



Through a Pragmatic Lens: Unpacking Schadenfreude in The Contexts of Illness and Death

Asst. Lec. Zahraa Shlaga Kadhim

Ministry of Education, General Directorate of Al-Qadisiya

Zahraa.shlaga@iunajaf.edu.iq

Received May. 21, 2026

Revised Aug.11, 2026

Accepted Aug.24, 2026

Online October1, 2026

ABSTRACT

In any culture and religion, feeling happy at the others misfortune is acknowledged as an immoral trait as humanity is above all titles. In normal life, individuals face a lot of misfortune where others may experience schadenfreude against them. This phenomena becomes very omnipresent due to social media platforms. The researcher intends to examine this phenomena due to the unpredicted evil feelings media users reflect. Their comments, posted after the announcement of King Charles III is diagnosed with cancer and the late Iranian President and his colleague's death after their helicopter crash, show pleasure. Fifteen comments about each incident were selected and collected from BBC channel on YouTube. After the channel posted such incidents, people flooded with comments reflecting their happiness. Many of them attribute such misfortune, both figures face, to their wrong doings. They consider it as a fair punishment. The researcher manipulates Culpeper (1996) Impoliteness model to examine the forms of schadenfreude.

Keywords: Schadenfreude, Impoliteness theory, misfortune, happiness.

من منظور تداولي: تحليل ظاهرة الشماتة في سياقي المرض والموت
م.م زهراء شلاكة كاظم
المديرية العامة للتربية في القادسية

المخلص

في مختلف الثقافات والأديان، يُعدّ الشعور بالفرح إزاء مصائب الآخرين — بغض النظر عن أفعالهم أو انتماءاتهم — سلوكاً مرفوضاً ومُداناً باعتباره سمة سلبية فإن الإنسانية تُعدّ قيمة تعلو على جميع الاعتبارات الأخرى. وفي الحياة اليومية، يواجه الأفراد العديد من الصعوبات والمحن، مما يجعلهم عرضة للشماتة من قبل الآخرين. وقد أصبحت هذه الظاهرة أكثر حضوراً وانتشاراً في ظل الإتاحة الواسعة لمنصات التواصل الاجتماعي. ومن هذا المنطلق، يسعى الباحث إلى دراسة هذه الظاهرة نظراً لما تعكسه من مشاعر سلبية غير متوقعة لدى مستخدمي وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي. إذ تُظهر التعليقات المنشورة عقب الإعلان عن إصابة الملك تشارلز الثالث بالسرطان، وكذلك وفاة الرئيس الإيراني الراحل و مرافقيه أثر تحطم مروحيتهما، تعبيرات واضحة عن الفرحة والشماتة. وقد تم اختيار خمسة عشر تعليقاً لكل حادثة تم جمعها من قنوات هيئة الإذاعة البريطانية BBC على منصة يوتيوب. فبعد نشر هذه الأحداث، انهالت تعليقات المستخدمين التي عكست سعادتهم بسماع مثل هذه الأخبار. كما يعزو العديد منهم هذه المصائب التي تعرض لها كلا الشخصيتين إلى أفعالهما الخاطئة، معتبرين ما حدث نوعاً من العقاب العادل. ويعتمد الباحث في تحليله على نموذج عدم الأدب لكوليبير (1996) للكشف عن أشكال الشماتة.

1.Introduction

Feeling pleasure at the other's suffering is a common recurrent tendency. The existing dispute is whether Schadenfreude is learnt or an innate attribute. Psychologists try to find reasons that activate it, how to reduce and control it besides under which category one can classify it. In other words, is it an evil feature or a benign behavior? (Feather & McKee, 2014; van Dijk & Ouwerkerk, 2014)

Some communities classify schadenfreude as malicious and unaccepted behavior. For Schopenhauer (1965, p.135) "there is no more infallible sign of a thoroughly bad heart and profound moral worthlessness than an inclination to a sheer and undisguised malignant joy of this kind". Schadenfreude is rejected throughout history due to the fact that it contradicts the "social contract" components which demand showing sympathy for others and avoiding any immoral act (Pinker, 2015).

Portmann (2000, p.18) states that "within Judaism and Christianity, moral opposition to schadenfreude almost certainly grew from successive endorsements of compassion, which unreflectively appears to be the opposite of schadenfreude." Schadenfreude is a current omnipresent notion in daily situations: politics, sport and friendly settings including teams and family members. It associates with public image and fairness (Van Dijk & Ouwerkerk, 2014; Cecconi, et al., 2020).

2.The Schadenfreude Notion

Schadenfreude is an English loanword originated from two German words: "schaden" which means harm and "Freude" which means joy. Nowadays, it denotes feeling happy at the others' misfortune (Van Dijk & Ouwerkerk, 2014, p.1). Despite the fact that such feeling is undesirable, it appears when someone disassociates him/herself from the sufferer's misfortune whether in an actual or virtual settings (Akre, 2023).

Montaigne (2006) shows that people often feel pleasure at the other's misfortune. Using different words, He said "we feel a kind of bittersweet pricking of malicious delight in contemplating the misfortunes of others" (p.34). For Portmann (2000, pp. xiii, 35) it denotes a joy that is both defensible and rational experienced when someone takes what s/he deserves. He assures "it is not the suffering of others that brings us joy, but rather the evidence of justice triumphing before our eyes."

Psychologists propose the genetic programming of human beings to feel happy in front of the other's discomfort especially those whom s/he envies (Cikara & Fiske 2012). Though man does not

stand seeing his loved ones feeling ill, yet s/he feels an “embarrassing spasm of gratitude” when somebody else suffers (Kushner 1981, p.39). Traditionally, man deserves his fate and the harm is a reward or a heavenly punishment for past wrongdoings (Pinker, 2015).

2.1 Features of Schadenfreude

Ben-Ze’ev (2000) refers to certain marked features that distinguish schadenfreude. He emphasizes the significant role of the misfortune degree. One may not experience pleasure at the others’ hardships if they fall a victim of terrible incident or face excruciating agony. In such environment, schadenfreude turns into a feeling of pity.

The exclusion for this kind of pleasure is the feeling people have for those who are considered as vicious. People welcome a tyrant’s death rather than feeling pity. An association arises between the suffering such tyrant undergoes and the pain he causes. His wrongdoings justify his awful end and he receives his justice punishment (Ben-Ze’ev, 2000).

Unlike malice and envy, schadenfreude indicates innate desire of being not involved in triggering the hardship of others. Envy may lead someone to break or attack someone else’s belongings or properties and constantly feels shame. This contradiction can be satisfied in a cheap method. If someone feels envy towards his friend who bought a new car, he will feel happy if someone else scratches it rather than he himself commits such action. This Schadenfreude feature fulfills human’s desire out of envy to harm others without any hint that the pleasure felt is a form of envy. A sense of relieve is experienced when the bad luck of others is assigned to their wrongdoings. Consequently, an exaggerated pleasure is felt without being involved in any source of regret or shame (Ben-Ze’ev 2000).

2.2 Mapping Schadenfreude: Forms and Motivations

Cecconi (2017) mentions four forms of schadenfreude: “injustice”, “aversion”, “identification” and “compensation”. Injustice indicates *A*’s practice of schadenfreude when *B* receives his justice punishment due to committing an evil action e.g., a person betrays someone was a subject of betrayal too. Aversion occurs when *A* experiences hatred against *B* out of the latter misfortune e.g., practicing schadenfreude when *B* does not pass an exam. Identification demands the involvement of both *A* and *B* in a direct conflict e.g. *A* feels pleasure when *B* loses a match. Compensation occurs when both *A* and *B* undergo a similar act of misfortune e.g., *A* experiences schadenfreude when the group, he supposed to go out with and couldn’t due to getting no permission, could not enjoy because of bad weather.

Alike, Wang et al. (2019) refers to three forms of schadenfreude: Aggression, rivalry and justice. Aggression originates from a previous feeling of social identity. A sense of identification with a group. Rivalry Schadenfreude relates to the social image in relation to those who feel pain out of negative incident. Justice is oriented towards others and practiced when public association occurs.

Hence, schadenfreude is a tool of abusing power (Leach & Spears, 2008). It can decrease other's dominance. Lange and Boecker (2019) state that schadenfreude is a response to someone's hardship who was himself practicing dominance and experiencing schadenfreude. Schadenfreude for "initially successful persons was intensified when they displayed dominance (i.e., hubristic pride or general dominance) instead of prestige (i.e., authentic pride or general prestige) or other displays (i.e., embarrassment) following their achievement" (p.1).

All cultures reject malicious pleasure because they are "morally wrong and socially disruptive" (Sanders, 2014, p. 17). As a consequence, the appropriate model for uncovering the forms of Schadenfreude is Culpeper's (1996) Impoliteness Model.

3. An Overview of Impoliteness

Impoliteness is connected with Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness as Culpeper's (1996) theory of Impoliteness is a methodical equivalent established out of Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory. The base of both theories is Goffman's (1967) notion of face as the public image of individuals. Brown and Levinson (1987) build their Politeness theory on analyzing how speaker uses certain Politeness tools to save or lessen "face threatening acts".

Whereas, Culpeper (1996, p. 355) declares that "impoliteness is very much the parasite of politeness." Politeness gained more attention than impoliteness due to the abundant frequency of politeness (Culpeper, 2011). Theories of politeness give great attention to "harmonious interaction" and a very little or non-consideration to impoliteness. These theories view impoliteness as "either some kind of pragmatic failure, a consequence of not doing something, or merely anomalous behavior, not worthy of consideration" (Culpeper, 2011, p. 6).

Bousfield and Locher (2008) say it is difficult to define impoliteness and refer to as indicating an act of aggression against another person's face. They elaborate that many specialists suppose the insufficiency of such definition and suggest the demand for a comprehensive one. Culpeper (2011) claims that impoliteness triggers an emotional impact on the victim and such point should be focal in defining the concept.

Thus, impoliteness phenomenon is multifaceted. Culpeper (2011) describes that impoliteness recons on recognizing what is done and spoken besides its connection with the current context. Put it

differently, no linguistic expression is listed as impolite by itself, though certain conduct are classified as impolite. The situation and the language used do not assure an analysis as im/polite but the relations between them.

3.1Culpeper's Model of impoliteness

Culpeper builds his model on Brown and Levinson's (1987) principle of politeness. Their theory sets many strategies to uncover negative and positive forms of politeness. He assures that his theory is among many other theories that is originated from Brown and Levinson's model. His model stands alone in its hypothetical feature. The concept of face is integral in Culpeper's (1996) model. It refers to the public image of someone that s/he intends to save in certain situation. The proposition is that politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson possess a counter impoliteness strategies (Culpeper,1996).

(1) "Bald on Record Impoliteness": It indicates performing FTA in brief, straight and clear settings. In this case face is relevant. This strategy differs from Brown and Levinson's "bald on record". The latter relates to certain situation. This includes contexts when the concern of a face is put off e.g., in an emergent situation, when little threat attacks the face of the listener e.g. "come in" and "sit down". Furthermore, when the authority of the speaker is more than that of the listener, e.g. a mother addressing her child by saying "stop complaining."

(2) Positive Impoliteness: Using strategies aim at damaging the needs of the listener's positive face.

(3) Negative Impoliteness: Using strategies aim at damaging the need of the listener's negative face.

(4) "Sarcasm or Mock Politeness": Performing a face threatening act by clear and specific politeness principles.

(5) Withhold Politeness: Indicates the lack of an expected polite act e.g. not showing gratitude for receiving a particular gift can be listed as an act of an intended impolite action (Culpeper, 1996,p 356).

3.2Culpeper's Strategies of Impoliteness

Culpeper (1996, pp. 357-358) presents the subsequent positive and negative strategies of impoliteness: Positive impoliteness output strategies include insulting, ignoring others and their presence, excluding them form certain activity e.g., showing no relation or sympathy, being indifferent, employing unsuitable indicators of identity e.g. using nickname. The theory also extends to include manipulating mysterious or vague expressions e.g. using jargon and symbols where people within the same group are familiar with, yet these symbols are vague for the target, looking for

disapproval e.g. choosing sensitive subject- causing discomfort for others, employing taboo words, intense or offensive linguistic expressions and derogatory names.

Negative impoliteness output strategies include triggering others' believe that something harmful will happens, being disrespectful- and belittling others and attacking their space e.g. assuming a closer relation than what the relation actually permits- talking or searching for intimate information and associating others with negative aspects. Culpeper (1996) assures that these strategies relate to the situation. Briefly, the theory of Culpeper puts forward many strategies for performing face threatening act in the obvious and the straightest technique probable.

4.Methodology

4.1Research Design

The researcher uses a qualitative pragmatic frame by means of Culpeper (1996) impoliteness theory to analyze how communicators express schadenfreude as regards the case selected. Simultaneously, the aim is to demonstrate the way these communicators construct their pleasure at King Charles' III illness and the Iranian President's death and violate the politeness norms.

4.2Data collection

Data mainly consist of comments on You tube appear under BBC news channels announcements of these two incidents and where schadenfreude is evident. The criteria for selection combines principles include comments where pleasure for illness and death is reflected explicitly or implicitly, the use of impoliteness strategies and to ensure that these comments are accessible and suitable for academic research.

4.3Data analysis

To analyze the data, the researcher uses the model of Culpeper's (1996) Impoliteness Strategies to analyze the tools used to show happiness and pleasure when seeing other individuals suffering. The researcher examines comments to recognize how commenters express their feeling for the misfortune of the selected individuals and by means of which impoliteness strategy. The analysis shows if someone (the commenter in this context) sees that these figures commit something wrong, then what happened to them is a fair punishment. Accordingly, the commenter will be happy and experience schadenfreude.

4.3. Analyzing Schadenfreude and King Charles III Illness

1-“Even with all the gold in the world you are small in the face of illness.”

The commenter embodies Negative Impoliteness through the strategy of “condescend, scorn or ridicule”. Calling The King *small* reduces his status and presents him as weak. Putting it near the end indicates that the commenter doesn’t start his utterance impolitely for successive impact. The comparison between “all the gold in the world” and “you are small...” functions as intensifier for the belittling effect. Wealth and power do not protect the king. The commenter pragmatically degrades and belittles the king and shows no sympathy to communicate his schadenfreude.

2-“God never sleep about injustices!”

This comment displays Negative Impoliteness as the commenter uses the strategy of “explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect” to emphasize his religious beliefs that the King is evil and God will punish him. As the commenter invokes “God” and mentions “injustice”, he links what happened to the King to the divine justice due to his immoral wrongdoings. The comment offers Schadenfreude as it shows the king is responsible for his injustice.

3. “Breaking news really. Millions get diagnosed every year to be pushed in the NHS queuing system. But not this guy top of the list free top treatment we pay for.”

This comment also displays Negative Impoliteness as “condescend, scorn or ridicule”. The commenter intends to convey a judgment about the King being indifferent and doesn’t deserve a special treatment. He has to endure the same suffering as an ordinary person. Calling him dismissively a “guy” and sarcastically on “top of the list” for “free top treatment” show he does not deserve a private medical treatment. Referring to “we pay for” functions as intensifier for the derogation and implies that the King’s medical care is a financial burden that individuals pay. Furthermore, according to the political attitude, the commenter disassociates himself from the King and communicates a retributive Schadenfreude.

4. “What goes around comes around?”

This comment is another example of Negative Impoliteness as the commenter uses the strategy of “explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect.” The commenter implies what happened to the king is the result of something wrong he has committed as an indirect reference to Princess Diana’s death. The rhetorical form changes the comment into an implicit warning and blame to show that the King cannot escape the divine justice as a consequence of his immoral action. Accordingly, the comment offers a retributive Schadenfreude due to being involved in Princess Diana’s death.

5. “Diana is loved and remembered.”

This comment is another example of Negative Impoliteness as the commenter implicitly uses the strategy of “associating the other with a negative aspect”. The commenter commemorates Princess Diana and connects the King to a criminal action. The commenter appraises Diana as “loved and remembered” and implicitly compares her positive remembrance to the King’s reduced position due to his previous wrongdoing. The commenter implicitly expresses his Schadenfreude as he elevates Diana and derogates the King.

6. “It's pretty sad but what he did to Princess Diana is the result of his diagnosis.”

This comment also reveals Negative Impoliteness through the strategy of “explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect”. The utterance refers to Princess Diana and recognizes a fundamental association between the King’s previous wrongdoing and his illness. The expression “it’s pretty sad” is an apparent reaction to the king’s illness, yet the following phrase portrays illness as a result of previous wrongdoing. The comment offers a retributive Schadenfreude as it shows the king receives his punishment because he was involved in Princess Diana’s death.

7. “My king is God!! There's no other king.”

This comment can be analyzed as an example of Positive Impoliteness as it excludes and denies the king’s positive identity. Attributing “king” and authority to God and assuring “there is no other king”, the commenter does not acknowledge Charles III as a royal king and religiously constructs schadenfreude.

8. “The reward of the wicked.”

The strategy of “explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect” as a subsequent Negative Impoliteness Strategy is employed in this comment. The adjective “wicked” explicitly portrays the King as evil and can also be listed under “calling the other names”. The noun “reward” functions as an ironic conceptualization of the King’s illness as fair judgment due to his “wicked” behavior and accordingly forms retributive schadenfreude.

9. “When karma gets you....”

The comment includes two Negative Impoliteness strategies. The commenter uses the strategy of “explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect” and “condescend, scorn or ridicule”. The commoner attributes the King’s misfortune to past evil action, reflects no sympathy and reveals his satisfaction. This Karmic end is an obvious example of schadenfreude as his illness is the reward of something wrong he has committed.

10. “He is actually gone with the winds.”

The comment is an example of Negative Impoliteness and clearly the strategy of “condescend, scorn or ridicule”. The metaphorical Phrase “gone with the wind” portrays the king as losing his power and denotes a derisive image The commenter is unsympathetic and performs derisive schadenfreude.

11. “Wishing him a slow and painful non recovery.”

This comment demonstrates Negative Impoliteness and mainly the strategy of “wishing the other harm”. The adjectives “slow” and “painful” intensify the act of wishing. These intensifiers contribute to form a long suffering and construct an obvious hostility. The commenter expresses his hatred for the king through wishing not only slow but a painful non recovery. This creates a malicious schadenfreude since the commenter shows his willingness that the King’s illness continues.

12. “KISS THE DUST KING OF WORMS.”

The commenter uses “condescend, scorn or ridicule” as a subsequent Negative Impoliteness strategy. Calling the king derogatorily as “kings of worms” intentionally juxtaposes his title with “worms” to portray him as disgraceful and weaken his status. The phrase “kiss the dust” strengthens the comment aggression as figuratively depicts the king as defeated. The comment displays derisive schadenfreude.

13. “The revenge of Diana?”

The comment shows Negative Impoliteness by the strategy of “explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect”. The noun “revenge” constructs the King’s misfortune as a retaliation for Princess Diana’s death. He refers to Princess Diana’s death intending to say that the King is responsible for her death and this an act of revenge. Accordingly, the comment expresses retributive schadenfreude.

14. “Hahahaha laughing so hard what can you do little boy hahaha congratulations.”

The commenter makes fun of the king as he uses “condescend, scorn or ridicule” as a subcategory of Negative Impoliteness. Addressing the king derogatorily as “little boy” functions to reduce the King’s status and power. “Boy” as a word is not a taboo, yet combining it with “little” constitutes taboo. Linking the king to ‘little boy’ is an obvious manipulation of condescend. The repetitive act of laughter presents the King’s misfortune as a cause of pleasure. The word “congratulation” is a Sarcasm and delivers Mock Politeness due to the contrast between its meaning and the present situation. The comment communicates derisive schadenfreude as the commenter experiences laughter at the king’s suffering.

15. “Why do we care about this joker lol?”

This comment is connected with Negative Impoliteness and the strategy of “condescend, scorn or ridicule”. Calling the King as “joker” diminishes his status into a ridiculous character and “lol” strengthens the mocking situation. The whole comment as a rhetorical question reduces the King’s power and shows he deserves no kindness. The commenter laughs at the King and reflects another instance of derisive schadenfreude.

4.3.2 Analyzing Schadenfreude and The Late Iranian President’s Death

1-“Those poor trees. May God give them a speedy recovery?”

The commenter mainly uses “Sarcasm/ Mock politeness” as an obvious phrase showing empathy and implicitly communicates mocking messages. The expression, “those poor trees,” intentionally reflects that the commenter does not care about the president’s death, instead he turns his attention to the trees. The expression “may God give them a speedy recovery” is a conventional phrase of prayer, yet in this situation, paradoxically works to ridicule the president and portrays him as unworthy of sympathy and displays derisive schadenfreude.

2-“This guy was responsible for many people’s deaths.”

The commenter expresses Negative Impoliteness and uses the strategy of “explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect”. The comment associates the president with the negative aspect of causing death for many people. The deictic expression “this guy” functions to deprive the president from his title and reduces his authority. From the commenter’s perspective, the president deserves his death accordingly, he expresses retributive schadenfreude.

3. “Mother Nature has her ways to make justice.”

The comment is categorized as “Off- record Impoliteness” reflecting that the undesirable evaluation of the president is implicitly communicated rather than through a direct insult. The personification of “mother nature” as a tool of performing justice functions to form the president’s death as fair judgment due to previous evil action. The commenter’s pleasure at the President’s death and showing no sympathy result in retributive schadenfreude.

4. “The Lord works in mysterious ways.”

This comment functions as an implicit impoliteness when analyzed in the schadenfreude situation. Despite the fact that the comment is not directly impolite and can express spiritual acceptance of the situation, yet in this context it implies that the president’s death is a divine justice. The commenter uses implicit religious construction which forms a sarcastic or mock effect. This reflects the commenter’s belief that God will punish those who are guilty and displays schadenfreude.

5. “All the blood the Iranian people have spilled will lead him to hell.”

The comment is an obvious example of Negative Impoliteness and “bald on record”. The emotive language of “all the blood” holds the president accountable for the death of his citizens. The expression “will lead him to hell” formulates an attack on the President’s face and states that he deserves his fair judgment. Accordingly, the comment reflects *schadenfreude*.

6. “Sending thoughts and prayers to the helicopter.”

The comment embodies Mock Politeness by sarcastic employment of conventional phrase of empathy. The commenter shows no concern for the death of the president and his colleagues. Instead of being sympathetic, the commenter turns his attention to the helicopter and ironically says that his thoughts and prayers are to it. Accordingly, he implies it is worthier than those who die. This formulates an intentional pragmatic incongruity. The commenter trivializes the president’s death and reflects his condolences to the helicopter. This comment displays mock politeness as a direct polite phrase communicates implicit impoliteness meaning. In relation to *schadenfreude*, the commenter expresses his happiness and detaches himself from the President’s death.

7. “I never celebrate death, but this guy sounds like the worst of the worst...”

The comment exemplifies Negative Impoliteness softened by a direct “moral disclaimer”. The phrase “I never celebrates death” detaches the commenter from celebrating death, but following it by the conjunction “but” conveys a shift to celebrating the President’s death. The phrase “the worst of the worst” functions to strengthen the derogation and portrays the president as reprehensible. Despite the fact that the commenter does not express direct happiness at the death of the president, yet the comment is an implicit form of *schadenfreude*.

8. “The people of Persia were "liberated" from their tyrant.”

The comment is an example of Mock Politeness by means of ironic judgment. Putting “liberated” between quotation marks expresses that the commenter ironically constructs the President’s death as liberation. The noun “their tyrant” constructs Negative Impoliteness through attributing the President a derogatory identity marker and presents the citizens as if they were in a metaphorical prison. The comment portrays the President’s death as positive to the Iranian individuals. As such, the commenter legitimatizes *schadenfreude* because he welcomes the President’s death as necessity to achieve liberation.

9. “Karma is tough, but fair. Hopefully he won’t get replaced by someone worse.”

The commenter employs Mock Politeness and Negative Impoliteness to imply exaggerated *schadenfreude*. Through the personification of “Karma” as a tool of fairness, the commenter portrays the President’s death as a result of his previous evil action. The appraisal in “fair” constructs ironic pragmatic power reflecting that the President deserves his misfortune. The second part of the comment, “Hopefully he won’t get replaced by someone worse,” attacks the President’s positive face and assumes he is bad. As a consequence, the comment displays implicit *schadenfreude* due to something wrong he committed in the past and now he receives his fair judgment.

10. “You know you were a bad guy if everyone is cheering your death.”

In this comment, the commenter uses Negative Impoliteness by means of derogatory assessment. The “bad guy” functions as an attack to the positive face of the President. Referring to “everyone” intends that the collective celebration of the President’s death is due to corrupt action. From a pragmatic angle, the comment formulates a relation between the President’s evil action and everyone’s response to his death. As such, the commenter legitimizes feeling happy at the President’s death and accordingly strengthens *schadenfreude*.

11. “We do not mourn our enemies. There is no mercy for them and no forgiveness.”

This comment presents an obvious example of “bald on record impoliteness”. The statement “we do not mourn our enemies” compares “we” and “our enemies”. The expressions “no mercy” and “no forgiveness” strengthen the face attack and deprive the President of any source of empathy. The repetition of “no” absolutely rejects any form of mercy and leaves no space for forgiveness. Pragmatically, the commenter excludes the President from his group. The comment, is on behalf of others, shows that all community must not mourn such death. It denotes the weakness of the addressee and elevates the commenter above him. The comment also shows that the commenter is unsympathetic. The absence of mercy and forgiveness besides denying any form of mourning display *schadenfreude*.

12. “Karma works in mysterious ways look on the amount people who lost their lives under his watch.”

The commenter employs Negative Impoliteness and Mock Impoliteness. The comment is a personification of “karma” as a tool of fairness and shows the Presidents’ death as a consequence of his evil action. The expression “mysterious ways” constructs a deep tone and implies a mocking and condemnatory. The second part of the comment, “the amount people who lost their lives under his watch,” associates the president with the act of losing life and holds him accountable for the evil action. The comment forms the President’s death as karmic fairness. The President’s misfortune is

the reward of something wrong he has committed that is of killing many people. Accordingly, this strengthens *schadenfreude*.

13. “Finally, Justice for Mahsa Amini.”

The commenter exemplifies Negative Impoliteness and uses the strategy of “associating the other with a negative aspect”. He refers to Mahsa Amini’s death intending to say that the President is responsible for her death. Mahsa Amini died after being arrested by ‘moral police’ due to what is called her improper scarf. The commenter justifies the President death as a fair punishment for Mahsa Amini’s unfair death and he receives his fair judgment. Accordingly, this reinforces *schadenfreude*.

14. “Mahsa Amini laughing in Heaven.”

Moreover, this utterance manipulates the strategy of “associating the other with a negative aspect”. The commenter refers to Mahsa Amini(see Comment No: 13). The commenter justifies the President’s death as a punishment for Mahsa Amini’s unfair death. Accordingly, this triggers retributive *schadenfreude*.

15. “The end of ‘the butcher of Teheran’ ”

The comment exemplifies Negative Impoliteness through the strategy of derogatory labeling. The metaphorical description, “the butcher of Tehran,” constructs the President as evil and weakens his identity to a brutality figure. Employing the definite article “the” demonstrates the derogation as identity rather than as an explanation. The phrase, “the end of” portrays the President’s death as an ultimate end that deserves no compassion. The comment reflects *schadenfreude* for the President’s death.

5.Conclusion

Outstandingly, the analysis mirrors the true feeling of the commenters’ which reveals the absence of the norms of respect in reaction to these individual’s suffering. Illness and death become a mirror for moral judgment and evil human emotion. In this respect, *schadenfreude* is a social constructed phenomenon. From a pragmatic perspective, the research displays that *schadenfreude* is expressed implicitly due to context, background information and impoliteness strategies. Implicitly, commenters are more free to convey their feeling for others in a way that is socially sensitive or taboo. Expressing pleasure at the King’s illness and the President’s death violates the social norms of being polite. Analyzing impolite comments about King Charles III illness and The Iranian

President's death reveal that commenters' reaction to these two incidents are not only expressions of resentment. They formulate intended face attacks that transform illness and death into deserved retribution. Commenters frequently employ Negative Impoliteness especially associating these political figures with negative aspect, scorn, condescension, ridicule, wishing harm and derogatory description. They also use Positive Politeness besides Sarcasm or Mock politeness.

Nevertheless, obvious difference appears in analyzing the datasets concerning the King and the President. Comments about King Charles III illness highlight degradation, ridicule and retaliatory mentioning his pervious actions. Comments about the President are mostly based on citizens suffering, political wrongdoing and fair judgment. 50% of the comments that show *schadenfreude* for the King's illness link this to the late Princess death and coin the word *Karma*. They regard this misfortune as a natural reward for what he may be involved in and deserves this fair punishment. On the other hand, the same is true for the President's death when they show their happiness at his misfortune and forms it as an act of natural revenge or *Karma* for Mahsa Amini's death besides others.

References:

- Akre, K. (2023, March 31). Schadenfreude. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/schadenfreude>.
- BBC News. (2024, February 5). *King Charles diagnosed with cancer, Buckingham Palace says* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=igYmSzom8YE>.
- BBC News. (2024, May 20). *Iran's President Ebrahim Raisi killed in helicopter crash: What we know so far* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eUcfg4A42DE>.
- Ben-Ze'ev, A. (2000). *The subtlety of emotions*. MIT Press.
- Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cecconi, C. (2017). Schadenfreude: Tra invidia, rivalsa, ed il godere per le disgrazie altrui. In M. Cruciani & M. Tabacchi (Eds.), *Nuovi sguardi sulle scienze cognitive* (pp. 93–104). Corisco Edizioni.
- Cecconi, C., Poggi, I., & D'Errico, F. (2020). Schadenfreude: Malicious joy in social media interactions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 558282.

- Cikara, M., & Fiske, S. T. (2012). Stereotypes and schadenfreude: Behavioral and physiological markers of pleasure at others' misfortunes. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(1), 63–71.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Feather, N. T., & McKee, I. R. (2014). Deservingness, liking relations, schadenfreude, and other discrete emotions in the context of the outcomes of plagiarism. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 66(1), 18–27.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. Routledge
- Kushner, H. S. (1981). *When bad things happen to good people*. Schocken Books.
- Lange, J., & Boecker, L. (2019). Schadenfreude as a social-functional dominance regulator. *Emotion*, 19(3), 489–502.
- Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2008). A vengefulness of the impotent: The pain of ingroup inferiority and schadenfreude toward successful outgroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1383–1396.
- Montaigne, M. (2006). *Montaigne denemeler* (S. Eyüboğlu, Trans.). Cem Yayınevi. (Original work published 1580)
- Pinker, A. (2015). Schadenfreude in the Tanakh. *Journal for Semitics*, 544–574.
- Portmann, J. (2000). *When bad things happen to other people*. Routledge.
- Sanders, E. (2014). *Envy and jealousy in classical Athens: a socio-psychological approach*. Oxford University Press.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1965). *On the basis of morality*. Bobbs-Merrill.
- Van Dijk, W. W., & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (Eds.). (2014). *Schadenfreude: Understanding pleasure at the misfortune of others*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, S., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Rochat, P. (2019). Schadenfreude deconstructed and reconstructed: A tripartite motivational model. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 52, 1–11.