

Facial Displays and their dialogical meanings: Lecture 3

Jonathan Ginzburg

Laboratoire Linguistique Formelle (LLF) & Laboratoire
d'Excellence (LabEx)–Empirical Foundations of Linguistics
(EFL)

Université Paris-Diderot, Sorbonne Paris-Cité

yonatan.ginzburg@univ-paris-diderot.fr

Ye Tian

Amazon Research, Cambridge

tiany.03@gmail.com

August 15, 2018, Sofia

Recap from Lecture 2 I

- ▶ Introduced basic notions of dialogical semantics necessary for explicating the meaning of laughter:

- ▶ Austinian propositions:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = r_0 \\ \text{sit-type} = p_0 \end{array} \right]$$

- ▶ Prop = $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} : \text{Record} \\ \text{sit-type} : \text{RecType} \end{array} \right]$

- ▶ originally used to represent contents of assertions
- ▶ Here used to represent utterance (*locutionary propositions*) and laughter (concrete examples, shortly)
- ▶ Truth:

(1) A proposition $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = r_0 \\ \text{sit-type} = p_0 \end{array} \right]$ is true iff $r_0 : p_0$

- ▶ Dialogue dynamics [with up/down-dates of: Moves, QUD, Pending ...], as a means of modelling various patterns of interaction.
- ▶ At each contextual configuration various options are possible:

Recap from Lecture 2 II

- ▶ An utterance can be grounded, clarified or ignored.
- ▶ An assertion can be accepted or discussed.
- ▶ A query can be answered, challenged, or eliminated.
- ▶ Enthymemes and topoi as capturing defeasible regularities
- ▶ A proposition p is **incongruous**—a clash between an enthymeme and a topoi where the enthymeme's domain serves as the sit-type of the proposition:

(2) Incongruous (p, E, τ) iff

$$p = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = I \\ \text{sit-type} = L \end{array} \right] : \text{TrueProp}, \tau = \lambda r : T_1 . T_2 :$$

$$(\text{Rec} \rightarrow \text{RecType}), E = \lambda r : L . PL : (\text{Rec} \rightarrow \text{RecType})$$

$$L \sqsubseteq T_1 \text{ and } PL \perp T_2$$

Recap from Lecture 2 III

- ▶ A lexical entry for incongruous laughter:

$$(3) \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phon} : \text{1phontype} \\ \\ \text{dgb-params} : \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{spkr} : \text{Ind} \\ \text{addr} : \text{Ind} \\ \text{t} : \text{TIME} \\ \text{c1} : \text{addressing}(\text{spkr}, \text{addr}, \text{t}) \\ \text{p} = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = \text{I} \\ \text{sit-type} = \text{L} \end{array} \right] : \text{Prop} \\ \text{MaxEud} = \text{e} = \lambda r. L(PL) : (\text{Rec})\text{RecType} \\ \tau = \lambda r : (T1)T2 : (\text{Rec})\text{RecType} \\ \text{c2} : \text{SubType}(\text{L}, T1) \end{array} \right] \\ \\ \text{content} = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = \text{s} \\ \text{sit-type} = \left[\text{c3} : \text{Incongr}(\text{p}, \text{e}, \tau) \right] : \text{Prop} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

- ▶ The laugh marks a proposition whose situational component I is *active as incongruous*, relative to the currently maximal enthymeme under discussion.

Analogy with event anaphors

- ▶ Exophoric antecedents:

- (4) a. (**loud bang is heard**) A: what was *that*?
b. (**man slips over banana peel**) A: laughs

- ▶ Previous utterance:

- (5) a. A: He's coming home at 1am. B: I don't like *that*.
b. A: She drives a pink Cadillac. B: laughs

- ▶ utterance medial:

- (6) a. A: And I hate (makes strange gesture) *that* movement.
b. A: He's her heh friend.

- ▶ Cumulative antecedent:

- (7) a. A: He left, she arrived late, the plants were unwatered, the dog got ill. B: I didn't know *that*.
b. A: He left, she arrived late, the plants were unwatered, the dog got ill. B: (laughs)

Some laughables I

(8) a. exophoric: man slips over banana peel \mapsto

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = I \\ \\ \text{sit-type} = \left[\begin{array}{l} x: \text{Ind} \\ c1: \text{Man}(x) \\ y: \text{Ind} \\ c2: \text{b-peel}(y) \\ c3: \text{slip-over}(x,y) \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

b. utterance: A: Bill is a turd. \mapsto

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = I \\ \\ \text{sit-type} = \left[\begin{array}{l} x: \text{Ind} \\ c2: \text{utter}(x, \text{'Bill is a turd'}) \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

Some laughables II

c. utterance medial: A: He's her heh friend. \mapsto

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = \text{l} \\ \text{sit-type} = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{x: Ind} \\ \text{c2: utter(x, 'friend')} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

d. A asks q; B: laughs. \mapsto $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = \text{l} \\ \text{sit-type} = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{x: Ind} \\ \text{q : Question} \\ \text{c2: ask(x,q)} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$

antiphonal laughter: sharing incongruous judgement I

► consider:

(9) a. Roger: you are what dey refer to in rougher circles as a chickn shit.

Roger: hhhhehh

Ken: heh:heh:heh

b. $p_0 = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = I \\ \text{sit-type} = \left[\begin{array}{l} x: \text{Ind} \\ y: \text{Ind} \\ c2: \text{Assert}(x, \text{chicken-shit}(y)) \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$

(10) a. A: Bill is annoying. B: Bill *is* annoying / Yes!

- Assume the laughter proposition has a similar force to a normal assertion.
- yields QUD update

antiphonal laughter: sharing incongruous judgement II

- ▶ enables B to express the same proposition and share in incongruity classification of /

Utt.	DGB Update (Conditions)	Rule
4	$\text{LatestMove} := \text{Assert}(B, A, \text{Incongruous}(p0, e1, \tau_1))$	
5	$\text{QUD} := \langle \text{Incongruous}(p0, e1, \tau_1)? \rangle$ $\text{LatestMove} := \text{Accept}(A, B, \text{Incongruous}(p0, e1, \tau_1))$ $\text{QUD} := \langle \rangle$ $\text{FACTS} := \text{cg1} \wedge \text{Incongruous}(p0, e1, \tau_1)$	Assert QUD-incrementation Accept Fact update/QUD downdate

Capturing Jefferson's observation: deflecting laughter I

- ▶ Now consider

(11) Bee: So the next class hhh!hh fer an hour and fifteen minutes I watched his ha:nds hh hh hhh Ava: What's the matter with him?

Bee: hh t hhh he keh he doesn't haff uh full use uff hiss hha fingers

- ▶ Treat using basic account of *utterance ignoring* discussed yesterday:

(12) **A:** Is there just one car there?

B: Why is there no parking there?

(13)

Utt.	DGB Update (Conditions)	Rule
initial	MOVES = $\langle \rangle$ QUD = $\langle \rangle$ FACTS = cg1	
1	LatestMove := Ask(A,B,q1) QUD := $\langle q1 \rangle$	Ask QUD-incrementation
2	LatestMove := $\langle \text{Ask}(B,A,q2) \rangle$ FACTS := FACTS $\cup \neg$ WishDiscuss(B,q1) QUD := $\langle \rangle$ QUD := $\langle q2 \rangle$	Ignoring questions FACTS update/QUD downdate Ask QUD-incrementation

Capturing Jefferson's observation: deflecting laughter II

- ▶ Same initial configuration as in (10). But after ignoring laughter utterance event, the initially expressed issue ('I watched his hands for an hour anda quarter') is MaxQUD.

Incongruity laughter: assertion cancellation I

- ▶ Recall:

(14) Frank: She was actually erm phonin the doctor to see if she could come in and see him that morning about her gastroenteritis. Emily: Oh. Frank: She'll love me for telling you that. (laughs) (↪ **Frank doesn't think his wife will love him for telling Emily** ... (From Hepburn & Varney, 2013)

- ▶ One simple view of the function of laughter here is as self-repair:

(15) Frank: She will love me for it; I didn't mean that.

- ▶ Frank relies on the enthymeme 'If I'm saying she will love me because I mentioned her gastroenteritis, then I don't mean it.' This clashes with the sincerity topos 'If A says p, then A means p'.

Incongruity laughter: assertion cancellation II

- ▶ How does this arise in context? Possible enthymemes: (i) If A's u conveys p, A will self ground p. (prob $>.9$) (ii) If A's u conveys p, A will correct u (prob $<.1$); A picks (ii) and contrasts it with a topos that grounds (i).
- ▶ Content: Incongruous(laughable: Frank's utterance,enth: If Frank's u conveys p, Frank corrects u,topos: If A's u conveys p, A intends p)

Incongruity laughter: Laughter as scare quoting I

(16) A: He's her (laugh) friend.

- ▶ Here we have an interaction between laughter and disfluency.
- ▶ Here the laughable is A's most recent speech (word) event u classified by a sign T_u . u is maximally Pending, assuming an incremental view of processing, as discussed above
- ▶ The laughter can mark it as incongruous. In what way incongruous?
- ▶ We assume this often relies on a clash with the topos 'If Utter(A,u1), u1 represents A's choice to refer to u1's referent.'
- ▶ Possible enthymemes: (i) If A utters u1, u1 will get its standard content ($p >.9$) (ii) If A utters u1, u1 will get a content that's close but distinct (prob $<.1$); A picks (ii) and contrasts it with a topos that grounds (i).

Incongruity laughter: Laughter as scare quoting II

- ▶ Content: Incongruous (laughable: utterance 'friend', enth: If spkr utters 'friend', the utterance 'friend' will get a content that's close but distinct from the standard, topos: If A utters u1, u1 will get its standard content)

Incongruity laughter: question deflection I

- ▶ How does laughing enable questions to be deflected?
- ▶ A poses q ; for B not to address q , B has to accommodate the issue $?Wish(B,q)$ [*whether B wishes to discuss q*] into QUD and provides an utterance about this issue
- ▶ Possible enthymemes: (i) If A poses q , B will address q . ($p > .9$) (ii) If A poses q , B will, B will address $?Wish(B,q)$ (prob $< .1$); B picks (ii) and contrasts it with a topos that grounds (i) and then indeed addresses $?Wish(B,q)$,
- ▶ Incongruous(laughable: Speaker's interrogative utterance u_q , enth: If spkr poses q , B will address $?Wish(B,q)$, topos: If A poses q , B will address q)

A “simple” joke

- ▶ Joker: What, according to Freud, comes between fear and sex? fünf.
- ▶ Corresponds to processing of:
(17) A: What comes between vier and sechs? B: Fear? A: The German word. B: Ah.
- ▶ So we directly capture why this will not work in the same way in French: Qu'est-ce qui se situe entre la peur et le sexe?
- ▶ An utterance of /lapeur/ does not have the same clarificational potential as /fi:r/
- ▶ Several possible incongruities based on clashes with the following topoi:
 1. If an utterance u has two possible classifications, one by far more probable, the speaker intends the latter.
 2. If speaker asks a deep question q , s/he expects a non-trivial answer.

Laughter clarification I

- ▶ The lexical entry for incongruity laughter indicates as contextual parameters the laughable, the topos, and the enthymeme:

$$(18) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phon} : \text{lphontype} \\ \\ \text{dgb-params} : \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{spkr} : \text{Ind} \\ \text{addr} : \text{Ind} \\ \text{t} : \text{TIME} \\ \text{c1} : \text{addressing}(\text{spkr}, \text{addr}, \text{t}) \\ \text{p} = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = \text{I} \\ \text{sit-type} = \text{L} \end{array} \right] : \text{prop} \\ \text{MaxEud} = \text{e} = \lambda r. L(PL) : (\text{Rec})\text{RecType} \\ \tau = \lambda r : (T1)T2 : (\text{Rec})\text{RecType} \\ \text{c2} : \text{SubType}(\text{L}, T1) \end{array} \right. \\ \\ \text{content} = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sit} = \text{s} \\ \text{sit-type} = \left[\text{c3} : \text{Incongr}(\text{p}, \text{e}, \tau) \right] : \text{Prop} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right]$$

Laughter clarification II

- ▶ When will clarification interaction about laughter ensue?
- ▶ According to this proposal—when the addressee cannot find values for one or more of the dgb-params posited:
 1. The laughable (argument of predication)
 2. The topos
 3. The enthymeme.
- ▶ Evidence that this is indeed the case:
 1. **Argument - pleasant incongruity:** In (19) the CR about the argument of the laughter is met by pointing at what Mazzocconi, Tian, , & Ginzburg, 2016 classify as a metalinguistic laughable (e.g., a slip of the tongue, pun, violation of conversational rules, inappropriate speech act etc.). This relates not to the content of Andrew's utterance, but to its form. While in (20) the laughable is clarified by describing verbally the gossip considered to be funny by Daniel and the Unknown speaker.

Laughter clarification III

(19) *Extract from BNC, KBW*

Tim: I don't want chocolate. Dorothy: Shh.

Shh.< unclear > Andrew: Tim. If you don't want to finish it just put it down there and keep quiet. Dorothy:

< laugh > Andrew: **What are you laughing at?**

Dorothy: < laughing > the way you said it .

(20) *Extract from BNC, KNY*

Alex: I can't get this right. Unknown: < laugh > Marc: What was that you said? Alex: Nothing. Marc: James,

who's he laughing at? What have you been saying?

Emma: James. Unknown: Alex please < unclear >.

Daniel: James[*last or full name*]fancies Zoe. Emma:

Does he?

Laughter clarification IV

2. **Argument - retracting funniness assumption:** In (21) it seems that the default interpretation of the laughter production "my partner has perceived something funny", justifies the question "what's funny?"; when the expected answer is not provided, this is then retracted in "What are you laughing at then?", Angela becoming open to the other possible laughter functions and laughable types.

(21) *Extract from BNC, KSS*

Angela: **What's funny?** < pause > What you doing?

Richard: I'm not doing a thing. You're doing it. Angela:
What you laughing at then?

Arthur: < unclear >. < laugh >

Angela: You're waiting for what? What you waiting for?

3. **Argument - pragmatic incongruity**

(22) *Constructed example*

A: She is John's long-term, heh friend.

B: < laughter/ > **Why the snigger?** < laughter/ > Is there something more than friendship?

Laughter clarification V

4. **Topoi and enthymemes:** In (23) and (24) the person asking for clarification does not have any issues identifying the laughable in itself, it is very clear for them what the interlocutor is *laughing about*; the objects of their CRs are, we argue, the topos and the enthymeme implicated in the incongruity.
5. In 23 probably Geoff even understood which topos and enthymeme his mum is considering, but still he doesn't appreciate the incongruity and ask critically for further explanations.
6. While in 24 the Anonymous speaker explains very clearly the reason for his/her incongruity appraisal stating that he wouldn't expect "him to do that", therefore pointing at a clash between expectations and reality.

Laughter clarification VI

(23) *Extract from BNC, KD6*

Geoff: ah

Lynn: < laugh/ >

Geoff: I like that

Lynn: gosh

Geoff: **What you laughing for?, I wouldn't laugh**

Lynn: oh

Geoff: silly mummy < pause > oh dear table's wobbling

(24) *Extract from BNC KST*

Margaret: Yes, but pretend she's not watching and he looks over the top of his paper.

Anonymous: And grins!

Margaret: Oh it's stupid! I mean if anybody else just got up on the stage like he does < pause > and kicks his leg, kick like their leg like er like that they'd boo him off!

Anonymous: It's quite funny though < pause > when he kicks his legs and he went < unclear > he goes < pause > ooh wah!

Laughter clarification VII

Margaret: **What's funny about it?**

Anonymous: **Well that's funny! You're not expecting him to do that.**

- ▶ (forthcoming work with: Chiara Mazzocconi and Vlad Maraev)

Today's lecture I



Summary I

- ▶ Basic tools used:
 - ▶ Austinian propositions
 - ▶ Conversational rules for assertion querying, repair
 - ▶ enthymemes
 - ▶ So far: no change in the DGB *per se*.
- ▶ Issues for tomorrow:
 - ▶ The force of laughter
 - ▶ Link to emotion: why is laughter pleasurable? How to relate it to smiling?
 - ▶ Will motivate one change in the DGB.

THANKS!!!

References I

- Hepburn, A. & Varney, S. 2013. Beyond ((laughter)): some notes on transcription. In Glenn, P. & Holt, E. (Eds.), *Studies of Laughter in Interaction*. Bloomsbury.
- Mazzocconi, C., Tian, Y., , & Ginzburg, J. 2016. Towards a multi-layered analysis of laughter. In *Proceedings of JerSem, the 19th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue* New Brunswick. Rutgers University.