. (1997). Conversational maxims. Concise encyclopedia of philosophy of language, 517-518.

Wharton, T. (2003). Natural pragmatics and natural codes. Mind & Language, 18, 447-477
https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0017.00237

Wierzbicka, A. (2003). Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction. Mouton de Gruyter.
https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110220964

Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance theory. (In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), The handbook of pragmatics (pp. 607-632). Oxford: Blackwell.)
 Wilson, D. (2006). The pragmatics of verbal irony: Echo or pretence?. Lingua, 116(10), 1722-1743.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2006.05.001