

Carnegie Mellon University

From the SelectedWorks of Adam Hodges

2015

Intertextuality in Discourse

Adam Hodges, *Carnegie Mellon University*



SELECTEDWORKS™

Available at: <http://works.bepress.com/adamhodges/53/>

The Handbook of Discourse Analysis

Second Edition

Edited by

*Deborah Tannen,
Heidi E. Hamilton, and
Deborah Schiffrin*

VOLUME I

WILEY Blackwell

This second edition first published 2015

© 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. except for Chapter 16 © Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Edition History: Blackwell Publishers Ltd (1e, 2001)

Registered Office John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester,
West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin to be identified as the authors of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The handbook of discourse analysis / edited by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton & Deborah Schiffrin. – Second edition.

volumes cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-470-67074-3 (cloth)

1. Discourse analysis—Handbooks, manuals, etc. I. Tannen, Deborah, editor. II. Hamilton, Heidi Ehernberger, editor. III. Schiffrin, Deborah, editor.

P302.H344 2015

401'.41—dc23

2014048413

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

Cover image: Painting on canvas © petekarici / iStock

Set in 9.5/12pt Palatino by Aptara Inc., New Delhi, India

2 Intertextuality in Discourse

ADAM HODGES

0 Introduction

A key element of social life is the interconnectivity of discourse across different contexts of situation. Social actors do not formulate utterances in a vacuum; nor do individual “speech events” (Hymes 1974) take place in isolation from one another. Rather, as Mannheim and Tedlock (1995) describe, “any and all present discourse is already replete with echoes, allusions, paraphrases, and outright quotations of prior discourse” (7). In short, discourse produced in one context inevitably connects to discourse produced in other contexts. As social actors interact, they imbibe their discourse with voices indicative of their social world, draw upon established genres to frame their discourse, engage with words that have come before them, and orient to anticipated responses. At issue in this chapter are the ways that intertextuality factors into the analysis of discourse. The chapter begins with a review of the philosophical foundations and terminology associated with the concept of intertextuality, and then proceeds to examine various aspects of intertextual discourse analysis.

1 Philosophical and Definitional Foundations

Central to the concept of *intertextuality* is the notion of *text*. In common usage, a *text* conjures up the image of a book or written document (e.g., novel, poem, letter) – that is, linguistic content bound together as a coherent whole that can be detached from a particular setting and moved about. The privileged position given to language – specifically, written language – is evident in this view. Yet, a text can more broadly be defined as “any coherent complex of signs” (Bakhtin 1986: 103; see also Hanks 1989: 95) so that

the concept can be extended into the domains of film, visual art, and music to talk about any creative work (e.g., movie, painting, musical score) that can be “read” for meaning. For the purpose of discourse analysis – whether focus is placed squarely on language in use (spoken or written) or broadened to include “all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity” (Blommaert 2005: 3) – a text can be thought of as an “objectified unit of discourse” (Gal 2006: 178) that can be lifted from its originating context (*decontextualized*) and inserted into a new setting where it is *recontextualized* (Bauman and Briggs 1990). In this way, fragments of discourse from one setting seemingly take on a life of their own as they are turned into texts (*entextualized*) and enter into social “circulation.”

The concept of intertextuality is grounded in the ideas of the Russian philosopher and literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin, who worked in the early part of the twentieth century (along with several contemporaries collectively known as the Bakhtin Circle) and recognized that language use is “filled with *dialogic overtones*” (Bakhtin 1986: 92; italics in original). By *dialogic*, Bakhtin does not merely mean instances of discourse that are externally structured as dialogue. Rather, he wishes to emphasize the “internal dialogism of the word” that permeates all forms of speech, including forms externally structured as monologues (Bakhtin 1986: 279). Even traditional monologues – as well as the “inner speech” within one’s mind (Jakobson 1953: 15) – are located in a world filled with prior utterances and are therefore implicated in an implicit dialogue with that pre-populated world of discourse. In other words, as Bakhtin (1981) writes, “in real life people talk most of all about what others talk about – they transmit, recall, weigh and pass judgment on other people’s words, opinions, assertions, information” (338). As a result, we continually “assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate” what has come before us (Bakhtin 1986: 89) and anticipate what may come ahead of us in “subsequent links in the chain of speech communion” (Bakhtin 1986: 94).

From the Bakhtinian perspective, language use is fundamentally a social phenomenon as “our speech, that is, all our utterances (including creative works), is filled with others’ words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of ‘our-own-ness,’ varying degrees of awareness and detachment” (Bakhtin 1986: 89). This perspective differs fundamentally from the approach espoused by linguists working first in the tradition established by Ferdinand de Saussure and later within the Chomskyian paradigm, where the source of language is taken to be the individual speaker rather than the social context in which the speaker lives, operates, and interacts (Mannheim and Tedlock 1995: 1). In the Bakhtinian perspective, “*The organizing center of any utterance, of any experience, is not within but outside – in the social milieu surrounding the individual being*” (Voloshinov 1973: 93; italics in original). Although the common notion of linguistic creativity forwarded by linguists involves an individual’s ability to generate an infinite number of utterances out of a finite number of words, in practice those infinite possibilities are socially constrained and limited. From a Bakhtinian perspective, creativity exists in the myriad ways prior utterances, voices, and types of discourse are appropriated and reanimated.

Perhaps due to the dominance of Saussurean and then Chomskyian linguistics throughout most of the twentieth century, as well as the health problems and political repression faced by Bakhtin throughout much of his career, his ideas had limited reach until the late 1960s. Literary theorist Julia Kristeva is credited with introducing his ideas to French audiences (Kristeva 1967, 1968, 1969, 1974), and English translations of many of his writings were published in the 1980s (Bakhtin 1981, 1986)

along with English translations of Kristeva's writings (Kristeva 1980, 1984, 1986). The term *intertextuality* is therefore first associated with Kristeva (1980), as she coined the term to describe the Bakhtinian idea that "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (66). The imagery of weaving is intentional here since, as Barthes (1977) points out, "etymologically, the text is a tissue, a woven fabric" (159). In this way, any text is woven out of previous pieces of discourse that are merely stitched together into a new patchwork of coherence. As Kristeva (1980) describes, a text is "a permutation of texts, an intertextuality" (36).

The ideas of the Bakhtin Circle have been a natural fit among sociocultural linguists interested in the social embeddedness of language use, and the concept of intertextuality has been broadly applied among scholars interested in the analysis of discourse. Given discourse analysts' broad focus on discourse practice and not merely the products of that practice (i.e., texts), the term *interdiscursivity* has arisen sometimes in lieu of and sometimes in addition to the term *intertextuality*. Thus, it is important to outline how these terms have been presented in the literature.

Kristeva (1980) distinguishes between two axes of intertextuality – horizontal and vertical – which capture the "three dimensions or coordinates of dialogue ... writing subject, addressee, and exterior texts" (66). For Kristeva (1980), the horizontal axis involves a subject–addressee relationship so that in written texts "the word in the text belongs to both writing subject and addressee" (66). These are the types of dialogical connections discussed by Bakhtin as "links in the chain of speech communion" (1986: 94) and elaborated in his discussion of dialogism (92–4) and addressivity (94–100). The notion of *horizontal intertextuality*, as picked up by discourse analysts (e.g., Fairclough 1992: 103; Johnstone 2008: 164), can be seen operating when one speaker responds to remarks made by another speaker, building upon those prior remarks to formulate a new conversational turn (cf. Du Bois 2014 on *dialogic syntax*). In this way, horizontal intertextuality involves sequential (or syntagmatic) relationships between texts (Johnstone 2008: 164). Of course, horizontal intertextuality is not limited to a dialogue that takes place in a single setting. Speech chains may form across contexts of situation where, for example, a speech delivered by a candidate at a campaign rally responds to criticisms waged by the opposing candidate in a televised campaign ad. The prior words may be quoted directly, paraphrased, or implicitly alluded to in the candidate's response. These are examples of repetition in discourse that Tannen (2006) terms "recycling," where previous statements or conversational topics are carried forward across distinct interactional moments. Where other texts are explicitly present, Fairclough (1992: 104) uses the term of French discourse analysts Authier-Révuz (1982) and Maingueneau (1987) to refer to this as *manifest intertextuality*. The texts (i.e., objectified units of discourse) may be "manifestly" marked by features such as quotation marks (in written discourse) or quotatives (in spoken discourse) – or otherwise made manifestly apparent as instantiations of prior discourse. Applying the familiar linguistic distinction between token and type, Silverstein (2005: 9) refers to the repetition of discourse fragments across encounters as "'token-source'd" intertextuality, where a token of speech (i.e., text) from a previous setting is placed into a new setting. In one way or another, these different terms deal with the horizontal relationships between discursive encounters where texts are produced and reanimated.

For Kristeva (1980: 66), the vertical axis (text–context) deals with the orientation of a written text to the broader literary and cultural context in which it is embedded. *Vertical intertextuality* has been taken up by discourse analysts to refer to the way a text relates (paradigmatically) to others as one member of a larger category of texts (Johnstone 2008: 164). Silverstein’s (2005) notion of “‘type-source’d” intertextuality further captures this idea. Here, social actors draw upon “an internalized notion of a type or genre of discursive event” to connect the language used across different discursive settings (9). Other discourse conventions (registers, voices, styles, or plots associated with traditional characters and genres) can be (re)configured to constitute new texts. Thus, Authier-Révuz (1982) and Maingueneau (1987) use the term *constitutive intertextuality* for the confluence of discourse conventions that contribute to text production. Fairclough (1992: 104) introduces this term but prefers instead to specifically refer to this type of intertextuality as *interdiscursivity* while reserving the term *intertextuality* as a broad label for all the phenomena discussed thus far. Yet it is important to keep in mind that other scholars, including American linguistic anthropologists, often use *interdiscursivity* as a general term that focuses on discursive practice while “reserving *intertextuality* for matters having to do with texts” (Bauman 2005: 146). Regardless of the terms used, there are clearly a variety of directions that intertextual discourse analysis can take. The following sections sample some of the main themes.

2 (Re)Contextualization, Genre, and the Intertextual Gap

To talk about the way prior text enters into new settings through *recontextualization* presupposes an unmarked process of *contextualization*. In line with the Bakhtinian perspective on language, sociocultural linguists have approached contextualization as “an active process of negotiation” that creates meaning (Bauman and Briggs 1990: 69; cf. Voloshinov 1973: 102; see also Duranti and Goodwin 1992). For example, in his work on contextualization cues, Gumperz (1977, 1982, *inter alia*) illuminates the process by which cues such as prosody, lexical choice, choice between phonological variants, and even choice between languages (i.e., code-switching) leads participants to interpretive frameworks that allow them to actively construct meaning. As Gumperz (1996) points out, “It is clear from the existing literature on discourse that, to enter into an encounter, participants always need some advance extra-textual knowledge about what is expected to be accomplished and how it is to be conveyed” (397). As often is the case, such “extra-textual knowledge” comes in the form of intertextual links to prior text types or tokens. In Gumperz’s (1996) own explication, contextualization cues indexically invoke “the memories of what Bakhtin has called previously heard texts, suggesting likely interpretations” (382). As Becker (1995) explains, “When we speak or write, we take those imperfectly remembered prior texts and reshape them into new contexts” (15). Meaning in language is therefore not the product of a single, isolated speech event; “meaning in language results from a complex of relationships linking” current with past (or future) discourse (Tannen 2007: 9).

A primary means by which (re)contextualization is achieved is through intertextual links to recognized “kinds” of texts and talk, or genres. As Bakhtin (1986) notes, language patterns into “types of utterances” or “speech genres,” which he describes

as “relatively stable thematic, compositional, and stylistic types of utterances” (64). Setting aside stylistic elements, which are more typically associated with the concept of *register* (Agha 2003, 2004), *genres* can be defined in general terms as “recurrent forms” or “recurrent actions” (Johnstone 2008: 181). For example, oral narratives are typically formed by combining an abstract, an orientation, a complicating action, an evaluation, a result of resolution, and a coda (Labov 1972; Labov and Waletzky 1967). A news report recognizably consists of several subcomponents, including headline, lead, satellites, and wrap-up (Fairclough 1995). Common literary genres, such as the romance novel, crime story, or murder mystery, are also prime examples. Examples of recurrent actions, or “activity types” (Levinson 1979), include an “informal chat, buying goods in a shop, a job interview, a television documentary, a poem, or a scientific article” (Fairclough 1992: 126), all of which are associated with a set of conventions that guide the activity. The activities typically involve established “participant roles” (Goffman 1981). The genre of the cowboy western, for example, has the roles of good guys (white hats) and bad guys (black hats) along with certain characteristics that the individuals in these roles are expected to fulfill (e.g., the hero stands for justice). In sum, genres provide “orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and sets of expectations” (Hanks 1987: 670; see also Bauman 2004: 5) that function to “frame” (Goffman 1974) discourse, providing conventionalized expectations for how those encounters should unfold and be interpreted. A soliloquy within a staged theatrical production is contextualized differently from a political speech broadcast on prime-time television, in large part due to the “genre knowledge” (Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995) associated with these culturally recognized discourse types.

As Bakhtin (1986) discusses, genres are only “relatively” stable patterns. They are locally formed and situated, are particular to a given culture at a given historical moment, and reflect “all the changes taking place in social life” (Bakhtin 1986: 65). Genres may mix, hybridize, and form new ones. Genres “are thus open to innovation, manipulation, and change” (Briggs and Bauman 1992: 143; see also Hanks 1987: 671, 677). Fairclough (1992, 1995) illustrates this point through his discussion of what he terms the “conversationalization” of news programs, where formal, public forms of address have mixed with more private, conversational ones. Fairclough (1992) claims that this is “part of the major restructuring of the boundaries between the public and private domains” (204). Another example of a hybridized genre is the “mockumentary,” which uses the form of a documentary with fictitious, comedic content.

The intertextual relationship between a particular text (or instance of talk) and an associated genre necessarily entails what Briggs and Bauman (1992) call an “intertextual gap.” A gap arises because the linking of particular utterances to generic (or prior text) models can never produce an exact fit by virtue of the fact that even prototypical and faithful re-creations always introduce some variation on the theme. However, the gap can be suppressed to minimize the difference, or it can be foregrounded to maximize the difference. For example, in ritualized intertextuality, such as in rehearsals of religious texts, the gap between the current recitation and the model is minimized in an effort to sustain textual (and hence religious) authority. The use of Latin in Catholic mass or the use of language from the King James Bible in a Protestant sermon harken back to “original” authoritative sources and reproduce traditionalizing modes of discourse. On the other hand, the gap can be maximized in an effort to introduce claims of “individual creativity and innovation” (Briggs and Bauman 1992: 149; see also Bauman

2004: 7). For example, a modern performance of a Shakespeare play may foreground the gap by setting the play in 1960s America with all that is associated with that era, including clothing and slang words to replace the traditional garb and linguistic features of Shakespeare's time. Thus, the notion of the intertextual gap underscores the fact that "diachronic repetition" (Tannen 2007) or "taking old language ... and pushing ... it into new contexts" (Becker 1995: 185) inevitably reshapes meanings.

In discussing the reanimation of prior discourse, Bakhtin (1981) introduces the notion of *double-voiced discourse*. "It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author" (Bakhtin 1981: 324). Prior meanings may be reshaped imperceptibly and subtly or radically. Another voice can be sympathetically represented through double-voiced discourse that is "unidirectional," or critiqued through double-voiced discourse that is "varidirectional" (Morson and Emerson 1990: 149ff). Perhaps the most obvious examples of varidirectional discourse are forms of parody that introduce "a signification opposed to that of the other's word" (Kristeva 1980: 73; see also Bakhtin 1981: 340).

Parodied recontextualizations effectively maximize the intertextual gap between prior text, a typified voice or generic model, and the recontextualized performance. Parody can be a powerful form of resistance to hegemonic structures by working to subvert traditionally established meanings. When comedian Tina Fey played vice-presidential candidate Sarah Palin on the comedy show *Saturday Night Live* during the 2008 presidential election season, the skits certainly did not help Governor Palin's claims to authority. Instead, the parodies – in which Fey often reanimated verbatim utterances attributed to Palin in speeches and media interviews – seemed to undercut her seriousness as a candidate. Another example of parody for political effect comes from the pun used by Rev. Joseph Lowery while speaking in February 2006 at the Coretta Scott King funeral (Hodges 2011: 107–10). In the speech, with President George W. Bush and the past living presidents sitting behind him on the stage, Lowery reshaped the phrase "weapons of mass destruction" (associated with Bush in the lead-up to the invasion of Iraq in 2003) into the phrase "weapons of misdirection" as an indictment against the Bush administration's policy. "The broader social meaning associated with the phrase ['weapons of mass destruction'] draws upon the already established meaning it has been given in Bush's prior speeches, but now that meaning is creatively reworked in the context of Lowery's speech" (Hodges 2011: 109). Parodic recontextualizations therefore create the potential for powerful transformations of prior text.

Varidirectional discourse in the form of intertextual "play" can also be seen in the artistic creativity of improv comedy. As Trester (2012) shows, improv performers consciously attune themselves to past discourse, looking "for opportunities to hang on to texts, and by noticing them, render them extractable (entextualizing them), moving them from the original interactional context in which they were used (decontextualizing them), and looking for an opportunity to use them again (to recontextualize them)" (Trester 2012: 238). Through this process of entextualization, performers are able to "play off" previous discourse in a manner that parodies, extends, or otherwise heightens the prior text for comedic effect. Particularly skilled instances of intertextual play are recognized as enjoyable by both performers and the audience. Neither, of course, may look upon the process from the analytic perspective of discourse analysts who, like Trester (2012), break down the analysis using an intertextual framework. Nevertheless,

for audience members the effect is spontaneous, enjoyable humor, and for performers the effect is satisfaction of a performance well played.

Recontextualizations are often much more subtle, however. Drawing from Goffman (1974), Tannen (2006) discusses the way recycled topics in everyday interaction are “reframed” and “rekeyed.” In particular, she shows how family members reshape their discourse over the course of a week as they attempt to negotiate ongoing conflicts by changing the meaning of the recurring texts (reframing) and the tone or tenor of the interactions (rekeying). For example, an initial proposal to make popcorn is reframed as an argument over who usually burns the popcorn, and later the serious tone is rekeyed as humorous when fault is admitted and the couple settles their differences. This everyday “intertextuality in action” (Tovares 2005) underscores the way the reshaping of prior texts effectively shapes social relations.

As Becker (1994) observes, “Social groups seem to be bound primarily by a shared repertoire of prior texts” (165; see also Becker 1995). Social actors draw from this shared repertoire to establish common ground, forge relationships, and create alignments of solidarity with one another. Gordon (2006, 2009) illustrates the way prior texts are reshaped in family interaction to create interactional alignments and situational identities among family members. For example, in Gordon (2006), words uttered by a mother to her child in one setting are recycled in a subsequent context to perform different interactional alignments. In the originating context, the mother – who is trying to talk on the phone while the child throws a tantrum in the background – warns her child of a time-out if the screaming doesn’t stop. Two days later, the same words feature in a pretend-play reenactment. This time, the mother and child swap roles as the child in role of “Mommy” recycles the warning of a time-out to the misbehaving “child.” Gordon (2006) notes that the repetition of this prior text “could be seen as having a ‘binding’ effect between interlocutors, tying them together and building rapport by referencing a particular shared experience” (568).

Another source of shared prior texts comes from the mass media. In her examination of intertextuality in everyday family interaction, Tovares (2006, 2007) demonstrates how prior texts from a television show become resources in private conversations. As family and friends draw upon these prior texts, they evaluate and interpret the words and actions associated with the television show, which allows them to display beliefs, voice values, and affirm friendships. Tovares (2006) argues that the talk, which “produces and blurs the boundaries between the public and private,” ensures that those boundaries remain constantly shifting (487–8). In addition, it is evident that the shared prior texts act as important resources for the construction of meaningful relationships.

Also examining the role of media discourse in everyday interaction, Spitulnik (1997) emphasizes the way intertextual links are central to the formation of a wider community. Specifically, Spitulnik (1997) demonstrates the way language originating in radio broadcasts makes its way into ordinary interactions among members of Zambian society to contribute to the sense of a national community. One example she details involves discourse emanating from Radio 2, an English-language station that operates primarily from a studio in the capital city of Lusaka. The station hands over operations to another studio in the town of Kitwe each weekday for several hours. When the broadcaster in the Lusaka studio gets ready to pass over control to the studio in Kitwe – a task frequently complicated by technical difficulties – he or she attempts to make

contact by saying, “Kitwe, are you there?,” “Kitwe, can you hear me?,” or “Hello, Kitwe?” Of interest to Spitulnik is the way pieces of discourse such as these may be recycled in other contexts. She illustrates this by describing an interaction that took place between two women in a crowded store in Lusaka, where one woman was trying to get the attention of her friend in a different aisle. After being unable to connect with her friend through loud whispers, the woman shouted, “Hello, Kitwe?” Not only did the friend hear her but also so did other customers “who were clearly amused by this clever allusion to the bungled ZNBC [Radio 2] communication link” (Spitulnik 1997: 168). Instances such as these draw from common reference points in widespread social circulation and help generate an “*experience of belonging and mutuality*” that leads to “an idea of belonging to a collectivity,” claims Spitulnik (1997: 163–4; italics in original).

Notably, intertextual links do not merely reach backward through the recontextualization of prior text in new settings; they also reach forward in anticipation of expected discourse. Oddo (2013, 2014) uses the term *precontextualization* for the process of previewing and evaluating a future rhetorical event. For example, Oddo examines the way journalists on NBC television provided a favorable framework for interpreting Secretary of State Colin Powell’s address to the United Nations in 2003. Powell addressed the international body to make the case for war against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq, and, in the days leading up to the actual speech, news outlets discussed the anticipated speech event and provided a supportive context for receiving Powell’s argument when it finally came. The result, Oddo claims, was that circumstantial evidence was accepted as solid proof by much of the public.

Thus, the “politics of recontextualization” (Hodges 2008) ultimately involves controlling how texts – prior or future – are interpretively shaped. Wilce (2005) points out that speakers often exercise what he calls “strategies of entextualization” in an attempt to control how their words are taken up by others in future contexts. In one case discussed by Wilce (2005), a Bangladeshi woman, Latifa, engaged in two weeks of lamenting while visiting the home of her uncle and cousins. In her laments, she complained of the treatment she had been receiving from her brothers. The lament positioned voices in support of her situation, and, importantly, used a recognized genre for legitimizing her problems in the eyes of community members. However, as Wilce (2005) explains, these strategies failed as her laments were recontextualized by witnessing family members not as *bilāp*, the traditionally recognized lament genre, but as *ai purān kāndā*, which translates as “that same old crying.” In other words, her relatives recontextualized her laments as inconsequential personal complaints. Obviously, social actors want to avoid negative recontextualizations of their words. However, while strategies of entextualization may aid social actors in positioning their words, they have no guarantee over the control of their discourse once it enters into social circulation.

3 Reported Speech and Constructed Dialogue

Words attributed to another speaker frequently find their way into subsequent contexts as reported speech. The Bakhtinian perspective is well represented on this topic

through Voloshinov's (1973) discussion in which he characterizes reported speech as "speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also *speech about speech, utterance about utterance*" (115; italics in original). The emphasis provided in Voloshinov's comments underscores the capacity for reported speech to be recontextualized with "varying degrees of reinterpretation" (Bakhtin 1986: 91). Voloshinov (1973) writes that the reporting of speech "imposes upon the reported utterance its own accents, which collide and interfere with the accents in the reported utterance" (154). In this way, rather than a clean separation between the reported (prior) speech and the reporting (subsequent) context, Voloshinov (1973) emphasizes that the two exist in a "dynamic interrelationship" (Voloshinov 1973: 119). This dynamic interrelationship exists for both direct speech (quotations) and indirect speech (paraphrases).

Nevertheless, English speakers often operate as if reported speech can be lifted from a prior context and dropped into a subsequent context unchanged. Underlying this view is the language ideology of referentialism (Silverstein 1976), which holds that language use is primarily about conveying information. As a result, words are often viewed as containers of meaning, as Reddy (1979) points out in his critique of the "conduit metaphor." This metaphor treats meaning as something that is encapsulated or "packaged" in words and "sent" from one interlocutor to another. Once the meaning has been sent by the speaker, the hearer then supposedly opens the package to retrieve the meaning as though it has passed unchanged from one end of a conduit to the other. The role of (re)contextualization in the construction of meaning is erased. Furthermore, the notion of context is reified, preserving "the premise that meaning essentially springs from context-free propositional content, which is then modified or clarified by the 'context'" (Bauman and Briggs 1990: 68). This model of meaning commits, as Voloshinov (1973) describes, "the fundamental error of virtually divorcing the reported speech from the reporting context" (119).

As Hill (2008) notes, "Referentialist ideology makes the question of whether or not statements are 'true' into a very salient issue" (39). Indeed, issues of "truth" often factor into disagreements over quotations of previously uttered words, and a prime site where issues of truth are at stake is the courtroom. In his examination of reported speech in the courtroom setting, Matoesian (2000) shows how reported speech can be taken as a transparent conveyor of truth, providing "an aura of objectivity, authority, and persuasiveness to the current moment of speech" (882). In large part, this is due to the boundary created between the reported and reporting voices in directly reported speech. Rather than being positioned as the reporter's perspective, the quoted speech is indexically anchored to the prior context and represents the point of view of the quoted speaker (Lucy 1993: 19). The role played by the reporter in contextualizing the utterance is backgrounded as the reported speech is often presented as if the "words speak for themselves." In fact, as Andrus (2011) discusses in her examination of the excited-utterance exception to hearsay in American courts, reported speech in such cases is typically presented as self-evident. As Matoesian (2000) illustrates, however, even iconic replications of prior speech events (as with tape-recorded speech) "never just speak for themselves – never interpret their significance, their meaning" (888). Rather, the reporter plays an active role in contextualizing the prior speech. In the courtroom, the attorney holds considerable power to instruct the jury on the significance of, for example, previously given testimony that is quoted or replayed during the trial (see also Bucholtz 2000; Goodwin 1994; Ehrlich 2007). Thus, as Bakhtin (1981) notes, "Given

the appropriate methods for framing, one may bring about fundamental changes even in another's utterance accurately quoted" (340).

In everyday interaction, the framing of reported speech begins with the subtle linguistic cues used to introduce another's words. Verbs of saying (*verbum dicendi*) or "quotation framing verbs" (Bauman 1986: 66; Silverstein 1976: 50) frame the reporter's stance toward the reported speech, which may vary from a more "neutral" position indicated through verbs (e.g., "said," "told," "commented upon") to more pointed framings of the quoted speech (e.g., "divulged," "blabbed," "yelled"). Nominal attributions that accompany the verb of saying – whether pronouns, proper names, or other nominal forms (e.g., "the teacher," "his sister") – work to construct the situationally relevant identity of the speaker. Adnominals linked to these expressions may further this process (e.g., "the well-respected teacher," "his younger sister"), and allow the reporter to convey positive or negative views of the speaker (e.g., "the decorated general" vs. "the disgraced general"). The reported speech frame may also include more elaborate metacommentary to characterize the reported speech in a certain light (e.g., "the lawyer said with honesty and conviction"). The effect is to filter the reported speech through the interpretive lens of the reporter. As Sclafani (2008) shows in her examination of news articles about the 1996 Oakland School Board decision on Ebonics, framing reported speech is an ideological process that introduces presuppositions, selectively capitalizes or suppresses certain voices, and variously internalizes or externalizes reported perspectives into the writer's (or speaker's) own voice.

As Irvine (1996) summarizes, "To animate another's voice gives one a marvelous opportunity to comment on it subtly – to shift its wording, exaggeratedly mimic its style, or supplement its expressive features" (149). Günther (1999), for example, examines the way prosody (i.e., loudness, duration, pitch, and pause) and voice quality (e.g., whispery, breathy, falsetto, aspirated voice) provide means by which speakers embed evaluations in reported speech. Not only are such linguistic devices used to create boundaries between different animated voices but they are also used to impute affective qualities on those voices. For example, in one instance Günther (1999) shows how the use of high pitch, increased volume, and vowel lengthening contrives a hysterical character that is frantic about a broken-down cable car (689–90). The animation of this person through reported speech signals her affective stance – at least as it is perceived, evaluated, and reported in the reporting context by the reporter. In a somewhat similar examination of conversations among friends, Holt (2000) shows how the friends build upon assessments that are implicitly embedded in reported speech as they work toward common understandings. This underscores how the recontextualization of prior words is a joint, active process achieved by all those involved in the reporting context.

Whereas the term *reported speech* presupposes historical accuracy, Tannen (2007) exposes the flaw of this presupposition. She notes that instances of direct quotation are not "clearcut" and are "primarily the creation of the speaker rather than the party quoted" (103). For this reason, Tannen (2007) prefers the term "constructed dialogue" for talking about reported speech. As is often the case, instances of constructed dialogue that imply the conveyance of historically uttered words frequently involve "hoped for speech" (Cohen 1996, cited in Buttny 1997: 486) or "typifying speech" (Parmentier 1993: 280; see also Irvine 1996). They act not as verbatim descriptions but as "demonstrations" that selectively depict their referents (Clark and Gerrig 1990). Constructed dialogue is therefore often employed to typify a voice (Agha 2005b) or to typify the

sentiment attributed to a person. Framing such typifications as reported speech works to construct an air of credibility and legitimacy around the reporter's representation of an issue. As a result, reporters are better able to provide evidence and make critical assessments of past events.

Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996) illustrates the way constructed dialogue can be used to create a believable representation of another's prior words even where there is a lack of continuity between the language used in the reported versus reporting contexts. Through what he terms "code-displacement," the language attributed to a prior speaker in the reported context (e.g., Galician) may differ from the language that was actually used in that context (e.g., Spanish). Despite the lack of continuity between the code used by the prior speaker and the code used by the reporter to represent that speaker, the representations are nevertheless positioned as faithful quotations through expectations of verisimilitude. In fact, the renditions may appear more believable when the code is displaced due to strong language ideologies that associate certain language varieties with particular types of speaker (e.g., Galician with rural, regional speakers). In this way, the typified speech may be more believable than even the most faithfully rendered prior discourse. Shoaps (1999) provides another example of typified dialogue as used by the conservative radio show host Rush Limbaugh. Instead of explicitly stating his point of view on the show, Limbaugh often conveys it by enacting various voices. As he animates those voices, he uses similar devices to those pointed out by Günther (1999) to embed evaluations and impute his own perspective on political events. Shoaps (1999) argues that this strategy of "transposition" allows Limbaugh to present his view of events as self-evident appeals to "commonsense." Thus, as Briggs (1992) suggests, "reported speech does not simply draw on experiences and events – it creates them" (345). Constructed dialogue, in effect, constructs more than dialogue; it persuasively constructs understandings.

Reported speech can also play a role in constructing identities and relationships. For example, reported speech figures centrally in Haviland's (2005) examination of the narratives told by his Tzotzil informant, Mol Maryan. In the stories told by Mol Maryan, Haviland (2005) argues that "it may be the narratives of *others* that most insistently create the textual self, as other voices, incorporated into an ongoing autobiographical story, become the central organizing features of the resulting composite text" (82). Mol Maryan's identity, therefore, constitutes itself by refracting and reanimating the words of others. Hamilton (1998) illustrates a similar function of reported speech in her study of an online discussion group on the topic of bone-marrow transplantation. Many of the list members have undergone bone-marrow transplantations themselves and contribute to the group to help others facing the same situation. Hamilton (1998) shows how the use of reported speech – both direct and indirect – in contributors' messages works to position them as strong self-advocates and as survivors rather than as victims of a potentially life-threatening medical procedure. It also provides a means by which those new to the community are socialized into these identity roles, helping them to maintain a positive outlook as they glean more information on the difficult options for medical treatment.

Another interesting example of the identity-shaping function of reported speech can be seen in the controversy over the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial in Washington, DC. The memorial, which consists of a statue of King along with several quotes from his speeches, opened to the public in August 2011. Controversy erupted, however,

over the way words were rendered from a speech, entitled the “Drum Major Instinct,” delivered by King in February 1968. In the speech, King explained to his Atlanta congregation how he would like to be remembered at his funeral, stating: “Yes, if you want to say that I was a drum major, say that I was a drum major for justice. Say that I was a drum major for peace. I was a drum major for righteousness. And all of the other shallow things will not matter.” However, due to design changes and space constraints on the statue, a shortened version was chiseled into the stone, reading “I was a drum major for justice, peace and righteousness.” An article in the *Washington Post* (Manteuffel 2011) highlighted the distinction and Maya Angelou, a consultant on the project, noted that the wording made King sound “arrogant” (Weingarten and Ruane 2011). Others, including the executive architect for the project, defended the wording as a legitimate paraphrase that still captured the gist of the sentiment conveyed by King and what he stood for – justice, peace, righteousness. Linguistically speaking, the shortened wording remains a better example of direct speech (quotation) than indirect speech (paraphrase) since it retains King at the deictic center of the utterance through the pronoun “I” – providing support for Angelou’s reading. Yet the larger point to make concerns Voloshinov’s (1973) emphasis on the dynamic interrelationship between the reported and reporting contexts. Even the most faithful wording of King’s prior speech introduces an intertextual gap. By virtue of the process of recontextualization, King’s words are necessarily transformed and reinterpreted as they are placed on the face of the monument. Especially as the spoken words are entextualized using a standard literary transcription practice, much of the nuance and rhythm of the original delivery is lost. Thus, even a direct and accurate quotation opens up prior text to new meanings. As Bakhtin (1981) writes, “The following must be kept in mind: that the speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is – no matter how accurately transmitted – always subject to certain semantic changes” (340). Incidentally, after first announcing in early 2012 that the inscription on the King Memorial would be changed, federal officials decided in late 2012 to resolve the issue by removing the inscription altogether (Ruane 2012).

4 Intertextuality, Discourse, and Power

As seen in the discussion of intertextuality thus far, connections across contexts of situation create understandings, establish relations, construct identities, and generally “yield social formations” (Agha 2005a: 4). Yet, as Briggs and Bauman (1992) suggest, “questions of ideology, political economy, and power must be addressed as well if we are to grasp the nature of intertextual relations” (158). One avenue of exploration in this regard concerns the propagation of truth claims and narratives that form the basis for what are typically defined as “ideologies” – that is, systems of thoughts and ideas that represent the world from a particular perspective and provide a framework for organizing meaning, guiding actions, and legitimating positions.

The work of French poststructuralist philosopher Michel Foucault is helpful in pursuing this avenue since his notion of “discourse” merges concerns about ideology with language. For Foucault (1972), a “discourse” is similar to an ideology in that it provides a systematic way of thinking about a topic. To classify social subjects as “homosexual” or “heterosexual,” for example, requires a “discourse of sexuality” (Foucault

1978) that provides a set of assumptions, explanations, and expectations that make the terms meaningful. The discourse constitutes these objects of knowledge and governs the way the topic can be discussed. To step outside the discourse of sexuality would be to step outside the ideological system in which certain types of social subjects and forms of knowledge are made possible. A discourse, in the Foucauldian use of the term, therefore constrains what can be said about a topic and how the topic is reasoned about.

The Foucauldian notion of discourse complements the Bakhtinian perspective on language. Where Bakhtin recognizes that we live in a world pre-populated by previously uttered words, Foucault (1972) recognizes that “there can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others” (98). What Foucault adds to discourse analysts’ concern with the use of language at micro-level sites of interaction is a broader concern with the macro-level forms of knowledge that appear in society during any given historical period. A focus on intertextuality is key to unraveling the way the micro feeds into the macro. “Ultimately, it is by the cumulative traces laid down across intersecting speech events that particular representations of an issue gain sufficient inertia to become reality. In other words, it is through a series of interconnected discourse encounters that isolated truth claims or representations turn into larger narratives and shared cultural understandings” (Hodges 2008: 500).

Phillips (1996), for example, examines the way key words and formulaic phrases were intertextually linked across speeches, interviews, and press reportage to propagate the discourse of Thatcherism in British society. As a discourse in the Foucauldian sense of the term, Thatcherist discourse forwarded a set of assumptions and explanations about the structuring of society, combining the classically liberal commitment to an unhindered free market with traditionally conservative commitments to law and order and a strong defense (Phillips 1996: 211). One of the key words studied by Phillips (1996) is “choice,” along with collocations such as “the freedom of choice” and “the right to choose.” Phillips (1996) claims that the “key word was used not only in ways which reproduced the discourse of Thatcherism but also in ways which transformed the discourse and in ways which resisted the discourse” (234). In this way, the natural history of a discourse is open to shifts and transformations as social actors discursively interact and carry prior text into new settings. Intertextuality in action, therefore, not only contributes to the propagation of hegemonic discourses but also holds the key to understanding processes of social change.

Central to the propagation of discourses is the notion of a “speech chain,” which Agha (2003) defines as “a historical series of speech events linked together by the permutation of individuals across speech-act roles” (247). In her discussion of language and political economy, Irvine (1989) introduces the concept of a special type of speech chain she terms a “chain of authentication,” which is involved in the valuation of material commodities. Irvine draws from Putnam’s (1975) example of how a precious metal, such as a piece of gold, relies “on a special subclass of speakers” to determine its authenticity (228). “The economic and symbolic value of gold for the wider community depends” on these “experts” to render the “usage of the term *gold* authoritative” (Irvine 1989: 257). More precisely, the process of authentication relies on more than a single authoritative pronouncement. It requires “a historical sequence by which the expert’s attestation – and the label (expression) that conventionally goes along with it – is relayed to other people” (Irvine 1989: 258). That is, it requires a series of intertextual connections to play out through a “chain of authentication” to effectively underwrite

the value of the commodity. While Irvine (1989) introduces the concept of a chain of authentication in relation to material commodities, it is equally applicable to verbal commodities: quotations, pieces of discourse, and narratives that enter into social circulation.

Chains of authentication are, for example, integral to the way truth claims were forwarded by the George W. Bush administration about putative links between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda or the supposed presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in 2003 (Hodges 2011). Pronouncements made by administration officials with substantial clout, such as Secretary of State Colin Powell, Vice President Dick Cheney, and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, can be compared to the valuations made by the “special subclass of speakers” in Putnam’s gold example (1975: 288). But such authoritative pronouncements in and of themselves would be insufficient to elevate the claims to the status of widely accepted truth. What is required is a chain of authentication – a historical sequence of reiterations of those claims in the “circular circulation” (Bourdieu 1996: 22) of the media and public discourse. Where sympathetic voices relay faithful reiterations of the truth claims, the narrative they support gains traction among the public as a valid explanation of the post-9/11 world. The result is what Foucault (1980) terms a “regime of truth,” a situation where knowledge is viewed and treated as the truth “even if in some absolute sense it has never been conclusively proven” to be true (Hall 1997: 49). Even as critical voices attempted to disrupt the chain of authentication, they drew from many of the sound bites and talking points associated with the administration’s position, and a “regime of truth” prevailed long enough to act as a sufficient justification for war.

As Dunmire (2009, 2011) elucidates in her “critical intertextual analysis” (Thibault 1991), part of the allure of the Bush administration’s “war on terror” (which entailed a link between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda) was the idea that “9/11 changed everything.” The events of 9/11 acted as a precipitating event for a new kind of doctrine – the Bush Doctrine – which rejected the “traditional military posture of defense and deterrence in favor of a policy of preventive intervention” (Dunmire 2009: 196). According to the Bush Doctrine, preventive war could be waged, as it was against Iraq, to eliminate a perceived threat even in the absence of hostilities against the United States. In her analysis, Dunmire examines the 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States along with policy documents outlining a neo-conservative approach to foreign policy stretching back to the early 1990s as the Cold War ended. The analysis aims to disrupt the “9/11 changed everything” narrative by illuminating the intertextual connections between the Bush administration’s national-security strategy and the previous articulations of that strategy in post-Cold War texts. Where the narrative underlying the Bush Doctrine creates a disjunction between that policy and those prior texts, Dunmire’s (2009) analysis illuminates “this disjunction by identifying the key thematic formations and transformations that underlie the Doctrine and connect it with its earlier versions” (217). As Dunmire (2009, 2011) points out, a key piece missing from the earlier documents was, as stated in the Project for the New American Century’s (2000) “Rebuilding America’s defenses: strategy, forces and resources for a new century,” “some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor” (51). And the events of 9/11 effectively “provided the exigency through which the Administration could simultaneously disjoin the Bush Doctrine from its prior articulations and implement the security goal of these earlier documents” (Dunmire 2009: 217). Thus, understanding subtle

erasures of the intertextual system that contributes to the production of politically powerful texts is just as important as understanding the role intertextual connections play in propagating such discourses.

5 Conclusion

The concept of intertextuality affords discourse analysts important insights into language and social interaction that the examination of isolated speech events does not. As Bauman (2005) summarizes, intertextuality “gives us a vantage point on social formations larger than those of the immediate interaction order, and it gives us ways of thinking of power and authority in discourse-based terms larger than those that are immediately and locally produced in the bounded speech event (interactional power)” (146). The survey of intertextuality provided in this chapter has attempted to touch on many of these issues and highlight the way intertextuality has factored into the work carried out by scholars interested in discourse. As should be evident from the discussion, there is no dearth of approaches or of potentially fruitful applications of the concept.

REFERENCES

- Agha, Asif. 2003. The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication*, 23, 231–73.
- Agha, Asif. 2004. Registers of language. In Alessandro Duranti, ed., *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 23–45.
- Agha, Asif. 2005a. Introduction: semiosis across encounters. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 1–5.
- Agha, Asif. 2005b. Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 38–59.
- Álvarez-Cáccamo, Celso. 1996. The power of reflexive language(s): code displacement in reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 33–59.
- Andrus, Jennifer. 2011. Beyond texts in context: recontextualization and the co-production of texts and contexts in the legal discourse, excited utterance exception to hearsay. *Discourse & Society*, 22(2), 115–36.
- Authier-Révuz, Jacqueline. 1982. Hétéroénéité montrée et hétéroénéité constitutive: éléments pour une approche de l’autre dans le discours. *DRLAV*, 32, 91–151.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, eds. C. Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans., Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Austin Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1977. *Image – Music – Text*, trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bauman, Richard. 1986. *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauman, Richard. 2004. *A World of Others’ Words: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Intertextuality*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bauman, Richard. 2005. Commentary: indirect indexicality, identity,

- performance: dialogic observations. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 145–50.
- Bauman, Richard and C. L. Briggs. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59–88.
- Becker, A. L. 1994. Repetition and otherness: an essay. In Barbara Johnstone, ed., *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, vol. 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 162–75.
- Becker, A. L. 1995. *Beyond Translation: Essays Towards a Modern Philology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Berkenkotter, C. and T. N. Huckin. 1995. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *Sur la télévision*. Paris: Liber – Raisons d'Agir.
- Briggs, Charles. 1992. "Since I am a woman, I will chastise my relatives": gender, reported speech, and the (re)production of social relations in Warao ritual wailing. *American Ethnologist*, 19(2), 337–61.
- Briggs, Charles and Richard Bauman. 1992. Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2(2), 131–72.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2000. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1439–65.
- Buttny, Richard. 1997. Reported speech in talking race on campus. *Human Communication Research*, 23(4), 477–506.
- Clark, Herbert H. and Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language*, 66(4), 764–805.
- Cohen, D. 1996. Direct reporting as a resource for demonstrating or enacting internal or psychological states. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego.
- Du Bois, J. W. 2014. Towards a dialogic syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25(3), 359–410.
- Dunmire, Patricia. 2009. "9/11 changed everything": an intertextual analysis of the Bush doctrine. *Discourse & Society*, 20(2), 195–222.
- Dunmire, Patricia. 2011. *Projecting the Future through Discourse: The Case of the Bush Doctrine*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Duranti, Alessandro and Charles Goodwin, eds. 1992. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrlich, Susan. 2007. Legal discourse and the cultural intelligibility of gendered meanings. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(4), 452–74.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- Gal, Susan. 2006. Linguistic anthropology. In Keith Brown, ed., *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 171–85.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1994. Professional vision. *American Anthropologist*, 96(3), 606–33.
- Gordon, Cynthia. 2006. Reshaping prior text, reshaping identities. *Text & Talk*, 26(4–5), 545–71.

- Gordon, Cynthia. 2009. *Making Meanings, Creating Family: Intertextuality and Framing in Family Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gumperz, John. 1977. Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inference. In Muriel Saville-Troike, ed., *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1977: Linguistics and Anthropology*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 191–211.
- Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John. 1996. The linguistic and cultural relativity of inference. In John Gumperz and Stephen Levinson, eds., *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 374–406.
- Günther, Susan. 1999. Polyphony and the “layering of voices” in reported dialogues: an analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 685–708.
- Hall, Stuart. 1997. The work of representation. In Stuart Hall, ed., *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, pp. 13–74.
- Hamilton, Heidi. 1998. Reported speech and survivor identity in on-line bone marrow transplantation narratives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 2(1), 53–67.
- Hanks, William F. 1987. Discourse genres in a theory of practice. *American Ethnologist*, 14(4), 668–92.
- Hanks, William F. 1989. Text and textuality. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 95–127.
- Haviland, John. 2005. “Whorish old man” and “one (animal) gentleman”: the intertextual construction of enemies and selves. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 81–94.
- Hill, Jane H. 2008. *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hodges, Adam. 2008. The politics of recontextualization: discursive competition over claims of Iranian involvement in Iraq. *Discourse & Society*, 19(4), 479–501.
- Hodges, Adam. 2011. *The “War on Terror” Narrative: Discourse and Intertextuality in the Construction and Contestation of Sociopolitical Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 2000. Reporting and reacting: concurrent responses to reported speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), 425–54.
- Hymes, Dell. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Irvine, Judith. 1989. When talk isn’t cheap. *American Ethnologist*, 16(2), 248–67.
- Irvine, Judith. 1996. Shadow conversations: the indeterminacy of participant roles. In Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, eds., *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 131–59.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1953. Discussion in Claude Lévi-Strauss, Roman Jakobson, Carl F. Voeglin, and Thomas A. Sebeok, *Results of the Conference of Anthropologists and Linguists. International Journal of American Linguistics Memoir*, 8, 11–21.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 2008. *Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edn. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1967. Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes. *Tel Quel*, 29, 53–75.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1968. Problèmes de la structuration du texte. *La Nouvelle critique* (special issue), *Actes du Colloque de Cluny*, April 16–17, 55–64.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1969. *Séméiotiké*. Paris: Seuil.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1974. *La Révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Seuil.

- Kristeva, Julia. 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. T. Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1984. *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1986. *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, William. 1972. The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In William Labov, ed., *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 354–96.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm, ed., *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 12–44.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1979. Activity types and language. *Linguistics*, 17, 365–99.
- Lucy, John. 1993. Reflexive language and the human disciplines. In John Lucy, ed., *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 9–32.
- Maingueneau, Dominique. 1987. *Nouvelles tendances en analyse du discours*. Paris: Hachette.
- Mannheim, Bruce and Dennis Tedlock. 1995. Introduction. In Dennis Tedlock and Bruce Mannheim, eds., *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 1–32.
- Manteuffel, Rachel. 2011. Martin Luther King a drum major? If you say so. *Washington Post*, August 25. www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/martin-luther-king-a-drum-major-if-you-say-so/2011/08/25/gIQAmUkeJ_story.html (accessed November 24, 2014).
- Matoesian, Greg. 2000. Intertextual authority in reported speech: production media in the Kennedy Smith rape trial. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 879–914.
- Morson, Gary Saul and Caryl Emerson. 1990. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Oddo, John. 2013. Precontextualization and the rhetoric of futurity: foretelling Colin Powell's UN address on NBC News. *Discourse & Communication*, 7(1), 25–53.
- Oddo, John. 2014. *Intertextuality and the 24-Hour News Cycle: A Day in the Rhetorical Life of Colin Powell's UN Address*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Parmentier, Richard. 1993. The political function of reported speech: a Belauan example. In John Lucy, ed., *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 261–86.
- Phillips, Louise. 1996. Rhetoric and the spread of the discourse of Thatcherism. *Discourse & Society*, 7(2), 209–41.
- Project for the New American Century. 2000. Rebuilding America's defenses: strategy, forces and resources for a new century. <http://cryptome.org/rad.htm> (accessed November 24, 2014).
- Putnam, Hilary. 1975. The meaning of meaning. In H. Putnam, ed., *Mind, Language and Reality: Philosophical Papers 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 215–71.
- Reddy, Michael. 1979. The conduit metaphor: a case of frame conflict in our language about language. In Anthony Ortony, ed., *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 164–201.
- Ruane, Michael E. 2012. Controversial King memorial inscription set to be erased, not replaced. *Washington Post*, December 11. www.washingtonpost.com/local/controversial-king-memorial-inscription-set-to-be-erased

- not-replaced/2012/12/11/41f2f8b6-43cc-11e2-8e70-e1993528222d_story.html (accessed November 24, 2014).
- Sclafani, Jennifer. 2008. The intertextual origins of public opinion: constructing ebonics in the *New York Times*. *Discourse & Society*, 19(4), 507–27.
- Shoaps, Robin. 1999. The many voices of Rush Limbaugh: the use of transposition in constructing a rhetoric of common sense. *Text*, 19(3), 399–437.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In Keith Basso and Henry Selby, eds., *Meaning in Anthropology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, pp. 11–55.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2005. Axes of evals: token versus type interdiscursivity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 6–22.
- Spitulnik, Debra. 1997. The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 6(2), 161–87.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2006. Intertextuality in interaction: reframing family arguments in public and private. *Text & Talk*, 26(4–5), 597–617.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2007. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thibault, Paul J. 1991. *Social Semiotics as Praxis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Tovares, Alla V. 2005. Intertextuality in family interaction: repetition of public texts in private settings. PhD dissertation, Georgetown University.
- Tovares, Alla V. 2006. Public medium, private talk: gossip about a TV show as “quotidian hermeneutics.” *Text & Talk*, 26(4/5), 463–91.
- Tovares, Alla V. 2007. Family members interacting while watching TV. In Deborah Tannen, Shari Kendall, and Cynthia Gordon, eds., *Family Talk*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 283–310.
- Trester, Anna Marie. 2012. Framing entextualization in improv: intertextuality as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 41(2), 237–58.
- Voloshinov, V. N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. Ladislav Matějka and I. R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press.
- Weingarten, Gene and Michael E. Ruane. 2011. Maya Angelou says King memorial inscription makes him look “arrogant.” *Washington Post*, August 30. www.washingtonpost.com/local/maya-angelou-says-king-memorial-inscription-makes-him-look-arrogant/2011/08/30/gIQAIYChqJ_story.html (accessed November 24, 2014).
- Wilce, James M. 2005. Traditional laments and postmodern regrets: the circulation of discourse in metacultural context. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 60–71.