Cognitive Poetics

Chloe Harrison and Peter Stockwell

The origins and principles of cognitive poetics

The explicit application of cognitive science to literary studies has a fairly recent history. The term 'cognitive poetics' was coined by Reuven Tsur in the 1970s to refer to his own research in the perceptual effects of literary works in readers (see Tsur 1992). Over the last two decades, the term has expanded its application to include the study of literary texts and readings which draws on cognitive psychology and cognitive linguistics. Even more broadly, a 'cognitive literary studies' has emerged in which more general matters of evolutionary criticism, embodiment and social cognition have been brought to bear as part of a critical theory of literature. In this chapter, we take the middle extent of the field of cognitive poetics: the study of literary texts and readings which draws centrally on cognitive psychology and cognitive linguistics. Central to this view of the field is a stylistic concern that any readerly or interpretative account must be underpinned by transparent textual evidence.

Of course, the implicit understanding that matters of readerly perception and cognition are pertinent to the reading of literature is a practice as old as the most ancient observations on literary activity. To this extent, a consistent thread can be delineated stretching from ancient Greek, Roman, Indian and Chinese rhetorical arts to the present account (which has even occasionally been termed 'cognitive rhetoric'). In our own time, however, the scholarly study of literature has been seized by successive crises of confidence throughout the 20th century, culminating in an anxiety about its own 'Theory' that has most recently been resolved by a retreat into historiography: obscurantism has been replaced by a rather simple 'history of the book' and literary scholarship has essentially become a narrow form of cultural studies. In other fields, methodological discussions are handled relatively calmly, but in literary studies these debates have removed the field increasingly from anything that non-academic readers of literature would recognise.

Cognitive poetics offers a reconnection of literary scholarship with natural readers, at first glance paradoxically because it aims to professionalise the discipline (Turner 1991). It is necessary to know the principles of cognitive linguistics, for example, and have a systematic notion of how language and communication works, in order to be able to provide a proper, rational account of literary meanings and effects. It is not good enough to arrive with an outdated understanding of language (such as Saussurean linguistics), or an incoherent pseudo-science (psychoanalysis), or a metaphorically poetic but vacuous set of gestures (deconstruction), or any briefly fashionable paradigm imported from other fields without genuine understanding (whether from evolution, quantum physics, neuroscience, sociology, anthropology or any of the other ill-fitting frames into which literary scholarship has tried to fit itself).

There are basic facts which entail a systematic cognitive poetics. Firstly, literature is composed in language and so its proper study should focus on language. This is not to say that literary study should be formalist, because it is clear that the workings of language involve not only the text itself but also contextual matters such as intention, interpretation, social negotiation. history and value, and so on. This means that the field of linguistics – traditionally narrowly institutionalised – cannot alone deal with literature, and a broader socio-cognitive linguistics is necessary.

Cognitive poetics takes its basic principles from the cognitive sciences on which it draws. There are general scientific methodological principles that apply: the object of investigation (whether an

emotional effect in a reading or a textual feature) should be available for analysis, not an imaginary or desirable phenomenon; the account should be supported by evidence of some sort; assertions made about a literary text and its reading should be clear, open and falsifiable; as far as possible, readings presented of a literary work should be replicable, rather than uniquely idiosyncratic or eccentric; terms for description should have a generally accepted and disciplined currency. All of these principles make cognitive poetics a scientific practice.

Aside from these principles common to all sciences, there are also foundational assumptions that are particular to cognitive linguistics and cognitive psychology. Firstly, the centrality of mind as the location of interest is important: though the brain and the sensory perceptual system is of contributory interest, cognitive poetics tends not to be absolutely materialist in its approach. So, for example, while MRI scans and anatomical measurements during reading might tell us things about the brain or body, they can tell us little about the particular literary work being read, except in the most general of terms. The principle of conceptual embodiment, and the continuities between mind and body (see Lakoff 1987, Lakoff and Johnson 1999) are generally regarded as central to cognitive poetics. The nature of metaphor or conceptual projection and compression in general are key. Prototypicality and situatedness are important factors in cognitive poetics. Empirical approaches to literary reading are also common in the field, with an emphasis on controllable and measurable evidential data (see Miall 2006, Gerrig 1993, van Peer 1986). Cognitive poetics can be seen in these regards as being like a social science.

However, it is important to recognise that literature itself is an artistic enterprise and social perceptions of literature are important factors in reading and evaluation. The literary work is a phenomenon for exploration not comprised solely of the text itself nor solely of the reader or reading themselves but as a heteronymous object involving the interaction of the two. Some effects generated in literary reading are extremely subtle and subjective; some are very difficult to articulate, and some are at the most delicate level of conscious awareness, if not part of a subconscious domain with very indirect or fleeting effects. Cognitive poetics has therefore been described as an 'artful science' (Stockwell 2012). Anyone working in cognitive poetics thus needs to possess both a scientific sensibility and also a firm grounding in history, aesthetics, interpretation and literary criticism.

Key work in cognition and literature

Although a great deal of work in cognitive science has been adapted for literary critical purposes, there have been a few key areas which have proven most productive over the last two decades. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) work on conceptual metaphor can be regarded as a seminal foundational text for cognitive poetics, and work in Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) continues to be produced. Fauconnier and Turner's (2002) work on 'blending' or 'conceptual integration' theory was in part a development of CMT and a response to some of its problematic aspects – particularly articulated in relation to literary texts (see Gross 1997, Stockwell 1999). Work in cognitive poetics drawing on CMT and blending includes exemplary studies of allegory (Crisp 2008), literary emotion (Kövecses 2002), lyric poetry (Freeman 2002), and narrative fiction (Turner 1991, 1996, Dancygier 2011).

Both CMT and blending theory (via Fauconnier's (1985, 1997) work on *mental spaces*) have drawn on *schema theory* (Schank and Abelson 1977), adapted for literary purposes as a schema poetics (Cook 1994, Cockcroft 2002). Schema analyses of literary reading capture the difficult fact that readers bring different sets of knowledge to the same text to produce a spectrum of readings. Steen (2003), for example, shows how an instantiation of the LOVE schema allows readers to understand and engage with a range of love poems and song lyrics.

The key questions for literary reading of how systematically to reconcile text and context, and generic value and readerly subjectivity, have also been addressed within text world theory (Werth 1999, Gavins 2007). Briefly, this is a discourse framework that is structured around the notion that states-of-affairs are conceptualised as embedded worlds, with textual triggers initiating a world-switch. Text world theory has been particularly focused from its outset on accounting for the sort of projection and displacement afforded by literary fiction. It is a particularly good way of mapping the relationships between authors and readers, and different versions of characters which are termed 'enactors'. Text world theory has been used successfully to account for literary plot twists as world-repairs, dramatic staging, and the poetics of absurdist literature (Cruickshank and Lahey 2004, Hidalgo Downing 2000, Gavins 2000, 2013).

Contextual Frame Theory (CFT) is closely associated with text world theory (Emmott 1997), and draws on the psychology of episodic attention to build an account of how readers negotiate their way through a literary world. At a corresponding textual level, researchers in cognitive poetics have also found work in Deictic Shift Theory (DST) useful (Duchan, Bruder and Hewitt 1995). This sets out a cognitive linguistic means of keeping track of particular viewpoints and 'voices' in a text, and has proven to be highly insightful for the analysis of drama (McIntyre 2006), and complex literary narratives (Stockwell 2002, 2009a).

Lastly, scholars in recent years have become interested in the striking effects that literary experiences can bring, as a form of literary *resonance* (Stockwell 2009a, 2009b). Combining cognitive psychological studies in visual field perception and memory with cognitive linguistic instantiations of agency and foregrounding, for example, an attention-resonance model (Stockwell 2009b) has proven to be potentially a way of accounting for these experiences. Resonance is a matter of the *texture* of the literary reading experience, which aims to integrate text and cognition according to the same principles. Like several of the models sketched above, it aims at an account of subjective experience within the institutional schema of literature.

Subjectivity: a case study

At the end of *Cognitive Poetics in Practice* (Gavins and Steen 2003), a collection of practical analyses, Keith Oatley (2003: 162) focused on three 'roads under construction' in the field of cognitive poetics: mimesis, the emotions and the personal, and the uses of literature. Oatley was looking to the future, and certainly, a decade on, these aspects of cognitive poetics have become central to the discipline. The middle aspect here – emotional and subjective effects – has become particularly important. There is in general a feeling that early cognitive poetics has provided a good account of meaningfulness, and is now engaged in a systematic account of personal features such as aesthetics and interpersonal features such as ethics. At the end of this chapter, we present a few of the most recent ideas that attempt to capture such features of literary reading. First, though, we present an exemplary case-study that illustrates and applies Oatley's appeal for a cognitive poetics of emotional engagement.

Oatley (2003: 170) proposed 'to distinguish between general processes of cognitive construction from the discourse structure, and idiosyncratic processes of each reader'. In this differentiation, he suggests bearing in mind two aspects of reading, which he sees as part of the combined creative reading process, or 'writingandreading', in his formulation:

Reading 1
- A *suggestion* structure that depends on the resonances a piece of literature has for each reader personally.

- An *association* structure, which affects the suggestion structure, and comprises autobiographical memories, cultural knowledge and personal preoccupations of writer and reader.

Reading 2
- The realisation of a story or poem drawing together the two aspects of *Reading 1*: the reader's own interpretation, that also includes its personal significance.

It will be apparent, from earlier in this chapter, that several frameworks including schema theory and text world theory are involved here. In general, Oatley (1992) himself approaches the emotions from a perspective which encompasses both literary criticism and cognitive psychological theory, asserting that 'psychology in cognitive poetics is not solely based on the work of laboratories or on psychometric questionnaires' but 'includes the psychology of lives lived by people in relation to each other, to culture, and to circumstances' (Oatley 2002: 162).

These founding concepts will be applied to readings of the cult novel, *Naïve. Super*, by Erlend Loe (2005), originally published in 1996 in Norwegian.

Reading 1: suggestion
Emotions and suggestions are, for the writerandreader, 'places of personal significance, not necessarily the same as emotions mentioned in the text' (Oatley 2003: 168). The *suggestion structure* therefore concerns a reader's individual literary reading of a text, and idiosyncratic resonances; essentially, the notion of *readerliness* (Stockwell 2002). Oatley points out (in relation to Steen's (2003) sketch of a schema for a literary LOVE scenario) that it is important to be aware of both cultural schemas and individual readerly resonance. Schema poetics is thus useful for both suggestion and association structures in the aspect of *Reading 1*.

The cultural schema on which *Naïve. Super* is built is a *Bildungsroman* – a 'coming-of-age' novel. This is apparent in the following passage from near the beginning of the novel:

> A few weeks have passed.
> I am sitting in my brother's flat.
> Once a day I go down to buy some food. And if there is any mail, I open it and fax it to my
>   brother. It is an amazingly long fax number. I feel increasingly sure he is in Africa.
> I've been looking for the note on which I wrote down his address, but I can't find it.
> Besides this, I hardly do anything at all.
> I flip through the newspaper or lie on the couch staring into space.
> I have no plans.
> I still have the feeling it's all pretty meaningless.
> It's no inspiring feeling.
> I've turned the tempo all the way down. To zero.
> I am thinking that I need to start from scratch. How does one start from scratch?
>
> (Loe 2005: 8)

This activates the genre-level *Bildungsroman* schema as follows:

SINGLE PROTAGONIST MEETS SITUATION X, CAUSES THEM TO QUESTION 'MEANING OF LIFE'

EXPERIENCES SOCIAL ISOLATION/ LONELINESS/ LACK OF MEANING/ DEPRESSION

FEELS 'LOST', BEGINS 'QUEST FOR IDENTITY'

EXPERIENCES PIVOTAL MOMENT – THINGS START TO 'MAKE SENSE' AGAIN

Schemas are useful for emotional narratives, for they 'are complex conceptual structures consisting of sequences of action concepts, which actions are to be performed in recurrent situations with a particular goal' (Steen 2003: 68). In addition, Steen's analysis also uses conceptual metaphors, which help explain some of the underlying emotions of a particular schema. In relation to this B*ildungsroman* schema, for example, the LIFE IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor is clearly the mega-metaphor, plus other conventional vector metaphors such as HAPPINESS IS UP and SADNESS IS DOWN ('I've turned the tempo all the way down. To zero'), which describe the orientation of emotions attached to the genre-schema.

Readers seem to understand literary emotions through *orientating* themselves around the situation of a reading, and this enacted metaphor has been demonstrated on the principle of embodiment and simulation by Gibbs (2006: 27), who observes that the 'affective space' of texts is vital to an emotive reading. Developing work be Gerrig (1993), Stockwell (2009a: 78-81) noticed that readers tended to frame their own experiences in one of three metaphorical ways:

- Reading as transportation
- Reading as control
- Reading as investment

Each of these conceptual metaphors condition the emotional experience. For illustration, here are the three top-rated reviews of *Naïve. Super* from the online book store *Amazon*:

After having ordered this item off Amazon, I read the blurb and I seriously thought I'd made a wrong decision in ordering it because although I tend to like most books I read, I'm only sixteen and I was in need of something light to read, not something about a struggling twenty-five year old.

After reading the first couple of lines, however, I was hooked on to it and now I am in need of something similar to read.

This is definitely one of the best books I've ever read.
Because it made me re-believe.
In trees, and bikes and in people.

It's simple. Nothing too bad happens. Nothing too exciting.
It's real.

(Review 1: 29 Jan 2007)

I think I enjoyed this while I was reading it, but hindsight keeps on telling me it wasn't that good. It was easy to read and I couldn't help but think of the protagonist as some "Lindstrom"-looking guy who you just want to give a big hug.

Hipsters no doubt love this book, from its sleek cover design to its nods toward European philosophy. And also, everyone loves making lists don't they? This book has lots of lists in it. And loads of pages towards the end which were just results from a library computer which you don't even have to read! Just imagine, you think you're half way through a book and are thinking you want to start reading something else soon and then you get 20 pages of nothing! Maybe it's this that's nagging my retrospective view of the book and making me feel like I got conned somewhere.

There are people I can think of who I would recommend it to and I'd imagine them enjoying it but at the same time I don't think I'd ever reread it.

(Review 2: 5 April 2009)

The narrator of this story is a 20-something, and with the use of simple sentences and his naive/childlike take on the world around him, gains him a certain empathy from the reader that makes this book a joy to read.

The story concerns the narrator and his attempts to figure out 'what it's all about'. It takes in a trip to New York, making new friends, sorting out his love life, a hammer and peg, and trying to understand the theory of relativity.

At times sad, at times laugh out loud funny yet always beautifully written... a must read.

(Review 3: 25 Dec 2002)

The first review predominantly shows 'reading as control' because of the individual's interpretation of the generic conceptual metaphors surrounding the term 'struggling': EMOTION IS A FORCE (macro) EMOTION IS AN OPPONENT (micro), and the reference to being 'hooked'. However, the reference to the changed state after reading ('made me re-believe') also creates empathy as a result of investment: in self-improvement, the reader receives a return on the effort-input that was required of the reading process (Stockwell 2010). This change in reviewer 1's beliefs also ties in with Oatley's (1992) *reading as transformation* metaphor; for it creates not only a return on emotional investment, but also an alteration of the reader's emotional state. This alteration is textually manifest in the reviewer's use of Loe's simplistic writing style.

For the second reviewer, the recognition of the schema-character brought about *resistance* in the reading, in that there is a disjunction between readerly disposition and literary disposition (Stockwell 2009a): the text made them view the character negatively, from an almost patronising stance. The review fully demonstrates the investment model, for the reference to being 'conned' reflects how the reviewer feels that they 'lost' something from their emotional investment; a point compounded through the fact that the use of multimedia is seen to create '20 pages of nothing!', and that the reviewer would not *re-invest* ('I don't think I'd ever re-read it'), or urge others to do the same.

The third reviewer discusses an integral part, I would like to argue, of an individual's association structure: the creation of a 'certain empathy'. The level of investment in this reading, when considered alongside the first review, is comparatively high; demonstrating the significance of empathy in the creation of a depersonalised and personalised reading. It could be argued therefore that the higher level of emotional investment in a reading, the more likely empathy is a product of the process (Stockwell 2010).

Sympathy and empathy evidently appear under the *reading as an investment* conceptual metaphor; for 'in the investment framework, sympathy is modelled as a distance from the readerly stance [...] The feedback loop that produces empathy as a return on investment indicates a shift back, as a result of the mapping, towards a realignment of the readerly stance' (Stockwell 2010). Both Oatley (2003) and Stockwell (2009a) observe that text world theory (Werth 1999, Gavins 2007) is a useful analytical framework for measuring readerly distance from fictional worlds and characters in terms of emotional distance. Distancing and closeness can be tracked through embedded world-switches, internalised viewpoints and the number if deictic markers between reader and character.

Goldie (2000: 178) discusses how empathy is often confused with 'emotional contagion', and how 'empathising with another person is an essentially simulationist approach, and involves *imagining the experience of a narrative* from that other person's point of view'. This change of focalization demonstrates how issues of orientation are integral to the comprehension of emotions, concerning

where the reader experiences a narrative in respect to the author and character, for issues of distance, proximity and positioning, are integral to understanding emotions: does the reader feel *of, for* or *with*? Essentially, then, the more closely the reader becomes displaced to a literary character or literary situation, the more likely they are to feel empathy. Finally, Stockwell (2009a: 78) maintains that, 'where sensation is largely located in individual subjectivity, empathy is a social matter'. In this way, sensation is inherently within the suggestion structure, and empathy within the association.

Reading 1: association
If you had read the above reviews before reading the novel, this knowledge would likely have affected the *association structure* of the reading experience. Oatley's notion of association structure essentially means the discourse structure of reading. In text world theory terms (see above), the associations that readers bring are inputs into the top-level *discourse world*, where readers' memories and experiences and social conventions collide with author's texts to allow a text world to be 'incremented' in the reader's mind (Werth 1999).

Further, returning to the notion of simulation, the creation of these worlds demonstrates how we can *attenuate* our emotions in the reading process: we can temporarily enter into the imagined world and carry our emotional and intertextual baggage in both directions. For the reviewers of *Naïve. Super*, this is evident:

> It was easy to read and I couldn't help but think of the protagonist as some 'Lindstrom'-looking guy who you just want to give a big hug. (Amazon Review 2)

> Loe certainly has some of Salinger's lightness of touch, and the often comic voice of his unnamed narrator recalls Holden Caulfield. (Publisher's blurb on Loe 2005)

The difference in character-schema attachment across the two opinions here demonstrates how schema can be personalised as well as generalised. It seems to us that the strong schema surrounding this character-type creates a strong vector relationship between a reader and the character (who remains unnamed), and he becomes a sort of everyman *bildungsroman* figure. In this way, *Naïve. Super* is a co-operative text (Gavins 2007: 143): it helps the reader with the process of identification, for they can *choose* the particular schema on which to model the protagonist, proffering a figure with simultaneously both an anonymous and a strong identity with which to identify. This strong prototype-matching therefore creates a book which is 'easy to read', because the reader can identify the character-stereotype with similar characters in their reading history. It is the reader's 'creative response' (Oatley 1992) to this construction – to the linguistic cues made by the writer – that orients the reader around the emotions and characters in a text; suggesting reader-*creativity* as they simultaneously have to construct, as well as infer, characters – they must writeandread to understand the narrative. This self-implication of readers in literary characters and worlds has been extensively studied by Kuiken et al (2004).

Personal resonances are integral to any reading. For one of the authors of this chapter (Chloe Harrison), the bildungsroman experience was strongly evocative of teenage life, and the fact that the book was recommended by a friend brought an extra layer of expectation and personal significance. These aspects cannot be bracketed-off from the reading; they are an integral part of the subjective experience.

Reading 2: realisation
Finally, the second reading aspect that Oatley (2003: 170) identifies is termed the *realisation* of a story or poem: 'the reader's own writing of it, using all the resources of the mind' – a reading which draws on the story structure, the discourse structure, and the suggestion structure. It might be

regarded as a reader's final, 'take-away' interpretation, but it is more than that: it also encompasses the reader's sense of the work's social *and* personal significance. This *writingandreading* process is inherently bi-directional, creative and integrated. Realisation, in this sense, is not necessarily a global consequence of what happens after reading the whole text; realisations are happening throughout the text itself. Here is another excerpt from the novel:

> Yesterday I made a list of what I have and what I don't have.
> This is what I have:
> - A good bike
> - A good friend
> - A bad friend
> - A brother (in Africa?)
> - Parents
> - Grandparents
> - A large study loan
> - A BA degree
> - A camera
> - A handful of (borrowed) money
> - An almost new pair of trainers
> This is what I don't have:
> - Plans
> - Enthusiasm
> - A girlfriend
> - The sense that things fit together and that everything will be all right in the end
> - A winning personality
> - A watch
> Every time I have looked at the list today, I've noticed that I have more than what I don't have. I have 11 things. I lack 6 things. This ought to be a source of optimism.
> But having read the list closely it has become clear to me that it is altogether an unbalanced and bad piece of arithmetic.
> It won't even out.

> <div align="right">(Loe 2005: 8-9)</div>

Clearly, our account of this is likely to be subjective, but we can temper that by deploying some of the analytical frames we have mentioned so far.

Most of the narrative of the novel is sequential in orientation, with a simple style of voice based on simple, minor and declarative sentences: we already have an empathy for the character being portrayed. The list, here, presents us the character's thinking as a *summary scan* (Langacker 2008) of the narrative. This format mirrors the fact that the protagonist is worried about time – a feature he notes on his next list, wanting to buy an object with the ability to make him 'forget about time'. Lists are not spatiotemporally bound (lexically, at least), and therefore form a sort of time-vacuum.

The list format here is schematically child-like. The choice of items in the list, describes a subjective world experience because the objects he describes are positive and negative world builders which have particular emotional value to him. Here, negatives are created in the list of positives ('things I have'): the list comprises the conceptually negative: 'a large study loan'; the semantically negative: 'a bad friend'; and negation by absence: 'a brother (in Africa)'. In this way, negation itself becomes profiled (Langacker 2008: 67), conceptually in line with the SADNESS IS DOWN spatial metaphor. Further, the very fact that the protagonist starts to play with the numbers by using 'unbalanced arithmetic' that 'won't even out' shows a misapplication of knowledge frames

– an impossible conjunction of LOGIC and EMOTION. In the context of the novel, these early passages establish readerly empathy for the unnamed character that largely drives the emotional response to the rest of the narrative.

Recent and future advances

The attempt to address subjective and inter-subjective aspects of literary reading represents the main current challenge for cognitive poetics. While the field continues to expand, and also revises its earlier achievements as well, we would like to finish (in Oatley's spirit) by identifying five (related) areas which seem to us good prospects for imminent innovative work.

Firstly, within cognitive poetics recently there has been a particular interest in *multimodal* literature: that is, those texts in which traditional linear narratives are subverted by the incorporation of graphics and images, hyperlinks, or diagrams, or in art installations and objects that incorporate text. Such literary works are of particular interest in cognitive poetics because they highlight many of the key features of traditional texts by disrupting them. Those who analyse such works often need to make very precise and minute distinctions – for example between the 'voice' of the narrating consciousness and the 'voice' of the organising authorial consciousness, in texts where this distinction is unreliable, experimental or playful. These deictic centres can be tracked within DST by noticing a distinction between textual deictic elements and compositional deictic elements (Stockwell 2009a) – a distinction that is rarely needed in analysing more traditional literary work.

Gibbons (2012), in particular, has brought a cognitive poetic analysis to multimodal and experimental fiction. For example, she explores the curious effects of second-person narratives, where 'you' has a doubly-deictic (Herman 2004) function in pointing at the imagined fictional addressee as well as the actual addressed reader. Such effects cannot be accounted for by a traditional stylistic account, since they are inherently concerned with the ways that the text interacts and alters the reader's sense of self and of characterisation. (See also Page 2010, and Bell 2010, Bell et al 2013).

This exploration of *character* and *characterisation* is also a current and developing interest. Characters have been a constant preoccupation for natural readers throughout literary history, but the notion has been dismissed or neglected by critical theory. Since the sense of people in fictional worlds is nevertheless so strong, the phenomenon is of interest to cognitive poetics. Again, this is because the object of a character is neither purely a textual nor purely a psychological matter, but is an interanimated effect of both. We currently do not have a systematic account of the degrees to which fictional characters can evoke sympathy, empathy or revulsion; nor of the fact that characters in fiction appear to be 'portable' – having the capacity apparently to take on a virtual life outside their source texts in the lives of readers; nor even of how as readers we can feel strong emotions and make moral judgements on people whom we know are not real. Culpeper (2001) has drawn on schema theory to address characterisation particularly in drama. Vermeule (2010) and Keen (2007) have explored character and empathy in narrative fiction. Zunshine (2006) has discussed character by drawing on the cognitive psychology of 'Theory of mind' and 'mind-reading', which Stockwell (2009a) has framed more actively as 'mind-modelling'.

The moral and *ethical* senses in which characters, narrators and authors can be positioned has also been an interest within the broad cognitive approach to literature. Phelan (1996, 2005), in particular, has set out a framework for the analysis of ethical positioning. He brings a systematic sense, informed by cognitive science, to this much discussed area of literary theorising. There is a great deal of work (see Gibbs 2006) arising from cognitive psychology which shows that there are very close connections between ethical judgements and aesthetic ones (crudely, that ugliness is aligned

with immorality and beauty with truth). The ways in which these general framing judgements are articulated and manipulated by literary texts is obviously of interest in cognitive poetics. ethics.

On of the most promising recent advances has been the deployment of *cognitive grammar* (Langacker 2008) as a means of undertaking a readerly-oriented stylistics of texture. This approach to the linguistic style of literary works allows analysts to explore matters of foregrounding, agency, action and reflection, within a grammatical framework that is consistent with general cognitivist principles. Harrison et al (2013) represents a collection of this work. While textual patterns can be described systematically, the emphasis given in cognitive grammar to readerly matters of profiling, construal, scanning, attenuation and projection (Langacker 2008) offers cognitive poetics a uniquely seamless incorporation of readerliness into the communicative process. This work suggests the potential for being able to account for very subtle stylistic effects in literature.

This capacity for cognitive grammar to explore effects that are delicate, rarefied or difficult to articulate might allow us to explore those experiences of literary reading that are fleeting, transient, almost ineffable, subliminal or subconscious. *Ambient* features of literary works such as the atmosphere of fictional worlds, or the tone of a narration, or the particularly striking resonance of a passage, are all potentially within the grasp of the literary stylistician who adopts a cognitive poetic approach. Stockwell (2013) explores these matters by bringing together the psychologically-based theory of lexical priming from corpus linguistics and Langacker's (2008) notion of 'dominion'; Deggan approaches the same phenomena by drawing on Talmy's (2000) concept of 'fictive motion'. Both offer the beginnings of an account of literary and experiential ambience that could not have been available to previous accounts of literary style.

While these emerging threads in cognitive poetics have much promise, almost certainly there will be further, unanticipated developments that will appear over the next few years. When Oatley (2003) set out his vision of the future, it was from a discipline still fresh and new and enthusiastic; a decade later, that sense of innovation and opportunity remains – the sense that, even taking all of the impressive work in cognitive poetics into account, there is more to be done than has yet been achieved.

References

Bell, A. (2010) *The Possible Worlds of Hypertext Fiction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
Bell, A., Ensslin, A. and Rustad, H. (eds) (2013) *Analyzing Digital Fiction*. New York: Routledge.
Cockcroft, R. (2002) *Renaissance Rhetoric: Reconsidered Passion – The Interpretation of Affect in Early Modern Writing*. London: Palgrave.
Cook, G. (1994) *Discourse and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Culpeper, J. (2001) *Language and Characterisation: People in Plays and other Texts*. Harlow: Longman.
Crisp, P. (2008) 'Between extended metaphor and allegory: is blending enough?' *Language and Literature* 17 (4): 291-308.
Cruickshank, T. and Lahey, E. (2010) 'Building the stages of drama: towards a text world theory account of dramatic play-texts', *Journal of Literary Semantics* 39 (1): 67-91.
Dancygier, B. (2011) *The Language of Stories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Deggan, M. (2013) 'What is literary "Atmosphere"? The role of fictive motion in understanding ambience in fiction', in M. Borkent, B. Dancygier and J. Hinnell (eds) *Language and the Creative Mind: Proceedings of the 11th Conceptual Structure in Discourse and Language Conference*. Chicago: CSLI: University of Chicago Press.

Duchan, J.F., Bruder, G.A. and Hewitt, L.E. (eds) (1995) *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Emmott, C. (1997) *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fauconnier, G. (1985) *Mental Spaces*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, G. (1997) *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, G. and Turner, M. (2003) *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Freeman, M.H. (2002) 'Cognitive mapping in literary analysis', *Style* 36: 466-83.

Gavins, J. (2000) 'Absurd tricks with bicycle frames in the text world of *The Third Policeman*', *Nottingham Linguistic Circular* 15: 17-33.

Gavins, J. (2007) *Text World Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gavins, J. (2013) *Reading the Absurd.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gavins, J. and Steen, G. (eds) (2003) *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London: Routledge.

Gerrig, R.J. (1993) *Experiencing Narrative Worlds: On the Psychological Activities of Reading*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gibbs, R.W. (2006) *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbons, Al. (2012) *Multimodality, Cognition, and Experimental Literature*. London; New York: Routledge.

Goldie, P. (2000) *The Emotions: A Philosophical Exploration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gross, S. (1997) 'Cognitive readings or the disappearance of literature in the mind', *Poetics Today* 18 (2): 271-97.

Harrison, C., Nuttall, L., Stockwell, P. and Yuan, W. (eds) (2013) *Cognitive Grammar in Literature*. New York: Benjamins.

Herman, D. (2004) *Story Logic: Problems and Possibilities of Narrative*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Hidalgo Downing, L. (2000a) *Negation, Text Worlds and Discourse: The Pragmatics of Fiction*. Stanford: Ablex.

Keen, S. (2007) *Empathy and the Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuiken, D., Miall, D.S. and Sikora, S. (2004) 'Forms of *self-implication* in literary reading', *Poetics Today* 25 (2): 171-203.

Lakoff, G. (1987) *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999) *Philosophy in the Flesh*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R. (2008) *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Loe, E. (2005) *Naïve. Super* (trans. T.K. Solberg). London: Canongate.

McIntyre, D. (2006) *Point of View in Plays*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Miall, D. (2006) *Literary Reading: Empirical and Theoretical Studies*. NewYork: Peter Lang.

Oatley, K. (1992) *Best-Laid Schemes: The Psychology of Emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oatley, K. (1992) 'Emotions and the story worlds of fiction', in T. Brock, M. Green and J. Strange (eds) *Narrative Impact*, Mahwah: Erlbaum, pp.36-69.

Oatley, K. (2003) 'Writingandreading: the future of cognitive poetics', in J. Gavins and G. Steen (eds) *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*, London: Routledge, pp.161-73.

Page, R. (ed.) (2010) *New Perspectives on Narrative and Multimodality*. London: Routledge.

van Peer, W. (1986) *Stylistics and Psychology: Investigations of Foregrounding*. London: Croom Helm.

Phelan, J. (1996) *Narrative as Rhetoric: Technique, Audiences, Ethics, and Ideology*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Phelan, J. (2005) *Living to Tell about It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Schank, R.C. and Abelson, R. (1977) *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Steen, G. (2003) '"Love stories": cognitive scenarios in love poetry', in J. Gavins and G. Steen (eds) *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*, London: Routledge, pp.67-82

Stockwell, P. (1999) 'The inflexibility of invariance', *Language and Literature* 8 (2): 125-42.

Stockwell, P. (2002) *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Stockwell, P. (2009a) *Texture: A Cognitive Aesthetics of Reading*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Stockwell, P. (2009b) 'The cognitive poetics of literary resonance', *Language and Cognition* 1 (1): 25-44.

Stockwell, P. (2010) 'The eleventh checksheet of the apocalypse', in D. McIntyre and B. Busse (eds) *Language and Style*, London: Palgrave, pp.419-32.

Stockwell, P. (2012) 'The artful science of literary study' (original in Chinese, translated by J. Ma), *Journal of Foreign Language and Literature* (Sichuan).

Stockwell, P. (2013) 'Atmosphere and tone', in P. Stockwell and S. Whiteley (eds) (2013) *The Handbook of Stylistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, L. (2000) *Towards a Cognitive Semantics. Vol. 1*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Tsur, R. (1992) *Toward a Theory of Cognitive Poetics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Turner, M. (1991) *Reading Minds: The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Turner, M. (1996) *The Literary Mind*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vermeule, B. (2010) *Why Do We Care about Literary Characters?* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Werth, P. (1999) *Text Worlds*. Harlow: Longman.

Zunshine, L. (2006) *Why We Read Fiction: Theory of Mind and the Novel*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.