

the future through

states—although
action responses,
first, the appraisal
of joy, contempt, or
disgust, these five pro-
cesses; “cocktail” isn’t
just a simple static
event that occurs and can
be followed by a sequence of

different feeling
emotions, musi-
cians’ reactions for these
examples in this
theory to explain
how musicians
see how the psy-
chology works. But before
we are a number of
questions: *what* to expect?
Is it innate? How
does it relate to a particular
other questions

2 Surprise

When I was in sixth grade, we held a surprise party for our teacher, Ms. Bradley. One of my classmate’s parents had invited Ms. Bradley to dinner. Hiding in the basement was my entire sixth-grade class. Under the pretense that dinner wasn’t yet ready, Ms. Bradley was led down into the darkened room. When the lights came on we all shouted “SURPRISE!” at the top of our lungs. The effect couldn’t have been more satisfying to a child’s mind: Ms. Bradley nearly jumped out of her skin. There was an expression of sheer terror on her face: her chin had dropped, leaving her mouth wide open, and the whites of her eyes were visible all the way around her pupils. But the expression of terror quickly dissolved into laughter as she regained her composure.

When a surprising event occurs, two brain processes are initiated: a rapid reaction response and a slower appraisal response. Research by Joseph LeDoux and his colleagues at New York University has helped to trace the corresponding pathways through the brain.¹ Figure 2.1 provides a schematic diagram of the reaction and appraisal tracks. Whether the stimulus is visual or auditory in origin, information is first relayed to the thalamus, where some basic processing occurs. At this point the fast and slow tracks are known to diverge. The fast track proceeds directly to the amygdala, which plays an important role in the assignment of affective significance to sensory stimuli. If fear is evoked, activity can be seen in the midbrain periaqueductal gray—which coordinates a number of defense responses. In addition, the paraventricular nucleus of the hypothalamus will be activated. This is a region of the brain that initiates changes to the viscera that contribute to the sensation of fear. When an event makes you feel something in the pit of your stomach, it is the paraventricular nucleus that is responsible.

The slow track amounts to a long detour between the thalamus and the amygdala. The detour here is via the cerebral cortex—the massive outer layer of the brain, which, among other things, is responsible for conscious thought. Here the stimulus causes activation throughout large areas of the cortex, especially in the frontal lobe region—areas associated with cognitive rumination and evaluation. All sorts of complex social,




Figure 2.1

Schematic diagram of the brain mechanisms involved in the fear response. Concurrent fast and slow pathways are activated. The fast track involves a direct connection between the thalamus and the amygdala. The slow track leads through the sensory cortex—the large mass located on the exterior surface of the brain.

environmental, and behavioral considerations are brought to bear in appraising the situation. All of this neural activity makes this track the more complicated pathway.

The fast and slow pathways converge in the lateral nucleus of the amygdala. In fact, the two pathways converge onto single neurons in the amygdala.² If the slow track leads to the assessment that fear is unwarranted, then the cortex will generate an inhibitory signal that effectively turns off the amygdala and arrests the fear response. Compared with reaction responses, such cognitive processes result in a more accurate, nuanced, and realistic appraisal of dangers, risks, or opportunities afforded by some situation. Unfortunately, this appraisal process is comparatively slow.

For both the fast and slow pathways, the context of the stimulus is known to influence the fear response. Several studies have shown that the context for fear associations depends on the hippocampus. That is, the hippocampus helps us interpret the fear-evoking stimulus.³

As noted, responds quickly must be related to the unexpected and pessimistic.

One consequence of sympathetic activation is increased glucose. The purpose of this is to increase carbon dioxide levels. This increase in carbon dioxide is sensed by the sensory system. Sensory system resources are allocated.

The height of the chin dropped directly in the chin dropping, producing a component of the component.

Contrastive

Surprising people documented features have and in nearly.

It is not surprising in some circumstances the person becomes pleasurable and enhance reactions. From a biological outcome turns out has failed to therefore cause the best surprise.

So if surprising physiological. It turns out. Consider the

As noted, the rapid reaction response to surprise assumes the worst. The body responds quickly—under the presumption that the outcome is bad and that the body must belatedly rally resources to deal with an unanticipated situation. When it comes to the unexpected, our physiological reflexes reveal that biology is deeply suspicious and pessimistic: bodies don't like surprises.

One consequence of this rapid reaction response to surprise is activation of the sympathetic nervous system: heart rate increases, and there is increased perspiration, increased glucose uptake, and an increase in the rate and volume of respiration. The purpose of the respiratory response is to bathe the body's tissues in oxygen (and purge carbon dioxide) in preparation for a possibly major energy expenditure. In addition to this increase in arousal, another consequence of surprise is an increase in attention. Sensory systems become more acute. Irrelevant thoughts are purged and attentional resources are focused on the immediate events.

The heightened arousal and attention associated with surprise can be observed directly in the characteristic facial expression for surprise. Recall that Ms. Bradley's chin dropped so that her mouth was wide open, and her eyelids were fully retracted producing a "wide-eyed" look. The open mouth facilitates respiration, which is a component of raising arousal. The open eyes facilitate visual perception, which is a component of increased attentiveness.

Contrastive Valence

Surprising people for fun appears to be a cross-cultural universal.⁴ Ronald Simons has documented many instances of "recreational" surprise in various cultures. Most cultures have an equivalent of the "peek-a-boo" interaction between parents and infants, and in nearly all cultures children take delight in sneaking up on each other.

It is not simply the case that surprises are fun for those doing the surprising. In some circumstances (such as Ms. Bradley's surprise party) surprises can also be fun for the person being surprised. But the observation that at least some surprises can be pleasurable raises a biological puzzle. Recall that the purpose of expectation is to enhance readiness. The phenomenon of "surprise" represents a failure of expectation. From a biological perspective, surprise is *always* a bad thing. Even when the surprising outcome turns out to be good, failing to anticipate the outcome means that the brain has failed to provide useful information about possible futures. Predictive failures are therefore cause for biological alarm. If an animal is to be prepared for the future, the best surprise is no surprise.

So if surprise is biologically bad, how is it possible for some surprises to activate the physiological machinery for pleasure? How can people possibly enjoy being surprised? It turns out that an answer to this question can be found on any basketball court. Consider the following experiment carried out by psychologist Peter McGraw.⁵ McGraw

"Slow Track"
thoughtful appraisal

context
illus

concurrent fast and
when the thalamus
ge mass located on

var in appraising
more complicated

amygdala. In fact,
If the slow track
will generate an
the fear response.
a more accurate,
afforded by some
w.

is known to influ-
ct for fear associa-
ps us interpret the

asked amateur basketball players to take shots from different locations around the court. Before each shot, the player was asked to estimate the likelihood of scoring a basket. Following each shot, the player rated how good he or she felt. As you would expect, players are happiest when they successfully make a shot and are unhappy when they miss a shot. Emotions are positively valenced for positively appraised outcomes and negatively valenced for negatively appraised outcomes. However, the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is also related to the player's expectation. McGraw found that basketball players experienced the greatest unhappiness when they missed shots judged easy, and were happiest when they scored baskets judged to be difficult. The magnitude of the emotional response is amplified when there is a large contrast between predicted and actual outcome. In general, *unexpected* fortune or misfortune causes the biggest emotional responses.⁶ That is, low expectation amplifies the emotional response to the outcome.

When we are surprised, a limbic contrast will sometimes arise between the reaction response and the ensuing appraisal response. The fast biological response to surprise is perpetually negative. But the slower appraisal response might be neutral or even positive. At Ms. Bradley's surprise party, the momentary terror she experienced was quickly displaced by a highly positive appraisal response. Her amygdala was switched on and then abruptly switched off. As with McGraw's basketball players, it was the limbic contrast that rendered the experience so powerful. In less than a second, Ms. Bradley's brain went from experiencing profound terror to happy celebration.

In the case of McGraw's basketball players, the limbic contrast was between the prediction response and the appraisal response. In the case of Ms. Bradley's surprise party, there was similarly a contrast between the prediction and appraisal responses, but the main limbic contrast was between the (very negative) reaction response and the (very positive) appraisal response.

Limbic contrasts between the fast and slow pathways are not limited to the extreme circumstances of a surprise party. In our daily lives we experience hundreds of small moments of surprise: a telephone rings, a pen runs out of ink, the car ahead changes lanes, a petal falls from a cut flower. Many of these episodes fail to reach conscious awareness. Most are ultimately appraised as innocuous.

The interaction of the fast and slow pathways has repercussions for how listeners experience sound. If a nominally unpleasant sound is not expected by a listener, then the sound will be perceived as even more unpleasant or annoying. Conversely, if a nominally pleasant sound is not expected by a listener, it will tend to be perceived as more pleasant. A lengthy dissonant passage is likely to lead listeners to expect further dissonant sonorities. If the music shifts toward a more consonant texture, then the resulting contrast will tend to evoke a pleasing effect that can be greater than experiencing only the consonant passage.

More inter
limbic contra
ant, if it is
response—wh

An appare
unexpected g
expected goo
feel good ab
In the case o
outcome but
unexpected g
good outcom
negative reac
consistently o

Perhaps the
prediction ac
A better un
physiological
release of en
analgesic effe
panic situati
settled in the
rush. Oddly, t
while at rest.

pain. Workin
Mary Brouilla
to fail at some
the other hal
of any endorp
tolerance for
less pain tole
in a release o

The body a
emotion such
Immediately,
allow you to
actually injur
opiate releas
tive valence

More interestingly, even neutrally appraised sounds have the capacity to generate limbic contrast. Whether or not a sound is regarded as inherently pleasant or unpleasant, if it is unexpected, it is capable of evoking a negatively valenced prediction response—which may contrast with an ensuing neutral appraisal.

An apparent problem for the contrastive valence theory is accounting for why an unexpected good outcome would be experienced as more positively valenced than an expected good outcome. In the case of an expected good outcome, a person should feel good about the outcome and should also feel good about the predictive accuracy. In the case of an unexpected good outcome, a person should feel good about the outcome but also feel bad about the poor predictive accuracy. Why then does an unexpected good outcome sometimes evoke a more positive emotion than an expected good outcome? It is possible that the contrast between the positive appraisal and negative reaction is the more powerful effect. But if so, it would be maladaptive to consistently experience a positive emotion whenever one's predictions prove wrong. Perhaps the only important lessons for an organism to learn occur when a wrong prediction accompanies a negative appraisal of the outcome.

A better understanding of the phenomenon comes from looking at some of the physiological research. When we experience stress, it is typically accompanied by the release of endogenous opiates such as endorphins. These natural opiates produce an analgesic effect that reduces the experience of pain. You've probably experienced a panic situation, such as where you've had to run to catch a bus. Only after you are settled in the bus do you realize that you inadvertently cut yourself in your frantic rush. Oddly, the pain is much more subdued than if the same injury had been inflicted while at rest. That is, the energetic panic had somehow attenuated the experience of pain. Working at Stanford University, Albert Bandura, Delia Cioffi, Barr Taylor, and Mary Brouillard carried out an experiment where individuals were artificially induced to fail at some task. Half of these individuals were administered a saline solution while the other half received naloxone—an opiate receptor antagonist that blocks the effect of any endorphins present. The participants were then given a test that measured their tolerance for pain. Those individuals who had received naloxone were significantly less pain tolerant, indicating that the stress caused by failing at the task had resulted in a release of endogenous opiates.⁷

The body appears to release opiates whenever we experience a negatively valenced emotion such as pain or fear. Suppose that a wild bear appeared and injured you. Immediately, analgesic opiates are released by the body to counteract the pain and allow you to continue to function. Now, suppose that it turned out that you weren't actually injured, but the opiates were released anyway. The net result is simply the opiate release—and the ensuing pleasant feelings. The physiological origin of contrastive valence might follow a path akin to this sequence of events.

The potential for increased pleasure provided by contrastive valence might explain a number of seemingly peculiar conscious strategies people use when mentally preparing for future outcomes. Recall that the imagination response occurs in the pre-outcome epoch—prior to the outcome event. Normally, the imagination response serves a motivational function. By imagining different outcomes (and experiencing a foretaste of the feelings associated with these outcomes) we are encouraged to take actions that will reduce future negative outcomes and increase the likelihood of future positive outcomes. Even for the most certain positive outcomes, if time permits, we will have an opportunity to consider the possibility that the positive outcome will not happen. The imagination response for such scenarios is sobering. We realize that even at the cost of reducing the predictive accuracy, it is better to lower the subjective probability of a positive outcome in order to mute the bad emotions that might ensue from an unexpected negative outcome.

Support for this view comes from a common mental strategy. When a good outcome seems highly probable, a person will sometimes mentally deny or minimize the likelihood of the positive result. (“Everyone seems certain that Caroline will agree to marry me, but I think there is a real chance that she will say no.”) This conscious mental strategy has the effect of reducing the magnitude of the negative feelings should a negative outcome ensue, while simultaneously increasing the pleasure evoked by a positive outcome. Similarly, people will occasionally exaggerate negative predictions. (“My coat is ruined; I bet that stain will *never* come out.”)

This view is reinforced by the reverse scenarios—found in the experience of *Schadenfreude*—pleasure in others’ misfortune. When a rival seems poised for failure, we may minimize the likelihood of their negative outcome (“Aaron is certain to escape punishment for what he did”). This conscious mental strategy will minimize the disappointment if our rival escapes the negative outcome, and increase the pleasurable *Schadenfreude* should the negative outcome be realized. Conversely, when a rival seems poised for success, we may amplify the likelihood of their success (“Barbara is certain to inherit the house”). This will maximize the *Schadenfreude* if the rival in fact does not succeed, and increase the positively valenced prediction response if the outcome for our rival is positive (“I absolutely *knew* that Barbara was going to get the house”).

Notice that these strategies are necessarily conscious. They supplant the underlying unconscious intuitions about the likelihood of various events and intentionally bias the subjective probabilities in order to maximize positively valenced emotional states. Since these strategies require conscious rumination, a certain amount of time is needed in order for a person to formulate the strategy. When events unfold quickly, there is insufficient time to arrange these strategies. By way of example, consider once again the case of the basketball players predicting the success of sinking baskets. The theory of contrastive valence can be used to make the following prediction. After a basketball player has predicted the likelihood of making a shot, suppose we stop

the player from
“With a mon
the likelihood
reduce the p
interval for c
Moreover, if
the effect wil
that the asse
making the s
order to mini

All of this p
negative emo
appraisal of s
also seem to
Human Under
attenuation o
the “sublime
inconsequen
philosophers
contrast: hap
who fast peri
stood, hunge

Three Flavor

Listening to r
der a joyous
serenity or g
or convey a
laugh out lou

Apart from
wealth of “n
describe but
feelings will
like to focus
and *frisson*. L
tive “ha-ha-h
a person to g
spine and th
described mo

the player from shooting. We then ask the player to pause and reflect again on the shot: "With a moment's thought here, would you like to consider revising your estimate of the likelihood of making this shot?" My prediction is that the players will tend to reduce the probability of making the shot. That is, in general, the longer the time interval for contemplation, the lower the assessed probability of a positive outcome. Moreover, if a large (monetary) reward is offered for completing a shot, I predict that the effect will be magnified: the larger the monetary reward, the greater the likelihood that the assessed probability will drop below the objective empirical likelihood of making the shot. That is, people will tend to adopt an overtly pessimistic attitude in order to minimize possible disappointment and maximize future pleasure.

All of this presumes a "contrastive valence" theory of the magnitude of positive and negative emotions. How we ultimately feel about an event is not simply tied to an appraisal of some absolute benefit or penalty associated with that event. Our feelings also seem to depend on limbic contrast.⁸ This is not a new insight. In his *Essay on Human Understanding*, John Locke spoke of the pleasure arising from the removal or attenuation of pain. Edmund Burke explicitly argued that the aesthetic experience of the "sublime" depends on an initial sensation of fear that is ultimately appraised as inconsequential. Nor do these ideas originate with these eighteenth-century European philosophers. Throughout history, sages have recognized that pleasure is enhanced by contrast: happiness is not so much a state of being as it is a state of becoming. People who fast periodically probably benefit from contrastive valence. As the Spartans understood, hunger is the best spice.

Three Flavors of Surprise

Listening to music can give rise to an enormous range of emotions.⁹ Music can engender a joyous exuberance or transport us into a deep sadness. It can evoke a calm serenity or generate spine-tingling chills. It can lead to a sense of ominous darkness or convey a mysterious sense of awe and wonder. Music can even cause listeners to laugh out loud.

Apart from these strong "whiz-bang" emotions, music is also able to generate a wealth of "microemotions"—more subdued or muted feelings that are not easy to describe but occur more frequently while listening to music. These more nuanced feelings will be considered in later chapters. For the remainder of this chapter I would like to focus on three strong emotions that are closely linked to surprise: *laughter*, *awe*, and *frisson*. *Laughter* is a state of jocular amusement that is characterized by a distinctive "ha-ha-ha" vocalization. *Awe* is a state of astonishment or wonder that may cause a person to gasp. *Frisson* is the feeling you have when "chills" run up and down your spine and the hair stands up on the back of your neck. (All of these responses will be described more carefully later.)

These strong emotions are not common while listening to music, but when they occur they are memorable. Such emotions are typically sparked by particular musical moments or passages. Of course, not all listeners will respond to these passages in the same way, and even a single individual listener may not have the same emotional experience each time the passage is encountered. When they are evoked, however, these emotions are distinctly pleasurable and so listeners often seek out these experiences. Although *laughter*, *awe*, and *frisson* appear to be very different from one another, I will suggest that they share a deep biological kinship. We will see that each of these emotions is related to a violation of expectation. All three are specialized varieties of surprise.

Extreme surprises lead to the characteristic “surprise” facial expression. Interestingly, the “surprise” expression is the same as the one for horror.¹⁰ The common element is simple fear. When in a fearful state, an animal has recourse to one of three behaviors. One response is to stand one’s ground and attempt to defeat, disarm, or neutralize the danger; the goal here is to prevail over the fear-inducing situation. Another response is to run away as quickly as possible; the goal here is to escape the fear-inducing situation. A third response is to hide by remaining perfectly immobile and quiet; the goal here is to escape notice while the fear-inducing situation passes. These three primordial behaviors of fight, flight, and freeze can be observed throughout the animal kingdom. Even insects respond to danger by generating one of these three behaviors.

In everyday life, these responses are rarely manifested as full-blown behaviors. Instead, they are occasionally glimpsed as momentary or fleeting states. In the case of the surprise party, the person being surprised will often exhibit the characteristic “surprise” face with the gaping mouth and wide-open eyes. The “surprised” facial expression can pass in the blink of an eye. It is sometimes so quick, that it is apparent only later when viewed on video. The surprised expression is soon replaced by smiles and laughter as the celebrated individual realizes the true meaning of the unanticipated event. But in that first brief moment of fear lies much that is important.

Laughter—A Pleasurable Panting

In chapter 14 we will see examples of musical passages that cause listeners to laugh out loud. People don’t often laugh while listening to music, but musically induced laughter does occur from time to time. Occasionally, composers explicitly set out to create works that provoke laughter—such as Mozart’s *Ein musikalischer Spass* (“A Musical Joke”), Haydn’s string quartet opus 33, no. 2 (“The Joke”), or Peter Schickele’s wacky *Pervertimento for Bagpipes, Bicycle and Balloons*. In chapter 14 we will see evidence that whenever music causes listeners to laugh, the response can be traced

to a massive musically induced surprise.

What is it? A tempting question. Can we make a “ha-ha-ha” make a “hiss-hiss-hiss” violated expectation? Laughter?

Scientific studies show that laughter is a circuitous, but that laughter are thirty times they are alone to humor. So inferiors are versa. For the depressing: the Laughter is a For example, nervously in

Although laughter itself is innate, the characteristic “ha-ha-ha” laugh makes people make a “chuckling” of giggling, a laughter pattern.

Provine describes the difference between “ha-ha” and “yukking.” If the inhalation is high pitched and closed during “yukking.” If the inhalation is a distinctly soft palet will person laugh

sic, but when they particular musical these passages in the the same emotional evoked, however, k out these experi- from one another, that each of these ialized varieties of

sion. Interestingly, ommon element is of three behaviors. arm, or neutralize ituation. Another o escape the fear- tly immobile and tion passes. These d throughout the ne of these three

blown behaviors. ag states. In the bit the character- The "surprised" o quick, that it is i is soon replaced true meaning of ies much that is

isteners to laugh usically induced xplicitly set out isikalischer Spass Joke"), or Peter apter 14 we will ase can be traced

to a massive violation of expectation. But for now, let's simply accept my claim that musically induced laughter is one of the responses a listener can experience when surprised.

What is it about some violations of expectation that will cause listeners to laugh? A tempting answer is to say that the violations are "humorous." But this begs the question. Consider a more literal version of our question: Why do people sometimes make a "ha-ha-ha" sound in response to violated expectations? Why don't listeners make a "hissing" sound, grit their teeth, or tug on their earlobes? What is it about violated expectations that can evoke the distinctive "ha-ha-ha" vocalization we call laughter?

Scientific studies on laughter can help answer this question—but the story is a little circuitous.¹¹ Perhaps the single most important lesson from research on laughing is that laughter is predominantly a *social* response. Robert Provine estimates that people are thirty times more likely to laugh in the presence of another person than when they are alone.¹² Field studies have established that most laughter is not in response to humor. Social inferiors laugh more in the presence of their social superiors. Social inferiors are also more likely to laugh at the instigation of social superiors than vice versa. For those of us who love to laugh, the scientific research on laughter seems depressing: the principal function of laughter seems to be to dissipate social fears. Laughter is a common response to humor, but humor is not necessary for laughter. For example, people frequently laugh at the misfortunes of their enemies, or laugh nervously in the face of danger.

Although laughter is predominantly a social phenomenon, the laughter response itself is innate rather than learned. All over the world, people laugh with a characteristic "ha-ha-ha . . ."¹³ Even congenitally deaf people who have never heard anyone laugh make the same sound. Of course there are many variations on a theme. Some people make little sound—simply allowing their chest to jiggle in paroxysms of laughter ("chuckling"). Other people squeal, bellow, or roar. Yet others exhibit all manner of giggling, yukking, snickering, and snorting. Despite these variations, the basic laughter pattern remains.

Provine describes laughter as a "punctuated exhaling." The onset-to-onset time between "ha's" occurs at regular intervals of about 210 milliseconds. If the vocalization is high pitched and quiet, the sound is regarded as "giggling." If the mouth remains closed during laughing, the sound is better described as "snickering." If the mouth opens and closes in synchrony with the "ha's" then the sound becomes one of "yukking." If the mouth is rounded and remains open, then the sound is modified to a distinctly Santa-like "ho-ho-ho." Each laugh-phrase is followed by a deep inhalation. If the inhalation relies on the nose alone, then sometimes a snorelike vibration of the soft palet will cause a distinctive "snorting" sound (often to the embarrassment of the person laughing). Sometimes the laughter is preceded by a high-pitched squeal. In

general, however, the basic laughter pattern consists of a punctuated exhaling that occurs at a rate of roughly five times per second.¹⁴

Humans are not the only animals that laugh. Recognizably laughlike responses are also observed in chimpanzees, bonobos, orangutans, and gorillas. For example, tickling a young chimpanzee will typically cause the chimp to produce a rapid "oo-oo-oo-oo" sound. Similar sounds are produced during rough-and-tumble play such as when an animal is being chased by a playmate. Interestingly, the rate of such punctuated breathing is comparable to the rate found in human laughter. However, the laughter of chimpanzees, bonobos, orangutans, and gorillas differs in one important respect from that of humans. Humans laugh by exhaling only. The "oo-oo-oo-oo" sound of nonhuman primates involves a rapid alternation of inhaling and exhaling that doubles the tempo of the vocalizations to about ten per second.¹⁵

Robert Provine has argued that the human exhale-only version of laughter is a recent evolutionary development since the inhale-exhale version is shared by the other primates. Says Provine, "The human variant with its looser respiratory-vocal coupling evolved sometime after we branched from chimpanzees about six million years ago. Evidence of the primacy of the chimp form comes from the identification of chimplike laughter in orangutans and gorillas, apes that split off from the chimpanzee/human line several million years before chimpanzees and humans diverged."¹⁶

The inhale-exhale laughter of chimpanzees, bonobos, orangutans, and gorillas is essentially a form of *panting*. In fact, when Provine played recordings to university students and asked them to identify the sounds, the most common response was to describe the sounds as "panting." Going beyond Provine's research, we might observe that panting is a common component of physiological arousal: panting prepares an animal for physical exertion by drawing in large quantities of oxygen and expelling carbon dioxide. When an animal fails to anticipate an event, this failure represents a potential danger. Like increased heart rate and increased perspiration, panting is a wholly appropriate response to surprise.

There are different types of laughter. *Nervous laughter* tends to occur when we are aware of an impending threat or danger. There is *slapstick laughter* where we laugh at physically awkward or calamitous body movements of others (or sometimes ourselves). *Sadistic laughter* occurs when we laugh at the misfortunes of our enemies. If our enemy is present, we may direct the response *at* the person as *mocking laughter*. *Surprise laughter* tends to occur when an event (such as a bursting balloon) is completely unexpected. *Social laughter* is the sort of polite or gregarious laughter that signals our participation or desired membership in a particular social group. In social laughter, we may be aware that nothing is particularly funny, but we may still laugh as a way of reducing any social tension. Finally, *humor laughter* is an overt form of pleasurable entertainment, usually relying on some form of joke-telling. Humor does

not require I
necessarily i

These diff
is it that all
humor, and
reflex? I thi
Aristotle des
ness that do

Aristotle's
Immanuel K
mation of a
the fast reac

The differ
with risk or
the future
worst in su
inhibits the
arises from
of others. I
College, Lo
someone el
tion respon
the ensuing
same patter
of those we
ourselves. C
by an appr
the situatio
appraisal th

Consider
Pediatricia
to a long g
that towel
How is it t
is the com
followed b
such a resp

There a
guard. The

ed exhaling that

like responses are
 for example, tick-
 e a rapid “oo-oo-
 ible play such as
 e of such punctu-
 er. However, the
 in one important
 re “oo-oo-oo-oo”
 ing and exhaling
 1.¹⁵

ughter is a recent
 by the other pri-
 y-vocal coupling
 nillion years ago.
 tion of chimplike
 mpanzee/human
 .¹⁶

is, and gorillas is
 ngs to university
 response was to
 we might observe
 ting prepares an
 en and expelling
 ilure represents a
 ion, panting is a

cur when we are
 here we laugh at
 : sometimes our-
 of our enemies. If
mocking laughter.
 balloon) is com-
 ous laughter that
 il group. In social
 re may still laugh
 an overt form of
 ling. Humor does

not require laughter (we can find things amusing without laughing). Nor does laughter necessarily indicate humor.

These different forms of laughter would seem to defy any single explanation. What is it that all of these situations share? Why do nervousness, surprise, sadism, slapstick, humor, and social politeness all tend to lead to a characteristic “ha-ha-ha” respiratory reflex? I think that Aristotle already had the answer 2,500 years ago. In his *Poetics*, Aristotle described laughter as “a species of the base or ugly . . . some blunder or ugliness that does not cause pain or disaster.”¹⁷

Aristotle’s view was reiterated by the eighteenth-century German philosopher Immanuel Kant when he characterized laughter as arising from “the sudden transformation of a strained expectation into nothing.” The key here is the contrast between the fast *reaction response* and the slower *appraisal response*.

The different forms of laughter all share two features: (1) Each situation is tinged with risk or fear, although this fear may arise simply because of a failure to anticipate the future (i.e., surprise). Remember that the reaction response always assumes the worst in surprising situations. (2) However, cognitive reflection either eliminates or inhibits the assessment of fear or risk. In the case of slapstick, the fast reaction response arises from *empathy*—the brain’s disposition to “mirror” the psychological experiences of others. For example, research by Tania Singer and her colleagues at University College, London, has shown that similar brain regions are activated when we see someone else experience pain as when we ourselves experience pain.¹⁸ The fast reaction response responds to the physical danger (whether to ourselves or others), but the ensuing cognitive appraisal recasts the apparent danger as inconsequential. The same pattern characterizes *Schadenfreude* when we laugh sadistically at the misfortunes of those we exclude from our social in-group: these are the misfortunes of *others*—not ourselves. Once again, there is a rapid recognition of the existence of harm, followed by an appraisal that we ourselves are not endangered—we might even benefit from the situation. In the case of nervous and social laughter, these rely on a cognitive appraisal that a social superior will not mistreat us, for example.

Consider the simple game of “peek-a-boo.” The game is surprisingly resilient. Pediatrician Dr. Robert Marion describes how his sympathy for a distressed infant led to a long game of peek-a-boo: “I covered my face with a hospital towel and pulled that towel away for nearly three hours, to the delighted squeals of this one-year-old.”¹⁹ How is it that the sudden appearance of a face can cause such delight? Once again, it is the combination of “innocent surprise.” The surprise causes a fast biological alarm, followed by the appraisal that no harm will happen. But how is it possible to sustain such a response for nearly three hours?²⁰

There are excellent reasons why the fast-track brain should not lower its guard. The sole purpose of these reaction responses is to defend against those rare

circumstances that are truly dangerous. The whole fast-track system is designed to tolerate large numbers of false alarms. Unlike the townsfolk in Aesop's fable, the fast-track pathway tends to respond to the cry "wolf" no matter how many times it occurs. The fast-track system maintains its vigilance. It never grows tired of assuming the worst. If the fast-track system did adapt or habituate to all the false alarms, then the reaction responses would not be available for those rare occasions when they are really needed.

Musical surprises fall almost exclusively into the category of innocuous risks.²¹ In generating musical humor, composers are taking advantage of the biology of pessimism. As we have noted, surprise is always a sign of adaptive failure, and so the initial limbic response is necessarily negative. However, the slower appraisal mechanism intercedes and the ensuing contrastive valence results in a broadly pleasant experience.

Laughter's Origin

If laughter is an innate reflex, then laughter must originate as an evolutionary adaptation with its own unique biological history of development. The idea that laughter originated as a type of fear response does not seem to square well with our human experience of humor. Laughing is fun. How is it possible that a species of fear became transmuted into something pleasant? If I might be permitted some evolutionary speculation, I would like to suggest that the development of human laughter might have evolved along the following path:

1. Unvocalized panting occurs in response to surprise. This panting is part of a generalized increase in physiological arousal. Like the gaping mouth of the "surprised" face, panting prepares the animal for action.
2. For highly social animals (like humans and great apes) the biggest dangers come from other members of our species (conspecifics).
3. Threats from other conspecifics also evoke unvocalized panting. The threatening animal recognizes the panting as a successful provoking of a momentary state of fear in the threatened animal. The evoked fear means that the threatened animal has been successfully cowed. Panting becomes a signal of social deference. As an aside here, we might note that dogs exhibit "social panting"—where submissive animals begin panting when a dominant animal (sometimes a human owner) appears.²²
4. Being able to evoke panting in another animal reassures the dominant animal of its dominant status. Similarly, panting in the presence of another animal serves to communicate one's submissiveness. For the submissive animal, this communication is valuable because it establishes the animal's submissive status without having to engage in fighting.

Surprise

5. In order to *ized*—that is, th
of deference or
6. Vocalized pa
7. In some pri
to nondangerou
- origin, so panti
8. In hominids
within a group
- and peaceful so
9. The contrast
ings evokes an
- feelings throug
- evoke laughter.
10. Laughter b
the energy cos
- cient vocalized

Evolutionary
viewed pretty s
behavior we ca
complicated b
luted ways. Th
But as a unive
history.

Awe—Takes Yo

Laughter is no
are making yo
progress fitful.
or two ahead.
standing imm
plunge over th
tion, a more
momentary h

This imagin
need for an in
the often-ove
no useful pur
vides a reserv

5. In order to enhance the communication of deference, panting becomes *vocalized*—that is, the vocal cords are activated. Vocalized panting becomes a specific signal of deference or submissiveness.
6. Vocalized panting generalizes to most surprising circumstances.
7. In some primates, “panting-laughter” is reserved specifically for surprise linked to nondangerous outcomes. In highly socialized animals, most dangers are social in origin, so panting-laughter is commonly associated with social interaction.
8. In hominids, panting-laughter becomes explicitly social. Mutual panting-laughter within a group becomes an important signal of reciprocal alliance, social cohesion, and peaceful social relations.
9. The contrast between negative reaction feelings and neutral/positive appraisal feelings evokes an especially pleasant state. Human culture expands on these agreeable feelings through the advent of “humor” as an intentional activity meant simply to evoke laughter.²³
10. Laughter becomes commonplace in hominid social interaction. In order to reduce the energy cost of laughter, the inhaling–exhaling form is replaced by the more efficient vocalized exhaling (i.e., modern human laughter).

Evolutionary storytelling is fraught with dangers, so the above story should be viewed pretty skeptically. My story is offered only as an illustration of how the innate behavior we call laughter might have evolved from surprise-induced fear. Biology is a complicated business, and most physiological functions develop in strikingly convoluted ways. The actual origin of human laughter is probably much more complicated. But as a universal human reflex, there is no doubt that laughter has an evolutionary history.

Awe—Takes Your Breath Away

Laughter is not the only response that can be evoked by surprise. Imagine that you are making your way through a dense jungle where tangled branches render your progress fitful. The thick vegetation obscures your vision so you can only see a foot or two ahead. Suddenly, you break through a mass of vegetation and find yourself standing immediately on the edge of a high cliff. A few more steps and you would plunge over the precipice. While laughter might be a possible response to this situation, a more likely response is to gasp. A *gasp* is an abrupt inhaling followed by a momentary holding of one's breath.

This imaginary scenario differs from the usual fight-or-flight response. There is no need for an impending expenditure of energy. Instead, the danger is more suited to the often-overlooked *freeze* response. Standing at the cliff's edge, *panting* would serve no useful purpose. But freezing *is* an appropriate response. A single rapid inhale provides a reservoir of oxygen that allows us to hold our breath.

Other situations that might evoke a freeze response are easy to imagine. You might encounter a snake, or a sparking electrical cable, or someone pointing a gun. In Brazil, I once encountered a spider's web the size of my outstretched arms and legs—it stopped me dead in my tracks, and I distinctly recall holding my breath. The enormous web was beautiful—brilliantly illuminated in the sunshine. But it was simultaneously a fearsome sight.

Holding one's breath has several benefits. It reduces movement and sound, which makes it more difficult for a possible predator to see or hear us. Reducing movement and sound also makes it easier for us to listen intently, and to see more clearly. Marksmen are better able to hit the bull's-eye when they stop breathing and shoot between heartbeats. A cricket will merrily chirp away until approached. Then it will become silent until it assumes you have moved away.

The freeze response is most probable when the danger remains fixed. The danger associated with the cliff remains as long as we are near the edge. The danger associated with encountering a snake remains as long as the snake is nearby. Laughter, by contrast, is more likely to occur when an apparent or actual danger rapidly dissolves. The bursting of a balloon represents a momentary rather than sustained danger. I might slip on a staircase, but immediately recover my footing without falling—an event that then results in my laughing. A parent says "boo" to a child, who subsequently erupts in laughter.

In short, laughter is a response to an apparent or momentary danger, whereas the gasp is a response to a sustained danger. Following the gasp, subsequent appraisal of the situation will determine whether the danger is real or "manageable." If the danger is real, then the gasp will be a prelude to sustained fear. If the danger is manageable, then the gasp will be a prelude to *awe*. Wobbling on the edge of a cliff we may experience fear. Standing securely on the edge of a cliff we may experience awe. Being in close proximity to a venomous snake we may experience fear. If the snake is being held by an experienced snake handler then we may experience awe.

Like laughter, the gasp can be vocalized or unvocalized. The unvocalized rapid inhale is the quiet, clandestine form. Silence is an appropriate response to sustained danger. The vocalized "ah!" when we gasp is more unusual, because it is rare for humans to vocalize while inhaling. Vocalizing also makes it more difficult to remain unobserved. But the vocalized form of the gasp is more audible to others and so may have some communicative function. In short, the unvocalized gasp is a self-serving defense response, whereas the vocalized gasp is a more altruistic response that can alert others to potential danger.²⁴

As in the case of laughter, the gasp can be evoked by stimuli that at first appear dangerous, but on reflection are recognized as not actually dangerous. That is, the reaction response is acutely negative, but the appraisal response is either

Surprise

neutral or pleasurable.

Accordingly, it mixes a sense of awe with a sense of good. This is the word "aw" in the word "awful" of positive appraisal. The word "aw" of the word "awful" is *achos*, which follows:

emotion in which one is inspired by deity or by authority or by the sublime

Standing on the edge of a cliff is an opportunity to take a breath away. A good reason for

Frisson—Thrill

Fear can provoke a fight response, by another and one's reaction back down, and the displaying of low-pitched vocalizations all intended to frighten. This includes massive). Cats, end.

All of these reactions can be signaled by the upper cusp of the hairless as man on end—a reflex

Piloerection and hair follicle

imagine. You might
ing a gun. In Brazil,
arms and legs—it
eath. The enormous
was simultaneously

and sound, which
educing movement
o see more clearly.
eathing and shoot
ached. Then it will

fixed. The danger
e danger associated
Laughter, by con-
idly dissolves. The
ed danger. I might
ing—an event that
ubsequently erupts

r danger, whereas
equent appraisal
“manageable.” If
ear. If the danger
on the edge of a
ff we may experi-
experience fear. If
e may experience

invocalized rapid
onse to sustained
use it is rare for
ifficult to remain
thers and so may
o is a self-serving
esponse that can

at at first appear
eagerous. That is,
sponse is either

neutral or positive. It is this contrast that transforms the experience into something pleasurable.

Accordingly, we might characterize awe as a form of pleasurable surprise, one that mixes a sense of apparent sustained danger with an appraisal that the situation is okay or good. This characterization of awe is reinforced by the word’s etymology. In English, the word “awe” traces a circuitous historical path that nicely echoes the combination of positive and negative emotions. My Webster’s dictionary reports the archaic meaning of the word “awe” as “the power to inspire dread.” The word originates in the Greek *achos*, which means pain. Webster’s defines the more modern meaning of “awe” as follows:

emotion in which dread, veneration, and wonder are variously mingled: as 1: fearful reverence inspired by deity or by something sacred or mysterious 2: submissive and admiring fear inspired by authority or power (he stood in ~ of the king) 3: wondering reverence tinged with fear inspired by the sublime

Standing on the edge of the Grand Canyon is both dangerous and a wonderful opportunity to get a good look around. The sight is surely awesome—it takes your breath away. If God is to be both loved and feared, then meeting God would be a good reason for a person to feel awe.

Frisson—Thrills from Chills

Fear can provoke many different types of physiological reaction. When threatened by another animal, we might prepare to *fight* rather than flee or freeze. In the fight response, the first order of business is to produce an aggressive display. By signaling one’s readiness to fight, it is possible that the threatening individual might back down, and so an actual fight can be avoided. Aggressive displays can include the displaying of teeth, making eye contact with the other animal, and generating low-pitched vocalizations. In addition, there are a series of behaviors that are all intended to make the individual appear bigger—and so more intimidating. This includes rearing up (to appear taller) and the bristling of hair (to appear more massive). Cats, by way of example, will arch their backs and make their hair stand on end.

All of these responses are also evident in humans. For example, human aggression can be signaled in the wrinkling of the upper lip, which, if the mouth is open, makes the upper cuspids (or canine teeth) more visible. Although humans are comparatively hairless as mammals go, fear can still cause the hair on the back of your neck to stand on end—a reflex technically known as *piloerection*.

Piloerection also occurs when a person is cold. Shivering causes the skin to tighten and hair follicles to pucker—causing the characteristic “goose flesh” texture. When it

