

# Sprache Interaktion

Arbeitspapierreihe

Arbeitspapier Nr. 69 (11/2016)

## **Performing Interdiscursivity: On Represented Speech in Communicative Practice**

Pepe Droste

<http://arbeitspapiere.sprache-interaktion.de>

Pepe Droste

## **Performing Interdiscursivity: On Represented Speech in Communicative Practice\***

### *Abstract*

This paper investigates forms and functions of interdiscursivity constructed by represented speech in ordinary conversation: In which ways do participants link discursive events by the means of represented speech and how do these ways contribute to the shaping of current conversations? Following the approach of communicative practice, I address the issue by analyzing data on German conversational small stories. I conclude by raising a number of implications and challenges, in particular, but not exclusively, for the study of represented speech in conversational interaction.

In questo contributo verranno analizzate forme e funzioni d'interdiscorsività, considerando il 'discorso rappresentato' in un contesto di conversazione ordinario. Di conseguenza verrà discusso in quale modo gli interlocutori collegano eventi discorsivi mediante il discorso rappresentato e come queste soluzioni possano modellare la conversazione stessa. Lo sviluppo di questi temi verrà inoltre affiancato da analisi di racconti discorsivi di origine tedesca. Si concluderà l'indagine concentrandosi su sfide e implicazioni legate in particolare, ma non esclusivamente, allo studio del discorso rappresentato in contesti di interazione discorsiva.

---

\* My thanks to the audience at and the organizers of the *International Conference of Studies on Quotation* in Verona, in particular Stella Merlin, Flavia Palma, and Rinaldo Rinaldi. Warm thanks to the editors, the anonymous reviewers, Lottie Jones, Marco Pravato, and especially Susanne Günthner for invaluable comments on earlier drafts. A scholarship by the Federal Republic of Germany, the LVM, and the University of Münster is gratefully acknowledged.

### ***1. Introduction***

Quoting is a frequent, salient and quasi-universal metalinguistic practice. Not only a multitude of literary genres from diverse cultures show the common use of quoting but also ordinary conversation within presumably all known societies. Linguistic research on quotation in conversation – commonly termed ‘reported speech’, ‘represented speech’ etc. – differs with regards to contextual import. We can broadly distinguish studies that investigate represented speech in its contexts of use from studies which examine represented speech in a decontextualizing way. On the one hand, a large part of studies on represented speech in conversation tend to take an *abstraction-oriented* stance. By analyzing construed examples or quotes taken from literary sources, they study the object as a static phenomenon that is isolated from both its dynamic contexts of use and the social life of the discourse participants (e.g., cf. Brendel et al. 2011). Note that even Valentin Vološinov’s (1973) vastly significant studies on represented speech exclusively include examples of literary quoting. On the other hand, *praxis-oriented* research in Interactional Linguistics, Conversation Analysis, Linguistic Anthropology, and intersecting transdisciplinary traditions significantly extends the study of represented speech in conversation by the activity-focused, dynamic and context-sensitive analysis of situated conversational interaction.

To study language as practice is to focus on how actual people (individuals and groups) engage in speech, writing, and other media. It is important from the outset to emphasize that practice is not merely another term for what people do understood in isolation from what they say or think they do. Rather, a practice approach to language focuses precisely on the *relations* between verbal action, linguistic and other semiotic systems, and the commonsense ideas that speakers have about language and the social world of which it is a part. It implies units of analysis distinct from those of other approaches.

(Hanks 2005: 191, emphasis in original)

Within the framework of *communicative practice* (Günthner 2000a, 2007a; Hanks 1996; Duranti 1988), concepts and methods for analyzing represented speech are adapted to the characteristics of the use of spoken language in social interaction. Represented speech or dialogue in ordinary conversation is conceptualized as a resource that participants systematically deploy in the management of social interaction, whereby patterns and structures of represented

speech are emergent properties of, and shaped by, the contingencies and demands of social interaction.

The objective of this paper is to shed further light on the ways represented speech in ordinary conversation links discursive events and how these ways contribute to the shapes of current conversational encounters. I begin with an outline of the central characteristics of represented speech in ordinary conversation. Subsequently, I address forms and functions of relations between discursive events accomplished by the means of represented speech with the help of analyzing German conversational ‘small stories’. I show that there are distinct levels of interdiscursivity, each allowing to contribute to the current conversation in different ways. I conclude by raising a number of implications and challenges, in particular, but not exclusively, for the study of represented speech within conversational interaction.

## ***2. Lessons from Studies of Represented Speech in Conversational Interaction***

Vološinov defines represented speech as “speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time *speech about speech, utterance about utterance*” (Vološinov 1973: 115, emphasis in original). Represented speech is inevitably intertextual or, putting it otherwise, “interdiscursive” (Bauman 2005). It creates distinctions within speech and simultaneously accomplishes certain ways in which the “now-said reaches back to and somehow incorporates or resonates with the already-said and reaches ahead to, anticipates, and somehow incorporates the to-be-said” (Bauman 2005: 145).

Represented speech rests on perceivable signs that enable for distinguishing quote and context. Signs of quoting and unquoting may be graphic, phonic, and/or visual-kinetic. In conversation, a variety of linguistic resources may allow for distinguishing quote and linguistic environment. Not only quotation frames (e.g., Buchstaller 2014; Bückler 2013; Golato 2000), e.g. metapragmatic expressions<sup>1</sup> like “s/he said”, serve as highly effective signals but also other resources. Prosodic means – i.e. variation in intonation, rhythm, and intensity – and modulations of voice-quality – e.g., use of breathy, creaky, harsh and pressed voice – play a major role (Günthner 1998, 2000b, 2002; Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen 1999; Couper-Kuhlen 1999).

---

<sup>1</sup> By term ‘metapragmatic expressions’ it is referred to expressions that denote events of language use (Silverstein 1976).

Furthermore, code-switching – the alternation of languages, varieties, styles, or registers which participants perceive as such – is a common practice of signaling represented speech (Gumperz 1982: 75–76; Günthner 2002; Deppermann 2007).<sup>2</sup>

Simultaneously, these linguistic resources help to design the “target event” of the quote and signal who is speaking right now. This implicates a distinction between the *projecting* event and the *projected* event: In the Peircian terminology, quotes “index” other discursive events. Represented speech involves certain forms of language use, letting one event of language use that is actually experienced in the here-and-now point to another: Stretches of ready-made talk are extracted from their contexts (“decontextualization”) and fitted to the immediate conversational encounters (“recontextualization”) (Bauman and Briggs 1990; see also Bauman 1986; Bauman 2004).

It is a persisting illusion that we can quote an utterance ‘accurately’ within conversational interaction – an illusion that is sometimes referred to as the ‘verbatim assumption’. This is obviously perpetuated by literacy, which permits us to “copy and paste” graphic representations, a technique that achieved perfection in the digital age. A growing body of research on represented speech in conversation shows that represented speech is first of all tied to local contextual circumstances rather than to characteristics of other discursive events (see Tannen 2007; Günthner 1997, 1998, 2002; Holt and Clift 2007; Kotthoff 2007; among many others).

[W]hen speech uttered in one context is repeated in another, it is fundamentally changed even if ‘reported’ accurately. In many, perhaps most, cases, however, material represented as dialogue was never spoken by anyone else in a form resembling that constructed, if at all. Rather, casting ideas as dialogue rather than statements is a discourse strategy for framing information in a way that communicates effectively and creates involvement.

(Tannen 2007: 112)

In her often-cited study, the linguist Deborah Tannen presents a wealth of examples showing that represented speech in conversation do not need to have occurred before, or may have occurred but not in the manner depicted. She shows that represented speech in conversation is

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that code-switching as a means to index represented speech is not always performed with an exact timing. Sometimes the stretch of represented discourse is preceded by elements of the target variety (fade-in), at other times the following stretch of talk enhances elements of it (fade-out). It remains open whether fade-ins/fade-outs are structurally motivated or motivated by interactional functions underpinned by the temporality of interaction.

not mimetically fixed to certain past discursive events for the sake of authenticity but represented speech rather represents performances that are immediately tied to the social interaction in the here-and-now (Tannen 2007: 112–119).

The indexing of discursive events encompasses a distinction of speaker roles. The ‘footing’ concept by the sociologist Erving Goffman has proven to be useful at that point. Goffman analytically splits the role of the ‘speaker’ into the role fractions ‘animator’, ‘principal’, and ‘author’ (Goffman 1981; Levinson 1988; Goodwin 2007). Represented speech gives the opportunity to speak overtly for someone else and in someone else’s words without necessarily composing the words which the figure in question is made to utter or indeed taking the stance which the figure’s words will be heard as attesting to. In the case of represented speech, the unity of the speaker role dissolves, leaving the role fraction of the animator – the one who physically produces the quote – separate from, and independent of, those of principal and/or author, i.e. the ones held responsible for its propositional content or its wording, respectively.

Quoting inevitably means to comment on the quote (Vološinov 1973). In represented speech, the animator positions the figures in the projected event and simultaneously positions himself/herself and the co-participants in the projecting event. This is exactly what Mikhail Bakhtin (1981b) calls “double-voicing”:

It [double-voiced discourse] 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. In such discourse there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions. And all the while these two voices are dialogically interrelated, they – as it were – know about each other (just as two exchanges in a dialogue know of each other and are structured in this mutual knowledge of each other); it is as if they actually hold a conversation with each other. [...] A potential dialogue is embedded in them, one as yet unfolded, a concentrated dialogue of two voices, two world views, two languages.

(Bakhtin 1981a: 324–325)

In represented speech, such “bilateral” stance-taking is accomplished by the very shape of the quote within its context. The indexical means of prosody and voice quality, code-switching and quotation framing do not only serve the distinction of projected and projecting event – as mentioned above – but simultaneously contribute to the characterization of the figures, the

depiction of the situation the figures are confronted with, and, reflexively, the positioning of the animator, his audience, and the conversational situation they are participating in.

The commenting character of represented talk is not restricted to indirect represented speech. In conversation, we find hybrid varieties of represented speech, gradually differing between the ideal poles of direct and indirect represented speech.<sup>3</sup> These varieties of represented speech may be analytically distinguished by deictic anchoring, modus usage, syntactic dependency, as well as prosodic and paralinguistic modulations, and also indexed linguistic varieties and styles (Günthner 2000a: 297 ff., 1997, 2000b). In direct represented speech, intervention is not restricted to quotation frames but it is additionally performable through indexicals like prosodic modulations and code-switching. Furthermore, indirect represented speech enhances many syntactic constructional variants that are ranging from syntactically independent to syntactically dependent and may enhance expressive aspects of the projected event. Sometimes the anchoring of the quoted utterance within the projecting or projected event is regimented by the indexical means of prosody and voice-quality. Whatever form the quote takes, “to quote is to mediate and to mediate is to interfere” (Sternberg 1982: 108).

It is concluded that the act of quoting involves more than the mere accomplishment of interdiscursivity: To quote means to *enact* utterances as representing other utterances and as a situated act of *performing* interdiscursivity it requires special attention to the very ways of acting (Kotthoff 2002). This means that represented speech as a performance “heightens awareness of the act of speaking and licenses the audience to evaluate the skill and effectiveness of the performer’s accomplishment” (Bauman and Briggs 1990: 73). Consequently, several researchers suggest rejecting the traditional term *reported speech* for quotation in conversation in favor of terms like *constructed dialogue* (Tannen 2007), *staged speech* (Imo 2005), *animated speech* (Ehmer 2011), or *represented speech* (Agha 2007).

---

<sup>3</sup> Formally, the distinction between direct and indirect represented speech rests on the degree of syntactic fusion and deictics. Direct represented speech shows a low degree of syntactic fusion and a deictic shift, indirect represented speech a high degree of syntactic fusion and deictic continuity. Functionally, the distinction is based on degrees of authenticity. Direct represented speech involves imitation and may entail a high degree of authenticity, indirect represented speech involves paraphrasing that may entail no authenticity at all. Susanne Günthner and others have shown that the distinction between direct and indirect represented speech should not be regarded in the traditional way as a dichotomy but rather as a continuum.

### ***3. Token-level and Type-level Interdiscursivity in Represented Speech***

Represented speech may differ in the way indexed discursive events are formulated. Following the linguistic anthropologist Michael Silverstein, the accomplished interdiscursive relations may either be formulated as a *token* or as a *type* (Silverstein 2005). In the case of token-level interdiscursivity, the indexed discursive events are formulated as instantiations of specific, historically contingent communicative events. In the case of type-level interdiscursivity, the indexed discursive events are formulated as normativities of form and function that evoke generic associations with social classifications including social types, activities, codes and so forth. Furthermore, it is possible to chain different formulations of interdiscursivity and produce 'hybrid' relations.

The analytic distinction between type-level and token-level interdiscursivity illuminates the ways in which participants link discursive events by the means of represented speech and how these ways shape and simultaneously are shaped by the contingencies and demands of current social interactions. The remainder this paper will inspect the use of types of interdiscursivity in conversation in more detail by drawing on represented speech in German conversational small stories. In recent years, research on small stories is surging (Bamberg 2004; Georgakopoulou 2007; Spreckels 2008; Günthner 2012). Small stories reproduce and actualize snippets of social reality, experiences and actions in everyday situations. Moreover, small stories affect current action as they comment on current events and evaluations, providing perspectives for future action. In small stories, thus, experiences are decontextualized from its original contexts and then recontextualized in the current social interaction where they are sequentially embedded, emergently produced, and dialogically negotiated.

The data stems from the dialectological research project "Sprachvariation in Norddeutschland" 'Language Variation in Northern Germany'. From 2007–2010 extensive data on dialect and regional language use of rural women in Northern Germany were collected. The data used in this investigation are extracts of dinner-table talk among the informants and their families and friends. The participants gossip and exchange news while partly using Low German dia-



lect. Transcription conventions follow the conventions of GAT 2 (Selting et al. 2009);<sup>4</sup> translations are given below.

### 3.1. Token-level Interdiscursivity

Represented speech that relies on token-level interdiscursivity opens up possibilities to represent unique instantiations of episodes of social life. The ‘classic’ case of quoting some utterance that actually is remembered as having occurred in a prior encounter rests exactly on that type of interdiscursivity. In the following example, Irmtraut launches a small story and reconstructs a unique episode of social life she experienced when having a conversation with the local pastor.

#### *Example 1 ‘Small talk with the pastor’ (SiN.WML-SUE01)*

1 Irmtraut: ik BÜN noch bin-  
 2 was vunmOrgen noch bi\_den pastOR,  
 3 Annette: ja,  
 4 Irmtraut: un\_do SAGGT\_he ähm;  
 5 **erZÄHL mal-**  
 6 **hAbt\_ihr\_n schönes FEST gehabt,**  
 7 **erZÄHL mal.**

#### *Translation*

1 Irmtraut: << LG > I was was...  
 2 I was at the pastor’s yesterday.  
 3 Annette: Yes.  
 4 Irmtraut: And then he says, huh,... >  
 5 << LG > “**Now tell me,**  
 6 **did you have a nice party?**  
 7 **Tell me.”>**

After giving the background that she was at the pastor’s, Irmtraut quotes the pastor inviting her to tell him about a party she organized. She indexes the quote by the use of a preceding verbum

---

<sup>4</sup> Represented speech is indicated by **bold face**. Code-switching is represented by changing the font type from equidistant `sanserif` to **serif**. In the translations given below each transcript, the target variety of code-switching is commented (SG = Standard German, LG = Low German).

dicendi and intonational modulations expanding the pitch register. Additionally, the narrator uses code-switching to signal the quote: She switches from Low German dialect to Standard German. However, the code-switching does not only allow her participants to distinguish between quote and co-text. Irmtraut crucially designs the utterance of the pastor. The use of Standard German indexes a more formal type of social situation in which she and the pastor participate. By switching codes, the narrator, thus, creates resemblance of the depicted social situation and the current social encounter.

In the quote, she introduces a specific spatio-temporal setting and refers to a unique discursive event even resembling code choice. Thus, she creates a token-level interdiscursive relationship between the past discursive event featuring herself and the pastor and the current reanimation performed in the conversational here-and-now. By quoting the pastor's invitation to tell him about the party, Irmtraut simultaneously succeeds in keeping the turn and receiving the rights to tell the story about the conversation with the pastor in the conversational interaction at hand. In other words, she uses represented speech formulating a discursive event as a token as a metapragmatic resource in the current social encounter to keep the floor and interactionally project what comes next.

The following example shows a similar case. Ursula tells a small story about a man whose precarious appearance caused her son to exclamationarily point to the resemblance to Karl Marx.

*Example 2 'Marx, he's alive' (SiN.NB-GRA04)*

```
01 Ursula:  bi uns war en MANN,
02          de (-) wer hett alleEn wohnt;=
03          =un wEr ok (-- ) LEdig, (---)
04          und denn hett die LEU ja ok dat mit dAt- (.)
05          dat DRINken hett schon dat Överfluss hatt- (-- )
06          un die kÖrperpflege dat hett nich mehr so
           HINhaut; (--)
07          dat WASCHen;
08          un denn de BUOard is ok ümmer LÄNger worrn, (-)
09          un denn kEEem_he hier mal de stroat LANG,=
10          =un denn HAT er (.) hat unser bengel rOpen-
11          << loud > !O!ma Oma-=
12          =da kommt !KARL! !MARX;>
13          (( allgemeines Lachen ))
```

*Translation*

01 Ursula: << LG > There was a man by us... (-)  
 02           who (-) who lived alone  
 03           and who was also (-- ) single. (---)  
 04           And then the people also had been (.)  
 05           drinking, and an abundance of it. (--)  
 06           And the body hygiene was at odds... (--)  
 07           the washing...  
 08           and the beard has grown longer and longer, (-)  
 09           And once he came down the street...  
 10           and then our kid shouted,>  
 11           << **loud, SG** > **“Grandma, grandma,**  
 12           **there comes Karl Marx.”>**  
 13           (( general laughter ))

Ursula introduces a man who is in a precarious situation of life, characterizing him as on his own, drinking, dirty, and with a long grown beard. Against this backdrop, she starts to reconstruct a unique social experience and describes the man coming down the street. The appearance of the man – note that the participants are from East Germany – causes Ursula’s son to overtly draw her attention to a resemblance between the man and Karl Marx. Ursula reanimates her son’s reaction to the man’s appearance by represented speech. The quote is not only signaled by *verbum dicendi* but also by salient modulations of prosody and voice-quality indexing the shouting. Ursula imitates her son by increased intensity, harsh voice, and expanded pitch register. Furthermore, she switches from Low German dialect to Standard German.

The quotation frame, the modulations of prosody and voice-quality and the code-switching contribute to a resemblance of the indexed discursive event and the current conversation. Like in example 1, the represented speech in example 2 is tied to a discursive event that is enacted as historically contingent and “complete in all its essentials as drawn upon” (Silverstein 2005: 6). However, the contribution of the quote to the current social interaction is different. Here, the represented speech functions as a metapragmatic sign that signals the point of Ursula’s small story and contributes to the narrative climax by co-occurring linguistic contrasts (cf. also Alfonzetti 1998). Finally, as the following laughter overtly shows, it entertains since the partici-

pants interpret the resemblance of Karl Marx to a man in a precarious appearance as a joke about the central political icon of the formerly communist countries.

### *3.2. Type-level Interdiscursivity*

Typifications are a fundamental part of social knowledge and help to reduce the complexities of the world(s) to effectively processable bits (Schütz and Luckmann 1973). It has proven that, in general, the less familiar an object or person is to us, the more likely the treatment as a type is. Represented speech drawing on type-level interdiscursivity works by representations of discursive events that point to some normativities of form and function in social life with which the discursive events are generally associated. In this case, the indexed discursive events are formulated as typifications of social life, not as instantiations of it.

The following examples do not show quotes representing a unique discursive event but quotes that index types of behavior. In the first example, Gerda talks with some women about the conversational behavior of people calling from call centers.

#### *Example 3 'Charmant call center agents' (SiN.SB-BAS03)*

01 Gerda: aber das SCHLIMme ist ja auch;  
 02 die (.) ham ja manchmal wirklich sYmpathische  
 STIMmen,  
 03 und denn- (-)  
 04 Ricky: mhm;  
 05 Gerda: [verSUCHen\_se- ]  
 06 Ricky: [vor allem die FRAUen auch;]  
 07 (.)  
 08 Gerda: versUchen\_se dich auch erstmal in irgendein  
 gesPRÄCH zu verwickeln [ne;]  
 09 Ricky: [hm;]  
 10 (-)  
 11 Gerda: **ach aus bad SAArow?** (.)  
 12 ja und **ach das kEnne ich ja noch von FRÜher-**  
 13 **oder-** (.)  
 14 [**ach hm**]**\_HM?**  
 15 Ricky: [hm; ]  
 16 Gerda: und **SCHÖN,** (-)

17 und denn (-- ) hörst du dir das eben DOCH an ne  
und.  
18 (---)  
19 Gerda: aber da MÜSSte man wirklich konsequEnt sagen;  
20 Ricky: [**ich-**]  
21 Gerda: [**ich ] hAbE kein InteRESse-**

*Translation*

01 Gerda: But the bad thing is,  
02 sometimes they (.) have really sympathetic voices.  
03 And then.. (-)  
04 Ricky: Uh huh.  
05 Gerda: [They try... ]  
06 Ricky: [above all the women.]  
07 (.)  
08 Gerda: They try to involve you in some conversation,  
[right? ]  
09 Ricky: [uh huh;]  
10 (-)  
11 Gerda: **"Oh, from Bad Saarow?"** (.)  
12 Yeah and, **"Oh, I know that from long time ago."**  
13 or: (.)  
14 [**"Oh, uh ] huh."**  
15 Ricky: [Uh huh; ]  
16 Gerda: And, **"Nice"**. (-)  
17 And then (-- ) you listen to that after all.  
18 (---)  
19 but you should say consequently,  
20 Ricky: [**"I..."**]  
21 Gerda: [**"I ] have no interests."**

In the example, Gerda introduces call center agents as a specific social type. Gerda characterizes them as sometimes having sympathetic voices and always trying to involve the called person into a conversation. By the means of represented speech, she *demonstrates* the verbal practices of

accomplishing and displaying intersubjectivity of call center agents. She neither refers to a unique discursive event nor to a unique figure but to an abstracted set of figures, i.e. figures on the type-level. She accomplishes that not only with import of the co-text, which contextualizes the reference to a group of persons, but by firing off a list of alternative quotes, supposedly arbitrarily linked together by the coordinating conjunctions *und* ‘and’ and *oder* ‘or’ (lines 11–16). She does not make use of canonical quotation frames but uses zero-framing. Furthermore, she employs an expressively marked prosodic design that parodies the pretention by the call center agents to align and affiliate by taking an affective stance.

With the syntactically and prosodically marked set of quotes, Gerda creates a hyperbole that gives rise to a stylization of the animated figures in form of a caricature. The verbal caricature enables Gerda to index the pattern of being ‘trapped’ by dishonest methods. By the parodistic animation, Gerda does not only position the social type ‘call center agents’ but she also positions herself in contradiction to this figure (cf. Günthner 2007b). In concluding that she listens to the agents albeit the normative action should be to quit the telephone call she adds to this identity work and displays herself *ex negativo* as belonging to a group of serious persons who struggle with the dishonesty of call center agents.

In the following example, the represented speech refers to a type of action sequence. The discourse participants are talking about how to knit with special crochet hooks.

*Example 4 ‘Addicted’ (SiN.NB-GRA04)*

01 Ursula: ja hIEr oben ANjehäkelt-  
 02 ja aver di brUK ik bi achim NICH anhäkeln;  
 03 wenn ik [denn sit,]  
 04 Anette: [ist noch ] kAffeesahne DRIN,  
 05 (--)  
 06 Ursula: [wEnn ik-]  
 07 Angelika: [hm\_hm- ]  
 08 Dorothee: ja,  
 09 Angelika: [ja; ]  
 10 Ursula: [wenn ik] denn STRICK [avends-]  
 11 Angelika: [ja; ]

12 Ursula: denn sAg ik-  
 13 **noch zwei RUnden;**  
 14 << :-) > un dann SAcHT\_er-  
 15 **du die sInd aber schon vorBEI; >**  
 16 man wird rEIne (.) !SÜCH!tig mit diese na;  
 17 det is so schön LICHT in\_ne hand;  
 18 und is Ok nich KOOLT un;

*Translation*

01 Ursula: << LG > Yes, crocheted on up here.  
 02 Yes, but I don't need to crochet them on with  
 Achim  
 03 When I [sit then... ] >  
 04 Anette: [is there any] coffee cream inside?  
 05 (--)  
 06 Ursula: [When I...]  
 07 Angelika: [uh\_huh...]  
 08 Dorothee: Yes.  
 09 Angelika: [Yes; ]  
 10 Ursula: << LG > [When I] knit then [in the evening...]  
 11 Angelika: [Yes. ]  
 12 Ursula: then I say, >  
 13 << SG > **“Two rounds left.”**>  
 14 << :-), LG > And then he says, >  
 15 << SG, :-) > **“Listen, they are already over.”** >  
 16 << LG > You just become (.) addicted to these  
 needles.  
 17 That's so nicely light in your hands.  
 18 And not cold. >

After having fished to describe how to knit with the crochet hooks, Ursula claims that she cannot do that in presence of her husband Achim. She tries to launch a small story as evidence (lines 02–03) while there is another participant framework which deals with the coffee at the

dinner table. After several tries, Ursula succeeds and reconstructs an event she recurrently encounters in the evening when she knits. With the means of represented dialogue, she stages her way of acting and the response by her recipient. Ursula reconstructs an adjacency pair that consists of an animation of herself stating that she goes on with knitting for two rounds as first pair part and an animation of her husband replying that they are already over as second pair part (lines 12–15). Both quotes are indexed by the means of canonical quotation frames. While the first pair part is prosodically unmarked, the second pair part is further lifted from its co-text by the use of smile voice, which contributes to the contextualization of an affective stance. This is complemented by the use of the responsive metapragmatic marker *Du* ‘listen’, which indexes a stance-calibration relevant point and indexes the deliverance of a – in this case – dispreferred second pair part.

Like in the previous example, the quotes draw on type-level interdiscursivity. The represented dialogue does not index a unique discursive event but a norm of action sequence. Quoting the typical adjacency pair allows Ursula to cast the action sequence at hand as proven by recurrent experience. Ursula’s small story of recurrent losing her sense of time thus prospectively reinforces her conclusion that these special crochet hooks are so superb that everybody gets addicted to them.

### ***3.3. Chains of Interdiscursivity***

The power of interdiscursivity in represented speech does not stop at the type- and token-level. In represented speech, moreover, token-level and type-level interdiscursivity may be significantly chained. ‘Hybrids’ emerge when episodes of social life are both represented *ad hoc* and simultaneously evoke associations with certain normativities.

In the following example, a unique discursive episode is referred to which, however, implicates a generic social model of language choice. In the fragment, Ursula tells a small story about a conversation with Heidi she had at a meeting of the local history society, which promotes the use of Low German dialect. Heidi speaks Standard German while Ursula is speaking in Low German. This leads to problems of normativity.



*Example 5 'We talk Low German, so I do!' (SiN.NB-GRA04)*

01 Ursula: ik daHIN för unjefähr ne stÜnn- (--)  
 02 un dann sollt ja ook PLATT red warn- (-)  
 03 un DENN: sacht\_se; (--)  
 04 **SAG mir mal- (.)**  
 05 **waRUM- (1.2)**  
 06 **öh würdest dU dir das schild in dEIn büRO**  
**stellen; (-)**  
 07 wi reden PLATT ik Ook ne==  
 08 =hAtte sie für mich in [GRÜN.]  
 09 Claudia: [hm- ]  
 10 Heike: hm-  
 11 Ursula: un denn äh SAG ik- (--)  
 12 **HEIdi wi wollen hier PLATT reden;**  
 13 **[un\_nich HOOGdüütsch.]**  
 14 Claudia: [hahaha ]  
 15 (( allgemeines Lachen ))

*Translation*

01 Ursula: << LG > I went there for about an hour.  
 02 And then we should speak Low German.  
 03 And then she says,>  
 04 << SG > “Now tell me,...  
 05 why...  
 06 huh... would you put the sign in your office?” >  
 07 << LG > “We speak Low German. So I do!” Right? >  
 08 << SG > She had for me in [green.]>  
 09 Claudia: [Hm. ]  
 10 Heike: Hm.  
 11 Ursula: << LG > And then I say,  
 12 “Heidi, we want to speak Low German here.  
 13 [Not Standard German.” >  
 14 Claudia: [Hahaha... ]  
 15 (( general laughter ))

The point of departure of the story is Heidi's question why Ursula would put a sign that displays “We talk Low German. So I do!” in her office. Ursula quotes Heidi using Standard German although Low German is the language of choice by explicit convention in the situation at hand (cf. line 02) and the sign claims and demonstrates the opposite. The quote is set

apart from the co-text not only by a quotation frame and code-switching from dialect to standard, but also by prosodic means. Ursula significantly reduces her speaking rate, inserts several pauses and limits her pitch register. Constructing a dialogue, Ursula reanimates herself refusing the answer made conditionally relevant and instead responding with a reminder of the convention to speak Low German. The quote is signaled by the *verbum dicendi* and prosodic modulations frequently found in reproaches, i.e. prominent accentuation and falling intonation patterns (Günthner 2000a).

The represented speech establishes token-level interdiscursivity, as it indexes the unique event of Ursula and Heidi's dialogue. In the dialogue, Heidi's use of Standard German is displayed as deviating in two points: First, using Standard German violates the explicit convention at the meeting. Secondly, it deviates from the claim and display of the sign at hand. The represented speech displays Ursula holding Heidi accountable for the responsibilities associated with Low German in that situation. Thereby, the represented speech simultaneously gives rise to type-level interdiscursivity since it serves as a shortcut to characterization and reconstructs a specific model of language use.<sup>5</sup> It typifies the use of Low German as an "act of identity" (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985) serving the community while it denies Standard German that valorization. This allows Ursula to do identity work in the current conversational interaction. As she and her co-participants speak dialect, the dialogue assigns qualities of the "*we-code*" (Gumperz 1982) Low German to them. In fact, Ursula's co-participants appreciate her performance, confirm her stance and affiliate with the proffered identity by laughing.

The following fragment is an immediate continuation of the previous example and displays further elaboration of the interdiscursive relations. Ursula continues the small story by reconstructing a teasing sequence.<sup>6</sup> She quotes herself answering Heidi's initial question and finally realizing the type of response previously made relevant.

---

<sup>5</sup> On the performance and negotiation of epistemic entitlements see Berger and Pekarek Doehler (2015).

<sup>6</sup> See Günthner (2000a) on teasing.

*Example 6 ‘Nicely Green’ continuation of Example 5 (SiN.NB-GRA04)*

16 Ursula: un denn SEGG ik-=  
 17 =dAt will ik di mol SEGgen warum ik dat in mien  
 büro stellen doo-  
 18 weil dat so schön GRÖÖN utsehn deit-=  
 19 =un to mene grööne Utleggwoor [passen deit-]  
 20 Claudia: [haha- ]  
 21 Heike: [hahaha- ]  
 22 (( allgemeines Lachen ))  
 23 Ursula: << lachend > un de Möbel- >  
 24 (( allgemeines Lachen ))  
 25 Ursula: << lachend > DU sacht\_se; >  
 26 hör AUF; >  
 27 (( allgemeines Lachen ))  
 28 Ursula: un stEIht aver ook dA wie\_n <<:-> EELgetzen; >  
 29 (( lacht ))

*Translation*

16 Ursula: << LG > And then I say,  
 17 “I gonna say to you why I put that one in my  
 office.  
 18 Because it’s so good looking green.  
 19 And it goes with my green [carpets.” ] >  
 20 Claudia: [Haha... ]  
 21 Heike: [Hahaha... ]  
 22 (( general laughter ))  
 23 Ursula: << laughing, LG > “And the furniture” >  
 24 (( general laughter ))  
 25 Ursula: <<:-), SG > “You”>, << :-), SG > she says,>  
 26 <<:-), LG > “stop it!” >  
 27 (( general laughter ))  
 28 Ursula: << :-), LG > And she stands there like an idiot.>  
 29 (( laughs ))

The first part of the quote represents a Low German reformulation of Heidi’s question. It contrasts with the question by phonology and by showing a “parallel syntactic architecture” (Du Bois 2014) that deviates in terms of the *tun*-periphrasis, which is a salient feature of non-standard German (cf. Langer 2001). In this case, furthermore, the periphrastic construction is used in a (causal) subordinate clause, which is a regional syntactic variant typically for Low

German and functionally serves as an indicator for subordination. Then in the second part, Ursula elaborates on the reasons why she would put the sign in her office. She reanimates herself shifting to a playful modality and reducing the emblematic status of the sign to purely aesthetical values motivating her to put the sign in her office. The represented speech is designed by affectively marked prosody, a higher speaking rate, an expansion of the pitch register and an increasingly articulated “smile voice”. Furthermore, Ursula reconstructs the sequencing by reanimating Heidi’s response. She quotes Heidi – the victim – pleading her to stop. The quote features affectively marked prosody as well and a high pitch register. Ursula’s audience follow Ursula’s little show and join in the bursts of laughter, showing alignment and affiliation.

The represented speech sheds further light onto the model of language use at issue, implicated by the unique discursive event. On the token-level, Ursula’s performance shows herself playfully sanctioning Heidi’s doubly deviating language choice. Albeit formally an act of exclusion, the teasing presupposes close social relations between Ursula and Heidi and simultaneously recycles them (cf. Günthner 2000a). On the type-level, then, the represented speech points to the significance of language use: Standard German is implicitly conceptualized as “they-code”, which is the language of the majority used in more formal, out-group situations (cf. Gumperz 1982). On the contrary, it characterizes Low German usage as a sign of belonging that effectively forges identities, as it also does in the current conversational encounter.

#### ***4. Concluding Comments***

This paper has focused on the ways in which represented speech in everyday conversation links discursive events and how these ways contribute to the shapes of current conversational interactions. It has shown that represented speech building on distinct levels of interdiscursivity is employed by the conversationalists in order to come to specific interactional ends. In general, represented speech is a central interactional device that enables performers to increase linguistic and ideological heterogeneity by drawing on multiple discursive events and, thus, points of view. Different levels of connectivity between projecting and projected events allow for employing the concepts of uniqueness and typicality in binary opposition for communicative purposes. By putting both signs-in-use and reflections of these signs-in-use on display, repre-

sented speech opens up possibilities not only for representing particular versions of social worlds but for reproducing and renegotiating them beyond the parameters of the performance itself. By attention to the contextualized use of represented speech, “the sociocultural reality manifested in-and-by discursive interaction becomes analytically visible, an immanent semiotic fact in such events of self- and other-definition” (Silverstein 2003: 227).

The representation of particular social worlds through represented speech are not restricted to explicit, exhibited, “overt” quotation but in fact concerns implicit, “hidden” quotation, too. In the sense of the Bakhtinian idea that every word is a “quoted” one – an idea that is also supported by contemporary so-called ‘exemplar’ or ‘episodic’ theories of human sensory memory (e.g., see Gahl and Yu 2006) – the functions of quotation permeate language use in general, since any token of usage ultimately indexes all the others (see also Tannen 2006). However, “[t]he less explicit a metapragmatic utterance, the more context is needed to establish its import, or even to recognize that it is a metapragmatic act of some kind” (Agha 2007: 31) – a circumstance that makes explicit quotation so powerful.

Although this paper has focused on forms and functions of interdiscursivity created by represented speech in *ordinary conversation*, the issue is clearly not restricted to this domain. The issue rather represents a generic problem that cuts through human communicative activities, languages, and discourses. Quoting of linguistic signs in conversation constitutes just one context of using an overall semiotic mechanism. Since quoting constitutes a special form of human action, acts of quotation undergo all the aspects that count for human action in general. Quotation and the ways of staging interdiscursive links by certain ways of quoting remains an intriguing issue of *interdisciplinary* interest and relevance.

## 5. References

- Agha, Asif. 2007. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alfonzetti, Giovanna. 1998. The Conversational Dimension in Code-switching between Italian and Dialect in Sicily. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 180–211. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981a. Discourse in the Novel. In *The Dialogical Imagination: Four Essays by M. Bakhtin*, 259–422. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- . 1981b. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bamberg, Michael. 2004. Talk, Small Stories and Adolescent Identities. *Human Development* 47: 366–369.
- Bauman, Richard. 1986. *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. *A World of Others' Words. Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Intertextuality*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2005. Commentary: Indirect Indexicality, Identity, Performance: Dialogic Observations. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15.1: 145–150.
- Bauman, Richard and Charles Briggs. 1990. Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19: 59–88.
- Berger, Evelyne and Simone Pekarek Doehler. 2015. Direct Reported Speech in Storytellings: Enacting and Negotiating Epistemic Entitlements. *Text & Talk*, 35: 789–813.
- Brendel, Elke, Jörg Meibauer and Markus Steinbach. eds. 2011. *Understanding Quotation*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2014. *Quotatives – New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bücker, Jörg. 2013. Indexing Narrative Metalepsis in German Conversational Story-telling: The Case of “von wegen” and “nach dem Motto”. *Pragmatics*, 23.1: 23–49,
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 1999. Coherent Voicing: On Prosody in Conversational Reported Speech. In Wolfram Bublitz, Uta Lenk and Eija Ventola (eds.), *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse: How to Create it and How to Describe it*, 11–34. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2007. Playing with the Voice of the Other: Stylized Kanakspak in Conversations among German Adolescents. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*, 325–360. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Du Bois, John W. 2014. Towards a Dialogic Syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25: 359–410.

- Duranti, Alessandro. 1988. The Ethnography of Speaking: Toward a Linguistics of the Praxis. In Frederick Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*, vol. IV: *Language: The Socio-Cultural Context*, 210–228. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehmer, Oliver. 2011. *Imagination und Animation. Die Herstellung mentaler Räume durch animierte Rede*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Gahl, Susanne and Alan C. L. Yu. eds. 2006. Special Issue on Exemplar-based Models in Linguistics. *The Linguistic Review* 23.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small Stories, Interaction and Identities*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Golato, Andrea. 2000. An Innovative German Quotative for Reporting on Embodied Actions: Und ich so/und er so ‘and I’m like/and he’s like’. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32: 29–54.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. *Interactive footing*. In Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift (eds.), *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, 16–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Günthner, Susanne. 1997. Direkte und indirekte Rede in Alltagsgesprächen – Zur Interaktion von Syntax und Prosodie in der Redewiedergabe. In Peter Schlobinski (ed.), *Syntax des gesprochenen Deutsch*, 227–262. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- . 1998. Polyphony and the ‘Layering of Voices’ in Reported Dialogues. 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.
- . 2000a. *Vorwurfsaktivitäten in der Alltagsinteraktion: Grammatische, prosodische, rhetorisch-stilistische und interaktive Verfahren bei der Konstitution kommunikativer Muster und Gattungen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- . 2000b. Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede. Formen der Redewiedergabe in Alltagsgesprächen. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik*, 28: 1–22.
- . 2002. Stimmenvielfalt im Diskurs: Formen der Stilisierung und Ästhetisierung in der Redewiedergabe. *Gesprächsforschung – Online Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 3: 59–80.

- . 2007a. Ansätze zur Erforschung der „kommunikativen Praxis“: Redewiedergabe in der Alltagskommunikation. In Vilmos Ágel and Mathilde Hennig (eds.), *Zugänge zur Grammatik der gesprochenen Sprache*, 73–98. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- . 2007b. The Construction of Otherness in Reported Dialogues as a Resource for Identity Work. In: Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*, 419–444. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- . 2012. Kleine interaktionale Erzählungen als Ressourcen der Fremd- und Selbststilisierung, In Friederike Kern, Miriam Morek and Sören Ohlhus (eds.), *Erzählen als Form – Formen des Erzählens*, 65–83. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Hanks, William F. 1996. *Language and Communicative Practice*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- . 2005. Explorations in the Deictic Field. *Current Anthropology*, 46.2: 191–220.
- Holt, Elizabeth and Rebecca Clift. eds. 2007. *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2009. Inszenierungen eigener und fremder Rede durch Konstruktionen mit dem Verb sagen. In Mareike Buss, Stephan Habscheid, Sabine Jautz, Frank Liedtke and Jan G. Schneider (eds.), *Theatralität des sprachlichen Handelns. Eine Metaphorik zwischen Linguistik und Kulturwissenschaften*, 319–335. München: Fink.
- Klewitz, Gabriele and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 1999. Quote – Unquote? The Role of Prosody in the Contextualization of Reported Speech Sequences. *Pragmatics*, 9.4: 459–485.
- Kotthoff, Helga. 2002. Irony, Quotation, and Other Forms of Staged Intertextuality: Double or Contrastive Perspectivation in Conversation. In Carl F. Graumann and Werner Kallmeyer (eds.), *Perspective and Perspectivation in Discourse*, 201–229. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . 2007. The Humorous Stylization of ‘new’ Women and Men and Conservative Others. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*, 445–475. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Langer, Nils. 2001. *Linguistic Purism in Action: How Auxiliary tun was Stigmatized in Early New High German*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.



- Le Page, Robert B. and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Ethnicity and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1988. Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman's Concepts of Participation. In Paul Drew and Anthony Wootton (eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*, 161–227. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Schütz, Alfred and Thomas Luckmann. 1973. *The Structures of the Life-World*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Selting, Margret et al. 2009. Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 10: 353–402.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description. In Keith H. Basso and Henry A. Selby (eds.), *Meaning in Anthropology*, 11–55. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- . Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life. *Language & Communication*, 23: 193–229.
- . 2005. Axes of Evals: Token versus Type Interdiscursivity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15: 6–22.
- Spreckels, Janet. 2008. Identity Narration in Small Stories among German Adolescent Girls. *Narrative Inquiry*, 18: 393–413.
- Sternberg, Meir. 1982. Proteus in Quotation-land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse. *Poetics Today*, 3.2: 107–156.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2006. Intertextuality in Interaction: Reframing Family Arguments in Public and Private. *Text & Talk*, 26: 597–617.
- . <sup>2</sup>2007. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. New York und London: Seminar Press.