Review of: "Conceptual oxymoron, oxymetaphor, and oxymetaphtonymy: inclusive border and violent inclusion in close-up"

Mirka Cirovic

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to start off by saying that this article has a considerable academic potential in the sense that oxymoron and paradox have not seen such proliferation of papers as studies on metaphor and metonymy have. I will proceed to offer a few suggestions that I believe could benefit the final draft of the article.

1. **Abstract:** The objective of the paper is to prove that *violent inclusion* is oxymetaphor while *inclusive border* is oxymetaphtonymy even though some speakers may fail to notice the oxymoric nature of these expressions. Along with this, it seems important to refer to corpus-based approach, which the analysis rests upon. What is the significance and selection criteria of the listed examples (1) - (6)? Also, how are these examples related to the most relevant one (example 7) from Mezzadra and Neilson's *Border as Method,* where *violent inclusion* and *inclusive border* are perceived as linked together (for the first time) to offer a coherent perception of the notion *border,* which assumes coexistence of opposite characteristics. Another goal set in the abstract is for the article to suggest the perception of oxymora in terms of parallax. In my view, this is not explicitly done in the body of the analysis, which is why I see no need to emphatically outline this aim of research.

2. Sections 1 and 2: I suggest that these two sections should swap places so that the article would benefit from a clear introduction. Namely, section 2 already presents the theoretical framework within which the analysis is carried out. Having readers familiarized with the theoretical background of the research would assist them in comprehending the significance, purpose, and meaning of examples presented subsequently. Another suggestion I have for the introduction is that the author should emphasize the importance of Mezzadra and Neilson's *Border as Method* in reference to this particular paper and more generally - in reference to our reconceptualization of notions *border* and *inclusion.*

3. Section 3: This is another instance where the article would profit from re-structuring. If section 2 listed examples of *inclusive border* and *violent inclusion* to be considered, then this would serve as a nice lead-in toward analytically the most significant example (7) quoted in section 3. Also, this part of the article could state more overtly in what sense the previous six examples are similar/ different from the quote taken from Mezzadra and Neilson.

4. Section 4: It is insufficiently clear for me whether *inclusive boarder* and *violent inclusion* are both oxymetaphtonymy, as the subheading suggests, or whether one is oxymetaphor and the other oxymetaphtonymy, as stated in the abstract. Either the subheading or the content of this section needs editing.

5. Conclusion: Insights should be less general and more paper specific. While it is undisputable that more research is

needed for some definitive answers, what can be suggested after this particular analysis? In which examples are we talking about different oxymora, and in which are we talking about combined conceptualization? Which of the three models seems most plausible to the author: metonymy within metaphor, metonymy from metaphor, or aspects are integrated?

I hope the author finds these suggestions useful.

I am looking forward to seeing edited version of the article.