

2nd Postgraduate Workshop in Pragmatics

March 4, 2024

Library of the School of Philosophy (NKUA)



HELLENIC REPUBLIC
National and Kapodistrian
University of Athens

— EST. 1837 —

unine[•]
Université de Neuchâtel
Faculté des lettres
et sciences humaines

2nd Postgraduate Workshop in Pragmatics
Department of English Language and Literature
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Library of the School of Philosophy
Auditorium

Monday, March 4, 2024



Organizers

Elly Ifantidou (NKUA)

Louis de Saussure (University of Neuchâtel)

Anna Piata (NKUA)

Funding Acknowledgement

Organization costs are covered by the funds provided by the NKUA Special Account for Research Grants to the Department of English Language & Literature for its research, educational, and functional needs. We would like to also thank the University of Neuchâtel for serving as a subsidiary partner in the Workshop organization.

Program

09.10-09.20	Welcome address by Prof. Nikolaos Lavidas, Director of the MA Program in English Language, Linguistics and Translation, NKUA
09.20-10.40	Plenary talks Chair: Prof. Elly Ifantidou
09.20-10.00	Prof. Diana Mazzarella (University of Neuchâtel) <i>“Understanding irony (mis)understanding”</i>
10.00-10.40	Prof. Stavros Assimakopoulos (University of Malta) <i>“Propositionality and non-propositionality in the interpretation of hate speech”</i>
10.40-11.10	<i>Coffee break</i>
11.10-13.10	Session 1: Speaker meaning, evidentiality, expressivity Chair: Prof. Louis de Saussure
11.10-11.40	Mélinda Pozzi & Diana Mazzarella (University of Neuchâtel) <i>“Believe me, I saw it! Speaker’s responsibility for evidential claims”</i>
11.40-12.10	Lemonia Tsavdaridou (NKUA) <i>“Mirative evidentials and the communication of emotions”</i>
12.10-12.40	Ismaël Pozner (University of Neuchâtel) <i>“Non-propositional meaning, affective goals and relevance”</i>
12.40-13.10	Jonathan Steimer (University of Neuchâtel) <i>“Epithet adjectives and subjective communication”</i>
13.10-14.00	<i>Lunch break</i>
14.00-16.00	Session 2: Non-literal meaning in typical and atypical populations Chair: Dr. Anna Piata
14.00-14.30	Marianna Vraka (NKUA) <i>“Irony comprehension in typically developed adults: The impact of linguistic and emotive factors”</i>
14.30-15.00	Eriketti Metaxa (NKUA) <i>“Metaphor interpretation and non-propositional effects: Evaluating evidence from behavioural and neuroimaging studies”</i>
15.00-15.30	Stella Lampri (University of Peloponnese), Theodoros Marinis, Eleni Peristeri & Maria Andreou

	<i>“Metaphor comprehension and production in children with high-functioning Autism Spectrum Disorder”</i>
15.30-16.00	Rongyu Wang (Dublin City University) <i>“A relevance-theoretic approach in multimodal translation: Subtitling humour for the deaf and hard of hearing”</i>
16.00-16.30	<i>Coffee break</i>
16.30-18.30	Session 3: Pragmatics and its interfaces Chair: Prof. Stavros Assimakopoulos
16.30-17.00	Vassiliki Geka (NKUA) <i>“The pragmatics of acceptance in atypical imperatives”</i>
17.00-17.30	Charlotte Eisenrauch (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz) <i>“The interaction of grammar and pragmatics in the interpretation of German regulatory signs in public spaces”</i>
17.30-18.00	Panagiotis Delis (NKUA) <i>“The analysis of textual and stylistic features of Greek hip hop songs through corpus linguistics”</i>
18.00-18.30	Dimitra Filippou (NKUA) <i>“Online hate speech: A study of comments on a criminal case of rape and homicide”</i>

PLENARY TALKS

Propositionality and non-propositionality in the interpretation of hate speech

Stavros Assimakopoulos

University of Malta

stavros.assimakopoulos@um.edu.mt

As evidenced by the prolific amount of research linking relevance-theoretic pragmatics with virtually all kind of communicative interaction, relevance theory's cognitive outlook has furthered our understanding of the processing that underlies such diverse activities as reading literature (e.g. Cave & Wilson, 2018), surfing the internet (e.g. Yus, 2011) or even getting convinced by advertisements (e.g. Forceville, 1998). In line with such previous efforts, this talk sets out to investigate how relevance theory can be applied to the critical discussion of discourse, as traditionally approached through the lens of Critical Discourse Studies (CDS). Focusing specifically on the distinction between the explicitly communicated and indirectly transmitted meanings that underlie the corresponding distinction between *hard* and *soft* hate speech in the relevant literature (Assimakopoulos et al., 2017), I will first assess the status of said meanings as elements of a statement's explicatures and implicatures. Following this appraisal, and in an attempt to provide a more complete picture of the communicative import of hate speech, I will turn to two aspects of its underlying meaning, which relevance theory allows us to approach more straightforwardly than competing accounts. On the propositional side, I will discuss soft hate speech's inherent argumentativity, as a means of deriving premises that lead to cognitive effects which justify discriminatory hatred. On the non-propositional one, I will suggest that hard and soft hate speech alike additionally instil in their audience particular affective reactions which crucially strengthen discriminatory attitudes.

References

- Assimakopoulos, Stavros, Fabienne H. Baider & Sharon Millar (Eds.). 2017. *Online Hate Speech in the European Union: A Discourse-Analytic Perspective*. Cham: Springer.
- Cave, Terence & Deirdre Wilson (Eds.). 2018. *Reading Beyond the Code: Literature and Relevance Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forceville, Charles. 1998. *Pictorial Metaphor in Advertising*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Yus, Francisco. 2011. *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-Mediated Communication in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Understanding irony (mis)understanding

Diana Mazarella

University of Neuchâtel

In this talk, I will focus on two claims made in the context of Relevance Theory on the nature of verbal irony and its cognitive underpinnings. The first claim is that irony is an echoic use of language. The second claim is that irony understanding relies on the exercise of epistemic vigilance. I will present new experimental data on adult processing and children's comprehension of irony that corroborate them both.

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

The analysis of textual and stylistic features of Greek hip hop songs through corpus linguistics

Panagiotis Delis

National & Kapodistrian University of Athens

This study is concerned with the analysis of textual and stylistic features in Greek hip-hop songs using the framework of corpus linguistics. Hip-hop, a musical genre and a cultural phenomenon, has evolved from its origins in New York City into a globally influential and commercially successful form of artistic expression. This study focuses on the linguistic and ideological transformations in Greek hip-hop from the 1990s to the 2010s, employing the affordances of corpus linguistics. Hip-hop is a genre that exists on both international and local levels. Artists draw from common experiences and cultural models, but also incorporate local references to create a more individual style. Linguistic studies in English have revealed that hip-hop artists make conscious linguistic choices to create an "authentic" style that deviates from linguistic norms. This study fills a gap in the existing literature by applying corpus linguistics to the study of Greek hip-hop and examining its linguistic and thematic choices in Greek. The research uses a synergistic approach combining quantitative and qualitative methods from corpus linguistics, corpus stylistics, and sociolinguistics. A corpus of Greek hip-hop lyrics from three decades (1990s, 2000s, and 2010s) is compared with a corpus of Anglophone hip-hop lyrics from 1960-2010. Factors such as the artists' gender, nationality, and language are taken into account in the analysis. The study addresses several key issues, including the conceptualization of Greek hip-hop as a distinct register, the thematic patterns in Greek hip-hop and their diachronic development, and the variation of stylistic features between decades, genders, nationalities, and languages. The study is expected to reveal that Greek hip-hop has developed its own stylistic features, mixing elements of orality and dialogicity, but also sharing thematic patterns with global hip-hop. It will highlight themes that are culturally specific to Greece and show the hip-hop artists' engagement with political and power-related issues. This research will contribute to a deeper understanding of the linguistic, stylistic, and contextual features of Greek hip-hop and offer insights into poetic genres and pop culture in the Greek context.

**The interaction of grammar and pragmatics
in the interpretation of German regulatory signs in public spaces**

Charlotte Eisenrauch

Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

The city represents a communication space that is characterised by a large variety of linguistic and non-linguistic signs. How public spaces are constituted by these visible signs is a question that is addressed in the context of research on *Linguistic Landscapes* (e.g. Scollon & Scollon, 2003). However, while previous studies have focused mainly on sociolinguistic and semiotic aspects, a comprehensive description of the grammatical and pragmatic features of this discourse domain remains a desideratum. In particular, public signs with a regulative function are characterised by their strongly reduced syntactic structures, which often deviate from common sentence and phrase structure rules:

- (1) Ausfahrt freihalten
gateway free-keep
'Keep gateway free'
- (2) Privatgrundstück
private lot
'Private lot'
- (3) Achtung Videoüberwachung
attention video surveillance
'attention video surveillance'

In addition, the effectiveness of regulatory signs is firmly linked to the place where they are displayed. This therefore requires recipients to incorporate situational and contextual knowledge to a large extent (e.g. Levinson, 2000; Sidnell & Enfield, 2016). On the one hand, the aim of my dissertation is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic phenomena on German regulatory signs in public spaces. On the other hand, I am particularly interested in the question how grammar and pragmatics interact in the interpretation of these signs. The investigation is based on a corpus of over 2800 regulatory signs that was compiled as part of a photographic data collection in the city of Mainz and, in a second step, annotated with regard to relevant grammatical and pragmatic criteria.

References

Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. *Language, speech, and communication*. MIT Press.

<https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/5526.001.0001>

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. Routledge.

Sidnell, J., & Enfield, N. J. (2016). Deixis and the Interactional Foundations of Reference. In

Y. Huang (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 217–239). Oxford University

Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697960.013.27>

**Online hate speech:
A study of comments on a criminal case of rape and homicide**

Dimitra Filippou

National & Kapodistrian University of Athens

The aim of this study is to examine online hate speech through linguistic data extracted from an online platform. Specifically, users of the platform comment on a notorious criminal case that was of great concern to Greek society in 2018, that is, the rape and murder of a young woman in Rhodes. The research problem of the study is the extensive mapping of the linguistic and pragmatic features that constitute hate speech and the connection with this hate crime. Hate crimes have already been linked to the implementation of hate speech by perpetrators (Culpeper et al., 2017). The contexts in which hate speech emerges are based on the use of abusive language, insults, threats, taboo words and attacks on one's identity and values (Waldron, 2012). However, as other research on online environments has pointed out (Assimakopoulos, Baider & Millar 2017; Baider, 2020; Guillén-Nieto, 2023), the phenomenon of hate speech in online environments carries several characteristics that make it a complex and multidimensional linguistic phenomenon. So, based on these, the main research questions are: (a) what are the linguistic and pragmatic features that make up hate speech, (b) what are the contextual elements that influence the linguistic context, i.e., how the context combines with the co-text to produce hate speech and (c) through which strategies hate speech is ultimately enacted. In this research, linguistic data from online discussions between anonymous YouTube users have been collected and analysed qualitatively with pragmatic and discourse analytic tools. In addition, principles of jurisprudence have been utilized, as well as European legislation. The research shows that hate crimes are characterised by hostility towards the victim, which is related to the social group to which the victim belongs or to which the perpetrator assumes the victim belongs. Hostility, which implies a state of violence and fear, is expressed linguistically mainly through insults, which constitute the main expression of hate speech. Consequently, in the considered corpus, it follows that the realization of hate speech emerges through the coexistence of specific pragmatic mechanisms and the public approval, denial, justification, or devaluation of crimes against human life through the system of online communication in which they are examined. This conclusion comes to unite the set of linguistic tools and strategies with the legal framework concerning hate speech.

References

- Assimakopoulos, S., Baider, F. & Millar S. (2017). *Online hate speech in the E.U. A discourse-analytic perspective*. Switzerland: Springer Open.
- Baider, F. (2020). Pragmatics lost? Overview, synthesis and proposition in defining online hate speech. *Pragmatics and Society* 11(2), 196–218.
- Culpeper, J., Iganski, P. & Sweiry, A. (2017). Linguistic impoliteness and religiously aggravated hate crime in England and Wales. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 5(1), 1-29.
- Guillén-Nieto, V. (2023). *Hate Speech: Linguistic Perspectives* (Vol. 2). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Waldron, J. (2012). The harm in hate speech. In *The Harm in Hate Speech*. Harvard University Press.

The pragmatics of acceptance in atypical imperatives

Vassiliki Geka

Hellenic Air Force Academy, Hellenic Police Academy

The semantic-pragmatic complexity and the different syntactic configurations of the Imperative have been an object of theoretical discussion in various linguistic paradigms (cf. Downes 1977; Bolinger 1977; Wilson and Sperber 1988; Han 1998, Stefanowitsch 2003, Takahashi 2004, 2011). Contributing to and extending this line of research through a Construction Grammar (CxG) approach, the present paper calls attention to the IMPERATIVE (IMP) as a constructional family with more and less prototypical (i.e., atypical/non-canonical) members (Stefanowitsch 2003; Takahashi 2004, 2011). In so doing, it focuses on ‘*you do that*’ (1-2 below) as an instance of an atypical Imperative, which on account of its explicit Addressee-encoding readily relates to the sub-network of OBLIGATORY SUBJECT IMPERATIVES (OSIs), so termed by Stefanowitsch (2003).

(1) “- *“Maybe I’ll go on another holiday. ” The Chief opened the top drawer of his desk and scooped Sully’s life into it. ” Good idea. **You do that.** And get your head screwed on straight while you’re at it. ”*

[COCA: *Taming the moon*, Source: Fiction, Year of Publication: 2010]

(2) “*Ah! You bitch! I will report you! Yeah, **you do that.** And make sure you tell your wife I said hello.”*

[COCA: *Law & Order: Special Victims Unit*, Episode: Forgiving Rollins, Release Year: 2014]

In the context of such empirical evidence, YOU DO THAT emerges as an atypical Imperative construction with fairly specific semantics-pragmatics, a distinctive syntactic configuration, and a consistently discourse-responsive scope over a previous Addressee-induced proposition /p/ (Geka 2023). In particular, it is shown to couch the pragmatics of *gradient acceptance*, ranging from (*disinterested*) *acceptance*, *indifference*, or *passive-aggressive acceptance*, taking the form of *acquiescence* (von Stechow and Iatridou 2017) and thus inheriting properties that account for its systematic encoding of *low Speaker-endorsement vis-à-vis /p/*. In light of the above, the paper seeks to respond to the following questions: a) How is ‘*you do that*’ different from its seemingly ‘formal twins’ in the Indicative (e.g., “***You do that** when you’re*

pissed...” (BNC)) or the Imperative featuring in an AND-CONDITIONAL IMPERATIVE (Culicover and Jackendoff 1997; Kaufmann 2012) as in “*You do that, Father, you do that just once and there’ll be one less for breakfast tomorrow morning.*” (COCA), b) What are its inherited and idiosyncratic properties that license its semantics, conventionalised discourse-pragmatics, and systematically responsive scope? And c) how productive is its Imperative-based licensing template to be profitably related to similar language patterns, such as the trending ‘*you do you (boo)*’? To respond to these questions, the paper adopts a usage-based methodological framework relying on empirical, corpus (BNC & COCA) evidence examined both qualitatively and quantitatively. It further correlates corpus-based findings with the preliminary results of a small-scale written response survey targeting the levels of awareness that instructors of English as a second language (ESL) and material developers working in two international ESL publication houses have over the specific atypical Imperative-based licensing template and the conventionalised discourse-pragmatics it gives rise to.

References

- Bolinger, D. (1977). *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.
- Culicover, P.W., & Jackendoff, R. (1997). Semantic Subordination Despite Syntactic Coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28(2), 195-217.
- Geka, V. (2023). Atypical Imperative constructions: The case of YOU DO THAT. *Constructions*, 15(2).
- Downes, W. (1977). The Imperatives and Pragmatics. *Journal of Linguistics*. 13(1), 77- 97.
- Han, C. (1998). *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar*. University of Pennsylvania, The USA.
- Kaufmann, M. (2012). *Interpreting imperatives*. Berlin: Springer.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2003). *The English imperative: A construction-based approach* [Paper presentation]. Workshop on Form and function of sentence types at the DGFS Jahrestagung, February 2003, University of Munich, Munich.
- Takahashi, H. (2004). *The English Imperative: A Cognitive and Functional Analysis*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Hokkaido University.
- Takahashi, H. (2011). The imperative in English: The Six-Parameter Approach to Analyzing its Force. *Journal of the graduate school of letters*, 6, 1-13.

- von Stechow, P. & Iatridou, S. (2017). A modest proposal for the meaning of imperatives. In A. Arregui, M. L. Rivero, & A. Salanova (Eds.), *Modality across syntactic categories*. (pp. 288-319). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (1988). Mood and the analysis of non-declarative sentences. In J. Dancy, J. Moravcsik, & C. Taylor (Eds.), *Human Agency: Language, Duty and Value*. (pp.77-101). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Metaphor comprehension and production in children with high-functioning Autism Spectrum Disorder

Stella Lampri¹, Theodoros Marinis², Eleni Peristeri³ & Maria Andreou¹

¹University of Peloponnese

²University of Konstanz

³Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Research in the field of figurative language processing in Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) has demonstrated that autistic individuals experience systematic difficulties in the comprehension of non-literal language. Interestingly, recent findings (Kalandadze et al., 2018) pinpoint metaphors as the most challenging form of figurative language in terms of processing for autistic participants. However, the exact source of these difficulties remains largely controversial. The main scientific debate focuses on the mediating role of structural languages skills (i.e. lexical knowledge) and cognitive traits (i.e. Theory of Mind, Executive functions) in autistic individuals' ability to comprehend and generate metaphors. The overall results of studies investigating possible factors influencing metaphor processing in ASD are far from conclusive. Moreover, thus far, very few studies (Kasirer et al., 2020; Kasirer & Mashal, 2014; 2016) have investigated metaphor production in ASD. These gaps constrain our current state of knowledge about metaphor processing in this population. This study is based on previous research (Lampri et al., 2023) and examines the comprehension and generation of metaphors in children with ASD and age-matched typically-developing (TD) controls. Participants completed a low-verbal multiple-choice sentence-picture matching task that tested their ability to comprehend conventional metaphors, and a sentence continuation task that assessed their ability to generate metaphors. The sample also undertook measures of fluid intelligence, expressive vocabulary and working memory. After testing 16 participants (8 with ASD and 8 TD), our preliminary results show that the autistic group had significantly lower performance than their TD peers in both metaphor comprehension ($M=6.8$ for autistic $< M=9.8$ for TD; $p=.036$), and production ($M=3.4$ for autistic $< M=7.8$ for TD; $p=.029$), even after controlling for the children's vocabulary, working memory and fluid intelligence skills. Moreover, almost 36% of autistic children's responses in metaphor generation consisted of inappropriate answers, which were considerably higher relative to the TD group (12% of inappropriate answers). The overall results reveal that autistic children have difficulty with comprehending

and using metaphorical language. The findings also show that autistic children do not merely adhere to the literal meaning of figurative sentences but assign to them pragmatically inappropriate meanings.

References

- Kalandadze, T., Norbury, C., Nærlund, T., & Næss, K.-A. B. (2018). Figurative language comprehension in individuals with autism spectrum disorder: A meta-analytic review. *Autism: The International Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(2), 99–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361316668652>
- Kasirer, A., Adi-Japha, E., & Mashal, N. (2020). Verbal and Figural Creativity in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder and Typical Development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 559238. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.559238>
- Kasirer, A., & Mashal, N. (2014). Verbal creativity in autism: Comprehension and generation of metaphoric language in high-functioning autism spectrum disorder and typical development. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00615>
- Kasirer, A., & Mashal, N. (2016). Comprehension and generation of metaphors by children with autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 32, 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2016.08.003>
- Lampri, S., Peristeri, E., Marinis, T., & Andreou, M. (2023). Figurative language processing in autism spectrum disorders: A review. *Autism Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.3069>

**Metaphor interpretation and non-propositional effects:
Evaluating evidence from behavioural and neuroimaging studies**

Eriketti Metaxa

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

In this overview, I intend to discuss experimental evidence from behavioural as well as neuroimaging studies on the process of metaphor interpretation. Left and right-based scalp distributions along with elicitation of the N400 and P600 ERP components suggest that comprehension of metaphorical expressions entails an effortful process of meaning resolution and inferential processing for the derivation of metaphorical meaning (Ahrens et al., 2007; Bambini et al., 2011, 2016; Bottini et al., 1994; Chen et al., 2016; Coulson & vanPetten, 2002; DeGrauwe et al., 2010; Eviatar & Just, 2006; Klooster et al., 2020; Mashal et al., 2009; Rapp et al., 2004; Schmidt & Seger, 2009; Shibata et al., 2012; Stringaris et al., 2006). Results show that, in the course of this process, non-propositional elements, such as mental imagery and affective effects, might also become manifest. Behavioural studies indicate that, when presented with metaphorical language, participants might entertain imagistic and affective elements that impact on the interpretation process (Citron et al., 2020). This is corroborated by findings from neuroimaging techniques, which point to the involvement of brain processing associated with imagery and emotion during metaphor comprehension (Canal et al., 2022; Citron & Goldberg, 2014; Citron et al., 2016; Lai et al., 2009; Mashal et al., 2014). Data from these studies further suggests that the presence of immediate linguistic context as well as the degree of novelty of metaphorical expressions might affect the evocation of non-propositional elements as well (Binder & Desai, 2011; Canziani, 2010; Citron et al., 2020; Mashal et al., 2005; Obert et al., 2014; Ojha et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2009).

References

- Ahrens, K., Liu, H. L., Lee, C. Y., Gong, S. P., Fang, S. Y., & Hsu, Y. Y. (2007). Functional MRI of conventional and anomalous metaphors in Mandarin Chinese. *Brain and Language, 100*(2), 163-171.
- Bambini, V., Bertini, C., Schaeken, W., Stella, A., & Di Russo, F. (2016). Disentangling metaphor from context: an ERP study. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*, 559.

- Bambini, V., Gentili, C., Ricciardi, E., Bertinetto, P. M., & Pietrini, P. (2011). Decomposing metaphor processing at the cognitive and neural level through functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Brain Research Bulletin*, *86*(3-4), 203-216.
- Binder, J. R., & Desai, R. H. (2011). The neurobiology of semantic memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*(11), 527-536.
- Bottini, G., Corcoran, R., Sterzi, R., Paulesu, E., Schenone, P., Scarpa, P. & Frith, D. (1994). The role of the right hemisphere in the interpretation of figurative aspects of language: a positron emission tomography activation study. *Brain*, *117*(6), 1241-1253.
- Canal, P., Bischetti, L., Bertini, C., Ricci, I., Lecce, S., & Bambini, V. (2022). N400 differences between physical and mental metaphors: the role of Theories of Mind. *Brain and Cognition*, *161*, 105879.
- Canziani, T. (2010). Metaphor and brain: a neuropragmatic overview. *Textus*, *23*(3), 737-762.
- Chen, H., Peng, X., Lu, Q., & Wang, H. (2016). ERP differences between literary and non-literary metaphors. *Lang. Cognit. Sci*, *2*, 27-53.
- Citron, F. M., & Goldberg, A. E. (2014). Metaphorical sentences are more emotionally engaging than their literal counterparts. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *26*(11), 2585-2595.
- Citron, F. M., Güsten, J., Michaelis, N., & Goldberg, A. E. (2016). Conventional metaphors in longer passages evoke affective brain response. *NeuroImage*, *139*, 218-230.
- Citron, F. M., Lee, M., & Michaelis, N. (2020). Affective and psycholinguistic norms for German conceptual metaphors (COMETA). *Behavior Research Methods*, *52*, 1056-1072.
- Coulson, S., & Van Petten, C. (2002). Conceptual integration and metaphor: an event-related potential study. *Memory & Cognition*, *30*(6), 958-968.
- De Grauwe, S., Swain, A., Holcomb, P. J., Ditman, T., & Kuperberg, G. R. (2010). Electrophysiological insights into the processing of nominal metaphors. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*(7), 1965-1984.
- Eviatar, Z., & Just, M. A. (2006). Brain correlates of discourse processing: an fMRI investigation of irony and conventional metaphor comprehension. *Neuropsychologia*, *44*(12), 2348-2359.
- Klooster, N., McQuire, M., Grossman, M., McMillan, C., Chatterjee, A., & Cardillo, E. (2020). The neural basis of metaphor comprehension: evidence from left hemisphere degeneration. *Neurobiology of Language*, *1*(4), 474-491.

- Lai, V. T., Curran, T., & Menn, L. (2009). Comprehending conventional and novel metaphors: an ERP study. *Brain Research, 1284*, 145-155.
- Mashal, N., Faust, M., & Hendler, T. (2005). The role of the right hemisphere in processing nonsalient metaphorical meanings: Application of principal components analysis to fMRI data. *Neuropsychologia, 43*(14), 2084-2100.
- Mashal, N., Faust, M., Hendler, T., & Jung-Beeman, M. (2009). An fMRI study of processing novel metaphoric sentences. *Laterality, 14*(1), 30-54.
- Mashal, N., Vishne, T., & Laor, N. (2014). The role of the precuneus in metaphor comprehension: evidence from an fMRI study in people with schizophrenia and healthy participants. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8*, 818.
- Obert, A., Gierski, F., Calmus, A., Portefaix, C., Declercq, C., Pierot, L., & Caillies, S. (2014). Differential bilateral involvement of the parietal gyrus during predicative metaphor processing: an auditory fMRI study. *Brain and Language, 137*, 112-119.
- Ojha, A., Indurkha, B., & Lee, M. (2017). Is language necessary to interpret visual metaphors? In F. Ervas, E. Gola & M.G. Rossi (Eds.), *Metaphor in communication, science and education* (pp. 61-76). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Rapp, A. M., Leube, D. T., Erb, M., Grodd, W., & Kircher, T. T. (2004). Neural correlates of metaphor processing. *Cognitive Brain Research, 20*(3), 395-402.
- Schmidt, G. L., & Seger, C. A. (2009). Neural correlates of metaphor processing: the roles of figurativeness, familiarity and difficulty. *Brain and Cognition, 71*(3), 375-386.
- Shibata, M., Toyomura, A., Motoyama, H., Itoh, H., Kawabata, Y., & Abe, J. I. (2012). Does simile comprehension differ from metaphor comprehension? A functional MRI study. *Brain and Language, 121*(3), 254-260.
- Stringaris, A. K., Medford, N., Giora, R., Giampietro, V. C., Brammer, M. J., & David, A. S. (2006). How metaphors influence semantic relatedness judgments: The role of the right frontal cortex. *NeuroImage, 33*(2), 784-793.
- Yang, F. G., Edens, J., Simpson, C., & Krawczyk, D. C. (2009). Differences in task demands influence the hemispheric lateralization and neural correlates of metaphor. *Brain and Language, 111*(2), 114-124.

Non-propositional meaning, affective goals and relevance

Ismaël Pozner

University of Neuchâtel

In this presentation, I draw upon existing works in pragmatics and attempt at offering a contribution to the way Sperber & Wilson's (1986) Relevance theory (RT) can account for 'non-propositional' meaning. What RT calls 'non-propositional meaning' cannot be paraphrased by unequivocal propositions attributed to the speaker's intention. Still, such meanings are considered as of propositional nature. For instance, 'impressions' (including procedural meanings, according to Wharton 2016), which are the typical case of non-propositional meaning, are described as activating 'arrays' of weakly manifest implicatures, being propositional "under the microscope". I follow Wharton & *al.* (2021) and de Saussure & Wharton (2020) in adopting a perspective for which emotions and feelings are omnipresent in communication without being 'translated' in propositional format at all, thus calling for an account of genuinely non-propositional meanings in pragmatics. I will suggest that non-propositional entities achieve higher-order representations inasmuch as they contribute to establishing a 'metacognitive acquaintance' (Sperber & Wilson 2015), resting on abilities that concerns both propositional and non-propositional communication, in particular affective or 'experiential' (de Saussure 2021) imports. Hence non-propositional entities could be relevant in their own right as specifiers orienting goal-directed attention and actions in the pragmatic world. In line with Wharton *et al.* (2021), I discuss the possibility that relevance is yielded not from the number of assumptions an utterance interacts with, but from affective 'goals'. In such a perspective, cognitive effects involve an inherent affective dimension, akin to affective effects in Saussure & Wharton (2020; 2023); consequently, there are virtually never such things as "cold" inference. It seems thus necessary to include this dimension in the very notion of 'cognitive effects'.

References

Blakemore, D. (2011). On the descriptive ineffability of expressive meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(14), 3537–3550.

- Saussure, L. de, & Wharton, T. (2020). Relevance, effects and affect. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 12(2), 183–205.
- Saussure, L. de. (2021). An experiential view on what makes literature relevant. *Beyond Meaning*, 324, 99.
- Sperber, D. W., & Wilson, D. (1995). *D.(1986): Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (Vol. 142). Citeseer.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2015). Beyond Speaker's Meaning. *Croatian Journal of Philosophy*, 15(2 (44)), 117–149.
- Wharton, T. (2016). That bloody so-and-so has retired: Expressives revisited. *Lingua*, 175–176, 20–35.
- Wharton, T., Bonard, C., Dukes, D., Sander, D., & Oswald, S. (2021). Relevance and emotion. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 181, 259–269.
- Wharton, T. & de Saussure, L. (2023). *Pragmatics and Emotion*. Cambridge University Press.

Believe me, I saw it!

Speaker's responsibility for evidential claims

Mélinda Pozzi & Diana Mazzarella

University of Neuchâtel

People are vigilant to risks of misinformation and carefully evaluate speaker's trustworthiness and calibrate their trust accordingly (Sperber et al., 2010). One mechanism for calibrating trust is to track speaker's epistemic commitments. Speakers are generally taken to be committed to the truth of their statements, and they can modulate this commitment with evidential claims to specify how they acquired information (Ifantidou, 2001); they can take responsibility by claiming to have first-hand evidence such as "I saw it", or they can defer responsibility to someone else by providing claims to second-hand evidence such as "somebody told me" (Mahr & Csibra, 2021). However, humans may provide (intentionally or not) inaccurate evidential claims. They can, for example, claim to have directly seen something while they have been told the information by somebody else, thus "overcommitting". Or, they can justify their claims by appealing to hearsay while they have direct perceptual evidence, thus "undercommitting". The present study experimentally attempts to support the two following predictions: 1) a speaker providing an inaccurate evidential claim will incur a reputational cost, especially when the speaker overcommits compared to a speaker who undercommits, 2) inaccurate evidential claims are more costly than inaccurate statements, particularly when the speaker overcommits. We will present the results of a pre-registered study, whose data collection is ongoing, which aims at testing these two hypotheses by manipulating the accuracy of speakers' statements, the accuracy and strength of their evidential claims, and by measuring reputational costs related to different types of misinformation.

References

- Ifantidou, E. (2001). *Evidentials and Relevance*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mahr, J. B., & Csibra, G. (2021). The effect of source claims on statement believability and speaker accountability. *Memory & Cognition*, 49(8), 1505–1525.

Sperber, D., Clément, F., Heintz, C., Mascaro, O., Mercier, H., Origgi, G., & Wilson, D. (2010). Epistemic vigilance. *Mind & Language*, 25(4), 359–393.

Epithet adjectives and subjective communication

Jonathan Steimer

University of Neuchâtel

Expressivity can be defined as the subjective dimension of communication which can be hardly spelled out in propositional terms. Expressivity can arise linguistically in stylistic figures or pragmatically as a marker of propositional attitude, particularly orally by means of non-verbal signs/signals (Sperber & Wilson, 1993; Wharton, 2003). Combinations are also possible, as with irony, where the attitude communicated is linked to a certain linguistic content in a certain context. In this talk, I address the question of expressivity as carried by epithets adjective (EA); I suggest that besides the radically subjective expressive epithets investigated in the semantic and pragmatic literature, such as ‘bastard’ in (1):

(1) That bastard Conner was promoted.

a number of other epithets also carry a form of subjectivity as markers of pragmatic justification for the predicate, as “generous” in (2) or “sick” (3):

(2) The generous Greeks always offer desserts to tourists.

(3) The sick president had to cancel his venue to COP 28.

Discussing examples like (1), Kaplan (1999) and Potts (2005) show that expressive epithets are non-truth-conditional terms, expressing the subjective attitude of the speaker. In a cognitive pragmatics framework, Padilla Cruz (2018) suggests that “bastard” in (1) trigger 'intermediate-level explicatures' as an 'attitude-support' marker. Drawing upon the notion that such elements share properties with conventional implicatures à la Grice (1975), I look at examples such as (2) and (3) in order to integrate their subjective dimension into the general picture. I contrast the two types of subjective epithets as represented respectively in (1) and in (2-3) with respect to the difference between "thick" and "thin" terms as introduced in philosophy of language by Williams (1985). I claim that their expressive dimension is closely tied to their syntactic and semantic dimension, which suggests that there is a form of procedurally encoded

meaning about them. This concurs with the notion that expressivity at large is of procedural nature (de Saussure & Wharton 2021).

References

- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds), *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Act* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Kaplan, D. (1999), What is meaning? Explorations in the theory of Meaning as Use. Brief version | draft 1, Ms., UCLA.
- Padilla Cruz, M. (2018). Expressive APs and expletive NPs revisited: Refining the extant relevance-theoretic procedural account. *Lingua* 205, 54-70.
- Potts, C. (2005). *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford University Press.
- Saussure, L & Wharton, T. (2021). Relevance, effects and affects. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 12(2), 183-205.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1993). Linguistic form and Relevance. *Lingua* 90, 1-22.
- Wharton, T. (2003). Interjections, language and the ‘showing’/‘saying’ continuum, *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 11(1), 39-91
- Williams, B. (1985). *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Mirative evidentials and the communication of emotions

Lemonia Tsavdaridou

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Surprise has been defined as ‘a peculiar state of mind, usually of brief duration, caused by encountering unexpected events of all kinds’ (Sander & Scherer, 2009, p. 386). Interestingly, however, experiencing surprise does not merely amount to the identification of novelty or unexpectedness. According to Reisenzein (2000), novelty and unexpectedness are two factors which can lead to surprise and its physiological and emotional responses, provided that they occur abruptly and are considered important for our purposes. This claim will serve the basis on which we will attempt to define surprise. A study that aims at the definition of a particular emotion needs to take on the task of resolving several issues. First, what is an emotion and how can it be distinguished from sentiments and feelings? Second, can we provide some emotion-specific criteria that can be applied to surprise? Finally, what does the emotion at issue contribute to the clause? To address the first research question, we will compare emotions with feelings and sensations (see Ekman, 1984; Frijda et al., 1991; Chaudhuri, 2006). ‘Action readiness’, namely, feeling the urge to take action is considered a distinctive characteristic of emotions. With regard to the second question, surprise is unique in terms of two criteria: namely, reaction time (Kosonogov & Titova, 2018) and relevance, as unexpected events that are perceived as important to the individual are deemed as surprising (Neta & Kim, 2022). Next, proposed markers of surprise in Greek, namely mirative evidentials (Ifantidou & Tsavdaridou, 2023) will be examined and their contribution to the meaning of the clause will be explored through the relevance-theoretic framework of utterance interpretation, which can adequately account for emotive effects (Piskorska, 2012; Carston, 2018; Ifantidou 2021; Ifantidou & Piata, 2021; Wharton & de Saussure, 2023).

References

- Carston, R. (2018). Figurative language, mental imagery, and pragmatics. *Metaphor and Symbol, 33*(3), 198–217.
- Chaudhuri, A. (2006). Emotion and reason in consumer behavior. In *Routledge eBooks*.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080461762>
- De Saussure, L., & Wharton, T. (2020). Relevance, effects and affect. *International Review of Pragmatics, 12*(2), 183–205.
- Ekman, P. (1984). Expression and the Nature of Emotion. *Approaches to Emotion*, Edited by: Scherer, K. and Ehan, 319–343. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315798806-24>
- Frijda, N. H., Mesquita, B., Sonnemans, J., & Van Goozen, S. (1991). The duration of affective phenomena or emotions, sentiments and passions. *International Review of Studies on Emotion*.
- Ifantidou, E., & Piata, A. (2019). Metaphor and mental shortcuts: The role of non-propositional effects. *Pragmatics & Cognition, 28*(2), 299-320.
- Ifantidou, E. (2021). Non-propositional effects in verbal communication: The case of metaphor. *Journal of Pragmatics, 181*, 6–16.
- Ifantidou, E., & Tsavdaridou, L. (2023). Mirative evidentials, relevance and non-propositional meaning. *Pragmatics & Cognition, 30*(1), 59–91.
- Kosonogov, V., & Titova, A. (2018). Recognition of all basic emotions varies in accuracy and reaction time: A new verbal method of measurement. *International Journal of Psychology, 54*(5), 582–588.
- Neta, M., & Kim, M. J. (2022). Surprise as an emotion: a response to Ortony. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 18*(4), 854–862.
- Piskorska, A. (2012). Cognition and emotions-Jointly contributing to positive cognitive effects?. *Relevance studies in Poland, 4*, 102-111.
- Reisenzein, R. (2000). The subjective experience of surprise. In Herbert Bless & Joseph Forgas (eds.), *The message within: The role of subjective experience in social cognition and behavior*, 262–279. Psychology Press.
- Sander, D., & Scherer, K. R. (2009). The Oxford companion to emotion and the affective sciences. *RePEc: Research Papers in Economics*.
- Wharton, T., & de Saussure, L. (2023). *Pragmatics and emotion*. Cambridge University Press.

**Irony comprehension in typically developed adults:
The impact of linguistic and emotive factors**

Marianna Vraka

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Previous research on irony comprehension has mainly focused on its metarepresentational nature as a way to explain its specific developmental trajectory and the overall processing effort it requires in order to be understood, compared to other linguistic devices (Winner, 1988; Happé, 1993). In those studies, irony has mostly been treated as a unified pragmatic device, with its different linguistic forms and instantiations being either neglected or assumed irrelevant for the purposes at hand (Kapogianni, 2014; Attardo, 2000). Moreover, although the communicative goals of irony have also been extensively investigated (Kreuz, 1994; Jorgensen, 1996; Lee & Katz, 1998; Leggitt & Gibbs, 2000; Colston & Gibbs, 2007; Thomson et al., 2016), they have been treated as a separate issue that does not quite fit in the existing theoretical accounts of verbal irony which describe and explain the interpretation process and its outcome (Yus, 2016). Finally, research on the role of irony in the emotional impact of an utterance has led to inconclusive results regarding whether irony enhances or mitigates the positive or negative uptake of an utterance (Dews & Winner, 1995; Colston, 1997; Toplak & Katz, 2000; Filik, Hunter & Leuthold, 2015). Thus, the aim of my PhD research is twofold: a) to investigate the comprehension of different linguistic forms of irony in typically developed adults in order to see whether, apart from the metarepresentational load, linguistic differences also affect the interpretation process and b) to investigate the emotional responses elicited by the ironical addressee to see whether irony typically strengthens or weakens the emotional impact of an utterance. Two separate experiments in the form of questionnaires with rating and judgment tasks will be developed in order for these questions to be answered. My presentation aims at providing the reasoning behind these experiments, as well as the methodology and data analysis that I plan on using to draw my conclusions.

References

- Attardo, S. (2000). Irony as relevant inappropriateness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(6), pp. 793-826.
- Colston, H. L. (1997). Salting a wound or sugaring a pill: The pragmatic functions of ironic criticisms. *Discourse Processes*, 23, pp. 24-45.

- Colston, H., & Gibbs, R. (2007). A brief history of irony. In R. Gibbs & H. Colston (Eds.), *Irony in language and thought: A cognitive science reader*, (pp. 3–21). London, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dews, S. & Winner E. (1995). Muting the meaning: a social function of irony. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10, pp. 3-19.
- Happé, F. (1993). Communicative competence and theory of mind in autism: A test of relevance theory. *Cognition*, 48, pp. 101-19.
- Jorgensen, J. (1996). The functions of sarcastic irony in speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, pp. 613–634.
- Filik, R., Hunter, C. M. & Leuthold, H. (2015). When language gets emotional: Irony and the embodiment of affect in discourse. *Acta Psychologica*, 156, pp. 114-125. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2014.08.007.
- Kapogianni, E. (2014). Differences in Use and Function of Verbal Irony between Real and Fictional Discourse: (Mis)interpretation and Irony Blindness. *Humor*, 27(4). pp. 597-618.
- Kreuz, R. J., Long, D. J. & Church, M. B. (1991). On being ironic: Pragmatic and mnemonic implications. *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity*, 6(3), pp. 149-162.
- Lee, C. J., & Katz, A. N. (1998). The differential role of ridicule in sarcasm and irony. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 13, pp. 1-15. Leekam & Prior, 1994;
- Leggitt, J. S. and Gibbs, R. (2000). Emotional reactions to verbal irony. *Discourse Processes*, 29(1), pp. 1-24.
- Roberts, R. M. and Kreuz, R. J. (1994). Why do people use figurative language? *Psychological Science*, 5(3), pp. 159-163.
- Thompson, D., Mackenzie, I., Leuthold, H. & Filik, R. (2016). Emotional responses to irony and emoticons in written language: Evidence from EDA and facial EMG. *Psychophysiology*. 53, pp. 1054-1062. doi: 10.1111/psyp.12642.
- Toplak, M., & Katz, A. N. (2000). On the uses of sarcastic irony. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, pp. 1467-1488.
- Winner, E. (1988). *The Point of Words: Children's Understanding of Metaphor and Irony*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Yus F. (2016). Attaching feelings and emotions to propositions. Some insights on irony and internet communication, *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 22, pp. 94-107.

**A relevance-theoretic approach in multimodal translation:
Subtitling humour for the deaf and hard of hearing**

Rongyu Wang

Dublin City University

Relevance theory (RT) is a cognitively-grounded theory of human communication. Today, scholars in AVT (Audiovisual Translation) extend the application of this theory to explain various translation challenges, especially translation of humour (see Pai 2017, 2021, Martínez-Sierra 2021, Rejeibi 2023). Nevertheless, previous AVT research on humour translation using RT primarily examines traditional AVT forms, such as subtitling, dubbing and voiceover, emphasizing the translation of verbal language. In contrast, there has been relatively little attention given to emerging AVT forms for accessibility: Subtitling for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (SDH) and Audio Description (AD) (cf. Martínez-Sierra 2009). These newer AVT forms transcend linguistic boundaries, expanding the translation across different modes of communication, constituting what is referred to as multimodal translation. In the context of SDH, multimodal translation involves a process of translating non-verbal audio information into verbal visual information. This process is particularly important for entertainment programmes like comedies, where many comedic moments are derived from non-verbal audio information, such as music, sound effects and paralinguistic cues (e.g., burps, farts or yawns). However, due to temporal and spatial constraints, and the need to minimize cognitive load for the target audience, not all non-verbal audio information can be fully presented on the screen. Although some AVT studies have mentioned ‘relevance’, very few have offered specific translation solutions. Thus, the present study adopts a relevance-theoretic approach to discuss how such non-verbal audio information in SDH should be translated. By understanding the intended purpose of non-verbal elements in the source text, subtitlers can effectively transfer these auditory elements into written words while preserving humour.

References

Martínez-Sierra, J. J. (2009). The relevance of humour in audio description. *Intralinea*, 11.

- Martínez-Sierra, J. J. (2021). Audio Description Humour: Seeking laughter when images do not suffice. In D. Chiaro (Ed.), *Humour Translation in the Age of Multimedia* (pp. 177-195). London: Routledge.
- Pai, F. S. (2017). Subtitling Humour from the Perspective of Relevance Theory: The Office in Traditional Chinese (Doctoral dissertation, University College London).
- Pai, A. F. S. (2021). A Corpus-based Approach to the Study of Subtitling Humour. In D. Chiaro (Ed.), *Humour Translation in the Age of Multimedia* (pp. 136-157). London: Routledge.
- Rejeibi, R. (2023). A Relevance Theoretic Approach to Explicating Humour in Subtitling Sitcoms from English to Arabic (Doctoral dissertation, SOAS University of London).
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance – Communication & Cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.