Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis

NORMAN FAIRCLOUGH

University of Lancaster

My aim in the first part of this article is to "operationalize" the concept of intertextuality by using it to analyse texts, and in the second part to set out rather more systematically the potential of the concept for discourse analysis. This is one part of an attempt to develop an analytical framework—a theory and a method—for critical discourse analysis (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 1992b). The view of critical discourse analysis in these publications is a three-dimensional one: Discursive events (e.g., interviews, conversations, newspaper articles) are analysed linguistically as texts, as instances of discourse practice, and as instances of social practice. By "discourse practice" I mean the practices of producing, distributing, and consuming texts. The aim is to map these different types or dimensions of analysis onto one another: to reach explanatory understanding of how particular sorts of text are connected with particular forms of social practice, and how the connections are mediated by the nature of the discourse practice. The orientation is historical: In my view, the priority for critical discourse analysis in contemporary society is understanding how changing practices of language use (discourse) connect with (e.g., partly constitute) wider processes of social and cultural change. Intertextuality is an important concept in the analysis of discursive events as discourse practice. It gives a way into the complexity of discursive events (realized in the heterogeneity of texts, in meaning, form, and style) which is such a particularly salient feature in a period of intense sociocultural and discoursal/linguistic change.

The term "intertextuality" was coined by Kristeva in the late 1960s in the context of her influential accounts for western audiences of the work of Bakhtin, which was not widely known until relatively recently (see Kristeva, 1986, which was actually written in 1966). Although the term is not Bakhtin's, the development of an intertextual (or in his own terms "translinguistic") approach to analysis of texts was a major theme of Bakhtin's work throughout his academic career

and was closely linked to other important issues including his theory of genre (see Bakhtin, 1986, a paper he wrote in the early 1950s).

Bakhtin (1986) points to the relative neglect of the communicative functions of language within mainstream linguistics, and more specifically to the absence of attention to ways in which texts and utterances are shaped by prior texts that they are "responding" to and subsequent texts that they "anticipate." For Bakhtin, all utterances, both spoken and written, from the briefest of turns in a conversation to a scientific paper or a novel, are demarcated by a change of speaker (or writer), and are oriented retrospectively to the utterances of previous speakers (be they turns, scientific articles, or novels) and prospectively to the anticipated utterances of next speakers. Thus "each utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication" (p. 89). All utterances are populated, and indeed constituted, by snatches of others' utterances, more or less explicit or complete:

> "Our speech . . . is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness and varying degrees of 'our-own-ness,' varying degrees of awareness and detachment. These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and reaccentuate." (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 89)

That is, utterances—texts, in my terms—are inherently intertextual, constituted by elements of other texts. Foucault (1972) adds the refinement of distinguishing within the intertextual aura of a text different "fields"—of "presence," "concomitance," and "memory."

Kristeva (1986) observes that intertextuality implies "the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history" (p. 39)—the insertion of history into a text, in the sense that the text absorbs and is built out of texts from the past (texts being the major artefacts that constitute history); the insertion of the text into history, in the sense that the text responds to, reaccentuates, reworks past texts, and in so doing helps to make history and contributes to wider processes of change (also as I have said anticipating and trying to shape subsequent texts). This inherent historicity of texts enables them to take on the major roles they have in contemporary society at the leading edge of social and cultural change (Fairclough, 1992a). The rapid transformation and restructuring of textual traditions and orders of discourse is a striking contemporary phenomenon, which suggests that intertextuality ought to be a major focus in discourse analysis.

The concept of intertextuality points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions (genres, discourses) to generate new ones. But this productivity is not in practice available to people as a limitless space for textual innovation and play: It is socially limited and constrained, and conditional upon relations of power. The theory of intertextuality cannot itself account for these social limitations, and so it needs to be combined with a theory of power relations and how they shape (and are shaped

by) social structures and practices. My feeling is that hegemony theory is a strong contender, which combines particularly well and fruitfully with intertextuality. Not only can one chart the possibilities and limitations for intertextual processes within particular hegemonies and states of hegemonic struggle, one can also conceptualize intertextual processes and processes of contesting and restructuring orders of discourse as processes of hegemonic struggle in the sphere of discourse which have effects upon as well as are affected by hegemonic struggle in the wider sense (see Fairclough, 1992a, for a detailed development of this position).

Bakhtin distinguished what Kristeva has called "horizontal" and "vertical" dimensions of intertextuality (or relationships in intertextual "space"; see Kristeva, 1986, p. 36). On the one hand, there are horizontal intertextual relations of a "dialogical" sort (though what are usually seen as monologues can be dialogical in this sense) between a text and those which preceed and follow it in the chain of texts. The most obvious case is how speaking-turns in a conversation incorporate and respond to turns which preceed them and anticipate those which follow; but a letter is also related intertextually to earlier and subsequent letters within the correspondence. On the other hand, there are vertical intertextual relations between a text and other texts that constitute its more or less immediate or distant contexts: texts it is historically linked with in various time-scales and along various parameters, including texts which are more or less contemporary with it.

In addition to incorporating or otherwise responding to individual other texts, the intertextuality of a text can be seen as incorporating the potentially complex relationships it has with the conventions (genres, discourses, styles, activity types) which are structured together to constitute an "order of discourse" (discussed in more detail later). Bakhtin, discussing genre, notes that texts may not only draw upon such conventions in a relatively straightforward way, but may also "reaccentuate" them by, for example, using them ironically, parodically, reverently, or whatever, or "mix" them in various ways (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 79–80). The distinction between intertextual relations of texts to specific other texts and intertextual relations of texts to conventions is linked to another distinction used by French discourse analysts: "manifest" as opposed to "constitutive" intertextuality (the terms are actually "heterogeneite montree" and "heterogeneite constitutive"; see Authier-Revuz, 1982; Maingueneau, 1987). In manifest intertextuality, individual other texts are explicitly present in the text under analysis—they are "manifestly" marked or cued by features on the surface of the text, such as quotation marks. Note, however, that a text may "incorporate" an individual other text without the latter being explicitly cued—one can respond to another text in the way one words one's own text, for example. The constitutive intertextuality of a text, on the other hand, is the configuration of discourse conventions that go into its production. I shall use intertextuality as a general term for both when the distinction is not at issue, but introduce the new term *interdiscursivity*

rather than "constitutive intertextuality" when the distinction is needed. The focus here is upon interdiscursivity.

Intertextuality entails, as I have indicated, an emphasis upon the heterogeneity of texts, and a mode of analysis which highlights the diverse and often contradictory elements and threads that make up a text. Having said that, texts vary a great deal in their degrees of heterogeneity, depending upon whether their intertextual relations are complex or simple. Texts also differ in the extent to which their heterogeneous elements are integrated—and so in the extent to which their heterogeneity is evident on the surface of the text. For example, the text of another may be set off clearly from the rest of the text by quotations marks and a reporting verb, or it may be unmarked and integrated structurally and stylistically (e.g., through a rewording of the original) in the surrounding text (see the discussion of discourse representation that follows). Again, texts may or may not be "reaccentuated," they may or may not be drawn into the prevailing (e.g., ironic or sentimental) key or tone of the surrounding text. Or again, the texts of others may or may not be merged into unattributed background assumptions of the text by being presupposed. So a heterogeneous text may have an uneven and "bumpy" textual surface, or a relatively smooth one.

Intertextuality is the source of much of the ambivalence of texts. If the surface of a text may be multiply determined by the various other texts that go into its composition, then elements of that textual surface may not be clearly or unambiguously placed in relation to the text's intertextual network, and their meaning may be ambivalent—different meanings may coexist, and it may not be possible to determine "the" meaning. For example, when the speech of another is represented in what is traditionally called "indirect speech" (an example from a university prospectus: *The Students say how much they like the flexibility and range of course choice*), there is always an ambivalence about whether the actual wording is attributable to the person whose speech is represented or to the author of the main text—one cannot determine in this case whether students are claimed to actually say things like "I like the flexibility and range of course choice." Whose "voice" is this, the students' or that of the university administration? And elements of a text may be designed to be interpreted in different ways by different readerships or audiences, which is another, anticipatory, intertextual source of ambivalence.

I shall begin by analysing two sample texts to illustrate some of the analytical potential of the concept of intertextuality. I shall then move, on the basis of these examples, to a discussion of certain dimensions of intertextuality which are I think worth focusing upon in building a framework for discourse analysis: interdiscursivity, textual "transformations," and how texts constitute social identities.

SAMPLE 1
News Report

The first sample is an article which appeared in a British national newspaper, *The Sun*, in 1985 (see Fairclough, 1988a for a more detailed analysis of this sample).

It is a report about an official document produced by a House of Commons committee entitled *Hard Drug Abuse—Prevention and Control*.

Britain Faces a War to
Stop Pedlars, Warn MPs
Call Up Forces in Drug Battle!

The armed forces should be called up to fight off a massive invasion by drug pushers, MPs demanded yesterday.

Cocaine pedlars are the greatest threat ever faced by Britain in peacetime — and could destroy the country's way of life, they said.

The MPs want ministers to consider ordering the Navy and the RAF to track suspected drug-running ships approaching our coasts.

On shore there should be intensified law enforcement by Customs, police and security services.

Profits

The all-party Home Affairs Committee visited America and were deeply shocked by what they saw.

In one of the hardest-hitting Commons reports for years, the committee — chaired by Tory lawyer MP Sir Edward Gardner — warned gravely:

"Western society is faced by a warlike threat from the hard-drugs industry. The traffickers amass princely incomes from the exploitation of human weakness, boredom and misery. They must be made to lose everything — their homes, their money and all they possess which can be attributed to their profits from selling drugs."

Sir Edward said yesterday: "We believe that trafficking in drugs is tantamount to murder, and punishment ought to reflect this."

The Government is expected to bring in clampdown laws in the autumn. (Kemp, 1985)

What I want to focus upon is what is usually called speech "reportage" or "representation" (for a good standard account, see Leech & Short, 1981) in this article. I shall in fact use a different term for reasons I go into later: *discourse representation*. Discourse representation is a form of intertextuality in which parts of specific other texts are incorporated into a text and are usually (though as we shall see not always) explicitly marked as such, with devices such as quotation marks and reporting clauses (e.g., *she said* or *Mary claimed*). Discourse representation obviously accounts for a major part of what news is: representations of what newsworthy people have said. But it is also extremely important in other types of discourse (for instance in evidence in courts of law, and in political rhetoric) including casual everyday conversation where people endlessly report what others have said. In fact, just how important discourse representation is, both as an element of language texts and as a dimension of social practice, has not generally been appreciated.

The choice of this particular article means that we have available information that readers usually don't have: The document that is being reported here is

publicly available (Her Majesty's Stationery Office [HMSO], 1985) and we can therefore compare report and original and focus upon how discourse is being represented.

Accounts of discourse representation standardly draw a basic distinction between "direct" and "indirect" discourse representation. *Mrs. Thatcher warned Cabinet colleagues: "I will not stand for any backsliding now"* is an example of direct discourse, and *Mrs. Thatcher warned Cabinet colleagues she would not stand for any backsliding then* is an example of indirect discourse. Both consist of a reporting clause (*Mrs. Thatcher warned Cabinet colleagues*) followed by a representation of discourse. In the case of direct discourse, the words represented are in quotation marks and the tense and deictics—words that relate to the time and place of utterance such as *now* in this example—are those of the "original." There is an explicit boundary between the "voice" of the person being reported and the "voice" of the reporter, and direct discourse is often said to use the exact words of the person being reported. In indirect discourse, the quotation marks disappear and the represented discourse takes the form of a clause grammatically subordinated to the reporting clause—a relationship marked by the conjunction *that*. Tense and deictics are shifted to incorporate the perspective of the reporter—for example, *now* becomes *then*. The voices of reporter and reported are less clearly demarcated and the words used to represent the latter's discourse may be those of the reporter rather than those of the reported.

Such standard "grammar hook" accounts typically understate the complexity of what actually happens in texts. Let us focus on the headlines. The main headline, *Call Up Forces in Drug Battle!*, has none of the formal markers of discourse representation—no reporting clause, no quotation marks—yet it is an imperative clause in its grammatical form and the exclamation mark indicates that it is to be taken as a demand. But *who* is demanding? There is nothing formally to mark this as other than the voice of *The Sun* itself, but newspaper articles traditionally report the demands of others rather than make their own demands—that's what they do in editorials—which suggests that maybe this is a peculiar form of discourse representation after all. On the other hand, the distinction between "report" and "opinion" is less clear than that suggests, especially in the "tabloids," so perhaps this *is* the voice of *The Sun*. Yet in the opening paragraph of the report, the demand of the headline is attributed to "MPs." We are faced with an ambivalence of voice, a headline whose ambiguous linguistic form makes it "double-voiced" (Bakhtin, 1981). *The Sun* appears to be blending the voice of the HMSO document with its own voice. This conclusion is supported by the preceding subheadline: *Britain faces a war to stop pedlars, warn MPs*. In this case there is a reporting clause but it is backgrounded by being placed *after* the reported discourse, and the latter again lacks quotation marks even though it is direct discourse. These formal properties again induce an ambivalence of voice.

But there is more to the blending of the voice of the HMSO document into the voice of *The Sun*. Compare these headlines and the opening paragraph with their original in the HMSO document:

> The Government should consider the use of the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force for radar, airborne or ship surveillance duties. We recommend, therefore, that there should be intensified law enforcement against drug traffickers by H.M. Customs, the police, the security services and possibly the armed forces.

In blending the voice of the document into its own voice, *The Sun* is also translating the former into the terms of the latter. This is partly a matter of vocabulary—*call up, battle, fight off, massive, invasion, pushers,* and *pedlars* are vocabulary items not used in the HMSO document. It is also a question of metaphor: *The Sun* is picking up a metaphor which is in fact used at one point in the HMSO document and transposing the voice of the document into its own frame—dealing with drug traffickers as fighting a war. The headline contains an elaboration of this metaphor wholly absent from the HMSO document—mobilisation (*call up*) of armed forces—and the same is true of the representation of drug trafficking as an *invasion*. It is also a question of translating the cautious recommendations of the report into a set of "demands."

What we find in the discourse representation of *The Sun*, then, is (a) ambiguity of linguistic form which means that it is often unclear whether something is represented discourse or not—further examples are the two paragraphs immediately before and after the subhead *Profits;* and (b) a merging of the voice of *The Sun* with the voice of the HMSO document which involves *The Sun* representing the recommendations and so forth of the document as if they were its own, but at the same time translating the document into its own language.

Is it however, simply "its own language"? The process of translation involves shifts away from the legitimated terminology of written language towards a spoken language vocabulary (*traffickers* becoming *pedlars* and *pushers, forces* occurring without *armed* as a modifier), from written monologue towards conversational dialogue (the demand in the headline is implicitly dialogic), drawing upon a metaphor (mobilisation for war) which has resonances in popular experience and mythology. The shift in short is from official document to popular speech—or rather to "the newspaper's own version of the language of the public to whom it is principally addressed" (Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, & Roberts, 1978, p. 61). This is associated with a tendency for the providers of news to act as "mediators"—figures who cultivate "characteristics which are taken to be typical of the 'target' audience" and a relationship of solidarity with that assumed audience, and who can mediate newsworthy events to the audience in its own "common sense" terms—or a stereotypical version thereof (Hartley, 1982, p. 87).

News media have been shifting broadly in this direction (though unevenly, as I suggest later), and one needs to consider why. On one level, it reflects what has been identified as an important dimension of consumerism: a shift, or apparent

shift, in power from producers, in a broad sense, to consumers. News media are in the competitive business of "recruiting" readers, viewers and listeners in a market context in which their sales or ratings are decisive for their survival, and the linguistic tendencies I have noted can be interpreted as one realization of a wider tendency for producers to market their commodities in ways that maximize their fit with the life-styles and aspired-to life-styles of consumers.

However, the process is more complex than that. Newsworthy events originate from the contracted set of people who have privileged access to the media, who are treated by journalists as reliable sources, and whose voices are the ones which most widely represented in media discourse. In some news media, these external voices tend to be explicitly identified and demarcated, a point I return to later. When, however, they are translated into a newspaper's version of popular language, as in this case, there is a degree of mystification about *whose* voices and positions are being represented. If the voices of powerful people and groups in politics, industry, and so forth are represented in a version of everyday speech (even a simulated and partially unreal one), then social identities, relationships and distances are collapsed. Powerful groups are represented as speaking in a language which readers themselves might have used, which makes it so much easier to go along with their meanings. The news media can be regarded as effecting the ideological work of transmitting the voices of power in a disguised and covert form.

Translating the language of official written documents into a version of popular speech is one instance of a more general translation of *public* language, be it written or spoken (the speech of Parliamentary debates for example), into *private* language: a linguistic shift which is itself part of the rearticulating of the relationship between the public domain of political, economic, religious, and so forth, events and social agents; and the private domain, the domain of the "lifeworld," of common experience. There has been a tendency for "private" events and individuals (e.g., the grief of relatives of accident victims) to become newsworthy in some of the media at least, and this tendency is beginning to move out from the tabloid press into, for example, television news. Conversely, people and events in the public domain have come to be depicted in private terms. Here is an example from the British press:

Di's Butler Bows Out . . . In Sneakers

Prince Charles's butler is quitting his job.

And yesterday he revealed that sometimes he carried out his royal duties in *sneakers*.

Mr. Alan Fisher usually wore the traditional Jeeves-style dark jacket and striped trousers at Charles' and Diana's Kensington Palace home.

The battered sneakers, he admitted, were a legacy from his service with Bing Crosby.

Mr Fisher, who leaves in six weeks, says the royal couple "are the most charming, nice and ordinary of people. The Princess is terribly down to earth and natural."

The 54-year-old butler, who also worked for the Duke and Duchess of Windsor in Paris, has no job lined up but hopes to return to America.

"There was something about the informality of life over there that I missed," he said.

"There is a certain formality about working in a royal household, but I am a great lover of the Royal Family."

Would he be writing his memoirs about the Royal couple?

"If you don't like the people you work for then perhaps," he said. "But I have really enjoyed working here."

A Buckingham Palace spokesman said last night the Prince and Princess had received Mr. Fisher's resignation "with regret." (*Daily Mirror*, May 17, 1984)

A butler in a royal household would traditionally be seen as a public figure, in terms of role and function, if a marginal one, rather than as an individual. The voice of the royal butler is in this case however a popular voice, both in the direct discourse representation at the end of the article and in the attributed use of "sneakers." This translation into the private domain of ordinary lives is underlined by the butler "quitting his job" rather than, for instance, resigning his post. At the same time, the more significant shift of members of the royal family themselves into the private domain is evident: Diana is referred to universally in the tabloid press with the reduced form of her first name (generally used in everyday experience only among family and friends, implying that the royal family is like the rest of us in using such reduced forms, and that "we" (journalists, readers) can refer to Diana as Di, as if we were on such intimate terms with her. What is implicit in this universal use of Di, is made explicit in this report in words attributed to the butler: She is "nice," "ordinary," "down to earth," and "natural."

The media have an important hegemonic role in not only reproducing but also restructuring the relationship between the public and private domains, and the tendency I have briefly identified here involves a fragmentation of the distinction so that public and private life are reduced to a model of individual action and motivation, and of relationships based in presumed popular experience of private life. This effect is brought off in large part through restructuring within the order of discourse of relationships between what I have referred to as "popular speech" and various other public types of discourse. I began this discussion by focusing upon discourse representation as a mode of intertextuality—how a text incorporates parts of other texts—but it has now broadened to a question of how the media discourse of newspapers like *The Sun* is constituted through a particular articulation of discourse types and particular processes of translation between them—what we can call the "interdiscursivity" or "constitutive intertextuality" of media discourse (see the section on interdiscursivity on p. 284). In the drug-abuse text, translations into popular speech coexist with direct quotations from

the HMSO document, though it is the former that are foregrounded in the headlines and in the opening paragraph. Although the media are diverse and include various practices of discourse representation and various patterns of interdiscursivity, the combination of public and private discourse types that I have identified here represents, I think, the dominant tendency in the contemporary media.

SAMPLE 2

"A Cardholder's Guide to Barclaycard"

The second sample (taken from Fairclough, 1988b) is the language content of one double page of "A Cardholder's Guide to Barclaycard"—the text occupies slightly more than the top one third of the double page, with the rest being taken up by a photograph of a smiling Japanese receptionist offering a (nonrepresented) customer a pen, presumably to sign the voucher referred to in the text. The numbering of sentences is my addition.

Using It's Simple, You Don't Even Have to Speak the Language

Wherever you see a Visa sign you can present your Barclaycard when you wish to pay [1]. The sales assistant will put your Card and sales voucher through an imprinter to record your name and account number [2].

He will then complete the voucher and after ensuring that the details are correct, you just sign it [3].

You'll receive a copy of the voucher, which you should keep for checking against your statement, and the goods are yours [4]. That's all there is to it [5].

You may use your Barclaycard as much as you wish, provided your payments are up to date and you keep within your available credit limit (this is printed on the folder containing your Barclaycard) [6].

Occasionally the shop may have to make a telephone call to Barclaycard to obtain our authorisation for a transaction [7]. This is routine requirement of our procedure, and we just make sure that everything is in order before giving the go-ahead [8]. In an effort to deal more quickly with these calls, Barclaycard is introducing a new automated system [9].

This will save time for you, but *please note that any transactions which could take a Barclaycard account over its credit limit could well be declined* [10].

It is important to ensure that your credit limit is sufficient to cover all your purchases and Cash Advances [11].

When you wish to take advantage of a mail order offer it's so much easier to give your Barclaycard number rather than sending cheques or postal orders [12].

Just write your card number in the space provided on the order form, sign it and send it off [13].

Or if you want to book theatre tickets, make travel reservations or even make a purchase by telephone, just quote your card number and the cost can be charged to your Barclaycard account [14].

You'll find Barclaycard can make life a whole lot easier [15].

My focus for this example is upon interdiscursivity (constitutive intertextuality) within a framework of hegemonic struggle and change: upon the social conditions and mechanisms for the emergence of a new discourse type which is constituted through a novel configuration of existing types. Specifically, the emergence of hybrid information-and-publicity (or "telling-and-selling") discourse. The particular mix in this sample is of financial regulations and advertising: The text sets out the conditions of use of the Barclaycard service, and at the same time tries to "sell" it. The text producers are functioning in two situations and two sets of subject positions at the same time, and also positioning readers in contradictory ways. The central contradiction is the authority relation between bank and public: The bank is on the one hand the "authoritor" communicating regulations to an "authoritee," and on the other hand a producer (authoritee) trying to sell to a consumer (authoritor). Correspondingly, it is interpersonal meanings in Halliday's sense (Halliday, 1978) that are at issue.

The text manifests a pattern of alternation at the level of the sentence between the discourse types of financial regulation and advertising, such that certain sentences are fairly clearly attributable to one discourse type or another. For example, the headline looks like advertising and sentence [6] looks like financial regulations. Others, such as [12] and [14], are more ambivalent. But even sentences that can be ascribed basically to one discourse type contain some trace of the other. For instance, in sentence [6] and throughout the text, the reader is directly addressed (as *you*). Direct address is conventionally used in advertising, and is one of the markers of informality which characterize modern advertising. There is one page in the guide headed "Conditions of Use" that makes an interesting comparison. It lists 13 conditions in very small print. There is no mixing of discourse types, and no direct address. Here is one of the conditions:

2. The card must be signed by the cardholder and may only be used (i) by that cardholder, (ii) subject to the terms of the Barclaycard Conditions of Use which are correct at the time of use, (iii) within the credit limit from time to time notified to the principal cardholder by the Bank, and (iv) to obtain the facilities from time to time made available by the Bank in respect of the card.

The word *just* as it is used in the text (sentences [3], [8], [13], and [14], belongs to advertising. It minimises impositions on the client, and thus mitigates the authority of the text producer with a shift towards the meaning of consumer authority. It communicates the core advertising meaning of simplicity—it's easy. A rather different case is the avoidance of meanings which would be problematic within this mix of telling-and-selling. For instance, one would expect in financial regulations that what is required from the client would be made explicit, as it is in the extract from the "Conditions of Use" quoted above (*the card must be signed by the cardholder*). Yet although the text refers by my count to 10 actions required of the client, obligation is explicitly expressed in only one case (*which*

you should keep for checking), and even then the meaning is a weak ("you ought to") rather than a strong ("you must") obligation.

The italicized portion of the text—sentences [10] and [11]—is the most clearly regulatory, yet even here there is a lot of toning down. The meaning expressed in [10] is potentially offensive to the client, but is toned down through hypothetical meaning (*could take, could . . . be declined*); the "hedging" of *could . . . be declined* with *well*, and the use here of a passive without an agent, which leaves unspecified who might do the "declining"—it can easily be inferred from the rest of the text that it's the bank, or rather particular persons within it, but the text does not foreground it. In [11], the card-holder's obligation is put in impersonal terms (*it is important to ensure* rather than *you must ensure*), and oddly transformed into a requirement to control the credit limit, which the bank in fact controls, rather than stay within it.

The mix of information about financial regulations and advertising for the Barclaycard service can be interpreted as a way of reacting to a dilemma which institutions like banking face in the modern market. Sectors of the economy outside commodity production are being drawn more and more into the commodity model and the matrix of consumerism, and are under pressure to "package" their activities as commodities and "sell" them to "consumers." This creates a particular difficulty for banks: To emulate consumer goods, their services must bow to the power of the consumer and be made attractive, simple, and maximally unconstrained; yet the peculiar nature of the "goods" on offer makes it imperative that consumers' access to them be controlled by rules and safeguards. This dilemma is not unique to banking. It arises in a rather different form in education, where pressure to "sell the product" is offset by pressure to protect it from the adulterating effects of the market. The dilemma is manifest in the "mode" of intertextual relation between the financial information and advertising elements of the text, and specifically the fact mentioned previously that the text alternates between sentences which are primarily one rather than another, giving the sense of the two discourse types trying uneasily to coexist in the text rather than being more fully integrated. Modes of intertextual relations will be discussed later.

Texts of the information-and-publicity or telling-and-selling sort are common in various institutional orders of discourse within contemporary society. They testify to a colonizing movement of advertising from the domain of commodity marketing in a narrow sense, to a variety of other domains. One can, I think, relate this to a current surge (associated in Britain with "enterprise culture") in the long-term process of commodification, the incorporation of new domains into the market, a spread of consumerism. Consumerism has been seen as entailing a shift in the relative power of producer and consumer in favour of the latter, though it is arguable to what extent this shift in power is substantive or cosmetic.

Commodification, spreading consumerism and marketisation are having widespread effects upon orders of discourse, ranging from a pervasive restructuring of institutional orders of discourse under the impact of the colonising move-ment of advertising, marketing and managerial discourse, to the ubiquitous "rewording" of publics, clients, students, and so forth as "consumers" or "customers" (Fairclough, 1993). These tendencies give rise to resistance, to hegemonic struggle over the structuring of orders of discourse, and to dilemmas for text producers and interpreters trying to work out ways of accommodating, containing, or subverting colonisation.

MANIFEST INTERTEXTUALITY

It is useful to bear in mind typological distinctions between different "modes" of intertextual relations which have already emerged in my discussion of the samples. One can distinguish between:

Sequential Intertextuality, where different texts or discourse types alternate within a text, as is partly the case in Sample 2;

Embedded Intertextuality, where one text or discourse type is clearly contained within the matrix of another; and

Mixed Intertextuality, where texts or discourse types are merged in a more complex and less separable fashion.

I shall discuss manifest intertextuality only in relation to discourse representation and presupposition. For a fuller discussion see the valuable accounts in Maingueneau (1987) and Fairclough (1992a).

DISCOURSE REPRESENTATION

I use the term "discourse representation" (Fairclough, 1988a; Slembrouk, 1992) in preference to the traditional term "speech reportage" because (a) it better captures the idea that when one "reports" discourse one necessarily chooses to represent it in one way rather than another, and (b) what is represented is not just speech, but also writing, and also potentially various other aspects of the discoursal event—its circumstances, the tone in which things were said, and so forth. Discourse types differ not only in how they represent discourse but also, for example, in the types of discourse they represent and the functions of represented discourse in the representing text. Thus, there are differences in what is quoted when, how, and why, between sermons, scientific papers, and conversation. A major variable in how discourse is represented is whether representation goes beyond ideational or "message" content to include aspects of the style and context of represented utterances. Volosinov (1973; pp. 119–120) suggests that some cultures are more exclusively message-oriented than others, and the same is true of some discourse practices within any particular culture, and within our culture.

Volosinov's work highlights a dynamic interplay between the "voices" of represented and representing discourse. Sample I has illustrated an example of how voices can be merged. Again, there is considerable variation between discourse types, which can be explained in terms of two overlapping scales: (a) To what extent are the boundaries between representing and represented discourse explicitly and clearly marked? and (b) To what extent is represented discourse translated into the voice of the representing discourse?

The degree of "boundary maintenance" is partly a matter of the choice between direct and indirect discourse representation. The former purports at least to reproduce the exact words used in the represented discourse, although, as Sample I showed, this is not always the case. Indirect discourse, by contrast, is ambivalent—one cannot be sure whether the words of the original are reproduced or not. Many accounts (see for example Leech & Short, 1981) also distinguish a category of "free indirect discourse" which lacks a reporting clause and is "double-voiced," mixing the voices of representing and represented discourse. The headline in Sample I (*Call Up Forces in Drug Battle!*) could be taken as an example.

Another claim in Volosinov's account is that the meaning of represented discourse cannot be determined without reference to how it functions and is contextualised in the representing discourse. A good example of this is the use of "scare quotes"—placing single words or short expressions in quotation marks (two journalistic examples are: *probe into "girlie" spy plot, a "final" pay offer*). Expressions in scare quotes are simultaneously used and referred to—scare quotes establish them as belonging to an outside voice. Beyond that, they can have various more specific functions: distancing oneself from the outside voice, using its authority to support one's position, showing a usage to be new or tentative, and introducing a new word. Similarly, one may use direct discourse to build up or show up represented discourse.

Contextualisation of represented discourse takes many forms. Here is an example from Sample I.

> In one of the hardest-hitting Commons reports for years, the committee—chaired by Tory lawyer MP Sir Edward Gardner—warned gravely: "Western society is faced . . . ."

The specification of the context of the represented discourse, of the prestigious status of its chairman, and of its "grave" tone, all underscore the weightiness and importance of it. Notice also *warned* which was selected in preference to, say, *said, made out,* or *pointed out.* The choice of representing verb, or "speech act" verb, is always significant. As in this case, it often marks the illocutionary force of the represented discourse, which is a matter of imposing an interpretation upon the represented discourse.

PRESUPPOSITION

Presuppositions are propositions which are taken by the producer of the text as already established or "given" (though there is the question of for whom they are given, as I argue later), and there are various formal cues in the surface organisation of the text to show this. For example, the proposition in a clause introduced by the conjunction *that* is presupposed following verbs such as *forget, regret, realize* (e.g., *I'd forgotten that your mother had remarried*); and definite articles cue propositions which have "existential" meanings (e.g., *the Soviet threat* presupposes that there is a Soviet threat).

Some accounts of presuppositions (see Levinson, 1983, chap. 4 for an overview) treat them in a nonintertextual way as merely propositions that are given for, and taken for granted by, text producers. But there are problems with this position: It would entail, for example, that the sentence *The Soviet threat is a myth* is semantically contradictory, because the text producer would be taking it for granted that there was a Soviet threat and asserting that there was no such threat simultaneously. If, on the other hand, we take an intertextual view of presupposition and assume that presupposed propositions are a way of incorporating the texts of others, there is no contradiction in this case: The expression *The Soviet threat* and the presupposition it cues come from another ("alien," as Bakhtin put it) text which is here contested. It should be added that in many cases of presupposition the "other text" is not an individual, specified, or identifiable other text, but a more nebulous "text" corresponding to general opinion, what people tend to say, accumulated textual experience. The expression *the Soviet threat* in this case, for example, is one that we can all recognize as a widely used formula, in Pecheux's (1982) terms a "preconstructed" expression which circulates in a ready-made form.

Within an intertextual account of presupposition, the case where the presupposed propositions does constitute something taken for granted by the text producer can be interpreted in terms of intertextual relations with previous texts of the text producer. A special case of this is where a proposition is asserted and established in one part of a text, and then presupposed in the rest of it.

It should be noted that presuppositions, whether they are based upon prior texts of the text producer or upon others' texts, may be manipulative as well as sincere. That is, the text producer may present a proposition as given for another or established by himself or herself dishonestly, insincerely, and with manipulative intent. Presuppositions are effective ways to manipulate people, because they are often difficult to challenge. An interviewee in a media interview for example who challenges a presupposition in a question from the interviewer can easily appear to be dodging the issue. Manipulative presuppositions also postulate interpreting subjects with particular prior textual experiences and assumptions, and in so doing they contribute to the ideological constitution of subjects.

INTERDISCURSIVITY

The concept of interdiscursivity draws attention to the potential heterogeneity of texts in terms of the diverse discourse conventions, types of discourse, which can be drawn upon in their production. I assume that what I am loosely calling "discourse types" makes up *orders of discourse* associated with particular institutions or domains of social life. For instance, there are particular orders of discourse associated with educational organisations, with the law, with science, and with the media. In describing orders of discourse, one is concerned with specifying what discourse types are used in the domain in focus, but also what relationships there are between them, for instance how rigid or permeable are the boundaries between them. For example, educational organisations differ across space and time in the strength of the boundaries they impose between the discourse types of classroom, playground, and home; in some schools, classrooms are characterized by a rigid exclusion of the latter two, in others they are articulated together, in various sorts of relationships. A major concern of the historically-oriented approach to critical discourse analysis that I have been developing is how relationships within and between orders of discourse shift as part of wider processes of sociocultural change (Fairclough, 1992a).

For the discourse types that constitute orders of discourse and are drawn upon in the production of texts, I shall use the terms *genre, activity type, style,* and *discourse.* I shall also refer to *modes of (manifest) intertextuality* associated with different genres. I shall draw especially upon Bakhtin (1986) and Kress and Threadgold (1988), though my account is somewhat different from both. Although these different types of element have a certain autonomy with respect to each other, they are not strictly equal. In particular, genre overarches the other types, in the sense that genres correspond closely to types of social practice (discussed later), and the system of genres which obtains in a particular society at a particular time determines which combinations and configurations the other types occur in. Moreover, the other elements differ in their degree of autonomy in relation to genre, the extent to which they are freely combinable with a variety of genres and with other types of element. On a scale from least to most autonomous: activity type, style, discourse. It is change in the system of genres and its effects upon configurations of other elements that is of particular interest. However, one strength of the (essentially Bakhtinian) view of genre I am adopting here is that it allows us to acknowledge and give due weight to both the way in which social practice is constrained by conventions and the potentiality for change and creativity.

I shall use the term *genre* for a relatively stable set of conventions that is associated with and partly enacts a socially ratified type of activity, such as informal chat, buying goods in a shop, job interview, a counseling session, a newspaper article, a television documentary, a poem, a scientific article. A genre implies not only a particular text-type, but also particular processes of producing, distributing and consuming texts. For example, not only are newspaper articles and poems typically quite different sorts of text, they are produced in quite different ways (e.g., one is a collective product, one an individual product), have quite different sorts of distribution, and are consumed quite differently—the latter including quite different protocols for reading and interpreting them. According to Bakhtin (1986, p. 65), genres are "the drive belts from the history of society to the history of language." Changes in social practice are both manifested on the plane of language in changes in the system of genres, and in part brought about through such changes.

Focusing upon genre as text-type, a particular genre is associated with a particular "compositional structure," as Bakhtin called it (1986, p. 60), or in the terminology I shall use, a particular *activity type* (a category I am adapting from Levinson, 1979). An activity type can be specified in terms of the structured sequence of actions it is composed of, and in terms of the participants involved in the activity—that is, the set of subject positions which are socially constituted and recognised in connection with the activity type. For example, the activity of buying goods from a shop such as a highstreet greengrocer's involves "customer" and "shop assistant" as designated subject types, and a sequence of actions some of which (including those in round brackets) may be optional or repeated, along these lines: customer enters shop and awaits turn, shop assistant greets customer (customer returns greeting, they exchange social pleasantries) and solicits purchase request, customer makes purchase request (possibly preceeded by a pre-request sequence such as "What are the apples like this week?"—"Well, the Coxes are nice"), shop assistant gets (weighs out, packages, etc.) goods and gives them to customer (customer and shop assistant possibly negotiate on whether the goods are acceptable, whether variations in the requested weight are acceptable, etc.), customer thanks shop assistant, shop assistant informs customer of the cost, customer pays, shop assistant gives change and thanks customer, customer thanks shop assistant and gives a farewell greeting, shop assistant returns farewell greeting. As this example shows, an activity type often delimits a range of options rather than specifying a single rigid pattern. See Hasan's contributions in Halliday and Hasan (1985) for a view of genre which emphasizes such properties of compositional structure.

A genre tends to be associated with a particular *style,* though genres may standardly be compatible with alternative styles—for example, interviews may be "formal" or "informal." Style, like the other terms I am using, is difficult to pin down, and has been used in various ways. We can think of styles as varying along three main parameters, according to the *tenor, mode,* and *rhetorical mode* of the text, to use the terminology of systemic linguistics (Halliday, 1978). First, styles vary according to tenor, that is, according to the sort of relationship that obtains between participants in an interaction. So we can classify styles with such terms as "formal," "informal," "official," "intimate," "casual"—of course there is no closed list of such terms. Second, styles vary according to mode,

according to whether texts are written or spoken or some combination of the two (e.g., written-to-be-spoken, written-as-if-spoken, spoken-as-if-written). So we can classify styles as spoken, written, spoken-as-if-written, and so forth. We can also use terms which in part reflect mode but in part reflect tenor, or genre, or discourse, such as "conversational," "formal written," "informal written," "academic," "journalistic," and so forth. Third, styles vary according to rhetorical mode, and can be classified with terms such as "argumentative," "descriptive," and "expository."

The most autonomous of the types of element (other than genre) is *discourse* (see Kress, 1985, and Kress & Threadgold, 1988, on the relationship between "genre" and "discourse"). Discourses correspond roughly to dimensions of texts which have traditionally been discussed in terms of "content," "ideational meanings," "topic," "subject matter," and so forth. There is a good reason for using "discourse" rather than these traditional terms: A discourse is *a particular way of constructing* a subject matter, and the concept differs from its predecessors in emphasizing that contents or subject matters—areas of knowledge—only enter texts in the mediated form of particular constructions of them. It is perhaps helpful in this regard to choose terms for particular discourses which designate both the relevant area of knowledge and the particular way it is constituted—for example, techno-scientific medical discourse (i.e., medicine as an area of knowledge constructed from a technological and scientific perspective, in contrast with the discourses associated with various "alternative" medicines), or "feminist discourses of sexuality" (sexuality as an area of knowledge constructed from feminist points of view). Discourses in this sense were a major concern for Foucault (1972). Discourses are, as I indicated earlier, more autonomous than other types of elements. That is, although there are still important constraints and rules of compatibility between particular genres and particular discourses, a discourse such as techno-scientific medical discourse is standardly associated with a range of genres (scientific articles, lectures, consultations, and so forth) and can show up in all sorts of other genres (conversations, television chat shows, or indeed poems).

Particular genres are associated with particular *modes of (manifest) intertextuality*. For example, the frequency, modes, and functions of discourse representation are quite different in a news report, a chat, and a scientific article. Contrasting modes and practices of discourse representation develop in connection with different sorts of social activity, according to the different significance and values the discourse of others comes to have. For example, a "verbatim" report of a conversation produced in a conversation or indeed a court of law is not necessarily expected to be word perfect, whereas a quotation from one scientific paper in another would be. Or again, whereas representations of the speech of others in conversation often attempt to capture aspects of the style in which things were said, this is rarely so in news reports. In more general terms, the extent to which other texts figure in a text depends upon the genre, as do the

forms of manifest intertextuality which are used, and the ways in which other text function within a text.

Now I will try to illustrate this set of types of element with reference to Sample 1 excluding the photograph and the section headed *Horror Watch on Addicts*. The genre is news report, and perhaps a subgenre would be tabloid newsreport which involves configuration with different styles from other subgenres. The activity type sets up subject positions for a newsgiver (a fictive individual author of the report, given that such reports are collectively produced) and a newsreceiver (the reader). It involves the following sequential structure: headlines (two in this case), which give the gist of the story; summary, (two) initial paragraphs which give a slightly fuller version of the gist; elaboration, two further paragraphs which elaborate the gist; development, all except the final paragraph under the subhead *profits*, which gives further detail on the story; outcome, the final paragraph, which indicates what action is to be taken. It is also worth noting that the story has a crisis–resolution structure: The headline and much of the body of the report sets out the crisis, the short final paragraph sets out the resolution.

The report is rather complex in terms of style. Let us begin with the rhetorical mode, which is giving information. More precisely, the newsgiver is constructed to be the source of knowledge and information; the reader, a passive recipient of it; and the report consists of the authoritative, categorical assertions that newspapers standardly make about events, despite the fact that such events are usually uncertain in character and open to various interpretations. What is interesting in this case is how the rhetorical mode combines with tenor-based and mode-based dimensions of style. The style is vernacular in tenor: As I suggested earlier, the writers simulate popular speech as if the relationship between news-givers and readers were a symmetrical one, a "lifeworld" one (in the sense of Habermas, 1984). The style is spoken and conversational in mode. The stylistic configuration appears to be contradictory because the rhetorical mode sets up asymmetrical subject positions and implies the written formality of public institutions which are at odds with the informal, conversational, lifeworld elements of the style.

There is one discourse whose presence in the report is particularly striking: what we might call a militarized discourse of criminality, built around the metaphor of criminals being "at war" with society and society having to "mobilize its forces" to "fight them off." In this report, however, the discourse and the metaphor are articulated with an appeal for mobilization in a literal sense, for the armed forces to be used against drug dealers, which leads to a certain ambivalence in the opening sentence: Is *The Sun* projecting some sort of real battle here?

INTERTEXTUALITY AND TRANSFORMATIONS

Particular practices within and across institutions have associated them with particular *intertextual chains*—series of types of texts which are transforma-

tionally related to each other in the sense that each member of the series is transformed into one or more others in regular and predictable ways. (On transformation, see Hodge & Kress, 1988, the discussion of critical linguistics in chap. 2, and Fairclough, 1992a; in the context of intertextuality, see Kristeva, 1986.) In contrast to the paradigmatic intertextual relations discussed in the previous section, these chains are sequential or syntagmatic. Specifying the intertextual chains that a particular type of discourse enters into is a way of specifying its *distribution*. A simple example would be the chain that links medical consultations with medical records; Doctors routinely transform the former into the latter. Given the considerable number and range of different types of text, there could, in principle, be a huge and indeed indeterminable number of intertextual chains between them. However, the number of actual chains is probably quite limited: Social institutions and practices are articulated together in particular ways, and this aspect of social structuring constrains the development of intertextual chains. Indeed, the study of actual intertextual chains is one way of gaining insight into this dimension of social structuring.

Intertextual chains can be quite complex. Think, for example, of the intertextual chains that the texts of international diplomacy and arms negotiation enter into. A major speech by President Gorbachev will be transformed into media texts of various types in every country in the world: into reports; analyses and commentaries by diplomats; academic books and articles; speeches that paraphrase it, elaborate it, and answer it; and so on. On the other hand, a contribution to a casual conversation is likely to be transformed into only formulations by coparticipants and perhaps reports by others. So different types of texts vary radically in the sort of distributional networks and intertextual chains they enter into, and therefore the sorts of transformations they undergo. Although there is no way that those designing a Gorbachev speech can anticipate in detail the many circuits of text production and consumption it is likely to enter, they are likely to try to design it in a way that anticipates the responses of the main types of audience. Such complex anticipation is a source of heterogeneity and ambivalence, and it may be that texts with complex intertextual chains are more prone to these properties than are other texts.

Transformations between text-types in an intertextual chain can be of diverse sorts. They may involve forms of manifest intertextuality, such as discourse representation. They may on the other hand have a more diffuse character. What can be interpreted as common elements shared by different text types may be manifested at different levels and in radically different ways—in the vocabulary in one case, in narratives or metaphors in another, or in selections among grammatical options, or in the way dialogue is organised. For example, a theoretical account of nonhierarchical, collaborative classroom practice in a book on educational theory may mainly shape its vocabulary, whereas the "same" theory may show up in actual classroom practice in the way in which dialogue between teacher and learners is organised, and in the staff room (or in research interviews)

in metaphors the teacher uses in talking about her classes and her relationship with learners (for example, do learners work in "groups," "teams," or indeed "task forces"?).

Let us consider a real example taken from Fairclough (1990). The speeches of Lord Young (formerly Secretary of State for Trade and Industry) between 1985 and 1988 were a major element in the development of the concept, practices and policies of "enterprise culture." It was Lord Young who renamed his department "The Department of Enterprise." In the speeches, the word *enterprise* is subjected to a process of semantic engineering (see chap. 6 in Fairclough, 1992a) which involves articulating around the word a set of qualities associated with entrepreneurship as understood by proponents of enterprise culture—including self-reliance and self-help. There is, I think, a relationship between the theoretical construction in these speeches of enterprising subjects, "the enterprising self," and the publicity put out by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) on Young's "enterprise initiative." What is contained in the vocabulary of the speeches is transformed here into a particular communicative style.

Here, from a DTI brochure on the enterprise initiative, is a section of an article dealing specifically with "the marketing initiative." It is the opening "orientation" section, which sums up the initiative.

The essence of good marketing is to provide your customers with what they want. Not to spend time and money trying to persuade them to take what you've got. So, whether you're selling at home or abroad, it's important to understand both the market and your competitors.

Like other orientation sections in the brochure, this consists of categorical and bald assertions about business practice which, like the first sentence in this example, must be truisms for the business audience the brochure is addressed to, or, like the second sentence, may be threatening to some businesses—notice that it is a negative sentence which presupposes that some businesses do spend time and money trying to persuade people to take what they've got. One might therefore expect business readers to find such orientations irritating and/or insulting. But I suspect they will be read quite differently. An enterprising person in Young's sense can talk and be talked to straight; what these orientations are perhaps attempting to do is both give the DTI an enterprising identity, and offer a model of an enterprising person and enterprising behaviour to businesses. The nature of the "enterprising self" figures not only in the vocabulary of the speeches, but also in the style of writing (implying a style of speaking) of the brochure.

Intertextual chains may constitute relatively settled transformational relationships between text types (as in the relationship between medical consultations and medical records, or the routines for transforming reports into newspaper articles). But, they often become lines of tension and change: the lines, or channels, through which text types are colonized and invested, and along which

relationships among text types are contested. This is, I think, the way to interpret intertextual chains associated with "enterprise culture": texts in health care, education, social services, the media, as well as official publicity such as the DH brochure, are being colonized with meanings associated with enterprise culture from centres such as Young's speeches, and invested with ideologies of enterprise and with New Right political strategies. Existing lines and channels within intertextual chains are being used for strategic purposes.

INTERTEXTUALITY, COHERENCE AND SUBJECTS

Intertextuality has important implications for the constitution of subjects through texts, and the contribution of changing discursive practices to changes in social identity (see, in this connection, Kristeva, 1986; Talbot, 1992; Threadgold, 1988). The intertextuality of texts substantially complicates the processes of text interpretation; for in order to make sense of texts, interpreters have to find ways of fitting the diverse elements of a text into a coherent, though not necessarily unitary, determinate, or unambivalent, whole. It is easy to see this as simply an achievement of interpreters, which implicitly places interpreters as discourse subjects above and outside intertextuality, as able to control discoursal processes which are exterior to them. Such a view implies social and discoursal subjects that mysteriously preexist social and discoursal practices, and misses the contribution of those practices to the constitution of subjects and to their transformation over time. The position I shall adopt here is that intertextuality and constantly changing intertextual relations in discourse are central to an understanding of processes of subject constitution. This is so on a biographical timescale, during the life of an individual, and for the constitution and reconstitution of social groups and communities.

Kress (1987) provides an example which underscores the social significance of such discoursal processes. He analyses samples of educational texts of various types, and suggests that their intertextual constitution incorporates elements shared with advertising discourse. For example, advertisements for household cleaning agents and school textbooks for home management classes share the property of distributing agency in cleaning processes between the human cleaner—by implication, the reader of the advertisement or of the textbook—and the commodity (e.g., *Ajax cleans without rinsing, fine powders can absorb liquids*), which suggests in both cases that the human cleaner "needs" the commodity. School textbooks, and other forms of educational discourse, thus contribute to the constitution of subjects as consumers, and the educational process appears, among other things, to be educating readers to read advertisements. As suggested, examples of this sort are relevant to the constitution of social groups and communities, as well as the socialisation of individuals; such discoursal practices simultaneously generate a (consumerist) view of the world, and a community (of consumers) associated with such a view. This accords with a view

of the ideological work of discourse as simultaneously generating representations and organising people into communities (see Maingueneau, 1987, p. 42).

The concept of "coherence" is at the centre of most accounts of interpretation. Coherence is not a property of texts, but a property which interpreters impose upon texts, with different interpreters possibly generating different coherent readings of the same text. Nor should coherence be understood in an absolute logical sense: A coherent text hangs together sufficiently well for present purposes as far as the interpreter is concerned, which does not preclude indeterminacies and ambivalence. Coherence depends upon the assumptions interpreters bring to the process of interpretation, including assumptions ideological in nature; for example, *She's giving up her job next Wednesday. She's pregnant* makes sense on the assumption that women cease to work when they have (and are expecting) children. Text producers interpellate interpreting subjects who are "capable" of making relevant assumptions and making the connections that yield coherent readings. One dimension of this is that texts postulate and implicitly set up interpretative positions for interpreting subjects who are "capable" of using assumptions from their prior experience to make connections across the intertextually diverse elements of a text, and to generate coherent interpretations. This should not be taken to imply that interpreters always fully resolve the contradictions of texts; interpreters may generate resistant interpretations. It is possible for interpreters to arrive at partial reconciliation or patching up of contradictions that is adequate for their immediate purposes. However, in so far as interpreters do resolve contradictions interpretatively, what is happening in part is that they are themselves being positioned (or having existing positionings reinforced) as complex subjects by texts.

Coherent interpretations across the intertextually diverse elements of a text are generated simultaneously for its various dimensions of meaning, ideational, and interpersonal (the latter including relational meanings as well as those pertaining to identity). For example, both Samples 1 and 2 have complex relational meanings associated with the ways in which they mix heterogeneous styles and genres. It is interpreters that find acceptable ways of marrying these diverse relational meanings. In the case of Sample 1, marrying relational meanings is a matter of rendering compatible, on the one hand, the relationship between a source and provider of information and a passive recipient of information, and, on the other hand, the relationship between comembers of the ordinary lifeworld. In the case of Sample 2, it is the advertiser–consumer relationship and the relationship between institution as rule-giver and member of the public as subject (bank and customer) that need to be married.

What has been said so far implies compliant interpreters, in the sense of interpreters who fit in with the positions set up for them in texts. But, not all interpreters are compliant: Some are to a greater or lesser extent, and more or less explicitly, resistant. Interpreters are more than discourse subjects in particular discourse processes, they are also social subjects with particular accumulated

social experiences and resources variously oriented to the multiple dimensions of social life. These variables affect the ways they go about interpreting particular texts, as do the particular interpretative protocols that are available to them and are drawn upon by them in that particular domain of discourse practice: the capacity for critical reading, for example, is not distributed equally among all interpreters in all interpretative environments.

Resistant readings may disarticulate to one extent or another the intertextual articulation of a text. For example, an interpreter may react against the advertising elements in Sample 2, reading them in terms of Barclaycard "trying to sell me something." As part of this process, the interpreter adds a further dimension of intertextuality to the text by bringing other texts to bear interpretatively; in this case, for example, sociological analyses or political critiques of consumerism. Resistant interpretations are one mode of hegemonic struggle over the articulation of intertextual elements. Although they typically lead to processes of text production which project this hegemonic struggle into more explicit forms, this is not necessarily the case, and it is important to take account of how interpreters interpret texts if one is to properly assess (and not, for example, exaggerate) their political and ideological effectivity.

Endnote

1. This article is a slightly revised version of Fairclough, 1992a, chap. 4.

REFERENCES

Authier-Revuz, J. (1982). Heterogeneite montree et heterogeneite constitutive: Elements pour une approche de l'autre dans le discours [Manifest and constitutive intertextuality: The other in discourse]. *DRLAV, 32*.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogical imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Di's butler bows out . . . in sneakers. (1984, May 17). *Daily Mirror*.

Department of Trade and Industry. (1988). *The enterprise initiative*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Fairclough, N. (1988a). Discourse representation in media discourse. *Sociolinguistics, 17*, 125–139.

Fairclough, N. (1988b). Register, power and sociosemantic change. In D. Birch & M. O'Toole (Eds.), *Functions of style*. London: Pinter Publications.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1990). What might we mean by 'enterprise discourse'? In R. Keat & N. Abercrombie (Eds.), *Enterprise culture*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992b). Discourse: Text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 3*, 193–217.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketisation of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society, 4*, 133–168

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action, Vol. 1*. London: Heinemann.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis*. London: Macmillan.

Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context and text*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Hartley, J. (1982). *Understanding news*. London: Methuen.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (1985). Hard drug abuse —Prevention and control. *Fifth Report from the Home Affairs Committee*. London: Author.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1988). *Social semiotics*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Kemp, D. (1985). Britain faces a war to stop pedlars, warn MPs. Call up forces in drug battle! *The Sun*.

Kress, G. (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. London: Oxford University Press.

Kress, G. (1987). Educating readers: Language in advertising. In J. Hawthorn (Ed.), *Propaganda, persuasion and polemic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Kress, G., & Threadgold, T. (1988). Towards a social theory of genre. *Southern Review, 21*, 215–243.

Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue and novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva reader*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Leech, G., & Short, M. (1981). *Style in fiction*. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. (1979). Activity types and language. *Linguistics, 17*, 365–399.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maingueneau, D. (1976). *Nouvelles tendances en analyse du discours* [New tendencies in discourse analysis]. Paris: Hachette.

Maingueneau, D. (1987). *Nouvelles tendances en analyse du discours* [New tendencies in discourse analysis]. Paris: Hachette.

Pecheux, M. (1982). *Language, semantics and ideology*. London: Macmillan.

Slembrouck, S. (1992). *The study of language use in its societal context: Pragmatics and the representation of parliamentary debates in newspaper discourse*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.

Talbot, M. (1992). The construction of gender in a teenage magazine. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman.

Threadgold, T. (1988). Stories of race and gender: An unbounded discourse. In D. Birch & M. O'Toole (Eds.), *Functions of style*. London: Pinter Publications.

Volosinov, V. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. New York: Seminow Press.