Comprehending Smiles Seldom Requires Embodied Simulation and Felt Emotion
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Abstract

The Simulation of Smiles Model (SIMS; Niedenthal, Mermillod, Maringer, & Hess, 2010), based on "embodied simulation," is contrived and of low ecological applicability, marshaling a seldom-used route for the comprehension and classification of smiles. Moreover, the tripartite division of smiles, for which the model has been developed, is of limited sociobiological importance. Genuineess of facial expressions should remain the central problem in this research area. Additional discussion is devoted to the relationship of dominance smiles to the experience of awe.
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From an evolutionary perspective, it seems clear that the key decision of a perceiver (P) regarding a sender’s (S) smile is whether the smile is genuine or false (based on the Duchenne marker and postural, contextual, and experiential cues). Past analyses of smiles have rightly recognized this and the “revisionist” dismissal of the true-false smile distinction by [1, p. 419] is not convincing on either conceptual or evidentiary grounds; nor is their claim that a more useful distinction requires P’s embodied simulation of S’s state – and his or her production of changes in no less than four systems (motor, somatosensory, affective, and reward)? P’s repeated engagement in the activities proposed by the SIMS model seems to be a frivolous waste of resources. By no means should this commentary be interpreted as saying that people do not sometimes mimic others’ facial expressions, consciously and unconsciously. This may occur spontaneously in real life or upon being instructed to mimic in experiments. It may be visible to the naked eye or the micro facial movements may be observable only electromyographically. It is equally self-evident that eye contact when S is smiling (which most of the time requires a face-to-face encounter) promotes mimicking – because of the desire to communicate.
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empathic gladness and because eye contact requires proximity that is usually permitted only to people likely to be favorably disposed to P. Furthermore, it has long been known that facial expression may independently produce a very slight, but statistically significant effect on reports of own emotion [e.g., 3], which may or may not be a genuine report of emotion [cf. 4, 5-6]. But the fact that people can carry out simulation operations under some, probably quite rare, circumstances, does not mean that SIMS is needed or that it is one of the main routes in the comprehension of human expressions – least of all of smiles, and even less so when smiles are treated as a trichotomy that is probably irrelevant from an evolutionary standpoint. SIMS seems to be a construction that is kin to some other questionable recent applications of the concept of "embodiment." Outlining the possible neural loci for the operations that are part of the model, but rarely part of routine human functioning, does not analytically strengthen the position of [1].

Finally, one can legitimately raise several issues about the treatment of the "dominance" smile by [1]. First, who would label Tony Blair's "smile" (Figure 3, left panel, p. 421) as one of "dominance" unless they knew not only his office, but also his allegedly coldly manipulative political style? Second, a dominance smile is unlikely to be mimicked, perhaps because people mimic unpleasant or phony smiles only intentionally, for ridicule, and not spontaneously. Perhaps human beings are not skilled in mimicking falsehood intuitively? Third, how P responds cognitively and emotionally to a dominance smile clearly depends on the relationship between P and S. Can S be a threat to P? Does P admire S? Is S a god or just a powerful contemporary?

Such issues touch upon the psychobiologically interesting relationship between the dominance smile and awe as P's moral and aesthetic emotional response [7-9]. They are stunningly exemplified at the Bayon (late 12th–early 13th century, within Angkor Thom, near Siem Reap, Cambodia), where over 200 gigantic smiling faces, sculpted in stone, of the Khmer King Jayavarman VII can be seen (Figure 1). Dominant? Sardonic? Benevolent? Irritatively self-assured? Serene? It depends on whether one thinks that the faces are likenesses of Jayavarman VII or portrayals of the Bodhisattva of Compassion; and on whether P is a slave-chiseler, a Mahayana Buddhist pilgrim, or a contemporary American or British tourist who is baffled by the King's self-satisfied smile, but welcomes or despises Clinton's and Blair's analogous expressions on the basis of political party affiliation.
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