


Sameness and Repetition in Contemporary Media Culture

**SUSANA
TOSCA**



 OPEN ACCESS
BOOK

Sameness and Repetition in Contemporary Media Culture

What has been will be again, what has been done will be done again; there is nothing new under the sun.

Ecclesiastes 1:9

Modern life is such that, confronted with the most mechanical, the most stereotypical repetitions, inside and outside ourselves, we endlessly extract from them little differences, variations and modifications. Conversely, secret, disguised and hidden repetitions, animated by the perpetual displacement of a difference, restore bare, mechanical and stereotypical repetitions, within and without us. In simulacra, repetition already plays upon repetitions, and difference already plays upon differences.

Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*.

Repetition's love is in truth the only happy love. Like recollection's love, it does not have the restlessness of hope, the uneasy adventurousness of discovery, but neither does it have the sadness of recollection – it has the blissful security of the moment. Hope is a new garment, stiff and starched and lustrous, but it has never been tried on, and therefore one does not know how becoming it will be or how it will fit. Recollection is a discarded garment that does not fit, however beautiful it is, for one has outgrown it. Repetition is an indestructible garment that fits closely and tenderly, neither binds nor sags.

Kierkegaard, *Repetition*.

Culture today is infecting everything with sameness.

Adorno & Horkheimer, *The Culture Industry*.

Sameness and Repetition in Contemporary Media Culture

BY

SUSANA TOSCA

University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

*This work has been possible thanks to the fellowship granted
by the*

**CARLSBERG
FOUNDATION**



United Kingdom – North America – Japan – India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2023

Copyright © 2023 Susana Tosca.
Published by Emerald Publishing Limited.



This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence.

Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of these works (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>.



Open Access

The e-book edition of this title is Open Access and is freely available to read online.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80455-955-0 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-80455-952-9 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-80455-954-3 (Epub)



ISOQAR
REGISTERED

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Definitions: Repetition, Sameness, Cognition and Learning	9
Chapter 2 Learning to Love Your Stone: The Aesthetics and Experience of Computer Games	33
Chapter 3 Sing, Goddess, of the Anger of Achilles <i>Formal Repetition in Storytelling</i>	57
Chapter 4 Many Happy Returns: Sameness in Digital Literature, Narrative Games, Adaptations and Transmedial Worlds	85
Chapter 5 If You Liked That, You Will Love This: On Sameness-Based Algorithmic Recommendation Systems	113
Chapter 6 Good Artists Copy, Great Artists Steal: Creativity and Originality in a New Media Landscape	141
Chapter 7 In Praise and Criticism of Repetition: The Cultural Affordances of Repetitive Media Formats	169
Bibliography	173
Index	183

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgements

It is perhaps a very fitting coincidence that I embarked on this project in the autumn of 2020, the year of the pandemic, the lockouts and the crushing routines. No other year has my life been so repetitive, so limited, so monotonous. All research trips were cancelled, physical presence on campus greatly reduced and for many months, the only variation came from looking at the sky and hoping for better weather, as we were in lockdown together with the rest of the world. Those should have been good conditions for writing about precisely repetition, but the various preoccupations, the home-schooling of three children and the need to move all sociality online made for bad writing companions. The project was stalled, restarted, stalled. . . again and again, so it ended up stretching through the whole pandemic, and a bit beyond.

This book has been underway for much longer than that, though, as it pulls together a lot of the threads that I had loosely spun in my previous research about digital narratives, computer games, transmediality and online cultures. Moreover, I have sneaked in a lot of the readings and aesthetic experiences which have formed me since my childhood, so the book is also a cultural biography of sorts. Like the final scene of a good old murder mystery, where the detective has gathered everybody in the library for the final reveal, the plot finally makes sense: everything is connected by repetition.

At the same time, repetition is a dangerous topic. On the one hand, everybody can see the point of such a project, there is repetition everywhere! When I told people about the project, all would eagerly suggest examples of repetitive experiences and practices from their own media consumption, pointing to the many ways in which repetition made aesthetic sense in their favourite art forms: painting, music, literature. . . . There was certainly no shortage of cases and approaches. On the other hand, if repetition and sameness are everywhere, it is very hard to set a reasonable scope for the book. Repetition is a feature of life itself, where organisms reproduce and develop similar traits; a part of culture, as objects are formed according to the patterns and rules established through the centuries; an aesthetic issue, as formal repetition exists across all modalities and media platforms; a key to understanding algorithms and computers. . . . Actually, it is also at the core of our idea of how human thought and understanding work, so it can hardly get more fundamental. With so many dimensions to it, the discussion can quickly become too abstract, too disperse, too metaphoric and superficial to be of any use, and yet, someone believed in this idea.

I thank the Carlsberg Foundation in Denmark for the generous monograph fellowship which allowed me to immerse myself in the necessary study that such a writing project requires. In the 20 odd years that have passed since I obtained my doctoral degree, this has been the first chance I have had to fully dedicate myself to scholarship. I had all but forgotten the joys of sitting long hours at libraries (even if mostly electronic this time), finding treasures in the writings of others and building up a long argument of my own. The profession of academic has become a quantified individual sport where we are measured and weighed constantly: the credits we teach, the number of students we supervise, the grant money we bring in, the publications we produce and how high our citation index is. Grants like this cannot be praised enough, for they give us time to stop, to think, to produce slow knowledge and to involve a community of peers. Without it, I would not have had the space and energy to embark on such an exploratory study, where I propose that paying attention to the aesthetics of repetition and sameness can show us something valuable about our world. I am of course not the first to do something like this. Others before me have proposed similarly open, associative approaches, writing about topics such as lines, clouds or stuff, among other risky subjects, revealing unexpected connections and insight.¹ But these are the kind of projects that do not fit peer-reviewed journals or narrow discipline boundaries.

A lot of people have helped me along the way, knowingly and unknowingly. I would like to thank my former colleagues at the Department of Communication and Arts at Roskilde University, specially my research group, *Audiences and Mediated Life* for constructive dialogue, challenging discussions and open doors and hearts during my 5 years in their company: David Mathieu, Kim Schrøder, Lene Bull Christiansen, Jannie Møller Hartley, Fabian Holt, Chris Peters, Josephine Lehaff, Anja Mølle Lindelof, Troels Fibæk Bertel, Rasmus Rex Pedersen, Sander Schwartz, Martina Skrubbeltrang Mahnke, Kristian Møller, Louise Yung Nielsen, Leif Hemming Pedersen, Daniel Bach, Lotte Bornemann Petersen, Tobias Raun, Niklas Alexander Chimirri, Morten Sivertsen, Julie Vulpus and Norbert Wildermuth. But also Rikke Andreassen, Louise Philips, Lisbeth Frølund, Eva Mayerhöffer and Sanne Knudsen, among many others.

I want to name a few brilliant friends who generously used their time to read my drafts for this project at various stages of disarray. Annette Markham, for introducing me to new recursive methodologies, for talking about timeless loops and making a bridge from Australia to Denmark. Torill Mortensen, for sharp comments to half-baked texts and providing a cosy writing refuge at her Copenhagen apartment. Lisbeth Klastrup, for all the years of thinking together about and around transmedial worlds; I have never had a conversation with her without becoming wiser. Pille Pruulmann Vengerfeldt, for her sharpness and energy, for inspiring me to systematically record my encounters with the algorithms and for showing me *BookBub*. Jesper Juul, for seeing the disruptive potential of repetition, encouraging me to break free from the boring journal

¹I'm referring to the wonderful books: *Lines* (Ingold 2007), *Marvelous Clouds* (Peters 2015) and *Stuff* (Miller 2010). If this book could be half as inspiring as theirs, I would be very satisfied.

article-writing style and helping make my points clearer. Maria Grajdian, for the good discussions and sharp academic eye. Victor Navarro Remesal, for his generous brain that can always spot fruitful connections and for reminding me of all the obscure games that repeat, loop and time-jump. Joleen Bloom, for her inspiring assertiveness, her gentle criticism and assistance with all things Japanese. Philip Prager, for all the playful connections to creativity research and for introducing me to Elsa von Freytag-Loringhoven. Liz Evans, for illuminating my text with her clarity and helping me never to forget the link between producers and audience, our business is not only about meanings. Rasmus Rex Pedersen, for sharing his knowledge so generously and making my ideas better than they were to begin with. Connie Svabo, for showing me the way in the academic career and a sharp structural eye that can bring the best out in any text. Beatriz Pérez Zapata, for a clear editing mind and always finding the best way to say things without them hurting at all.

Last but not least my family: Martin, Elena, Lucas and Clara, who have put up with an absent-minded wife and mother, chained to her desk for days on end with her noise cancelling headphones on. They have supported me, cheered me on, cleaned, cooked, washed, walked the dog and tiptoed around my office as much as they could so I would finish the damn writing. I have learned about repetition and sameness from them too, with their ever-repeating instrument practice, their contagious enthusiasm about new media forms, our marathon sessions of re-watching favourite movies and series and their patience with my asking the same thing five times again. I am fortunate to spend every day with you.

CARLSBERG FOUNDATION

The research for this book was funded by the Carlsberg Foundation.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Admit it, you have been there. Watching an episode of your favourite sitcom for the umpteenth time. Singing along to the eternal loop of 1980s music which Spotify keeps pushing to you. Choosing another production of *Les Misérables* for your trip to the theatre over that avant-garde play. Reading a hack work thriller similar to all the others because you are too tired to decode actual literature. . . I know I have. When was the last time we encountered something new on purpose? Perhaps it is not entirely our fault. Our media channels keep offering us the same content, repeated in endless reinterpretations, rehashes, reboots, sequels, prequels in a cycle of perhaps eternal returns.

Our culture has an uneasy relationship with repetition and sameness. On the one hand, familiarity can be pleasurable and soothing; on the other, we (and the critics) crave novelty and long for a sense of discovery. We put the blame on algorithms, intent on keeping us in a loop of constant consumption of similar products, or on the media industry, too greedy to risk investing in intellectually challenging and, above all, radically new, media products. But what is the nature of these repetitions and what does it mean for us to consume them?

This book scrutinises repetition and sameness in our contemporary media culture, as an overarching category that constitutes a fusion of aesthetic and market strategies. Previous academic attention to repetition and sameness has mostly occurred within the confined area of a single medium (for instance, serial television) or the study of a formal pattern (like a specific kind of verse). Here I undertake a comprehensive approach that both theorises and historically grounds the idea of repetition in relation to media, not exclusively as a product of big data or late capitalism, but as something that has long roots in our cultural tradition.

Take, for instance, storytelling. In an oral tradition, alliteration, repetition and rhythm are essential both formally (to memorise and structure) and thematically, to reinforce a view of the world and connect to the universal topics that the public cares about. In fact, the history of literature and the performing arts can be seen as a long series of variations upon a common repertoire of themes and tropes, recombined and reinterpreted in new ways to cater to shifting popular taste. Myths, epic poems, sagas, legends, folk tales, morality plays, chivalry novels, renaissance theatre, rakugo, romances and sentimental novels are all genres that thrive upon repetition of form and content. With romanticism, our culture

Sameness and Repetition in Contemporary Media Culture, 1–7



Copyright © 2023 Susana Tosca.

Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of these works (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>. doi:10.1108/978-1-80455-952-920231001

2 *Sameness and Repetition in Contemporary Media Culture*

acquired a new aspiration to newness, originality and individual genius. Breaking with tradition became a quality in itself, heightened by modernism and its extraordinary focus on the individual. By contrast, post-modern popular entertainment forms (genre literature, serial television, film sagas, Japanese media mix) have become more and more dependent on formulaic structures, as the media industries look for the perfect recipe that can be repeated and sold endlessly. This has culminated in our present era of on-demand entertainment and an unprecedented explosion of repetitive tendencies (both human and machine made) where the search for sameness has become a taken-for-granted, omnipresent value.

My intention here is twofold: to consider the genuinely joyful aesthetic pleasures offered by repetitive formats, but also to adopt a critical perspective that interrogates sameness-maximising systems of meaning and consumption. For there is a danger of monolithic uniformity, of partisan algorithms hiding divergent voices, anaesthetising us.

The combination of an aesthetic and media perspective is perhaps provocative, both for the humanities and media studies areas. In fact, I commit in this book the sin of mixing high art and popular culture, sometimes even talking about arts like opera or kabuki as *media*, and popular culture products like computer games as *art*. This slippery attitude is of course not *comme il faut*, but I do it on purpose to break the boundaries between high and low, media and the arts, entertainment and fine culture. When the focus is on the platforms and modalities, I use the word *media*, when it is on the aesthetics, I talk about *arts*. The same object can thus be a medium or an art, depending on the discussion.

In this omnivorous endeavour, I would like to enlist the help of art critic Lawrence Alloway, who already back in 1958 coined the term ‘mass arts’ to contrast them to the ‘high arts’, in his plea to do justice to popular culture and not judge it by the same upper-class standards as the so-called ‘genuine’ culture.¹ He argued that mass art should not be seen as kitsch, but on the contrary, ‘urban and democratic’. While high art looked back at the past, mass art was the cultural site where things that people cared about were happening. ‘Popular art, as a whole, offers imagery and plots to control the changes in the world; everything in our culture that changes is the material of the popular arts’. Even today, some 60 years after the foundation of the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies, the idea that culture is a continuum of high and popular formats is not taken seriously by academia. We belong to one side or the other, cultivating our own separate sets of concepts and theories. This book shakes both camps together mercilessly, even in the conception of the chapters, which all start with an old myth or story from antiquity and weave it together with contemporary popular media practices, both analogue and digital. Computer games, series, digital narratives, social media, movie franchises and AI-generated art are considered in relation to high art formats such as painting, sculpture, conceptual art, poetry, music or opera.

¹Alloway (1958). He is also known for having coined the term ‘pop art’.

Even though our *Zeitgeist* seems to be more repetitive than any previous one, there are many subtle ways in which repetition and sameness have shaped our arts and culture through the ages, from the ancient concept of *mimesis* as the main principle for artistic creation for many centuries, to Walter Benjamin's famous essay 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction'. Benjamin hoped in 1935 that the art world was going to be democratised, liberated from its subservience to a ritualistic system of production and access, for 'to reproduce a work of art was (...) a means of renewing it, of making it useful again in the present'.² Everybody would have access to everything. Time has proven him right in terms of universal access, even more than he dared dream then, but rituals, boundaries and social fences are still standing.

In the wake of mass media, repetition was seen as a means to lower the access threshold for the enjoyment of popular art forms. Alloway noted how: 'An important factor in communication in the mass arts is high redundancy. TV plays, radio serials, entertainers, tend to resemble each other (though there are important and clearly visible differences for the expert consumer). You can go into the movies at any point, leave your seat, eat an ice-cream, and still follow the action on the screen pretty well. The repetitive and overlapping structure of modern entertainment works in two ways: (1) it permits marginal attention to suffice for those spectators who like to talk, neck, parade; (2) it satisfies, for the absorbed spectator, the desire for intense participation which leads to a careful discrimination of nuances in the action'.³ In the industry's view, repetition is thus a structural building principle that facilitates casual consumption in any media platform. Alloway does seem to admire good craftsmanship in this respect anyway, pointing out the fact that popular culture can also cater to the kind of discerning participation that would be theorised later by modern aesthetic scholars like Jacques Rancière.⁴

This pragmatic attitude has certainly not been widespread in the field of cultural theory, where the depiction of popular culture as corrupting and false, spearheaded by the Frankfurt school, has held on for many years. I included a quote by Adorno and Horkheimer in the opening of this book, 'Culture today is infecting everything with sameness', which they write at the beginning of their famous 'The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception'.⁵ This is actually also my premise here, but instead of recoiling in horror, I would rather like to see what that sameness actually affords. Even though Adorno and Horkheimer are blind to the aesthetic potential of popular media formats, I think that their insistence on the problematic aspects of popular culture as commodity is as relevant as it was in their time. They write, for example: 'Sharp distinctions like those between A and B films, or between short stories published in magazines in

²Haxthausen (2004, p. 47).

³Alloway (1958), without page number as it is an online document.

⁴Rancière (2008). In his book he does a series of close readings of art, photography, literature and video installations. He does not incorporate other digital media, but his argument has resonated strongly with new media theorists.

⁵Adorno and Horkheimer (1944, p. 94).

4 *Sameness and Repetition in Contemporary Media Culture*

different price segments, do not so much reflect real differences as assist in the classification, organization, and identification of consumers. Something is provided for everyone so that no one can escape; differences are hammered home and propagated'.⁶ One could be forgiven for thinking that they are talking about algorithmic recommendation systems.

Scholars of postmodernism saw in the repetitive strategies of mass media proof of a general decadence, related to a loss of the self, warned of by Fredric Jameson.⁷ Pastiche, repetition and copies are for Jameson empty signifiers that can only operate at the surface. For Hiroki Azuma, the consumers of this surface entertainment become animalised, and the eternal permutations facilitated by our current database culture are the perfect expression of postmodernism.⁸ Genuine art is still associated with innovation, rupture and originality, or in Umberto Eco's words 'novelty, high information', while the repetition of patterns is seen as something typical of crafts and industry, but not the arts.⁹

Umberto Eco is actually one of the first critics to see value in popular media and appreciate the aesthetic potential of the repetitive mechanisms of contemporary formats. But it is his friend and fellow semiotician, Omar Calabrese, who inaugurates what we could call the field of repetitive studies. Working in the 1990s, he proposes the notion of the *neo-baroque* to understand contemporary culture, challenging outdated conceptions of originality. I would like to quote a long reflection of his that could serve as a manifesto for this project as well:

This kind of position seems confused, out of date, and inadequate when confronted by the aesthetic objects produced by our culture. Confused, because the attitude, which is not only idealistic but survives in many other philosophical formulations, tends to superimpose upon each other a variety of accepted meanings of repetition without distinguishing between them. Out of date, because an attitude that idealizes the work of art's uniqueness has undoubtedly been swept away by contemporary practices; since the 1960s invented multiples, modern art movements have delivered a death blow to the myth of the original, and the idea of citation and pastiche is now exalted in many so-called postmodernist creations. Finally, inadequate, because the pre conceived notion prevents us from recognizing the birth of a new aesthetic, the aesthetic of repetition.¹⁰

If this was true in the 1990s, it is even more so now. Neither Eco nor Calabrese considered digital formats in their work for good reasons. It was Angela Ndaianis who updated the idea of the neo-baroque in her *Neo-Baroque aesthetics and*

⁶Ibid., p. 96.

⁷Jameson (1991).

⁸Azuma (2009).

⁹Eco (1985, p. 161).

¹⁰Calabrese (1992, p. 28).

contemporary entertainment, where she works intensively with cinema as a paradigmatic Neo-baroque medium, but also incorporates multilinear narratives, games, art and maps. She relates the rise of repetitive formats and intertextuality to wider socioeconomic transformations, globalisation, postmodernism and media convergence. She also notes that audiences have become more media literate, so there is a new intensity to the demand for popular culture that can resonate with their media repertoires.

In the high art camp, not many care for repetition. A notable exception is literary scholar Joseph Hillis Miller, who in *Fiction and Repetition* proposed that repetition (of a motif, a structure, a mood) was the key to interpreting any literary work. For him, repetitions ‘make up the structure of the work within itself’ and he pays attention to the cognitive, semantic and craftsmanship aspects of repetition.¹¹ His book has seven chapters, each with the analysis of a novel through a repetitive lens, showing seven complex ways in which repetition creates meaning.¹² Hillis Miller’s deconstructive close readings work with the question ‘what does repetition do in this case?’ without offering definite answers that would close interpretation. Complexity is still possible, and although the role of repetition in constituting human experience and memory are at the centre of his discussion, it is not the ambition of the book to move beyond the literary realm.

I will be drawing on these authors, even as I incorporate other media formats in this book, particularly algorithmic fuelled practices, which the industry uses to produce and to recommend content. From an audience perspective, I will consider the many ways in which social media users engage in repetitive practices, both in regards to imitating formats or schemata, but also in the repetitive nature of the content they produce: like memes, video challenges or *TikTok* dances. Audiences have also begun to play with AI systems to generate texts and images in new ways. So even though this book connects to all the ‘old’ media and art forms mentioned above, my focus is on contemporary repetitive formats.

This book offers a synthesis of perspectives, from a philosophical understanding of repetition to a cognitive one, to the way that the aesthetics of repetition shapes our conscience and our agency in different ways. I am greatly inspired by the work of Caroline Levine, who in her book *Forms: Whole, Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network* wrote ‘Forms matter, in these accounts, because they shape what is possible to think, say, and do in a given context.’¹³ She is an advocate for the humanities revealing something new about our everyday reality, our institutions and even ‘the historical workings of political power’, that maybe cannot be seen otherwise.¹⁴ Like the formal patterns she examines in her book, repetition

¹¹Miller (1982, p. 3)

¹²The chapters are:- *Lord Jim*: Repetition as Subversion of Organic Form- *Wuthering Heights*: Repetition and the Uncanny- *Henry Esmond*: Repetition and Irony- *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*: Repetition as Immanent Design- *The Well-Beloved*: The Compulsion to Stop Repeating- *Mrs. Dalloway*. Repetition as the Raising of the Dead- *Between the Acts*: Repetition as Extrapolation.

¹³Levine (2015, p. 5).

¹⁴Ibid., p. xiii.

6 *Sameness and Repetition in Contemporary Media Culture*

affords specific ways of thinking and being in the world. In this optic, the study of formalist patterns is never just an abstract operation disconnected from reality. A formalist pattern acts like a structuring scaffold for a number of actions and thoughts. Making them visible gives us the opportunity to interrogate ourselves: is this the kind of world, of relationships, of society that we want? Her perspective addresses power in a more complex and, according to herself, chaotic understanding that Foucault's.¹⁵

Levine appropriates Donald Norman's definition of affordances from the field of design 'as potential uses or actions latent in materials and designs. Glass affords transparency and brittleness. Steel affords strength, smoothness, hardness and durability'.¹⁶ Armed with this concept, she examines the aesthetic forms of *whole*, *rhythm*, *hierarchy* and *network*. Her analysis goes well beyond the pages of literary works, asking what actions or thoughts are made possible or impossible due to the forms we use in our society. Levine's interest is in how affordances are both constraints and capabilities, with hidden social and ideological potentialities in the world.

This is also my guiding question in each of the chapters you are about to read: what does repetition do in terms of constraints and capabilities? Or, in other words, what are its affordances? Every chapter will look into a specific kind of repetition and/or sameness, establishing connections between historical media formats and current ones, always interrogating the avenues of thought that are opened (or closed) by that specific use of repetition.

Chapter 1, *Definitions*, frames the concepts of repetition and sameness in relation to the scope of this project, drawing upon a series of philosophers that have dealt with the topic as well as on music research and linguistics. It describes how repetition affects cognition and learning, and how that in turn shapes our media consumption.

Chapter 2, *Learning to Love Your Stone*, focuses on computer games, the most repetitive of all media. Games need to be interacted with by following repetitive patterns, looking for mastery and flow. The chapter examines the pleasures and pains of playing computer games, wondering what the potential of repetition is for the player.

Chapter 3, *Sing, Goddess, of the Anger of Achilles*, looks at the ways in which storytelling structures are repetitive. I focus on form, studying repetition from the smallest to the biggest scopes, from *bits*, to *plots*, to *genre* and finally *archetypes*. The chapter also deals with seriality, variation and other schemes that keep audiences engaged.

Chapter 4, *Many Happy Returns*, is complementary to the previous one, as it focuses on the repetition of specific content in storytelling genres. What exact fragments are repeated and to what effect? I begin with the smallest units, words

¹⁵Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 6. Norman is a designer who adapts the idea of affordance from psychology (Gibson, 1977). In communication studies, a common definition is that of Hutchby (2001, 2006).

and phrases, and move up through hypertexts and branching narratives, adaptations and transmedial worlds.

Chapter 5, *If You Like That, You Will Love This*, considers how algorithmic recommendation systems based on sameness are changing the way we find and enjoy media products, focusing on books as a case. Personalisation strategies challenge the very notion of taste as well as the social and industrial dynamics through which our cultural desire is awakened, structured and commodified.

Chapter 6, *Good Artists Copy, Great Artists Steal*, looks at creativity and originality in a repetitive perspective. It introduces the notions of *mimesis*, *imitatio* and *combinational creativity* and applies them to a series of repetitive user practices mostly looking at the platforms of *YouTube* and *TikTok*, as well as at AI image generators.

In Praise and Criticism of Repetition acts as a brief epilogue to all chapters, pulling the affordances threads together to offer a nuanced view of how repetition is both something we can use and something we can be domesticated by in different ways. It distinguishes between producer and audience perspectives, also considering the machines as agents in this equation.

A final note about language before you move on. Repetition being its subject, this book is written in a somewhat cyclical style, as motifs reappear and threads resurface in different places, sometimes as copies, sometimes in slight variations. Please bear with it, with me. Our beliefs about the inherent goodness of novelty and change are so ingrained that it will take several cycles before I can convince you that there could be another way to look at things. In repetition, meaning gathers.¹⁷

¹⁷Kierkegaard (2009, p. xiii).

This page intentionally left blank