

*The Mayor and the Comedian. Parody as a route to delegitimization**

Isabella Poggi
Università degli Studi Roma Tre

isabella.poggi@uniroma3.it

Abstract:

The paper defines the notion of ridicule, discredit, and delegitimization in terms of a socio-cognitive model of communication, and proposes a definition of parody as a distorted imitation of a text, discourse, behavior or trait of a person performed in order to elicit laughter. Focusing on the parody of politicians as a way to discredit and possibly to delegitimize political opponents, a qualitative analysis is presented of the parody of a Mayor of Rome, Gianni Alemanno, by the Italian comedian Max Paiella: the importance of allusion in parody is highlighted and the function of ridicule as a route to delegitimization is stressed.

Key-words: Discredit; Ridicule; Delegitimization; Parody

INTRODUCTION

«A laughter will bury you». Bakunin's motto claims that laughing at others is a formidable weapon against power; and a weapon of power. People make fun of others to abase them, to make them powerless and not to be afraid of them anymore. Actually, as a powerful person is no more the object of awe or fear, s/he is devoid of power.

History is made by economic and social issues, but also by the emotions of people, by how their feelings make up their relations to others. This paper approaches the issue of political delegitimization by seeing it as a possible final outcome of discredit brought about through ridicule. It defines parody as a specific way to make fun of people, and views the parody of politicians as a way to ridicule political opponents in order to discredit them, in such a way as to destroy any awe and fear towards them, and to demonstrate they are not worth their status. In this sense, parody may be seen, in the long run, as a way to erode a person's right to pretend his status, hence a route to delegitimization.

By analyzing the parody of a mayor of Rome by a comedian, this work tries to highlight the communicative processes implied in making a Parody and to disentangle the cognitive and social mechanisms of this powerful communicative act.

DELEGITIMIZATION, DISCREDIT, AND RIDICULE

A strong weapon to win in political struggle is to delegitimize the opponent, and a way to do so is to cast discredit over him/her. Moreover, a particular way of discrediting others is to make them ridicule. But what are delegitimization, discredit and ridicule from a cognitive and social point of view?

DELEGITIMIZATION

To define the notion of delegitimization according to a socio-cognitive model of mind, social interaction and communication (Conte - Castelfranchi, 1995) we can say that a person, a group, an institution, even an idea, is de-legitimized when some people A think that X, who aims at playing the Role R, and to be credited the corresponding status S, does not have the features a, b,... n, that are required to fulfil role R. In this case, A will think that X is not entitled to play the role R and

* Research supported by SSPNet Seventh Framework Program, European Network of Excellence SSPNet (Social Signal Processing Network), Grant Agreement N. 231287.

to be acknowledged status S. Therefore, a person or group P will be the one who delegitimizes X when s/he, either deliberately or not, causes X to be delegitimized.

DISCREDIT

D'Errico et al. (2013) define discredit as the spoiling of the image of a person X in the eyes of some audience (other people) A, caused, either deliberately or not, by a person P by performing communicative acts that mention or point at actions or qualities of X that are considered negative by Audience A.

In political persuasion, people sometimes use 'discrediting moves', i.e., they spoil the other's image before an audience, for persuasive purposes. In persuasion, the Persuader A aims at convincing the Persuadees not only by what he says (*logos*), but also by the emotions he induces (*pathos*) and by the reliable image he presents of himself (*ethos*): Aristotle's (1973) 'orator's character'. But as well as the Persuader needs to project a positive image of himself, to prevent the Audience from being persuaded by an opponent, he may try to convey a negative image of the other, i.e., cast discredit over him/her.

According to D'Errico et al. (2013), in political persuasion discredit is cast over opponents concerning three different features of their ethos, that is, of their way of being or behaving: the politician's 'benevolence' (caring the electors' goals, working on behalf of their interest, being trustworthy, honest, ethical), 'competence' (expertise, skill, knowledge, planning and reasoning capacity), and 'dominance' (capacity of winning in contests, of influencing others and imposing one's will).

RIDICULE

Ridiculization is a communicative act conveying a particular kind of negative evaluation of someone, aimed at performing a sort of 'moralistic aggression' (Bishof, 1979) toward him/her, to be used as a sanction against a-social behavior. A negative evaluation (Miceli - Castelfranchi, 1998) is the belief that some object, event or person does not have (or does not provide someone with) the power to achieve some goal. We evaluate something negatively for two reasons: either because it lacks the power to achieve some goal (negative evaluation from lack of power) or because it has the power of thwarting some goal (negative evaluation from dangerousness). When a person A ridicules another person B, A is conveying a negative evaluation of B for lack of power, but one that contrasts with some pretence of superiority exhibited by B (Castelfranchi, 1988). Such contrast between pretence of power and actual lack of power, whose outcome is though not threatening for A, can elicit laughter (Bergson, 2007): the physiological expression of relief that follows the sudden disconfirmation of some expectation of danger, thus resulting in a sense of superiority. Ridiculization may thus be defined (Poggi et al., 2012) as a communicative act through which a Sender S remarks, in front of some Audience A, a feature of a victim V that is worth a negative evaluation of lack of power; this contrasts with V's pretence of superiority, and is seen as not threatening for S and A, thus eliciting relief and laughter in them. Ridiculization further implies S deliberately soliciting Audience A to laugh at V, with the effects, (that may be goal of S) of causing that:

- a. S and A feel superior to V, because they feel above the inadequacy of the victim, and not threatened by it;
- b. This common superiority strengthens the social bonds between S and A, through the shared positive emotion of laughing together, through feeling similar to each other as opposed to different from V, and a sense of alliance and complicity;
- c. With image and possibly self-image attacked, the Victim feels emotions of shame, humiliation, abasement, s/he feels different, rejected, isolated from the group. All this may induce V to future different behaviour: which is the function of ridiculization as "moralistic aggression" (Bishof, 1980), i.e., aggression from the group aimed at changing a member's conduct.

In previous works, Poggi et al. (2012) analyzed verbal and multimodal cases of ridiculization in political debates, where political opponents try to make fun of each other, to lower each other's credibility before voters, thus performing a 'discrediting move', i.e., trying to spoil the other's image before an audience, for persuasive purposes. Even through ridiculization, a politician may discredit the other on all three features seen above, competence, benevolence, and dominance, and may do so by signals in various modalities that call for the Audience's laughter: laughter or smile only or in combination with words, words only, without any smile or laughter; but also by irony, that may be metacommunicated by licking lips, tongue in cheek, or by an exaggeratedly unexpressive face (Attardo et al., 2003), and finally, by parody.

This work presents a cognitive model of parody, its function and its devices, viewing it as a way to make fun of something or someone, and focuses on parody as a means for discrediting political opponents in Italian politics, proposing a qualitative analysis of the comedian Max Paiella's parody of the Mayor of Rome, Gianni Alemanno.

WHAT IS PARODY?

Parody is a communicative act – a text or a verbal or multimodal communicative behaviour (discourse, song, film, fiction) – that performs a distorted imitation of another text or multimodal behaviour, with the aim of amusing and eliciting laughter. Not only a person, but also a text or another communicative event (for instance, a rite) may be the object of parody. For example, in classical literature *Apokolokyntosis*, attributed to Seneca the younger, is a satire aimed at spoiling the memory of Emperor Claudius, exploiting a parody of the texts that used to glorify emperors as transformed in Gods; in Italian literature, Tassoni's *La secchia rapita* (*The kidnapped basket*) is a parody of epic poems.

In political satire, to make fun of the target person T in front of the audience, the Parodist P imitates the Target's traits and/or communicative or non-communicative behaviors, actually performing a distorted imitation that enhances the Target's flaws. To do so, the Parodist must 1. single out the most characterizing features of Target T's physical traits or behaviors, and 2. imitate them while exaggerating them in such a way as to make them appear ridicule.

How can a feature exhibited by P evoke a similar (but less extreme, less exaggerated) feature of T? The key to parody is allusion.

In Allusion, an Agent P wants an Addressee A to infer that P refers to X, but not by explicitly mentioning X, rather simply making reference to it in an indirect way. P does not mention X out of reasons of euphemism or other kind of protection, and yet does want A to understand both what P refers to and why P does not mention it explicitly.

In performing an imitation P produces some trait or behavior Y while soliciting A to recognize it as similar to another trait or behavior X of someone else (V). The Parodist may refer not only to visible or audible features of the Victim's traits or behavior, but also to a story that saw the Victim as protagonist. In such cases allusion makes appeal not only to similarity of visible features but also to events in that story that are relevant because they allow to infer non-visible features of the Victim. Visible features and relevant events are then 'allusion points' that must be known by both Parodist and Audience, and are deliberately chosen by the Parodist as vividly characterizing the Victim's behavior or internal traits. Both bare imitation and allusion to specific events, to be understood as such, typically require a shared knowledge: there must be a common culture, a shared frame of reference between Parodist and Audience; so much so that both imitation and parody cannot be entirely understood across different cultures. Further, the Parodist must insert some 'humor points' in the imitation, that is, distort it by hyperbolic, surreal, funny aspects that make the humorous intent clear. Finally, there is one more step from imitation and allusion to satiric parody, that is, for a parody of a Victim – whether a politician or not – to a deliberate act of discredit, possibly aimed at political goals: the Parodist must induce, through allusion and inference, some negative evaluation of the Victim with respect to the criteria to evaluate politicians.

The necessary ingredients of political parody are therefore:

1. Imitation
2. Allusion
3. Distortion of imitation aimed at highlighting ridicule aspects of the Victim (which implies making a choice among possible traits to display)
4. Induction of inferences implying a negative evaluation concerning some discredit feature (benevolence, competence, dominance).

Ingredients 1. and 2. define any kind of imitation: if we add ingredient 3. they apply to any parodistic imitation, i.e. one aimed at eliciting laughter; but for 'political' parody a satiric intent is required in addition (ingredient 4.): to imply a negative evaluation in terms of some politically relevant criteria.

If these are, conceptually, the necessary conditions for political parody, the requirements for the Audience to understand it are the following:

- a. to catch the similarity of the Parodist's displayed trait or behavior with one of a possible Victim;
- b. to understand what are the specific behaviors or traits of the Victim that the Parodist's imitation alludes to, within a given episode;
- c. to understand that the imitation is distorted, in such a way as to catch the intent to make fun of the Victim;
- d. to infer the (type of) negative evaluation the Parodist wants to imply.

Steps b. and d., more than others, require a high level of knowledge sharing between Parodist and Audience.

THE PARODY OF A POLITICIAN. A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

To better illustrate my definitions of parody and allusion, I present a qualitative analysis of a real parody of a politician: the Italian comedian Max Paiella's parody of Gianni Alemanno, the mayor of Rome from 2008 to 2013.

Alemanno, a former exponent of the Italian fascist party *Alleanza Nazionale* (National Alliance), and a fascist drubber in his youth, during his role as Mayor was accused of familism, since he was said to have hired lots of relatives and friends in the town bus company. After five years in his mandate, he was quite easily defeated by Ignazio Marino, the left-wing candidate, who became the new mayor, and his mandate was not regretted.

Max Paiella is a skilled imitator and parodist working in Channel 2 of the Italian public Radio, but also in the left-wing satire TV show *The show must go off*, where he ridicules ties and behaviors of various right-wing politicians. Here he appears on a screen and talks to the show conductor, the comedian Serena Dandini who, from the TV studio, comments on what he says and takes the role of his stooge.

In the parody I analyze here, Paiella picks up a recent episode in which Alemanno, as the Mayor of Rome, really made himself ridicule: the snow in Rome.

Below I describe the context and background of this event, with words in bold describing the 'allusion points': the contents in the background knowledge that are supposedly shared with the audience, and to which the Parodist alludes in his parody (see below, [Table 1](#)).

On February 3rd, 2012, a lot of snow came on Rome. Not so used to see snow, Rome is generally not well prepared to confront this challenge, but in this case, the disorganized management by Alemanno and his staff turned a meteorological event into a disaster. A newsletter from the national Civil Protection had warned him that 35 millimeters of water were expected to come; actually, 1 millimeter of water equates 1 cm. snow, but Alemanno and his staff were not expert on this, so they expected 3,5 centimeters of snow instead of the 35 and more that came in fact. No kind of prevention was undertaken: no salt to prevent streets from freezing, no snow chains for buses; cars could not go around, buses stopped for hours with roman citizens inside, since getting off might mean dying for cold... The only actions taken by Alemanno were to warn people to stay home, to buy a stock

of shovels and distribute them to Roman citizens recommending them to clean up their doors (he also was videorecorded on TV while shoveling snow), and to say he would call the army to cope with the emergency. When the emergency was over, Alemanno was accused of disorganization and inefficiency, and to justify himself he appeared in all possible TV news and talk shows imputing the disaster to the Civil Protection, who had not warned how serious the situation was, and complaining that he had been left alone to confront the emergency.

My hypothesis is that each element of Paiella's imitation alludes to a relevant element of the story to stigmatize it and cast some flavor of ridicule on it. So, analyzing a parody of a politician implies discovering what are the beliefs alluded to by each of the Parodist's words or visual behaviors, what is the information, opinion, or evaluation they indirectly convey, and their import in terms of the criteria of competence, benevolence and dominance, and what are the 'humor points', that is, the points in which the Parodist deliberately says something hyperbolic, surreal or anyway funny, in such a way as to cast ridicule on the politician. In the following, I separately analyze Paiella's parody of Alemanno on the sides of his body behavior and of his verbal discourse.

ALLUSIONS AND PARODY IN ALEMANNO'S COSTUME AND BACKGROUND

Let us first see what, in the visual scene – Paiella's costume and background scenery – is allusive and parodistic.

Paiella, acting Alemanno, shows on the screen with Coliseum in the background and flocks of snow gently falling down; he is dressed as a Roman centurion, his helmet on the ground, while holding a big shovel in his right hand and a sheet of paper in his left hand.

1. Coliseum with flocks of snow falling down alludes to snow in Rome: quite a 'neutral' information, only aimed to set the stage of the parody.
2. Alemanno dressed as a Roman centurion alludes to the Roman tourist operators that welcome tourists around Coliseum dressed as centurions. This is not, though, a neutral information, but one loaded with somewhat negative evaluation: men playing centurions with tourists are generally connoted as underprivileged uneducated people from Roman slums, waiting for a tip after posing for a picture. This suit then conveys Alemanno a nuance of a lout, a buffon, certainly intended by the parody, attacking him on the feature of dominance.
3. The shovel in his hand alludes to the shovels he distributed to Romans to help themselves, and to his showing himself shoveling, to project an image of a willing boy who, though left alone by civil protection, did everything he could to help. Of course, another inference that can be drawn from this is about Alemanno's impotence to organize Rome for the emergency. At the same time his keeping the shovel in his hand reminds (and ridicules) his display of the good boy shoveling his door. All of this, again, seems to point at the Mayor's lack of power, hence to attack him as to dominance.
4. The sheet of paper in his left hand alludes to the newsletter from the Civil Protection about the centimeters of water expected: this points at Alemanno's ignorance in meteorology. Here the discrediting attack points at his competence.

ALLUSIONS AND RIDICULE IN PAIELLA-ALEMANNO'S WORDS

The same kind of analysis given in a discursive way on Paiella-Alemanno's costume and visual background is provided in a schematic way for his words in [Table 1](#).

In column 1. we write the time in the video and the character whose behavior is analyzed (whether Paiella-Alemanno or the show conductor Serena Dandini). In

col. 2. we write the Parodist's sentences, with the words giving rise to allusions in bold; in col. 3, we phrase the literal meaning of the sentences of col. 2; in col. 4. we write the belief each word or sentence alludes to (or, in the case of the show conductor, the allusion that she is making explicit); in col. 5, since, according to our model, any sentence beside its literal meaning can have an indirect meaning, that is some inferences it aims at inducing, we write the indirect meaning conveyed by the sentence of col. 2 and by the allusion of col. 4. In col. 6 we finally classify the example in terms of the feature of the Target made fun of, whether Competence, Benevolence or Dominance. The presence of humor points is represented by words in red italics bold (Table 1).

Let us see some lines of this representation in detail.

At time 0.8, Paiella-Alemanno says: «*Io sono il sindaco del fare*». (I am the Mayor of doing, col. 3). This alludes to the fact that the right-wing government, that supports Alemanno, generally defines itself 'the government of doing' (col. 4). But Paiella is ironic, hence the meaning he wants the Audience to infer is the opposite of this: Alemanno in fact did not do anything for Rome (col. 5). Thus, Paiella is attacking Alemanno's competence (col. 6): his skill in doing things, and in being a good Mayor for Rome.

At time 0.10 he says: «*Io sono stato lasciato solo in questo Colosseo a spalare la neve io sono stato lasciato solo*». (I have been left alone; in this Coliseum I have been left alone shoveling snow). This alludes to Alemanno's frequent complaint for his being left alone (by the Civil Protection) (col. 4), and at the same time to the fact that the only thing he did was showing himself shoveling snow. Here we also have a 'humor point': Alemanno's being left alone is instantiated in his being alone in shoveling snow; quite a ridiculous action for one being interviewed on TV. In any case, the intended inference is to highlight how Alemanno often played the victim (col. 5). But playing a victim has the undesirable outcome that you appear impotent; and actually through this Alemanno's dominance is being attacked (col. 6).

At 0.17 he says: «*Io l'avverto che sto spalando la neve*». (I warn you that I am shoveling snow). The word *l'avverto* (I warn you) is one more 'humor point': it is quite funny to warn someone of something that can be clearly seen; but this alludes to Alemanno's frequent presence in all media, aimed at his self-justification (col. 4). The intended inferences are that he does not do so many things in fact, but he overexposes the few things he does; a criticism of being a show-off (col. 5), that hence results in attack to his moral image, to his benevolence (col. 6).

The illustration of the first three lines of the fragment analyzed in detail in Table 1. shows how this kind of representation and analysis can account for the specific features of a given parody and of the type, intensity and seriousness of the criticism borne by it.

As it may be seen from Table 1, the messages indirectly communicated by this fragment end up with criticizing and making fun of Alemanno about all of the three features of the political leader mentioned by our model.

First, Paiella attacks him as to his competence five times: because he was not able to take the necessary actions during the emergency (at time 0.08), and all his organization was very poor (see the lack of snow chains, at 2.34); because he and his staff were ignorant of basic meteorological issues (0.43), and he is stupid, keeping to the literal meaning of the newsletter, unable to interpret it adequately (1.34); finally Paiella even makes fun of Alemanno as to his linguistic competence in Italian (1.48), making mistakes in uttering Italian words.

Second, he attacks the Mayor as to his moral qualities, his 'benevolence', three times in the fragments analyzed: at 0.17 for his exhibitionism, his caring his own political image more than acknowledging his faults; at 2.02 by alluding to his familistic management of the Roman bus company; and at 2.28 by alluding to his past as a fascist drubber, who used (real) chains to hit political opponents.

Finally, Paiella attacks Alemanno's dominance in five cases: at 0.10 and 0.19 by mimicking his playing the victim, complaining he has been left alone, and repeating he will call the army; at 0.42 and 0.46 by showing how he rejects his own responsibilities, thus looking coward and helpless; then at 1.18 by making fun of his awful loss of face.

In this way the annotation of Table 1. allows us to assess density and quality

of a parody, measured, respectively, in terms of the number of ridiculing allusions, and of how much the Victim is made fun of concerning his/her immorality, incompetence, or impotence.

CONCLUSION

In this paper I have tried to highlight the social and cognitive mechanisms of parody and to show how they can be used to make fun of politicians, in such a way as to discredit them and possibly to delegitimize them. A parody is a distorted imitation of a person or an event aimed at eliciting amusement and laughter, hence to open to a critical look at it: thus, it paves the way to viewing even the more sacred things as potentially funny, not frightening nor awesome.

This does not imply, though, that a parody is always and necessarily aimed at discrediting the Target: it may simply be intended to make it closer, more familiar, even, friendly and nice. For example, among the parodies by Maurizio Crozza, another famous Italian satiric comedian, his depiction of Giorgio Napolitano, the Italian Republic President, though in some sense making fun of him, seems to have the effect of letting him appear very nice, even closer to people than he already is felt to be. This kind of parody is not at all delegitimizing, whereas others – even ones by Crozza himself – are much more so. Therefore, an issue for further research is in what aspects of a parody a delegitimizing effect might most likely dwell. What I argued in this work is that the parody of a politician always targets the three features of discredit: the politician's competence, benevolence, and dominance; and what might be the object of future research is whether one of the three features, and if so, which one, might be more effective as a means for delegitimization. Is it more serious for a politician to be made fun for his immorality, his incompetence, or his impotence?

REFERENCES

- Aristotele (1973), *Retorica*, Roma-Bari, Laterza.
- Attardo, Salvatore - Eisterhold, Jodi - Hay, Jennifer - Poggi, Isabella (2003), «Multimodal Markers of Sarcasm and Irony», *Humor*, 16, 2, pp. 243-260.
- Bergson, Henri (2007), *Le rire: essai sur la signification du comique*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bischof, Norbert (1980), «On the phylogeny of Human Morality», in Stent, Gunther S. (ed.), *Morality as a biological phenomenon. The Presuppositions of Sociobiological Research*, Berkeley (CA), University of California Press.
- Castelfranchi, Cristiano (1988), *Che figura. Emozioni e immagine sociale*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Conte, Rosaria - Castelfranchi, Cristiano (1995). *Cognitive and social action*, London, University College.
- D'Errico, Francesca - Poggi, Isabella - Vincze, Laura (2013), «Discrediting Body. A Multimodal Strategy to Spoil the Other's Image», in Poggi, Isabella - D'Errico, Francesca - Vincze, Laura - Vinciarelli, Alessandro (eds.) *Multimodal communication in political speech. Shaping minds and social actions*, Berlin, Springer.
- Miceli, Maria - Castelfranchi, Cristiano (1998), «The role of evaluation in cognition and social interaction», in Dautenhahn, Kerstin (ed.), *Human cognition and agent technology*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Poggi, Isabella - D'Errico, Francesca - Vincze, Laura (2012), «Ridiculization in public debates: making fun of the other as a discrediting move», in Calzolari, Nicoletta et al. (eds). *Proceedings of the 8th International conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC '12)*, Istanbul 21-27 May, European Language Resources Association (ELRA), pp. 44-50.

1. TIME AND SPEAKER	2. BELIEF MENTIONED	3. MEANING DIRECTLY CONVEYED	4. BELIEF ALLUDED TO	5. MEANING TO BE INFERRED	6. RIDICULED FEATURE
0.08 Paiella-Alemanno	<i>Io sono il sindaco del fare</i>	I am the Mayor of doing	The right wing government, that supports Alemanno, generally defines itself 'The government of doing'	He did nothing in fact	COMPETENCE
0.10-0.15 P-A	<i>Io sono stato lasciato solo in questo Colosseo a spalare la neve io sono stato lasciato solo</i>	I have been left alone ; in this Coliseum I have been left alone shoveling snow	Alemanno often complained he had been left alone	Alemanno plays the victim to justify himself	DOMINANCE
0.17-0.19 P-A	<i>Io l'avverto che sto spalando la neve</i>	I warn you that I am shoveling snow	Alemanno went to many TV programs	He displays the few right things he did. He values the image of doing more than doing in fact Exhibitionist	BENEVOLENCE
0.19-0.25 P-A	<i>Io se continua così chiamo l'esercito. La Protezione Civile mi ha lasciato solo</i>	If things go on like this, I'll call the army . Civil Protection has left me alone	A. always threatened to call the army	He threatens but also plays the helpless	DOMINANCE
0.25-0.31 Serena Dandini	<i>Sindaco Alemanno! Ma pure qua deve intervenire? A momenti andava pure a Media-shopping!</i>	Mayor Alemanno! Even here should you appear? You were almost going to MediaShopping too!	Alemanno went to many TV programs	He appears in all TV programs to justify himself and fix his own image	BENEVOLENCE
0.42-0.43 P-A	<i>Il gelo non è di nostra competenza</i>	Freeze is not our competence	A. complained the disaster was not his fault	He tries to reject his responsibilities, therefore acknowledging his impotence	DOMINANCE
0.43-0.46 P-A	<i>Dovevano dir-celo che l'acqua ghiacciava a zero centigradi centimetri</i>	They should have told us that water froze at zero centigrade centimeters	A. and his staff proved very ignorant about meteorological facts	A. is very ignorant	COMPETENCE
0.46-0.55 P-A	<i>Nessuno ci ha avvisato. Se io ero avvisato da un bollettino dove c'era scritto che l'acqua veniva, ghiacciava a zero centigradi centimetri, io avrei preso i provvedimenti giusti</i>	No one has warned us. Had I been warned by a newsletter where it was written that water would come, would freeze at zero centigrade centimeters , I would have taken the right actions	A. complained that civil protection did not help him	A does not take on his responsibilities. A coward, helpless	DOMINANCE

Table 1 – Paiella-Alemanno's words and their allusions

Legenda: **bold**: allusion points; **red**: humor points

1.16 SD	<i>Mi sa che lei non se l'aspettava però, tutte 'ste critiche, eh?</i>	But I think you expected all of this criticism, did you?			
1.18-1.27 P-A	<i>Ascolti io nun me l'aspettavo no. Perché la Protezione civile aveva detto che sul Campidoglio sarebbero piovuti soltanto 35 millimetri di mmerda</i>	Listen, I did not expect it at all. Because Civil Protection had said that only 35 millimeters shit would have fallen on Capitulum	The snow was cause of a great loss of face for A	Alemanno was utterly impotent in the whole event	DOMINANCE
1.34-1.36 P-A	<i>C'è scritto qua, sul bollettino. Mi risulta, questi sono i bollettini, questi so 'i fatti</i>	It's written here, on the newsletter. This is what I know, these are the newsletters, these are facts	He kept close to the very words of the newsletter	He cannot interpret things the right way: he is stupid	COMPETENCE
1.41-1.47 SD	<i>Hanno esagerato nel criticarla, però diciamo, un pò di disorganizzazione, catene antineve inesistenti, mezzi pubblici fermi</i>	They exaggerated in criticizing you, but let me say, a little disorganization, no snowchains, buses stopped	Dandini explicitly mentions some of the problems in the event		COMPETENCE
1.48-2.01 P-A	<i>Colgo l'occasione, a proposito di mezzi pubblici, per inviare un messaggio a tutti coloro i quali, quei romani i quali sono rimasti dentro bloccati sugli autobus, i cinquantotti bar-rati, e i sessanti notturni</i>	I take the chance, as far as buses are concerned, to all those who, those romans who remained blocked on buses, the barred fiftyeights , the night sixties	<i>Cinquantotti</i> and <i>sessanti</i> (the plural of numbers, an error in Italian) alludes to A.'s linguistic ignorance	He is ignorant also in Italian language	COMPETENCE
2.02-2.09 P-A	<i>Vi sono vicino, è come se fosse tutti quanti parenti miei.</i>	I am close to you, as if you all were relatives of mine.	This alludes to A.'s familism in hiring all his relatives in the bus company.	He is dishonest because he is familistic in his administration	BENEVOLENCE
2.10-2.12 SD	<i>Come se fossero parenti suoi?? In realtà, molti lo sono... vabbè, lasciamo perdere</i>	As if they were your relatives?? Actually, many are... Ok, just let it go...	Dandini makes the allusion explicit	He is dishonest because he is familistic in his administration	BENEVOLENCE
2.24-2.27 SD	<i>D: Eh, non sarebbe il caso di tendere un po' più la mano alla Protezione Civile? Collaboriamo bene, mo?</i>	D: Well, shouldn't you lend a hand to Civil Protection more? Are we collaborating well, now?	People commented that the Mayor and the Civil Protection should have collaborated more	A. did not collaborate but only tried to discredit over Civil Protection	BENEVOLENCE

2.28-2.33 P-A	<i>A: Su questo le posso dire che ha ragione: è il momento di tendergli una mano... e prenderli a ccatenate!</i>	A: About this I can tell you that you're right: it's time to lend them a hand. And take them by chain hits!	Alemanno as a fascist drubber in his youth, possibly using chains to hit political rivals	A. was formerly a violent person	BENEVOLENCE
2.34-2.36 P-A	<i>Se solo si trovasero ste catene... Però, 'n se trovano!</i>	If only we might find these chains.... But you can't find them!	Snowchains lacking in the emergency	A. was disorganized	COMPETENCE