Viewpoint in and across multimodal artifacts

Barbara Dancygier and Lieven Vandelanotte
University of British Columbia / University of Namur & University of Leuven

Background

This session reflects current trends in cognitive linguistics and beyond, centering on viewpoint and multimodality. Viewpoint was once mainly studied in (typically narrative) discourse from the sentence level up, but recent studies (e.g. Dancygier & Sweetser 2012) have refocused interest both to lower-level constructions marking viewpoint (such as determiners, genitives, polarity and negation markers), and outward, beyond the purely textual, to gesture, sign language, visual artifacts, and various multimodal combinations (e.g. in advertising or comics). This meshes well with the increasingly general recognition that language as a whole is best understood in terms of the interaction between verbal and embodied (kinesic and visual) modalities, and has led to recent work establishing clearly that multimodality in viewpoint is the norm rather than the exception (e.g. Parrill 2012, Green 2014).

Given the recent emergence of numerous forms of communication relying on multiple channels of expression, a theoretical engagement with these issues and the construction of analytical tools is more needed than ever. With this in mind, this session investigates how various expressive modalities complement each other in communication, how they negotiate the varieties of viewpoint (spatial, embodied, gestural, visual, etc.), and what this tells us about viewpoint as a cognitive phenomenon.

The session starts with two papers rethinking some of the theoretical foundations of viewpoint research: Dancygier & Vandelanotte discuss the role of image schematic scaffolding and linguistic frames in the emergence of complex multimodal artifacts (in street art, various text genres, and film), and Feyaerts et al. use a multimodal corpus of face-to-face interaction to enhance our understanding of how conversationalists align their behaviour depending on contextual and social factors. The next set of papers consider whether and how viewpoint phenomena traditionally studied in narratology, such as free indirect discourse, focalization, empathy, dramatic irony, and others, apply beyond purely textual modes. Two of these papers focus on comics, with Borkent looking at how (multi)modal features in comics contribute to various types of multi-viewpoint blends, and Forceville studying the interaction between visual and verbal resources in construing 'metarepresentations' (i.e. representations of what others say, think, perceive, feel, etc.); Sweetser shows how ads subtly prompt us to empathize with a viewpoint through the visual more than the verbal stream; and Tobin studies differences in how story twists (requiring reanalysis of viewpoint) work in prose vs. film, in which the visual and auditory streams come into play. The next two papers analyse aspects of embodiment and viewpoint blending in political settings: Lou analyses the frames and metaphors involved in Hong Kong's "Umbrella Revolution", with the umbrella itself seen as a blend of a shield and a gun, open to ideological use and challenge, and Guilbeault studies gestures that accompany antithesis in political discourse, where the material setting of two podiums equidistant from the centre further enhances the oppositions. This gestural focus is continued in two papers using more experimental data: Rekittke analyses observer vs. character viewpoint in relation to stance in re-enactments of film prompts about a taboo topic, and Mittelberg studies simulated artifact immersion as a viewpoint strategy used in descriptions of different static visuo-spatial prompts (painted scenes and architectural models). The final two papers study different aspects of recent technological innovations in communication modes: Hayler studies the e-reader as multi-modal artifact, showing how the different experience of amateurs and experts produces differently encounterable objects – with different real effects in the world – from the same artefact, and the closing paper by Vandelanotte & Dancygier studies how the textual and visual patterns used in internet memes such as *binders of women* or *said no one ever* are reused and modified across a range of contexts, always driven by new viewpoints, with the ultimate viewpoint usually unstated but emerging from a hierarchical network of evoked viewpoints.

The shared concern of these contributions is to tease out and formulate viewpoint mechanisms across different modalities (verbal, visual, gestural, postural, etc.), be they shared, synchronized, or in some sense modality-specific. These questions are considered across a broad range of data and methodologies, involving existing multimodal artifacts as well as corpus data and experimental 'enactment' tasks. Jointly, the papers afford a better understanding of the interaction between language, embodied communication, material objects and visual artifacts, clarifying the role of viewpoint in the emergence of multimodal forms and allowing a more textured definition of the phenomena involved.

Contributors

Barbara Dancygier and Lieven Vandelanotte. University of British Columbia / University of Namur & University of Leuven. Image-schematic scaffolding in visual and textual artifacts
Kurt Feyaerts, Bert Oben, Ilona Papousek and Helmut Lackner. University of Leuven / University of Leuven / Karl Franzens Universität Graz / Medizinische Universität Graz. Alignment and viewpoint

Mike Borkent. University of British Columbia. Multimodality and multi-viewpoint construction in comics

Charles Forceville. University of Amsterdam. Representation and metarepresentation of thoughts and speech in the medium of comics

Eve Sweetser. University of California, Berkeley. Metaphor and iconicity in advertising: Dividing modalities and conquering the audience?

Vera Tobin. Case Western Reserve University. Viewpoint and sound design in film: Misdirection and re-construal in *The Conversation*

Adrian Lou. University of British Columbia. Viewpoint blending in Hong Kong's Umbrella Revolution

Douglas Guilbeault. University of British Columbia. Opposition and viewpoint in political debate

Linn-Marlen Rekittke. RWTH Aachen University. Viewpoint and stance in gesture: How tabooed discourse content influences speakers' gestural viewpoint in film retellings

Irene Mittelberg. RWTH Aachen University. Experiencing artworks from within: Simulated artifact immersion as viewpoint strategy in transmodal enactments of paintings and architectural sketches

Matt Hayler. University of Birmingham. The same, but different: An ontology of expert and amateur interactions with technology

Lieven Vandelanotte and Barbara Dancygier. University of Namur & University of Leuven / University of British Columbia. Multimodal interaction and viewpoint in internet memes

References

Dancygier, Barbara and Eve Sweetser (eds.). 2012. *Viewpoint in Language: A Multimodal Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, Jennifer. 2014. *Drawn from the Ground: Sound, Sign and Inscription in Central Australian Sand Stories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parrill, Fey. 2012. Interactions between discourse status and viewpoint in co-speech gesture. In Dancygier & Sweetser (eds.). 2012. 97-112.

Image-schematic scaffolding in visual and textual artifacts

Barbara Dancygier and Lieven Vandelanotte
University of British Columbia / University of Namur & University of Leuven

Background

Comparing textual and visual means of expression is often difficult because of the different natural affordances of each medium. However, it seems inherently possible and productive to attempt such comparisons, as they provide more reliable information on the underlying conceptual patterns and the nature of frames evoked. In this paper, we consider one type of image schema (Johnson 1987, Lakoff and Johnson 1999) – a barrier – to uncover its viewpoint potential and the ability to yield richer visual, linguistic or multimodal meaning. We show how such an approach uncovers shared conceptual underpinnings of various forms of expression. We propose the concept of '*image-schematic scaffolding*' as a general strategy: very simple image schemas provide skeletal structure which language users fill in, through frames, metaphors and blends, to yield various creative artifacts across different modalities. Crucially, it is the inherent *viewpoint* potential of image schemas that allows complex creative edifices to be built on the basic scaffolding they provide.

A barrier can schematically be understood as a line separating two regions in space. There are then several ways in which the frame enrichment of the schema yields different viewpointed construals: one can imagine observing the divided regions from 'God's eye view' (cf. Bergen 2012), or align oneself with one side of the barrier. The latter viewpoint implies potential experiences of attempts to cross the barrier or remove it, in order to reach or at least see the other side. This 'cross or remove' construal builds on the primary scene, and thus reaches back to early childhood experiences (cf. Grady 1997, Johnson 1997).

The object that is possibly the most common representation of a barrier is a wall. We will look at various representation of walls and barriers, in texts and in visual forms. We will start with street art examples by Banksy, where images on the Israel/Palestinian territories wall create an illusion of removal of the barrier it constitutes, inviting the viewers to participate in the reconstrual of the wall as 'pliable' or 'crossable'. We will also look at political speeches (especially concerning the Berlin Wall and its removal), examples from poetry (by Robert Frost, where the need to remove barriers is the focus) and a novel (*How to be both* by Ali Smith, where the very nature of the hidden structure of the wall is used as a metaphor for layers of narrative meaning). Finally, we will look at the use of the barrier schema in cinematography of the movie *Babel*, where the concept of a boundary brings together various narrative strands of the movie.

These artifacts jointly reveal the meaning-construction potential of a simple underlying schema. The richness of available meanings – social, cultural, political, and moral – relies in a very basic way on the viewpoint potential of the barrier schema. Importantly, the viewpointed nature of a barrier is what gives the artifacts their meaning. For example, graffiti art uses walls as public surfaces. In contrast, when Banksy paints a window on a wall, he foregrounds the wall as a barrier (rather than a surface) and visually prompts the possibility of the barrier being permeated. Much of the importance of walls refers to embodied concepts such as permeability, mobility, vision, or control (all of which are diminished by barriers). When image schemas interact with these concepts, they provide the conceptual scaffolding various modalities build on to achieve similar meaning-construction goals.

References

Bergen, Benjamin (2012) *Louder than Words: The New Science of How the Mind Makes Meaning*. New York: Basic Books.

Grady, Joseph (1997) Theories are buildings revisited. *Cognitive Linguistics* 8: 267-290.

Johnson, Christopher (1997) Metaphor vs. conflation in the acquisition of polysemy: The case of SEE. In Masako K. Hiraga, Chris Sinha and Sherman Wilcox (eds), *Cultural, Typological, and Psychological Issues in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 155-169.

Johnson, Mark (1987) *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1999) *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Alignment and Viewpoint

Kurt Feyaerts[1], Bert Oben[1], Ilona Papousek[2], Helmut Lackner[2]
[1]University of Leuven, [2]University of Graz

Background

People in face-to-face interaction align their behaviour. Both in speech and in non-verbal behaviour interlocutors copy each other. This has already been demonstrated for a wide variety of multimodal levels including speech, gaze, gesture, posture and facial features. (a.o. Bergmann & Kopp 2012; Louwerse et al. 2012). Most studies on alignment measure repetition of formal linguistic (verbal or not) features. To date, not much attention has been paid to alignment at the *pragmatic* level. In this study we demonstrate how interlocutors align in performing viewpoint shifts, and how this type of pragmatic alignment is related to other types of linguistic or physical alignment

Experimental research in social neuroscience, has provided evidence that phenomena such as alignment, but also empathy or emotional contagion are affected by a wide range of factors: contextual appraisal, the interpersonal relationship between empathizer and other, or the perspective adopted during observation of the other (Decety & Lamm 2006; Langford et al. 2006; Hein & Singer 2008). Gonzalez-Linecres et al. (2013) describe the awareness of a distinction between the experiences and the viewpoint of the self and others as a crucial aspect of empathy, the level of which appears to be modulated by the *contextual factors* familiarity, relatedness, cooperation and shared social goals (similarity).

What the studies above show, is that alignment is not a mere matter of *mechanistic* priming. As indicated by Oben & Brône (2014) "different factors predict different types of alignment". Alignment not only occurs automatically, but also contextual and situational factors determine whether or not interlocutors will align. In the present study we zoom in on the following factors: familiarity and similarity among speakers, speaker dominance and conversation duration. We will do this using a corpus of 35 dyads, each engaged in 22 minutes of spontaneous face-to-face conversation, in which speakers were complete strangers to each other prior to the experiment. The corpus is fully transcribed, tagged for parts of speech and has an interdisciplinary design: it is annotated for verbal, gestural, physiological (heart rate, respiration) and psychological, empathy-related parameters.

On the basis of this particular multimodal corpus we seek converging empirical evidence in linguistics, physiology and psychology for an analysis of alignment as a *process*, in which progressively – as conversation but also the social relationship between the interlocutors unfolds –, more and more contextual factors get entangled in what at first sight may appear to be just a repetition of formal segments on different levels of semiotic expression. As interlocutors, strangers at first, get to know each other better, thus increasing their familiarity and possibly also their cooperation in function of a shared social or communicative goal, they align more. Also, we observe an increasing variety of levels and contents in which alignment is involved. Alignment is not only dynamic quantitatively (more alignment) but also qualitatively (different levels). To be more precise, alignment of viewpoint shift is dependent on the duration of the interaction (more alignment towards the end), but also on social factors (dominant speakers align less; interlocutors that like each other align more). These findings seem to favour a non-mechanistic take on the phenomenon of alignment, with viewpoint as a gateway into the complexity of how alignment operates at different levels, including the pragmatic level.

References

Bergmann, K. & Kopp, S. (2012). Gestural alignment in natural dialogue. *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1326-1331.

Decety, J. & Lamm, C. (2006). Human Empathy through the Lens of Social Neuroscience. *The Scientific World Journal* 6, 1146-1163.

Gonzalez-Liencres, C., Shamay-Tsoory, S. & Brüne, M. (2013). Towards a neuroscience of empathy: Ontogeny, phylogeny, brain mechanisms, context and psychopathology. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 37, 1537-1548.

Hein, G. & Singer, T. (2008). I feel how you feel but not always: the empathic brain and its modulation. *Current Opinions in Neurobiology* 18, 153-158.

Langford, D., Crager, S., Shehzad, Z., Smith, S., Sotocinal, S., Levenstadt, J.,Chanda, M., Levitin, D. & Mogil, J. (2006). Social modulation of pain as evidence for empathy in mice. *Science* 312, 1967–1970.

Louwerse, M., Dale, R., Bard, E., & Jeuniaux, P. (2012). Behavior matching in multimodal communication is synchronized. *Cognitive Science* 36, 1404-1426.

Oben, B. & Brône, G. (2014). Context shapes interactive alignment: the role of cumulative priming. *Leuven Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, 91-113.

Multimodality and Multi-viewpoint Construction in Comics

Mike Borkent
University of British Columbia, Vancouver

Background

As the chapters presented in Dancygier and Sweeter (2012) show, viewpoint is a crucial component of the discussion of embodied meaning across a range of expressive modalities in natural and mediated forms of communication. My presentation will discuss several types of viewpoint construction in the popular medium of comics, which includes graphic novels and comic strips. Comics often present multiple viewpoints simultaneously and multimodally, both within individual panels or in sequences, in a way presenting a mediated and artificial version of some viewpoint constructions found in gesture (Sweetser 2013). I will focus on how the strategic use of modal and multimodal features in comics contribute to specific construals of multiple viewpoints and inform interpretations of characters and events.

To develop my analysis, I will employ the blending framework (Fauconnier and Turner 2002) in conjunction with mental simulation theory (Bergen 2012) to describe how readers simulate modal prompts to develop viewpointed construals of characters and scenes. This method allows for a careful analysis of how viewpoints are established, aligned, complicated, and augmented within single panels and in sequence. My will analyze several different viewpoint constructions to illustrate the complexity of viewpoint cues in these multimodal artifacts. I will outline the basic contributing modal and multimodal features of multi-viewpoint construction in comics, focusing on pictographic conventions, verbal dialogue, and narratorial prompts.

I will analyze an example comic-strip by Johnston (2010) to show how she multimodally develops contrasting viewpoints to construct dramatic irony and viewpoint transformation. I will go on to show how character-specific viewpoints can be externalized and projected into the environment to produce a variety of multi-viewpoint blends that develop elaborate interpretations in the graphic novels and collections by Lemire (2012), Will (2013), and Doucet (1995). These examples will include blends of bird's eye viewpoints with inner monologues, viewpoint elaboration through personification of inanimate environmental features, and visual projection of subjective perceptions onto whole scenes, in which one viewpoint filters and re-construes interpretations of other viewpoints. Many of these multi-viewpoint blends are prompted by instantiations of visual and multimodal metaphors (Forceville 2008) as well as other perceptual cues that facilitate viewpoint construction and characterization. The proposed analyses of multi-viewpoint blends show how meaning is construed through various dimensions of viewpoint interactions, driven both by formal means and linguistic choices. The specific medium of comics informs our understanding of language, as we observe it in ongoing interaction with the attendant visual forms. Importantly, the examples show that viewpoint is a central contributor to the construction of meaning, regardless of the communicative modality or modalities involved.

References

Bergen, Benjamin. 2012. *Louder than Words: The New Science of How the Mind Makes Meaning.* New York: Basic Books.

Dancygier, Barbara, and Eve Sweetser. 2012. *Viewpoint in Language: A Multimodal Perspective.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doucet, Julie. 1995. *My Most Secret Desire.* Montreal: Drawn & Quarterly.

Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner. 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities.* New York: Basic Books.

Forceville, Charles. 2008. "Metaphor in Pictures and Multimodal Representations." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought,* edited by Raymond W. Jr. Gibbs, 462–482. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, Lynn. 2010. *Something Old, Something New: For Better or for Worse, 1st Treasury.* Kansas City: Andrews McMeel.

Lemire, Jeff. 2012. *The Underwater Welder.* Atlanta: Top Shelf Productions.

Sweetser, Eve. 2013. "Creativity across Modalities in View-Point Construction." In *Language and the Creative Mind,* edited by Mike Borkent, Barbara Dancygier, and Jennifer Hinnell. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Will, Elain M. 2013. *Look Straight Ahead.* Saskatoon: Cuckoo's Nest Press.

Representation and metarepresentation of speech, thought, and perspective in the medium of comics

Charles Forceville
University of Amsterdam

Background

Comics draw on the visual and the verbal modality, making it a thoroughly multimodal medium. A central strand of comics research is partly or wholly inspired by cognitive linguistics and relevance theory (e.g. Forceville 2005, 2011, 2014, Forceville and Clark 2014, Yus 2008, Kukkonen 2013, Cohn 2013, Cohn in prep.). As in monomodal written and spoken language, the representation of speech and thoughts in comics is a central issue. Consider the following utterances:

    (1) Lisa: The apple tree is to the right of the barn.
    (2) Lisa: John says the apple tree is to the right of the barn.
    (3) Lisa: John thinks the apple tree is to the right of the barn.

Relevance theory states that utterances such as (2) and (3) show the speaker's "'metarepresentational' ability, i.e. the ability to represent the representations of others" (Clark 2013: 345). Here is another type of metarepresentation:

    (4) Lisa: John sees/hears/smells/feels that the apple tree is to the right of the barn.

While the addressee of (1) knows that the speaker, Lisa, herself is committed to the judgment that the apple tree is to the right of the barn, in (2-4) the speaker reports someone else's (i.e. John's) judgment. In (2-4), the responsibility for stating the correct location of the apple tree increasingly involves Lisa's interpretation of John's perspective on its location – and this interpretation may be wrong, or biased.

In comics this issue is further complicated because salient information about "saying/thinking/ perceiving that …" can be conveyed verbally, visually, or in their combination. At the highest level, the comics reader will of course postulate an agency that is responsible (as "Lisa" is in [1]) for the information conveyed in the two modes – namely that of the creator of the comics. That is, there is a narrating agency that 'says' verbally and visually: "the apple tree is to the right of the barn." But this narrating agency may metarepresent this information via a character, and this may involve further levels of embedding representation.

In this paper I will analyse panels from various comics sources to inventory which visual resources play a role in metarepresentations, and the degree to which these depend on interaction with the verbal mode. These resources include point-of-view shots and body postures as well as non-verbal information in characters' text balloons. The findings will show that, and how, there are multimodal and purely visual equivalents for "thinking/perceiving that …" and even for "*saying* that …"

The broader interest of the paper is that considering "metarepresentations" in visual and multimodal modes helps expand our understanding of phenomena that have traditionally been seen as belonging exclusively to the domain of the verbal. Adopting cognitive linguistic and relevance-theoretical approaches for the study of comics shows how these models contribute to our understanding of visual and multimodal discourses. This will benefit both the theorization of such discourses and help develop these hitherto mainly language-oriented models.

Metaphor and iconicity in advertising viewpoint: Dividing modalities and conquering the audience?

Eve Sweetser,
University of California, Berkeley

Background

It is recognized (e.g. Fauconnier and Turner 2001, Forceville 1994) that advertising involves creative combinations of visual and linguistic modalities. This paper analyzes some "division of labor" between modalities in building iconic and metaphoric advertising blends, in a corpus largely taken from on-line access to American print and television ads. What gets put into language, and what gets put into pictures? And how are ads special? Advertisers quite frequently prefer source-domain visuals combined with target-domain language, simply because pictures are not legally subject to the same constraints on truth or responsibility as language. A video ad for Sharron Engle's U.S. Senate campaign in Nevada uses relatively neutral language (no

racial slurs) to advocate limiting illegal immigration; the accompanying video track shows apparently Hispanic men, carrying machine guns and walking through broken cement walls. The source-domain inferences are vividly present, but the metaphor (possibly OUR COUNTRY IS A HOME, ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS ARE VIOLENT HOME-INVADERS?) is never put into words,

nor is it anywhere stated even that the depicted men are criminal, much less that they are to be taken as categorically metonymic for Hispanic immigrants in general. So Engle could not be charged with making quite such an emotional claim.

Often more effective, however, is fuller integration of visual and textual blends, with both domains present in both modalities. In a successful Apple television ad sequence, a cool young black-t-shirted guy says, "I'm a Mac," and a dorky non-cool guy in a sports jacket says, "I'm a PC." Metonymically, the two characters evoke stereotypical frames of both the relevant corporate employees and the relevant customers. Metaphorically, as stated, they are the computers; the PC guy, for example, stops talking at one point and the Mac guy helpfully calls on IT to "reboot" him. (Note, however, that despite the linguistic overtness of the mappings, Mac ads would not want to say in words that PCs in general are unreliable; this metonymy is very strongly implicated, but unstated for good reason.) Such relatively balanced blends are not specific to advertising at all:

political cartoons frequently show a visual blend of source and target domains, with linguistic labels.

Crucially, in both of these situations, the video track is strongly viewpointed, in a way that the linguistic track can avoid. Engle's prose is pretending to be a "balanced" viewpoint on immigration; the Mac ad starts with the two characters saying in language that they are friends and can work together (e.g., within the metaphor, they can both use Microsoft programs). But viewers can see from the start that the machine-gun-toting characters are scary to them, just as they know that the "Mac guy" is cool, while the "PC guy" is dorky and nervous. Advertisers strongly intend to advocate a particular viewpoint, but of course they don't want viewers to be too aware of their advocacy; hence overtly stated linguistic viewpoint is not ideal, while more implicit visually presented viewpoint is more effective.

Viewpoint and Sound Design in Film:
Misdirection and Re-Construal in *The Conversation*

Vera Tobin
Case Western Reserve University

Background

This paper takes up a particularly narrative viewpoint phenomenon: the case of story twists that hinge on the re-analysis of what, or whose, viewpoint should be associated with a given element in the narrative. Stories can and very often do build surprises by encouraging audiences to attribute certain assertions, presuppositions, and evaluations to an "objective" or base-level perspective, only to reveal later on that these elements should be attributed only to the mistaken or deceptive viewpoint of a particular character. This happens commonly in written narratives, but also in drama and film. Film is quite different from purely linguistic narratives in terms of when and how it is obligatory to associate a given element explicitly with a single coherent viewpoint, and in how it shifts between character and observer viewpoints. The orientation and movements of the camera's "gaze," dialogic speech, voice-over speech, non-verbal auditory elements, and the timing of edits can all be more or less overtly associated with the viewpoint of a particular individual, and their viewpoints can track together or separately.

Francis Ford Coppola's film *The Conversation* (1974) famously capitalizes on these complexities to create its climactic surprise. The film centers on a surveillance expert, Harry Caul, who is working on a particularly difficult piece of audio reconstruction. For the first third of the film, the crucial snippet is indecipherable. We see and hear the process of juxtaposing and combining the information from different tapes, until words emerge from the muddle. Later, in the film's final moments, Harry realizes that his interpretation was wrong, and we hear (as he does) a new version of the recording. As the film's sound designer, Walter Murch, said in an interview (Ondaatje & Murch 2002), the audience suddenly learns that the film has been "wholly and singularly made from Harry's point-of-view," when "most unexpectedly, we discover that Harry has—all along—mentally altered the cadence of the line."

The degree to which viewers judge this twist to be fair play or a cheat varies considerably; I will discuss why and how this is the case, and how it relates to similar viewpoint construals in prose. This paper will look at how viewpoint blends, shifts, and distinctions between the "viewpointed" and "non-viewpointed" (cf. Dancygier & Sweetser 2012) status of elements in the visual and auditory stream in film can work together to create this effect, and how these are and are not analogous to similar effects of unreliable narration, focalization, and free indirect discourse in prose. I will compare three increasingly multimodal and indirect examples of this maneuver, moving from represented viewpoints in a purely linguistic mode to their analogues in film:

(1)   How misleading evaluations and attributions can be embedded in a first-person narrative, through both presuppositions and entailments: an example from Elizabeth George's *A Great Deliverance*;

(2)   Similar effects achieved through free indirect discourse: an example from John Le Carré's *The Spy Who Came in From the Cold*; and

(3)   The case of *The Conversation*.

References

Dancygier, B, and Sweetser, E. (2012). *Viewpoint in Language: A Multimodal Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ondaatje, M. & Murch, W. (2002). *The Conversations: Walter Murch and the Art of Editing Film*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf.

Viewpoint Blending in Hong Kong's Umbrella Revolution

Adrian Lou
University of British Columbia

Background

Unlike Occupy Wall Street and other recent demonstrations, the ongoing suffrage protests in Hong Kong have been defined by one symbolic object: the umbrella. "The Umbrella Revolution" received its name after images of protesters using umbrellas to shield themselves from police tear gas and pepper spray proliferated online. This paper assesses the multimodal depictions of the umbrella (the textual and visual artifacts disseminated online). I examine how these multimodal entities are informed by a set of conceptually blended viewpoints, which incrementally modify the ways in which the material object of the umbrella can be used, both physically and ideologically, as a symbol of resistance.

First, I argue that the media's textual and visual evocation of the Tiananmen Square Massacre and the iconic photo of the "Tank Man" provide foundational frames to construe the images of the Hong Kong protests. Both "The Tank Man" and the photos of the Umbrella Revolution highlight a common image schema of blockage (an average citizen standing against a conspicuously stronger militarized force). However, the parallels are also solidified by the media's labeling of one protester as the "Umbrella Man" which works to multimodally establish, and perhaps limit, the viewpoints available to interpret the images of the events. Much artwork created since has integrated Tiananmen Square imagery.

Second, I view the umbrella as a conceptual blend (Fauconnier and Turner 2002) of a shield and a gun, with which it shares many physical and functional qualities. This visual blend gives the umbrella new affordances, enabling it to be construed as a symbol of defiance or victory when held up high, and as a harmless, makeshift and precarious shield when positioned in front of the body. The fact that the umbrella is, of course, not a gun makes these bold gestures peaceful ones.

Third, I unpack the multiplicity of viewpoints (Dancygier and Sweetser 2012) embedded in the visual representations of the umbrella by targeting specifically their frames and metaphors. For instance, the umbrella embodies the unity of people (protesters) under one shared environment (ideological belief). Moreover, the umbrella is a viewpointed object that places the umbrella user in an unwelcoming outside space (the public demonstration). The lack of movement exhibited by an umbrella user (the occupation of streets with umbrellas), furthermore, suggests the user is persevering through harsh conditions (lack of suffrage and democracy) and waiting for the cessation of such conditions (the implementation of suffrage and the resignation of Hong Kong's Chief Executive).

Lastly, I explore the ways in which viewpoint blending is used politically to rhetorically control the discursive message of the protests. I analyze the Hong Kong government's attempt to challenge the umbrella by inserting new construals of viewpoints (umbrella as a dangerous weapon) to subvert the momentum of the movement. Ultimately, the Umbrella Revolution, I contend, is an illustrative case that demonstrates how, in the age of new media technology, frames and viewpoints of material objects are not only being constantly created but also manipulated and re-appropriated to drive or challenge social movements.

References

Dancygier, Barbara, and Eve Sweetser. 2012. *Viewpoint in Language: A Multimodal Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner. 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Opposition and Viewpoint in Political Discourse

Douglas Guilbeault.
University of British Columbia

Background

Politicians are under immense pressure to defend their viewpoint, over and against the viewpoints of their opponents. Out of these pragmatic conditions emerge a unique set of multimodal techniques for opposing multiple viewpoints. While verbally expressing multiple viewpoints, both their own and others, politicians will simultaneously express multiple viewpoints in the gestural stream. Expressive choices in each modality combine to frame each viewpoint with respect to each other, forming a dynamic, crossmodal system. To outline the rhetorical affordances available to this system, I examine the multimodal delivery of *antithesis*, a rhetorical figure wherein contrastive terms are placed in close proximity, within roughly parallel syntax (Fahnestock 1999).

Consider the following antithesis from Obama's *A More Perfect Union* speech: "Conservative commentators built entire careers unmasking bogus claims of racism while dismissing legitimate discussions as mere political correctness or reverse racism" (2008, 23:36). Here *unmasking bogus* is antithetically opposed to *dismissing legitimate*. At the verbal level, we observe multiple viewpoints: Obama reflects an evaluative stance in his lexical choice of *bogus* and *legitimate*, while also referring to his opponents' lexical choice of *political correctness* and *reverse racism*. At the gestural level, however, we observe several techniques for characterizing these viewpoints. For instance, Obama uses his gestures to pair *bogus* and *legitimate* with polar regions of space – bogus with right, legitimate with left. Then, when delivering the words of his opponents, he returns to his right hand in the right space. Doing so allows him to link his opponents' words to the same space as *bogus,* consequently casting a negative valence upon them that stems from his viewpoint. This is one of many rhetorical strategies that rely upon elaborate crossmodal coordination.

Opposition is one of the most fundamental relationships in human thought, and several linguistis have grounded its structure in the body (Turner 1991; Jeffries 2010; Israel 2011). I incorporate gesture into these models to expose how viewpoint intermingles with opposition during communication. In recent years, a dynamic model of metaphorical gestures has begun to account for how gesture modifies the use of embodied structures in abstract thought (Müller 2008). In this paper, I discuss how gestures modify embodied oppositions to channel how they map onto abstract oppositions, *in accord with the speaker's viewpoint*. That is, I argue that viewpoint operates as a dynamic constraint on the online crossmodal construction of oppositional meaning. Specifically, I discuss a range of gestural parameters that allow Obama to characterize his antithesis in terms of his viewpoint – for example, by pairing positive words with one hand and negative words with the other, he reflects an emotional alignment (Casasanto 2010); and by varying the distance between the hands, he stresses a particular degree of contrast (Sweetser 1998; Casasanto 2008). These parameters and several others illuminate core dimensions of opposition and its cognitive instantiation, while also shedding light on why it has served, throughout history, as a persuasive technique.

Altogether, my paper shows (1) how embodied oppositions are dynamically interpreted in the context of viewpoint, (2) how multiple viewpoints are interrelated in crossmodal settings, and (3) how modalities interact to construct viewpoint in a rhetorical manner.

References

Casasanto, D. 2008. Similarity and proximity: When does close in space mean close in mind? *Memory & Cognition 36* (6), 1047-1056.

Casasanto, D. 2009. The Embodiment of Abstract Concepts: Good and Bad in Left and Right Handers. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 138*(3), 351-367.

Israel, M. 2011. *The Grammar of Polarity*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fahnestock, J. 1999. *Rhetorical figures in science*. New York: Oxford University Press

Jeffries, L. 2010. *Opposition in Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Müller. Cornelia. 2008b. *Metaphors Dead and Alive, Sleeping and Waking: A Dynamic View*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Obama, B. 2008. *A More Perfect Union*. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pWe7wTVbLUU

Sweetser, E. 1998. Regular metaphoricity in gesture: bodily-based models of speech interaction. *Actes du 16e Congrès International des Linguistes* (CD-ROM), Elsevier.

Turner, M. 1991. *Reading minds*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Viewpoint and stance in gesture: How tabooed discourse content influences speakers' gestural viewpoint in film retellings

Linn-Marlen Rekittke
RWTH Aachen University

Background

This research investigates how a speaker's stance towards a tabooed topic may affect her gestural viewpoint strategies in multimodal discourse. A Ugandan short film revolving around the topic of adultery here serves as the stimulus of a narration task in which bilingual subjects retell the film in the two languages they speak natively. In the analysis of the retellings, special attention was paid to: a) how the speaker's attitude towards critical contents is expressed through communicative action (Kendon 2004, Debras 2013); and b) how gestural viewpoint and the use of gesture space provide insights into the construal of these contents for communication (McNeill 1992; Dancygier & Sweetser 2012; Stec 2013).

Besides linguistic markers of viewpoint, co-speech gestures may also function as indices of conceptual viewpoint (Parrill 2012; Sweetser 2012). When employing observer viewpoint (OVPT), the speaker may gesturally profile schematic, spatial information of a given scene or relations holding between elements. By contrast, when employing character viewpoint (CVPT) the character's body is mapped partially or entirely onto the narrator´s body. That is, the speaker re-enacts the character's actions from a first-person perspective through embodiment (Stec 2013). So-called *dual viewpoint* gestures may profile these two different perspectives simultaneously (McNeill 1992). Parrill (2012) further identified gestures signaling *narrator viewpoint* as metanarrative gestures with metaphoric dimension: while verbally describing a given scene, the speaker presents the referent in the form of an imagined object on a palm-up open hand to the listener.

Parrill (2010) suggests that event structure motivates the choice of viewpoint. For example, movement trajectories primarily evoke OVPT, whereas other aspects such as handling an object, use of the torso, and emotional state or affect predominantly induce CVPT. Using an Ugandan short film with human actors as stimulus material, the present study investigates whether tabooed discourse *contents* may influence the speakers' use of gestural viewpoint. 30 bilingual native speakers of both Luganda and Ugandan English were asked to retell the film once in each language (Author 2012). The analysis focuses on the recounts of a film sequence featuring a scene of adultery, involving two characters in an emotional state, moving bodies and heads, and the handling of an object.

The results of the analysis resonate with Parrill's (2010) findings for most of the film retellings except for the descriptions of the taboo scene. In the English narrations, OVPT was found to be the preferred strategy of gestural construal of problematic discourse contents, followed by narrator viewpoint. In the Lugandan data, narrator viewpoint was predominantly used; OVPT was employed significantly less. In both languages only few cases of CVPT or dual viewpoint gestures were found, predominantly in the stage-setting parts of the narration not involving taboo discourse. The findings thus suggest that tabooed discourse content may predispose narrators to adopt OVPT or narrator viewpoint in their gestures. Through distancing themselves from the described scene using OVPT or narrator viewpoint, speakers take a neutral or distanced position towards the content. By contrast, through adopting CVPT when reenacting parts of a film scene, speakers include themselves in the narration and do not distance themselves from the discourse contents. Overall, this study shows that speakers' stance toward discourse contents may shape their viewpoint practices.

References

Dancygier, B. & Sweetser, E. (Eds.) (2012). *Viewpoint in language: A multimodal perspective.* Cambridge UP.

Debras, C. (2013). *Multimodal stancetaking in videotaped corpus of discussions about the environment in British English.* Doctoral Thesis, Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3 University, France.

Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visual action as utterance.* Cambridge UP.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought.* University of Chicago Press.

Parrill, F. (2010). Viewpoint in speech-gesture integration: Linguistic structure, discourse structure, and event structure. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 25 (5), 650-668

Parrill, F. (2012). Interaction between discourse status and viewpoint in co-speech gesture. In: B. Dancygier & E. Sweetser (Eds.), *Viewpoint in language: A multimodal perspective.* Cambridge UP, 97-112.

Rekittke, L.-M. (2012). *Geste und Tabu. Multimodale und figurative Diskursstrategien in Erzählungen in Englisch und Luganda.* M.A.- Thesis, RWTH Aachen University.

Stec, K. (2013). Meaningful shifts: A review of *viewpoint* markers in co-speech gesture and sign language. *Gesture* 12(3), 327-360.

Sweetser, E. E. (2012). Viewpoint and perspective in language and gesture, from the Ground down. In: B. Dancygier & E. E. Sweetser (Eds.), *Viewpoint in Language: A Multimodal Perspective.* Cambridge UP, 1-24.

Experiencing artworks from within: Simulated artifact immersion as viewpoint strategy in transmodal enactments of paintings and architectural sketches

Irene Mittelberg
RWTH Aachen University

Background

Viewpoint, a flexible construal operation, may shape expressions and discourse structures in spoken and signed languages, as well as other modalities and media (e.g., Dancygier & Sweetser 2012). Being indexically anchored in rich semiotic contextures (Mittelberg & Waugh 2014), gestures and full-body enactments tend to reflect perspectivation: one may, e.g., describe an experience or film scene from within by adopting *character viewpoint*, or from a distance by assuming *observer viewpoint* (McNeill 1992). Communicative action typically not only exhibits subjective aspects of the gesturer's own bodily and mental disposition and what she profiles as particularly relevant; it also embodies others' experiences and perspectives intersubjectively. Speakers of different languages have been observed to combine multiple, often shifting viewpoints on a given scene using various viewpoint markers regardless of whether the scene is something they witnessed first-hand, part of a story told to them, or of an artifact such as a cartoon or a novel (e.g., Parrill 2009; Sweetser 2012; Stec 2013).

Exploring the transmodal dimensions of *simulated artifact immersion*, this paper investigates viewpoint strategies speakers employ when combining speech, manual gestures, full-body postures and actions when dynamically describing static visuo-spatial artifacts such as paintings and architectural sketches. The term *transmodal* goes back to Krois' (2011: 218) ideas on the connection between embodiment and enactivism in the visual arts, particularly to his claim that for the beholder images are not simply visual but transmodal phenomena (see also Johnson 2007). *Simulated artifact immersion* here is understood as a viewpoint technique by which speakers submerge into their mental representation of an artifact, e.g. through viewing and experiencing a painted scene or architectural sketch/model from within – without any artifact-inherent narrative structure to fall back on.

The first data set consists of multimodal American English descriptions of paintings by Paul Klee, in which human-like figures take center stage. In their descriptions from memory, participants elaborate the imagined scenarios through creatively interacting with the affordances offered by the image-internal elements and environments (Mittelberg 2013). Crucially, they systematically perform viewpoint shifts when – after detailing the composition and background of a given painting from observer viewpoint – they begin to describe the figures in the painting from character viewpoint, thus imitating their posture and enacting what they are wearing, doing and perhaps sensing from this picture-internal vantage point. In the second data set (multimodal German discourse), architecture students simulate moving through imagined spatial structures and landscapes that they either have already designed or that they see emerging in front of their mental eye while communicating their ideas in the early stages of the design process. Besides viewpoint shifts, varying techniques and degrees of simulated artifact immersion could be observed.

Interacting embodied operations such as gestural simulation (e.g., Hostetter & Alibali 2008), abstraction, metonymy and metaphor are discussed throughout the paper, while trying to reconstruct complex embodied cognitive-semiotic processes of imagining, conceptualizing, representing, and creating artifacts in an experientially grounded, multimodal fashion.

References

Dancygier, B. & E. E. Sweetser (Eds.) (2012). *Viewpoint in Language: A Multimodal Perspective*. Cambridge UP.

Hostetter, A. B. & M. W. Alibali (2008). Visible embodiment: Gestures as simulated action. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 15(3), 495-514.

Johnson, M. (2007). *The Meaning of the Body: Aesthetics of Human Understanding*. Chicago UP.

Krois, J. M. (2011). *Körperbilder und Bildschemata. Aufsätze zur Verkörperungstheorie ikonischer Formen*, ed. by H. Bredekamp & M. Lauschke. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago UP.

Mittelberg, I. (2013). Balancing acts: Image schemas and force dynamics as experiential essence in pictures by Paul Klee and their gestural enactments. In: M. Bokrent, B. Dancygier, & J. Hinnell (Eds.), *Language and the Creative Mind*. Stanford: CSLI, 325-346.

Mittelberg, I. & L. R. Waugh (2014). Gestures and metonymy. In: C. Müller, A. Cienki, E. Fricke, S.H. Ladewig, D. McNeill & J. Bressem (Eds.), *Body – Language – Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction (38.2.)*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1747–1766.

Parrill, F. (2009). Dual viewpoint gestures. *Gesture* 9 (3), 271–289.

Stec, K. (2013). Meaningful shifts: A review of viewpoint markers in co-speech gesture and sign language. *Gesture* 12 (3), 327–360.

Sweetser, E. E. (2012). Viewpoint and perspective in language and gesture, from the Ground down. In: B. Dancygier & E. E. Sweetser (Eds.), *Viewpoint in Language: A Multimodal Perspective*. Cambridge UP, 1-24.

The Same, but Different: An Ontology of Expert and Amateur Interactions with Technology

Dr. Matt Hayler
University of Birmingham

Background

This paper aims to investigate the ways in which prior experience impacts upon our reception of (our *reading* of) our material technologies. By focusing on the distinction between amateur and expert experience with e-readers as distinctive multi-modal artefacts, the paper demonstrates how the perspectives that amateur and expert users take results in the production of ontologically discrete objects – in a real way the same Kindle is a different thing to the first-time novice and to the "switched-on" power user and this is a product of the viewpoints that they are able to adopt. The phenomenological philosopher Edmund Husserl (see e.g. 2002) describes the appearance of objects as products of both immediate perception and co-present "adumbrations" that exist beyond the horizon of our current experience (e.g. the back of the iPad is part of my perception of the device even if I'm currently viewing it from the front; I expect it to be there and I'm not surprised when I change my view and see that it is). Experience fleshes out these adumbrations, challenging the idea of viewpoint as being simply about encountering what's in front of us - viewpoint also includes what we know to be missing. Following this lead, the proposed paper will offer an ontological underpinning for understanding the impact on adumbrated viewpoint of the always-combined forces of culture, embodiment, materiality, milieu, and the deployment of artefacts (Author 2015).

Amateurs and experts produce differently encounterable objects from the same artefact, objects with different real effects in the world. The amateur user finds the Kindle cumbersome and complex without knowing all of its parts; the expert user finds it simple, or at least knows it quirks; the engineer knows its guts and why it might not be working; the programmer knows the layers of code that manifest a novel on screen – four different objects (one to be frustratingly read, one to be usefully read, one to be built and fixed, and one to be written on), but always a single artefact. In exploring this distinction in perspective and practice, the approach taken will be broadly post-phenomenological (see e.g. Ihde 2009 and Verbeek 2005), but will also draw on challenges to the phenomenological tradition from recent object-oriented philosophy (see Harman e.g. 2010) and cognitive science. These fields are each impacted, however, by paying attention to how language, metaphor, and embodiment intertwine in our encounters with technology.

That language plays a role in the ways in which we see the world is one of the fundamental insights of cultural criticism – cultural forces shape our perception of our environments, our being, and the status of our fellow humans. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, and linguistic relativism more broadly, have been problematic themes in cognitive science (to say the least!), but a recent thread of empirical studies has returned to considerations of language's explicit (and measurable) priming of action and perception (e.g. Landau et al 2010). Similarly the role of gesture and haptics in human encounters have been theorised and tested (e.g. Symes et al 2011, Dotov et al 2010), and, in response to such research, cognitive linguistics has expanded the study of language to include a vital embodied component. The role of metaphor, as a nexus of language and embodied concern (see, e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 1999), offers further evidence for the shaping of perception through forces which always have this dual tension of shifting culture and unavoidable (if mediated) material reality.

The proposed paper aims to demonstrate a fundamental, i.e. ontological approach to the linguistic, more broadly metaphoric, and embodied effects upon viewpoint that we see in the use of artefacts, effects that stem from our prior experience and expertise.

References:

Dotov, Dobromir G., Lin Nie, and Anthony Chemero. "A Demonstration of the Transition from Ready-to-Hand to Unready-to-Hand." *PLoS ONE* 5.3 (2010). Web. 2 Jul. 2010.

Harman, Graham. *The Quadruple Object*. Winchester: Zero Books, 2010. Print.

Hayler, Matt. *Challenging the Phenomena of Technology*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2015. Print.

Husserl. Edmund. *Ideas*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Ihde, Don. *Postphenomenology and Technoscience: The Peking University Lectures*. New York: SUNY Press, 2009. Print.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic, 1999. Print.

Landau AN, L. Aziz-Zadeh, R.B. Ivry. "The Influence of Language on Perception: Listening to Sentences About Faces Affects the Perception of Faces." *Journal of Neuroscience*. 30 (2010): 15254–15261. Web. 30 Sept. 2014.

Symes, Ed et al. "When Motor Attention Improves Selective Attention: The Dissociating Role of Saliency." *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 63.7 (2010): 1387-1397. Web. 24 Feb. 2011.

Verbeek, Peter-Paul. *What Things Do*. University Park: U of Pennsylvania P, 2005. Print.

Multimodal interaction and viewpoint in internet memes

Lieven Vandelanotte and Barbara Dancygier
University of Namur & University of Leuven / University of British Columbia

Background

Internet memes have become a pervasive form in on-line communication (Shifman 2013, Wiggins and Bowers 2014). Given their increasing role in structuring interaction, it is time to consider the way they function in communication as multimodal artifacts. While existing descriptions have focused mainly on issues of definition, genre and spread, we show how their use of linguistic forms and images creates viewpointed dimensions of interaction.

What distinguishes memes from many other forms of creative expression is their interactive character. Typically, a meme starts with a popular artifact (e.g., an ad, a quote or a song), which becomes recognizable to a group of users and thus carries a frame (Fillmore 1982) that can then be built on. The frame is then reused through adding text, rephrasing, substitution, extension, etc. We show how such edits are driven by new viewpoints and how the resulting emergent viewpoint blends constitute a form of ongoing interaction among users who only share an internet medium – an interactive website, a form of social media, etc. Memes go 'dormant' for a while, but when a new interesting event attracts the users' attention, they are quickly re-construed to comment on the recent situation. As such, they provide a multimodal version of a long-distance conversation, specifically through proposing new (often humorous) viewpoints.

In the talk, we will closely analyze two series of memes. One emerged after the unfortunate line of Mitt Romney's, about *binders of women*. In itself a not-too-graceful metonymy, the phrase went through a long chain of viewpoint reframings, generally addressing the social status of women, but primarily 'viewpointing' Romney's words in increasingly extreme ways. The shifts included additions of new lines, old meme visuals and new visuals, songs, while evoking various strongly viewpointed frames of the roles women play in various situations.

The second meme, "said no-one ever" is mostly textual and in its very form contrasts two viewpoints – of someone who might say, for instance, *Your Facebook status really made me change my political views*, and then another person who comments with the stable *said no-one ever* line. While presenting two contrasting viewpoints in the meme itself, new iterations currently circulating on the web also start off with other viewpoints, for instance focusing on stereotypes (as in *said no student ever, said no TSA agent ever*) or subverting the expected format (e.g. *says everyone all of the time; (says) every digital language learner ever*).

Jointly, examples such as these and others we will touch on reveal many salient features of meme communication. Some of the observations we will discuss are as follows: a) the textual form of memes gradually achieves constructional status, as do some visual patterns (such as the division of labour between 'top text' and 'bottom text'), and the construction is frame-metonymic (Sweetser and Fauconnier 1996) for the entire interaction and viewpoint pattern; b) subsequent steps in the re-construal of the meme (visual or textual or both) constitute steps in a (rather lighthearted) discussion of how the current event is to be understood; and c) the formal changes and the flow of interactive re-construal are driven entirely by viewpoint – the nature of the matter under discussion does not change. Memes thus provide a window to a better understanding of viewpoint in interaction.

References

Fillmore, Charles J. 1982. Frame semantics. In The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.), *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co., 111-137.

Shifman, Limor (2013) *Memes in Digital Culture*. Harvard, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Sweetser, Eve and Gilles Fauconnier (1996) Cognitive links and domains: Basic aspects of mental space theory. In Gilles Fauconnier and Eve Sweetser (eds), *Spaces, Worlds and Grammar*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1-28.

Wiggins, Bradley E. and G. Bret Bowers (2014) Memes as genre: A structurational analysis of the memescape. *New Media & Society* May 26, 2014, doi: 10.1177/1461444814535194.