

International conference
École Normale Supérieure de Lyon

**Egocentrism and anthropocentrism
in language and discourse**

30-31 March 2017

ABSTRACTS & BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENTS



©<https://www.flickr.com>

CIBULSKIENĖ Jurga, Lithuanian University, Lithuania

**‘Animation of the euro and de-animation of refugees:
Critical Metaphor Analysis’**

The philosophical viewpoint of anthropocentrism maintaining that human beings are the central entities in the world finds its manifestation in various studies of metaphor within cognitive linguistics. We choose to animate a huge part of our reality, as Talmy (2002) claims, and this happens due to the embodiment, as Lakoff (1987), Lakoff and Johnson (1999) argue. Thus, one of the manifestations of animation of inanimate reality is personification, which is considered as a type of ontological metaphor (Lakoff, Johnson 1980/2003, Kövecses 2002/2010). This way we inevitably animate the world around us by making it more understandable and expressing our attitudes towards it. However, it might be argued that anthropocentrism is bidirectional as we not only ascribe human or animate qualities to inanimate objects or phenomena, but we also tend to “de-animate” human beings by attributing inanimate qualities to them. Thus, the paper further explores the idea of anthropocentricity focusing on metaphorical conceptualization of the issues of the *euro* adoption in 2015 and refugees’ crisis in 2015–2016, two real-life phenomena, which have significantly affected social life in Lithuania. Hence, the paper aims to investigate how animation of the *euro* and “de-animation” of refugees is metaphorically conceptualized in Lithuanian media and what rhetorical implications arise out of this. The research is conducted within the framework of Critical Metaphor Analysis (Charteris-Black 2005/2011, 2013, Musolff 2004, Hart 2010, etc.), which suggests that metaphors are used as an argumentative tool with the aim to persuade and manipulate the audience. The findings show that while preparing for the adoption of the new currency, the Lithuanian media tend to conceptualize the *euro* as a human being, whereas the refugees, who are human beings, are likely to be perceived as things, objects and goods. The paper therefore argues that animation of the euro and “de-animation” of the refugees carry serious rhetorical implications and show the society’s attitudes towards the analysed phenomena. This works in line with Croft’s ‘Extended Animacy Hierarchy’ system (2002) in that human beings outrank animate and inanimate entities and this strongly implies that inanimate entities tend to be perceived as being inferior.

References

- Charteris-Black J. (2005/2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black J. (2013). *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Croft W. (2002). *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hart C. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science. New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kövecses Z. (2002/2010). *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M. (1980/2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Musolff A. (2004). *Metaphor in Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Towards a Cognitive Semantics (Vol. 2)*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jurga Cibulskienė is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Philology at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences in Lithuania. She reads Introduction to Literary Text Analysis to BA students and Cognitive Linguistics to MA students. Her research attempts to bring together cognitive metaphor studies and Critical Discourse Analysis. Recently, she has been extensively working on the persuasive role of metaphor in public discourses.

CORBETT Greville, Surrey Morphology Group, University of Surrey, UK
‘The Animacy Hierarchy: challenges, progress and challenges’

The Animacy Hierarchy constrains the distribution of plurality, as Smith-Stark (1974) shows convincingly. In a given language, the singular-plural distinction must affect a top segment of the hierarchy. There is much supporting evidence. And yet, there are various sets of challenging data; five of these lead to clarification of the Animacy Hierarchy, and to better analyses.

Challenge 1: *sheep*

Sheep has no morphological plural, yet many nouns lower on the hierarchy (*table, idea*) have a singular-plural opposition. We need to specify that agreement aligns with the hierarchy more closely than does inflection, and in this respect *sheep* is normal (*the sheep is grazing vs the sheep are grazing*). And this points us to languages like Miya, where number inflection and number agreement are systematically different (but both are consistent with the hierarchy).

Challenge 2: *we*

It might be suggested that there is a problem at the very top of the Animacy Hierarchy, since some believe that *we* is not the plural of *I*. When we look more carefully we find instances of this opposition in the first person which are morphologically regular, and we see that the ‘associative’ meaning involved is found more generally at the top of the hierarchy.

Challenge 3: other values

We should generalize the constraint of the Animacy Hierarchy to other number values. This is easy for languages like Sanskrit, where the dual patterns rather like the plural. But then there are languages like Slovene, which have a dual which is more restricted than the plural; in this instance the dual too is subject to the hierarchy.

Challenge 4: top, second, bottom systems

Once we are dealing with more than two number values, we may face more than a simple split, and have to reckon with multiple systems. This will be illustrated with new data from Mian.

Challenge 5: recategorization

There are many examples where non-count nouns can be recategorized as count nouns (*a coffee, two coffees*). However, this is not a new number opposition, but a different reading (‘unit reading’ in this instance). Such recategorization is more readily available low on the hierarchy, and is subject to interesting variation between languages.

Challenge 6: *pluralia tantum*

Binoculars and *scissors* would be expected to be count nouns, yet they lack the singular-plural opposition. They are relatively common, in English and cross-linguistically. They are the most serious challenge to the Animacy Hierarchy.

In the years since 1974, the weight of the data supporting the Animacy Hierarchy has encouraged us to seek solutions to data which challenge it. Generally this has led to a better understanding of the constraints of the hierarchy. Therefore, it is likely that *pluralia tantum* nouns will lead to another step forward in our understanding of animacy and exceptionality.

Greville G. Corbett is Distinguished Professor of Linguistics, University of Surrey, where he leads the Surrey Morphology Group. He works on the typology of features, as in Gender (1991), Number (2000), Agreement (2006) and Features (2012), all with Cambridge University Press. Recently, with several colleagues, he has been developing the canonical approach to typology. Within that approach he has papers in Language, on suppletion (2007) and on lexical splits (2015). He is a Fellow of the British Academy and of the Academy of Social Sciences, a Member of the Academia Europaea and an Honorary Member of the Linguistic Society of America.

CREISSELS Denis, University of Lyon, France

‘Humanness, animacy, and sex in the Niger-Congo noun class systems’

In a general typology of nominal classification systems, the systems traditionally labeled ‘noun class systems’ (in particular those found in Niger-Congo languages) do not belong to a type different from those traditionally designated as gender systems: if gender as a morphosyntactic notion is defined as a particular type of nominal classification in which a partition of the set of nominal lexemes into subsets manifests itself in agreement mechanisms in which nouns act as controllers, then Niger-Congo noun class systems unquestionably meet this definition. Ex. (1) illustrates noun class agreement (or gender-number agreement) of a noun modifier with its head in Banjal (Joola, Bak, Atlantic). In this example, **fomango** ‘mango’ belongs to the class pairing (or gender) F/G, whereas **ebe** ‘cow’ belongs to the class pairing (or gender) E/S.

(1a) **f**_o-mango **f**_o-emək
CL_f-mango CL_f-big
‘big mango’

(1b) **g**_o-mango **g**_o-emək
CL_g-mango CL_g-big
‘big mangoes’

(1c) **e**-be **y**-emək
CL_e-cow CL_e-big
‘big cow’

(1d) **si**-be **s**-emək
CL_s-cow CL_s-big
‘big cows’

One of the features that however distinguish Niger-Congo gender systems from those found for example in Indo-European or Afroasiatic languages is that they are not sensitive to the male vs. female distinction. By contrast, the human vs. non-human distinction is crucial in Niger-Congo gender systems, which typically include a singular-plural class pairing (or gender) showing the following characteristics:

- all of the nouns that fall into this class pairing denote human beings;
- most nouns denoting humans (in particular, basic terms such as ‘human being’, ‘man’, ‘woman’, and all agent nouns derived from verbs) are found in this class pairing;
- personal names do not show class markers, but as agreement controllers they behave like common nouns belonging to this class pairing;
- when adnominals showing agreement markers of the class pairing in question are used pronominally, they can refer to an antecedent belonging to this class pairing given or suggested by the context, but they may also have an ‘absolute’ use, independent of any contextual conditioning, in which they are simply interpreted as meaning [+human].

However, many Niger-Congo languages deviate more or less from the ideally simple situation in which the set of nouns belonging to a particular class pairing coincides exactly with the set of human nouns delimited in purely semantic terms:

- Some human nouns may show class markers characteristic of class pairings other than the human class pairing. They sometimes constitute isolated exceptions that probably have historical explanations, but in some languages, human nouns showing certain semantic features systematically show class markers of class pairings other than the human class pairing. As regards agreement, the human nouns that show class markers other than those of the human class pairing may have agreement properties fully consistent with their class markers (morphological agreement), but they may also behave like the nouns whose class markers are those of the human class pairing (semantic agreement);
- Non-human animates always show class markers other than those of the human class pairing, but in many languages, instead of behaving in agreement like the non-human nouns showing the same class markers, they show agreement properties that are partially those of the non-human nouns showing the same class markers, and partially those of the nouns belonging to the human class pairings.

Denis Creissels (professor emeritus, born 1943) taught general linguistics at the Universities of Grenoble (1971-1996) and Lyon (1996-2008). The topic of his Habilitation thesis (1979) was the typology of possessive constructions. He wrote grammars of four African languages (Baule (Kwa), Kita Maninka (Mande), Mandinka (Mande), and Ganja (Atlantic)). His articles and book chapters dealing with questions of morphosyntactic and/or phonological description concern various African languages, but also Basque, Hungarian, and Akhvakh. He is also the author of articles and book chapters on various aspects of morphosyntactic typology: possessive and existential constructions, impersonal constructions, spatial cases, applicative periphrases, functive phrases, alignment typology.

ELMIGER Daniel, University of Geneva, Switzerland

**‘Anthroponyms as a heterogeneous category:
Is there such a thing as personal nouns?’**

While there are clearly typical examples of personal nouns, i. e. common nouns that refer to human beings (such as, in English, *woman*, *pupil* or *cousin*), it is not easy to decide which criteria are the best suited to encompass all types of personal nouns.

Among the numerous difficulties, we’d like to mention the following:

- Various parts of speech are commonly used to refer to human persons: besides common nouns, other types of words such as pronouns and proper nouns share important (morphosyntactic) features; transitions from one category to another are quite common.
- The boundaries of what qualifies as a (solely) human being are not very clear (what about dead persons, protohumans, animals, fictional universes, etc.?).
- Morphologically, no clear difference can be made between personal nouns (*teach·er*) and other common nouns (*dry·er*).
- Personal nouns are not the only way to relate to humans: sometimes, the reference to human individuals is made via a predication (e. g. *to give an opinion*).
- Various kinds of rhetorical figures (such as *apostrophe*, *allegory*, *antonomasia* or *personification*) blur the lines between referents, attributions and lexical means used to express (human) animateness.

In our contribution, we will consider three languages (English, French and German) in order to explore which factors are best suited to define personal nouns, distinguishing them from other related concepts (such as proper nouns, allegories, group designations, etc.). We will show that while some criteria are comparable in all three languages, others fit only for some of them.

We will also reflect upon the designations used in these three languages to name the category of nouns used to refer to human persons (*personal noun*, *nom commun de personne*, *Personenbezeichnung*, etc.) and their implications for nonsexist language use.

Daniel Elmiger is Senior Lecturer at the University of Geneva, both at the German Department and the Institute for teacher training. He's worked, as a linguist, in several universities and research institutes, dealing mostly with the German and French languages, but also with other languages such as English or Italian.

Among his search interests, one could mention personal, social and academic bilingualism, teaching and learning of foreign languages or language policies. His talk today is related to his work on personal nouns and nonsexist language in various contexts.

KAVALIR Monika, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

‘The Anthropocentrism of absolute adjectival uses’

The paper builds on a Hallidayan Systemic Functional analysis of the systems of standard and degree in the use of adjectives in English. The approach developed by Kavalir (2014) shows that, generally speaking, adjectives can be used either with an external standard (so that the nominal referent is compared with other members of the same class) or with an internal

standard (where no other instances of the class are needed for interpretation to be successfully completed), and can in both cases combine with any of the three degrees, basic (traditionally called positive), comparative and superlative, yielding a set of different meanings with systemic differences in terms of both the semantics (e.g., entailment) and the grammatical patterns (e.g., synthetic vs. analytic comparison) of such structures.

While several disparate notions such as the difference between intersective and subjective adjectives, or the idea of absolute comparatives and superlatives can thus be subsumed under the same overarching approach, the question remains where the norms of the internal standard come from. The answer seems to be that this standard is in fact anthropocentric and relates to “the ‘egocentric’ nature of linguistic communication” (Dik 1997: 40). While the analysis shows any adjective can be used either relatively or absolutely depending on the context of use, a close look reveals that there is a strong link between absolute use and meanings to do with what Dixon (1982) terms human propensity.

Selected references

- Dik, S.C. (1997) *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Dixon, R.M.W. (1982) *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? and Other Essays in Semantics and Syntax*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
Kavalir, M. (2014) *Skladenjske in pomenske razsežnosti pridevniških zgradb*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Ljubljana.

Monika Kavalir teaches Modern English Language at the Department of English and American Studies, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. Her main interests lie in the fields of Systemic Functional Linguistics, contrastive analysis of English and Slovenian, intercultural communication, language testing and stylistics. Some of her recent projects focus on the use of adjectives in English and Slovenian and the notions of house and home across cultures.

LACASSAIN-LAGOIN Christelle, University of Pau, France

***‘See / Witness and the “setting-subject construction”:
From egocentrism to anthropocentrism?’***

Cognition verbs, including perception verbs, denote processes that come within the perspective of humans. Sentences with perception verb as in [1] frequently have a grammatical subject referring to a person, and as such express the perceiver’s subjective point of view on the situation, which can be considered as egocentric. Cognition processes can only be accessed if the primary participant lets others know about his apprehension of the scene or his mental processing, as in first-person clauses for instance ([1-2]). As for third-person sentences, they can also come from the speaker’s hypothetical reasoning ([3]). Two cognition verbs nevertheless share the distinctive feature of licensing an inanimate grammatical subject, more precisely a spatial or temporal setting – that is, a non-participant subject (*the middle of the 20th century* in [4] and *the late 1940s* in [5]) – in a “setting-subject construction” (Langacker 1991, 2008).

- (1) The consequences of the 1914-18 war are only now being reversed. After that war we saw the rise of communism and fascism and of Hitler. (BNC)

- (2) Since 1990, we have witnessed the rise and fall of alternative rock; [...]. (COCA)
- (3) He felt an instant of relief as he saw the rise and fall of breathing – but that breathing was exceedingly shallow.
- (4) The first part of the 19th century saw the question of slavery, long a routine part of human history, become an issue of such transcendent importance that it ignited a horrible war. That fight was mandatory; to duck it was to choose sides. The middle of the 20th century saw the rise of Hitler. (COCA)
- (5) The late 1940s welcomed the baby boomers and **witnessed** the rise of the cult of domesticity. (COCA)

Given these observations, the current study sets out to accomplish three goals: first, to establish whether each construction matches with one particular phenomenon – an egocentric perspective in [1-3] and an anthropocentric, or even allocentric or altruist, perspective in [4-5]; second, to determine what can motivate the choice of one or the other structure only with the two verbs *see* and *witness*; third, to bring to light the parameters and factors that either constrain the “setting-subject construction” or contribute to its occurrence in discourse.

These aims are achieved using a corpus-based analysis, which enables us to understand to what extent the grammatical coding as well as the differing nature of the subject referent embody a specific way of viewing the scene. It turns out that the three dimensions involved in the Extended Animacy Hierarchy and the cognitive schemas or models underlying the two types of structures both prove to be particularly relevant and significant.

References

- BOULONNAIS, Dominique. « La notion de sujet : contribution diachronique ». C. Delmas, *Complétude, cognition, construction linguistique*. Paris : Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2006 : 61-96.
- CHUQUET, Jean. « LOOK et SEE : deux orientations différentes du repérage ». J. Chuquet (éd.), *Verbes de parole, pensée, perception. Études syntaxiques et sémantiques*. Rennes : Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003 : 157-172.
- COTTE, Pierre. « Réflexions sur le sujet, le thème et le cadre ». J. Pauchard & F. Canon-Roger (éds.), *Recherches en linguistique et psychologie cognitive* 21. Reims : Presses Universitaires de Reims, 2005 : 267-282.
- COTTE, Pierre (b). « Un sujet, deux prédications ». D. Lebaud, C. Paulin & K. Ploog, *Constructions verbales et production de sens*. Besançon : Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2006 : 17-26.
- CROFT, William & Alan CRUSE. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. I. *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. II. *Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W. *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- MILLER, George A. & Philip N. JOHNSON-LAIRD. *Language and Perception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- POTTIER, Bernard. *Représentations mentales et catégorisations linguistiques*. Louvain / Paris : Éditions Peeters, 2001.

Christelle Lacassain-Lagoin is a Senior Lecturer in English linguistics at the University of Pau and Pays de l'Adour and is a member of the CRPHLL research team. She completed a PhD in English Linguistics on the complementation of perception verbs, focusing on syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

The main focus of her work is verb complementation in contemporary English within the theoretical frameworks of Enunciative and Cognitive Linguistics. Her research interests can be broadly grouped into three different areas: (a) complements of mental verbs – particularly perception, cognition and emotion verbs; (b) the syntax-semantics-cognition interface; (c) the implicit in some types of discourse.

MIGNOT Elise & Caroline MARTY, Paris Sorbonne University, France
'Human animate nouns and opacity: the case of compounds in English'

In English, the lexicon is one of the many areas affected by the asymmetry in the treatment between animates (human animates, more specifically) and inanimates. Indeed, from a morphological point of view, nouns denoting human animates differ from those denoting inanimates. This can be accounted for by the previously mentioned asymmetry.

We observe that human animate nouns are more opaque than inanimate nouns. By 'opaque' we mean that when a noun is complex, its meaning is not immediately and/or entirely inferable from the meaning of its parts.

The study focuses on compounds, but takes into account all means of compounding. We compare compounds denoting human animates to those denoting inanimates. Our data is extracted from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*.

First of all we note that amongst nouns which denote humans there are proportionately few compounds. As compounds are less opaque than other nouns, in particular than simple nouns, this small proportion of compounds denoting humans reveals a tendency for human animate nouns to be *opaque*. We propose that this is due to the way we conceptualize humans. Humans are considered as wholes, i.e. as being more than the sum of their parts. They resist transparent denominations because those would bring out only one aspect of them. We take this to be a manifestation of *anthropocentrism* in language. Speakers being humans, they grant special status to other humans.

Moreover, when human animate nouns *are* compounds (in spite of their tendency to be opaque), they exhibit two semantic characteristics which are not shared by inanimate nouns. The first one is that they tend to be derogatory. This again indicates that humans cannot easily be reduced to one characteristic. If they are, denominations tend to be negatively loaded. The second one is that they often involve the representation of a *personal relationship*, in some cases a hierarchical one, between a speaker and a referent (for example, a *paper boy* delivers newspapers, i.e. comes to someone's place / works for someone). Transparency is meaningful, and in this case we consider it to be a manifestation of *egocentrism* in language.

Elise Mignot is a senior lecturer at Paris-Sorbonne University. She is affiliated to the CeLiSo (Centre de Linguistique en Sorbonne, EA7332). She is currently working on a semantic approach to the nominal class. She also conducts research on reference to humans.

Caroline Marty is a teacher and PhD candidate at Paris-Sorbonne University. She is affiliated to the CeLiSo (Centre de Linguistique en Sorbonne, EA7332). Her research mainly

focuses on the semantics of verbal structures such as The room sleeps four. She is also interested in word formation.

NELSON Diane & Virve VIHMAN, University of Leeds, UK /University of Tartu, Estonia

“The toys are alive!”: Animacy, reference and anthropomorphism in *Toy Story*

This paper investigates how the children’s film *Toy Story* uses linguistic cues to anthropomorphize toys to varying degrees. We relate these findings to well-established scales of animacy mediating between our perception of the world and the categories imposed by language.

In *Toy Story*, toys spring to life when their human owners are away. The storylines and characters explore the nature of animacy, cues to animacy (like sentience, physiology and independent motion), and relationships between conspecifics and “others”. Some toys, like the cowboy doll Woody and action figure Buzz, are entirely anthropomorphized. Yet the large cast of toy characters displays a mix of animate and inanimate properties and occupies the spectrum of animacy, from a mute but motile Etch-a-Sketch to a talking Mr Potato Head and the godlike mechanical Claw worshipped by a herd of aliens. Viewers are invited to take the perspective of the toys interacting with the animate world.

The quality of speech children hear has been shown to affect their language development (Hoff & Naigles 2002), and referential language is strongly correlated with vocabulary development (Tamis-LeMonda et al. 2012).

We look at one child-directed film and focus on the use of referring expressions as they reflect the animacy of their referents, mediated by events in the narrative. We find that, as predicted by Croft's (2003) Extended Animacy Hierarchy and related proposals (e.g. Yamamoto 1999), shifts in reference – specifically from common noun to proper noun to pronoun, and collective to individuated referents – reflect characters’ shifting conceptualisation of, and empathy with, each other. Such shifts include the protagonists’ identification of unfamiliar, alien toys as benevolent conspecifics; an existential discussion between the main characters as Buzz realizes he is a toy; and the rescue activities of a battalion of toy soldiers. We argue that referring expressions are used at key points in the film script to subtly mediate accessible cues to animacy like eyes, speech and motion, and to guide viewers’ empathies and allegiances, extending our understanding of animacy beyond ordinary anthropocentrism.

Diane Nelson is a Senior Lecturer in Linguistics in the School of Languages, Cultures and Societies at the University of Leeds.

Virve Vihman is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics at the University of Tartu and Honorary Research Fellow in Psychology and Mental Health at the University of Manchester. The authors jointly organised the Workshop on Animacy in Language and Cognition in November 2015 at the University of Leeds.

SEALEY Alison, Lancaster University, UK
'Animals, animacy and anthropocentrism'

This presentation draws on data collected for the 3-year project, ['People', 'Products', 'Pests' and 'Pets'](#): The Discursive Representation of Animals, funded by the Leverhulme Trust. Our electronically stored corpus (9 million words) of language about animals comprises texts in contemporary British English from a range of genres, including newspaper reports, legislation and transcripts of the commentaries accompanying wildlife broadcasts – as well as interviews and focus groups in which professional communicators and members of the public were asked to reflect on the language they use about animals.

Extending the approach used in a small pilot study (Sealey and Oakley 2013; 2014), the analysis to be presented will reveal the extent to which the hierarchy of animacy identified in previous research is evident in our corpus of texts about animals. Writing that discusses categories of animacy often takes for granted a categorical distinction between humans and other animals, finding evidence across languages for that distinction being encoded in the grammar (e.g. Croft 1991; Halliday and Matthiessen 2004). As Yamamoto points out, the 'hierarchical scale of animate and inanimate beings is a product of anthropocentric human cognition' (1999: 9), and humans are invariably represented as situated at the top of the hierarchy or the centre of the circle of animacy and/or empathy (Langacker 1991).

Our specialised corpus contrasts with data previously used to investigate how humans and animals are referred to, in that it includes references to numerous different kinds of animal, from a wide range of genres, as well as explicit metalinguistic reflections on how people talk and write about animals. I will present findings on the various kinds of classification revealed by both quantitative and qualitative analysis, including evidence of criteria for hierarchies that confirms, develops or challenges those identified in previous research.

References

- Croft, W. (1991). *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: the cognitive organization of information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R.W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. II Descriptive Application. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K., and C.M.I.M. Matthiessen. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.
- Sealey, A., and L. Oakley. (2013). "Anthropomorphic grammar? Some linguistic patterns in the wildlife documentary series *Life*." *Text & Talk* 33/3. 399–420.
- Sealey, A., and L. Oakley. (2014). "Why did the Canada goose cross the sea? Accounting for the behaviour of wildlife in the documentary series *Life*." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 24/1. 19 - 37.
- Yamamoto, M. (1999). *Animacy and Reference: a cognitive approach to corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alison Sealey is Professor of Applied Linguistics at Lancaster University, UK. She has published widely about the role of discourse in representations of the social world, often using corpus-assisted methods, and is the author, with Bob Carter, of Applied Linguistics as Social Science. As well as researching the political discourse generated in Prime Minister's Questions in the UK parliament, she is currently co-investigator on the project "'People", "products", "pests" and "pets": the discursive representation of animals', funded by the Leverhulme Trust.

SEMINO Elena, Lancaster University, UK

‘A mixed-methods linguistic approach to self-focus in narrative’

An increased tendency to focus attention on the self has been observed both in mental illness (e.g. psychosis and depression) and in disorders involving Theory-of-Mind problems (e.g. autism-spectrum disorders) (Silvia and Eddington 2012). Previous studies have discussed the frequency of self-references in particular as an important linguistic manifestation of heightened self-focus (e.g. Fineberg et al. 2016). In this talk I present a linguistic approach to self-focus in first-person narratives that combines the detailed analysis of textual extracts with the computer-aided methods of Corpus Linguistics. I demonstrate this approach by applying it to two published narratives: Mark Haddon’s novel *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*, whose narrator is usually attributed an autism-spectrum disorder (Semino 2014); and the chapters narrated by Henry Cockburn, who has a diagnosis of schizophrenia, in *Henry’s Demons – Living with Schizophrenia: a Father’s and Son’s Story* (Demjén and Semino 2015). I show how this approach can result in a more nuanced understanding of heightened self-focused attention in different types of first-person narratives, both in terms of its linguistic manifestations and of the ‘lived experience’ of conditions that involve increased self-focus.

References

- Demjén, Z. and Semino, E. (2015) Henry’s voices: the representation of auditory verbal hallucinations in an autobiographical narrative, *Medical Humanities*, 41: 57-62.
- Fineberg, S. K., Leavitt, J., Deutsch-Link, S. et al. (2016) Self reference in psychosis and depression: A language marker of illness, *Psychological Medicine*, 46: 2605-15.
- Semino, E. (2014) Language and autism in Mark Haddon’s *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*. In Fludernik, M. and Jacob, D. (eds) *Linguistics and Literary Studies*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 279-303.
- Silvia, P. J. and Eddington, K. M. (2012) Self and emotion. In Leary, M. R. and Tangney, J. P. (eds) *Handbook of Self and Identity*, 2nd edition. New York and London: The Guildford Press.

*Elena Semino is Professor of Linguistics and Verbal Art and Head of the Department of Linguistics and English Language at Lancaster University. She holds a Visiting Professorship at the University of Fuzhou in China. Her interests are in: stylistics, medical humanities, health communication, corpus linguistics, narratology and metaphor theory and analysis. She has (co-)authored four monographs, including *Metaphor in Discourse* (Cambridge University Press, 2008) and *Figurative Language, Genre and Register* (Cambridge University Press, 2013, with Alice Deignan and Jeannette Littlemore). Her latest papers have appeared in *Metaphor and the Social World and Applied Linguistics*, and she has an essay forthcoming in *The Lancet* in early 2017. Her latest book is the co-edited Routledge Handbook of Metaphor and Language (2017, with Zsófia Demjén).*

Animacy is a major distinction in human cognition (Dahl 2008) and its reflection in language is well-documented in a wide variety of domains (cf. e.g. Dahl & Fraurud 1996, de Swart, Lamers & Lestrade 2008, Comrie 1989). Animacy in language is correlated with linguistic notions such as person (Yamamoto 1999, Dahl 2008) and thematic roles to such an extent that these are often incorporated into animacy hierarchies (e.g. Croft 2003, Rosenbach 2008): Agents are animate in a majority of cases, as most Proto-Agent (Dowty 1991) properties entail animacy (Primus 2012), Experiencers are necessarily animate, as conscious experience implies animacy. Similarly, first person pronouns necessarily refer to human entities, as only human entities can use language to refer to themselves by uttering a pronoun such as 'I'.

That is, until we consider literary fiction. Stories are filled with inanimate objects acting on and observing the world around them, seemingly in violation of all real-world constraints (cf. Bernaerts et al. 2014). Can we tell these inanimate characters apart from their animate counterparts based on the language used? In a corpus study we compared a first-person inanimate narrator (a painting in Willem Jan Otten's Dutch novel *Specht en Zoon* (2004)) with a more traditional human narrator in a novel by the same author. We find that whilst the inanimate narrator displays clear features of animacy, there are differences in the distribution of thematic roles between the two: The animate is attracted to the Agent role (42.5%), whereas the inanimate (associated with just 16.7% Agentive verbs), is predominately an Experiencer (43.8%), undergoing and commenting on the events in the story rather than actively participating. Thus, whilst the inanimacy of a character in terms of its biology, morphology and inability to act remains obvious in context, we still readily accept it as animate for the purposes of taking its perspective.

In a follow-up literary-immersion study we explore the relationship between identification and empathy with inanimate characters in different thematic roles: Is the capacity to have a perspective enough to elicit empathy for an entity, in the absence of other animate features such as action, similarity or movement; i.e., what happens when we take a non-human perspective?

References

- Bernaerts, L., Caracciolo, M., Herman, L. & Vervaeck, B. 2014. The storied lives of non-human narrators. *Narrative* 22. 68-93.
- Comrie, B. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Croft, W. 2003. *Typology and Universals*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Ö. 2008. Animacy and egophoricity: Grammar, ontology and phylogeny. *Lingua* 118. 141-150.
- Dahl, Ö. & Fraurud, K. 1996. Animacy in grammar and discourse. In Fretheim, T. & Gundel, J. K. (eds.), *Reference and referent accessibility*, 47-64. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dowty, D. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67. 547- 619.
- Primus, B. 2012. Animacy, generalized semantic roles, and differential object marking. In: Lamers, M. J. A. & de Swart, P. (eds.), *Case, word order and prominence: Interacting cues in language production and comprehension*, 65-90. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rosenbach, A. 2008. Animacy and grammatical variation – Findings from the English genitive variation. *Lingua* 118. 151-171.
- de Swart, P., Lamers, M. & Lestrade, S. 2008. Animacy, argument structure, and argument encoding. *Lingua* 118. 131-140.
- Yamamoto, M. 1999. *Animacy and reference: A cognitive approach to corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

This Trompenaars (t.trompenaars@let.ru.nl) started as a PhD student at Radboud University's Centre for Language Studies in November 2015. He is a member of Prof. dr. Helen de Hoop's research group Grammar and Cognition. His project Bringing Stories to Life focuses on the topic of animacy in literary fiction: how do we conceptualise inanimate objects as animate characters in stories?

Taki Bremmers is a student of the Research Master Language and Communication at Radboud University. In her studies, she aims to adopt a linguistic approach to literary fiction. As an intern in the research group Grammar and Cognition she is closely involved with the project on empathy for inanimate characters in narrative fiction.

TRUAN Naomi, Paris Sorbonne University, France / Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
'On the pragmatics of the third person in political discourse'

Whereas the use of pronouns in political discourse has already been widely studied (Wilson 1990; Pennycook 1994; Duszak 2002; Krizsán 2011), it actually mainly focuses on the first and second person paradigms. The third person, considered as a “non person” referring to referent(s) outside the actual situation of utterance (Benveniste 1966:254; Lyons 1977:638; Levinson 1983:69), tends to be reduced to an oppositional pattern (*us* vs. *them*). By doing so, the inclusive potential of the third person in political discourse, for instance in maximising markers like *everybody/everyone* (English), *tout le monde / chacun/e* (French) or *jede/r* (German), seems to remain largely neglected.

Following Obeng (1997:80), I argue that the use of the third person in political discourse can be seen as a marker of “verbal indirection”. Relying on a common sense or presupposed shared knowledge amongst the participants, the use of inclusive markers morpho-syntactically linked with third-person agreement is simultaneously a mitigation strategy of a Face Threatening Act (negative face) and an inclusive strategy (positive face) (Brown & Levinson 1978; Brown & Levinson 1987). It enables to embrace categories of population who become target recipients (*destinataires*) without being the addressees (*allocutaires*) of political discourse (Ducrot 1980).

The qualitative and quantitative analysis relies on the official transcripts and video recordings of parliamentary debates on Europe at the British House of Commons, the French Assemblée nationale and the German Bundestag between 1998 and 2015. The corpus has been manually annotated according to the guidelines of the Text Encoding Initiative (<http://www.tei-c.org/Guidelines/>).

First results show that similar patterns occur in the three countries independently from the political affiliation. The purpose of this ongoing research is to identify and classify the use of maximising expressions in terms of frequency, distribution and pragmatic effects in order to determine what these underspecified markers “signal[] with respect to the referent's degree of accessibility or activation in the addressee's mind” (Borthen 2010:1799–1800). More specifically, how and when do inclusive markers trigger reactions from the addressees? In this respect, the interactional nature of parliamentary debates provides a rich material for the study of the audience's perception.

References

- Benveniste, Émile. 1966. La nature des pronoms. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, vol. 1, 251–257. Paris: Gallimard.
- Borthen, Kaja. 2010. On how we interpret plural pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(7). 1799–1815. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.008.
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. Universals in Language Usage. Politeness Phenomena. In Ester N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and Politeness Strategies in Social Interaction*, 56–311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ducrot, Oswald (ed.). 1980. *Les mots du discours*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Duszak, Anna (ed.). 2002. *Us and Others. Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Krizsán, Attila. 2011. “The EU is Not Them, But Us!”. *The First Person Plural and the Articulation of Collective Identities in European Political Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Obeng, Samuel Gyasi. 1997. Language and Politics: Indirectness in Political Discourse. *Discourse & Society* 8(1). 49–83. doi:10.1177/0957926597008001004.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 1994. The politics of pronouns. *ELT Journal* 48(2). 173–178. doi:10.1093/elt/48.2.173.
- Wilson, John. 1990. *Politically Speaking. The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Naomi Truan is a PhD Student in Contrastive Linguistics at the Université Paris-Sorbonne and the Freie Universität Berlin (“cotutelle de these”), having previously completed her B.A. and M.A. (summa cum laude) in German Studies from the École Normale Supérieure de Lyon. Her research interests include Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, Corpus Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics. She was a Visiting Scholar at the Maison Française d’Oxford (MFO) and at the Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages of the University of Oxford in 2015–2016, but also at the Centre Marc Bloch in Berlin (several research stays between 2014 and 2016).

In her PhD Thesis entitled “Representations of the Other in the British, French and German Discourse on Europe: A Corpus-Based Contrastive Discursive Analysis”, she focuses on the category of person, pronouns, terms of address and reported speech in political discourse in France, Germany and the United Kingdom.

VIRTANEN Tuija, Åbo University, Finland
‘Linguistic egocentrism in collapsed contexts’

New media have brought with them the phenomenon of ‘context collapse’ (Marwick & boyd 2010), forcing users to invent ways of coping with their imagined audiences. This is particularly difficult in the kind of many-to-many social media such as microblogging where reciprocity is not expected. Still, self-branding in these highly public spaces presupposes management of imagined audiences, involving flexibility in assumptions of possible ‘unique’ and ‘static’ audiences where these can, in fact, only be fluid and varying in nature. In such

contexts, users may also engage in efforts of constructing apparently coherent interactions with other users, as shown by Honeycutt & Herring (2009) for microblogging and Vásquez (2014) for consumer reviews. For central factors behind users' navigations of audiences for their social media performances, see Litt (2012).

This paper explores user visibility in collapsed contexts through three modes of computer-mediated communication, i.e. (i) microblogging and (ii) prosumer discourse as well as (iii) the interactive mode of discussion boards, where, unlike in (i) and (ii), reciprocity is expected. While virtual communities tend to be imagined around the discourse of these and other modes of online communication, users are variously in need of adjusting their constructions of the virtual self and imagined audiences, adapting to the emerging discourses and assuming agency for their contributions. The aim of this study is to explore linguistic manifestations of egocentrism in these three environments of very different kinds, by focusing on (i) self-branding through pronominal uses for self-reference, (ii) textual realizations of a 'me-first' strategy in self-commodifying consumer reviews, for added social authenticity, and (iii) ways of bonding and attracting attention to the virtual self through discourse transformers triggering the onset of self-centred play. The study has implications for the understanding of users' pragmatic adaptation (Verschuereen 1999) of the self to context collapse across new media.

References

- Honeycutt, Courtenay & Susan C. Herring. 2009. Beyond microblogging: Conversation and collaboration via Twitter. *Proceedings of the Forty-second Hawai'i International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-42)*. Los Alamitos: IEEE Press.
- Litt, Eden. 2012. "Knock, knock, who's there?" The imagined audience. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 56(3): 330-345.
- Marwick, Alice E. & boyd, danah. 2010. I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society* 3: 4-33.
- Vásquez, Camilla. 2014. *The Discourse of Online Consumer Reviews*. London: Bloomberg.
- Verschuereen, Jef. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Tuija VIRTANEN is Professor of English Linguistics at Åbo Akademi University, Finland. Her research interests lie in the fields of text and discourse linguistics, and pragmatics, encompassing studies of text/discourse strategies, text/discourse types and genre dynamics, the interface between grammar and text, corpus studies of textual phenomena, and the pragmatics of computer-mediated communication. She was co-editor of and contributor to Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication (de Gruyter Mouton 2013) and is at present guest-editing a special issue on Adaptability in New Media. She serves as a member of the IPrA (International Pragmatics Association) Consultation Board, as well as the editorial board of Language@Internet, and is an affiliate of the Center for Computer-Mediated Communication Research, Indiana University at Bloomington. She has repeatedly been a visiting fellow at Wolfson College, Cambridge, UK.
