Lodz Papers in Pragmatics 4.1 (2008) / *Special Issue on Humour*: 1-12 1
DOI 10.2478/v10016-008-0007-1

Marta Dynel
University of Łódź

INTRODUCTION TO SPECIAL ISSUE ON HUMOUR: A MODEST ATTEMPT AT PRESENTING CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO HUMOUR STUDIES

Verbal humour[1] is a phenomenon prevalent in everyday and media discourses, occurring in various contexts (e.g. formal/informal or spoken/written) and manifesting itself in an array of forms, e.g. canned jokes, witticisms, teasing or humorous lexemes. Likewise, nonverbal humour enjoys a gamut of forms, such as cartoons, pictorial advertisements, or exaggeration in facial expressions and gestures. Given its prevalence and multifariousness, it is hardly surprising that humour should garner wide-ranging scholarly interest. It is next to impossible to present a coherent and exhaustive picture of the state-of-the-art research on humour, inasmuch as this is a greatly diversified field, comprising a wide spectrum of disciplines (philosophy, psychology, psychiatry, sociology, anthropology and linguistics) and innumerable approaches within which all manner of humour's manifestations and humour-related phenomena may be studied. Even narrowing down the scope of interest to one discipline does not render the task unchallenging.

Linguistic literature on humour, mostly of the verbal type, consists of discussions primarily on semantic mechanisms and cognitive-perceptual processes, translation, as well as sociological and pragmatic analyses of humour in various types of interactions. Humour researchers assume diversified methodological perspectives, conducting analyses of real-life or media discourses, doing sociolinguistic research, carrying out laboratory studies, or theorising on humour processes with recourse to pragmatic or cognitive proposals concerning human communication. Regardless of the methodologies and particular postulates advocated, the global aim of language researchers is to describe chosen aspects of humour, rather than account for its funniness or the provenance of laughter, which is, nota bene, not the only humour appreciation response.

[1] Despite the strong tendency to spell this word according to the American English pattern, I choose to obey the British norm. British English is the version Europeans are normally taught to adhere to and breaking the rule for one word is, I believe, unsubstantiated.

Linguistic research focused on describing semantic and pragmatic mechanisms of humour appears to have been dominated during the past two decades by the *General Theory of Verbal Humour* (Attardo and Raskin 1991; Raskin and Attardo 1994; Attardo 1994, 2001; Attardo et al. 2002, inter alia), an offshoot of Raskin's (1985) *Semantic Script Theory of Humor*. The pivotal tenet of the General Theory of Verbal Humour captures canned jokes and longer humorous narratives by means of six hierarchically organised Knowledge Resources, the most significant of which are the script opposition/overlap and the logical mechanism. Contrary to its name, the model does not explicitly account for all humour forms, even if intermittent attempts are also made at applying it to the analysis of conversational data (Norrick 2003; Archakis and Tsakona 2005). Raskin and Attardo's methodologically complex model undergoes constant development, furthered not only by the original proponents but also other researchers. On the other hand, irrespective of the theory's attractiveness, a number of its subordinate tenets and conceptualisations can be considered elusive, not fully elaborated on and even fallacious (see e.g. Ritchie 2004; Dynel forthcoming). Also, the dominance of this framework does not mean that other semantic, pragmatic or cognitive approaches aiming to shed light on the workings of various humorous forms should be discredited and dismissed as being specious or, at least, less plausible. On the contrary, some proposals are more tenable, given that they usurp no right to be all-embracing theories and thus describe certain phenomena more adequately.

Linguistic research on humour mechanisms is acknowledged to enjoy a cognitive orientation. By necessity, the studies on the comprehension of verbal humour entail the description of cognitive processes. The conceptual framework provided by cognitive linguistics for language use in general should easily capture the nature of humour, simultaneously shedding light on its distinctive features (Giora 1991; Brône et al. 2006). One budding area of research presents humour phenomena in view of cognitive construal operations (e.g. Coulson 2005; Brône et al. 2006; Veale et al. 2006). Nevertheless, humour studies need not rely heavily on existing cognitive linguistic theories, but may only resort to viable concepts or postulates, facilitating the explanation of humour's mechanisms. A variety of cognitive theories and findings are particularly useful in the description of on-line interpretation processes (e.g. Giora 1991, 2003; Coulson 2001; Coulson and Kutas 2001; Coulson et al. 2006). Of vital importance are also psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic studies on humour comprehension processes (e.g. Vaid et al. 2005; Coulson and Severens 2007; Uekermann and Daum 2007).

What is significant, the primary mechanism underlying humour is grounded in cognitive, both psychological and linguistic, proposals. The generalisation emergent from the bulk of literature is that humour invariably arises from *incongruity*, as already observed by many psychologists and linguists (e.g. Forabosco 1992; Ritchie 2004; Partington 2006). The notion of incongruity as the

DOI 10.2478/v10016-008-0007-1

correlate[2] of humour is known to have been initially advocated in philosophical and psychological writings. It was only later that it aroused interest also within linguistic studies on humour, where it is commonly assumed that incongruity alone does not suffice as an explanation for verbal humour but must be followed by the resolution stage. Broadly speaking, the *incongruity-resolution* (I-R) model, credited primarily to Suls (1972, 1983) but also to Shultz (1972), assumes that incongruity is first observed and later resolved, i.e. made congruous. This broadly conceptualised model will obviously have an array of sub-mechanisms in particular humour forms (for an overview, see Forabosco 1992; Raskin 1985; Attardo 1994; Ritchie 2004; Martin 2007; Dynel forthcoming, inter alia).

Most contemporary humour linguists expounding on the formal or cognitive mechanisms of humour narrow down the scope of investigation to canned jokes, admittedly due to their heuristic advantages over other humour forms (cf. Attardo and Raskin 1991). Nevertheless, there are authors (e.g. Norrick 1993, 2003; Kotthoff 2006b, 2007; Boxer and Cortés-Conde 1997; Veale et al. 2006) who do fill the lacuna in humour research, examining, according to chosen criteria, forms used in everyday interactions, which tend to be captured under the umbrella term *conversational joking* (Norrick 1993). However, to avoid associations with the act of joking or joke telling, forms such as teasing, banter, witticisms or humorous lexemes could be collectively referred to as *conversational humour* (cf. Coates 2007). Usually, articles tackle particular humour phenomena in isolation, distinguished as pragmatic categories or formal realisations, which need not be placed on any hierarchical tier in humour taxonomy. Writings pertain, for example, to *stock conversational witticisms* (Norrick 1984, 1993, 2003), *teasing* (e.g. Norrick 1993; Hay 2000; Boxer and Cortés-Conde 1997; Lampert and Ervin-Tripp 2006), *banter* (Norrick 1993), *riddles* (Dienhart 1999), *adversarial humour* (Veale et al. 2006), *puns* (e.g. Attardo 1994; Norrick 1993), *story puns* (Binsted and Ritchie 2001), or *parody* (Rossen-Knill and Henry 1997; Mascha 2008). Yet another prominent form of humour is *irony* (e.g. Giora 2001; Jorgensen 1996; Kotthoff 2003; Attardo 2000, 2001; Partington 2006, 2007). It must be remembered, however, that this trope may, but does not have to, overlap with humour. This is why not all of the extensive literature on irony should be subsumed under humour research.

On the whole, sociolinguistics, sometimes supported by socio-psychological findings, gives insight into humour's functions in interpersonal communication (see e.g. Norrick 1993; Attardo 1994; Cann et al. 1997; Martin 2007 and references therein). As regards discussions within the discourse-analytic approach, an infinite range of topics are pursued, with a view to showing how particular forms of

[2] On the other hand, not all incongruities must be conducive to humour. For example, there are anxiety-provoking ones (e.g. Forabosco 1992; Martin 2007).

humour affect or depend on human interactions and relations. A prolific area of research is gender-dependent humour (e.g. Kotthoff 2000, 2006a; Hay 2000; Crawford 2003; Davies 2006; Ardington 2006; Lampert and Ervin-Tripp 2006; Bubel and Spitz 2006; Bing 2007). Another prominent field of study concerns the use of humour in various situational contexts. Apart from humour in informal settings (e.g. Norrick 1993; Hay 2000; Holmes and Marra 2002; Everts 2003; Antonopoulou and Sifianou 2003; Fine and de Saucey 2005, Lampert and Ervin-Tripp 2006; Coates 2007), humour in formal contexts, such as workplace, is under investigation (e.g. Yarwood 2001; Holmes and Marra 2006; Holmes 2002, 2006; Bonaiuto et al. 2003; Hobbs 2007ab; Plester 2007; Romero et al. 2007; Bippus 2007, Mik-Meyer 2007). Furthermore, researchers examine cross-cultural differences and similarities of humour forms and their application (e.g. Davies 2003; Davis 2005; Habib 2008; Bell 2007ab; Norrick 2007; Rogerson-Revell 2007). Humorous phenomena are also expounded on from the perspective of translation studies (e.g. Attardo 2002; Chiaro 2005; Antonini 2005; Zabalbeascoa 2005).

Pragmatically oriented articles and books embrace basically all the topics and viewpoints listed above, irrespective of whether or not authors do resort to core pragmatic postulates and models. This is because pragmatics, whose subject matter is language in use, will naturally capitalise on proposals and findings generated in all the strands of linguistics, as well as other realms of study, such as sociology, social and cognitive psychology or anthropology. Even though humour proposals may develop upon pragmatic theories of communication, e.g. the Gricean model (e.g. Raskin 1985; Raskin and Attardo 1994; Attardo 1990, 1993, 1994, 2006), relevance theory (e.g. Yus 2003; Curcó 1995, 1996) or politeness theory (e.g. Zajdman 1995), they appear to be in minority in humour literature. Transcending radical pragmatics, pragmatic humour studies enjoy greater diversification and, consequently, flourish. Apart from all the areas of interest enumerated in the paragraphs above, another orientation of research concerns humour's forms and roles within media discourse genres, such as advertising rhetoric or the language of the press (e.g. van Mulken 2005; Bucaria 2004). In all likelihood, this list of topics will not be exhaustive. The emergent conclusion is that the pragmatics of humour is a broad church, encompassing a wide spectrum of interests and perspectives.

This special issue of Lodz Papers in Pragmatics comprises seven contributions[3] offering diversified analyses of humorous phenomena. This collection is a ragbag of riches meant to exemplify the current, and very often innovative, directions of contemporary humour research within linguistics. Hopefully, each of the papers

[3] Readers are also invited to familiarise themselves with the next issue (4.2) of Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, where more articles on humour will be published in a special section. Authors who have already confirmed their contributions are Chiara Bucaria, Alan Partington, and Geert Brône and Kurt Feyaerts.

DOI 10.2478/v10016-008-0007-1

presenting an authorial viewpoint will give readers food for thought and provoke future research, whether supportive or polemical.

The first three articles, rooted in cognitivist research, present the foundations of humorous mechanisms.

Orna Peleg, Rachel Giora and Ofer Fein report on their psycholinguistic research findings on the graded salience hypothesis, in the light of two experiments verifying the impact of contextual effects on lexical processing. Further evidence is thus adduced that the most salient meanings of ambiguous lexemes are invariably activated, irrespective of their contextual misfit. Contextual bias in favour of less salient meanings appears to be insignificant at the lexical access stage, even if ambiguities occur in the final sentential position, where context should have a greater bearing on their interpretation. Although the authors explore the perception processes of ambiguities which are not directly conducive to humour, their findings will certainly prove germane to cognitive studies on humour couched in lexical ambiguities, i.e. puns.

Giovannantonio Forabosco's discursive paper gives an overview of the multidisciplinary research on incongruity and the incongruity-resolution approach in humour studies, paying attention mainly (but not exclusively) to the psychological perspective and research findings. Forabosco proposes that incongruity can be conceived of as a diversion from a cognitive model of reference. Creating a patchwork image of the workings and foundations of incongruity as a mechanism underlying humour, the author does not refrain from discussing a number of queries and counterarguments. The conclusion, hardly surprising, is that incongruity is a tenable conceptualisation of humour perception processes and is still fertile ground for further research.

Tony Veale propounds an innovative postulate of figure-ground duality as an intrinsic mechanism underlying both nonverbal, i.e. pictorial, and verbal humour. First, the author introduces the cognitive construal, as originally defined in psychological literature, in order to show that it can be employed as a heuristic tool to account for the workings of humorous images. Further, Veale discusses figure-ground duality as the underpinning of various forms of verbal humour, and critically addresses the widely acknowledged models of humour analysis, i.e. the incongruity approach and a few tenets of the General Theory of Verbal Humour.

The next two articles are written from the perspective of discourse analysis, but are focused on divergent humorous phenomena.

In their collaborative article, Neal Norrick and Janine Klein examine forms and functions of disruptive humour produced by pupils in an elementary school classroom. The authors intertwine succinct surveys of related literature with discourse analyses of conversational extracts, focusing on unruly children's verbalisations and teachers' responses. The emergent extrapolation is that "class clowns'" humour-oriented behaviour serves the purpose of identity construction.

Stephanie Schnurr and Charley Rowe's contribution is devoted to the discussion of subversive humour occurring in workplace emails. The paper opens with an introduction to the studies on humour in workplace and subversive humour as well as on the new, albeit fast-developing, area of research concerning e-mails. The authors launch a data analysis, proving that, via humour, workers in powerful positions can "legitimately" voice their criticism against bureaucratic norms, by means of poking fun at normative practices or re-defining organisational reality.

The last two articles investigate humour phenomena from pragmatic theoretical standpoints, albeit representing two competitive strands, post-Gricean and neo-Gricean.

Francisco Yus champions a relevance-theoretic four-fold classification of jokes, which are demonstrated to entail diversified inferential activity on the hearer's part. Having briefly revisited a few pertinent tenets of relevance theory and its import for humour studies, the author categorises jokes into those which are hinged on: the invalidation of inferred explicit content, a clash between explicit and implicit information, the audience's recovery of implicit premises or implicated conclusions, and broad contextual assumptions on social or cultural society values.

This issue of LPP closes with its editor's article, whose aim is to argue against Raskin and Attardo's well-entrenched approach to humour as a phenomenon standing vis-à-vis the Gricean model of communication. The article takes as the departure point the recapitulation of the Gricean model's pertinent premises germane to substantiating that humour violates neither the CP nor the subordinate maxims and is perfectly embraced by Grice's rationality-based model of communication, in which maxims can be legitimately flouted for the sake of reaching a communicative goal, i.e. generating a humorous effect.

References

Antonini, Rachele. "The perception of subtitled humor in Italy." *Humor* 18 (2005): 209-225, doi: 10.1515/humr.2005.18.2.209.

Antonopoulou, Eleni and Maria Sifianou. "Conversational dynamics of humour: The telephone game in Greek." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 741-769, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00150-9.

Ardington, Angela. "Playfully negotiated activity in girls' talk." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (2006): 73-95, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.005.

Archakis, Argiris and Villy Tsakona. "Analyzing conversational data in GTVH terms: A new approach to the issue of identity construction via humor." *Humor* 18 (2005): 41-68, doi: 10.1515/humr.2005.18.1.41.

Attardo, Salvatore. "The violation of Grice's maxims in jokes." In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, edited by Kira

Hall, Michael Meacham and Richard Shapiro, 355-362. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.

—. "Violation in conversational maxims and cooperation: The case of jokes." *Journal of Pragmatics* 19 (1993): 532-558, doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(93)90111-2.

—. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.

—. "Irony as relevant inappropriateness." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (2000): 793-826, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00070-3.

—. *Humorous Texts: A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001.

—. "Translation and humour: An approach based on the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH)." *Translator* 8 (2002a): 173-194.

—. "Cognitive linguistics and humor." *Humor* 19 (2006): 341-362, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2006.017.

—. and Victor Raskin. "Script theory revis(it)ed: Joke similarity and joke representation model." *Humor* 4 (1991): 293-348.

—., Christian Hempelmann and Sara Di Maio. "Script oppositions and logical mechanisms: Modeling incongruities and their resolutions." *Humor* 15 (2002b): 3-46, doi: 10.1515/humr.2002.004.

Bell, Nancy. "How native and non-native English speakers adapt to humor in intercultural interaction." *Humor* 20 (2007a): 27-48, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.002.

—. "Humor comprehension: Lessons learned from cross-cultural communication." *Humor* 20 (2007b): 367-387, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.018.

Bing, Janet. "Liberated jokes: Sexual humor in all-female groups." *Humor* 20 (2007): 337-366, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.017.

Binsted, Kim and Graeme Ritchie. "Towards a model of story puns." *Humor* 14 (2001): 275-292, doi: 10.1515/humr.2001.004.

Bippus, Amy. "Factors predicting the perceived effectiveness of politicians' use of humor during a debate." *Humor* 20 (2007): 105-121, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.006.

Bonaiuto, Marino, Elio Castellana and Antonio Pierro. "Arguing and laughing: The use of humor to negotiate in group discussions." *Humor* 16.2 (2003): 183-223, doi: 10.1515/humr.2003.010.

Boxer, Diana and Florencia Cortés-Conde. "From bonding and biting: Conversational joking and identity display." *Journal of Pragmatics* 27 (1997): 275-295, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00031-8.

Brône, Geert, Kurt Feyaerts and Tony Veale. "Introduction: Cognitive linguistic approaches to humor." *Humor* 19 (2006): 203-228, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2006.012.

Bubel, Claudia and Alice Spitz. "One of the last vestiges of gender bias: The characterization of women through the telling of dirty jokes in Ally McBeal." *Humor* 19 (2006): 71-104, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2006.004.

Bucaria, Chiara. "Lexical and syntactic ambiguity as a source of humor: The case of newspaper headlines." *Humor* 17 (2004): 279-309, doi: 10.1515/humr.2004.013.

Cann, Arnie, Lawrence Calhoun and John Banks. "On the role of humour appreciation in interpersonal attraction: It's no joking matter." *Humor* 10 (1997): 77-89.

Chiaro, Delia. "Foreword. Verbally expressed humor and translation: An overview of a neglected field." *Humor* 18 (2005): 135-145, doi: 10.1515/humr.2005.18.2.135.

Coates, Jennifer. "Talk in a play frame: More on laughter and intimacy." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (2007): 29-49, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2006.05.003.

Coulson, Seana. *Semantic Leaps. Frame-Shifting and Conceptual Blending in Meaning Construction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

—. "Extemporaneous blending: Conceptual integration in humorous discourse from talk radio." *Style* 39 (2005): 107-122.

—. and Marta Kutas. "Getting it: Human event-related brain response to jokes in good and poor comprehenders." *Neuroscience Letters* 316 (2001): 71-74, doi: 10.1016/S0304-3940(01)02387-4.

—., Thomas Urbach and Marta Kutas. "Looking back: Joke comprehension and the space structuring model." *Humor* 19 (2006): 229-250, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2006.013.

—. and Els Severens. "Hemispheric asymmetry and pun comprehension: When cowboys have sore calves." *Brain and Language* 100 (2007) 172-187, doi: 10.1016/j.bandl.2005.08.009.

Crawford, Mary. "Gender and humor in social context." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 1413-1430, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00183-2.

Curcó, Carmen. "Some observations on the pragmatics of humorous interpretations. A relevance-theoretic approach." *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 7 (1995): 27-47.

—. "The implicit expression of attitudes, mutual manifestness and verbal humour." *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 8 (1996): 89-99.

Davies, Christie. "European ethnic scripts and the translation and switching of jokes." *Humor* 18 (2005): 147-160, doi: 10.1515/humr.2005.18.2.147.

Davies, Catherine Evans. "How English-learners joke with native speakers: An interactional sociolinguistic perspective on humor as collaborative discourse across cultures." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 1361-1385, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00181-9.

—. "Gendered sense of humor as expressed through aesthetic typifications." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (2006): 96-113, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00181-9.

Dienhart, John. "A linguistic look at riddles." *Journal of Pragmatics* 31 (1999): 95-125, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00056-3.

Dynel, Marta. *Humorous Garden-Paths: A Pragmatic-Cognitive Study*, forthcoming.

Everts, Elisa. "Identifying a particular family humor style: a sociolinguistic discourse analysis." *Humor* 16 (2003): 369-412, doi: 10.1515/humr.2003.021.

Fine, Gary Alan and Michaela De Soucey. "Joking cultures: Humor themes as social regulation in group life." *Humor* 18 (2005): 1-22, doi: 10.1515/humr.2005.18.4.431.

Forabosco, Giovannantonio. "Cognitive aspects of the humour process: The concept of incongruity." *Humor* 5 (1992): 9-26.

Giora, Rachel. "On the cognitive aspects of the joke." *Journal of Pragmatics* 16 (1991): 465-485, doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(91)90137-M.

—. *On Our Mind: Salience, Context, and Figurative Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Habib, Rania. "Humor and disagreement: Identity construction and cross-cultural enrichment." *Journal of Pragmatics* 40 (2008): 1117-1145, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2008.02.005.

Hay, Jennifer. "Functions of humor in the conversations of men and women." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (2000): 709-742, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00069-7.

Hobbs, Pamela. "Judges' use of humor as a social corrective." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (2007a): 50-68, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.001.

—. "Lawyers' use of humor as persuasion." *Humor* 20 (2007b): 123-156, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.007.

Holmes, Janet. "Having a laugh at work: How humour contributes to workplace culture." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (2002): 1683-1710, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00032-2.

—. "Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (2006): 26-50, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.007.

—. and Meredith Marra. "Over the edge? Subversive humor between colleagues and friends." *Humor* 15 (2002), 65-87, doi: 10.1515/humr.2002.006.

—. and Meredith Marra. "Humor and leadership style." *Humor* 19 (2006): 119-138, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2006.006.

Jorgensen, Julia. "The functions of sarcastic irony in speech." *Journal of Pragmatics* 26 (1996): 613-634, doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(95)00067-4.

Kotthoff, Helga. "Gender and joking: On the complexities of women's image politics in humorous narratives." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (2000) 55-80, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00031-4.

—. "Responding to irony in different contexts: On cognition in conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 1387-1411, doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00182-0.

—. "Gender and humor: The state of the art." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (2006a): 4-25, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.003.

—. "Pragmatics of performance and the analysis of conversational humor." *Humor* 19 (2006b): 271-304, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2006.015.

—. "Oral genres of humor. On the dialectic of genre knowledge and creative authoring." *Pragmatics* 12 (2007): 263-296.

Lampert, Martin and Susan M. Ervin-Tripp. "Risky laughter: Teasing and self-directed joking among male and female friends." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (2006): 51-72, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.004.

Martin, Rod. *The Psychology of Humor. An Integrative Approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier, 2007.

Mascha, Efharis. "Political satire and hegemony: A case of 'passive revolution' during Mussolini's ascendance to power 1919–1925." *Humor* 21 (2008): 69-98, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2008.003.

Mik-Meyer, Nanna. "Interpersonal Relations or Jokes of Social Structure? Laughter in Social Work." *Qualitative Social Work* 6 (2007): 9-26, doi: 10.1177/1473325007074163.

Norrick, Neal. "Stock conversational witticisms." *Journal of Pragmatics* 8 (1984): 195-209, doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(84)90049-3.

—. *Conversational Joking: Humor In Everyday Talk*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

—. "Issues in conversational joking." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 1333-1359, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00180-7.

—. "Interdiscourse humor: Contrast, merging, accommodation." *Humor* 20 (2007): 389-413, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.019.

Partington, Alan. *The Linguistics of Laughter. A Corpus-Assisted Study of Laughter-Talk.* Oxon: Routledge Studies in Linguistics, 2006.

—. "Irony and reversal of evaluation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (2007): 1547-1569, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.009.

Plester, Barbara and Janet Sayers "'Taking the piss': Functions of banter in the IT industry." *Humor* 20 (2007): 157-187, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.008.

Raskin, Victor. *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor.* Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1985.

—. and Salvatore Attardo. "Non-literalness and non-bona-fide in language: An approach to formal and computational treatments of humor." *Pragmatics and Cognition* 2 (1994): 31-69.

Ritchie, Graeme. *The Linguistic Analysis of Jokes*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Rogerson-Revell, Pamela. "Humour in business: A double-edged sword: A study of humour and style shifting in intercultural business meetings." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (2007): 4-28, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2006.09.005.

Romero, Eric, Carlos Alsua, Kim Hinrichs and Terry Pearson. "Regional humor differences in the United States: Implications for management." *Humor* 20 (2007): 189-201, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.009.

Rossen-Knill Deborah and Richard Henry "The pragmatics of verbal parody." *Journal of Pragmatics* 27 (1997): 719-752, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00054-9.

Shultz, Thomas. "The role of incongruity and resolution in children's appreciation of cartoon humor." *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 13 (1972): 456-477, doi: 10.1016/0022-0965(72)90074-4.

Suls, Jerry. "A two-stage model for the appreciation of jokes and cartoons: An information processing analysis." In *The Psychology of Humor*, edited by Jeffrey Goldstein and Paul McGhee, 81-100. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

—. "Cognitive processes in humor appreciation." In *Handbook of Humor Research, Vol.1*, edited by Paul McGhee and Jeffrey Goldstein, 39-57. New York: Springer Verlag, 1983.

Uekermann, Jennifer and Irene Daum. "Toward a cognitive and social neuroscience of humor processing." *Social Cognition* 25 (2007): 553-572, doi: 10.1521/soco.2007.25.4.553.

Vaid, Jyotsna, Rachel Hulla, Roberto Heredia, David Gerkens and Francisco Martinez. "Getting a joke: The time course of meaning activation in verbal humor." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 1431-1449, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00184-4.

van Mulken, Margot, Renske van Enschot-van Dijk, and Hans Hoeken. "Puns, relevance and appreciation in advertisements." *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (2005): 707-721, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2004.09.008.

Veale, Tony, Kurt Feyaerts and Geert Brône. "The cognitive mechanisms of adversarial humor." *Humor* 19 (2006): 305-340, doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2006.016.

Yarwood, Dean. "When Congress makes a joke: Congressional humor as serious and purposeful communication." *Humor* 14 (2001), 359-394, doi: 10.1515/humr.2001.010.

Yus, Francisco. "Humor and the search for relevance." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003): 1295-1331, doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00179-0.

Zajdman, Anat. "Humorous face-threatening acts: Humor as strategy." *Journal of Pragmatics* 23 (1995): 325-339, doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(94)00038-G.
Zabalbeascoa, Patrick. "Humor and translation – an interdiscipline." *Humor* 18 (2005): 185-207, doi: 10.1515/humr.2005.18.2.185.