Learning processes that connect: Dilemmas, metaphors, contemporary art, education

Eleni Butulussi[1]

Prologue

The video

The video entitled "The metaphor that connects: Contemporary Art in a linguistics lesson at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (A.U.Th.)" shows bits from a linguistics lesson. What we see is a teaching/learning process on the notion of metaphor that unwinds through the description of a contemporary work of art. The "Laboratory of Dilemmas" by G. Drivas was originally presented as a video installation project in Venice Biennale (2017). It deals with the anguish and confusion of people in the face of distressful dilemmas such as the ones suddenly emerging in a laboratory of scientific research and Aeschylus' tragedy "Iketides" (Suppliant Women), alluding to the contemporary migrant and refugee issue. The project presents the dilemma: the rescue of the "foreign/unfamiliar," or the preservation of the safety and certainty of the "native/familiar"?

The text

The following text provides basic information on the content, the objectives, the theoretical approaches, and the methods used in the seminar "Discourse analysis and language teaching." The clips shown in the video are recorded during a lesson in this seminar. The text also describes the contemporary art project "Laboratory of dilemmas" by G. Drivas. It analyzes metaphors connected to the dilemma as well as the argumentations of the two central opinions constituting the dilemma. Finally, an investigation of sociological, psychological, and philosophical perspectives that view the dilemma as a structural feature of thought, and emphasize the critical role of processing dilemmas during the learning process in and out of school follows.

The interview

The presentation of the general topic is concluded with the transcription of parts of an interview with the artist and the students/professor entitled 'Talking to the artist, G. Drivas', which was rendered possible via Skype.

The video, the text, and the interview are independent descriptions, but they supplement each other and portray various views of the lesson and the whole seminar for that matter.

---

[1] Professor of Applied Linguistics, School of German Language and Literature, Faculty of Philosophy, A.U.Th., butulusi@del.auth.gr

A linguistics seminar: "Discourse analysis and language teaching": Content, objectives, theoretical approaches

It is observed that in education -higher and secondary-, there is still a considerable number of instances of disjunction and discrimination toward both the students/educators and the subjects. The roles of the educators and the students are clearly delineated, and a similar distinction is drawn between students, who are divided into 'good-bad,' 'smart-stupid,' 'native- foreigners' (Moureli, 2010:25). Except for limited cases of interdisciplinary programs or CLIL (combinatory method of teaching a second/foreign language and a content subject, e.g., geography, history)[2], the subjects are also differentiated. Language study holds a privileged status as a communication system, and the same is true for literature as a text at the expense of other semiotic systems or different textual genres. A similar privilege -or even exclusivity- is observed for the use of the school textbook, which is language-oriented. Views on issues of modern social life are also divided into 'good' and 'bad,' and there is a complete lack of processing dilemmas and complex approaches (see, e.g., Koutsogiannis, 2017:377, 384; Butulussi, 2001).

The lack of focus on connections and relations in education has long ago been stressed by Bateson as a severe problem, but it is only until recently that his ideas became widely known (Bateson, 1972; 2017).

Critical multiliteracies with emphasis on multimodality, polyphony, and reflection

During the linguistics seminar course at the School of German Language and Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, A.U.Th., I have attempted to make these discriminatory lines fade away by combining principles and methods suggested in the framework of critical multimodal multiliteracies. This approach belongs to the new critical approaches to education and begins with critical education, critical multiliteracies, critical linguistic awareness e.t.c.[3] This framework of critical multiliteracies proposes the connection between education and the needs of the modern multicultural society, which makes use of new technological media. It is supported that education needs to distance itself from monocultural models.[4] It also needs to promote the acceptance of differences (social, cultural, linguistic, e.t.c.) along with the values of democracy, justice, parity, and solidarity so that these values can be the landmark of modern societies (see Declaration on European Identity (Copenhagen 1973)[5] in Wodak, 2015:189).

---

[2] CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning (see Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010).

[3] See, e.g., Fairclough, 1992; Kalantzis and Cope, 2001:214, 216; Janks, 201o; Helland, 2018 and for an overview in Greek, see, e.g., Koutsogiannis, 2017; Mitsikopoulou, 2001:209-212; Butulussi 1999; Stamou, Archakis, and Politis, 2016.

[4] For a brief, critical overview of the approaches of multicultural, intercultural, anti-racist education see Butulussi, 2010b.

[5] https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/-9c69-4b7d-b2c9-f03a8db7da32/publishable_en.pdf

It also needs to equip the citizens of tomorrow with those skills that are necessary for communication in multilingual and multimodal co-texts/contexts. Those involve texts that combine various semiotic manners, e.g., written texts and oral transcripts that make use of images, schematics, maps, and semiotically complex productions such as videos, films, TV shows e.t.c.

The aim of education, according to critical multiliteracies, is to raise awareness of the various forms of literacy and language use, which are considered to shape and be shaped through ideologies connected to multiple types of social power (e.g., Mitsikopoulou, 2001:209-213).

The linguistics seminar course focuses on content and methods which foster the discovery and creation of connections, syntheses, interactions, and as holistic as possible views. Therefore, our theoretical framework of analysis is a critical, reflective analysis of multimodal discourses, and our focus is mainly on the study of texts relating to current issues taken from the Media, politics, education, mass culture, and art, which trouble the students. The analysis attempts at highlighting polyphony (Bakhtin, 2002), that is, the many views and ideologies which are popular both within society and among people and unveil features pertinent to their construction. To that end, the main concern in this seminar course is the constant reflection (Kotsakis et al., 2010) regarding our own views and actions in connection with the discourses under study.

Critical, multimodal discourse analysis and contemporary art as a genre germane to education

The clips that are shown on the video are taken from the lesson "The metaphor that connects: Contemporary art in a linguistics lesson at A.U.Th.", which is part of the seminar course "Discourse analysis and language teaching." This seminar course, which is completed in 14 3-hour lessons, analyzes different textual genres in German and Greek, which approach migration from a sociolinguistic, socio-political, historical, and psychological perspective. The texts are taken from academic sources, Greek and German TV talk shows, and contemporary art pieces such as the "Laboratory of Dilemmas," which is studied here. These texts are analyzed within the scope of the theoretical framework of discourse analysis, which associates the principles and methods of critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992; 2010) with the social semiotic multimodal discourse analysis (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006). The study of the art project is focused on metaphor and argumentation. A brief overview follows on the reasons for the choices made concerning the theoretical framework, and the object of the analysis.

The theoretical framework of a critical multimodal discourse analysis offers a holistic view of a topic, which, in this case, regards migration. It investigates the intertextual dialogue among the various texts which constitute the migration discourse. It highlights the polyphonic perspectives (agreement, disagreement, clash, dilemma) by focusing on the particular communicative and social conditions as well as on the ways these are produced and consumed (Fairclough, 1992; 2010).

Let us now take a closer look at why a contemporary art project, specifically the "Laboratory of Dilemmas" by G. Drivas, can play a cardinal role in the educational process. This project includes texts from different eras, which appear either in clips (of a documentary about a biological experiment) or as references (to Aeschylus' "*Suppliant Women*"). These texts are presented in an installation, in video or audio format throughout a kind of a peripatetic (walking) cinema. The analysis of the project "Laboratory of Dilemmas" allows us to connect the ancient Greek tragedy with the documentary, art with science and ethics, the peripatetic narration and cinema with the other kinds of multimodal texts emerging in the international space of the Biennale, e.g., interviews, speeches, internet posts, digital material.

Approaching migration through various voices and shapes creates many multisensory connections between the viewers and students and the project. These activate multiple mental-emotional processes and physical experiences that stimulate the imagination and offer a holistic and active understanding of the project and its addressing issues (Stavrakakis et al., 2008).

The composability in contents and forms of a contemporary art project and the active investigation in various current multimodal sources make the lesson engaging. These help educators and students practice thorough observation and discover associations between content and form through familiarizing themselves with many interactive ways.

Consequently, we, students and educators, are initially at the position of the "researcher who does not know" (see the following section). We work together to figure out the interpretations in the mind of the artist as well as any other possible interpretations that arise from the connections made, during the lesson, with other texts and our own opinions.[6]

We opted to investigate metaphor and argumentation in these texts because they both play a connecting role; they condense, connect, and construct the views presented in a text.

Metaphor

In linguistics, the theory that took metaphor out of the limelight and laid the groundwork for its study is Conceptual Metaphor Theory. According to it, metaphor is a central mechanism of human cognition (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:153).

According to Bateson, the metaphor does not concern only humans but "constitutes a pattern of thought, perception, and communication throughout the whole living world. It may be a part of the mental strategy of the entire biosphere. Metaphor defines the relation between the associations of two entities, their resemblance or their difference. The statement "the world is a (theatrical) stage" delineates the relationship between these connected

---

[6] See related excerpt from the interview in the appendix "Talking to the artist, G. Drivas": "*First of all, I had discussed this with Mrs. Butulussi, that I don't necessarily believe that there is only one interpretation. Let alone if this interpretation is mine. For example, I don't believe that if someone doesn't understand my work the way I have thought of it, he/she is wrong. On the contrary, I believe that this is a basis for discussion.*"

elements that constitute the theater and those related parts that constitute the world, in the framework of specific communication. Metaphor comprises of two parts, each of which has its own complexity (world, stage) but is one single entity (Moureli, 2018:10).

Let us now focus on metaphor as a mechanism of human cognition and see when and how it is used in human communication. Metaphor helps us understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:5).

Look at the example taken from the following excerpt of the project:

> "We need to get lost in a labyrinth of problems and challenges and find our way out."

Based on this linguistic metaphor (*get lost in a labyrinth)* lies the conceptual metaphor THOUGHT or THINKING IS WALKING IN A LABYRINTH [7], meaning that the source domain WALKING IN A LABYRINTH is used to make the target domain THOUGHT or THINKING understood. This metaphor creates conceptual mappings between the course someone takes in a labyrinth and the thought process.

Contemporary theories on metaphor do not just bring forward the conceptual views of metaphors but also focus on its various forms (language, picture, sound, gestures, and more) as well as the co-text and context of the discourse within which the metaphor is produced.[8] According to Forceville (2009:24), *"(...) multimodal metaphors are metaphors whose target and source are each represented exclusively or predominantly in different modes."*

He also distinguishes between the following modes: spoken language; written language; pictures; gestures, music, non-verbal sound; smell; taste; and touch.

The conceptual metaphor (DILEMMATIC) THOUGHT IS WALKING IN A LABYRINTH can be manifested through various linguistic signs. Also, through other signs that employ multiple modes, e.g. visual signs, 3D constructions -as in the art project under analysis- ultimately rendering it multimodal. Each form of metaphor and the context within which it is produced gives us the necessary evidence to define, as precisely as possible, the cultural, ideological, and rhetorical motivation of a metaphor user (Charteris-Black, 2014), as well as the multiple connections and relations it creates.

Nora Bateson (2010) talks about these relations and the significance of art in human communication in the documentary about her father:

> "Metaphor is the language of relationships, the language of natural systems, in which there is room to communicate in spectrums of possibility, instead of tightly defined cul-de-sacs. (…) Expression through the arts was considered by

---

[7] Small Capital letters indicate a concept.
[8] See Cameron and Deignan, 2006· Forceville, 2009· Charteris-Black, 2014· Musolff, 2016, and for a brief overview of the development of the theoretical approaches on metaphor see Butulussi, 2019a.

Gregory to be the most honest and pure form of human communication." (Nora Bateson in van Boeckel, 2011).

For the various connections and relations to emerge, the whole project needs to be analyzed in its entirety based on the principles and methods of critical discourse analysis and social semiotic multimodal discourse analysis within which framework metaphor analysis is included. Therefore, to fully understand and interpret the metaphors employed by the artist in "Laboratory of Dilemmas," the description of the whole project is needed with references to its content, its modes of elaboration, its production and presentation conditions (see Biennale 2017; national participation of Greece; socio-political situation in Greece and Europe; migration/refugee issue).

Argumentation

During the study of the project, the analysis of argumentation is in the spotlight since it highlights the dilemma's components. According to Toulmin's classical model (1958), argumentation includes at least a) data or arguments, b) warrants (e.g., principles, values), and c) claim or conclusion, meaning that data and warrants lead to a conclusion. Warrants (e.g., principles, values) are significant because speakers draw their conclusions primarily due to them. For example, when the warrants of a person lead them to a specific conclusion (e.g., foreigners must go), that person in order to defend it, "constructs" the data in such a way (e.g., stresses the risks of having foreigners) to be in accordance with the conclusion they wish to draw.

Data comprise of the circumstances and the consequences that can be predicted for an action.[9] In cases where the consequences cannot be predicted, the warrants again lead us to a particular conclusion.[10] The discovery of the components of argumentation offers the possibility of connecting arguments, principles, values, and conclusions and lets the different voices and the corresponding ideologies emerge.

Methods of teaching-research emphasizing the active role of the students and reflective dialogue

In this seminar course, the chosen methods of teaching-research facilitate the active role of the students resulting in the roles of 'student,' 'professor,' 'researcher' being alternated during the learning process.

After the professor's presentations, students choose and study (multimodal) texts, which are later presented in the seminars at the university (or in secondary education classes). During the lesson, there are frequent discussions regarding the presented topics.[11] The lessons take place in a computer room, and the forty-five (45) junior and senior year students are

---

[9] Consequences are important mainly in a practical reasoning context found in problem-solution cases (see Fairclough and Fairclough, 2010:60, 65· 2012:45, 51, 88).

[10] Drivas addresses the issue of this difficulty in the interview because the dilemma emerging in his project is due to the fact that consequences cannot be accurately predicted.

[11] See Butulussi 2010c about the "Open Dialogue" in education.

required to post written texts on the forum 'Reflective comments and evaluation' created on A.U.Th. e-learning platform. As soon as a student posts her/his comments, she/he can read all the other comments. These comments offer ground for new discussions in the next lessons.[12] Students have access to the posted files regarding the particular lesson, e.g., lecture slides, scanned texts, activities, and they can also look for information online. Regarding reflection, students also transcribe and analyze seminar discussions.

At times, our task goes beyond the university grounds; e.g., we watch a play, go to contemporary art exhibitions relating to issues tackled at the seminar, carry out interviews between the artists and the students, collaborate with secondary education, and more (Butulussi, 2010a).

So, the emergence and creation of polyphony emanate from the different texts under analysis. And also, the discussions and the texts produced by the students. The main target is to trigger interactions among subjects (e.g., linguistics, sociology, psychology, history, art), between educators and students, among linguistic and other semiotic forms, among different textual genres.

Through this active process of analyzing a work of art in relation to metaphor and argumentation, we acquire a complex and dynamic image of the migration and refugee issue. And also, some awareness of the various parameters factoring into the production and interpretation of this image.

A distinctive feature of the project is that it places the dilemmas surrounding the complex issues of migration and refugee seeking at the center of its problematic. These dilemmas regard the saving of what is 'foreign/unfamiliar' and preserving the security and safety of the 'native/familiar.'

"Laboratory of dilemmas": A critical, reflective, multimodal analysis with emphasis on metaphor and argumentation

Description of the construction and the basic story[13]

"Laboratory of dilemmas" is a project by the artist George Drivas curated by Orestis Andreadakis. The work has been selected by an advisory committee, appointed by the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports, among a total of 30 proposals to represent Greece at the 2017 Venice Biennale.[14] It is a narrative installation in a 2-floor building expanding on 200 sq.m., which is composed of

---

[12] This forum was designed by the staff members of the e-learning platform at A.U.Th. at the request of the instructor. I would like to deeply thank the staff members, and especially Despina Papadaki, for their willingness and constant availability to solve any problems that arise and improve it.

[13] I owe tremendous gratitude to the artist, George Drivas, who made all of the unpublished texts of his project available to us and was open to discuss our questions and interpretations through any means necessary (e-mails, personal meetings, Skype).

[14] At the end of this text, following the references, there is a list of websites which contain information for the project (video, photographs, texts, and more).

three spaces that construct the narration. Let us now see the story and the central narration as this is distributed in the actual area.

Entrance:

When someone enters the building, they read the following on a big sign:

> *In June 2016, visual and audio excerpts of a documentary on a biological experiment were discovered in Buenos Aires; it took place from October 1968 to December 1969, probably at a lab in Central Europe.*
>
> *The clips are accompanied by the notes of the unidentified filmmaker, along with an English translation of Aeschylus' the "Suppliant Women", an ancient tragedy that recounts the adventures of fifty women fleeing Egypt to seek asylum in the city of Argos in Greece. The experiment concerned the treatment of all types of hepatitis, through the creation of resistant liver cells that were to be transplanted into patients. It has become a sort of legend in the scientific community since its results remain unknown. Very little information has been preserved about the experiment's progress and the film that documented it. According to the findings, the events seem to have unfolded as follows.*

Next, the spectator climbs a flight of stairs to their right and moves upstairs. After they go through the top floor, they move downstairs and go through the lower level into a projection room where they sit and watch a film.

This construction comprises three spaces in total:

A. *Upper floor:*

On the top floor, there is a corridor with videos and five monitors. As the spectators walk in this corridor, clips of a documentary are shown referring to a biological experiment that targets the treatment of hepatitis. In those clips, only the professor and his colleagues are shown talking. The professor informs us that their struggling year-long research is now successful.

B. *Lower floor:*

At the lower level, the spectator -while crossing the labyrinth- hears, in 5 audio points, audio files from the same documentary in which the professor discusses an unexpected development in the experiment with his colleagues. One of the researchers talks about the sudden appearance of a problem:

> *"A new cell population in our cell culture (liver cells) increases!"*

These new cells are trying to organize with the existing resilient cells because it seems that they will not survive otherwise.

The professor must now face a dilemma:

a) *"If we don't allow these new cells to organize with our culture, we risk losing them. (…)* (The new discovery must be saved). *It will be to our benefit and, most of all, to the benefit of science."*

b) On the other hand, *"if we let them stay with our culture, the whole experiment might be in jeopardy."*

PROFESSOR

> "(…) *I can't make this decision alone. Risking a whole experiment is not a matter of personal choice. I need to take this to the board of the Institute. I believe that these new cells should be saved. Let's hope that the final decision is the correct one.*"

The professor, the researchers, the manager, and the board members gather to decide what should be done.

C. Projection room:

In the projection room, spectators watch a 15-minute film of the discussion among the professor, the manager, the researchers, and the board members.

In this *third space* with the cinema screen, the spectator watches the debates and the detailed arguments of each side without ever finding out their final decision regarding the development of the experiment.

(Multimodal) metaphors: The dilemma - the laboratory, the "Suppliant Women," the labyrinth

The central narration is associated with Aeschylus' tragedy "*Suppliant Women,*" which is being referred to by the Professor in the video clips shown on the top floor (see below). Through the different texts and the various ways chosen by the artist, the spectator processes a series of dilemmas, which are directly or indirectly linked to the dilemma of the research team and the board members, in a mental-emotional and physical manner.

The artist opts for the metaphor of the labyrinth to shed light on the dilemma from different angles. The concept of LABYRINTH initially appears as a word and as an image in the second clip showing the Professor talking:

> "*So, here you can see a model of our laboratory building! It is designed to look and feel like a labyrinth, like a maze. All areas communicate with each other and lead one to another. If you don't know how to find your way in it, you will probably get lost! That is exactly what should happen, though! We should first get lost in a labyrinth of problems, maybe… in a complicated research study in order to find the way out, the solution that will help us to exit the maze as winners! We have often put in our experiments small, adorable mice in a maze-like this one. Watching them, I realized that the way they move inside the maze should inspire us as human beings and scientists! A mouse never stops moving in the maze until it finds the exit! That should be our attitude! To enter this laboratory with questions and problems and never stop moving inside it until we find the solution! Nothing should prevent us or discourage us! We are entering a period where the only limit, the only obstacle, is our imagination. We have to dare the impossible!*".

The laboratory maquette, which the professor shows to his colleagues, is the same maquette of the project's entire installation, through which the spectator moves. This reference allows the spectator to become part of the project.

Hearing and reading these words, you automatically lean forward to look at the spectators in the lower level, and you think that the artist wants to impose this idea on you; that is, the spectators are like the mice in a laboratory. So, you view the spectators, much like how the researchers observe the mice in the laboratory, and you automatically think: 'I will be down there in a while; the other spectators will see me like a mouse.' The sense of security that comes with the role of the spectator wavers. Now the feeling of anxiety is about "what I have to understand, and how I will be further involved in the project.[15]

The artist begins to construct a series of conceptual metaphors in the mind of the spectators:

RESEARCHERS ARE MICE IN A LABORATORY [16]

SPECTATORS ARE RESEARCHERS

SPECTATORS ARE MICE IN A LABORATORY

SOCIETY IS A LABORATORY

MENTAL PROCESS FOR PROBLEM AND CHALLENGE SOLVING IS WALKING IN A LABYRINTH

ARGUMENTATION IS WALKING IN A LABYRINTH.

A few moments before the spectators move downstairs toward the labyrinth, hear the professor talking to a group of doctors telling them that he is rereading Aeschylus' "*Suppliant Women*" and that he would never want to be in the King's position and have to answer to that dilemma:

"I am reading Aeschylus' "Suppliant Women" again. Do you know the King's dilemma? If he saves the suppliant women, he risks confrontation with their persecutors, and this can have adverse consequences to him and his people. It could even mean war! If he does not save them, he goes against the will of the gods who dictate that no asylum-seeker will be ignored. I often think that I have been a lucky man in my life. I never had to face any such dilemma. Imagine being forced to decide whether to save someone in need by risking your own life or leave them to perish. What would you do were you in the King's position? Would you risk your own security to help or protect someone or… something?"

Afterward, you go downstairs and start crossing the labyrinth with its openings and shiny surfaces. At the beginning of the route, we are informed that we will hear five audio files, as recorded by the director of the documentary on his recorder. In these files, the researchers are heard telling the professor about the unexpected development in the experiment as well as their discussions with him. They present their arguments about the preservation or removal of the new cells. At first, the professor is heard saying how lucky he has been because he never had to face such a dilemma like the King of Argos. However,

---

[15] See Kress & van Leeuwen (1996:119-158) about the analysis of interpersonal/interactive metafunction created between the producer and the audience.

[16] The first concept is always the target domain, and the second is the source domain. E.g., Conceptual metaphor RESEARCHERS ARE MICE/ target domain: RESEARCHERS/ source domain: MICE.

then, the situation is overturned, and the professor does have a dilemma on his hands concerning the experiment's development. As a spectator, I caught myself thinking: "Thank goodness, I don't have to answer that dilemma." But while I was walking through the labyrinth anxiously and with great difficulty due to the openings, the shiny surfaces, the darkness, the bad sound quality, I started to worry that I will not find the correct audio file, I will get lost on my way out; I was wondering about the different opinions of the researchers, and I was eager to find out what the answer to the dilemma is.

There are points in the project where the line distancing the spectator from the project is blurred out. Step by step, the whole project makes us a part of it. It pushes us to think, while at the same time is creating the analogous emotion and experience. To think, that the position of the powerful, the observer or the uninvolved is risky, and that we can quickly lose the security that comes with each position and render ourselves weak, observed, being under control.

In the last audio file, the professor states that the decision cannot be made only by himself, but the issue needs to be presented to the Board of the Institute.

Before we see what is discussed in the third area, let us take a closer look at the function of the instantiations of the conceptual metaphor (DILEMMATIC) THOUGHT IS A LABYRINTH or (DILEMMATIC) THOUGHT IS WALKING IN A LABYRINTH.

By constructing a real labyrinth, the artist converts the linguistic metaphor of the *labyrinth* into a multimodal one. As such, the spectator receives the metaphor (DILEMMATIC) THOUGHT IS WALKING IN A LABYRINTH with more than one senses and experiences it physically. The spectators, in reality, walk through the 'paths,' the branches of the dilemma. So, the strenuous mental attempt, which the spectator is making in order to follow the arguments and think them through, is accompanied by the physical effort to see and hear clearly, to move toward the right direction and finally find their way out. Language, image, sound, light, movement, touch are all united and impact the body that moves and reacts. The real-life labyrinth embodies the experience of the conceptual metaphor (DILEMMATIC) THOUGHT IS WALKING IN A LABYRINTH.[17]

We could schematically describe the different instantiations of the LABYRINTH metaphor as follows:

Source domain: LABYRINTH

a) Linguistic instantiation of the metaphor: e.g., *Get lost in a labyrinth of problems and challenges and find our way out.*

b) Visual instantiation of the metaphor: The professor shows a picture of the model of a laboratory, which is the exact same as the laboratory in which we are.

---

[17] See Butulussi (2019b) about "The interweaving of the Embodied, the Cultural, and the Ideological".

c) The 3D instantiation of the metaphor:[18] In the "Laboratory of dilemmas," the spectator walks with difficulty in the dilemma's 'paths' through a real-life labyrinth.

The experience of the spectator is not only physical but also cultural, because the labyrinth is a cultural heritage and some of its associations to history, art, and science are well-known. Some examples: The museum in Heraklion exhibits a series of labyrinths created as part of art projects, e.g., the Maze in the Hampton Court Palace in England designed by George London and Henry Wise in 1700, the labyrinth garden in Kubrick's *The Shining* (1980), the album *Labyrinth* by David Bowie (1986).[19] In psychology, the unconscious is often symbolized by corridors, labyrinths, or mazes (Jung 1988:171). In modern times, there is a trend to design labyrinths in hospital or church gardens, e.t.c., because walking through a labyrinth is considered to have a healing effect (Lauren, 2006).

After the labyrinth, the spectators enter the third space and watch the 15-minute film, which shows the professor, the researchers, the director, the manager, and other board members[20] presenting their arguments in favor of one or the other view. The spectators anxiously wait for a final decision, which is never shown.

In the "*Suppliant Women,*" Aeschylus does not narrate what was discussed or on what premises the decision was taken. Instead, he presents what was indeed decided: their decision was to provide asylum to the suppliant women. The Laboratory of dilemmas, on the contrary, unveils all of the components (arguments -data and consequences-, values, the conclusion) of the board members' argumentation, but the final decision remains a secret. Spectators are required to continue their deliberation, take the dilemma of the board members with them together with a further indirect dilemma emerging from the professor's reference to the "*Suppliant Women.*" With this intertextual reference, Drivas creates an allegory which produces more metaphors in the minds of the spectators:

SUPPLIANT WOMEN ARE THE NEW CELLS IN THE BIOLOGICAL EXPERIMENT

MODERN MIGRANTS/REFUGEES ARE SUPPLIANT WOMEN and NEW CELLS

THE NATIVES OF A HOST COUNTRY ARE THE OLD CELLS

GREECE IS THE GREEK PROFESSOR

THE TECHNOCRATIC COUNTRIES ARE THE DIRECTOR

---

[18] The description of the model and the real labyrinth is only possible with words. Consequently, it limits the analysis of the features that constitute multimodal metaphors to the options that are lexically possible.

[19] About a discussion on the influence of the LABYRINTH metaphor in the topic selection and structure of the texts of literature, see Rassidakis (1994) and Babassikas (2017).

[20] The final scene features Charlotte Rampling, George Kotanidis, Lazaros Georgakopoulos, Kora Karvouni, Polidoros Vogiatzis, Rena Kiprioti, Panis Kalofolias.

THE MARKETS ARE THE MANAGER

THE MEMBERS OF HUMANITARIAN ORGANIZATIONS, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, etc. ARE THE RESEARCHERS OF THE BIOLOGICAL EXPERIMENTS

The reference to the "*Suppliant Women,*" which makes the creation of the metaphors mentioned above possible, leads spectators to yet another dilemma emerging in the current situation involving asylum-seekers. What do we do with migrants and refugees? What dilemmas do we need to process before deciding what should happen? Who makes the decision and based on which warrants? How much is each one of us involved in these issues? This project was selected to represent Greece during a time when Greece was one of the host countries of the most massive refugee flows. Therefore, the project automatically creates two different dilemmas to its spectators; the direct one which regards the protagonists and the cells, and an indirect one which concerns the spectators and the refugees.

The artist does not give us an answer. Various interpretations about this open ending are investigated in the video and the interview. Some of the artist's thoughts are quoted here:

> In the interview, Drivas says: *"(…) thinking is going in a labyrinth from which we may never get out, but we can find 300 cracks on the walls. (…) The point is, through this discussion, to understand each time why you decide what you decide, and to cover the whole range of arguments. Not to say something just by reacting, automatically, let us say, not to repeat clichés. Think about why you did this or that at the time, what was at stake and what was lost. It is essential to know the whole color palette."*

Drivas addresses a more specific request on the project's listing:

> *"In the Greek pavilion, the spectator and the story's protagonist share the same agony. We have to get lost in its data; we have to expose ourselves, in order to find a solution and become wiser, in the words of the protagonist. The labyrinth is a challenge we have to undertake; it is the time and energy we have to invest, the work we must do, as individuals and as societies." (Drivas and Andreadakis, 2017:45).*

Taking the analysis of the project and Drivas' answers to the issues that troubled him into consideration, the desire of the artist for his work to continue through the deliberations of the spectators in various spaces where these can occur (politics, educations, social movement, and more) became apparent to us. These deliberations involve crucial issues that were in existence from the time of Aeschylus to date and for years to come.

Dilemma and argumentation

The questions mentioned above, as well as both sides of the dilemma, were thoroughly discussed during the seminar at the University. Having access to the texts of the video discussions between the professor and the researchers and of the film discussion among the board members, the arguments of both

sides were classified according to the practical reasoning model by Fairclough and Fairclough (2010:65; 2012:45, 51, 88).

A. The dilemma and arguments about the cells

Aα. The professor and the researchers:

- Arguments:

  1a) Data, circumstances:

  New cells have been accidentally developed in the culture. The analyses show that they will not survive if they do not organize with the existing ones. They are related because they look like ours.

  1b) Consequences:

  There is a possibility that if the new cells are united with the old ones, ours will become weaker (negative), but this does not necessarily entail the destruction of our culture (neutral). There are indications that this can make our liver cells more resilient (positive).

- Values:

  We need to try and change the lives of people for the better. We need to dare what is impossible. We need to believe in ideas, values, visions, and devote our lives to them. Not fear what is unknown; otherwise, we will not get anywhere. Scientific discoveries need to be protected. The values and principles of scientists are in favor of constant experimentation and testing of new things. We need to face change not as a danger but as the birth of something new. These values are part of scientific ethics.

- Conclusion: Claim for action (solution)

  Preserve and protect the new cells.

Ab. The director:

- Arguments:

  1a) Data and circumstances:

  The new cells were developed by accident, out of control.

  1b) Consequences:

The new cells will jeopardize the experiment. Even if they do not destroy the old ones, but join them, they might prove dangerous for the human body in which they will be implanted.

- Values:

  Control and preserving the old are the highest values. What is of value is the hard work of those who have devoted themselves to a particular cause, which is almost accomplished. What is of value is the joint coordinated effort. These should be protected, and not what is unknown.

- Conclusion: Claim for action (solution)

  Preserve our initial objectives, settle with our culture of old cells, isolate the new cells, and leave them on their own fate.

These argumentations gave rise to research questions and the study of texts which examine the principles and values determining the ways of problem-tackling in contemporary social life and environment. Such examples could be control, rationalism, determinism or humanitarianism, parity, solidarity, indeterminism, contingence (see Epicurus in Theodoridis 1999:367).

B. Dilemma and arguments about refugees

From the thorough discussion regarding the dilemma which directly involves the spectators in relation to migrants and refugees, the following task with only a fraction of students' answers is adduced:

Task: If we did not talk about 'new cells' but 'migrants,' 'refugees,' 'the excluded' who reach our country, which would be the claim for action based on Ba) the professor's values and Bb) the director's values?

Ba) Claims for action according to the professor's values:

Rescue, protection, better living conditions (no camps), educational opportunities, inclusion in the country and society, information for the local communities and collaborations with locals and foreigners regarding problem-solving in the area, e.g., refugee participation in the parents' association or the building management committee, etc.

Bb) Claim for action according to the director's values:

Isolation from society and exclusion in camps and accommodation centers, non-provision of help or rights (see anti-incentives policy: so that others do not come), etc.

The deliberation was continued in the seminar with specific examples taken from the lives of migrants/refugees who experience exclusion in society and

school. Therefore, the descriptions of certain occasions yielded more information that was incorporated in the argumentation, and specific claims for actions were drawn. This process clarified that there are no generalized answers or axiomatic solutions regarding the course of action that needs to be taken each time there is an exclusion incidence (Kotsakis 2010:146).

The study of related bibliography on social/sociolinguistic and psychological approaches to the 'foreign,' to racism, nationalism and more, set the basis for understanding the contemporary migration/refugee issue and its various constructions in historical and geopolitical context as well as the particular circumstances in Greece (see, e.g., Agamben 1995; Bauman, 2011; Gazakis et al., 2014; Papastergiou et al., 2019).

The dilemma and the importance of its process in education

At the beginning of this text, it was mentioned that in education, there are still many instances of opinion control and their distinction in 'good' or 'bad,' rendering the processing of dilemmas and complex approaches on contemporary life issues prohibitive. Further, the various subjects, as well as the roles of educators and students, are strictly delineated. One of the objectives of this seminar is to bring all those educational parameters, so rigidly defined, closer together, and highlight the significance of processing dilemmas.

In this final chapter of the text, some observations about the educational praxis in connection with parameters which inhibit the processing of dilemmas about contemporary life issues are put forward. There is also a brief presentation of sociological, psychological, and philosophical perspectives of dilemmas and education, which show that the realization, acceptance, and processing of dilemmas, inside the school or outside of it, sets the basis for any active, emancipating, learning process.

In contemporary education, it has been observed that monocultural and traditional perspectives co-exist together with intercultural and inclusive ones (Butulussi, 2010b). According to bibliography[21] and students' and educators' testimonies, in both cases, the processing of dilemmas and the accompanying mixed feelings created in the school and the broader community regarding the inclusion or exclusion of the unfamiliar is avoided.

Through their posts on the 'Reflective comments' forum and the discussions during the lesson, students have stated that it was not possible to express their contradictory views at school, e.g., out of fear of being labeled as 'racist' or because teachers would not allow such discussions to continue.

Through discussions under the scope of collaborations between the University and secondary education, educators have claimed that they avoid elaborating on dilemmas and contradictory feelings, e.g., out of fear of creating tension in the classroom, inciting parents' reactions, or empowering the opposing discourse. They worry that in such an open discussion, they will be unable to provide an answer, which will nullify them as teachers.

---

[21] See Mitsikopoulou & Koutsogiannis, 2005:103, 104 in Butulussi, 2006:335-336 and in Koutsogiannis, 2017:255-256.

There is, also, a reference to perspectives that view the dilemma as a structural feature of thought. They underline, on the one hand, the critical role of the 'Pedagogy of seeing,' and on the other hand, the 'Student emancipation.' These opinions might mitigate the fears the educators have expressed and show how significant and self-evident the processing of dilemmas in the learning process is.

The dilemma as a structural feature of thought - Awareness and acceptance of dilemmas in education

According to Billig et al. (1988), the thought, common sense, and ideology are dilemmatic in nature. The theory of ideological dilemmas highlights the role of the argumentation of the 'thinking society' and of 'thinking individuals.' Dilemmas are not considered contradictions but structural features of thought, without which argumentation and ideological dialogue would not be possible. For the writers, the analysis of the dilemmatic features of speech contributes to the development of critical thinking and social change and action (Billig et al., 1988:32).

Mixed feelings and ambivalence usually accompany dilemmas. Green (1996) claims that an individual's primary concern is *"to be aware of their ambivalence and be able to withstand the tension created by contradictory feelings. However, for this process to be possible for an individual, it needs to be supported by social institutions, which handle contradiction and difference with flexibility rather than dividing and polarizing it" (*Green, 1996:20 in Vosniadou, 2002:7).

To that end, education could search for an active role including the processing of dilemmas and the accompanying mixed feelings. Through discussion, experiential, and reflective 'tasks,' text or art project analysis, much like the one analyzed here and many more, could lead to the awareness of their existence and their acceptance. The latter is of cardinal importance, since avoiding the processing of dilemmas is one of modern society's primary lacks.

'The Pedagogy of seeing' and 'The emancipation of the student'

Avoiding processing dilemmas is not only observed in education, but it is one of the deficits of modern societies. According to Han, our society wants to be sleek, like Jeff Koons' sculptures or iPhone screens. The fast transmission of information makes our society conducive to positivity rather than negativity and insightful thinking (Han, 2015a:10-11). Trends in critical multiliteracies, as mentioned above, place great emphasis on critical, reflective analysis, which is more insightful and aims at -for example- unveiling ideologies and power relations that govern texts and discourses. Han draws on Nietzsche's views on education and supports that it needs to be prioritized yet again. The individual must learn to resist the immediate reaction to a stimulus, but learn how to see, meaning that they need to practice being in tranquility, patience, contemplative, and profound attention. This pedagogical seeing leads to consolidation, contemplation, and spirituality (Han, 2015b:79).

This goal can be achieved if students have an active role, much like the researcher's - among others. The recent approaches within the framework of

pedagogy, psychology, and linguistics offer productive arguments for the inadequacy and inefficiency of a teacher-oriented approach (Bibou, 2010). A brief reference to Rancière is in order here. He expresses this exact opinion with a quite successful metaphor; he says that the educators "*do not teach their own knowledge to students, but push them to wander in the forest of things and signs, say what they saw and think about what they saw.*" As a result, "*the student learns from their teacher something that the teacher him/herself does not know*" (Rancière, 2015:20, 23). Together they transform the map of what is "perceived and thought" and create "*new forms of experiencing the perceived, new distances with the existing form of the granted (…)*" (Rancière, 2010:20, 23, 85).

The educators, delving into these views and reflecting on the construction of models governing their teaching, are expected to distance themselves from the perspective of the all-knowing teacher, who provides answers with the security and certainty of their authority. Uncertainty throughout the processing of dilemmas will not create insecurities or guilt. The status of the "not knowing researcher," another one of Rancière's statements, leaves room for educators and students to assume a more active role and stimulates inventiveness, imagination, and willingness to play during the learning process (see Huizinga, 2010 about "Homo Ludens"). Bateson was very interested in art because he believed that the logical mind needed correction from dreams, art, and poetry (van Boeckel, 2011).

These learning processes can facilitate the prevention of various social and mental problems that can arise from an education characterized by disjunction, discrimination, and authority. I sincerely hope that the lesson featured in the video, as well as the seminar presented in this text, will give enough food for thought.

Concluding Remarks

This text presented a linguistics seminar course called "Discourse analysis and language teaching," during which students learn about the theoretical framework of (critical) discourse analysis, the theories for the analysis of (multimodal) metaphors and argumentation, and the theories of language teaching (literacy). The application, practice, and consolidation of these theoretical approaches include the analysis of Greek and German (multimodal) texts with an emphasis on the analysis of metaphor and argumentation. These texts are primarily taken from TV debates and contemporary art projects. In the particular lesson shown in the video, there is the analysis of the contemporary art project "Laboratory of dilemmas," which is grounded on metaphors and argumentation used to express a dilemma about exclusion or inclusion of the unfamiliar.

Through these analyses, we had the opportunity to delve into issues of discourse analysis, metaphor, argumentation, migration, and language teaching. The choice of this contemporary art project, in particular, made it possible for us to discover various connections between different forms and meanings, and give multiple interpretations highlighting its polyphony. The various multimodal texts posted online to present the project, the complexity of its forms, and the openness of its interpretations allowed the professor and the students to assume the role of the

researchers. They have become collaborators looking for possible interpretations, each one contributing to the joint work through their own views, actions, and feelings.

I will conclude with quotes from some of the students' comments posted on the forum 'Reflective comments and evaluation,' and I want to thank all of them for our discussions and their valuable feedback:

"The lesson was intriguing and alternative. Students could freely express their views on the topic, and there was an interesting discussion." (Ch. K, A.T.)

"Our lesson today was absolutely understandable and incredibly interesting. We were particularly impressed with the 'laboratory of dilemmas,' which looked like a peripatetic cinema, as our professor told us. It is indeed impressive how contemporary art is trying to involve us and encourage us to be works of art ourselves, to be a part of it." (V.V., S.Th., P.K.)

"The lesson was something different, it was not just a lecture, but it made us think through Drivas' video on "Laboratory of dilemmas'. The idea of juxtaposing it with the migration issue and contradict the director's and the professor's arguments with those of the migrants was exceptional." (D.M., E.V.)

"The 'Laboratory of dilemmas' was a lesson that raised concerns and awoke our critical thinking; we practiced our ability to process texts. The lesson was interesting; we were given the opportunity to be a part of it each time. Still, the English part was quite hard." (G.G., Ch., P.)

"Today's lesson was particularly interesting because we saw -through metaphors- how hard it is to decide about an issue. The dilemma that arises when someone thinks of the pros and cons of a situation can be a mentally and spiritually agonizing process. We loved the film with the experiment because it showed how an individual's perception and attitude changes when they are implicated in a situation and they are not just bystanders, who just have an opinion, sometimes without being asked to." (O.L., M.M., M.V.)

"The use of the project 'Laboratory of dilemmas' was particularly successful. It highlights multimodality in discourse and, at the same time, reveals the multilevel use of metaphor. We dove in with two feet." (I.P.)

Acknowledgments

References

In English and German

Agamben, G. (1995). "We Refugees." Symposium 49 (2):114–119.

Babasikas, P. (2017). A Fork, a Path, a Film. In: G., Drivas (Ed.), 2017. *Laboratory of Dilemmas*. 57th International Art Exhibition La Biennale di Venezia 2017. Athens: National Museum of Contemporary Art (pp. 83-89).

Bakhtin, M. M. (2002). Discourse in the Novel. In: M., Holquist (Ed.): *The Dialogic Imagination by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press (pp. 259-422).

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Bateson, N. (2010). *An Ecology of Mind* - IMDb.

Bauman, Z. (2011). *Collateral damage. Social inequalities in a global age.* Cambridge. Polity Press.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A.R. (1988). *Ideological Dilemmas.* London: Sage Publications.

Butulussi, E. (2019a). Practical Reasoning and Metaphor in TV Discussions on Immigration in Greece: Exchanges and Changes. In: Musolf, A., and Lorella, V. (Eds.) *Migration and Media: Discourses about Identities in Crisis*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Butulussi, E. (2019b). Multimodal Metaphor and Discourse: The interweaving of the Embodied, the Cultural, and the Ideological. Presentation in the 40th Annual Meeting Department of Linguistics, Aristotle University Thessaloniki, April 5-6, 2019.

Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2006). "The Emergence of Metaphor in Discourse." *Applied Linguistics* 27 (4), (pp 671-690).

Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing Political Speeches. Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Drivas, G., & Andreadakis, O. (2017). Drivas George Orestis Andreadakis Mail in Progress. In: G., Drivas (Ed.), *Laboratory of Dilemmas*. 57th International Art Exhibition La Biennale di Venezia 2017. Athens: National Museum of Contemporary Art (pp. 39-45).

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language. London/ New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N., &. Fairclough, I. (2010). Argumentation analysis in CDA: Analyzing Practical Reasoning in Political Discourse. In: R. De Cillia, H. Gruber, H., Krzyżanowski, M. and Menz, F. (Eds.). *Discourse, Politics, Identity. Diskurs, Politik, Identität. Festschrift für Ruth Wodak.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg (pp. 59-70).

Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London/New York: Routledge.

Forceville, C. (2009). Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. In: Forceville, C., and E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.). *Multimodal metaphor.* Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, (pp.19-42).

Gazakis, A., & Syrri, D., & Takis, A. (2014). *Racism and Discrimination in Greece today.* Thessaloniki: Heinrich Böll Stiftung Greece http://www.selectrespect.org/ Interactive_EN.pdf

Helland, K.I. (2018). Mona AKA Sad Girl: A multilingual multimodal critical discourse analysis of music videos of a Japanese Chicana rap artist. *Discourse, Context & Media* 23 (pp. 25-40).

Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and Power.* New York, London: Routledge

(https://www.scribd.com/document/361163027/JANKs-Hilary-2010-Literacy-and-Power

Jung, C.G. (Ed.) (1988) (1964, 1. ed.) *Man and his symbols*. Doubleday. New York, London, Toronto: Anchor Press.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (1996, 2. εκδ. 2006). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design.* London: Routledge. London & NY.

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lauren, A. (2006). *The Sacred Path Companion: A Guide to Walking the Labyrinth to Heal and Transform*. New York: Penguin Books.

Mitsikopoulou, B., & Koutosogiannis, D. (2005). The Iraq war as curricular knowledge. From the political to the pedagogic divide. *Journal of Language and Politics* 4, 1, (pp. 92-117).

Musolff, A. (2016). *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury.

Papastergiou, V., & Takou, E. (2019). *Persistent Myths about Migration in Greece*. Rosa Luxemburg Foundation. Office in Greece. https://rosalux.gr/en/publication/persistent-myths-about-migration-greece

Rassidakis, A. (1994). Labyrinth-Figurationen: Eine absolute Metapher und ihre rhizomatischen Auswüchse. *Mythologica* 8, (pp. 88-109).

Toulmin, S.E. (1959). *The uses of arguments.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Boeckel, J. (2011). When we find meaning in art, our thinking is most in sync with nature: A Review of An Ecology of Mind - The Gregory Bateson Documentary.

http://www.naturearteducation.org/AnEcologyOfMind.htm

Wodak, R. (2015). *The Politics of fear. What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*. London, UK: Sage.

In Greek

Aeschylus (463 b.C.). (1992). *Suppliant Women* [Ικέτιδες]. (T. Roussos, trans.). Athens: Kaktos.

Babasikas, P. (2017). *A Fork, a Path, a Film.* [Μια διακλάδωση, ένα μονοπάτι, μια ταινία]. In G., Drivas (Ed.), 2017. *Laboratory of Dilemmas*. 57th International Art Exhibition La Biennale di Venezia 2017. Athens: National Museum of Contemporary Art, (pp. 73-81).

Bateson, G. (2017). *Steps to an ecology of mind* [Βήματα για μια οικολογία του νου]. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.

Bibou, I. (2010). Psychology and school [Ψυχολογία και σχολείο]. In Kotsakis, D. et al. *Reflective Praxis. The exclusion in school* [Αναστοχαστική Πράξη. Ο αποκλεισμός στο σχολείο.]. Athens: Nissos, (pp. 307-383).

Butulussi, E. (1999). Language Awareness [Γλωσσική επίγνωση]. In A. F. Christidis (ed.) *Encyclopedic Guide to Language* [Εγκυκλοπαιδικός οδηγός για τη Γλώσσα]. Thessaloniki: Center for the Greek language & Electronic Hub. EPEAEK www.komvos.edu.gr, (pp. 223-229).

Butulussi, E. (2001). Critical thinking and doubting in a multicultural school: Perspectives beyond common sense [Η κριτική σκέψη και η αμφισβήτηση στο πολυπολιτισμικό σχολείο: Οπτικές πέρα από την κοινή λογική]. In A. Psaltou-Joycey & M. Valiouli (eds) *The contribution of Teaching and Learning Languages Promoting a Culture of Peace* [Η συμβολή της Διδασκαλίας και Εκμάθησης Γλωσσών στην Προώθηση ενός Πολιτισμού Ειρήνης]. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference of the Greek Applied Linguistics Association. December 9-12, 1999. Thessaloniki. (pp. 353-369).

Butulussi, E. (2006). The national self and the 'other' in lessons of critical linguistic awareness [Ο εθνικός εαυτός και ο 'άλλος' σε μαθήματα κριτικής γλωσσικής επίγνωσης]. In *Studies on Greek Language* [Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα], Proceedings of the 26th Annual meeting of the Linguistics department, School of Philosophy, A.U.Th., May 14-15, 2005, Thessaloniki. (pp. 329-346).

Butulussi, E. (2010a). Multimodality and multiliteracies in linguistic seminars at university education: The example of argumentation. [Πολυτροπικότητα και πολυγραμματισμοί σε σεμινάρια γλωσσολογίας της τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης: Το παράδειγμα της επιχειρηματολογίας]. In *Studies on Greek Language* [Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα], Proceedings of the 30th Annual meeting of the Linguistics department, School of Philosophy, A.U.Th., May 1-3, 2009, Thessaloniki. (pp. 411-421).

Butulussi, E. (2010b). Social Exclusion and School [Κοινωνικός αποκλεισμός και σχολείο]. In Kotsakis, D. et al. *Reflective Praxis. The exclusion in school* [Αναστοχαστική Πράξη. Ο αποκλεισμός στο σχολείο.]. Athens: Nissos, (pp. 253-306).

Butulussi, E. (2010c). Open dialogue and education [Ανοιχτός διάλογος και εκπαίδευση]. In *Metalogos 18.* Systemic Association Northern Greece. (pp. 118-130).

Drivas, G., & Andreadakis, O. (2017). George Drivas and Orestis Andreadakis, mail in progress [Γιώργος Δρίβας Ορέστης Ανδρεαδάκης αλληλογραφία εν εξελίξει]. In G., Drivas

(Ed.), 2017. *Laboratory of Dilemmas*. 57th International Art Exhibition La Biennale di Venezia 2017. Athens: National Museum of Contemporary Art (pp. 29-37).

Han, M.T. (2015a). *Transparency Society* [Κοινωνία της διαφάνειας]. Athens: Opera.

Han, M.T. (2015b). *Burn out Society* [Κοινωνία της κόπωσης]. Athens: Opera.

Huizinga, J. (2010). *Homo Ludens* [Ο άνθρωπος και το παιχνίδι]. Athens: Gnosi.

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2001). Multiliteracies (E2) Encyclopedic Guide to Language [Πολυγραμματισμοί [Ε2] Εγκυκλοπαιδικός Οδηγός για τη γλώσσα]. Thessaloniki: Center for the Greek language. (pp. 214-216).

http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/studies/guide/thema_e2/index.html
http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/studies/guide/thema_e2/01.html

Kotsakis, D., Moureli, E., Bibou, I., Butulussi, E., Alexandris, Ch., Gkesoglou, E., Karamanoli, K., Karpouza, A., Spanopoulou, E. (2010). *Reflective Praxis. Exclusion in School exclusion* [Αναστοχαστική Πράξη. Ο αποκλεισμός στο σχολείο.]. Athens: Nissos.

Koutsogiannis, D. (2017). *Language teaching yesterday, today, tomorrow: a political approach* [Γλωσσική διδασκαλία χθες, σήμερα, αύριο: μια πολιτική προσέγγιση]. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies: Manolis Triantaphyllidis Foundation.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2010). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design.* [Η ανάγνωση των εικόνων: Η γραμματική του οπτικού σχεδιασμού]. Thessaloniki: Epikentro.

Mitsikopoulou, V. (2001). Literacy (E1) *Encyclopedic Guide to language* [Γραμματισμός [Ε1] Εγκυκλοπαιδικός Οδηγός για τη γλώσσα]. Thessaloniki: Center for the Greek language. 209-213. Retrieved on 1/08/2016 from

http://www.greek- language.gr/greekLang/studies/guide/thema_e1/index.html

Moureli, E. (2010). The Reflective Praxis Group: Examples [Η Ομάδα της αναστοχαστικής πράξης: Παραδείγματα]. In Kotsakis, D. et al. *Reflective Praxis. The exclusion in school* [Αναστοχαστική Πράξη. Ο αποκλεισμός στο σχολείο.]. Athens: Nissos, (pp. 19-45).

Moureli, E. (2018). *Steps for the Ecology of the Mind: Humankind is a part of nature* [Βήματα για μια Οικολογία του Νου»: Η ανθρωπότητα είναι μέρος της φύσης.]. Retrieved from

https://www.psychologynow.gr/psyxologia-texni/vivlia/6275-vimata-gia-mia-oikologia-tou-nou-i-anthropotita.html

Rancière, J. (2010*). The emancipated spectator.* [Ο χειραφετημένος θεατής]. Athens: Ekkremes.

Stamou A.G., Archakis A., Politis P. (2016). Sociolinguistic variation and critical literacies in popular culture discourse: Mapping the field. [Γλωσσική ποικιλότητα και κριτικοί γραμματισμοί στον λόγο της μαζικής κουλτούρας: Χαρτογραφώντας το πεδίο]. In A.G. Stamou, P. Politis, A. Archakis (eds.). Sociolinguistic Diversity and Critical Literacies in Popular Culture Discourse: Suggestions for Language Teaching [Γλωσσική ποικιλότητα και κριτικοί γραμματισμοί στον λόγο της μαζικής κουλτούρας: Εκπαιδευτικές προτάσεις για το γλωσσικό μάθημα]. Kavala: Ekdoseis Saita, (pp. 13-55).

Stavrakakis, G., & Stafilakis, K. (Eds). (2008). *The political in contemporary art* [Το πολιτικό στη σύγχρονη τέχνη]. Athens: Ekkremes.

Theodoridis, Ch. (1999). *Epicurus. The real view of the ancient world* [Επίκουρος. Η αληθινή όψη του αρχαίου κόσμου]. Athens: Estia.

Vosniadou, T. (2002). Resilience in ambivalence as antidote to mental violence [Η αντοχή στην αμφιθυμία ως αντίδοτο στην ψυχική βία]. In K. Navridis (ed.) *Authority, violence, pain* [Εξουσία, βία, πόνος]. Part B. Athens: Kastaniotis, (pp.161-67).

Internet Sources: "Laboratory of Dilemas"

Athens Voice: [video file]. Retrieved from:

http://www.athensvoice.gr/culture/arts/429898_ti-gyreyei-i-charlotte-rampling-sto-emst.

Drivas, G. (2017). Laboratory of dilemmas. National participation in 57th Biennale Venice. National Commissioner: National Museum of Contemporary art. (Andreadakis, O., curator). (www.drivas.org)

National Museum of Contemporary art:

http://www.emst.gr/exhibitions/current-exhibitions/ergastirio-dilimmaton-giorgos-drivas,

http://laboratoryofdilemmas.gr/press/,

http://laboratoryofdilemmas.gr/el/texts/

Kaltaki, M. (2017)

http://www.monopoli.gr/EDITORS/item/164397-Oi-Iketides-toy-Aischyloy-kai-to-Ergasthrio-Dilhmmatwn-sto-EMST

Kaltaki, M. (2017). [Video file]. Retrieved from:

http://webtv.ert.gr/ert2/eidiseis-ert2/politistiko-deltio-ert2/29mar2018-politistiko-deltio/

Ottica TV. A walk-through of the Pavilions of Greece, Brazil, Austria, and Finland at the 57th Venice Biennale 2017. [Video file]. Retrieved from:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D2gfyW8rgSw

Time of image [Εποχή των εικόνων] (2017). Biennale Venice 2017: Part A. [Video file]. Retrieved from:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kmPFjr_vq54

Vogiatzis, K. (2017). *Laboratory of dilemmas.* [Video file]. Retrieved from:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y-nsB12IE7kPopagandagr

Interviews of G. Drivas in English

Drivas, G. (June 2018). *City Code Magazine.* Retrieved from:

https://www.citycodemag.com/george-drivas-artist-interview-emst-biennale-venezia/

Drivas, G. (July 2017). *Studio International.* Retrieved from:

https://www.studiointernational.com/index.php/george-drivas-laboratory-of-dilemmas-video-interview-greece-venice-biennale-2017-charlotte-rampling

Drivas, G. (April 2017). The Venice Questionnaire. Retrieved from:

https://artreview.com/previews/2017_venice_17_george_drivas_greek_pavilion/

Interviews of G. Drivas in Greek

Drivas, G. (June 2018). *City Code Magazine.* Retrieved from:

https://www.citycodemag.com/george-drivas-artist-interview-emst-biennale-venezia/

Drivas, G. (March 2018). What is Charlotte Rampling doing at the NMCT? [Τι γυρεύει η Charlotte Rampling στο ΕΜΣΤ;]. Retrieved from:

https://www.athensvoice.gr/culture/arts/429898_ti-gyreyei-i-charlotte-rampling-sto-emst

Drivas, G. (September 2017). *Venice Biennale* [Biennale Βενετίας]. [video file]. Retrieved from:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kmPFjr_vq54