

Intertextuality and ideology in discourse

Kim-Sue Kreisler (University of Nottingham, UK)

In this paper I argue for a corpus-cognitive approach (cf., Mahlberg *et al.*, 2016; Stockwell & Mahlberg, 2015) to address first the question of how discourses are related to each other, and second what they function is in context. To this end I first explore the potential of collocations and collocation networks to identify particular discourse relations and track their development. Second, I use frameworks from Cognitive Grammar (Langacker, 2008) to evaluate how discourse relations are expressed in context and how attention is distributed between related discourses to make a specific argumentative or ideological point.

Collocations are centrally connected to meaning-making, embodying implicit aspects of meaning such as connotations, or assumptions, and offering semantic analyses of a word in general or in a particular discourse. From a critical perspective, collocations can be informative of ideological attitudes, which is exemplified by the growing body of research that identifies these via collocational patterns. Yet discourses and their ideologies are not singular phenomena, but are complex, intertextually connected to each other, and continually negotiated (Sunderland, 2004). There is not just one but many discourses on a subject, whose relations can be visualised as a netted structure which results in ideological viewpoints. Corpus methods are particularly suitable to investigate discourses. Recent research on collocations and collocation networks (Baker, 2016; Baker & McEnery, 2015; Brezina, 2016) and the tools LancsBox (Brezina *et al.*, 2015) and DiaCollo (Jurish, 2016) are promising ways into the research area of discourse relations. Such connections and the importance of the intertextuality of texts, has been explicitly identified in both discourse analysis and corpus linguistics as a major aspect of discourse that needs to be researched in more depth (e.g., Fairclough, 1992; Teubert, 2005).

Discourses as textual expressions also need to be held and negotiated cognitively and are the interface between the cognitive representations and processes on the one hand, and the particular societal position they express on the other hand (van Dijk, 1995). The relation between cognition and text is not direct, rather the repeated patterns in text provide familiar representations of people and events (Stubbs, 1996). These habitual ways of representation and argumentation do not determine the discourse, but impede a critical assessment of their underlying conceptualisation (cf. Hoey, 2005). I argue that certain research questions, such as how discourses are argumentatively related and understood by readers, can only be answered by considering both the textual and the cognitive aspect of discourse.

The discourse investigated in this paper is the debate on the legislation of abortion in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. The corpus is a sub-section the specialised Irish Abortion Debate Corpus (IADC), which comprises Irish online and offline newspaper articles from 2005 to 2016 on the issue of abortion. The sub-section analysed in this paper is related to the death of Savita Halappanavar on 28 October 2012 and contains articles from October 2012 until October 2013; it comprises 6.711 articles with more than 3.5 million tokens. Halappanavar died due to the complications of a septic miscarriage after her request for an abortion was denied by hospital staff. Her death became a headline news story, leading to

national and international protests, increased media discussion on abortion access in Ireland, and was ultimately responsible in part for the Protection of Life During Pregnancy Act 2013, which allows abortion in the case that a woman's life is at risk. Argumentative discourses, such as the debate on the legalisation of abortion, are particularly amenable to an analysis of discourse relations and how they form ideological messages because they necessarily harbour conflicting viewpoints. Many of the textual contributions to such discourse have the aim to persuade an addressee to accept a particular viewpoint, which results in drawing attention to some discourses over others.

In the analysis, I first identify the discourses connected to specific node words, such as *mother*, *woman*, or *church*, using collocation measures (MI3). All collocates are then sorted into ad-hoc created thematic groups. Only after the collocates have been identified and classified is the corpus separated into texts that contain two specific node words, which are assumed to influence each other ideologically, such as *mother* and *church*, and another set of texts where each node words occurs without the other. The thematic collocational behaviour of the two node words in these two sub-corpora is then compared to identify discourse relations between the nodes. To assess the functionality of these discourses, I further implement notions from Cognitive Grammar, mostly the trajector/landmark alignment and the reference-point relationship. This first explains the kinds of conceptualisations that are encoded by text-producers and how these are proffered for readers' cognitive attention during interpretation. It second gives insight into how the discourses functionally relate to each other.

Such a combined corpus-cognitive analysis offers insight into how intertextual discourses are formed contextually and how they can reflect the reproduction of ideologies. For example, there is a clear association in the discussion of Halappanavar's death whereby a mother is conceptualised as part of a mother-child entity and consistently attentionally de-focused in the text in comparison to the child. Extending the trajector/landmark alignment from sentences to discourses, I demonstrate that the ubiquity of this discourse in the Irish abortion debate at the time can be traced to one specific text and its influence, but also to how it was conceptually made available by this text and then subsequently repeated in other articles.

I argue that a consideration of how readers comprehend discourses and their relation to each other enriches our understanding of how discourse themselves: both how they are formed in context and how they can be emblematic of particular viewpoints. A viewpoint may be more persuasive because its is integrated into a coherent web of discourses which mutually support each other and whereby more attention is placed to some part of the web over others. In this paper I hope to demonstrate that corpus and textual analysis can profit from implementing frameworks from Cognitive Linguistics, while the empirical evidence of corpus methods can challenge and extend these frameworks.

References

Baker, P., & McEnery, T. (2015). Who benefits when discourse gets democratised? Analysing a Twitter Corpus around the British Benefits Street Debate. In P.

- Baker & T. McEnery (Eds.), *Corpora and discourse studies: integrating discourse and corpora* (pp. 244-265). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baker, P. (2016). The shapes of collocation. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 21(2), 139-164.
- Brezina, V., McEnery, T., & Wattam, S. (2015). Collocations in context: A new perspective on collocation networks. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 20(2), 139-173.
- Brezina, V. (2016). Collocation Networks: Exploring Associations in Discourse. In P. Baker & J. Egbert (Eds.), *Triangulating Methodological Approaches in Corpus Linguistic Research* (pp. 90-107). London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics and Education*, 4(3-4), 269-293.
- Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language*. London: Routledge.
- Mahlberg, M., Stockwell, P., de Joode, J., Smith, C., and M. B. O'Donnell, M. B. (2016). CLiC Dickens - Novel Uses of Concordances. *Corpora*, 11(3), 433-463.
- Jurish, B. (2016). *DiaCollo*. Talk presented at the Centre for Corpus Research, University of Birmingham, 28th June, 2016.
- Langacker, R.W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stockwell, P., & Mahlberg, M. (2015). Mind-modelling with corpus stylistics in David Copperfield. *Language and Literature*, 24(2), 129-147.
- Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and Corpus Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered Discourses*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Teubert, W. (2005). Evaluation and its discontents. In E. Tognini-Bonelli & G. Del Lung Camiciotti (Eds.), *Strategies in Academic Discourse* (pp. 185-204). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In C. Schäffner & A.L. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and Peace* (pp. 17-33). Aldershot: Dartmouth.