

List of figures

- Figure 1** Information-processing model of humor (adapted from Suls 1972: 85) — 52
- Figure 2** Syntagmatic LM (adapted from Attardo, Hempelmann and Di Maio 2002: 18) — 59
- Figure 3** Reasoning LM (adapted from Attardo, Hempelmann and Di Maio 2002: 19) — 59
- Figure 4** GTVH's six Knowledge Resources in hierarchical order — 61
- Figure 5** Expanded Knowledge Resources of the GTVH — 64
- Figure 6** Humor implicatures on 7 levels (based on Canestrari 2012: 65–73) — 65
- Figure 7** Continuum of contrariety depending on contrariety type and invariance of further feature (based on Canestrari and Bianchi 2013: 17–18) — 67
- Figure 8** Correlation of incongruity type and humorous success (based on Canestrari and Bianchi 2013: 20) — 67
- Figure 9** Expanded Knowledge Resources (equals Figure 5) — 73
- Figure 10** Incongruity processing steps in art-horror and humor — 76
- Figure 11** Rothbart's model of affective responses to incongruity (adapted from Rothbart 2017: 39) — 79
- Figure 12** Three phases of the neural Circuit Model (NCM) (adapted from Chan, Chou, Chen, Yeh, Lavallee, Liang and Chang 2013: 175) — 98
- Figure 13** Results of Questionnaire I regarding means per condition and question. Scariness, surprise, and funniness were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 7 = absolutely), error bars = sd — 120
- Figure 14** Results of Questionnaire II for all 67 triplets. Means per condition and questions. Scariness, funniness and surprise were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 7 = absolutely), error bars = sd — 126
- Figure 15** Results of Questionnaire II for the 36 triplets. Means per condition and questions. Scariness, funniness, and surprise were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 7 = absolutely), error bars = sd — 127
- Figure 16** Schematic illustration of predictions of reading times (RT) for the three conditions art-horror, humor, and coherence — 132
- Figure 17** Log residual reaction times for the six target segments over all conditions, error bars = sd — 137
- Figure 18** Comparison of the muscular anatomy of the human face (left picture) and its notation in action units (AU), here AU 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 (right picture). The encircled number indicates the ending point of a movement (Ekman, Friesen, and Hager 2002b: 15 — 140
- Figure 19** Comparison of AU 12 (lip corner puller) as a schema of the oblique movement (left picture) and its facial expression (right picture) (Ekman et al. 2002b: 175,484). Side note: the facial expression on the right side also includes AU 25 (open mouth) — 141
- Figure 20** Comparison of AU 6 (cheek raiser and lid compressor) as schema (left) and facial expression (middle). Combination of AU 6 and AU 12 (right) (Ekman et al. 2002b: 15,468,485) — 142

- Figure 21** Comparison of AU 10 (upper lip raiser) and AU 9 (nose wrinkle) as schema (left picture) and facial expressions (middle: AU 10, right: AU 9) (Ekman et al. 2002b: 91,95). Side note: Middle picture also shows AU 25 (opened mouth) — **143**
- Figure 22** Comparison of AU 1 and 2 as schema (left) and facial expression (middle: AU 1, right: AU 2) (cf. Ekman et al. 2002b: 15,466) — **144**
- Figure 23** Facial expressions of AU 4 (brow lowerer, left) and its combination with AU 1 and AU 2 (right) (cf. Ekman et al. 2002b: 466, 472) — **144**
- Figure 24** Facial expressions of AU 5 (upper lid raiser, left) and its combination with AU 1 and AU 2 (right) (cf. Ekman et al 2002b: 467,472) — **145**
- Figure 25** Visual summary of predicted facial expressions. 1: happiness (AU 6,12). 2: disgust (AU 9), 3: disgust (AU 10), 4: fear (AU 1,2,4); 5: fear (AU 1,2 5) (Ekman et al. 2002b: 472–474,485) . Side note: In 3, AU 25 (open mouth) is activated additionally — **145**
- Figure 26** FACS results – mean frequency of action units (AU) per condition on and after the critical segment, and percentage of AU of 148 AU shown across conditions and locations — **152**
- Figure 27** Schema of recording procedure (adapted from Hung 2011: 46) — **159**
- Figure 28** Illustration of electrode cap (extended version) according to 10/20 system (adapted to recorded electrode positions from Luck 2014: 167) — **167**
- Figure 29** Electrophysiological results of the grand-averaged ERPs for 9 selected electrode sides for the conditions coherence, horror, humor, and incoherence — **170**
- Figure 30** Incongruity processing model for humor and art-horror (IPM) — **188**