Language in Society **51**, 735–748.
doi:10.1017/S0047404522000641

Semiotic timescapes

MICHELLE M. LAZAR

National University of Singapore, Singapore

ABSTRACT

In linguistic/semiotic landscape (LSL) studies, overall, time and temporalities have occupied a curious space between visibility and invisibility, resulting in time and temporalities being treated as an optional, additive, subordinate, or separate dimension in the linguistic and semiotic study of place-making. The term semiotic timescape serves as a heuristic concept which endeavours to centre time and its imbrication with space/place, with an explicit focus on the semiosis of 'temporalized place-making'. The five articles in this special issue highlight the 'complex and multiplex' dimensions of time (Adam 2008) interconnected with spaces/places, as important aspects in understanding social realities and practices, via entanglements with multimodal meaning-making, materialities, embodiment, and politics of social actors and communities. (Semiotic timescapes, interconnectedness of time and space, complexities and multiplexities, multimodality, materialities)*

INTRODUCTION

Linguistic/semiotic landscapes (LSLs) is a burgeoning area of study within sociolinguistics, which investigates the semiosis, or meaning-making practices, of public spaces as 'places', and regards space, broadly construed, as a semiotic resource in its own right in sense-making by social actors and communities (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara, & Trumper-Hecht 2006; Jaworski & Thurlow 2010; Stroud, Peck, & Williams 2019). As testament to the vitality of LSL scholarship, scores of edited volumes (e.g. Shohamy & Gorter 2008; Shohamy, Ben-Rafael, & Barni 2010; Jaworski & Thurlow 2010; Peck, Stroud, & Williams 2019; Putz & Mundt 2019; Malinowski & Tufi 2020), themed journal issues (e.g. Gorter 2006; Ben-Rafael & Shohamy 2016; Blackwood 2017; Milani 2018; Thurlow & Gonçalves 2019; Gaiser & Matras 2020; Jaworski & Li Wei 2021), and a journal on *Linguistic Landscape* (Shohamy & Ben-Rafael 2015) have emerged within a span of two decades.

Given the historical development of the field, space/place compared to time/temporality have received singular prominence in LSL scholarship. Descriptors such as 'geosemiotics' or 'place semiotics' (Scollon & Scollon 2003), 'a spatially interested sociolinguistics' (Karlander 2018), and 'spatial repertoires'

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/22 $15.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Malinowski & Tufi 2020), for instance, index the foregrounding (even if unintentional) of spatial semiosis in the field. Geographer Doreen Massey's (1994:249) observation a few decades ago that '"space" is very much on the agenda these days' still largely characterises the LSL field today. In the foregrounding of spaces/places in LSL scholarship, a corresponding emphasis on temporalities vis-à-vis spatialities remains comparatively under-explored and under-theorised in the field as a whole. The spatial hegemony in LSL studies has tended towards time and temporalities being overlooked, implicit, and assumed, or accorded ancillary attention (see, however, Blommaert 2013; Stroud et al. 2019).

TIME, SPACE, AND SEMIOSIS

Theorists especially from literary studies, geography, and sociology have emphasised that time cannot be bracketed off from the study of place, and that the two are mutually implicated and entangled (e.g. Bakhtin 1981; Lefebvre 2004; Massey 2005; Harvey 2009; Glennie & Thrift 2009), hence, the terminological expressions like 'time-space' or 'timespace'/'spacetime' to conceptually signal their interconnectedness. In the humanities and social sciences literature on temporalities and spatiotemporalities, consensus converges on a couple of points. First, like space (see Massey 2005), the temporal and temporal-spatialities are multiple, heterogenous, and complex in at least three ways. (i) There is more to temporality beyond simply the categories of 'past', 'present', and 'future', and their assumed linearity. Temporality is multifaceted and comprises a range of dimensions or expressions, and coexist and interact in multiply complex ways (Adam 1995). Among temporal dimensions that have been identified include synchronisation, memory and memorialising, repetition, delay, opportunity, inevitability, anticipation, events, speed, ephemerality, frequency, duration and passage, timed access, scheduling, historicity, contemporaneity, and change (Adam 1995; Moran 2015). (ii) What time 'does' in each situation varies tremendously, and spaces and times are made to interact in a multiplicity of ways; so, we might ask what kinds of time are seen interacting with what kinds of space (Crang 2012; Moran 2015). (iii) Sense-making of time and temporality are plural and heterogeneous. For instance, people can make sense of the experience of multiple times simultaneously (Moran 2015). Temporalities are also lived and experienced differently in different situations and by different persons and communities (Adam 1995; Schwanen & Kwan 2012).

Second, time is conceptualised as a social construct. Like the re-thinking of space/place that goes beyond physical location, scholars have argued that temporality is not merely about 'objective' measures of time, but is fundamentally social, subjective, and interpretive. Moran (2015:289) puts it this way: 'it is not the source of that which we recognise as temporal, but the sense made of it'. Temporality lends itself to empirical investigation in and through social events and practices, and is made manifest materially through cultural artefacts and embodied actions. The sociality of time varies according to the manner and purpose for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which it is employed in human societies (Cheng 2017). One could also speak of practices as 'making' time, in that it is in the practices that we experience the sense of temporality (Shove, Pantzar, & Watson 2012) and its movements, and different practices create and make use of different conceptualisations of time (Harvey 2009). At the same time, scholars refer to time as performative—it 'does things' (Moran 2015), and has influence on social life, and concretises social relations (Poulantzas 1978) through human (inter)actions.

In LSL research, time and temporalities have occupied a curious space between invisibility and visibility. One might contend that surely temporalities are implied in any LSL study, even when not attended to overtly, for signs-in-place are necessarily contingent upon sociohistorical contexts. In this case, temporality is assumed as an 'absent presence' in the background, and subsumed by a focus on space/place. More recently, however, a growing body of LSL scholarship has made temporalities explicit and visible, albeit to varying extents, in the semioticisation of spaces. These studies may be categorised, broadly, in the following ways, with the caveat that the categories are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive. Bakhtin's (1981) concept of the 'chronotope' has proven to be a productive lens through which various inherently linked configurations of time and space expressed in LSLs have been identified (e.g. Pietikainen 2014; Guissemo 2019; Lyons & Karimzad 2019; Dong 2021). Foucault's (1986) notion of 'heterotopia' has also sparked explorations of various temporalities (such as ephemerality and simultaneity) juxtaposed alongside heterogeneous spaces (e.g. Lou 2007; Milani & Levon 2019; Anfinson 2020). Relatedly, Foucault's (1986) lesser explored temporal notions of 'heterochronies' and 'slices in time' (*découpages du temps*) have been taken up to document complex, nonlinear patterns of temporal layering of material and discursive spaces (Milani & Richardson 2022a). Semiotic practices of memorialisation as acts of collective remembering have been an important thematic in LSL research also[1] (e.g. Kohn & Rosenberg 2013; Moore 2019; Kosatica 2021; see also Ben-Rafael & Shohamy's 2016 special issue on 'Memory and memorialisation'). Another dimension of historicity that has been discussed in LSL studies is the experience of the diachronicity of signs in any given environment (e.g. Bakhaus 2005; Pavlenko & Mullen 2015; Tufi 2022), or what has been termed as 'chronoscapes' (Baro 2019). Relatedly, others have investigated stability, change, and mobility in the semiosis of places. For example, in spatial representations of urban sites, multiple semiotic aggregates may interact and overlap over periods of time to create historical layers of a 'palimpsest' (e.g. Shep 2015; Bendl 2019; Starks & Phan 2019); or spaces are momentarily transformed by the appearance and disappearance of transient acts of semiosis (Hanauer 2012; Karlander 2018) or through the material-semiotic orchestration of complex temporalities (Mpendukana & Stroud 2019).

The sampling of recent research augurs well for the study of time and temporality in LSL scholarship. Multiple approaches, dimensions, and relations of temporality in a variety of spaces have begun to surface. Yet, the degree of explicitness and emphasis in theoretically conceptualising the inseparability of temporalities vis-a-vis

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

spatialities, and a sustained analytical focus on time, remains variable and uneven.[2] In the context of the wider field of LSL, the unevenness of approach renders time and temporality as an optional, subordinate, and separate dimension in the study of place-making practices. May & Thrift (2001) caution against slipping into a 'space and time' dualism even among scholars interested in both, where space is still accorded priority over time, and the latter becomes an additive dimension in the study of place. It is timely (pun intended), therefore, to centre time and its imbrication with space, and shift the focus explicitly on TEMPORALIZED place-making in LSL scholarship.

SEMIOTIC TIMESCAPES: THE SPECIAL ISSUE

Coined by Adam (2008:1), *timescape* refers to the 'complex and multiplex' dimensions of time existing in an interdependent relationship with spatiality, materiality, and contextuality (encompassed by the term *scape*). Among the multi-faceted dimensions of time explored by Adam (2008) include time frame (e.g. a day, generations, historical periods), temporality (e.g. processual, (ir)reversibility, directionality), timing (e.g. synchronisation, coordination, and social, political, technological contexts for action), tempo (e.g. pace and intensity of activity established for whom and on what basis), duration (e.g. instantaneity, extent, temporal distance), sequence (e.g. simultaneity, succession in what order), and temporal modalities (e.g. individual and/or collective past, present and future, memory traces, futurities). While her ideas and categorisations remain pertinent and insightful, Adam's approach has been sometimes criticised for prioritising the temporal over the spatial (May & Thrift 2001).

The adaptation of the term *semiotic timescapes* in this issue is intended to serve as a heuristic concept, rather than to operationalise or advance Adam's particular framework. *Semiotic timescapes* seek to take semiotic practices of time and temporality seriously in LSL scholarship, while upholding the interconnected and interdependent relationship between time and space. In relation to the latter, I agree with Malpas (1999) that 'there is no temporality which does not bring spatiality along with it, and no spatiality that does not bring temporality also' (cited in Stroud et. al 2019:1), and highlight the role of semiosis in this process of mutual entanglement. The intertwining of time, space, and semiosis demands reflecting on the way we approach our subject matter ontologically, epistemologically, and methodologically, that is, how we may know our subject matter and how we study it (cf. Adam 1995, 2008). The special issue embarks in this direction. Key points pertinent to the collection, as a whole, are first outlined, followed by a summary of individual articles.

Overview of the special issue

Several key points underpin and lend coherence to this special issue on semiotic timescapes. First, all of the articles seek to highlight time and temporalities, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their connections ineluctably with spaces and places, as important aspects of understanding social realities. The objects of analyses covered in the special issue are varied and wide-ranging from museum exhibits in Denmark (Maegaard & Mortensen), street art and mediated dance performance at a heritage site in Brazil (Borba, Fabrício, & Lima), protective shields used during political unrest in Venezeula (Velásquez Urribarrí), real estate advertisement hoardings for private housing in Singapore (Lazar), to discursive waste management and recycling in Switzerland (Thurlow, Pellanda, & Wohlgemuth). Whereas previous studies of similar objects of analyses have been largely spatiocentric, the present set of articles centres diverse ways of understanding time and its connectedness with space in the meaning-making practices of everyday situations. In dealing with temporal-spatial meaning-making practices that constitute and/or challenge social realities, the subject matter of the articles invariably impinges upon issues of power and dominance, regulation, privilege and/or resistance, in varying extents and explicitness. Timing and placing of events and practices, as critical scholars have emphasised, often reveal mechanisms of power and social, material, and experiential inequalities (Crang 2012; Bastian, Baraitser, Flexer, Hom, & Salisbury 2020). Referring to the 'social life of time', Bastian & colleagues (2020:293) observe that, 'Where we find politics, in all its varied forms, we are likely to find time and temporality doing important conceptual and practical work in the service of governance and contestation'. This is borne out in the present collection as the topics variously grapple with responses to lingering colonial legacies in Denmark and Brazil respectively, violent protests in Venezuela, racial-class privilege in Singapore, and banal waste regulation in Switzerland. Temporalisations in and of spaces not only structure particular sociopolitical relations, but as Crang (2012:2119) suggests, power also gets 'etched into the kinds of times and spaces that organise events and through which events unfold'. In a similar vein, Lazar (in this issue) explores the particular way social privilege gets chronotopically 'etched' on condominium hoardings.

Second, in efforts to avoid treating time and space as ontologically separate, social scientists, generally, have opted to conceptualise their relationship in the form of conjunctions (e.g. time-space) or imbrications (e.g. timespace), and order them in different ways (timespace or spacetime) to highlight temporalisations of space or spatialisations of time. For our purposes, all of these articulate ways of theorising the interdependence of these dimensions and allow differing points of entry as well as enable possibilities for shifting the relative focus within a given project, without overlooking their boundedness in researching any and all social, semiotic, and material practices and events. While these conceptual linkages are useful and necessary, one needs to be cognisant of a 'chaotic' assemblage that actually belies them, for the terms 'space' and 'time' encompass many different senses and interact in a multitude of ways (Crang 2012). The articles in this issue evidence the 'complex and multiplex' (Adam 2008) relationships of time, space, and semiotic practices at work in their selected case studies. Three of the articles (Thurlow

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

et al., Lazar, and Borba et al.) engage with the notion of chronotopes as conceptual anchors in their respective studies. Although Bakhtin's chronotope (literally, time-space) was originally coined as an analytic device to identify and explain how literary genres work, its conceptual richness in theorising 'the inseparability of space and time' (Bakhtin 1981:84) in textual forms and meanings has inspired scholarship in linguistic anthropology, discourse studies, sociolinguistics, and LSL research. De Fina & Perrino (2019:67) note that the notion of chronotope has illuminated 'understandings of reality and [participants'] relations within different discursive and semiotic practices'. The LSL studies in this issue advance this research trajectory in various ways. Thurlow & colleagues follow Crang's (2001) understanding of chronotope as a 'temporalised place' comprising multiple temporalities inhabiting a concrete place, in order to show how the placing and timing of 'stuff' work simultaneously to produce it as (urban) waste. Lazar explores the notion of privilege through a chronotopic lens at two levels: the temporal-spatial artwork on condominium hoardings and the temporariness of the hoardings which allow for the visibility-yet-elusiveness of the particular workings of privilege. Borba & colleagues disrupt a 'linear Eurocentric chronotope' to show the mobilisation of a 'necrotope' (a spacetime of death during the Atlantic slave trade) and visceral resistance to the necrotope through emergence of a timespace at the crossroads of colonial power. Although the notion of chronotopes informs three of the articles conceptually, it is important to note that chronotopes are not the only conceptual anchor for investigating semiotic timescapes. As a heuristic, semiotic timescapes encompass heterogeneous ways to theoretically approach time. Maegaard & Mortensen's study, inspired by the works of time scholars Adam (1995) and Moran (2015), demonstrates how complex relations of past and present are constructed in the Danish National Museum, resulting in temporal ambiguity in the museum exhibitions, such that the latter avoid offering a conclusive understanding of the Danish colonial period. In Velásquez Urribarrí's study, Scollon's (2008) idea of 'discourse itinerary' is employed as a conceptual anchor for tracing transformative historical pathways in a semiotic artefact's itinerary to understand aspects of its emergence, circulation, and usage over different periods of time.

Third, methodologically, the study of semiotic timescapes is varied. Three methods are outlined in this special issue. (Visual) ethnography, conventionally employed in LSL research remains a significant method for documenting evolving and rhythmic movements in timescapes (see Borba et al. and Thurlow et al.). Borba & colleagues and Thurlow & colleagues' ethnographic studies, moreover, highlight the importance of attending to the semiosis of historical traces and remnants of stories and experiences that might have been overlooked or suppressed, yet nonetheless hover over people's senses of space and place (see also Bock & Stroud 2019). Data mining from online archival sources has proven a useful way to document semiotic artefacts that are materially transient and bygone, but continue to exist virtually. Sourcing for photographs of protective shields used in past Venezuelan protests from public Instagram accounts, in fact,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

offered Velásquez Urribarrí the advantage of researching these artefacts virtually from a temporal and spatial distance, instead of having to be present in situ at the unfolding of the event. Close semiotic analysis of temporal-spatial representations of cultural artefacts is yet another method employed in timescape research (see Maegaard & Mortensen, and Lazar).

Regardless of methodology, the studies refuse to be limited by the linguistic aspects of their objects of analyses, without refusing the relevance of language in the overall constitution of the objects. Language is analysed, variously, in terms of presence of bilingual codes and scripts, and their chronotopic implications on advertising hoardings (Lazar), removal of words motivated by current verbal hygiene efforts and voicing in storytelling accounts of the past in museum exhibits (Maegaard & Mortensen), and a combination of overt discourses and implicit stories from the past that construct waste (Thurlow et al.). Multimodality, however, is a central analytical approach in the timescape studies in this issue. The multimodal character is evident in the analyses of visual images and symbolisms, sounds, videos, and embodied dance movements, besides language. Multimodal semiosis is often paired with the materiality of artefacts investigated and their emplacement in particular times and spaces. In this sense, a semiotic-materiality or a material semiotics is a feature that characterises the studies in this issue.

Fourth, in proposing time as an important analytical focus, it is worth highlighting that the assumptions and implications of the temporal-spatial dynamics revealed in the set of articles have wider global significance, in which the local temporal-spatial practices of the cases studied are embedded. In this regard, it is useful to consider the 'semiotic timescape' heuristic in relation to Appadurai's (1990:296) theorisation of global cultural flows, understood as 'a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order', which defies simple binaristic models. Appadurai proposed a set of '(land)scapes', which serves as the basis for formulating the conditions under which current global flows occur, giving shape to larger 'imagined worlds', that is, 'multiple worlds constituted by the historically situated imaginations of persons and groups around the globe' (1990:297). To the list of 'scapes' identified by Appadurai (viz. ethnoscapes, technoscapes, finanscapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes), we could add 'semiotic timescapes' as connected to larger dynamics of temporal-spatial meaning-making in global or transnational cultural flows. Here, I highlight a few of the larger connecting dynamics arising from the articles. Although not the specific focus of their present study, Thurlow & colleagues allude to 'running out of time' in relation to global environmental consequences of waste. Maegaard & Mortensen's case 'speaks' more generally to the role of national museums in constructions of central ideologies of nationalism, and especially how colonising nations come to understand themselves and their former colonies through memorialisation practices. Borba & colleagues' study contribute to wider discourses of decolonisation, in dismantling teleological notions of time espoused by White modernity, and offering rival epistemologies of temporality 'outside and against' the dominance of racialized colonial conceptualisations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Velásquez Urribarrí's timescape example, in fact, intersects with Appadurai's notion of 'mediascapes', where she describes how images of successful use of shields as protective devices in other protest movements globally became viral, and influenced the itinerary of shields in the Venezuelan protests. In turn, the itinerary in the latter case has since continued in shields used in other parts of the world, owing to global media circulation. Lazar, in her study, identified a neo-traditional aesthetic, emergent from the blending of chronotopes of traditionalism and modernity in local advertisement representations—an aesthetic which resonates among the urban upper-middle class in Asia, more widely (see Bunnell, Goh, & Ng 2018).

Summaries of individual articles

Jessica Velásquez Urribarrí documents the conditions of emergence and transformation of protective shields over time in situations of political unrest. Adopting Scollon's (2008) concept of 'discourse itineraries', she examines the transformative paths in the use of the said material-semiotic artefact in Venezuela when it first emerged in anti-government demonstrations in 2014, and again in a different protest cycle in 2017, against its wider use in historical and global spatiotemporalities. The author shows the evolution in the materiality of shields in Venezuela from improvised, repurposed objects to specifically purpose-built artefacts, as well as changes in the sociopolitical and religious symbolic meanings that accrued to the shields over time. Surfaced in this article, also, are methodological issues for LSL time studies regarding the delimitation of adequate historical surveys, and documentation of semiotic artefacts that either cease to exist or change over time.

The next two articles are concerned with temporal-spatialities of memorialisation and coloniality. Marie Maegaard & Kristine Kohler Mortensen show how the Danish National Museum reformulates the historical relationship between Greenland and Denmark in ways that avoid the colonizer's language, yet construct complex relations of past and present, resulting in a temporal ambiguity in the museum exhibitions. At the same time, they show how the presence and absence of colonial language in public space is inscribed into temporal frames legitimizing or problematizing their status. Their study offers an account of how the collective memory of the Danish nation is sought to be changed as the museum attempts to remove the monochrome authoritative voice from the telling of history and replace it with a plurality of voices and perspectives. Furthermore, the location of the colonial exhibition in a particular historical building erected on colonial wealth brings different times and different perceptions of colonialism into dialogue, again adding to the plurality of voices articulating different times and stances in relation to colonialism. The study shows how in the museum time is constructed not simply as past-present-future, but as complex and multi-faceted.

Rodrigo Borba, Branca Fabrício, & Fátima Lima's study is based on *Pedra do Sal* ('Rock of Salt') in Little Africa, near the port of Rio de Janeiro, which has become an epicenter for Afro-Brazilian culture and, notably, memorialization

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conflicts surrounding the Atlantic slave trade in that area. The authors explore the phantasmagoric nature of meanings at the site as an outgrowth of the ways colonial histories haunt everyday experiences in former colonies. Analytically, investigating the colonial histories that undergird signs, as Borba & colleagues argue, require attending both to their semiotic materiality as well as to the immaterial dimensions that anchor possible meanings. Drawing on the work of Gordon (2008), they approach the LSL of Pedra do Sal as an expression of 'ghostly matters' in the sense of listening to the murmurs of stories that, having been forgotten or lost, keep manifesting as spectral memories in the present. This posture requires acute attention to nonlinear relations across and between times, different paces and durations of time, and to how history materializes in multiple apparitions. The authors examine multiple layers of temporal-spatial indexicalities with a view to inspecting both the present materiality of the sign in the LSL and the 'ghostly' dimensions that (in) form its temporal emplacement but are nevertheless immaterial.

Crispin Thurlow, Alessandro Pellanda, & Laura Wohlgemuth build on existing scholarship that has focused either on spatialities or temporalities of waste, by wanting to show how the placing and timing of materials work simultaneously to produce them as waste. The authors approach their study through the idea of 'discursive chronotopes' of waste, notably, how language mediates and frames the temporal-spatialities of domestic waste in the contexts of garbage collection and thrift store merchandising in Swiss cities. Three kinds of discursive chronotopes concerned with regulation, repression, and (re)valuation are identified in these situations, in which the authors demonstrate how waste is simultaneously 'liminal' and 'laminated' by a variety of spaces (e.g. inside/outside, private/public, micro/macro) and times (past/present, old/new, long-term/short-term). By approaching waste through a time-space lens, Thurlow & colleagues advocate for the study of 'linguistic hauntings' in LSL studies, by which they mean attending to language use that is not always visible or expressed, yet is no less significant.

Using a temporal-spatial lens, Lazar explores the particular way racialized 'Chinese' privilege is performed on advertisement hoardings for a condominium development in a multiracial neighbourhood in Singapore. She investigates 'chronotopes of privilege' on the artwork depicted on the hoardings as well as the temporariness of the hoardings emplaced proximally to the site while it is being built. The depictions on the hoardings reveal a complex assemblage of multiple timespaces, referred to as a *chronotopic bricolage*. This comprises a fusion of two overarching chronotopes, a 'traditional racial-cultural chronotope' and a 'modern cosmopolitan chronotope', into which are folded further multiplicities and complexities of times and spaces. Lazar argues that through this bricolagic chronotopicity, a 'neo-traditional' aesthetic is constructed for prospective upper-middle class Chinese Singaporean residents. The visible representability of a type of 'Chineseness' on the hoardings, however, is transient, which Lazar argues is a necessary characteristic for securing 'immunity' of racialized privilege—a contentious topic—in Singapore.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CONCLUSION AND CONTINUATIONS

The articles in this issue attempt to foreground the centrality of time and its interweaving and interdependence on space/place as important dimensions for understanding social realities, via their entanglement with linguistic/semiotic and material practices. The studies surface a plurality of temporalities and timescales such as memorialisation of historical pasts; coloniality and decoloniality; transformation and change; interrelations of tradition and modernity; periodicity, rhythmicity, and cyclicity of time; complementarity and clashing of times; permeabilities of pasts in presents and futures; and durational appearances and disappearances of semiotic artefacts in spaces. The spaces in/on which the temporalities materialise are physically manifest (e.g. heritage sites, museum exhibitions, commercial hoardings, protest shields, designated street spaces, and thrift stores). However, it is also more complex and multiplex than that. Hoardings and museum exhibitions stand in relation to built environments, onsite activities are connected to discourses in digital online spaces, and an intertwining of inside/outside, private/public, and local/global spaces are evident. Times and spaces play a part in structuring power relations of various sorts, which include the dynamics of racial oppression and counter-movements of resilience, state repression and defiance of protestors, authoritative regulation of 'good' citizenry, colonial sense-making, and normalisation of racialised-class privilege. At the same time, the articles manifest the construal of a range of social identities (e.g. authoritative, commercialised, and contestative) for individuals and communities based on nationhood, coloniality, 'race', class, and to some extent gender and sexuality.

The objective of *Semiotic timescapes* is to contribute to, and extend further, LSL scholarship such that time/temporalities and place/spatialities are regarded seriously as coeval and inextricably bound up dimensions in the study of any and all LSLs. The special issue is not intended to be comprehensive nor conclusive in the kinds of issues raised, however. Instead, the aim is to instigate further dialogue, discussion, and research projects on timespaces as they are entangled with semiosis, materialities, embodiments, politics, and identities of social actors, communities, and 'imagined worlds'. In that spirit, in bringing the introduction to a close, I leave with a number of open-ended questions, most of which emerge, in part, from the articles in the special issue, to serve as departure points for reflection and future LSL research: How from the perspective of time do meanings of spaces and places evolve, take shape, or get reconstituted? How from the perspective of space and place do temporalities become manifest? What various dimensions of temporalities intersect with dimensions of spatialities, semiotically and materially, in our LSLs? What types of temporalities (e.g. historicities) are foregrounded or backgrounded by social actors and for what purposes (e.g. commercial, religious, political, cultural)? What sorts of politics accrue to what sorts of timescales and timeframes and their circulation in places? What are the social and political implications in the mobilisation of different forms of temporality and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

spacetimes, and semiotic acts and meanings which in fact 'exceed' times and spaces (e.g. 'out-of-placeness', 'timelessness', extratemporalities, eternity)? What are various temporal-spatialities and their associative social meanings (e.g. modernity, cosmopolitanism, globalisation, traditional heritage, cultural authenticity, preservation or reclamation of histories, nostalgia, protest and defiance) in activating particular ideological effects and affects? How do multiple spacetimes interact in LSLs (synchronically, diachronically, hierarchically, convergently, chaotically)? How do people experience places temporally and time spatially? How do people make sense of movements of time in/through space? What sorts of metaphors are productive for conceptualising the multiplex assemblages of timescapes in LSLs (e.g. temporal lamination, temporal crossroads, discursive itineraries, bricolagic chronotopicity, layering, palimpsest)? How do we grasp the semiosis of absent-presences and their lingering significance on LSLs? What methodological challenges arise, and what kinds of methodological tools are needed for apprehending and documenting different kinds and spans of time in LSLs? How can temporal-spatialities inform our social-theoretical concepts of power, privilege, exclusions, inequalities, and identities?

NOTES

*I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for their constructive comments and suggestions. Thanks, also, to Jessica Velásquez Urribarrí for reading an earlier draft and for offering useful suggestions.

[1]See also the special issue on discourses of collective remembering edited by Milani & Richardson (2022b).

[2]Greater immersive engagement with theorisations of time, temporalities, and temporal-spatialities from other disciplines is still very much required. Also, gaps remain in LSL scholarship with regards to exploring a fuller range of temporalities (e.g. irreversibility, speed, instantaneity).

REFERENCES

Adam, Barbara (1995). *Timewatch: The social analysis of time*. Cambridge: Polity.

——— (2008). Of timescapes, futurescapes and timeprints. Paper presented at Lüneburg University, 17 June 2008.

Anfinson, Aaron (2020). Hong Kong's paper cities: Heterotopia and the semiotic landscape of civil disobedience. In Malinowski, Milani, & Tufi, 137–59.

Appadurai, Arjun (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7:295–310.

Bakhaus, Peter (2005). Signs of multilingualism in Tokyo: A diachronic look at the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175/176:103–21.

Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Ed. by Michael Holquist. Trans. by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baro, Gilles (2019). Chronoscape of authenticity: Consumption and aspiration in a middle-class market in Johannesburg. In Peck, Stroud, & Williams, 49–70.

Bastian, Michelle; Lisa Baraitser; Michael J. Flexer; Andrew R. Hom; & Laura Salisbury (2020). Introduction: The social life of time. *Time & Society* 29(2):289–96.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bendl, Christian (2019). Appropriation and re-appropriation: The memorial as a palimpsest. In Robert Blackwood & John Macalister (eds.), *Multilingual memories: Monuments, museums and the linguistic landscape,* 263–84. London: Bloomsbury.

Ben-Rafael, Eliezer, & Elana Shohamy (eds.) (2016). Memory and memorialisation. Special issue of *Journal of Linguistic Landscape* 2(3).

———; Muhammad Hasan Amara; & Nira Trumper-Hecht (2006). Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 3(10):7–31.

Blackwood, Robert (ed.) (2017). Methodology in linguistic landscape research. Special issue of *Journal of Linguistic Landscape* 3(3).

Blommaert, Jan (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. London: Multilingual Matters.

Bock, Zannie, & Christopher Stroud (2019). Zombie landscapes: Apartheid traces in the discourses of young South Africans. In Peck, Stroud, & Williams (eds.), 11–28.

Bunnel, Tim; Daniel P. S. Goh; & Huiying Ng (2018). Aspiration in urban(izing) Southeast Asia. In Rita Padawangi (ed.), *Routledge handbook of urbanization in Southeast Asia*, 54–63. London: Routledge.

Cheng, Tsuo Yu (2017). The ecology of social time: An outline of an empirical analytic framework of the sociology of time. *Time & Society* 26(2):137–64.

Crang, Mike (2001). Rhythms of the city: Temporalized space and motion. In Jon May & Nigel Thrift (eds.), *Timespace: Geographies of temporality*, 187–207. London: Routledge.

——— (2012). Temporal ecologies: Multiple times, multiple spaces, and complicating space times. *Environment and Planning* 44:2119–23

De Fina, Anna, & Sabina Perrino (2019). Introduction: Chronotopes and chronotopic relations. *Language & Communication* 70:67–70.

Dong, Jie (2021). Labor is the most glorious: Chronotopic linguistic landscaping and making of working class identities. *Language & Communication* 80:1–10.

Foucault, Michel (1986). Of other spaces: Utopias and heterotopias. *Diacritics* 16(1):22–27.

Gaiser, Leonie, & Yaron Matras (ed.) (2020). Multilingual landscapes and the construction of community. Special issue of *Linguistic Landscape* 6(2).

Glennie, Paul, & Nigel Thrift (2009). *Shaping the day: A history of timekeeping in England and Wales 1300–1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, Avery (2008). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gorter, Durk (ed.) (2006). Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism. Special issue of *International Journal of Multilingualism* 3(1).

Guissemo, Manuel (2019). Orders of (in)visibility: Colonial and post-colonial chronotopes in linguistic landscapes of memorialisation in Maputo. In Peck, Stroud, & Williams, 29–48.

Hanauer, David J. (2012). Transitory linguistic landscapes as political discourse: Signage at three demonstrations in Pittsburg, USA. In Christine Hélot, Monica Barni, Rudi Janssens, & Carla Bagna (eds.), *Linguistic landscapes: Multilingualism and social change*, 139–54. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Harvey, David (2009). *Cosmopolitanism and the geographies of freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jaworski, Adam, & Crispin Thurlow (2010). Introducing semiotic landscapes. In Adam Jaworski & Crispin Thurlow (eds.), *Semiotic landscapes: Language, image, space*, 77–101. London: Continuum.

———, & Li Wei (2021). Introducing writing (in) the city. *Social Semiotics* 31(1). Online: https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2020.1827934.

Karlander, David (2018). Backjumps: Writing, watching, erasing train graffiti. *Social Semiotics* 28(1):41–59.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kohn, Ayelet, & Hananael Rosenberg (2013). Collapsing walls and the question of commemoration: Graffiti in the Israeli withdrawal, August 2005. *Social Semiotics* 23(5):606–31.
Kosatica, Maida (2021). The semiotics of living memorials. *Social Semiotics* 31(5):738–56.
Lefebvre, Henri (2004). *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time, and everyday life*. London: Continuum.
Lou, Jackie J. (2007). Revitisalising Chinatown into a heterotopia: A geosemiotic analysis of shop signs in Washington D.C.'s Chinatown. *Space and Culture* 10(2):170–94.
Lyons, Kate, & Farzad Karimzad (2019).Chronotopography: Nostalgia and modernity in South Delhi's linguistic landscape. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 13(1):83–105.
Malinowski, David & Stefania Tufi (eds.) (2020). *Reterritorialising linguistic landscapes: Questioning boundaries and opening spaces*. London: Bloomsbury.
Malpas, Jeff (1999). *Place and experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Massey, Doreen (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Cambridge: Polity.
——— (2005). *For space*. London: SAGE.
May, Jon, & Nigel Thrift (2001). *Timespace: Geographies of temporalities*. London: Routledge.
Milani, Tommaso M. (2018). Gender, sexuality and linguistic landscape. Special issue of *Journal of Linguistic Landscape* 4(3).
———, & Erez Levon (2019). Israel as homotopia: Language, space, and vicious belonging. *Language in Society* 48:607–28.
———, & John E. Richardson (2022a). Responsibility for justice in action: Commemoration, affect and politics at Il Memoriale della Shoah in Milan. *Critical Discourse Studies*, to appear.
———, & ——— (2022b). Discourses of collective remembering: Contestation, politics, affect. *Critical Discourse Studies*, to appear.
Moore, Irena (2019). Vilnius memoryscape: Razing and raising of monuments, collective memory and national identity. *Linguistic Landscape* 5(3):248–80.
Moran, Chuk (2015). Time as a social practice. *Time & Society* 24(3):283–303.
Mpendukana, Sibonile, & Christopher Stroud (2019). Of monkeys, shacks and loos: Changing times, changing places. In Peck, Stroud, & Williams, 183–200.
Pavlenko, Anita, & Alex Mullen (2015). Why diachronicity matters in the study of linguistic landscapes. *Linguistic Landscape* 1(1–2):114–32.
Peck, Amiena; Christopher Stroud; & Quentin Williams (eds.) (2019). *Making sense of people and place in linguistic landscapes*. London: Bloomsbury.
Pietikainen, Sari (2014). Spatial interaction in Samiland: Regulative and transitory chronotopes in the dynamic multilingual landscape of an indigenous Sami village. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18(5):478–90.
Poulantzas, Nicos (1978). *State, power, socialism*. London: New Left Books.
Putz, Martin, & Neele Mundt (2019). *Expanding the linguistic landscape: Linguistic diversity, multimodality and the use of space as a semiotic resource*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Schwanen, Tim, & Ma-Po Kwan (2012). Critical space-time geographies: Rethinking the spatiotemporal. *Environment and Planning* 44:2043–48.
Scollon, Ron (2008). Discourse itineraries: Nine processes of resemiotization. In Vijay K. Bhatia, John Flowerdew, & Rodney H. Jones (eds.), *Advances in discourse studies*, 233–44. London: Routledge.
———, & Suzie W. Scollon (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. London: Routledge.
Shep, Sydney J. (2015). Urban palimpsests and contending signs. *Social Semiotics* 25(2):209–16.
Shohamy, Elana, & Eliezer Ben-Rafael (2015). Introduction: Linguistic landscape: A new journal. *Linguistic Landscape* 1(1):1–5.
———; Eliezer Ben-Rafael; & Monica Barni (eds.) (2010). *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
———; Eliezer Ben-Rafael, & Durk Gorter (eds.) (2008). *Linguistic landscapes: Expanding the scenery*. New York: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Shove, Elizabeth; Mika Pantzar; & Matt Watson (2012). *The dynamics of social practice: Everyday life and how it changes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
Starks, Donna, & Nhan Phan (2019). An exploration of stasis and change: A park in the Old Quarter Hanoi as a palimpsest. *Social Semiotics* 31(4):550–69.
Stroud, Christipher; Amiena Peck; & Quentin Williams (2019). Introduction. In Peck, Stroud, & Williams, 1–10.
Thurlow, Crispin, & Kellie Gonçalves (2019). X-scapes: New horizons in linguistic landscapes. Special issue of *Journal of Linguistic Landscape* 5(2).
Tufi, Stefania (2022). Situated spatialities and the linguistic landscape: A diachronic account of an emblematic square in Naples. *Social Semiotics* 32(2):240–61.

(Received 26 February 2022; revision received 21 September 2022;
accepted 28 September 2022; final revision received 2 October 2022)

Address for correspondence:
Michelle M Lazar
National University of Singapore
Department of English, Linguistics & Theatre Studies
Block AS5, 7 Arts Link, Singapore 117570
ellmml@nus.edu.sg

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000641 Published online by Cambridge University Press