

Science and Literary Criticism

A symposium at 20 St Giles, St John's College, Oxford

12 April 2012

Programme

An event generously funded by the St John's College Research Centre
in collaboration with the Balzan Interdisciplinary Seminar 'Literature as an Object of
Knowledge', directed by Professor Terence Cave

Convenors: Dr Emily T. Troscianko (St John's College, Oxford)
and Dr Michael Burke (University College Roosevelt Academy, Utrecht University)
Moderator (discussion sessions): Professor Terence Cave (St John's College, Oxford)

- 9.00-9.25** Registration
- 9.25-9.30** *Michael Burke and Emily Troscianko: Welcome*
- 9.30-10.30** *Plenary session*
 - *Raymond Gibbs: Moving Bodies in the Discourse, Enchanting Literature in the Mind*
- 10.30-11.00** Coffee, Kendrew Quad Café
- 11.00-12.50** *Session 1: Literary Theory, Science, and Philosophy*
 - *Marcus Hartner: Reductionism, Speculation and Explanatory Levels: Reflections on Cognitive Literary Studies*
 - *Gregory Currie: On Living in an Ugly Country*
 - *Frank Hakemulder: Bringing Literature Closer to its Readers: An Empirical Perspective on Foregrounding*
 - *Catherine Emmott: “I”, “you”, and “he/she” in Narratives and Other Texts: Psychological and Stylistic Perspectives*
- 12.50-13.50** Lunch
- 13.50-15.40** *Session 2: Literature and Empirical Study*
 - *Francesca Stregapede: Can Poetry Be Investigated Empirically? An Online Reading Study on the Processing of Metaphorical Juxtapositions in Original and Modified Haiku*
 - *Anežka Kuzmičová: Imagery from Visual Description and the Predicament of Prediction*
 - *Stephen Hinde: Presence While Watching Movies and Reading*
 - *Emily Troscianko: Testing the Kafkaesque*
- 15.40-16.10** Tea, Kendrew Quad Café
- 16.10-17.40** *Session 3: Literary Characters and Readers*
 - *Alan Palmer: Perspectives on Social Minds*
 - *Michael Burke: Measuring the Feeling of Reading: The Kairos Conundrum*
 - *Karin Kukkonen: Comeuppance, Irony and Plot Development in Ann Radcliffe’s Novels*
- 17.40-17.50** *Emily Troscianko and Michael Burke: Concluding remarks*
- 17.50-19.00** Drinks reception, St Giles House (16 St Giles)
- 19.15** Conference dinner, St Giles House

PRESENTATION ABSTRACTS

Plenary Session

Raymond Gibbs: Moving Bodies in the Discourse, Enchanting Literature in the Mind

Our meaningful experiences of literature are mostly explained as aesthetic, cognitive acts which are distinct from bodily sensations and actions. But contemporary research in cognitive science suggests that much of cognition and language use is deeply tied to ongoing sensorimotor experiences. Even metaphoric expressions, such as “John couldn’t grasp abstract mathematics,” referring to physically impossible actions may be interpreted via our past and present experiences of the body. More specifically, people’s use and understanding of metaphorical language is guided by processes of embodied simulation in which people imaginatively reenact the bodily actions alluded to in discourse. My goal in this talk is to describe several lines of empirical research consistent with this general claim, including corpus linguistic studies and psycholinguistic experiments focusing on how metaphoric discourse and interpretation is closely tied to people’s embodied understandings of real-world and physically impossible events. I outline the implications of these research developments for the theories of literary interpretation and the practice of literary criticism.

Session 1: Literary Theory, Science, and Philosophy

Marcus Hartner: Reductionism, Speculation & Explanatory Levels: Reflections on Cognitive Literary Studies

The past decade has witnessed a growing interest in cognitive approaches within the humanities. Yet particularly in the study of literature many scholars remain sceptical towards this development and Cognitive Literary Criticism has by and large only had a moderate impact on the way literature is being taught and studied within academic contexts. This may partly be due to the heterogeneous diversity of cognitive approaches and their lack of a common theoretical framework; another contributing factor might be what Patricia Waugh has called the old-fashioned and yet still existing concern about the ‘infiltration and contamination [of literary criticism] by other disciplines’.

While such reservations might ultimately be misguided, I believe that a valid reason for the widely spread hesitation to embrace cognitive approaches can be found in the epistemological and methodological uncertainties surrounding the intersection of empirical (cognitive) science and (non-empirical) literary studies. There exist extensive general discussions about issues such as the ‘explanatory gap’ between mind and brain (Joseph Levine), the relation between (individual) cognition and art as a social phenomenon, or the different aims of science and literary scholarship. With a few exceptions, however, the contributions to those meta-debates rather raise an awareness of the problems connected with cognitive approaches than attempt to reflect on solutions, i.e. methodologically sound ways of conceptualizing such research. As a result, many works in Cognitive Literary Studies either display a tendency to questionable reductionism or engage in unchecked ‘neurospeculation’ (Raymond Tallis), in which scientific theory is treated with poetic licence.

Given this situation, my paper is concerned with developing a set of general conceptual criteria for the academic meeting of literature and science. Although hardly being able to solve all existing epistemological problems, I contend that Patrick Colm Hogan’s concept of explanatory

levels in science provides a promising starting point for the attempt to steer clear of the Scylla of simplification and the Charybdis of conjecture. Drawing on meta-reflections by critics like Gregory Currie, Julia Mansour, and Patricia Waugh, as well as on Hogan's model of the structural relationship between different levels of scientific investigation, my paper attempts to provide some orientation in this conceptually tricky terrain. Specifically, I propose a set of general criteria and suggest that they might serve as theoretical and methodological guiding principles for the understanding and design of cognitive approaches to literature. In this way, I hope to undercut some of the methodological criticism aimed at Cognitive Literary Studies and make a useful contribution to this exciting field of research.

Gregory Currie: On Living in an Ugly Country

What can science tell us about literature? It depends on what sort of science is in question. I can't myself see physics or chemistry telling us much, though no doubt there is a physical story to be told about the patterns of brain activity that go on when people write and when they read. The biological and psychological sciences look more promising and, if we think of them as genuinely sciences (and why not?), economics, sociology and anthropology can help us as well. But I'm interested not merely in what we can learn about literature from the sciences, but what we can learn from the sciences *that would be relevant to understanding and appreciating literature*. I begin with a distinction between explaining the aesthetic and explaining *within* the aesthetic. Critics do the second, not the first; while evolutionary biologists and anthropologists do the first and not the second.

Does that mean that the literary critic can rest easy – no longer facing the necessity of retraining? Not quite. All this might do for the determinedly formalist critic who insists that what criticism points to must be in the work itself (and the formalist takes a very narrow view of what is in the work). But criticism has rarely been practiced in that way and is more interesting and helpful when it isn't. Critics contextualise the works they discuss—historically and socially at least, and we expect that from an intelligent and sensitive critic. Justifications in literature and elsewhere in art don't stand up well when isolated in the way this argument suggests. Science, including evolutionary science, can help us contextualise our aesthetic arguments. It can also help us to group literary phenomena in new and interesting ways. I illustrate this from Trollop's *Can You Forgive Her?*

Frank Hakemulder: Bringing Literature Closer to its Readers: An Empirical Perspective on Foregrounding

Foregrounding theory (Mukarovsky, 1964; Shklovsky, 1965) has three advantages as a point of departure for a cognitive approach to literary studies. First, it makes precise and falsifiable claims concerning the effects that particular text qualities have on readers. In general these claims pinpoint the exact place in a text that is expected to cause readers to ponder a little longer on the meaning of the text, and refresh or change their perception of the world around them (e.g., Hakemulder, 2004). Thus it is a suitable focal point for truly interdisciplinary work, in which sensitivity for literary text qualities is combined with methodological rigor in the assessment of cognitive processing and changes in perception. Second, over the years the theory has gathered a considerable amount of empirical support (Van Peer, 2007). Results of empirical studies of literature (as well as in response studies of film) suggest that deviations of 'normal' representations catch readers' (and spectators') attention (cf. Jakobson, 1960) and may enhance aesthetic appreciation. A third benefit of a focus on foregrounding is that it may improve our understanding of what the distinguishing functions of literary communication are. Thus it could

be the basis for attempts to bring literature closer to readers' personal experiences, for instance in literary education, literary criticism, or bibliotherapeutic contexts (Hanauer & Hakemulder, 2012).

Catherine Emmott: “I”, “you”, and “he/she” in Narratives and Other Texts: Psychological and Stylistic Perspectives

This talk will examine the different effects of first, second and third person pronouns on readers. In narratives, first and third person pronouns are of key importance in relation to establishing internal and external perspectives. The second person pronoun has been much discussed in relation to its supposed ability to draw readers of narratives into texts. The effects of pronouns are also of practical significance in other types of texts, such as popular health books and medical leaflets, where the intention is to see how switching the pronouns can convey information with more impact.

I consider specific empirical work from psychology on these pronouns in relation to perspective, attention and memory. This includes an experiment from our *STACS Project (Stylistics, Text Analysis and Cognitive Science)* (Emmott/Sanford) at the University of Glasgow, and other relevant experimental work from cognitive and social psychology. I then examine these pronouns from the standpoint of narratology and stylistics, discussing the complexity of their use in real narratives as opposed to the artificial materials of the psychology work.

I argue that the scientific methodologies provide useful ways of testing out theories in the humanities about narrative perspective, attention, and memory which otherwise are just speculation, very often based purely on individual introspection. Humanities methodologies provide essential insights into the complexity of use of the pronouns, in particular in relation to types of narrators, focalisers, and narratees, which need to be taken into account in future scientific work. Overall, the approaches from science and the humanities need to be amalgamated, although the challenges of doing this are considerable.

Session 2: Literature and Empirical Study

Francesca Stregapede: Can Poetry Be Investigated Empirically? An Online Reading Study on the Processing of Metaphorical Juxtapositions in Original and Modified Haiku

a bitter rain –
two silences beneath
the one umbrella

In a metaphorical juxtaposition, two seemingly unrelated terms are placed together and the reader has to infer the connection between them. Is the connotative meaning of texts that contain metaphorical juxtapositions readily available or is it gleaned at an extra cognitive cost? The eye-movements of 30 English native speakers (9 males, mean age 21 years) were recorded while reading 24 haiku, 12 in the original/symbolic version, and 12 in a modified version where one of the two terms (the word 'bitter' in the example) was replaced by a more literal word ('loud') thus reducing the distance between the two terms.

The effects of substitution of the first term were measured globally, comparing total reading times for the two haiku types, and locally, examining the first pass durations and dwell times on the second term, the referent 'silences', and on the last word, 'umbrella', to examine wrap-up

processes. First pass duration showed marginal effects of the substitution. However, dwell time on the second term and last-word region, and total reading time, were significantly longer for the original than for the altered haiku, suggesting that the connection between the two terms was not available immediately but only through re-reading of the texts. A poetry expert however showed no differences in the reading times for the two haiku types. The implications of these findings are discussed in relation to the literature on processing symbolic texts and to models of poetry comprehension.

Anežka Kuzmičová: Imagery from Visual Description and the Predicament of Prediction

One of the most challenging topics for cognitive literary study is the reader's mental imagery. In this talk I will focus on the particular kind of mental imagery prompted by the stylistic device of visual description. Although valuable predictive inquiries have been made into readers' mental imagery in general (Scarry 1999, Burke 2011), its relation to visual description is largely undertheorized. In spite of the fact that visual description is unique, compared to other modes of verbal representation, in its potential to control the specific contents of one's mental image.

Referring to my own experimental data from an imagery study conducted under the tutorship of Professors Bortolussi and Dixon of Alberta, I will use the example of visual description to make the following points regarding all predictive inquiry into the cognitive effects of literary style, and into readers' mental imagery in particular:

- 1) To advance literary study, prediction about the parameters of literary processing (e.g., the occurrence of visual imagery) should be made conjointly with prediction about the specific value of these parameters (e.g., the contents of the visual image).
- 2) Therefore, cognitive science can be fully helpful to literary study only insofar as it encompasses phenomenology and other methods of informed introspection.
- 3) That prediction made from within traditional scientific paradigms sometimes runs counter to phenomenological prediction does not necessarily entail mutual exclusivity. Rather, the tension between the two is exactly what is distinctive for literature as an object of scientific knowledge.

References:

Burke, Michael. 2011. *Literary Reading, Cognition and Emotion: An Exploration of the Oceanic Mind*. London: Routledge.

Scarry, Elaine. 1999. *Dreaming by the Book*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Stephen Hinde: Presence While Watching Movies and Reading

This talk presents some preliminary, but promising, findings from experimental studies in which a simple presence measure has been used to investigate degrees of immersion in the experience of watching a movie, and will suggest how this research paradigm can be extended to encompass the experience of reading fiction. People working in computer graphics have developed the concept of 'presence' (Sheridan 1992, 1994) in order to indicate the degree to which the perceiver is involved in the illusion of non-mediation. High levels of presence mean that perceivers believe that they are "in the situation" being depicted, whereas low levels of presence indicate that the perceivers believe that they are merely observing events unfolding on a display. These simple presence measures have been used experimentally with participants watching movies, and correlated against other measures which were gathered during the movie (and which could also be gathered from subjects reading texts), such as pupil diameter and reaction time.

The study then attempts to use the presence measure to study the effectiveness of film craft in creating increased immersion in the experience of the film. The elements studied so far in film include stereoscopic 3D, colour versus black-and-white, and varying shot length. The simple presence measure has also been used to measure effects of colour versus black-and-white illustrations while reading, and lends itself to work on textual variables such as sentence length or semantic features.

References:

Sheridan TB. 1992. Musings on telepresence and virtual presence. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments* 1: 120–126.

Sheridan TB. 1994. Further musings on the psychophysics of presence. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments* 5: 241-246.

Troscianko T, Hinde S. 2011. Presence while watching movies. *i-Perception* 2(4): 216 (in press).

Emily Troscianko: Testing the Kafkaesque

In this talk I outline the methodology and findings of an empirical study designed to test hypotheses based on my theoretical work on Kafka and the science of perception. These hypotheses concern the nature of the ‘Kafkaesque’ reading experience and the effects on this experience of the manuscript changes made by Kafka. Participants’ reactions to a short story by Kafka were gathered in a free-response format. Independent judges then derived a set of categories from the responses, and coded responses numerically according to the extent to which each category was manifest in it. Statistical analysis of the resulting codings, combined with the rich detail of the original responses, as well as results from two standardised questionnaires, provided a valuable combination of quantitative and qualitative measures. The results add precision to dictionary definitions of the term ‘Kafkaesque’, and complement critical conclusions regarding the nature of the reading experience induced by Kafka’s texts as in various ways paradoxical. In conclusion, I offer some more general reflections on the benefits and pitfalls of studying literature empirically. I discuss the differing objects, methods, conventions, and epistemological frameworks of the cognitive sciences and literary criticism, and suggest some ways in which they might be reconciled.

Session 3: Literary Characters and Readers

Alan Palmer: Perspectives on Social Minds

An internalist perspective on the mind stresses those aspects that are inner, introspective, private, solitary, individual, psychological, mysterious, and detached. An externalist perspective stresses the aspects that are outer, active, public, social, behavioural, evident, embodied, and engaged. I use the term *social mind* to describe those aspects of the whole mind that are revealed through the externalist perspective. An important part of the social mind is our capacity for *intermental thought*; this is joint, group, shared, or collective thinking, as opposed to intramental, or individual or private thought. It is also known as *socially distributed, situated, or extended cognition*, and also as *intersubjectivity*. Advocates of the concept of socially distributed cognition such as the theoretical anthropologists Gregory Bateson (1972) and Clifford Geertz (1993), the philosophers Andy Clark and David Chalmers (1998) and (2009) and Daniel Dennett

(1996), and the psychologists Edwin Hutchins (1995) and James Wertsch (1991) stress that the purpose of the concept is increased explanatory power.

Intermental thought is a crucially important component of fictional narrative because, just as in real life, where much of our thinking is done in groups, much of the mental functioning that occurs in novels is done by large organizations, small groups, work colleagues, friends, families, couples, and other intermental units. It could plausibly be argued that a large amount of the subject matter of novels is the formation, development, maintenance, modification, and breakdown of these intermental systems. Although intermental thought in the novel has been invisible to traditional narrative approaches, it becomes clearly visible within the externalist perspective. Issue 45.2 of the journal *Style* is devoted to the topic of social minds. It consists of a long essay by me, responses to the essay by 24 distinguished narrative theorists as well as three psychologists and a philosopher and a long rejoinder by me to the 24 responses. My paper will describe some of the concerns raised by the responses and my reactions to them.

References:

Bateson, Gregory. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: A Revolutionary Approach to Man's Understanding of Himself*. New York: Ballantine, 1972.

Clark, Andy. *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Clark, Andy and David Chalmers. "The Extended Mind." *Analysis* 58 (1998): 7-19.

Dennett, Daniel C. *Kinds of Minds: Towards an Understanding of Consciousness*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1996.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. London: Fontana, 1993.

Hutchins, Edwin. *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 1995.

Wertsch, James V. *Voices of the Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Michael Burke: Measuring the Feeling of Reading: The Kairos Conundrum

In the drive to understand how consumers of prose fiction read and what (and how) such readers feel when they are engaged in the act of literary reading, we are confronted with the rhetorical problem of kairos: the how, the when, the where and the why of self-determined literary (aesthetic) engagement. In this presentation I will look at some of the methodological challenges faced in the literature-science interface. In the discussion that follows it is hoped that together we can start to find ways to disentangle the conundrum that scientific empiricism faces in this literary aesthetic domain.

Karin Kukkonen: Comeuppance, Irony and Plot Development in Ann Radcliffe's Novels

In *The Italian*, the evil monk Schedoni schemes to exploit the idealism and energy of the young lover Vivaldi, to 'turn [his] very virtues [...] against himself' (52). The author Ann Radcliffe herself pursues a rather similar strategy: the virtues of the good characters often cause their plight, whereas the strategies of the bad characters frequently fall back upon themselves and thwart their very plans. On the basis of Ann Radcliffe's Gothic novels, this paper considers comeuppances and their importance for the development of plot.

As William Flesch outlines in his book *Comeuppance*, our understanding of just outcomes of narratives is based on the (evolutionary) principle of strong reciprocity: when characters are morally reproachable, they cheat on the social contract of cooperation, and on the basis of strong reciprocity, readers then expect them to be brought to heel at the end of the narrative. Ann Radcliffe not only stresses these final effects of poetic justice, but also uses small comeuppances throughout her novels to keep the plot going (cheating leads to more cheating or to attempts to undo the cheating), and takes the workings of moral hierarchies and comeuppance to their ironic extreme, as she punishes good characters (temporarily) for their virtues, and as she makes bad characters try to undo their evil.

This paper applies the evolutionary principle of strong reciprocity to the connections between moral hierarchies, participatory responses (in Gerrig's sense), and plot development in narrative, and the ways in which their basic workings are complicated in literature.

SPEAKERS: BRIEF BIOGRAPHIES

Professor Raymond Gibbs is Professor in Psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. His publications include *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding* (CUP, 1994), *Intentions in the Experience of Meaning* (CUP, 1999), and *Embodiment and Cognitive Science* (CUP, 2006). His research interests lie in the fields of cognitive science and experimental psycholinguistics, and include the role of embodied experience in thought and language, as well as the use and understanding of figurative language.

Dr Marcus Hartner is Lecturer of English Literature at Bielefeld University (Germany). He studied Literature/Linguistics and Philosophy at the University of Tübingen in Germany and Tufts University in Medford, MA. Since 2007 he has been teaching a broad range of courses at Bielefeld University from where he also received his Ph.D. His particular research interests include cognitive narratology, literary theory and philosophy, as well as the study of contemporary literature and culture.

Professor Gregory Currie teaches Philosophy at the University of Nottingham and works on the arts and cognition. His most recent book is *Narratives and Narrators* (OUP, 2010). He was a British Academy Senior Research Fellow in 2008-9. He currently leads a three-year AHRC-funded research project on “Method in Philosophical Aesthetics: The Challenge from the Sciences”. He is writing a book on the value of literature.

Dr Frank Hakemulder teaches at the Department for Media and Culture Studies, Utrecht University. His research tackles two major questions, ‘what art does to us’ and ‘what we do with art’ (using ‘art’ in a broad sense). Specific research areas include literature and ethics, the effects of stories on social perception, the persuasive effects of narrative, and empirical aesthetics generally. His publications include *The Moral Laboratory: Experiments Examining the Effects of Reading Literature on Social Perception and Moral Self-Concept* (Benjamins, 2000), ‘Foregrounding and its Effects on Readers’ Perception’ (*Discourse Processes* 38 (2004), 193-218), and (with van Peer and Zyngier) *Muses and Measures: Research Methods for the Humanities* (Cambridge Scholars Press, 2007).

Dr Catherine Emmott is a Senior Lecturer in English Language at the University of Glasgow, Scotland. She is Director of the STACS Project (Stylistics, Text and Cognitive Science) which brings together a team of researchers from Stylistics and Psychology. Her publications include *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective* (OUP, 1997) and a forthcoming book (with A. J. Sanford), *Mind, Brain and Narrative* (CUP). Her research interests include narrative processing, cognitive stylistics, empirical study of literature, and reference theory. She is Assistant Editor of the journal *Language and Literature*.

Dr Francesca Stregapede has recently submitted her PhD at the Individual Differences in Language Processing department of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen (The Netherlands) in cooperation with the University of Birmingham, where she carried out her experimental research. Her main research interest, the study of the cognitive mechanisms that underlie the comprehension of figurative language, derives from a mixed academic background in English Studies, Poetry, Psychology and Cognitive Neuroscience. Other research interests lie in the use of poetry reading and writing for therapeutic purposes.

Anežka Kuzmičová is pursuing a PhD in Narrative Theory at the Research School of Aesthetics, Stockholm University. Drawing on research from outside the departments of literature, she looks into how the reader’s mind engages with the phenomenal effects of literary narrative (inner speech, sensorimotor imagery) and how these effects can be traced to distinct textual cues. Her relevant publications include ‘Presence in the reading of literary narrative: a case for motor enactment’ (*Semiotica*, 2012) and ‘The words and worlds of literary narrative: the

tradeoff between verbal presence and direct presence in the activity of reading' (forthcoming, U of Nebraska Press).

Stephen Hinde is a PhD student in the School of Experimental Psychology, University of Bristol. Prior to this he worked as a researcher for Hewlett-Packard Labs on using Cloud Computing services to produce services for CGI Movies such as Shrek 2. He holds several degrees, including a degree in Physics from the University of Sheffield, an MA in Buddhist Studies from the University of Bristol, and a degree in Experimental Psychology from the University of Bristol. His current research interests include the study of cognitive load, eye movements, and presence when watching movies and reading.

Dr Emily Troscianko is Junior Research Fellow in Modern Languages at St John's College, Oxford. Her broad research interest is in scientifically informed approaches to the study of literature. Her doctoral thesis, *The Literary Science of the 'Kafkaesque'* (forthcoming with Routledge as *Kafka's Cognitive Realism*) focused on the effects of Kafka's fictions with reference to the character-reader continuum mediated by vision and imagination. Her current research project investigates 'cognitive realism' (the correspondence between textual evocations and cognitive realities) in memory, attention, emotion, and agency, in French and German Realism and Modernism. Recent publications include 'Kafkaesque Worlds in Real Time' (*Language and Literature*, 2010).

Dr Alan Palmer is an independent scholar. His book *Fictional Minds* (U. of Nebraska P., 2004) was a co-winner of the MLA Prize for Independent Scholars and also a co-winner of the Perkins Prize (awarded by the International Society for the Study of Narrative). The current issue of the journal *Style* (45.2) consists of a debate with 24 narrative theorists, psychologists and philosophers on the subject of his second book, *Social Minds in the Novel* (Ohio State U. P., 2010). His next book will be a history of country and western music.

Dr Michael Burke is Associate Professor of Rhetoric and English at Roosevelt Academy, Middelburg (Utrecht University), where he is also head of department. He is the current Chair of the International Poetics and Linguistics Association (PALA) and is a Routledge Linguistics Series Editor (in rhetoric and stylistics). His publications include *Contextualised Stylistics* (co-edited with Stockwell and Bex, 2000) and the monograph *Literary Reading Cognition and Emotion: An Exploration of the Oceanic Mind* (2011). He has published stylistics and rhetoric-related articles in several journals. He is the founder (in 2003) of the Special Interest Group in cognitive stylistics within PALA.

Dr Karin Kukkonen is Balzan Postdoctoral Research Fellow at St John's College, Oxford. She has researched cognitive approaches to comics and graphic novels, and published on multiperspective narrative (*Neue Perspektiven auf die Superhelden*, Tectum 2008), metafiction (ed. *Metalepsis in Popular Culture*, de Gruyter 2011) and the impact of postmodernism on comics storytelling. Her current research project, *Rules of Old*, investigates the cognitive underpinnings of the neoclassical rules of poetics and their appropriation in the eighteenth-century novel.

Professor Terence Cave (moderator) is Emeritus Research Fellow of St John's College, Oxford. His previous publications include studies on early modern French literature and cultural history; *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics* (1988); and *Mignon's Afterlives: Crossing Cultures from Goethe to the Twenty-First Century* (2011). As director of the Balzan project, his principal task is to look for ways of creating connections between the different sub-projects and convergence in the conceptual and methodological evolution of the project as a whole. This synthesis will eventually take the form of a monograph with the provisional title *Thinking with Literature*.