Communication and Processing of Mixed-Viewpoint Situations:

‘Ready-Made Packages’ versus Online Construction

ICLC Conference 2013
University of Alberta, Edmonton

Theme Session 8: ‘Linguistic Manifestations of Mixed Points of View in Narratives’

Max van Duijn, MPhil
PhD candidate Leiden University
Mindreading & Multiple-Order Intentionality

A knows that B believes…

‘mindreading’, ‘metarepresentation’, or ‘theory of mind’

A knows that B believes that C intends …etc.

‘multiple-order intentionality’
Representation of multiple-order intentionality

Ted knows that Sarah knows that the apple is red.
The audience believes that Iago intends that Cassio believes that Desdemona intends that Othello believes that Cassio was thinking that he served the good cause...

(cf. Van Duijn et al., in prep.; Dunbar 2008)
Representation of multiple-order intentionality

Some aspects of the exposition of information in *Othello* ‘alleviate’ the cognitive burden of processing multiple-order intentionality

(Van Duijn et al., in prep.)

> Viewpoint alternation (‘focalization’)

> Episodic structure (cf. also ‘narrative anchors’, Dancygier 2012)
Representation of multiple-order intentionality

One more example: Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925)

[Woolf intends

*us to recognize . . ."]

that Richard is aware

that Hugh wants

Lady Bruton and Richard to think

that because the makers of the pen believe

that it will never wear out

the editors of the Times will respect and publish the ideas recorded by this pen...

(Zunshine 2006, 32-33)

>> Obviously, *Othello* and *Mrs. Dalloway* do not contain such sentences
Case 1: Dancygier’s analysis of Eggers’ *AHWOSG*


>> main character Dave worrying about having left his small brother at home with a baby-sitter:

I will come home … door will be open … baby-sitter will be gone … blood on the walls … a note to me … There will be a hearing, a trial … *How did you come to meet this … baby-sitter?* We found a posting, on a bulletin board. …etc.

(excerpt based on Dancygier 2012, p. 38, citing *AHWOSG*, p. 126)
Case 1: Dancygier’s analysis of Eggers’ AHWOSG

> ‘micro-level viewpoint phenomena’…
  (such as pronouns, verb tenses, italics)

> …prompt input spaces that blend into higher-level structures of ‘narrative spaces’

> Result: aggregate at the macro-level is increasingly rich and complexly structured

(Dancygier 2012, esp. ch. 2 & 3; see also Coulson 2001; Fauconnier & Turner 2002)
Case 1: Dancygier’s analysis of Eggers’ *AHWOSG*

**Main narrative space: structure**

low-level phenomena
--> narrative spaces: one layer at a time

>> complexity of the main narrative space is built online, ‘from the ground up’

(Dancygier 2012, 38-40)
Case 1: Dancygier’s analysis of Eggers’ *AHWOSG*

Main narrative space: contents

After a while…
(from the chain of the imagined, terrifying though unlikely scenario’s)

…readers can conclude that at the level of the main narrative space, we are dealing with a first person-narrator with *hysteric* tendencies

>> however, ‘overarching’ word *hysteria* is nowhere found in the text
February 14, 2013: Pistorius’ girlfriend Reeva Steenkamp dies from 4 gun shots, fired by Pistorius from behind the bathroom door

> Murder or accident? Depends on assumed mind-states!

**Pistorius:** *I thought there was an intruder*

**Police:** *he knew it was Reeva in the bathroom*

> Other people (witnesses, spokespersons) also have beliefs and views on which newspapers report
Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

At the end of the day…
[Readers understand]
that Beeld.com [etc.] reported
that a spokesperson declared
that the police detective reported
that the athlete claimed
that he did not know
that his girlfriend was behind the bathroom door when he fired shots at it.
Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

> Again, obviously, the news reports nowhere phrase this in such an explicit and exhaustive form

> In fact, in the actual headlines and articles, the news is never just presented in the format of embedding constructions, but it is also ‘packed’ in more common and convenient expressions...
Athlete Oscar Pistorius allegedly accidentally shot dead his girlfriend at his house in Pretoria on Thursday morning, Beeld.com reported.

He had mistaken her for a robber, the Afrikaans daily reported on its website.

Police spokeswoman Captain Sarah Mcira confirmed she was shot in the arm and head. She died on the scene.

Athlete Oscar Pistorius allegedly accidentally shot dead his girlfriend at his house in Pretoria on Thursday morning, Beeld.com reported.

He had mistaken her for a robber, the Afrikaans daily reported on its website.

Police spokeswoman Captain Sarah Mcira confirmed she was shot in the arm and head. She died on the scene.

Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

‘packaging’:

Athlete Oscar Pistorius allegedly accidentally shot dead his girlfriend at his house in Pretoria on Thursday morning, Beeld.com reported.

He had mistaken her for a robber, the Afrikaans daily reported on its website.

Police spokeswoman Captain Sarah Mcira confirmed she was shot in the arm and head. She died on the scene.

JOHANNESBURG, Feb 14 (Reuters) – South African police said on Thursday a woman had been found dead at the Pretoria home of paralympic star Oscar Pistorius.

Local radio and online newspaper reports said the woman was understood to be Pistorius’ girlfriend and that he may have shot her after mistaking her for an intruder.

(Reuters, ‘Woman found dead at Pistorius home - S.Africa police’, 14 February 2013)
Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

indirect discourse:

JOHANNESBURG, Feb 14 (Reuters) – South African police said on Thursday a woman had been found dead at the Pretoria home of paralympic star Oscar Pistorius.

Local radio and online newspaper reports said the woman was understood to be Pistorius’ girlfriend and that he may have shot her after mistaking her for an intruder.

(Reuters, ‘Woman found dead at Pistorius home - S.Africa police’, 14 February 2013)
Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

‘packaging’:

JOHANNESBURG, Feb 14 (Reuters) – South African police said on Thursday a woman had been found dead at the Pretoria home of paralympic star Oscar Pistorius.

Local radio and online newspaper reports said the woman was understood to be Pistorius’ girlfriend and that he may have shot her after mistaking her for an intruder.

(Reuters, ‘Woman found dead at Pistorius home - S.Africa police’, 14 February 2013)
Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

> Is it reasonable to assume that readers do indeed conceptualize the event as a layered complex situation?

Evidence: details in the texts presuppose complex structure, e.g.:

…a witness saying there had been “nonstop talking, like fighting” from 2 a.m. to 3 a.m. at the Pistorius home on the morning of the shooting. The prosecutors are seeking to depict the killing as happening after an argument.

→ intentional killing, not an accident
Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

[Readers understand]
that Beeld.com [etc.] reported
that a spokesperson declared
that the police detective reported
that the athlete claimed
that he did not know
that his girlfriend was behind
the bathroom door when he
fired shots at it.

> Relevance of several different pieces of information implies accessibility of layered structure!
Case 2: Newspaper articles on Pistorius shooting

Layered structure communicated by means of:

1. indirect discourse (different subtypes):
   “Athlete... shot dead his girlfriend..., Beeld.com reported.”
   “Police spokeswoman Captain Sarah Mcira confirmed she was shot ....”

2. lexical units, ‘viewpoint packages’:
   “Athlete Oscar Pistorius allegedly accidentally shot dead his girlfriend...”
   “He had mistaken her for a robber...”
   “he may have shot her after mistaking her for an intruder.”
Viewpoint packages

> Lexical viewpoint packages evoke a topology of mind-states

this is then mapped onto situation-specific details

> Gestalt-like, holistic

*Cf. constructions, frames: retrievable, not built up ('online') from parts, but parts are accessible

(> different from/similar to ‘frames’? >> question time)
> “Athlete Oscar Pistorius allegedly accidentally shot dead his girlfriend…”

*allegedly:* EVIDENCE FOR CLAIM IS INDIRECT, HEARSAY, OTHERS HAD REASONS TO MAKE THE CLAIM

*accidentally:* AGENT INTENDED THAT P; WE KNOW THAT OUTCOME IS DIFFERENT FROM INTENTION

> ‘Unpacking’ allegedly accidentally already comprises 3\(^{rd}/4^{th}\) order intentionality

*(cf. ‘decompression’, Dancygier 2012)*

> co-occurrence with indirect discourse: combination easily leads to 5\(^{th}/6^{th}\) order!
Discussion
This analysis demonstrates that:

> Linguistic construction of mixed-viewpoint situations matters to processing/understanding
  
  \textit{(Othello/Mrs. Dalloway: sentence vs. narrative)}

> Complex viewpoint structures can be constructed
  - through blending of separate levels, from the ground up
  
  \textit{structure built on stage, ‘whole’ implicit}; or
  
  \textit{viewpoint packages}

  \textit{‘whole’ on stage, structure implicit though accessible}
Future: packaging vs. ad-hoc construction

> Frequencies are likely to differ across genres and modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th></th>
<th>Per 100,000 words</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spoken discourse</td>
<td>written fiction</td>
<td>spoken discourse</td>
<td>written fiction</td>
<td>wf/sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>packages (average)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per ongeluk</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misverstand</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vergis</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misleid</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stiekem</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complementation</td>
<td>14218</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>157.98</td>
<td>101.30</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequencies based on Corpus Gesproken Nederlands (CGN), containing spoken Dutch discourse (9,000,000w) and written Dutch fiction (1,000,000w)
How many orders can we process?

psychologists: brain-inherent limit at around 5th-order

(cf. Stiller & Dunbar 2007)

However...

Viewpoint packages clearly support efficient communication of mixed-viewpoint situations. If it is assumed that they support processing similarly, understanding multiple-order intentionality may get as complex as can be constructed in a story!
Bigger picture: viewpoint packaging and evolution of human cognition

Genes → [bigger brain] + [practices that increase effective thinking power] → Modification of modern human cognition

Cultural information

‘tools for thinking’
(cf. Beekhuizen & Van Duijn at this conference; Dennett 2000)
Many Thanks!

Prof. Arie Verhagen
Prof. Ineke Sluiter
Barend Beekhuizen
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Extra slides
Frames vs. Packages

> Frames

‘war criminal’ or ‘national hero’; ‘restaurant’ or ‘bar’; ‘terrorist’ or ‘freedom fighter’

rich, hierarchical conceptual structure, lots of (evaluation-laden) default content, allowing/inviting many (related) inferences

> Argumentative/discourse operators

Negation: evokes conceptual structure of two perspectives, without specific (default) content

If-conditional: same
Frames vs. Packages

> Viewpoint packages: do both

*mistake, error*: negative; *surprise*: positive

in CTPs: *promise, hope* (positive), *threaten, warn* (negative)

(Possibly cline of specificity in combinations)

> In all cases: contextual details mapped onto conceptual structure
  given by the expression (space builder, operator, package)

> ‘By-product’: order(s) of intentionality