The Semiotics of Multilingual Wordplay in Linguistic Landscapes: Communicative Settings, the Hearer-Origo, and Contextual Knowledge

Abstract: Notions like linguistic vs. social context, or co-text and context, as well as the range of phenomena to be included within these categories have been intensely discussed in previous research. The present paper approaches these issues from a usage-based perspective. I will focus on selected examples of multilingual wordplay in advertising messages in the Linguistic Landscape (LL). Multilingual wordplay appears to be particularly informative, as it implies that several linguistic codes are involved. Moreover, linguistic utterances which form part of the LL are characterised by spatial boundedness and may refer to various kinds of situational facts. In addition, this paper aims at reflecting upon the semiotic and communicative foundations of LL advertising. It will be argued that the messages are mostly characterised by communicative distance between the speaker and the addressees, but that a more immediate communicative setting is often simulated, involving a referential shift to the hearer-origo functioning as the basic point of reference. The spatial boundedness of LL messages can be interpreted from a general semiotic perspective, which underlines the importance of different types of contextual information. I will finally argue that the different types of knowledge involved can be systematised with the help of two distinctions: 1) linguistic vs. extra-linguistic knowledge, and 2) knowledge related to the concrete situation of communication vs. general, situation-independent knowledge.
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1 Introduction

The assumption that acts of communication generally emerge from specific communicative contexts appears to be uncontroversial. However, when it comes to determining what types of contexts should be taken into account in
linguistic analyses, and more generally, what subtypes of contexts should be distinguished, things become more problematic. Notions like linguistic vs. social context, or co-text and context have been intensely discussed in previous research. This paper is aimed at systematising different types of references to contextual information in a larger sense. I will analyse selected examples of multilingual wordplay in advertising messages in Linguistic Landscapes (LL). These appear to be particularly informative, as multilingual wordplay implies that several linguistic codes are involved, and linguistic utterances which form part of the LL are characterised by spatial boundedness and may refer to various kinds of situational facts (e.g. to other utterances in the nearby or more global spatial environment, to specific knowledge shared by the inhabitants of a certain city or district, to cultural or linguistic stereotypes, etc.).

However, it can be shown that in spite of the inherent spatial boundedness of LL communication, the semiotic and communicative foundations have not been systematically taken into account (cf. Auer 2010). This paper aims to fill this gap by discussing case studies of LL advertising messages containing multilingual wordplay and by referring to various approaches that permit us to identify basic features of the messages analysed. This implies that, in contrast to “traditional” LL research, the focus of this paper will not be quantitative and sociolinguistic, but will present some theoretical reflections on the situational and communicative setting of LL advertising. Moreover, this paper will include not only standard cases of LL communication (billboards, posters, etc.) and LL spaces (urban spaces), but also integrate untypical LL messages in “on the road” settings, such as messages displayed on vehicles and in non-urban settings, which will typically be read by car drivers and passengers. However, the following remarks will be restricted to graphically realised utterances, and the presence of auditory stimuli in LL will not be discussed here.

The paper is structured as follows: I will first present some case studies on different types of advertising messages. These will be classified according to the parameters of granularity and seriality / reuse as well as to the types of vehicles on which the messages are displayed (section 2). In the next step, I will then reconsider the examples from three different theoretical angles, which will permit us to refine the analyses by referring to general semiotic and communicative features. Section 3 will focus on the communicative setting of LL advertising and examine whether it can be considered a case of mass communication. The parameters proposed by Koch and Oesterreicher (2011) contribute to a fine-grained analysis and evaluation of the complex communicative setting. Section 4 will then be dedicated to the semiotics of LL communication, and I will introduce the notion of hearer-origo in order to express the shift to the stage of
decoding. Finally, section 5 will be based on the proposals made by Coseriu (1955–56) and Aschenberg (1999), and present some reflections about different types of contexts involved in LL advertising. I will argue that from a usage-based perspective, the various subtypes of contexts should be conceived as domains of contextual knowledge. By combining the distinction between linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge, and between knowledge related to the concrete situation of communication and general, situation-independent knowledge, we can identify four basic types of contextual knowledge that interact in the coding and decoding of linguistic utterances, as in the examples of multilingual wordplay studied in this paper. Section 6 will present some concluding remarks.

Before approaching the analyses of multilingual wordplay, some terminological remarks should be added. I will speak here of Linguistic Landscape communication (LL communication), which is based on an understanding of communication in a wide sense. That includes not only direct interactions between individual (and identifiable) speakers and hearers / senders and receivers, but also (at least partially) anonymous communicative settings, where the acts of encoding and decoding may occur in temporal and spatial distance. In order to refer to the communication partners, I will use the terms of speaker and addressee (or hearer), understood in a large sense as including communication in the graphic medium. Finally, I will use the term multilingual wordplay as a superordinate term, encompassing all instances of wordplay that involve two or more languages.¹

### 2 Multilingual Wordplay in Advertising in the LL – A Multifaceted Phenomenon

Assuming a wide definition of LL as language in public space, a broad range of utterances presented in very different communicative settings becomes part of this research domain (e.g. road signs, public signage, graffiti, etc.). The focus on wordplay and, more specifically, on multilingual wordplay adopted here strongly privileges the subdomain of advertising language (for a general overview on advertising language, cf. Janich 2010; Zielke 1991; on the use of wordplay in advertising language, cf. e.g. Vittoz Canuto 1983; Tanaka 1992, 1999). The following reflections will therefore focus on advertising but include different kinds of

¹ I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this contribution for their insightful comments.
utterances, such as advertising headlines, slogans and shop names. Moreover, the examples will illustrate different kinds of multilingual wordplay and include marginal instances of wordplay as well (cf. the reflections on defining wordplay in the “Discussion Forum” of this volume). At the same time, my aim is to analyse not only uncontroversial examples of LL utterances in urban space but also utterances present in public spaces that have been less studied up to now (e.g. advertisements on moving objects). The data has not been gathered in a systematic and exhaustive way; instead, the examples have been randomly collected at various locations in different European countries, mostly Germany. This can be justified by the focus on a theoretically oriented discussion of semiotic and communicative features of multilingual wordplay in LL. Follow-up studies of a more quantitative nature will remain subject of further research.

The examples to be studied in this section will be grouped into four categories, according to the general communicative setting that can be inferred from the material realisation of the messages. The notion of granularity proposed by Auer (2010: 280–282) provides a first parameter which permits us to distinguish between various types of utterances in LL according to the intended addressees of the messages. Following Auer, high granularity (corresponding to a low resolution) characterises messages that are addressed to a broad public with no specific social roles. These messages contain few details; they are aimed at contributing to the individual’s general and superficial orientation in space and they are linked to higher-ranking actions the addressee wants to perform. By contrast, low granularity (corresponding to a high resolution and more detail) implies that specific individuals (i.e. individuals with specific social roles) are selected, and the message is aimed at helping them to perform subordinate actions. These definitions show us that the main focus of Auer’s analyses are situations where an individual wants to perform a certain action and is guided by the messages in the LL (e.g. road signs, instructions, interdictions, etc.). Nevertheless, the concept can be adapted to advertising messages that are addressed to an a priori uninterested reader and aim at capturing his / her attention, arouse certain needs and make him / her perform a specific action (e.g. of buying a certain product).

Secondly, a basic classification of various types of LL utterances can be made according to the diffusion of the utterances. In fact, some utterances to be found in the LL are truly individual, in the sense of existing only once (although they will be read various times); for others there are various identical versions of the utterance (e.g. road signs, flyers, etc.) which are normally diffused across a large area. In contrast to the parameter of granularity, which can be immediately evaluated based on the concrete utterance at hand, the parameter of seriality
and reuse of the messages is not directly visible and can only be inferred or determined by additional studies.

2.1 Multilingual Wordplay on Road Signs, Posters, etc.

Multilingual wordplay in LL can be observed in ludic advertisements appearing on road signs and posters, i.e. on advertising vehicles where the messages appear with a high level of granularity and are addressed to a broad public passing by at a relatively great distance. Wordplay serves here first of all to attract the attention of the passerby and to make the a priori uninterested addressees read the advertising message and get interested in the product. We could analyse this as a high-ranking “action” of the individual. However, it should be acknowledged that in contrast to other examples of high granularity messages such as signposts the intended action/reaction will normally not be immediate here.

We are usually dealing with messages that are produced in a certain number of copies (posters, billboards, etc.). Moreover, the use of wordplay – and more specifically, of multilingual wordplay – is often a basic feature of certain advertising campaigns. It contributes to present the different messages of the campaign as belonging to one and the same campaign and product, and enhances the memorisation not only of the individual headline, slogan and product, but also of the campaign and the brand altogether. According to Auer (2010: 286), this could be regarded as a semiotic discourse, which is characterised by the fact that an individual utterance belongs to an (invisible) group of formally and functionally similar signs. In advertising campaigns, this implies both visual elements which indicate a continuity (images, layout, colours and typography of the advertising messages belonging to the campaign) and the linguistic formulation of the headlines, etc. (cf. section 5).

The insertion of individual utterances into a general semiotic discourse with a specific communicative purpose can be illustrated by the advertising campaigns for the food delivery service lieferando in 2014 and 2015. The co-director of the advertising agency fhain ideas, Alf Frommer, explicitly comments on the use of wordplay in the campaign as follows:


[We have very deliberately chosen groaners and wordplay in order to draw the attention on the diversity and range of lieferando products. As soon as the wordplays are under-
stood, they will remain impressed in people’s minds. No matter whether they are perceived as really funny or daft, they practically always provoke laughter.

(http://www.fine-sites.de/kreativagentur-berlin-fhain-ideas-startet-zweite-kampagne-lieferando, 16.05.2016, translation into English EWF)

This statement explicitly confirms some key assumptions about wordplay in advertising language that have been advanced in previous research: wordplay is used to attract the reader’s attention, and it functions as a riddle that, once solved, leads to an intellectual satisfaction enhancing the memorisation of both the message and the product (cf. Tanaka 1992, 1999). While monolingual wordplay is generally characterised by a script opposition (Attardo 2001) that has to be resolved by the addressee, the processing difficulty is still enhanced by multilingual wordplay, where the addressee needs to take into account items from different languages (see also the contribution by Fuhrich and Schmid, this volume). However, the possibilities of using multilingual wordplay are restricted by the linguistic knowledge of the average speaker / addressee with respect to the foreign / non-native items, and it is thus mainly highly frequent and strongly entrenched linguistic items of foreign origin that are used in multilingual wordplay (cf. Stefanowitsch 2002). These basic features of multilingual wordplay can be illustrated by the following road signs from the lieferando campaign.2

(1) “Isch will mit dir Penne!” Hol dir deine Lieblings-Nudel ins Bett: mit 7.500 Lieferdiensten. Sexy bestellen per lieferando-App / lieferando / Hier wird Essen bestellt
[translation included in the discussion below]

(2) Isch bin dir Farfalle. 10.000 Lieferdienste sorgen für Schmetterlinge in deinem Bauch. Wollüstig bestellen per lieferando-App / lieferando / Hier wird Essen bestellt
[translation included in the discussion below]

At a first level of analysis, we can identify puns with a bilingual dimension3 in (1) and (2), playing on the names of specific subtypes of pasta borrowed from Italian


3 For reasons of simplicity, I will treat examples involving borrowed items which still show features of formal markedness / non-nativeness, as cases of multilingual wordplay, although the items may already have become conventionalised in the target language.
into German (Penne, Farfalle), and near homophones in German: pennen ‘sleep’ / mit jmd. pennen ‘(colloq.) have sex with’, jmd. verfallen sein ‘to be under the spell of / deeply fallen in love with’. In both examples, the linguistic context induces a dialectally marked realisation: Isch instead of Ich for the 1st person sg. pronoun indicates that we should imagine a diatopically marked speaker voice (cf. also the use of the quotation marks in (2), which, interestingly, are absent in (2)). The pasta names appearing in the headlines have been borrowed from Italian into many languages and can be considered to be internationalisms; nevertheless they are still perceived as borrowed by speakers of German and thus function as eye-catching elements. In both examples, the linguistic context and / or other non-linguistic semiotic entities reinforce the two possible readings: the pasta reading is taken up by the hypernym Nudel ‘noodle’ in (1) and the lexeme Schmetterling ‘butterfly’ in (1) (which creates a second pun remotivating the phraseme Schmetterlinge im Bauch ‘excitement caused by amorousness’ by pointing towards its literal meaning ‘(pasta) butterflies in the stomach’; similarly, the lexeme Nudel can also be interpreted as a wordplay that alludes to the domain of sexuality). Additionally, in both cases the bill displays a plate with the specific kind of pasta mentioned in the headline. For the second reading, which is in both examples related to sexuality / love, we have the sentence Hol dir deine Lieblings-Nudel ins Bett ‘take your favourite noodle into your bed’ (with a double meaning of the female noun Nudel, which can be interpreted in the sense of a ‘female person’ or ‘the male sexual organ’), and the phraseme Schmetterlinge im Bauch, as well as the adjectives sexy and wollüstig ‘lustful’. The two examples thus illustrate the complex structure of advertisements containing multilingual and monolingual wordplay. This is confirmed by other examples from the same campaign:

(3) “Knock, knock Gnocchi on Heavens Door.” Lieber Gott: 7.500 Lieferservices freuen sich auf Ihre Bestellung. Göttlich bestellen per lieferando-App / lieferando / Hier wird Essen bestellt [translation included in the discussion below]

In (3), the multilingual dimension of wordplay is enhanced, as the headline plays on an English song title or song line (Knock, knock, knockin’ on Heaven’s door), into which the name of a type of pasta borrowed from Italian into Ger-

---

4 The spelling “error” – the omission of the apostrophe in “Heavens” – could be explained by a desire to keep the graphic image clearer. Again, this shows that the English sentence is inte-
man is inserted (Gnocchi). Again, the two semantic domains are reinforced by other elements in the context (Lieber Gott ‘oh my God’, göttlich ‘divine’, and the image of the pasta plate, respectively). As in the examples above, the pun in (3) is based on paronymy (cf. Winter-Froemel 2009). In order to minimise the phonic distance between the lexemes Engl. knock and Germ. Gnocchi, the addressee has to read the lexemes with a relatively strong degree of adaptation to the target language German on the level of pronunciation, realising E. knock [nɒk] as [nɔk], and Gnocchi as ['nɔkki] (adaptation of the Italian pronunciation ['ɲɔkki]), or with additional influence of the graphemic realisation, i.e. ['gnɔkki], or with a stronger adaptation ['knɔkki] (the latter pronunciation could be reinforced by the graphic realisation of the English words in kn- appearing in the headline, but it is also attested in German independently from this example).

In this case, multilingual wordplay thus consists not only in the combination of native (here, German) and borrowed elements, but combines various non-native elements of different origins (English, Italian) and different structure. The use of the English sentence can be analysed as a case of code-switching. By contrast, Gnocchi represents a lexical borrowing inserted into the English sentence. Moreover, the utterance induces the addressee to realise a strong degree of loanword integration / phonic adaptation of the foreign items, even if this is not the pronunciation the addressee would normally choose. This could be analysed as a case of ludic deformation: at least for some addressees, the headline exhibits an (unusually) strong degree of loanword adaptation contributing to the perception of the pun as a groaner / “forced” wordplay (for the notion of ludic deformation, see my contribution to the Discussion Forum, this volume). In the domain of advertising, the use of groaners and “bad” wordplay can be communicatively effective, as it will probably enhance the memorisation of the headline (cf. the statement by Alf Frommer cited above).

Another example of multilingual wordplay is given in (4).


5 “Bad” is put in quotation marks here, as this category is not defined by objective linguistic criteria, but represents a folk-linguistic concept which is based on speakers’ judgments. Typical linguistic features of examples that are perceived as “bad wordplay” are the use of homophony or paronymy, and a relatively great semantic distance between the meanings on which the wordplay is based.
bestellen per lieferando-App / lieferando / Hier wird Essen bestellt [translation included in the discussion below]

The headline is based on an allusion to the famous German sentence that John F. Kennedy uttered during his speech in West Berlin on June 26, 1963. This reference is also flagged in the linguistic co(n)text, where the speech and the name of Kennedy as well as the adjective präsidial ‘presidential’ are explicitly mentioned. This could be seen as a more general type of verbal humour with a certain multilingual dimension, as for many German addressees, the citation will evoke the sound of the original version of the sentence pronounced by Kennedy with an American accent. Moreover, the second sentence contains a pun on the ambiguous item Hamburger, meaning 1) ‘inhabitant of Hamburg’ (reinforced by the co-taxonomic – and antonymic, as indicated by the use of selbst ‘even’ in (4) – relation with Berliner ‘inhabitant of Berlin’), and 2) ‘hamburger (sandwich)’ (this meaning is reinforced by the image of a beef burger and by the world knowledge of the addressee: a food delivery service supplies products such as hamburgers, sandwiches, etc.). Additionally, this pun has a multilingual dimension by virtue of the fact that the word in its latter meaning has been borrowed from English into German (cf. EWDS, which indicates that the English form probably goes back to the German expression Hamburger Rundstück, so that this is an example of re-borrowing into German; the use of the lexeme in the headline thus also leads to a remotivation of the borrowed item; cf. Käge 1980).

---

Moreover, Kennedy’s speech itself contains a potential source of humour introduced by the use of the indefinite article, which allows an interpretation as ‘I am a jam doughnut [ein Berliner]’ (in contrast to Ich bin Berliner ‘I am a citizen of Berlin’; cf. Chiaro 2011: 374).
Fig. 1: Multilingual wordplay in public advertising (1) Mai first love. / 2) Alaaf you! / 3) Für Clutch und Tratsch / 4) Die Grill ¡Sensación!; photographed at 1) Kohlenstraße, Trier, Germany, 09.06.2016 / 2) bus stop, Im Avelertal, Trier, Germany, 04.02.2016 / 3) Paulinenstraße, Tübingen, Germany, 06.02.2016 / 4) Wilhelmstr. 50, Tübingen, Germany, 14.05.2014; © E. Winter-Froemel)

Further examples illustrating the use of multilingual wordplay in publicity campaigns are the following examples of advertising messages for the beer brand
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Cölner Hofbräu Früh ((5) and (6), see the images in Fig. 1; I will focus here only on the headlines of two of the messages of this campaign).

The road signs displayed at various bus stops and at the main station in Trier, Germany, show a glass of beer against a red background, together with a short headline mixing German and English. In (5), the German word Mai ‘May’ is embedded into an English sentence, punning on Mai / My first love. In (6), the carnival exclamation from Cologne Alaaf appears in the multilingual pun Alaaf / I love you.\(^7\) In both cases, the second (“love”) interpretation is supported by the red colour of the sign. The German words Mai / Alaaf are indicated by the graphic realisation of the items; moreover, this interpretation is supported by the season in which the publicity messages were displayed (the carnival season in 2016, and May 2016, respectively; additionally, the head of the beer appears in the form of a carnival cap in (6)). As in the lieferando examples discussed above, the wordplays are based on semantically distant meanings. The main effect intended by the use of wordplay is to attract the attention of the persons waiting at the bus stop or the train station or driving by, and to give them a sort of riddle that requires additional processing effort. Once solved, this will grant intellectual satisfaction and (hopefully, from the perspective of the speaker / advertiser), guarantee the memorisation of the headline and product, as well as of the implicit message of the beer being somehow linked to the atmosphere of an intense springtime love and a hilarious carnival love.\(^8\) Moreover, once again, the insertion of German elements into the English sentences invokes a ludic deformation of the English items (my / I love).

(5) Mai first love.

---

\(^7\) This example also has an intertextual dimension, as the message can be understood as an allusion to a film of the same title released in 2015.

\(^8\) This could be analysed as an example of conceptual blending (cf. also (7), where the cigarettes are not only suitable for being smoked at occasions of gossip, but they also fit into a modern and up-to-date handbag – the expression Clutch und Tratsch thereby introduces a new concept of modern lifestyle gossip at occasions of having a night out; for an application of the theory of conceptual blending to the domain of language contact, see Knospe 2015). A reviewer criticises this analysis and assumes that the examples are classic examples of frame-shifts that do not involve the construal of a new conceptual unit. To my view, however, the examples cited are different from classical puns in that advertisements are very often aimed at suggesting new products, lifestyles, etc., and this is often realised via new lexical and conceptual combinations as illustrated by the examples. It would seem interesting to discuss these issues based on further research.
A very similar interpretation also holds for the advertisement in (7) (cf. Fig. 1). The use of verbal humour and wordplay (both mono- and multilingual), is a frequent characteristic of the advertising messages of the cigarette brand Lucky Strike (cf. Stefanowitsch 2002: 82, n. 3). It is realised here in the form of a bilingual pun which inserts the borrowed item Clutch ‘handbag’ into the German phraseme Klatsch und Tratsch ‘gossip’. In this case, the phonic distance between the borrowed item and the element of the phraseme replaced is minimal: a frequent pronunciation of the loanword in German is [klatʃ], so that we can analyse this example as an instance of wordplay based on homophony. At the same time, the replacement of the word Klatsch is semantically facilitated by the fact that Klatsch and Tratsch can be considered to be synonymous. The sentence need not be interpreted as an instance of code mixing (as in the examples (1), (3), (5) and (6) above, which are, from the perspective of the grammar of the matrix language, “incorrect” or innovative), but we are dealing here with an example of wordplay where the first interpretation of the sentences remains possible, and an “innocent” interpretation (not involving a pun) is grammatically and lexically possible (cf. also example (4)) – nevertheless, it is of course the semantic and pragmatic context which induces the wordplay reading. The comparison of the examples discussed up to now thus reveals another parameter along which cases of multilingual wordplay can be classified, i.e. the recognisability or forcedness of wordplay / the necessity to consider an alternative interpretation of an otherwise ungrammatical utterance.

(7) Für Clutch und Tratsch.

A final example I would like to discuss in this section exhibits still another kind of multilingual wordplay, mainly located below the word (or morpheme) level (cf. 3.4.3 of my contribution to the Discussion Forum, this volume). The headline in (8) (see Fig. 1) involves a ludic deformation of German items by introducing non-native graphemes / diacritical signs and punctuation marks (the inverted exclamation mark at the beginning of the sentence, the <ã>, and the <ç>). Again, we can analyse this example as a case of ludic deformation; however, the deformation does not consist in an unusually strong degree of loanword adaptation, but in a (hyper-)foreignisation of the German word Sensation and of the punctuation of the utterance. The language mixing is facilitated by the fact that the word Sensation is an internationalism of Latin origin; moreover, what is central to this advertisement is the context of the soccer world cham-
pionships in Brazil in 2014, when the advertisement was displayed. During the championships, elements of Brazilian culture were widely present in the German media, and certain products of Brazil, together with their Portuguese names, and Brazilian toponyms (containing some foreign graphemes and dia
critical signs, cf. Curaçao, São Paulo, etc.), were introduced and diffused in Germany. The product advertised here itself promotes a mixing of tastes and cultures, proposing a new variant to the traditional German pasta product called Maultaschen.

(8) Die Grill ¡Sensãçion! Feurige Maultaschen in Salsa-Marinade. WM Grillers

A new way of preparing this product is shown, which fits the seasonal barbe
cuing during spring and summer, and a new, spicy flavour is added to the dish. Interestingly, however, the element salsa (which is of Spanish origin) does not perfectly match the Brazilian context, and this “unexact” exotisation, where Latin American elements from various origins are mixed up together, also becomes linguistically visible in the word ¡Sensãçion!, which combines Spanish (<¡>-ion [cf. Sp. -ión]) and Portuguese / Brazilian elements (<ã>, <ç>). Moreover, their introduction does not respect the rules of Portuguese, where the <ã> would appear in the ending -ão (Port. sensação). It can be supposed that this latter kind of realisation was avoided because it would have reduced the transparency of the pun. This clearly shows that in multilingual punning, it is not linguistic correctness / orientation towards the source language that is central, but that the foreign elements are adapted to the needs of the communicative context in which they are used (cf. also the neologism Grillers in the product name, which is based on a combination of Germ. grillen ‘to barbecue’ with the English / German agentive suffix -er and the plural morpheme -s, or the orthographic “error” observed in the form Heavens in example (3) above).

---

9 Cf. also other elements appearing on the poster that point towards the soccer championships, such as the abbreviation WM for Weltmeisterschaft and the dot on the letter i in the form of a soccer ball.

10 This morpheme can be interpreted as typically English, but it is also productive in German for certain domains of the lexicon, as illustrated by plurals such as Unis, Studis, Pizzas, etc. (cf. Wegener 2004).
2.2 Multilingual Wordplay in Settings with Low Granularity

Let us now turn towards an example of multilingual wordplay that can be observed in the public domain, but in a different setting.

(9) Espress yourself. LAVAZZA

Example (9) is a message found at a motorway service area, which represents an untypical (non-urban), but still public setting. The message is written on a small sugar bag served together with espresso at the bar of the motorway service area, and it presents the neologism espress, which lexically and conceptually blends Engl. express and It. espresso, and could be interpreted in the sense of ‘consume some espresso and thereby express your personal lifestyle’. In this case, the immediate function of wordplay is not to attract the attention towards the product and make the addressee buy it (i.e. to make him / her perform a certain high-ranking action), but rather to amuse the consumer who has already been served a cup of coffee and thereby create or reinforce a positive image of the company / brand (Lavazza), which may of course indirectly increase the number of products bought by the consumer in the long run.

Moreover, when analysing this example, it is important to bear in mind the diffusion of this wordplay. The sugar bags are distributed across a broad range of places, potentially in different countries throughout Europe, and over a relatively long period of time. Contrary to the examples discussed above, this instance of wordplay does not presuppose a German audience and / or a specific seasonal context. The only prerequisite for the wordplay to be understood is that it is presented in a context where most addressees have a basic knowledge of English and will recognise and understand the expression express yourself, to which the message alludes, and in a context where Italian coffee products are consumed and the internationalism espresso is known.

2.3 Multilingual Wordplay on Moving Advertising Vehicles

Still another type of multilingual wordplay occurs when the advertising vehicles are vehicles in a literal sense, i.e. moving objects, as illustrated by the message in (10) found on a lorry belonging to a quarry enterprise. Another motor-lorry by the same enterprise carries the message Rolling Stones, which can be analysed in a very similar way.
of untypical messages that have only been rarely studied in classical LL research. The status of messages on moving objects in the public space has been a controversial subject of discussion (cf. Auer, who defines the object of LL research as “ding- und vor allem ortsfeste Schriftverwendung” [usage of writing fixed to the object and above all fixed to space], Auer 2010: 273). The messages still clearly belong to the domain of public communication, and they are formulated in a way that a public and anonymous group of addressees is reached. In my view, LL research can therefore gain new insights by including these types of LL and by investigating their specificities.

(10) Rock’n’Roll / bmk-Steinbruchbetriebe.com / bmk STEINBRUCHBETRIE- BE / SCHMITZ
(inscription on a motor-lorry, photographed at motorway service area Hockenheim, 31.03.2016)

Fig. 2: Multilingual wordplay Rock’n’Roll on the lorry of a quarry enterprise (photographed 31.03.2016, Hockenheim service area, Germany, © E. Winter-Froemel)

The graphic message displayed on the lorry contains the expression Rock’n’Roll, which represents an anglicism designating a specific kind of music and dance. This is an internationalism that has been borrowed by German and many other languages. However, the original sense of the expression does not fit the communicative context, and its use thus poses a riddle to the addressee. In order to solve it, (s)he is invited to reflect upon the message and to uncover an additional interpretation, and it is here that a multilingual dimension is opened up. In fact, both the linguistic context of the advertising message (cf. the word Steinbruchbetriebe, which equally appears on the lorry, and other semiotic entities – the iconic representation of a rock with a smiling face) and the situational con-
text (the message is written on a lorry transporting stones) favour an interpretation of the element *Rock* in the sense of the English word *rock*, whose meaning is taxonomically related (or identical) to the load transported by the lorry. It can be assumed that most speakers of German will have sufficient knowledge of English to decode this lexical item. Moreover, the element *Roll* can be motivated when interpreted as an imperative of the German verb *rollen* ‘to roll’, which also fits the communicative context (as the message appears on a lorry that rolls along the motorway).\(^\text{12}\)

This example can thus be analysed as a ludic transmotivation, which introduces a new, contextually induced interpretation of the elements of a compositional expression (Käge 1980: 101–107). At the same time, the message is characterised by a high degree of granularity and a clear advertising function, although in a sense different from the examples discussed above. The anticipated reader of the message in (10) is a car driver (or passenger) who is likely to be annoyed by the presence of a relatively slow lorry on the motorway. This potentially conflictual situation motivates the wordplay which functions as a facework strategy (Goffman 1967; Brown and Levinson 1978) adopted by the speaker (the quarry company).\(^\text{13}\) It serves to present the speaker in a positive way as being full of wit, and it invites the reader to reflect on the necessity of transporting vehicles and to be more indulgent towards the possible slowdown caused by the lorry (cf. similar examples of advertising messages that can be found on other trucks and lorries).

### 2.4 Multilingual Wordplay in Shop Names, Product Names and Brand Names

Let us finally turn to instances of wordplay which are characterised by the fact that the context in which they are originally used strongly induces a reuse in other contexts and communicative settings. In the advertising domain, this applies most importantly to shop names, product names and brand names (for a linguistic in-depth study on product names see Platen 1997). In contrast to (9), in which the utterance (the message on the sugar bag) is reproduced in identical typographical form on a great number of advertising vehicles of the same type (the sugar bags), so that the message(s) will be reproduced / read in very similar

\(^\text{12}\) The English word allows the same interpretation, and the reader could interpret the element *Roll* as being English as well.

\(^\text{13}\) For a more refined discussion of the notion of speaker, see section 3 below.
situations, the messages below are reused by other speakers, in different communicative settings, and probably with different degrees of granularity, visibility, etc. For example, a pun appearing in a shop name will also be cited / re-actualised in the mercantile directory, where it is introduced into a different linguistic context and realised in a different typography, etc. (see also the contributions of Paviour-Smith and Knospe, this volume). A pun contained in a product name is cited each time a speaker mentions the product, e.g. when talking to his / her friends and family. This involves a transition from the graphic to the phonic medium and a transition to more personal and private situations of communication (i.e. to situations which are characterised by a stronger degree of communicative immediacy; this parameter will be discussed in more detail in section 3 below).

The choice of a pun in a product / brand / shop name implies that the wordplay will be strongly and stably linked to the product, shop or brand, and that it will be diffused more easily than the messages discussed above; however, this also implies stronger restrictions concerning the communicative adequacy of wordplay. Different to the examples in section 2.1, which had the main function of attracting the receiver’s attention (even by using “bad” or communicatively risky wordplay, e.g. by punning on taboo concepts or on potentially offensive contents), these more stable instances of wordplay need to fit the central characteristics of the shop, product or brand and be perceived in a positive way by a large group of receivers (which, normally, rules out offensive wordplay).

This category of multilingual wordplay in the LL can be illustrated by the title of a CD appearing on the cover of a CD of saxophone music:

(11) SAX AND THE CITY

The title combines the English word sax, an apocope for saxophone, with the title of the American TV drama Sex and the City, broadcast in Germany from 2001 to 2004. This is an example of paronymy (sax [sæks] – sex [seks]) where both units in the pun are English. The wordplay can thus, at a first level, be analysed as a case of monolingual (English) wordplay. However, its multilingual dimension arises from the fact that the utterance is presented in a German setting and is targeted to a mainly German-speaking audience. At the same time, comprehension of the two units in the pun is facilitated by the international diffu-

---

14 Although the name of the instrument represents an internationalism going back to the Belgian name of its inventor Sax, the abbreviation is common in English only, and it is still not included in the Duden, for example.
sion of the name of the instrument, by the image on the CD cover showing a saxophone, and by the skyline and four pairs of female legs in high heels, which recall the four female protagonists of the TV drama. This instance of wordplay thus serves to appeal to a specific group of addressees and expresses the essence of the CD in a nutshell: containing saxophone music that fits a modern and urban lifestyle.

Fig. 3: CD cover Sax and the City (photographed at motorway service area Hockenheim, Germany, 31.03.2016, © E. Winter-Froemel)

Another example is provided by the name of an Italian food market and international mall chain in (12). The first store of this chain was opened in 2007 in Turin; currently, there are 27 stores world-wide, and more are being planned. The name of the chain combines the English words *Italy* and *eat*, which are strongly linked to the main characteristic of the shop on a conceptual level, and which point to the international reputation of Italian gastronomy. Moreover, by using English elements in an (originally) Italian setting, a certain exclusivity is suggested, which fits the advertising message perfectly. At first sight, the pun appears to be monolingual; however, it functions best if we imagine a speaker with an Italian accent pronouncing the English word *Italy* in an adapted form with a closed and long initial vowel [iːt], which matches the pronunciation of the English verb *eat*. The name of the market thus refers to both cultural and linguistic stereotypes.

15 This seems to be valid for the introduction of the name of the market in Italy, but the situation is of course different in the later reuses of the label in English-speaking countries.
Another example that illustrates the use of wordplay in shop names is given in (13) with the name of a hot dog restaurant and foodtruck by Jeroen Meus, a famous Belgian TV chef.\footnote{Thanks to Eline Zenner for drawing my attention to this example.}

(13) WÜRST. HAUTE DOGS


The name appears in the LL of Dutch-speaking Flanders, and it puns on Engl. hot dog (which has been borrowed by many languages and can be considered to be an internationalism) and Fr. haut, haute ‘high’, alluding to the French expression haute cuisine and possibly also to haute couture (which have also been borrowed into many languages and become internationalisms). These allusions underline the high quality of the products served. In addition to this English-French pun, we can observe a ludic deformation of the Dutch word worst by replacing the vowel by <ü>, a grapheme which does not exist in Dutch,\footnote{In Dutch, <ü> appears for uses of <u> with a trema, which, however, represents a different kind of use.} but evokes the German plural form Würste and thereby the reputation of various types of German sausages. The shop name thus combines linguistic units of three different languages, which, moreover, do not correspond to the native language of the place of the shop, so that four languages are involved (English, French, German, and Dutch). This could be additionally interpreted as an attempt to create a sort of international flavour, and it can be hypothesised that multilingual societies like Dutch-speaking Flanders favour this kind of truly multilingual pun.
3 LL Advertising as a Kind of Mass Communication Marked by Communicative Distance?

In 2.1–2.4, basic types of multilingual wordplay in LL communication have been distinguished according to typical communicative settings. In the remainder of this paper, I will link these case studies to more general reflections about the communicative (section 3) and semiotic (section 4) setting of LL communication and the types of contextual knowledge the messages may draw upon (section 5).

With respect to the communicative setting of LL communication, and specifically advertising messages, we can observe that the speaker role is frequently divided into various persons and speaker roles participating in the production of the message. For example, the “speaker” of the *lieferando* advertising campaigns in examples (1)–(4) is the company who wants to advertise the *lieferando* products (“the company” being a metonymy for the members of the management and various employees in charge of the company’s advertising), the advertising agency who formulates the advertising message (again, possibly including several persons with different roles and functions), the printing shop who materially “produces” the message, the company who sells the advertising space, the person who fixes the road sign, etc. Of course, these persons are not equally important for our concerns, and I will therefore concentrate on the first two (groups of) persons mentioned. On the one hand, the product-selling company acts as the official speaker of the message to which the possible communicative effect obtained by the use of wordplay (e.g. appearing as creative and full of wit, or as tasteless, etc.) will be attributed. The advertising agency, on the other hand, is the actor which formulates the message, but it is maximally faded out: the advertising message explicitly mentions the product-selling company *lieferando*, but the role and identity of the advertising agency is nowhere signalled. Advertising communication can thus be analysed as a situation which simulates a situation involving only one speaker, and even if this speaker role is incorporated by a company and not by an individual person, the communicative effects obtained by the production of the message will be attributed to this speaker as if it were a real person.

Turning towards decoding, the messages in the LL are read by an unknown number of recipients, who remain anonymous. Advertising communication in the LL could therefore, at first sight, be considered to be a typical case of mass communication, characterised by communicative distance between the speaker and the addressees in the sense of Koch and Oesterreicher (2011). At a closer look, however, public advertising shows certain characteristics which suggest a
more complex picture. The ten parameters (a) to (j) proposed by Koch and Oesterreicher (2011: 7) can help us to evaluate degrees of communicative immediacy and distance in LL advertising communication.

Public advertising messages are characterised by a low degree of cooperation and participation of the addressee in the production of the message (parameter (g), “Kooperation”), a low degree of dialogicity and absence of turn-taking ((h), “Dialogizität”), a low degree of spontaneity (cf. the long stage of planning of the advertising messages that normally takes place; ((i), “Spontaneität”)) and by fixed topics ((j), “Themefixierung”). All these features point towards a setting of communicative distance. However, the messages are often characterised by a certain involvement of the speaker (i.e. the messages may contain signs of expressivity and affectivity; (c), “emotionale Beteiligung”). Moreover, it seems important to equally take into account the addressees here, as the messages are aimed at obtaining a certain effect on them, very often in the form of an emotional reaction (approval, arousal of personal interest and personal needs, or disapproval / rejection of partly offensive contents, “bad wordplay”, etc.). At the same time, advertising messages are generally characterised by a strong pragmatic dimension, functioning as directive speech acts (this may be explicitly expressed or remain implicit). Finally, wordplay often functions as a riddle that has to be decoded, and it is thus aimed at triggering the addressee’s involvement in the sense of actively reflecting upon the message and its possible interpretations.

Advertising messages in LL are a form of public communication, with many addressees ((a), “Öffentlichkeit”, “Zahl der Rezipienten”). However, this parameter can be refined by taking into account the communicative setting in decoding. Whereas for typical situations of mass communication and communicative distance (e.g. a public speech at a commemoration, at a demonstration or a trade union meeting), decoding is performed by a mass of individuals at the same time, public advertising is most of ten characterised by a series of time-delayed acts of decoding by individual addressees, i.e. the situation of decoding involves a certain degree of privacy (e.g. a car driver reading a bill board). In this sense, the messages are not addressed to a mass, but to a mass of individuals, and this difference may influence the organisation of the message (e.g. choice of 2Pl vs 2Sg address pronouns, exhortations aiming at creating or strengthening group identity vs. utterances addressing personal interests of the individual addressees, etc.).

18 This is not a unique feature of LL communication; for example, similar patterns of individual, time-delayed acts of decoding also occur in literary texts, YouTube videos etc.
Nevertheless, the familiarity between the speaker and the recipient is low ((b), “Vertrautheit der Partner”), and the temporal and spatial distance between speaker and addressee ((parameter (f), “physische Nähe der Kommunikationspartner”) implies that the speaker can only anticipate who will read the message and in what kinds of situations. Depending on these anticipations, the speaker will formulate the message in a way that the communicative success can be maximised. For LL communication, we might suspect that the speaker can only anticipate very general characteristics of the addressees; however, some advertising messages indicate that specific groups of receivers are targeted.

This is illustrated, e.g., by the advertising message on the lorry cited in 2.3, which involves an anticipation of a specific kind of situation of decoding, or by the messages in (5), (6) and (8) which are formulated in a way that adapts to the anticipated time and season when the messages are decoded. Other examples are messages which are adapted to a specific spatial context of use, e.g. by alluding to the city where the advertising message is displayed (e.g. Berlin in (4)).

In these previous examples, there may be a certain degree of entanglement to the situation and context of activities (parameter (d), “Situations- und Handlungseinbindung”), and the advertising messages may contain elements which point to the communicative context ((e), “Referenzbezug”; however, explicit relations to the immediate communicative context are generally scarce). Interestingly, in spite of the spatial and temporal distance between the speaker and the addressee(s), this could be regarded as a simulation of a more immediate communicative setting. From the perspective of the speaker, we could analyse this as an instance of scheduled and transferred communication, which anticipates situations of decoding.

An additional parameter which can be evaluated in order to describe advertising in LL is seriality and reuse, i.e. the degree to which a message will remain unique, i.e. be uttered only once (but read by different addressees at different points in time), or reused at later points in time, at other locations, or by other speakers. In the domain of advertising, producing a message which will be displayed only once is a costly choice for companies, and this choice needs to be...
outweighed by certain communicative advantages (e.g. the anticipation of a high number of addressees for advertising spaces / places with a lot of attendance, and the anticipation of a strong communicative effect of feigning communicative immediacy; the latter concept will be commented on in more detail in section 4 below).

Moreover, the communicative setting of public advertising is characterised by the fact that it is normally costly in a very literal sense: the advertising material has to be printed, advertising space has to be purchased or rented, etc. The speaker is therefore faced with a strong need to maximise the communicative success of the messages, and (s)he needs to carefully anticipate whether the use of a particular wordplay will be communicatively successful (being judged as adequate by the addressees, being memorised, etc.). The most basic requirement is that the wordplay is understood, and this is especially important in wordplay in absentia (cf. Hausmann 1974) which is based on homonymous or polysemous linguistic items and which is not indicated by formal hints in the utterance (such as the repetition of the expression in its different meanings, the use of morphologically or graphemically deviant realisations, etc.; cf. Winter-Froemel, DF, 2.7, this volume). The speaker thus needs to anticipate whether the average addressee will be able to decode the message. In multilingual wordplay, this involves anticipating the average foreign language knowledge of the recipients and evaluating if this knowledge will be sufficient to decode a specific multilingual pun.

Summing up, the communicative setting in advertising messages in LL is predominantly characterised by communicative distance, but involves (to various degrees) a simulation of immediacy. The strategy of feigning immediacy requires additional planning, but it may give the addressee the impression that the speaker (the company) and the product advertised strongly match his / her personal needs and interests. In this way, the production costs can be outweighed, and the communicative success of the advertising messages can be enhanced.

4 The Semiotics of LL Communication: Spatial Boundedness and the Hearer-Origo

The specificities in the communicative setting of LL advertising can be linked to more general semiotic features of LL communication: spatial boundedness (“Ortsgebundenheit”, cf. Auer 2010) represents a defining feature of LL messages, as these are part of the landscape, i.e. a specific spatial scenery. However,
this aspect has often been neglected in previous research or been treated in a simplified way (cf. Auer 2010: 274).

The spatial context can first of all be understood as the concrete location and surrounding where a LL message is displayed and which will be perceived by the addressees together with the advertising message. This location is externally fixed by choosing a specific advertising space for a particular advertising message, and we have already seen that the message may contain elements referring to this immediate utterance context.

For advertising campaigns where the advertisements will be displayed on various billboards etc., spatial boundedness is given with respect to the sum of the various advertising spaces that have been rented, so that the message must fit all of these contexts, or, put the other way round, the advertising spaces rented for the campaign need to be suitable for the advertisement the speaker has chosen. However, advertising campaigns may also exceptionally involve messages which are designed to fit one particular location only.

Another interesting special case are messages displayed on moving objects, such as vehicles: at first sight, spatial boundedness does not appear to be a pertinent factor here, as the messages will move across space and be read in different locations. In Auer’s terms (2010), these messages are fixed to the object (“dingfest”), but not spatially fixed (“ortsfest”). Nevertheless, a spatial boundedness is also evident in this case: it is defined by the sum of the possible or probable physical environments in which the message will be read, i.e. the zone where the advertising message will probably be displayed. For example, advertising on local buses is spatially bounded by the coverage of the bus network and the destinations of the concrete bus on which the message appears; for advertisements displayed on lorries or trucks, we can take into account the geographical area where the vehicles will probably circulate, etc. In spite of being more complex and less predictable than the spatial contexts mentioned above, these spaces may be important for determining the adequacy of a particular advertising message (e.g. advertising for a delivery service with a limited operating distance).

Beyond offering possibilities of referring to specific elements of the spatial utterance context, the spatial boundedness of LL communication also comprise more abstract spaces in the sense of spaces that are characterised by a community of (potential) addressees, by shared cultural knowledge and traditions (e.g. Rhenish traditions of celebrating carnival; cf. the advertising message in (6)), etc. Moreover, there is also a spatial boundedness defined by linguistic borders, i.e. by the diffusion of a particular language or variety, which permits the
speaker to anticipate whether the utterance will be understood by most addressees (cf. wordplay containing dialectal realisations).

The fundamental importance accorded to the stage of decoding furthermore requires an extension of standard models of semiotics. According to the classical view, the notion of the speaker-origo permits us to analyse the relation of a message to the concrete situation (see e.g. Bühler 1934).20 Thus, the centre which determines spatial, temporal and personal deixis is the person of the speaker producing the utterance at a particular location and time (ego – hic – nunc), and deicticals such as “you”, “here”, “there”, “tomorrow” can only be interpreted with respect to the centre given by the speaker origo.

However, Fricke (2003, 2007, 2015) has argued that the origo needs to be considered to be a complex entity, as specific instances of communication may involve more than one origo, and there may be origo-allocating acts creating secondary origos.21 Fricke mainly focuses on shifts and divergences between verbal and gestural origos in situations of communicative immediacy, but the examples studied here show that settings of communicative distance frequently exhibit shifts to secondary origos as well.

In fact, for advertising in LL (and also for other subtypes of LL communication), it is not the speaker-origo and the situation in which the message is produced that is decisive. Instead, the situation of decoding is central here, and the centre from which spatial and temporal relations are calculated is strongly linked to the person of the addressee.22 I would therefore propose to introduce the notion of a hearer-origo functioning as the centre which determines reference in specific communicative settings, as in LL advertising.23 The reference to the hearer-origo can be illustrated by the following examples:

---

20 In addition, however, Bühler also considers imagination-oriented deixis (Deixis am Phantasma; cf. Dufter 2015, 371–372).

21 See e.g. Fricke (2015: 714): “an origo is not necessarily fixed to the speaker but can be transferred to other people and objects.”

22 For personal deixis the picture appears to be more complex, as advertising messages frequently contain deictic elements that are defined with respect to the speaker-origo (see for example the imperatives Hol dir... ‘go and fetch’ and es- / express yourself in (1) and (9), where the receiver of the advertisement is addressed as a second person). First person deicticals referring to the person of the addressee are, however, equally possible, cf. Mai [my] first love in (5)).

23 For reasons of symmetry, I use the term hearer-origo, understood in a wide sense as being opposed to the classical term of the speaker-origo, although in many cases the addressees will be readers rather than hearers in a narrow sense. Additional support for introducing the concept of hearer-origo can be gained from deicticals such as It. codesto, which refer to elements that are close to the hearer (cf. also Meira 2003, who discusses the addressee’s relevance for demonstrative systems in Tiriyó and Brazilian Portuguese, and Jungbluth 2003, who claims a
The headlines have a multilingual dimension by virtue of containing English borrowings that still exhibit a formal markedness (cf. Winter-Froemel 2008); at the same time, they contain temporal and spatial deictics: (14) is a pun on hier steckt mehr drin ‘there is more to it’ / Steak; (15) plays with the homophony of ab (jetzt) ‘from now on (your trip is going to be even more fun)’ and App (realised as [ap], which can be analysed as a spelling pronunciation (instead of the more common realisation of the loanword, [ɛp]; cf. Jabłoński 1990).

References to the hearer-origo may concern spatial and temporal deixis (and sometimes also personal deixis, see note 22), as well as more general references to a specific temporal and spatial context anchored to the situation of decoding. For example, the boundedness to the carnival season in (6) needs to be respected at the stage of decoding, but the advertisement could have been invented much earlier. What is important is adequate timing for displaying the message. In other words, when planning / producing the message, the speaker needs to ensure that two requirements are met: the message needs to be displayed at the right time, and it should no longer be displayed when the relevant season is over. In this sense, some of the messages have a date of expiry that needs to be respected. If the advertising message is still displayed after the date of expiry, this can even have an unintended communicative effect, provoking a

“dyad-oriented” system for deictic research, taking into account both the speaker and hearer and their different relative positions).

24 Italics are used here for the expression App jetzt, which is realised in a larger typographic font than the rest of the message; this shows how typography can be used to signal wordplay. Moreover, the example nicely illustrates the entanglement to the situation and context of activities: the poster is displayed at the exit of the service area and alludes to the addressee’s departure (ab jetzt ‘from now on’) and the continuation of the trip, during which bored car passengers might download the app in order to kill time. At the opposite side of the door (i.e. the entrance), a different message is displayed (“App jetzt können Sie Ihre Pausen perfekt planen!” → ‘from now on you can perfectly plan your breaks’), which alludes to the break the anticipated addressee is about to take.
negative interpretation by the addressee, who might be tempted to conclude that the company who advertises the product is not up-to-date, etc. This leads us back to a sort of paradox: in spite of the speaker’s and hearer’s temporal and spatial distance, the messages are spatially – and temporally – bounded, and they may contain explicit references to the spatial and temporal context in the situation of decoding, i.e. references that are determined with respect to the hearer-origo. The feature of feigned immediacy explains how the advertising messages “speak to” the addressee as if a “real” co-present speaker directly approached him / her.

5 Types of Contexts and Contextual Knowledge in LL Communication

The previous remarks have already made it clear that contexts are important for LL communication, and that not only the spatial, but also the temporal dimension needs to be included. Additionally, the linguistic system also represents a point of reference, and in multilingual wordplay we have to take into account several linguistic systems. Moreover, wordplay may also allude to certain elements of shared cultural knowledge, cultural stereotypes, etc., and thereby refer to the general extra-linguistic context in which the utterance is produced. It therefore seems necessary to adopt a broad approach, which encompasses the various kinds of references mentioned. At the same time, it seems useful to discuss how these references or contexts can be systematised.

The notion of context has been extensively debated in previous research, and different classifications of (sub)types of contexts have been proposed (cf. among others Coseriu 1955–56; Aschenberg 1999; Fetzer 2004; Stainton 2006). Coseriu emphasises the importance of various kinds of Umfelder (~ surrounding fields) for the transmission of linguistic information, and proposes to distinguish between four basic types of Umfelder: 1) the situation in which the concrete utterance is realised and where the speaker-origo represents the basic point of reference, 2) the region which includes different types of geographic spaces and which defines the area(s) where particular linguistic items are diffused, 3) the context, which includes linguistic and extra-linguistic relations (the linguistic co-text preceding and following the concrete utterance as well as situationally given elements and the speaker’s and hearer’s general knowledge), and 4) the discourse universe, which represents a very general reference system defining specific modalities of texts, e.g. fictional or scientific texts (we might add here...
the modality of advertising texts). It becomes immediately clear that all of these categories are relevant to our field of investigation. However, compared to the other categories, the definition of the third category – context – is considerably more heterogeneous (cf. Aschenberg 1999: 74; Winter-Froemel 2013: 154). As the term has been used in previous research to refer to the other categories as well (especially Coseriu’s situation), I will adopt here a broad view, understanding context as a superordinate category which embraces various subtypes of contexts.

A similar stance is taken by Aschenberg (1999), who distinguishes between three types of contexts, 1) the extra-linguistic situation, 2) the discourse context, and 3) knowledge (including linguistic competence as well as extra-linguistic knowledge). This alternative approach thus insists on the necessity of the linguistic vs. extra-linguistic parameter, but adds again a very general and internally heterogeneous subcategory (knowledge). Her classification points to a very basic aspect which, in my view, needs to be taken into account in an even more essential way. In fact, the two first subcategories in Aschenberg’s classification represent external, objective realities; the third, in contrast, refers to subjective realities internalised in the minds of the speaker and hearer. When adopting a genuinely usage-based approach (cf. Winter-Froemel 2011: 206), objective reality is not directly relevant to communication, but only inasmuch as it has been internalised by the communication partners. For instance, the speaker may only refer to concrete objects given in the situation if they are available for him / her, e.g. if (s)he can perceive them; similarly, the linguistic context relevant to analyses of communication events is restricted to the amount of text that is (still) available to the speaker’s and hearer’s memory at a certain stage of communication, etc. (this leaves of course certain margins of interpretation).

Without being able to compare and extensively discuss the various other proposals that have been made as well as the controversies they have given rise to, I would therefore propose to conceive all subtypes of contexts from the perspective of the speakers’ and hearers’ knowledge of various types of contextual information (cf. Winter-Froemel 2013; Winter-Froemel and Zirker 2015). In this sense, speaking of “contexts” needs to be understood as an abbreviation replacing the more correct term of “internalised contexts” or “contextual knowledge.” At the same time, sticking to the usage-based perspective adopted here, the various types of contextual knowledge, including the general, situation-independent types (see below), are intended as explanatory concepts for linguistic usage, which need to be perceived from the perspective of their realisation in concrete utterances. Moreover, adopting an epistemic perspective, we can refer to a second basic parameter, which also appears in the Saussurean distinction of langue
vs. parole and opposes abstract, system-related vs. concrete, discourse-related phenomena. Generalising this description in order to apply it to both linguistic and extra-linguistic phenomena, we can speak here of general, situation-independent facts or knowledge vs. facts or knowledge related to the concrete situation (of communication). This second parameter can be combined with the parameter of linguistic vs. extra-linguistic knowledge, yielding four general types of contexts / contextual knowledge, as shown in Fig. 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Extra-linguistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General, situation-independent</td>
<td>General linguistic knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grammatical and lexical knowledge of the languages involved, discourse traditional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete, situation-dependent</td>
<td>Knowledge of linguistic context (co-text)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4: Types of contextual knowledge (adapted from Winter-Froemel 2013: 156)

The various subtypes of contextual knowledge permit us to integrate the different kinds of relations observed in the preceding analyses into a coherent framework, and to systematise the semiotic processes involved.

We have already seen in sections 3 and 4 that the insertion into a specific spatial – and temporal – context represents a key feature of LL communication, and that in spite of the spatio-temporal distance between the speaker and addressee, the messages often contain direct references to the concrete situation in which they are realised (according to the speaker’s anticipations about the addressee decoding the message). It should be added that the concept of

25 Rey-Debove comments on this distinction in her definition of métalangage as follows (1978: 21): “Par monde ou objets, on entend tout l’univers référentiel qui n’est pas le langage [...]. Cette dichotomie qui oppose le monde (sans langage) au langage est purement méthodologique et terminologique, puisqu’il n’y a pas de monde sans langage. Mais il est nécessaire pour notre propos, de poser comme hypothèse que l’on peut validement distinguer deux types de discours, correspondant à deux univers de discours, l’un sur ce qui n’est pas le langage (traditionnellement étudié par les linguistes) et l’autre sur le langage.” – The importance of this distinction has also been stressed in many other previous proposals, where a terminological distinction between (linguistic) co-text and (extra-linguistic) context is sometimes made. However, the term co-text still competes with alternative labels such as linguistic context or verbal context, and as the distinction between co-text and context is not sufficient to systematise all of the relevant phenomena, I will stick to the term linguistic context here.
knowledge includes not only explicit knowledge (which would typically be expressed in factual statements), but also the perception of the surrounding objects and situation (e.g. “We are in Berlin”, “It is May”, “I am driving on a motorway”, “I have been driving behind a slow lorry transporting stones”, “I am about to continue my car trip”, etc.).

The intratextual dimension, i.e. the importance of the knowledge of the specific linguistic context, is illustrated, for example, by the fact that in the lieferando messages in (1), (2) and (3), we can in each case find various linguistic items in the context of the puns which belong to the different conceptual frames evoked in the pun: GASTRONOMY and LOVE / SEXUALITY in (1) and (2), GASTRONOMY and RELIGION in (3) (cf. the analyses in section 2.1).

In addition to these references to items which are particular to the concrete message and the situation(s) in which it is displayed, the messages also contain references to various abstract or general types of knowledge. “Classical” LL research has mainly focused on how the utterances are embedded in a specific social and cultural context, e.g. in situations of language contact and language conflict (this tendency is illustrated e.g. by the seminal paper by Landry and Bourhis 1997, as well as by the contributions in Gorter 2006, Shohamy and Gorter 2008; Shohamy 2010; Bulot 2011; Hélot et al. 2012). In this sense, previous research has mainly approached LL communication with respect to its relations to general extra-linguistic knowledge, and more specifically, to language-related facts, e.g. beliefs about language domination, language conflicts, the prestige of particular languages, etc., as perceived by the speakers. This dimension is illustrated by multilingual wordplay as well, as the combination of items from different linguistic codes represents a marked choice which can be explained by the speaker’s intent to convey specific pragmatic or stylistic effects compared to a more usual / less marked way of expressing the content (cf. Winter-Froemel 2011: Ch. 12; Onysko and Winter-Froemel 2011). For example, in (13), Haute dogs refers to the prestige of the French language and gastronomy.

The notion of extra-linguistic knowledge also includes knowledge about cultural traditions, events, etc. (e.g. carnival in (6), the 2014 soccer world championships in (8), or the TV series Sex and the City in (11)). Moreover, world knowledge is activated in the speakers’ processing of linguistic items in general, and we have seen how the speakers of LL advertising messages need to anticipate the type of knowledge that will be available to the average addressee.

Equally important in this respect is the speakers’ and addressees’ general linguistic knowledge, and the anticipations the speaker can make about the addressee in this respect. We have already seen in the examples that multilingual wordplay is restricted to highly entrenched items of the foreign language, and
we can now explain this restriction in a straightforward way as being based on an anticipation of an average addressee (in the specific context of the message). This dimension is also illustrated by allusions to particular elements of foreign languages – or precisely to common stereotypes about these (cf. the ludic deformation based on the introduction of foreign graphemes and punctuation marks in (8), or the imitation of a typical Italian accent in English in (12), etc.).

Additionally, the abstract linguistic knowledge also includes knowledge of certain linguistic traditions. As we have seen in section 2.1, Auer (2010: 286) speaks of a semiotic discourse, characterised by formal and functional similarity of the various messages belonging to it. The speakers and addressees thus refer to certain traditions in coding and decoding which are independent from the linguistic code in the sense of the language system; nevertheless, the traditions represent a domain of general knowledge that is available at a certain point in time. We could therefore also evoke the notions of seriality, reuse / repetition, and discourse traditional knowledge (cf. Koch 1997; Winter-Froemel et al. 2015), i.e. knowledge about typical (traditional) ways of expressing certain contents which are not defined by the language system but historically given and generally respected by the speakers.

Some of the advertising campaigns studied in this paper can serve to illustrate this aspect, as they create new traditions at a micro-level. Examples (1) to (4) are part of the 2014 and 2015 campaigns of lieferando in Germany, and the advertising messages displayed on the billboards were generally characterised by various features which enhanced the brand recognition and the memorisation of the messages: 1) the use of wordplay, and often “bad” wordplay throughout the advertising message, 2) the frequent use of multilingual wordplay, 3) the headline contains the name of a meal or a speciality of foreign origin (or more generally, a reference to foreign objects and realities), 4) this name is part of the pun, 5) the homogeneous graphic design of the road signs (typography, colours, etc.), and 6) the homogeneous structure of the textual elements (headline, subheadline with mention of the number of delivery services at the point when the message was displayed, claim containing the infinitive pattern [Adv] bestellen per lieferando-App, final slogan, etc.). These features are summa-
rised in Tab. 1, where the linguistic items contained in (1) to (4) as well as in six other messages of the campaigns are analysed.

**Tab. 1: Structure of advertising messages of the 2014 / 2015 lieferando campaign**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Subheadline</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Slogan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>['I have fallen in love with you / I have fallen in love the Indian way.']</td>
<td>Inder lieferando-App verführen Sie 7.500 Lieferservices.</td>
<td>Liebevoll mobil bestellen</td>
<td>['Lovingly...']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>['I like Maki', paronymic play based on the name of a type of sushi and Bavarian moag i 'ich mag/ I like']</td>
<td>Unsere 7.500 Lieferservices setzen Maßstäbchen.</td>
<td>Rollig bestellen per lieferando-App</td>
<td>[play on Rolle 'roll' and rollig 'on heat']</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Subheadline</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Slogan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanisch am Essen.</td>
<td>Spar lieber Zeit und lass einen unserer 10.000 Lieferdienste kochen.</td>
<td>Mit Caramba bestellen per lieferando-App</td>
<td>Hier wird Essen bestellt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'Don’t skimp on the food.' | ['Rather skimp on / save time and let one of our 10.000 delivery services cook.'] | [interjection of Spanish origin Caramba! ‘—Golly!’] | ['Food is (to be) ordered here']. Identical for all of the examples studied; play on the assertive vs. directive meaning of hier wird /
| Wu schicken Chicken. | Hunger? Dann fliegst du bestimmt auf einen unserer 10.000 Lieferdienste. | Chic bestellen per lieferando-App | (es) wird |
| 'We send chicken.' | ['Hungry? So you will really be attracted by one of our 10.000 delivery services’, play on fliegen auf ‘to be attracted by’ and its literal meaning ‘to fly (on)to’] | [paronymic play chic – chicken] | |
| Da China satt zu werden. | Lang Zhou: 10.000 Lieferdienste fleuen sich auf deine Bestellung. | Klischeefrei bestellen pel lieferando-App | |
| ‘he seemed (to become fully sated)’ | [play on the (pseudo-)name Lang Zhou and the imperative Lang zu! ‘Dig in / Have a go and eat as much as you like’] | [‘Order free of clichés...’]28 | |

To conclude these observations about different types of contexts, let us briefly come back to example (8), which nicely illustrates the interplay of the various dimensions. This example of multilingual wordplay contains references to the speaker’s and addressee’s knowledge about the situation of communication, which is located in spring / summer 2014. As part of general extra-linguistic knowledge, this period can be related to the soccer world championships taking place in Brazil / Latin America, which was a period of international exchange as well as of watching TV together with friends, accompanied by a barbecue meal, etc. Some of these elements are taken up in the concrete linguistic context of the wordplay, which contains an iconic representation of a soccer ball and the abbreviation WM for Weltmeisterschaft ‘world championships’. Moreover, several lexical items allude to Latin American culture and gastronomy (feurig ‘fiery’, Salsa) and to the tradition of barbecuing, which is widespread in Germany.

28 This message is thus self-contradictory, as it is based on the stereotypical imitation of Chinese pronunciation which substitutes [l] for [r] and in this way ludically deforms the “correct” realisations Lieferdienste ... freuen sich ... klicheefrei ... per lieferando-App (for ludic deformation as a subtype of verbal humour see also my contribution to the DF, this volume).
Finally, the ludic deformation of the word *Sensation* requires general linguistic knowledge about (pseudo-)Brazilian (or Spanish), in order to recognise the allusion to this language realised by introducing the foreign graphic segments.

6 Conclusion: Specificities of Multilingual Wordplay in LL

As we have seen, multilingual wordplay represents a well attested phenomenon in LL, and, by virtue of its complexity, it illustrates various types of interplay: between different semiotic systems, between the utterances and different types of knowledge, and between the speaker and anticipated addressees. The use of elements of foreign origin is very often motivated by a desire to capture the addressee’s attention. As the speaker needs to anticipate the average addressee’s knowledge, multilingual wordplay is restricted to the use of frequent and highly entrenched linguistic items in the contexts observed here, involving allusions to linguistic and cultural stereotypes as well.

Moreover, we have seen that various parameters can be used to characterise specific instances of LL advertising: granularity, seriality and reuse of the messages, as well as the forcedness / recognisability of wordplay. Additionally, the approach proposed by Koch and Oesterreicher (2011) to analyse communicative settings, as well as semiotic reflections on the spatial boundedness, deictic reference and types of contexts and contextual knowledge in LL allow explaining basic features of the messages pertaining to this field of study. The communicative setting exhibits specific features which distinguish the use of wordplay in LL advertising from other instances of wordplay, as well as from other types of LL communication. While the use of wordplay in general is often motivated by a strategy aiming to create an effect of complicity by virtue of the joint intellectual satisfaction shared by the speaker and hearer (see Winter-Froemel, DF, 1.5, 2.1.1 and 2.7.8, this volume), LL advertising is characterised by the paradox of being predominantly located in a setting of communicative distance, but of simulating (to varying degrees) immediacy, with an anonymous speaker who is partly faded out. What counts instead is the stage of decoding, which implies that the speaker-origo may shift to a hearer-origo. This can be explained by the fact that LL advertising occurs in a setting of scheduled and anticipated communication, where the speaker follows a communicative strategy of particularisation and adaptation to the anticipated situation of decoding, including references not only to general linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge, but also to the con-
crete linguistic and extra-linguistic context at the stage of decoding. A question which has only been briefly touched upon and which opens up interesting perspectives for further research is the interplay of different referential systems, including discourse traditional knowledge and references to other semiotic systems and means of expression (e.g. images, typography, etc.).
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