Wordplay as a tool of building an online community on X founded on connivence

Haoran Liu (Université de Lorraine, Metz)

Wordplay can be used by speakers to show their opinion and include or exclude hearers (Winter-Froemel 2016) because of its two essential features: the co-presence of double *scripts* (Raskin 1985) and the reflection of speaker's intelligence.

To decode wordplay, hearers are required to share the same information as the speakers. Therefore, interlocutors can use wordplay to build a community based on *connivence*. Defined as *sharing the common* (*partage du commun*) (Priego-Valverde 1999), connivence governs the exclusion or inclusion in communities.

This hypothesis has been proved in my research founded on a corpus of wordplay in interaction on X (formerly Twitter). To summarize, the production and interpretation of wordplay on X is based on *collective intelligence* (*intelligence collective*) (Lévy 1994) as the foundation for building an *online community* (*communauté en ligne*) (Pereira 2020). Like connivence, the concept of collective intelligence is based on the same key feature: to share common information.

The corpus is constituted by 502 screenshots of tweets containing wordplay. To build my corpus, I've followed 700 accounts on X, observed their tweets and saved the tweets containing wordplay by making screenshots. The followed accounts were selected in a semi-random way: I followed 20 accounts who posted tweets mentioning the first topic of *Trend: France* (*Tendance : France*) on the 1st and 16th of the month from Mars 1st 2020 until August 1st 2021. In this way, the wordplay examples in my corpus can have different topics, which allows me to analyze different functions of wordplay and investigate how the users gather as an online community.

The main idea of my article is to analyze various elements of connivence by associating contextual elements to features of X as social media. The following aspects will be developed. First, two factors on X can be used as contextual resources to decode wordplay and as *signs of connivence* (*signes de connivence*) (Lipovetsky1983, Priego-Valverde 1999) to justify the exchange of connivence: *interactive operations* (*operations interactives*) (Paveau 2013) (like, retweets, comments) and elements constituting the form of tweet (Paveau 2013) which are *techno-language forms* (*formes techno-langagières*) – language units with special features added on the Web (images, videos, hashtags, emojis, clickable links, etc.) – and *language forms* (*formes langagières*) without any features of techno-language forms (the text of the tweet, date, username, etc.).

Then, the connivence on X can be linked to interlocutors' *wavelength* (*la longueur d'onde*) (Priego-Valverde 1999), which includes two aspects: shared knowledge (*connaissances partagées*) and mindset (*état d'esprit*). Here are some details.

The inclusion brought about by successful decoding of wordplay is based on shared basic linguistic competence (such as lexicological, morphological, orthographical, phonetical, grammatical, syntactic competence) and shared references referred to the three types of contextual inferences by Charaudeau (2006). The inclusion founded on common opinions depends on interlocutors' mindset such as *distancing attitude* towards certain subject (*attitude de distanciation*) (Priego-Valverde 1999), aesthetic pleasure linked to the *intellectual enjoyment* (*jouissance intellectuelle*) (Lecolle 2016) and sense of humor.

References

Charaudeau, Patrick. 2006. La situation de communication comme lieu de conditionnement du surgissement interdiscursif. in *TRANEL* n°44, *Interdiscours et intertextualité dans les médias*, Institut de linguistique de l'Université de Neuchâtel, Neuchâtel.

Lecolle, Michelle. 2016. Jeux de mots et motivation : une approche du sentiment linguistique. Esme Winter- Froemel et Angelika Zirker. *Enjeux du jeu de mots. Perspectives linguistiques et littéraires*, De Gruyter, pp.217-244, 2015, 978-3-11-040834-8. halshs-01216744.

Lévy, Pièrre. 1994. *L'Intelligence collective. Pour une anthropologie du cyberespace,* Paris, Éd. La Découverte.

Lipovetsky, Gilles. 1983. *L'ère du vide. Essais sur l'individualisme contemporain*, Paris, Ed.Gallimard, 1993, Ed. Folio, P.328.

Paveau, Marie-Anne. 2013. Technodiscursivités natives sur Twitter. Une écologie du discours numérique, dans Liénard, F. (2013, coord.) *Culture, identity and digital writing, Epistémè 9, Revue internationale de sciences humaines et sociales appliquées*, Séoul : Université Korea, Center for Applied Cultural Studies, p. 139-176.

Pereira, Gonçalves. 2020. Communauté en ligne, pp.[En ligne]. hal-02968446.

Priego-Valverde, Béatrice. 1999. L'humour dans les interactions conversationnelles : jeux et enjeux. *Linguistique*. Aix Marseille Université. Français. NNT : . tel-01696163.

Raskin, Victor. 1987. Linguistic heuristics of humor: a script-based semantic approach, in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, n°65 : 11-25.

Winter-Froemel, Esme. 2016. Approaching Wordplay. In Knospe, Sebastian & Onysko, Alexander & Goth, Maik (eds.), *Crossing Languages to Play with Words. Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 11–46. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Zappavigna, Michele. 2011. Ambient affiliation: A linguistic perspective on Twitter, in *New Media & Society* 13(5), 789-806.