



HAL
open science

Review of: Jenny Arendholz, Wolfram Bublitz & Monika Kirner-Ludwig (eds.) (2015), The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then

Naomi Truan

► **To cite this version:**

Naomi Truan. Review of: Jenny Arendholz, Wolfram Bublitz & Monika Kirner-Ludwig (eds.) (2015), The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then. *Discourse and Society*, 2018, pp.592-594. halshs-01734565v1

HAL Id: halshs-01734565

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01734565v1>

Submitted on 14 Mar 2018 (v1), last revised 28 Sep 2023 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

This is a pre-print version of: Truan, Naomi. forthcoming. Jenny Arendholz, Wolfram Bublitz & Monika Kirner-Ludwig (eds.) (2015), *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then*. *Discourse & Society*.

Arendholz, Jenny, Wolfram Bublitz & Monika Kirner-Ludwig (eds.), *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then*. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 2015; viii + 428 pp. € [D] 119.95 / US\$ 168.00 / GBP 89.99 (ebook/hardcover).

Reviewed by: Naomi Truan, *Department of German Linguistics, Université Paris-Sorbonne, France* and *Department of English Linguistics, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany*

Producing new discourse is basically an illusion: in everything we say or write, we integrate words or expressions that already circulated among speakers and were already used by others. Quoting is everywhere – this could be one of the major findings of the edited volume *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then*, in which Arendholz, Bublitz, and Kirner-Ludwig present sixteen original contributions to pragmatics through the lens of quoting as “an act of taking up text and, in doing so performing a shift of context, focus and perspective” (p. 2). Each chapter relies implicitly or explicitly on the introductory distinction between the act of *quoting*, its products (*quotations* or *quotes*), and its indicators (*quotatives*). The identification of the *quoters* – the speakers who produce quotations or quotes – also constitutes an important dimension of all contributions.

Whereas most contributions are devoted to quotations or quotes as traces of so-called ‘reported speech’ (which actually does not *report* anyone’s words, but *constructs* them through the incorporation into the speaker’s perspective), the act of quoting – of producing discourse based on prior discourse – is less easy to grasp, since it can fail. The act of quoting might for instance not be identified as such by the addressee, or the speaker himself/herself might not be aware of referring to prior discourse. Between these two extremes, it is also possible that the speaker marks his/her speech as ‘reported speech’, but that the addressee does not understand the prior context the quotation refers to. Quoting always relies on a context shift: an element of a prior context A is incorporated into a new context B. Quotatives are usually used to clearly indicate the quoted segments; they help identifying an utterance as a quotation and to draw the addressee’s attention to the disruption of speech quotations are. Quotatives can be typographic markers (e.g. quotation marks, italics), verbal markers (for instance *say*), or rely on prosody or gestures, but they are never obligatory.

All contributions are corpus-based and several are contrastive. They alternatively rely on small corpora produced by the researcher for specific research purposes (Landert, Arendholz, Finkbeiner, to name just a few), a large and complex specialised corpus of professional discourse (Johnson) or big corpora such as the COHA (Corpus of Historical American English) (Moore).

The book consists of sixteen chapters divided into two parts plus an introduction: Part I, ‘Quoting Now’, is devoted to contemporary quoting practices, whereas Part II, ‘Quoting Then’, concentrates on diachronic analyses. Yet diachronic investigations are often pursued in Part I as well, since they are a valuable insight into discourse variation or continuity. In Part I, five (out of eight) papers deal with computer-mediated communication, whereas two others focus on specific German quoting expressions and the last one on quoting practices in academic settings. Part II hosts contributions on historic corpora, without losing touch with modernity, since two papers compare old texts with modern ones. The diachronic overview moreover sheds light on how surprisingly similar quoting functions can be across space and time.

A common interrogation for all contributions could be how the speaker positions herself or himself regarding the other interactants; similar conclusions on identity are to be found in several articles despite various discourse genres. Throughout the contributions, two main functions of quotations are investigated: enhancing the speaker's credibility and establishing new relationships.

Quoting can contribute to the speaker's credibility in various genres; it is extensively used as a stance-taking strategy. In British newspapers (Landert), where the quoter, i.e. the journalist, draws upon other voices, quoting helps making news reportable facts since statements are traced back to the original source. Similarly, in political interviews (Fetzer and Reber), quotations are used strategically to enable the speaker to position herself or himself towards the source of quotation. In German newspapers on commemorations (Musolff), quotations also reinforce the speaker's credibility by quoting a well-known source (argument from authority). The central notion of authorship and related terms such as intertextuality and transmission are included in the authors' reflexions: attributing a quote to a source is never a neutral act, as journalists (Landert) or politicians (Fetzer and Reber) might pretend. Sometimes, despite graphic indicators (a position in the textual margin), recognizing a text as a quote is not obvious, as Arendholz and Kirner-Ludwig show on a corpus of medieval manuscript and contemporary message board entries.

Secondly, quoting serves creating and maintaining new relationships with other interactants: if the addressee understands the quotation, a community of practice is established between the speaker and the addressee. In his article on square quotes, Meibauer shows how quotation marks enable the speaker to distance himself or herself from the quoted segment. Modern and medieval scholars alike use quotations for relational work. In academic journals (Schneider), quoting becomes a positioning strategy to present oneself with a positive professional image. Similar findings can be found in Lindner's contribution on German medical case reports from the 17th and the 18th century, where quoting serves self-praising and self-promoting, even though back then, quoting did not belong to obligatory academic standards. Medieval authors already used quoting as a legitimization strategy to embrace the spirit and the tradition of other author writers (Kirner-Ludwig and Zimmermann). In court (Johnson), quoting serves both the prosecution and the defence, whether to plead for guilt or inability to commit a crime. Finally, quoting also represents a tool widely used for face saving strategies. Quoting in message board communication or in online discussion for a for instance serves interpersonal functions; the online community reacts to quotes by *ad hominem* evaluations or positive alignment (Arendholz, Bös and Kleinke).

Apart from the discursive functions of quotations aforementioned, several papers, in particular based on historical corpora, address other issues related to quotes, such as specific constructions (Finkbeiner's paper on the German formula 'X is good'), grammaticalization processes (Aijmer's paper on lexical markers of quotation between 1560 and 1760), etymological issues (the verb *quoth* and *quote* in Middle English (Moore) or of the terms *quotation*, *citation* and *reference* (Kirner-Ludwig and Zimmermann)), pragmatic markers in direct speech passages (Lutzky), or the link between Latin citations and the Vercelli Homilies (Rudolph).

Despite the heterogeneity quoting functions analysed, the volume fulfils its role: investigating the forms and functions of quoting from the Middle Ages until now. The variety of the corpora surprisingly shows a significant continuity: as I said, quoting is everywhere.