

UDC 81'25:81'42:791

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2412-933X/2026-XXVII-3>

## PRAGMATIC AND DISCURSIVE CONSTRAINTS IN THE TRANSLATION OF IRONY IN AUDIOVISUAL TEXTS

**Gladio Svitlana**

PhD (Philology),

Associate Professor at the Department of English Language  
and English Language Teaching Methodology,

Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University

Svitlana.Gladio@vspu.edu.ua

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6698-524X

**Ivas'kevich Kristina**

Higher Education Applicant in 035.041 Philology

(Germanic languages and literatures (translation included))

Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University

kristinaivas9@gmail.com

*The article summarizes the results of the ways irony is translated, taking into account the choice of translation strategies depending on the definition of the cognitive-interpretive complexity of source text. It has been determined that literal translation provides formal accuracy, but loses shades of ironic intention, which leads to a weakening or loss of the humorous and evaluative effect. However, traditional translation strategies of adaptation, explication and compensation make it possible to preserve pragmatic intentions, even in the absence of formal equivalence. It may sound obvious that the use of the above strategies requires additional skills to analyze contextual environment, cross cultural features and recognize the communicative impact on the addressee inherent in the original text. To reproduce the cognitive-emotional effect of target text, irony should be considered as a dynamic process that integrates linguistic, pragmatic and cultural factors. Thus, the authors dare to claim that the translation of irony is primarily aimed at the reconstruction of communicative intention rather than the reproduction of linguistic form. Thus the irony translation appears as a complex, multi-level process of intercultural communication, which emphasizes the importance of translation competence, intercultural awareness, analytical flexibility, etc. In audiovisual translation, in particular in the translation of sitcoms, this means preserving the speech characteristics of the characters, the dynamics of interpersonal interaction, and the comic effect, which allows us to define the audiovisual translation of sitcoms as a creative interpretative act of cultural mediation. It has also been determined that adequate translation of irony used in sitcoms involves achieving pragmatic equivalence, which is realized in the ability of the target audience to experience comparable emotional reactions as a result of mastering a similar inferential process.*

**Key words:** translation of irony, audiovisual translation, pragmatic equivalence, translation strategies, intercultural communication, interpretive complexity, cultural mediation.

### **Гладь Світлана**

кандидат філологічних наук,  
доцент кафедри англійської мови та методики її навчання  
Вінницький державний педагогічний університет  
імені Михайла Коцюбинського

### **Іваськевич Крістіна**

здобувач вищої освіти за спеціальністю 035.041 Філологія  
(Германські мови і літератури (переклад включно))  
Вінницький державний педагогічний університет  
імені Михайла Коцюбинського

## **ПРАГМАТИЧНІ ТА ДИСКУРСИВНІ ОБМЕЖЕННЯ В ПЕРЕКЛАДІ ІРОНІЇ В АУДІОВІЗУАЛЬНИХ ТЕКСТАХ**

*У статті йдеться про узагальнення результатів дослідження іронії у перекладацькому аспекті з урахуванням вибору перекладацьких стратегій в залежності від визначення когнітивно-інтерпретаційної складності оригінального тексту. Визначено, що буквальний переклад забезпечує формальну точність, але втрачає відтінки іронічного наміру, що призводить до послаблення чи втрати гумористичного і оцінного ефекту. Втім, традиційні перекладацькі стратегії адаптації, експлікації й компенсації дають змогу зберегти прагматичні інтенції, навіть за відсутності формальної еквівалентності. Зрозуміло, що використання вищезазначених стратегій вимагає додаткових зусиль аналізувати контекстуальні умови, культурологічні особливості та розпізнавати закладений у тексті оригіналу комунікативний вплив на адресата. Для відтворення когнітивно-емоційного ефекту похідного тексту слід розглядати іронію як динамічний процес, що інтегрує мовні, прагматичні та культурні чинники. Таким чином, доведено, що переклад іронії пріоритетно передбачає реконструкцію комунікативного наміру, а не відтворення мовної форми. Переклад іронії постає як складний, багаторівневий процес міжкультурної комунікації, що підкреслює важливість перекладацької компетенції, інтеркультурної обізнаності, аналітичної гнучкості тощо. В аудіовізуальному перекладі, зокрема у перекладі ситкомів, це означає збереження мовленнєвих характеристик персонажів, динаміки міжособистісної взаємодії та комічного ефекту, що дає змогу визначати аудіовізуальний переклад ситкомів як творчий інтерпретаційний акт культурного посередництва. Визначено, що адекватний переклад іронії, яка застосовується у ситкомах, передбачає досягнення прагматичної еквівалентності, яка реалізується у можливості цільової аудиторії пережити зіставні емоційні реакції внаслідок опанування подібного інферентного процесу.*

**Ключові слова:** переклад іронії аудіовізуальний переклад, прагматична еквівалентність, перекладацькі стратегії, міжкультурна комунікація, інтерпретаційна складність, культурне посередництво.

**Introduction.** Translation as a complex semiotic re-encoding task necessitates the navigation of implicit meaning-inference structures across diverse linguistic and cultural frameworks. The fundamentals of irony translation can be traced back to Gricean pragmatics, since irony should be considered as an intentional divergence from his Maxim of Quality, with the inconsistency between a proposition and its context, which not only prompts an inferential search for an implicature [8, p. 44–47], but also creates as a pragmatic effect that depends on shared knowledge, contextual expectations, and the recognition of communicative intentions rather than on explicit linguistic marking [1, p. 37]. While Gricean theory defines irony as

a pragmatic deviation, Relevance Theory (Sperber, Wilson) reframes it as a cognitively motivated interpretation [14, p. 260–274]. Within this paradigm, irony is interpreted through the lens of relevance by recognizing the speaker's dissociative attitude toward a cited thought or utterance, yielding high cognitive effects through minimal processing effort [17, p. 159–161]. Conversely, discourse-oriented approaches (Hutcheon, Muecke) emphasize that irony is not inherent to textuality but emerges through the interaction between discourse conventions and evaluative positioning [10, p. 11–14]. This view, however, underscores the role of discourse conventions, cultural knowledge, and evaluative positioning in the recognition of irony [2] as well as multi-layered nature and the capacity of irony to function differently across genres and communicative situations [11, p. 10–15]. As a result, translating irony involves more than lexical or syntactic transfer; it demands the reconstruction of unstated meanings, attitudes, and discursive positioning, which may not be equally accessible across linguistic and cultural boundaries [3, p. 126–128]. Hence, the primary translational challenges are based on the convergence of several variables, such as 1) instability of implicature. Since implicatures are non-encoded and context-dependent, they cannot be mechanically transferred. According to Baker, the translator must ensure that target audiences possess the requisite contextual assumptions to trigger the same inferential process [5], which makes the interpreter infer communicative intent on the basis of pragmatic cues, shared knowledge, and cultural norms [1].

2) explicitness variables. While irony thrives on understatement and on implicit cues, the «explicitation hypothesis» the need to explicate certain elements in order to maintain coherence for target readers [10], often leads to a reduction of pragmatic force, transforming subtle irony into overt sarcasm or literal statement [12].

3) pragmatic coherence. Mona Baker's work on pragmatic equivalence provides an important insight into the mechanism of irony translating [5, p. 11–14]. Meaning is actively constructed through the interaction of textual cues and the reader's world knowledge. Maintaining coherence often requires adjustments beyond formal correspondence, especially when target readers lack the source-culture's evaluative frames [see also 9].

4) Cultural and semiotic embeddedness. Chiaro's research on humor and irony concludes that irony frequently relies on culture-specific stereotypes and institutional norms [6, p. 1–10; 14]. In audiovisual contexts, irony is supported by paralinguistic cues (prosody, deadpan delivery) that are often lost in subtitling or written translation, forcing the verbal component to carry a disproportionate pragmatic load.

Strategic dimension of translating irony is highlighted in Lawrence Venuti's discussion of domestication and foreignization, when translators face a persistent dilemma whether irony should be adapted to the norms of the target culture or retain features that foreground its source-cultural specificity [16, p. 24–41]. While domestication enhancing accessibility via target-culture norms may flatten ideological tensions, foreignization aimed at preserving source-culture specificity increases the cognitive burden on the reader. Attardo emphasizes that irony functions as a form of evaluative stance-taking, positioning the speaker in relation to the utterance and its context [4]. Dynel similarly highlights the role of irony in managing interpersonal relations and signaling attitudes indirectly [7]. Hatim and Mason point out that irony often carries ideological implications, serving as a subtle means of critique or distancing. Preserving these functions in translation requires sensitivity not only to linguistic form but also to discourse-level meaning and social positioning [9]. Taken together, these considerations demonstrate that the difficulty of translating irony stems from the convergence of several factors: varying degrees of explicitness across languages, the inferential nature of implicature, differences in

cultural knowledge and social norms, and the reliance on genre-specific and paralinguistic cues [8; 14; 17]. Irony operates precisely at the boundary between what is said and what is meant, making it resistant to straightforward transfer. This section has outlined the general problematics of irony translation and established a theoretical foundation for the subsequent analysis, which will examine how these challenges manifest in concrete translational choices across specific contexts [15]. The difficulty of irony translation stems from its operation at the boundary of the explicit (said) and implicit (the unsaid), requiring the reconstruction of unstated attitudes and discursive positioning, ensuring the preservation of the original's critical or distancing force within the target system and necessitating a shift from lexical transfer to the reproduction of comparable interpretive effects.

**Research methods and techniques.** Irony poses a particular challenge in translation because it emerges not at the level of explicit linguistic form but at the interface between semantics, pragmatics, discourse, and culture. Thus, the analysis of irony relies on several core linguistic techniques:

1) echoic interpretation method based on relevance theory. It helps identify irony as a dissociative stance toward a cited thought to achieve optimal cognitive effects through minimal processing;

2) reproduction of the intended communicative effect (the illocutionary force) rather than formal syntactic structures to achieve pragmatic equivalence;

3) discourse analysis that helps view irony as evaluative stance-taking, a strategic means of signaling critique, distancing, or ideological alignment.

Accordingly, the irony translation in audiovisual texts is mainly based on several strategic techniques:

1) functional adaptation that results in replacing source-culture stereotypes or institutional conventions with target-language analogues to ensure the ironic «trigger» remains accessible.

2) explicitation when converting implicit pragmatic cues into overt linguistic markers. However, while ensuring clarity, it may lead to pragmatic neutralization, where the irony's subtle force is diminished or flattened into sarcasm.

3) a strategic choice between domestication vs. foreignization, which means either aligning irony with target-culture communicative norms or preserving the source-text's cultural distinctiveness at the cost of higher cognitive effort.

4) semiotic compensation is especially appropriate for audiovisual contexts, where lexical or stylistic shifts are used in order to compensate for the absence of paralinguistic cues such as prosody or deadpan delivery. These methods and techniques generally enable translators to navigate the inference stability of the target text using specific interventions with the aim of recalibrating a configuration of lexical and contextual signals so as to reproduce a comparable interpretive effect for the target readership.

**Results and discussions.** One of the most frequent sources of difficulty in translating irony is **pragmatic mismatch**, particularly when ironic meaning is constructed through conversational implicature rather than explicit evaluation. In English-language discourse, irony often arises from an apparent violation of Grice's Cooperative Principle, especially the maxims of Quality and Relation, prompting the addressee to infer an unstated meaning. However, this inferential mechanism does not always function in the same way for target audiences, which may lead to partial or complete loss of the ironic effect. This issue can be illustrated by the following exchange: **3:01**

- *You set me up. You lured me into that classroom with promises of donuts and loose women.*
- *I'm sorry. I honestly thought there'd be donuts.*

**Translation:**

- *Ти мене підставив. Заманив на збори пончиками і розпусними жінками.*
- *Пробач. Я думав, що пончики будуть.*

In the source text, the humorous effect is created through pragmatic contrast. The first speaker exaggerates the accusation by listing «*donuts and loose women*» clearly signalling irony and emotional overstatement. The second speaker's response is ironic in a different way: by focusing exclusively on the trivial element («*donuts*») and ignoring the absurdly exaggerated accusation, he violates the maxim of Relation. This selective literalism generates an implicature: the speaker did not take the accusation seriously and unintentionally confirms the absurdity of the situation. For an English-speaking audience, this response is easily interpreted as ironic because understatement and deadpan delivery are conventional markers of humor. However, in Ukrainian, the literal translation of «*I honestly thought there'd be donuts*» risks being interpreted as a sincere justification rather than an ironic one. Without additional pragmatic cues, the target reader may fail to recognize that the humor lies in the speaker's obliviousness and pragmatic misalignment. This example demonstrates that English irony frequently relies on the audience's ability to recover implicatures based on pragmatic norms. When these norms differ, irony may require adaptive strategies, such as slight explicitation or tonal adjustment, to ensure that the communicative intention is preserved rather than merely the propositional content.

Another significant challenge in translating irony arises from the presence of culturally embedded evaluative norms and the necessity to **adapt cultural references**. As Venuti argues, translators must constantly negotiate between strategies of **domestication and foreignization**, deciding whether to adapt the text to the target culture or retain its source-cultural specificity. This dilemma becomes particularly acute in ironic discourse, where humor often depends on culturally shared assumptions. Consider the following examples: **3:04**

- *Teenagers are pretty sophisticated these days. He's ten.*

**Translation:**

- *Сучасні підлітки продвинуті. Йому десять.*

In the given example the irony is based on the pragmatic incongruity between the category «*teenagers*» and the age «*ten*». The humor relies on the audience's cultural understanding of what constitutes a teenager and the exaggerated application of adult social labels to children. While the Ukrainian translation preserves the factual contrast, the ironic tone is weakened because the term «*продвинуті*» carries a more neutral or even positive connotation, potentially reducing the implicit criticism present in the original.

A similar mechanism operates in the following example: **20:10**

- *How good do you feel about yourself right now? On a scale of one to two.*

**Translation:**

- *І як твоя самооцінка? За шкалою від одного до двох.*

The humor in the example above derives from deliberate scale manipulation. By offering an absurdly limited scale, the speaker ironically undermines the addressee's self-esteem. While the translation is formally accurate, the ironic force depends on cultural familiarity with exaggerated rating systems commonly used in English-speaking humor. Without such familiarity, the utterance may be perceived as merely sarcastic rather than subtly ironic. All in all, the examples illustrate that cultural references in irony often function as evaluative shortcuts. Domestication may enhance accessibility but risks neutralizing irony, while foreignization preserves source norms at the cost of immediacy. The translator's task is therefore to balance cultural transparency with pragmatic effectiveness, ensuring that irony remains recognizable as such.

Irony is also highly sensitive to lexical choice and stylistic conventions. English often employs minimalistic or syntactically simple structures to convey ironic evaluation, whereas Ukrainian may require more explicit markers to achieve a comparable effect. Such **lexical and stylistic asymmetry/ discrepancies** can lead to stylistic shifts that alter the tone or intensity of irony. Consider the following exchange: **3:26**

- *She will come to her senses.*
- *Yeah. That's what women do.*

**Translation:**

- *Вона одумається.*
- *Так, жінки ще й думають.*

In the source text, irony is generated through a seemingly affirmative response that subtly undermines the original statement. The phrase «*That's what women do*» operates as deadpan irony, relying on shared awareness of gender stereotypes and their absurdity. In Ukrainian, however, the translated line becomes more overtly sarcastic, shifting from implicit irony to explicit mockery. This change increases clarity but reduces the layered ambiguity of the original utterance.

A similar stylistic shift occurs in the following example: **8:52**

- *Buddy, I feel for you.*
- *Thank you.*
- *Unfortunately, the feeling is nausea.*

**Translation:**

- *Брате, ти мене розчулив.*
- *Дякую.*
- *Аж до блювоти.*

The original humor relies on delayed reinterpretation: the idiomatic expression «*I feel for you*» is reanalyzed literally, producing an unexpected semantic shift. In Ukrainian, the idiomatic-pragmatic ambiguity is less conventional, which necessitates a more explicit and emotionally charged lexical choice. As a result, irony is preserved, but its stylistic texture changes from understated wordplay to blunt expressiveness. These examples show that lexical and stylistic discrepancies force the translator to choose between preserving ironic subtlety and ensuring pragmatic intelligibility. Irony rarely survives intact without some degree of stylistic transformation.

Thus, it can be seen that the translation of irony and sarcasm requires more than a mechanical transfer of lexical meaning. Unlike neutral informational texts, ironic discourse engages multiple cognitive and interpretive levels, forcing the translator to evaluate not only what is said but what is implied, evaluated, or deliberately left unsaid. Consequently, different translation strategies demand varying degrees of interpretive effort, creativity, and cultural awareness. The strategies discussed below reflect increasing levels of translational complexity, ranging from literal rendering to more cognitively demanding procedures such as adaptation, explicitation, and compensation.

The analysis of **literal translation**, which relies primarily on lexical substitution and dictionary-based equivalence, showed it as a low-complexity but often ineffective strategy. Literal translation presupposes that meaning can be recovered directly from the linguistic surface of the utterance. While this approach may be effective in purely referential contexts, it frequently proves inadequate in cases of irony and sarcasm, where meaning emerges through pragmatic inference rather than explicit wording. From a cognitive perspective, literal translation operates at a relatively basic level of processing: the translator identifies lexical units, selects their equivalents, and evaluates grammatical correctness. However, ironic meaning rarely resides at this level alone. In sarcastic dialogue, the humor often arises from contrast, exaggeration, or evaluative stance, which literal

translation may reproduce formally but not functionally. For instance: **17:27**

- *Change is not easy for me, Charlie.*
- *Really? I hadn't noticed.*

**Translation:**

- *Змінюватися не так легко.*
- *Справді? Я і не помітив.*

Although the Ukrainian version is lexically accurate, the ironic force depends on recognizing the reply as an evaluative judgment rather than a factual observation. Without strong contextual or prosodic support, the literal translation risks sounding neutral, thereby weakening the sarcastic intent.

A similar constraint can be observed in the following episode: **3:48**

- *I'm happy to see you, Mom.*
- *I don't believe you, sweetheart. But at least you care enough to lie.*

**Translation:**

- *Радий тебе бачити мамо.*
- *Не вірю синку. Але брехня приємна.*

In the example above literal translation preserves the semantic content but reduces the pragmatic sharpness of the insult, as irony in the original relies on the conversational implicature that affection is feigned. These examples demonstrate that literal translation, while cognitively economical, is often pragmatically insufficient for ironic discourse.

**Adaptation** serves as cultural and interpretive recontextualization that represents a more cognitively demanding strategy, as it requires the translator to move beyond lexical equivalence and re-situate the utterance within the target culture. Rather than transferring words, the translator transfers situations, evaluations, and communicative intentions. Adaptation aims at an understanding of irony as culturally embedded. Ironic meaning frequently relies on shared assumptions, social norms, and evaluative frameworks that may not exist in the target culture in the same form. Therefore, the translator may need to reconstruct the ironic situation rather than replicate its linguistic structure. This postulate can be illustrated in the following dialogue: **5:17**

- *Charlie, we are trying to teach the kids not to keep score.*
- *You should've thought of that before you taught them to count.*

**Translation:**

- *Чарлі, ми привчаємо дітей грати без рахунку.*
- *Тоді б не вчили рахувати.*

The Ukrainian version does not reproduce the syntactic structure of the original but successfully adapts the ironic logic. The humor arises from exposing an internal contradiction, and this contradiction is preserved through pragmatic rephrasing rather than literal correspondence. Similarly, adaptation functions effectively in culturally intelligible sarcasm: **9:28**

- *Great. Why don't I just shoot myself?*
- *You can't afford a gun.*

**Translation:**

- *Чудово. Може мені тоді застрелитися?*
- *Немає за що купити пістолет.*

The exaggeration is retained, while the response grounds the irony in a socially recognizable reality, maintaining character voice and humorous effect. Adaptation thus enables the translator to bridge cultural distance by reshaping ironic meaning according to target norms.

Being a strategy for recovering implicit meaning, **explicitation** involves rendering implicit meanings more explicit in the target text when they are likely to be missed by the target audience.

This strategy is particularly relevant for irony, which often depends on subtle implicatures and indirect evaluation. Rather than adding new information, explicitation makes contextually recoverable meanings more accessible, reducing the interpretive burden placed on the audience. However, this strategy entails a trade-off: increased clarity may come at the expense of irony's characteristic subtlety. An illustrative example is: **7:20**

– *You know what, it doesn't matter if I look cool, we judge a person by what's inside them, not by what they wear.*

– *Lucky for you.*

**Translation:**

– *Мені байдуже який у мене вигляд, людину судять за внутрішніми якостями.*

– *На твоє щастя.*

The Ukrainian version strengthens the evaluative component of the response, clearly signaling sarcasm. The ironic implication – when the speaker lacks admirable inner qualities – is made more explicit, ensuring pragmatic comprehension. Explicitation can thus be justified when irony is heavily reliant on shared assumptions that may not be universally accessible. In audiovisual translation, where processing time is limited, such strategic clarity can enhance reception without entirely neutralizing humor.

**Compensation** is employed when ironic or sarcastic effects cannot be fully preserved at the same textual location and must be reinforced elsewhere. This strategy operates at the discourse level rather than the sentence level and is especially relevant in character-driven comedy.

In *Two and a Half Men*, irony and sarcasm are central to character construction, particularly in the portrayal of Charlie. When specific ironic nuances are weakened in translation, compensation allows the translator to restore the character's overall evaluative stance. For example: **6:54**

– *My mom and dad are splitting up...*

– *You're lucky. When I was your age, I could only dream about my parents splitting up.*

**Translation:**

– *Мої предки розлучаються.*

– *Ти щасливчик. У твоєму віці я й про таке не мріяв.*

The Ukrainian version compensates for potential cultural sensitivity by emphasizing exaggeration and blunt cynicism, reinforcing the character's ironic worldview. A similar effect is achieved in: **13:58**

– *It's not that I don't care what you want. It's just that you're a kid. And what you want doesn't matter. Wow, I do suck.*

**Translation:**

– *Не те щоб мене не цікавили твої бажання. Просто – ти дитина, і чого ти хочеш – немає значення. Я справді козел.*

The explicit self-evaluation intensifies ironic self-awareness and restores comedic balance, compensating for earlier pragmatic losses. The analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that irony is not a marginal stylistic device but a complex communicative mechanism that operates at the intersection of pragmatics, discourse, and culture. Its successful interpretation depends on the ability to recognize implicit meanings, evaluative stances, and shared assumptions between interlocutors. For this reason, the translation of irony cannot be reduced to lexical substitution or formal equivalence, especially in audiovisual genres such as sitcoms, where irony plays a central role in character construction and narrative dynamics.

**Conclusion.** One of the key findings of this research is that different translation strategies correspond to different levels of cognitive and interpretive complexity. The data reveals that

there has been an obvious shift from a mechanical, literal translation, which is considered to be formally accurate, but frequently fails to convey ironic intent with a risk of further neutralizing humor or evaluative resonance, to a more sophisticated transfer in cognitive and cultural verbal architecture. True equivalence in irony can be achieved via a synthesis of contextual interpretation, namely, decoding the «unsaid» within specific contexts; cultural imagination by considering socio-cultural target environment; and communicative evaluation implying the prediction of emotional and intellectual impact on the target audience. Strategies such as adaptation, explicitation, and compensation enable the preservation of pragmatic meaning even when formal equivalence cannot be maintained.

The findings suggest that the goal of translating irony cannot be the mechanical reproduction of linguistic form, but rather the reconstruction of communicative intention. In the context of sitcom translation, this involves prioritizing preserving character voice, interpersonal dynamics, and humorous impact over adhering rigidly to the source text. From this perspective, translation emerges as an interpretive and creative act, closely aligned with cultural mediation rather than mechanical transfer.

The overarching conclusion of this study is that the translation of irony represents a test of pragmatic equivalence. Successful solutions appear to be those that allow the target audience to access the same inferential path as the source audience, even if the linguistic means differ. Thus, effective irony translation is achieved not when the target text mirrors the source text, but when it prompts a comparable interpretive and emotional response. This insight underscores the necessity of viewing irony translation as a dynamic process that integrates linguistic, pragmatic, and cultural dimensions into a coherent translational decision-making framework.

#### Bibliography:

1. Гребенюк А. А. та ін. Іронія як філософсько-естетичне явище серед інших мовних засобів комічного. *Типологія мовних значень у діяхронічному та зіставному аспектах*. 2019. № 38. С. 31–40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31558/2075-2970.2019.38.3>
2. Калита О. Типи комічних текстів та особливості їх стилістичного аналізу. *Лінгвостилістичні студії*. 2015. Вип. 2. С. 54–61.
3. A Comprehensive Study of Irony in Human Communication. *Journal of Sociology and Ethnology*. 2025. Vol. 7, no. 1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23977/jsoce.2025.070118>
4. Attardo S. Irony as Relevant Inappropriateness. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2000. Vol. 32. P. 793-826.
5. Baker M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2018.
6. Chiaro D. Translation and Humour, Humour and Translation. In: *Translation, Humour and Literature*. London: Continuum, 2010. P. 1–17.
7. Dynel M. Isn't It Ironic? Defining the Scope of Irony. *Humor*. 2014. Vol. 27, no. 4. P. 619–639.
8. Grice H. P. Logic and Conversation. In: *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press, 1975. P. 41–58.
9. Hatim B., Mason I. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge, 1997.
10. Hutcheon L. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. London: Routledge, 1994.
11. Muecke D. C. *The Compass of Irony*. London: Methuen, 1969.
12. Murtisari E. Explicitation in Translation Studies: The Journey of an Elusive Concept. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*. 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.108202.2016.a05>
13. Pinheiro M. Translation Techniques. *Communication & Language at Work*. 2015. Vol. 4, no. 4. P. 121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7146/claw.v1i4.20775>
14. Sperber D., Wilson D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
15. Two and a Half Men. Season 1. Episodes 1-24.
16. Venuti L. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 1995.

17. Yelnikova N. Irony as a Means of Trolling. *Humanities Science Current Issues*. 2021. Vol. 1, no. 41. P. 158–162. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/41-1-24>

### References:

1. Hrebenuik, A. A. ta in. (2019). Ironiia yak filosofsko-estetychne yavyshe sered inshykh movnykh zasobiv komichnoho [Irony as a philosophical and aesthetic phenomenon among other linguistic means of the comic]. *Typolohiia movnykh znachen u diakhronichnomu ta zistavnomu aspektakh – Typology of Language Meanings in Diachronic and Comparative Aspects*, 38, 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.31558/2075-2970.2019.38.3> [in Ukrainian].
2. Kalyta O. Typy komichnykh tekstiv ta osoblyvosti yikh stylistychnoho analizu. [Types of comic texts and peculiarities of their stylistic analysis]. *Linhvostylistychni studii – Linguostylistic Studies*, 2, 54–61. [in Ukrainian].
3. A Comprehensive Study of Irony in Human Communication. (2025). *Journal of Sociology and Ethnology*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.23977/jsoce.2025.070118> [in English].
4. Attardo, S. (2000). Irony as relevant inappropriateness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 793–826. [in English].
5. Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge. [in English].
6. Chiaro, D. (2010). Translation and humour, humour and translation. In *Translation, humour and literature* (pp. 1–17). Continuum. [in English].
7. Dynel, M. (2014). Isn't it ironic? Defining the scope of irony. *Humor*, 27(4), 619–639. [in English].
8. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3: Speech acts, pp. 41–58). Academic Press. [in English].
9. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as Communicator*. Routledge. [in English].
10. Hutcheon, L. (1994). *Irony's edge: The theory and politics of irony*. Routledge. [in English].
11. Muecke, D. C. (1969). *The compass of irony*. Methuen. [in English].
12. Murtisari, E. (2016). Explicitation in translation studies: The journey of an elusive concept. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.108202.2016.a05> [in English].
13. Pinheiro, M. (2015). Translation techniques. *Communication & Language at Work*, 4(4), 121. <https://doi.org/10.7146/claw.v1i4.20775> [in English].
14. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell. [in English].
15. Two and a Half Men. (2003). Season 1, episodes 1-24 [TV series]. Warner Bros. [in English].
16. Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge. [in English].
17. Yelnikova, N. (2021). Irony as a means of trolling. *Humanities Science Current Issues*, 1(41), 158–162. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/41-1-24> [in English].

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 15.04.2026  
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 11.05.2026  
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 29.05.2026



Стаття поширюється  
на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу  
(CC BY 4.0)