# Arcana imperii[*]

## The power of humorous retorts to insults on Twitter

Marta Dynel[1] and Fabio I. M. Poppi[1,2]
[1] University of Łódź, Poland | [2] Sechenov University, Russia

This paper reports the findings of a study on the mechanics of insult-retort adjacency pairs in Twitter interactions. The analysis concerns primarily the humorous retorts made by the pornographic entrepreneur Stormy Daniels, who has been pelted with politically-loaded misogynist insults, many of which qualify as slut-shaming. These acts of verbal aggression are the result of her involvement in a legal dispute with President Donald Trump and his former attorney. Based on a carefully collected corpus of public exchanges of tweets, our qualitative analysis achieves a few goals. First, it brings to focus a previously ignored function of witty and creative humour, including the self-deprecating variety, as a powerful rhetorical strategy that helps address insults with dignity and that displays the speaker's intellectual superiority over the attacker and a good sense of humour, as evidenced by multiple users' positive metapragmatic evaluations of Stormy Daniels's retorts. Second, these findings carry vital practical implications for handling misogynist comments, including slut-shaming, online. Third, this study offers new insights into the workings of insults and retorts thereto, not only in multi-party interactions on social media, specifically on Twitter, but also through traditional channels of communication.

**Keywords:** creative humour, insult, misogyny, self-deprecating humour, slut-shaming, superiority, Twitter, witty retort

## 1. Introduction

Focusing on witty retorts to insults on Twitter, this paper contributes to the studies of *creative humour* in online interactions (Demjén 2016, 2018; Vásquez and Creel 2017; Vásquez 2019; Dynel and Poppi 2018, 2019) and, in a more general

---

[*] Secrets of power/the empire (Latin)

sense, to the vast area of research on the use of humour as a powerful rhetorical tool and a robust image management factor. Humour, in its different forms and guises, serves numerous socio-psychological and interactional purposes (for an overview, see e.g. Martin 2007; Martin and Ford 2018; Dynel and Sinkeviciute forth). Strategic use of humour is vital on social media especially for public figures, notably politicians and celebrities, who use Twitter to self-promote and communicate with vast audiences in a personal manner (e.g. Marwick and boyd 2011), thereby building their positive image and fostering a sense of familiarity with the followers. The success of public figures' accounts is premised on the assumption of authenticity and sincerity; it is the public figures, not their assistants, that are believed to be responsible for tweeting (Marwick and boyd 2011). This is the point of departure for the present study of Stormy Daniels's quick *retorts* to the misogynist insults hurled at her on Twitter.

While Twitter is often seen as a public microblogging site and does not necessitate direct replies to previous tweets (see Zappavigna 2011), it does facilitate conversational exchanges. Twitter is based on sequential organisation and turn-taking, which are amenable to conversational-analytic investigations (e.g. Paulus et al. 2016; Housley et al. 2017a). Despite evident differences (e.g. written rather than spoken discourse, or spatial and temporal divisions), Twitter interactions do show some characteristics of regular *multi-party* conversations between participants, conventionally called "speakers" and "hearers"; the latter can be divided into different categories, notably the *addressee* and the collective *third party* encompassing innumerable, frequently unidentified users, who are (by default) ratified participants in publicly available interactions (see e.g. Dynel 2017a). What is most significant is that an insult and a reply thereto are regarded here as an *adjacency pair* (Schegloff 1968), albeit not in spoken conversation (as originally conceptualised) but in written interaction, which may involve multi-modality (e.g. pictures, GIFs and emoticons).

This is the topic of Section 2, where we introduce the notion of the *insult-retort sequence* (Sacks 1992 [1972]), shedding light on both components and indicating the need to study them jointly. In Section 3 entitled "Setting the scene", we proceed with a description of the political drama, which serves as a backdrop for the present research. Section 4 depicts our research methodology, most notably the data collection and annotation procedures, indicating problems key to the analysis of insults and retorts on social media. In Section 5, we duly present a micro-analysis of the data, focusing primarily on the formal and conceptual creativity of Daniels's humorous retorts to the insults she receives. We extrapolate from this investigation general findings concerning the workings of humorous replies to misogynist insults in the "Discussion" that ensues in Section 6. The paper closes with concluding comments in Section 7.

## 2.    Insult-reply adjacency pairs

A standard insult is typically thought of as an utterance that is intended to *offend* the target. An insult (or a putdown) is a spoken or written utterance that ascribes a negative characteristic to the *target* by debasing his/her "physical appearance, mental ability, character, behaviour, beliefs and/or familial and social relations" (Allan and Burridge 2006, 79). Insults may centre on, but should not be reduced to, the use of, typically taboo, pejorative/derogatory terms that aim to abuse the person whom they concern (see e.g. Jay 1996; Dynel 2012a and references therein). These can be dubbed *slurs*, even though, according to a narrow definition, this term pertains to pejorative terms indicative of a social category, such as ethnicity, race or sexual orientation (for a solid overview, see Hess, forth).

It needs to be emphasised that, contrary to what the semantics of the success verb "to insult" might suggest, insults need not always achieve the perlocutionary effect desired by the speaker. A distinction needs to be drawn between the speaker's intention to insult the target and the target's resulting emotional state, which may, but does not need to, show in his/her reaction. Essentially, the relevant verbal act is performed with a view to causing offence, while the effect exerted on the target does not have to involve taking offence. On the other hand, a person might feel insulted even when there has been no relevant intention on the speaker's part, and even if the offended person should be cognisant of this fact (cf. Jucker and Taavitsainen 2000, see also Mateo and Yus 2013 on (mis)understanding insults).

A successful insult proper rests on the speaker's intention to demean the target, and the target's considering the remark demeaning. Jucker and Taavitsainen (2000) add to this definition a third condition, namely the target's belief that the speaker did have the intention to hurt or demean him/her. This condition is, however, questionable – not merely optional, as Jucker and Taavitsainen (2000) suggest, pointing to the hearer's recognition of the unintentionality of an insult – inasmuch as intention recognition is not necessarily part of interlocutors' cognitive reality (see Dynel 2019). Most importantly here, an insult need not cause offence, or at least its target does not have to explicitly show taking offence or may even "explicitly refuse to be insulted" (Kampf 2015, 107). Overall, distinctions must be drawn between the addressee's perception of the speaker's intent, his/her actual taking offence, and his/her perceivable reaction. There is no way of knowing what the target of an insult actually feels or thinks, even though some conjectures can be made given his/her perceptible reaction. In any case, insults must be examined in tandem with the responses they elicit from the target of offence. It is these responses that can be the central topic of investigation.

Sacks (1992 [1972]) is, presumably, the first to have talked about the *insult-retort sequence*, pointing out that insults "come in pairs" and can be "returned" (Sacks 1992 [1972], 419). However, a counter-insult is not the only possible reaction. Jucker and Taavitsainen (2000, 74) suggest that apart from a "reaction in kind", i.e. a counter-insult, the original insult is apt to invite denial, violence or silence. However, this list of reactions is not exhaustive. Insults may elicit *retorts*, here defined as quick and witty responses, which can be rhetorically powerful even if not they are not tantamount to counter-insults. In interactional terms, a retort to an insult is a *second pair member* (Sacks 1992 [1972]), which together form an *adjacency pair* (Schegloff 1968).

Reactions to insults vary depending on the nature of the insults, which – according to a traditional distinction – may be *ritual* or *personal* (Labov 1972; Arnovick 1995). This distinction seems to correspond to the difference between what Labov (1972) calls a "factual statement" which communicates some intended offensive meaning and a humorous ritual utterance making some absurd or, at least "obviously implausible" (Stokoe and Edwards 2007, 340) or not "accurate statement of reality" (Smitherman 1977, 133–134), which typically elicits another insult in response. Technically, what these authors must mean to suggest is that speakers doing ritual insulting do not believe what they are uttering to be true, and hence that the insults exhibit what can be labelled "autotelic untruthfulness" (Dynel 2018). However, the juxtaposition of personal insults with ritual insults, as conceptualised above, is not appealing. Jocular insults performed as a humorous ritual (e.g. on social media) can be immensely creative and may communicate truthful meanings about targets even though they are not intended to cause offence (Dynel and Poppi 2019, forth), while insults proper made with the intent to offend the target may present conventionalised formats, and need not always be "factual" or represent the speaker's true beliefs, let alone correspond to the objective truth. Also, both types of insults are capable of eliciting relevant insults in reply.

It is, nonetheless, crucial to differentiate between (genuine) insults and *jocular insults*. Unlike the former, the latter are not intended to offend the target, being a form of solidarity-building humour instead (see e.g. Maíz-Arévalo 2015; Dynel and Poppi 2019 and references therein). Therefore, both insults and pejorative terms therein should be viewed in context, that is, through the lens of what the speakers – in both face-to-face conversations and social media interactions – seem to mean regardless of what the literal meanings may suggest.

## 3.    Setting the scene

Stephanie Clifford (née Stephanie Gregory), better known as Stormy Daniels, is an acclaimed American pornographic actress, scriptwriter and director. Her name became widely known outside film industry in 2018 when she entered a legal dispute with US President Donald Trump and his attorney Michael Cohen.[1] In a nutshell, in 2018, it transpired that in October 2016, just before the presidential election, Stormy Daniels had signed a non-disclosure agreement and had been paid $ 130,000 worth of hush money so that she would not disclose her (alleged) affair (and sexual intercourse) with Trump back in 2006. Whilst admitting to the payment made from his personal account (rather than campaign funds), Cohen, together with Trump's other spokespeople, accused Daniels of lying and denied the affair. In 2018, Daniels filed two lawsuits against Trump, one concerning the invalidity of the non-disclosure agreement (which Trump himself never signed) and Cohen's intimidating threats; and the other on libel charges (i.e. Trump calling her statements "fraud"). On 5th April 2018, on Air Force One, Trump denied having any knowledge of the $ 130,000 payment made by Cohen to Daniels or the underlying rationale of this act. In September 2018, Trump's lawyers stated that he would neither enforce the non-disclosure agreement nor oppose Daniels's claim about its invalidity.

Whatever the truth may be, the Stormy Daniels-Donald Trump scandal is likely to have critical political repercussions given the potential suspicion of impeachable offences "committed in the service of fraudulently obtaining the office."[2] Additionally, in the #MeToo age, the political drama has feminist overtones. This is interesting given that Trump has eluded the consequences of his

---

**1.**  https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-lawyer-arranged-130-000-payment-for-adult-film-stars-silence-1515787678

https://www.npr.org/2018/03/25/596868354/stormy-daniels-shares-graphic-details-about-alleged-affair-with-trump

https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-04-06/donald-trump-says-he-didnt-know-about-payment-to-stormy-daniels/9625396

https://edition.cnn.com/2018/06/06/politics/stormy-daniels-new-lawsuit/index.html

https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/22/nyregion/cohen-trump-organization-campaign-hush-money.html

https://www.washingtonpost.com/gdpr-consent/?destination=%2fpolitics%2ftrump-cohen-do-not-plan-to-enforce-stormy-danielss-nondisclosure-agreement-court-filings-state%2f2018%2f09%2f09%2fb4492cc4-b45e-11e8-a2c5-3187f427e253_story.html%3f&utm_term=.6f83ef3e7ab2

**2.**  https://nypost.com/2018/08/28/stormy-daniels-on-becoming-unlikely-heroine-of-the-resistance/

https://nypost.com/2018/12/09/nadler-says-trump-could-be-impeached-for-stormy-daniels-payment/

misogyny (e.g. Jenkins and Mazer 2017), and Daniels is a sex entrepreneur. Notwithstanding her policies, Stormy Daniels is considered a feminist heroine who bravely speaks up, inciting other harassed or assaulted women to step forward against President Trump.[3]

Most importantly here, Stormy Daniels is held in high regard for her humour.[4] Numerous journalists have commented on her acerbic wit on Twitter[5] often in response to aggressive sexist and/or misogynist comments posted by users known as "(Trumpkin) trolls."[6] Whether these "trolls" (see Dynel 2016 on the ambiguous emic/etic label) are to be seen as Trump's vehement but sincere supporters (of both sexes) or as his spin doctors who deceptively pretend to be the former, they chastise and insult Daniels often only to delete their tweets or entire accounts after they receive her immediate (as the Twitter data demonstrate) replies. These exchanges are the topic of the present paper.

## 4.    Methodology: Data collection and annotation

Set up in February 2009, Stormy Daniels's publicly available Twitter page (https://twitter.com/stormydaniels) had almost 35,000 tweets, 958,000 followers and over 3,000 likes in June 2019, that is, at the time this paper was being written. The dataset examined in this study is a corpus of tweets collected between 15th and 20th June 2019 from the account's "timeline", which encompasses the most popular/successful tweets, namely those showing the highest visibility gauged on the basis of the number of likes (symbolised by hearts) and retweets.

Each of the authors independently did a manual search through the account's timeline, going back to the beginning of the political drama in 2016, in pursuit

---

**3.**  https://www.salon.com/2018/03/18/stormy-daniels-is-a-feminist-hero/
https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/24/opinion/sunday/stormy-daniels-michael-cohen-feminist-hero.html

**4.**  https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/tv/la-et-st-stormy-daniels-60-minutes-trump-20180325-story.html

**5.**  https://hollywoodlife.com/2018/03/20/stormy-daniels-donald-trump-sex-joke-no-sleeping/
https://www.huffpost.com/entry/stormy-daniels-twitter_n_5aa2b4a6e4b07047bec60145?guccounter=1
https://www.rawstory.com/2018/03/stormy-daniels-brilliantly-shuts-trump-defenders-sit-hurt/
https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/10/18/17990914/stormy-daniels-trump-horseface-tweet-tiny

**6.**  https://www.thecut.com/2018/03/stormy-daniels-donald-trump-twitter-trolls.html
https://www.thedailybeast.com/stormy-daniels-slays-trump-trolls-on-twitter
https://www.thecut.com/2018/03/stormy-daniels-donald-trump-twitter-trolls.html

of users' insults targeted at Stormy Daniels (with the posts not necessarily being addressed to her) and her humorous reactions thereto, taking either component as a cue. The initial results were duly compared and collated, with repetitions eradicated. This yielded a tentative corpus of tweets to be duly annotated. However, in many cases, the tweets triggering what looked evidently like replies to insults were missing, insofar as either the specific messages had been deleted or user accounts suspended. We thus commenced an online search for the relevant nicknames or the verbatim replies in order to recover the original insulting messages. This search proved successful thanks to reposting on Twitter (i.e. retweeting), as well as the tweets' snowballing across social media, notably on humour hubs and online magazines' websites, where the original insults were retained thanks to screenshots taken in time. Thus, the visual and typographic presentation of the consecutive tweets, captured as screenshots, differs depending on the channel via which the tweets are syndicated and displayed (see also Zappavigna 2011). In some cases, the ever-growing numbers of replies, retweets and likes are captured in the images as well, corroborating the popularity of Stormy Daniels's posts.

Regardless of their visual format, notably the visual order, the insult-reply adjacency pairs are composed of first pair members (insults) and the chronologically ensuing @replies (retorts) directed to "@username". Although "@username" is used to tag the author of the original tweet, this tag is deployed as a personal deictic marker (Zappavigna 2017) and conventionally indicates also the addressee of the tweet (Honeycutt and Herring 2009; Housley et al. 2017a). The addressee, who may be a single individual or multiple ones for one tweet, is the person or people who have authored the previous comment(s) now replied to. Nonetheless, each message is also intended to have countless many ratified receivers (not only the followers of, or unregistered "lurkers" on, the original account, but also those who search for specific hashtag metadata). A tweet – whether or not in accordance with the original speaker's intent – ultimately reaches vast unpredictable audiences, who cannot be fully predicted or determined (see Chovanec and Dynel 2015; Dynel 2017a), also thanks to retweeting and further reposting online (Marwick and boyd 2010). Cognisant of this potential broad reach of their publicly available tweets, both insulters and Stormy Daniels tailor their posts in order to interact not only with the "@"-indicated addressees but also with the collective third party with different goals in mind, as the present analysis will show.

In this context, an ethics statement is in order. As is often the case on social media, both the celebrity's tweets and other users' insulting tweets presented in this paper are publicly available, and so are the usernames, all being widely searchable and accessible, whether on Twitter or reposting sites. Be that as it may, we anonymise all tweets except for Stormy Daniels's, deleting from the screen-

shots other names and monikers in the sender and receiver positions,[7] which is a common ethical practice adopted in social-media research: we deploy publicly available data accessed without signing in and delete the usernames and photographs/icons representing "everyday users" while keeping the names and usernames, as well as photographs, of public figures (see Townsend and Wallace 2016).

With an initial corpus of adjacency pairs ($n = 58$) gathered, a *grounded theory* approach was followed, allowing the relevant qualitative insights to emerge from the data. As predicted (and consonant with various media reports), the majority of Stormy Daniels's retorts to insults in the corpus of the timeline tweets do show humorous potential. This is evidenced by the formal properties of the tweets coinciding with the hallmarks of various humour categories (to be described in Section 5), in tandem with users' reactions to Stormy Daniels's tweets involving laughter emoticons, emoji and/or relevant verbal *metapragmatic* evaluations (e.g. "So funny"), all being indicative of users' humour experience on social media (see Dynel 2018 on methodology in humour research).

However, not evidently humorous replies to insults were also found in the original corpus. Suffice it to say that these non-humorous retorts were apt and meritorious, presenting facts and/or logical arguments. This is the case with Stormy Daniels's reply to the tweet that calls her a failure (Example 1) or another one involving an accusation and insult questioning the deservedness of an Adult Video News Award on which she had just reported (Example 2).

Examples 1–2.



In both cases, Stormy evaluates the observations made by insulters as "funny" (which does not mean "amusing", but rather "strange" in these contexts) given the objective evidence at hand that disproves the messages relayed in the insulting tweets. Even though sharp replies like these, based on arguments which pre-empt further counter-attacks, can still occasion humorous reactions in some receivers, they are discarded from the corpus insofar as they lack the structural properties of any previously identified form of verbal humour, which relies on formal and/or conceptual creativity. We also disposed of adjacency pairs encompassing humorous replies to non-insulting posts (Example 3) or insults targeted at other users but supportive of Stormy herself (Example 4).

---

7.   There is an ongoing academic debate on the ethics of Twitter studies, namely whether or not personal data in widely available content should be removed in academic discussions (Webb et al. 2017).

Example 3.



**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · 15 Mar 2018
You sick fuck. LOL

> Replying to @StormyDaniels
> really liking your sense of humor!

💬 24    🔁 17    ♡ 836    ✉    ⌄

Example 3 presents Stormy's jocular insult targeted at a fan who has paid her a compliment on her sense of humour. Through this kind of humorous *teasing* involving *overtly pretended* aggression (see e.g. Sinkeviciute and Dynel, forth and references therein), she deflects the compliment and builds a bond of solidarity with the user, assuming that he will recognise the humorous nature of her retort and will take the abuse as being overtly pretended (see Dynel 2017c on overt pretence).

Example 4.



**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · Jan 12
Hey! I like to suck, too! Got the awards to prove it!

> Your a FUCKING idiot, I hope Stormy brings PRESIDENT TRUMP'S money. She fucks and You Suck. 😂👋

💬 685    🔁 550    ♡ 9.6K    ✉    ⌄

In Example 4, a user hurls an insult at another one, endorsing Stormy's political activities. In her teasing reply, Stormy voices a humorous objection based on the pun anchored in the two meanings of the verb "suck". This answer may communicate truthful meanings, but the protest is overtly pretended and does not mean that Daniels sincerely objects to the supportive tweet.

In the original corpus, we also found several examples of insults that, upon closer inspection, turned out to be jocular insults (see Dynel and Poppi 2019, forth and references therein).

Example 5.



**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · 1 Apr 2018
Ok. Ok. Fine! I admit it. My pussy is a Sith Lord.

> @StormyDaniels Damn girl, don't you know this is all your fault. You got Trump naked, you inserted his dick into you, you made him text you, you made him pay you off, it's all YOU girl (I hope you detected the sarcasm)

💬 238    🔁 366    ♡ 3.3K    ✉    ⌄

The male user metapragmatically labels his comment – seemingly rife with accusations and tantamount to a complex insult – as "sarcasm", a commonplace emic label in American English for the figure of irony (Dynel 2017b). He thus indicates

that he dissociates himself from such opinions, of which he is critical. What the user does is express his negative evaluation of this kind of criticism levelled at Stormy by others, thereby showing his support for her, implying that she is not the one to blame. Thus, the insult ("Damn girl") qualifies as a jocular one. Stormy responds in kind through a humorous ironic reply based on absurdity and a cultural allusion (to the lord of the dark side of the force from *Star Wars*), overtly pretending to agree with the purported criticism. While the jocular nature of the insult in Example 5 is rather easy to determine in the local context thanks to the metapragmatic label, Example 6 presents a more problematic case.

Example 6.



At first blush, the user's tweet in Example 6 is based on the figure of irony aimed to deprecate Stormy Daniels (i.e. there is no real challenge for her to face since she is a porn actress). Understanding the nature of this potentially offensive tweet, which Stormy Daniels receives with humour, necessitates knowing a broader context, specifically the preceding tweets to which the user is replying.

Example 6′.

The broader interactional context (see Example 6′) reveals that the post by a user (whose account indicates that he is not Trump's supporter) is a reply to a comment that praises Stormy Daniels for her political actions and a good sense of humour, in view of Melania Trump's post about a ceremony in recognition of influential female leaders. Therefore, the seemingly offensive comment is not, in fact, meant to deny Stormy her political courage but rather to jocularly comment on her profession, which the user seems to have nothing against. This causes Stormy to tease the user. She accepts the positive evaluation and does not deny her sexual activities, but she playfully takes issue with the user's imagery, pointing to her moderation in accessories, indicative of her good taste.

The detection of this example, which indicates the necessity to study insults in a broader interactional context, prompted us to double-check the whole dataset to ensure that the ultimate corpus would encompass only adjacency pairs comprised of insults proper (rather than jocular ones) and humorous retorts, all annotated with regard to the various types of humorous creativity (formal and/or conceptual) that they represent. We thus arrived at the corpus of examples ($n = 44$) briefly depicted in Section 5 below.

## 5.    Data analysis

This section presents the result of the qualitative analysis of Stormy Daniels's humorous retorts to insults. We depict the corpus of humorous replies, focusing on their creative construction and novelty of expression (see Dynel and Poppi 2019, forth; Vásquez 2019 and references therein), finding similarities and recurrent patterns therein. The analysis aims to seamlessly present all the diversified examples before the essence is distilled, namely their common denominators and the key functions are teased out in Section 6.

As one of her recurrent strategies, Stormy rhetorically turns tables on the insulters by making humorous but, at the same time, logical extrapolations from the insulting comments, and thus questioning their premises.

Examples 7–8.



In reply to the condemning post pointing out her promiscuity in Example 7, Stormy takes up on the religious scenario and rationalises the determiner ("so

many") only to defiantly reject the premise endorsed by the prudish insulter and to jocularly suggest that she does care for going to hell actually. On the other hand, when responding to the "villain" epithet in Example 8, she refers to the two incompatible elements of the aggressive post. She thus invokes a cultural *allusion* to a fairy-tale film adaptation while building a sexual scenario. (This is followed by a rational observation, which ridicules the dubious logic of the insulter.) A fictional scenario can also be co-constructed in an insult-retort adjacency pair, a special case of humorous *joint fantasising* (e.g. Chovanec 2012; Tsakona 2018; cf. Poppi forth), as is the case in Example 9.

Example 9.



The insult in Example 9 appears in an interaction concerning Stormy's advanced (sic) age and her alleged seeking attention at the dusk of her career through creating the political scandal. The insulter presumably means to suggest, based on folk knowledge of female biology, that, as a result of her long career in pornographic industry, her pelvic muscles and ligaments have weakened, causing her uterus to slip down and protrude out of her vagina. What Stormy does is develop this absurd, *hyperbole*-based insult into a fictional scenario, in which she takes the image to the extreme (not just falling out, but falling down) and pictures herself as casually asking the insulter for help.

   Stormy Daniels creatively plays also with other stylistic figures, not just hyperbole, notably *metaphor* (on the humorous potential of metaphor in interaction, see Dynel 2012b). Specifically, she uses an interactant's literal expression as a point of departure for a metaphor (Example 10), develops on a metaphor (Example 11), or feigns obliviousness to it (Example 12).

Example 10.

In Example 10, Stormy outwits the insulter by using the same imagery as he did ("farm animals") for the sake of creating a metaphor ("pig") that serves as an insult, albeit not targeted at the addressed user. Also, she skillfully handles the accusation concerning her alleged insignificance by making a rational observation about the lengths to which Twitter users go before they can deprecate her (see also Example 39).

Example 11.



As Example 11 shows, in her retort to the metaphorical chiasmus-based insult targeting her provenance and presumed vulgarity, Stormy seems to reconcile herself with her humble origins, as evidenced by the hashtag she adds, but she elaborates on the metaphor in order to communicate her success. A reverse strategy involves overtly pretended obliviousness to, and misunderstanding of, a metaphor (Example 12), as well as irony (Example 13), thanks to which she purports to be blind to the insults.

Examples 12–13.



The insulter in Example 12 metaphorically implicates that Stormy Daniels is physically used up, having served men sexually in pornographic films (similar to the proverbial western film horses), possibly alluding also to Trump's notorious "horseface" epithet.[8] In her riposte, Stormy takes "horse" as if it was meant literally and jocularly teases the addressee about his/her experience and fetishes.[9] Similarly, in Example 13, Stormy overtly pretends to be blind to the *irony* (see Dynel 2019), and hence the implicated criticism the ironic utterance carries (namely that she is the source of her father's shame/humiliation). She also humorously performs an act of subversive disobedience, as though she wants to be subject to the criticism.

---

**8.**  https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/1052213711295930368

**9.**  She also rightly observes that the tweet is confusing. First, the canine imagery is used in the conventionalised metaphor, resulting in catachresis (i.e. mixed metaphor). Second, a typo must be involved: either a question mark missing or "and" is mistaken for "are".

These two retorts in Examples 12 and 13 (see also Examples 7 and 8) qualify as *trumping* (Veale et al. 2006), which is a witty adversarial language game based on the speaker's overtly pretended misunderstanding of the preceding turn and skewing the intended meaning to activate an alternative one, typically facilitated by the ambiguity of the original turn, here an insult. This ambiguity may be lexical, and so trumping may involve what is known as *interactional puns* (Norrick 1993) or *reformulation puns* (Partington 2006), as in Example 14 (see also Example 33).

Example 14.



In her response to the insult, Stormy Daniels humorously makes use of the polysemy of the word "sleep" and focuses on the irrelevant sense (clearly not intended by the insulter) for the sake of humour. Only then does she confirm and clarify the user's observation (i.e. she had intercourse with Trump, an actor at the time), tacitly accepting the insulting slur (cf. Examples 23–35). She then pursues a serious agenda regarding the President's activities, only to defiantly assert her position on the political arena and close her post with the patronising (in this context) superiority-building "hugs and kisses" symbol. Interactional puns that serve trumping are not the only ones that Stormy deploys.

Examples 15–17.



Responding to an implicit insult suggesting that she is despised rather than liked (which involves a tacit reference to her profession) in Example 15, Stormy makes use of the polysemy of the word "grow" used in the insult, boldly addressing the taboo topic. She then rationally dispels the doubt that she is disliked. On the other hand, in Example 16, Stormy produces a pun that allows her to change the subject smoothly. Thus, rather than addressing the offence based on a sexual taboo, she wittily disparages some cowardly Twitter users. In yet another punning reply

(Example 17) based on *zeugma* and the polysemy of the word "stimulate", she deflects the criticism of her profession and exploitation, whilst taking the slur for granted (see Examples 23–35). Punning is not the only type of wordplay that Stormy uses to her advantage in the retorts she makes.

Examples 18–19.

**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · Mar 22
But the paycheck cleared so laughing all the way to the bank.

> You are so dumb you don't even see how you are the joke here.

○ 400   � 621   ♡ 13K   ✉   ⌄

**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · 30 Mar 2018
Which is a perfectly legal way to make money and provide for said child, BTW. If you have an issue, don't watch porn (although I bet you do). Quack! Quack!

> lol well if it quacks like a duck lol look you have a child and you get paid to have sex on camera

○ 326   ↻ 456   ♡ 6.3K   ✉   ⌄

Using the word "joke" in the insult as the wordplay's basis in Example 18, Stormy deploys an idiom with the word "laugh" and thereby shows her superiority, both financial and rhetorical. In the tweet in Example 19, she boldly admits to her profession, which she does not find shameful. The humorous nature of Stormy's reply resides in her use of the onomatopoeia, whereby she alludes to the idiomatic expression in which the insulting tweet is couched and accepts the implicit epithet. However, wordplay (including puns) is not the only way in which Stormy *plays* with the form of derogatory comments, which Examples 20–22 illustrate.

Example 20.

**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · Jan 19
Ok! Boy, who poorly tweets at lady who sucks dicks for a living.

> Replying to @StormyDaniels
> Ok lady who sucks dicks for a living

○ 1.1K   ↻ 1.2K   ♡ 18K   ✉   ⌄

As Example 20 shows, Stormy begins her retort by mimicking the rather uncanny opening format of the insulting tweet only to superciliously criticise it and repeat the rather obvious observation the user has designed to insult her, clearly to no avail.

Examples 21–22.

**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · 4 May 2018
Correct spelling is "vile". Fuck off

> FOR ANY FEMALE to use that VIAL VULGAR word in public PROVES she has no self respect

**Stormy Daniels** ✔
@StormyDaniels                                             ⌄

Hahaha! I don't need to fuck Cohen. He's fucking the shit out of himself.

**Stormy Daniels** ✔ @StormyDaniels · 10 Mar 2018
Such a badass...that won't spell out the naughty words.  Ok

> @StormyDaniels YOU are a traitor to our country!!  Keep up your sh**t and YOU will be tried for treason and HUNG   LIAR You sold your SOUL WON"T WORK B**CH

○ 484   ↻ 291   ♡ 2.9K   ✉   ⌄

In Example 21, referring to Stormy's previous tweet involving a swearword, the user submits a prudish comment in which he/she makes a spelling mistake. Stormy corrects it and, moreover, uses the swearword again as an act of marked disobedience. It is, however, more often ordinary Twitter users that post abusive

expletives, albeit sometimes editing them out. In her ironic meta-pragmatic comment in Example 22, Stormy criticises the insulter for not being able to spell out the "naughty" words while she does not protest against their abusive content.

Examples 23–24.

@StormyDaniels SHAME ON YOU FOR WHAT YOU'RE DOING! YOU'RE A MONEY GRUBBING B____! & YOU KNOW WHAT THAT MAKES YOU (A W_____)! PLAIN.& SIMPLE!

**Stormy Daniels** ✓
@StormyDaniels

Replying to

Your keyboard appears to be broken. I'll help. BITCH and WHORE? Am I right? What do I win? I like this game! Xoxo

whats the word for someone who sells body for cash. i think it rhymes
with floor or core or door. i can't think of the word can you stormy?

**Stormy Daniels** ✓
@StormyDaniels

Replying to

Whore. You're welcome

Example 23 shows how Stormy plays with the visual form of the tweet through feigning naivety and taking the insult as an inadvertently submitted riddle, which she solves by spelling out the, in fact, purposefully deleted slurs. Similarly, in Example 24, she playfully engages with the implicit insult, solving the puzzle as if she is oblivious to the use of Socratic *irony* (i.e. overtly pretended ignorance) in the insulting tweet.

Generally, as Examples 23–24 demonstrate (cf. also Example 19), whether more implicit or evidently containing misogynist slurs, these insults hurled at Stormy are tantamount to online *slut-shaming*[10] performed by representatives of both sexes[11] (see Webb 2015; Jane 2017). Even though the stigmatising taboo labels, not only "slut" but also "whore", may be regarded as reflecting the celebrity's profession,[12] they show disdain for her sexual activities and serve as an expression of strong negative emotions with a clear intent to offend her (cf. Jay 2018). Stormy's standard strategy is to accept the invectives, whether tacitly (see also Examples 14, 17 and 45) or explicitly. In the latter case, she unabashedly admits to her stigmatised profession, joyfully taking slurs on the chin, which many examples in the corpus bear out. Here is a collection of insults and retorts (Examples 25–32) focused specifically on slurs, not only slut-shaming ones, with a longer conversational strand on the left, in which various users fling insults at Stormy, who replies to each.

---

10.   Slut-shaming may also be performed without the use of slurs, see Examples 20 and 48.

11.   In the dataset, the users' names and photographs (deleted here), indicate both men and women. Whether any of this user information is truthful cannot be confirmed.

12.   Technically speaking, however, a porn actress need not have many sexual partners, so the central concept underlying the semantics of both the slurs does not need to obtain.

Examples 25–32.



As these examples indicate, Stormy gladly accepts and confirms the various pejo-rative epithets. In some of the cases, she replies as if they hold formally (a "busi-ness card") and playfully uses them as part of a distancing form of address ("Miss"). Faced with the blatantly offensive (impolite) insults, she performs politeness upshifts as she addresses the insulters with a polite formula ("Nice to meet ya") or praise ("At least you've been paying attention" and "I love your enthu-siasm"). Another noteworthy strategy involves modifying the pejorative epithets. Whilst retaining the slurs, Stormy substitutes positive modifiers for negative ones either in her post content ("happy" vs "sad" "whore") or in the hashtag metadata that she corrects ("successful" vs "poor" "old slut"). She thus pictures the con-structs communicated through the pejorative epithets as being positive. Here are some further, more elaborate Examples (33–35), where she makes apt and/or witty observations, accepting the pejorative labels applied to her.

Example 33.



In Example 33, doing wordplay based on two derogatory terms, Stormy explicitly conceptualises what she is accused of as something pleasurable. She also does trumping, based on the meaning of "180" with the use of vivid sexual imagery.

Examples 34–35.



Whilst accepting the stigmatising label as being relevant to her, in Example 34, Stormy makes a rational observation about her marital status at the time, which proves the insulter wrong. Also, similar to other cases above, in Example 35, she changes the epithet preceding the slur as if paying herself a tongue-in-cheek compliment ("dumb" vs. "smart") and thereby she wittily escapes the doom pictured by the insulter. Yet another strategy that Stormy uses involves recognising positive aspects in the pejorative label not envisaged by the insulter. This is the case of the pig epithet, illustrated with a GIF (showing an *Angry Birds* pig dancing) in Example 36.

Example 36.



Stormy turns the offensive epithet (together with its visual representation) into a compliment (see also Kampf 2015) based on a positive feature attributed to the animal, feigning obliviousness to the intended meaning. This instance may then be seen as *rhetorical re-focusing* (similar to trumping), that is changing the topic by focusing on a non-salient or basically irrelevant issue present in, or inspired by, the original comment. Insulters sometimes facilitate this, for instance through making typos, as in Example 37, or questionable assumptions, as in Example 38.

Example 37.



@StormyDaniels YOU ATE PURE
TRASH!@!...I TRULY HOPE YOUR 15
MINUTES OF FAME BRING YOU A LIFETIME
OF KARMA HELL

**Stormy Daniels** ✓
@StormyDaniels

Replying to

Damn it! Way to call me out for my moment
of dietary weakness. I did, in fact, have Taco
Bell last night. I'm so ashamed...although by
far not the worst thing that I have put in my
mouth.

Capitalising on a typo in the insult ("are" vs "ate"), Stormy offers what she presents as a compromising revelation (its veracity aside) about her recent meal, as well as making a sexual allusion with impunity to taunt the insulter, who seems to have intended to frown upon her sexual activity.

Example 38.



**Stormy Daniels** ✓ @StormyDaniels · 3 May 2018
That's all you got, honey? I WISH that I had a "fat" ass!

Replying to @StormyDaniels
Honey, you are your horse's manure. Poor animal, has to cart your fat ass
around. Animal cruelty

◯ 693      ↻ 300      ♡ 5.1K      ✉      ☑

Stormy opens another tweet (Example 38) by mocking the form of address the user has deployed (cf. Example 20) only to address a secondary issue, possibly irrelevant from the latter's perspective. Thereby, Stormy rationalises the premise underlying the insult, which has somewhat convoluted imagery ("manure" and a metonymic passenger to "cart" simultaneously). Rationalisation that reveals some flaws in the insulter's logic or premises can be a humorous response strategy in its own right, as many of Stormy's comebacks bear out, such as the one in Example 39 (see also Examples 7, 8 and 34).

Example 39.



Puke. That's sad and pathetic 100%

**Stormy Daniels** ✓
@StormyDaniels

Replying to

Hahahahaha!!! Who is more pathetic though?
You're tweeting a "whore" at the crack of
dawn. Hope you didn't stay up all night
thinking of me...but if you did, hope you
rubbed one out at least.

Replying to a female user (which can be gathered based on the name and picture edited out here) who has cast a slur at her in the previous tweet, Stormy makes a

rational comment referring to the time of the exchange only to tease the prudish interlocutor with a sexual scenario involving herself. Additionally, in Examples 40–42, the few rationalising replies bring to light the *situational irony* (see Dynel 2017b and references therein) co-created by the users' mildly insulting tweets suggesting that Stormy's contributions are irrelevant, offensive or uninteresting. Stormy wittily points out the contradiction co-constructed by the tweets, which exerts humorous effects.

Examples 40–42.



Apart from providing rational replies that bring out the contextual silliness of the original tweets in Examples 40 and 41, in Example 42, Stormy attempts to insult the attacker through a relevant slur, in tandem with other target group members, wittily playing with im/politeness effects. After making a metapragmatic remark about avoiding "rudeness", she actually goes on to be seemingly impolite, ultimately indicating her jocularity with the hugs and kisses symbol. It needs to be pointed out that she rarely insults her Twitter interlocutors. Besides this example, the corpus contains only a few other cases where Stormy seems to trade insults.

Examples 43–44.



In the tit-for-tat retorts in Examples 43 and 44, Stormy makes rational observations that puncture the users' insulting rhetoric only to give potentially offensive statements herself. These, nonetheless, may be considered more of jocular insults, rather than genuinely abusive assertions, given their hyperbolic nature and no validation for the claims she makes. This is even more pronounced in the next two cases in Examples 45 and 46, where absurdity is evident.

Examples 45–46.



What Example 45 shows is that Stormy seems to reconcile herself to the slut-shaming slur while not accepting the retirement suggestion. She thus creates a fictional scenario that hyperbolises her allegedly old age and jocularly threatens the insulter's grandmother, calling her "nana", which is in line with "muffin", another old-fashioned term of endearment typifying an elderly person's idiolect. Similarly, in the retort in Example 46 based on the *garden-path mechanism* (see Dynel 2009) – "can you?" promotes an interpretation that the speaker can perform the incredible sexual feat and is boasting about this, which turns out not to be the case – Stormy seems to allude to the "yo mama" humorous routine in order to jocularly insult the addressee with the rather absurd suggestion.

However, as many examples have corroborated, rather than aggressively but still playfully teasing her insulters via jocular insults, Stormy often performs *self-deprecation* (see Section 6). This is manifest in her honest admissions delivered in a humorous tone or just self-compromising statements whose truthfulness is irrelevant. In either case, she brazenly admits to her profession and other "flaws", as in Examples 47 and 48.

Examples 47–48.



Having made a rational observation about the post (cf. Examples 40–42), Stormy makes an honest admission about her breasts, coupled with an absurd comparison for hyperbolic and humorous effects. On the other hand, rather than denying the insulting slut-shaming premise that underlies the rhetorical question, she overtly pretends – as is quite clear – to be engaged in the activity in order to turn tables on the insulter. In some cases, the truthfulness of the jocular self-revelations cannot be established for lack of any available evidence.

Examples 49–50.



As Examples 49 and 50 show, while implicitly accepting the pejorative labels and the well-known facts about her profession, Stormy makes humorous admissions (about her pet hates and musical preferences), whose truthfulness cannot be categorically known and is basically insignificant in the context at hand.

## 6.    Discussion

The analysis of the representative corpus of Stormy Daniels's humorous replies to insults indicates a significant function of humour that has not been widely recognised so far, namely humour as a successful rhetorical strategy in response to insults. As the data examined here illustrate, the most salient leitmotifs in her humorous reactions to insulting tweets are wit and creativity, often coupled with self-deprecation.

Stormy Daniels uses a range of form-related linguistic tools and conceptual operations, which may not only overlap but also co-occur, such as: wordplay (including puns) and play with the form, creative applications of rhetorical figures (metaphor and irony), teasing, trumping, jocular insults, joint fantasising, witty acceptance of slurs, rhetorical re-focusing, rational observations puncturing insulters' rhetoric and logic (including recognition of situational irony), and compromising self-revelations. All of these help her to save face and, not necessarily fully consciously, display her wit and eloquence, as well as a good sense of humour. What Stormy Daniels must be mindful of, however, is that the insults she endures and the retorts she hurls are publicly available. This is why she will intend not only to address the insulters but also to communicate her replies to other Twitter users so that they should find them apt and possibly also amusing. Her tweets are indeed appreciated as being humorous and rhetorically successful by users on Twitter and, thanks to reposting, on other new media, as indicated by the vast numbers of hearts, reposts and positive metapragmatic comments by ordinary people and public commentators (e.g. journalists).[13]

---

**13.**   Nevertheless, it is not the case that all members of the general public must find the humour amusing. Humour appreciation is idiosyncratic and depends on many variables. In the present

The humour receivers, presumably, do not include the retorts' addressees, inasmuch as their rhetoric is deflated. As long as they do read the replies and see other users' reactions, they may find themselves conversationally defeated, hence feeling embarrassed or even dejected. Even though most of Stormy's reactions are not insulting to the addressees, many might sound a tad aggressive as she outwits the interlocutors and thereby demonstrates her intellectual superiority over them. Her public retorts to insults online epitomise utterances which (aim to) attain different communicative goals with respect to different hearers in multi-party interactions, with not all being intended, or able, to appreciate the creative humour (see Dynel 2013, 2018).

Rather than evidently taking offence or counter-attacking her insulters, which Stormy does rather rarely, she typically prefers to deploy what most receivers can see as creative humour, which is a testament to her composure and sharp wit. Thereby, she skillfully deflects the criticism (cf. Stewart 2011), not conceptualising the features and epithets (concerning the sexual domain) ascribed to her as shameful. In most of these witty retorts, Stormy Daniels boldly admits to, or tacitly concedes to, what is traditionally considered vices, taking the insults on the chin. Such retorts then qualify as *self-denigrating* or *self-deprecating* (or *self-deprecatory*) *humour* (Zajdman 1995; Boxer and Cortés-Conde 1997; Holmes 2000; Hay 2001; Greengross and Miller 2008; Schnurr and Chan 2011; Stewart 2011), also known as *self-directed joking* (Ziv 1984; Norrick 1993; Lampert and Ervin-Tripp 2006; Ervin-Tripp and Lampert 2009). This form of humour testifies to her ability to laugh at herself, building a positive self-image (Norrick 1993; Boxer and Cortés-Conde 1997; Lampert and Ervin-Tripp 2006; Schnurr and Chan 2011). Therefore, Stormy Daniels very often tacitly communicates a message along the lines of: "I am weak, I admit it. To admit means to be strong. So, I am strong" (Zajdman 1995, 338), thus being in control of the situation (Schnurr and Chan 2011) and even superior, especially when her retort is not only self-deprecatory but also creatively constructed and undermines the interlocutor's rhetoric and/or logic at the same time. Greengross and Miller (2008, 394) rightly observe that "expert use of self-deprecating humor can be an especially risky, reliable indicator not only of general intelligence and verbal creativity, but also of moral virtues such as humility." As various psychological studies indicate, self-deprecation is a very well-received type of humour, which puts the speakers in a positive light (e.g. Greengross and Miller 2008; Stewart 2011), which is believed to facilitate affiliation and solidarity-based relationships (Chapel 1978; Ziv 1984; Meyer 2000).

context, relevant factors include people's individual attitudes to sexual matters, as well as dispositions towards the actress and the US President.

Self-deprecating humour is reported to be a risk-laden strategy for it involves self-handicapping and explicitly indicating one's latent faults and flaws, and thus it is mainly high-status individuals that can afford to deploy it (Greengross and Miller 2008). Stormy Daniels's use of self-deprecation does testify to the claim that "the individual making the self-deprecatory comment may be seen as having so much social prestige they can afford to" (Stewart 2011, 205). It is because she is aware of her high status earned thanks to her profession, which, paradoxocally, the general public can consider – or, at least, present as being – morally questionable (see Poppi and Sandberg forth), that she boldly admits to the widely known facts, rhetorically turning tables on the accusers. In her case, self-deprecation is not the standard coping strategy that allows the speaker to make light of his/her shortcomings (see Ziv 1984). When dealing with the insults, Stormy Daniels reconceptualises the alleged shortcomings as advantages. On a related note, self-deprecating humour is often associated with covert weaknesses and vices that the speaker identifies himself/herself before they are discovered (Ziv 1984). The speaker thus performs "confessional self-abasement" for instance through personal anecdotes (Lampert and Ervin-Tripp 2006). By contrast, Stormy Daniels boldly admits to her widely known activities or characteristics and gladly echoes the slurs with which she is pelted. This is in line with the suggestion that "self-deprecating humor often highlights – in a socially pre-emptive way – perceived deficits" (Greengross and Miller 2008, 394). Stormy Daniels turns what the attackers conceive as a source of embarrassment into a source of pride, encoding her messages humorously (cf. Holmes 2000) and/or making humorous admissions or self-revelations, whether truthful or not (Dynel 2018).

## 7.    Conclusions and final comments

This paper has addressed the topic of insult-retort adjacency pairs on Twitter, focusing on the rhetorical effects of humour. Our study indicates the need to examine insults and replies thereto in a broader context, which poses a challenge especially in the case of social media data, so that jocular/ritual insults can be distinguished from insults proper. Additionally, rather than examining the insults alone, it is crucial to focus on the reactions they elicit in line with the conversation-analytic tradition. Instead of openly taking offence, the target of an insult may respond, among other things, in a humorous tone, without necessarily reciprocating the insult. This, in turn, reveals a hitherto ignored communicative function of humour as a means of saving face and achieving rhetorical victory over the insulter.

The empirical findings reported here are based on a corpus of select top tweets posted by Stormy Daniels, who has developed a reputation as an emancipated woman endowed with a great sense of humour and capable of producing witty replies. She thus gains the upper hand in online exchanges when publicly replying to insults that seem to be deployed as a political weapon, namely to publicly intimidate and disparage Trump's opponent, rather than being merely a prevalent means of garnering interest and high status online (see Housley et al. 2017b). The Twitter data analysed in this paper indicate that through her humorous retorts, Stormy Daniels never shows taking offence at the misogynist insults, nor does she come across as being inferior; instead, she uses the alleged vices as a source of pride, and she does so in a very witty and creative manner. She must post the superiority-building, but hardly insulting, tweets with the multiple receivers in mind (cf. Vásquez 2019), aiming to build a positive public image and amuse the general public, albeit – presumably – not the insulter (and like-minded people endorsing his/her tweet). Indeed, her retorts are positively evaluated by both Twitter users and journalists, as the plethora of upvotes and metapragmatic comments online demonstrate. Stormy Daniels's humorous reactions to misogynist insults, many of which qualify as slut-shaming, come across as being much more effective than any aggressive replies might be (cf. Jane 2017). Given her profession, she is able to "one up" her insulters by acknowledging and unapologetically owning her sexual activities.

All this offers interesting practical implications for women subjected to sexist/misogynist remarks in everyday conversations, as well as in online interactions, where women are the frequent targets of verbal aggression and pejorative ideologies (see e.g. Bou-Franch and Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2016; Jaki et al. 2019). Whilst slut-shamed women in lines of work other than sex business might not be able to respond in quite the same way as Stormy Daniels does, they could still attempt to claim their sexuality, rather than succumb to the dominant sexist ideologies (cf. Poppi and Sandberg forth). Most importantly, regardless of the nature of the misogynist insult, trying to keep a stiff upper lip and retorting in a witty and humorous manner may be the best way of silencing the verbal abuser and securing a rhetorical victory over him or, importantly, her.

Additionally, while previous studies have shown that self-denigration is a means of sharing amusement and affirming solidarity, as well as a tool for overcoming evident embarrassment (Walkinshaw et al. 2019), our study adduces evidence that self-deprecating humour can be used in markedly different contexts, namely where no embarrassment can be detected on the target's part. Self-deprecating humour may be employed to communicate one's superiority over the interlocutor with a view to amusing other participants in publicly available

multi-party interactions online and asserting one's strong social and interpersonal position.

On a higher plane, humorous replies to insults can be considered "dispreferred" (cf. e.g. Sacks 1973; Levinson 1983) reactions to the intimidating comments. The insults are thus undermined, if not wholly disarmed, rather than occasioning the planned/preferred reactions indicative of offence being taken, for instance, when no answer or an angry reply follows from the target. Even though each consecutive insulter should be braced for Stormy Daniels's comebacks (cognisant of how she has responded to the previous ones), they cannot really envisage the nature of her reply to their own insult, which is the essence of the retort's rhetorical success.

Following Sacks (1992 [1972], 161), we can conclude that "there's a big crucial thing on having the last word" after an insult has been produced. Irrespective of who the winner of the political and legal Trump-Daniels battle turns out to be in future, Stormy Daniels is a powerful opponent, if not an unquestionable winner, in the battle of wits on Twitter.

## Funding

## References

Allan, Keith and Kate Burridge. 2006. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511617881

Arnovick, Leslie. 1995. "Sounding and Flyting the English Agonistic Insult: Writing Pragmatic History in a Cross-cultural Context." In *The Twenty-First LACUS Forum 1994. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States*, edited by M. Powell, 600–619.

Bou-Franch, Patricia, and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich. 2016. "Gender Ideology and Social Identity Processes in Online Language Aggression against Women." In *Exploring Language Aggression against Women*, edited by Patricia Bou-Franch, 51–89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.86.03bou

Boxer, Diana, and Florencia Cortés-Conde. 1997. "From Bonding and Biting: Conversational Joking and Identity Display." *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 275–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00031-8

Chapel, Gage. 1978. "Humor in the White House: An Interview with Presidential Speechwriter Robert Orben." *Communication Quarterly* 26: 44–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463377809369283

Chovanec, Jan. 2012. "Conversational Humour and Joint Fantasizing in Online Journalism." In *Language and Humour in the Media*, edited by Jan Chovanec and Isabel Ermida, 139–161. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Chovanec, Jan, and Marta Dynel. 2015. "Researching Interactional Forms and Participant Structures in Public and Social Media." In *Participation in Public and Social Media Interactions*, edited by Marta Dynel and Jan Chovanec, 1–23. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Demjén, Zsofia. 2016. "Laughing at Cancer: Humour, Empowerment, Solidarity and Coping Online." *Journal of Pragmatics* 101: 18–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.05.010

Demjén, Zsofia. 2018. "Complexity Theory and Conversational Humour: Tracing the Birth and Decline of a Running Joke in an Online Cancer Support Community." *Journal of Pragmatics* 133: 93–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.06.001

Dynel, Marta. 2009. *Humorous Garden-Paths: A Pragmatic-Cognitive Study*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dynel, Marta. 2012a. "Swearing Methodologically: The Impoliteness of Expletives in Anonymous Commentaries on YouTube." *Journal of English Studies* 10: 25–50. https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.179

Dynel, Marta. 2012b. "Humour on the House: Interactional Construction of Metaphor in Film Discourse." In *Language and Humour in the Media*, edited by Jan Chovanec and Isabel Ermida, 83–106. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dynel, Marta. 2013. "Impoliteness as Disaffiliative Humour in Film Talk." In *Developments in Linguistic Humour Theory*, edited by Marta Dynel, 105–144. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/thr.1.07dyn

Dynel, Marta. 2016. "Trolling is not Stupid: Internet Trolling as the Art of Deception Serving Entertainment." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 13: 353–381. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2016-0015

Dynel, Marta. 2017a. "Participation as Audience Design." In *Pragmatics of Social Media. Mouton de Gruyter Handbooks of Pragmatics*, edited by Christian R. Hoffmann and Wolfram Bublitz, 61–82. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431070-003

Dynel, Marta. 2017b. "Academics vs American Scriptwriters vs Academics: A Battle over the Etic and Emic 'Sarcasm' and 'Irony' Labels." *Language & Communication* 55: 69–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2016.07.008

Dynel, Marta. 2017c. "No Child's Play: A Philosophical Pragmatic View of Overt Pretence as a Vehicle for Conversational Humour." In *The Dynamics of Interactional Humour: Creating and Negotiating Humour in Everyday Encounters*, edited by Villy Tsakona and Jan Chovanec, 205–228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/thr.7.09dyn

Dynel, Marta. 2018. *Irony, Deception and Humour: Seeking the Truth about Overt and Covert Untruthfulness*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501507922

Dynel, Marta. 2019. "Ironic Intentions in Action and Interaction." *Language Sciences* 75: 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2019.06.005

Dynel, Marta, and Fabio I. M. Poppi. 2018. "In Tragoedia Risus: Analysis of Dark Humour in Post-terrorist Attack Discourse." *Discourse & Communication* 12(4): 382–400. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481318757777

Dynel, Marta, and Fabio I. M. Poppi. 2019. "Risum Teneatis, Amici?: The Socio-Pragmatics of RoastMe Humour." *Journal of Pragmatics* 139: 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.10.010

Dynel, Marta, and Fabio I. M.. Poppi. forth. "Quid rides?: Targets and Referents of RoastMe insults." *Humor*.

Dynel, Marta, and Valeria Sinkeviciute. forth. "Conversational Humour." In *Handbook of Sociopragmatics*, edited by Michael Haugh, Daniel Kádár and Marina Terkourafi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan, and Martin Lampert. 2009. "The Occasioning of Self-disclosing Humor." In *Humor in Interaction*, edited by Neal Norrick and Delia Chiaro, 3–27. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.182.01erv

Greengross, Gil, and Geoffrey Miller. 2008. "Dissing Oneself versus Dissing Rivals: Effects of Status, Personality, and Sex on the Short-term and Long-term Attractiveness of Self-deprecating and Other-deprecating Humor." *Evolutionary Psychology* 6: 393–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/147470490800600303

Hay, Jennifer. 2001. "The Pragmatics of Humor Support." *Humor* 14(1): 55–82. https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.14.1.55

Hess, Leopold. forth. "Slurs." In *Oxford Handbook of the Philosophy of Language*, edited by Piotr Stalmaszczyk. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, Janet. 2000. "Politeness, Power and Provocation: How Humour Functions in the Workplace." *Discourse Studies* 2 (2): 159–185. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445600002002002

Honeycutt, Courtenay, and Susan Herring. 2009. "Beyond Microblogging: Conversation and Collaboration via Twitter." *Proceedings of the Forty-second Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-42)*. Los Alamitos: IEEE Press.

Housley, William, Helena Webb, Adam Edwards, Rob Procter, and Marina Jirotka. 2017a. "Digitizing Sacks? Approaching Social Media as Data." *Qualitative Research* 17(6): 627–644. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794117715063

Housley, William, Helena Webb, Adam Edwards, Rob Procter, and Marina Jirotka. 2017b. "Membership Categorisation and Antagonistic Twitter Formulations." *Discourse & Communication* 11: 567–590. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481317726932

Jaki, Sylvia, Tom De Smedt, Maja Gwóźdź, Rudresh Panchal, Alexander Rossa, and Guy De Pauw. 2019. "Online Hatred of Women in the Incels.me Forum: Linguistic Analysis and Automatic detection." *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00026.jak

Jane, Emma. 2017. "Feminist Digilante Responses to a Slut-shaming on Facebook." *Social Media and Society* 3(2): 1–10.

Jay, Timothy. 1996. *What to Do When your Students Talk Dirty*. San Jose: Resource Publications, Inc.

Jay, Timothy. 2018. "Swearing, Moral Order and Online Communication." *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* 6: 107–126. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00005.jay

Jenkins, Alexandria, and Joseph Mazer. 2017. "#NotOkay: Stories of Sexual Assault in the midst of the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election." *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1080/17459435.2017.1404487

Jucker, Andreas, and Irma Taavitsainen. 2000. "Diachronic Speech Act Analysis: Insults from Flyting to Flaming." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1(1): 67–95. https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.1.1.07juc

Kampf, Zohar. 2015. "The Politics of Being Insulted: The Uses of Hurt Feelings in Israeli Public Discourse." *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* 3(1): 107–127. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.3.1.05kam

Labov, William. 1972. "Rules for Ritual Insults." In *Studies in Social Interaction*, edited by D. Sudnow, 120–169. New York: The Free Press.

Lampert, Martin, and Susan Ervin-Tripp. 2006. "Risky Laughter: Teasing and Self-directed Joking among Male and Female Friends." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 51–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.004

Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313

Maíz-Arévalo, Carmen. 2015. "Jocular Mockery in Computer-mediated Communication: A Contrastive Study of a Spanish and English Facebook Community." *Journal of Politeness Research* 11(2): 289–327. https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2015-0012

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

Martin, Rod, and Thomas Ford. 2018. 2nd edn. *The Psychology of Humour: An Integrative Approach*. Burlington: Elsevier.

Marwick, Alice and danah boyd. 2010. "I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience." *New Media & Society* 13(1): 114–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810365313

Marwick, Alice, and danah boyd. 2011. "To See and be Seen: Celebrity Practice on Twitter." *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 17: 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856510394539

Mateo, Jose, and Francisco Yus. 2013. "Towards a Cross-cultural Pragmatic Taxonomy of Insults." *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* 1(1): 87–114. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.1.1.05mat

Meyer, John. 2000. "Humor as a Double-edged Sword: Four Functions of Humor in Communication." *Communication Theory* 10: 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2000.tb00194.x

Norrick, Neal. 1993. *Conversational Joking: Humor in Everyday Talk*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Partington, Alan. 2006. *The Linguistics of Laughter. A Corpus-assisted Study of Laughter-talk*. Oxon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203966570

Paulus, Trenna, Amber Warren, and Jessica Lester. 2016. "Applying Conversation Analysis Methods to Online Talk: A Literature Review." *Discourse, Context & Media* 2: 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.04.001

Poppi, Fabio I. M. forth. "Sancte et Sapienter: Joint Fantasizing as the Interactional Practice of Micro and Macro contextual Understanding." *Pragmatics & Society*.

Poppi, Fabio I. M., and Sveinung Sandberg. forth. "A Bene Placito: Narratives of Sex Work." *Narrative Inquiry*.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992 [1972]. *Lectures on Conversation*. Volumes 1 and 2. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey. 1973. "On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation." In *Talk and Social Organization*, edited by Graham Button and John R. E. Lee, 54–69. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, Emanuel. 1968. "Sequencing in Conversational Openings." *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075–1095. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1968.70.6.02a00030

Schnurr, Stephanie, and Angela Chan. 2011. "When Laughter is not Enough. Responding to Teasing and Self-denigrating Humor at Work." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(1): 20–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.001

Smitherman, Geneva. 1977. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Stewart, Patrick. 2011. "The Influence of Self- and Other-deprecatory Humor on Presidential Candidate Evaluation during the 2008 US Election." *Social Science Information* 50: 201–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018410396616

Stokoe, Elisabeth, and Derek Edwards. 2007. "Black this, Black that': Racial Insults and Reported Speech in Neighbour Complaints and Police Interrogations." *Discourse & Society* 18 (3): 337–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507075477

Townsend, Leanne, and Claire Wallace. 2016. "Social Media Research: A Guide to Ethics." https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_487729_en.pdf

Tsakona, Villy. 2018. "Online Joint Fictionalization." In *The Dynamics of Interactional Humor: Creating and Negotiating Humor in Everyday Encounters*, edited by Villy Tsakona and Jan Chovanec, 229–255. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/thr.7.10tsa

Vásquez, Camilla. 2019. *Language, Creativity and Humour Online*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315159027

Vásquez, Camilla, and Samantha Creel. 2017. "Conviviality through Creativity: Appealing to the Reblog in Tumblr Chat Posts." *Discourse, Context & Media* 20: 59–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2017.08.005

Veale, Tony, Kurt Feyaerts, and Geert Brône. 2006. "The Cognitive Mechanisms of Adversarial Humor." *Humor* 19: 305–340. https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMOR.2006.016

Walkinshaw, Ian, Nathanial Mitchell, and Sophiaan Subhan. 2019. "Self-denigration as a Relational Strategy in Lingua Franca Talk: Asian English Speakers." *Journal of Pragmatics* 139: 40–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.10.013

Webb, Helena, Marina Jirotka, Bernd Stahl, William Housley, Adam Edwards, Matthew Williams, Rob Procter, Omer Rana, and Pete Burnap. 2017. "The Ethical Challenges of Publishing Twitter Data for Research Dissemination." *WebSci '17 Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Web Science Conference*, pp 339–348. https://doi.org/10.1145/3091478.3091489

Webb, Lewis. 2015. "Shame Transfigured: Slut-shaming from Rome to Cyberspace." *First Monday* 20(4), 54–64. https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v20i4.5464

Zajdman, Avner. 1995. "Humorous Face-threatening Acts: Humor as Strategy." *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 325–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00038-G

Zappavigna, Michele. 2011. "Ambient Affiliation: A Linguistic Perspective on Twitter." *New Media and Society* 13: 788–806. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810385097

Zappavigna, Michele. 2017. "Twitter." In *Pragmatics of Social Media*, edited by Christian Hoffmann and Wolfram Bublitz, 201–224. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431070-008

Ziv, Avner. 1984. *Personality and Sense of Humour*. New York: Springer.

## Address for correspondence

Marta Dynel
University of Łódź
Department of Pragmatics
Institute of English Studies
ul. Pomorska 171/173
90-236 Łódź
Poland
marta.dynel@yahoo.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4647-946X


## Co-author information

Fabio I.M. Poppi
University of Łódź
Sechenov University
fabioimpoppi@me.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0731-3099