

Authorial voice and intertextual reference: an analysis of intertextuality in selected British opinion articles on Trump's tariffs policies

Amjed kadhun Alrickaby

General Directorate of Education in Babylon

amjed.linguist@gmail.com

صوت المؤلف والإشارة النصية: تحليل للتناص في مقالات رأي بريطانية مختارة تتناول سياسات ترامب

الجمركية

أمجد كاظم الركابي

المديرية العامة للتربية في بابل

ملخص البحث:

تبحث هذه الدراسة في استخدام التناص في مقالات رأي صحفية بريطانية مختارة تتناول سياسات دونالد ترامب الجمركية. بالاعتماد على الأطر النظرية التي وضعها وايت (٢٠٠٢) وبازرمان (٢٠٠٤)، يحدد البحث ويحلل استراتيجيات التناص المختلفة المستخدمة في مقالات الرأي. يكشف التحليل عن غلبة عناصر التناص الصريحة والمنسوبة - لا سيما الاقتباسات، والخطابات المنقولة، والإشارات إلى البيانات الاقتصادية والمصادر المؤسسية. تخدم هذه العناصر التناصية أغراضاً متعددة: إضفاء المصداقية، وتوفير مرجعية سياقية، والانخراط في تحديد المواقع الأيديولوجية، وبناء مواقف تقييمية مقنعة. تتراوح المصادر بين المؤسسات المالية والشخصيات السياسية والخبراء الأكاديميين، وتستخدم غالباً لدعم حجج الكاتب، وإن كانت تُستخدم أحياناً لمعارضة أو نقد السرديات السائدة. ويتحقق التأييد من خلال الجمع بين التوافق مع سلطة الخبراء والحوار النقدي، مما يعزز الصوت التقييمي للكاتب. وتؤكد النتائج على دور التناص كآلية حوارية تضع الكاتب في مجال خطابي أوسع، مع عكس الطبيعة الهجينة لمقالات الرأي كنصوص جدلية وتفسيرية في آن واحد. يساهم هذا البحث في فهم كيفية عمل مقالات الرأي التناصية لتشكيل الخطاب العام وتفسير قضايا السياسة المعقدة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التناص، الخطاب الإعلامي، مقالات الرأي، ترابط النصوص، التأييد

Abstract

This study investigates the use of intertextuality in selected British newspaper opinion articles concerning Donald Trump's tariff policies. Drawing on theoretical frameworks developed White (2002), and Bazerman (2004), the research identifies and analyzes various intertextual strategies employed in opinion articles. The analysis reveals a predominance of explicit and attributed intertextual elements—particularly quotations, reported speech, and references to economic data and

institutional sources. These intertextual inclusions serve multiple purposes: to lend credibility, provide contextual authority, engage in ideological positioning, and construct persuasive evaluative stances. Sources range from financial institutions and political figures to academic experts, and are predominantly used to support the author's arguments, though occasionally to contrast or critique prevailing narratives. Endorsement is achieved through a combination of alignment with expert authority and critical dialogism, reinforcing the columnist's evaluative voice. The findings underscore the role of intertextuality as a dialogic mechanism that positions the author within a broader discursive field, while reflecting the hybrid nature of opinion articles as both argumentative and interpretive texts. This research contributes to the understanding of how opinion articles operate intertextually to shape public discourse and interpret complex policy issues.

Key words: intertextuality, media discourse, opinion articles, texts interconnectedness, endorsement

1. Introduction

The concept of intertextuality has origins rooted in post-structuralist theory. The concept is mainly centered on the interconnectedness of texts through overt and covert referencing and citations from other texts. In this sense, the dynamic interplay between texts highlights the absorptivity of textual boundaries and the multiplicity of authors and voices within texts. In media discourse, the concept of intertextuality can serve two primary functions, both as a stylistic device and an interpretive practice (Velykoroda & Moroz, 2021). With this feature, intertextuality shapes the manner media producers create content and the manner the readers engage with these texts. Recent research has underscored the transformative role of intertextuality in meaning creation through the process of situating texts within their wider cultural, ideological and social contexts. This process emphasizes the dialogic relationship between texts where meanings, or sign systems, are constantly negotiated and created. Thus, it enables the flow and interpretation of meanings and ideas across texts (Iqani, 2009).

Research on the application of intertextuality has been extended beyond the scope of mere textual analysis to critical studies in discourse analysis and media studies. Prominent studies by Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) suggest that intertextuality helps in tracing the ideological features of media discourses through the examination of media texts assimilations and contradiction (Meinhof & Smith, 2000). More specifically, the concept of intertextuality is of paramount place in analyzing how media texts

including news articles, advertisements, editorials, political commentaries, etc. include and make references from history, popular culture, literature, politicians, and other sources to create narratives that reverberate the varied target readers (Blinova, 2019). For instance, intertextual elements such as citations from historical documents or popular stereotypes that readers can see in political media discourses are intentionally utilized by writers to influence public opinion or lead the public to react in certain ways (Ott & Walter, 2000).

2. Intertextuality

Inspired by Bakhtin's work on dialogism, Kristeva introduced the term *intertextuality* in linguistics and literature in 1969 (Allen, 2011). The term simply implies that every text is essentially an intertext, built from earlier texts and serving as a foundation for texts that follow. The term has developed considerably with time but the underlying idea of texts interconnectedness has been preserved (Vellykoroda & Noroz, 2021). The term is said to reflect Bakhtin's idea of polyphony, which refers to the presence of multiple and independent perspectives and voices that exist alongside the authority of the author. This claim is based on the claim that text construction is situated within the authors' social and communicative contexts (Van Zoonen, 2017).

Intertextuality can be defined as a powerful and analytical tool that defines and challenges the notions of textual boundaries and attempts to explore texts by relocating them on the contexts of the other texts (Iqani, 2009). Put simply, intertextuality, as defined by Child and Flower (2006), suggests that all texts, whether written or spoken, formal or informal, artistic or mundane, are connected in certain ways. In some ways related to each other. For example, a tourism blog can be linked to media content, sport news, commercials, etc. While the very beginning of the theory started with Bakhtin's observation that meanings are the products of texts relations, the term developed with the works of Kristeva who brought it to the academic context of media and communication studies. Kristeva pointed out that "any text is a mosaic of quotations" any text is the absorption and transformation of another (1986, p. 37).

The scope of intertextuality is no longer confined to literature studies but it is extended to include other fields including, but not limited to, media studies, political discourse, advertisements and field production, human communication, etc. With this diverse application, intertextuality has been dealt with from different perspectives. Some studies viewed it as a technique of allusion while other studies viewed it as a network of

evaluative devices employed in literary discourse to reinforce text meaning (Bell, 2000).

The relationship between the active reading a text and the interpretation of intertextuality in the text has been a subject for investigation. Under this view, the reader is no longer assigned a passive role but is often expected to extract from the text what is not explicitly said by presupposition, promising, entailment or logical implications, reading is thought of as cooperation between the text and its reader. According to Eco (1993), the active reader will fill in the empty spaces and link what appears in the text with the mosaic of intertextuality. He specifies two types of readers depending on the process of cooperation: the semantic reader and the semiotic reader. The former wants to know what happens while the latter wants to know how what happens is narrated (Eco, 2006). This interconnectedness on readers' background knowledge and text reading has also been highlighted by Kress (2000). Kress explains that intertextuality assumes that text producers use materials bearing meanings of their social contexts which they have already encountered to produce new materials connecting with those other texts and materials.

3. Dimensions of intertextuality

Intertextuality, at its core, implies that meaning is constructed through acts of interpretation and that there is no inherent meaning in texts themselves. While this does not necessarily mean that meaning is arbitrary and it is only text interpretation that produces meaning, the room for interpretation varies across texts. Some texts are open while others are closed for interpretation (Fiske, 1988). This view entails that the process of text interpretation relies on the text's relations to other texts.

Recognizing these relations between texts is essential in understanding the text's, or the author's, intended meanings. This is termed obligatory intertextuality (Fitzsimmons, 2013). For example, one cannot fully understand or enjoy the American sarcastic show, The Daily Show, if they are not posted with the current updates in news and politics (Druick, 2009). In other cases, texts can be less demanding to be understood and readers can enjoy without the need to be knowledgeable in other texts. This is termed optional intertextuality (Fitzsimmons, 2013). However, in some other cases when readers impose on their own interpretations on texts, often not intended by writers, Fitzsimmons (2013) explains that accidental intertextuality takes place.

4. Intertextuality and Media

In the world of media content, the flow of messages and symbols continues on constantly on daily basis (Bauman, 2000). The intertextual links between media products can be seen in the form of references, shared and syndicated sources and articles, similar styles, discourses and signifying systems. The multiplicity and interconnectedness in media content are self-evident on many levels, including the linguistic, visual, and structural. In this regard, Fiske (1988) introduced and developed the term *intertextuality for media studies*, distinguishing between primary, secondary and tertiary texts. Under this classification, primary texts are works that readers can typically understand and construct meaning without referring to other texts. Secondary texts, on the other hand, are texts that refer only to secondary texts. For tertiary texts, Fiske explains that these texts are constituted by the interpretations by the audiences. Meinhof and Smith (2000: 3), on the other hand, contend on the superficial observation that texts carry direct traces of other texts and instead suggest the concept of the interaction between texts, texts producers, and the immediate context of the texts consumers. This view underscores the continuity of media discourse and the everyday experiences of the discourse participants.

Two influential theories have been introduced to further explore the concept of intertextuality in media studies. The first, the intertextual commodity, was developed by Marshall (2002). Marshall's notion focuses on the intertextual movements of media brands across asset of genres such as films, video games, print media, and commercials, and claims that the dynamics of intertextual movement can determine the brand value. The second theory, the ethnography of intertextuality, was proposed by Petersen (2005). According to Peterson, because intertextuality can be utilized to explore the media-influenced social actions, it is fundamental to trace the movements of popular culture knowledge from formal media products (e.g., TV shows) to everyday and personal talks from both intertextual and ethnographic perspectives. Relevant to media studies, critical discourse analysts emphasize the centrality of intertextuality in conceptualizing some texts properties such as demarcation, assimilation, contradiction, etc.

5. Research Questions

Based on the previous literature review and discussion, this research paper seeks to answer these questions:

1. What types of intertextuality are implemented in the selected newspaper opinion articles?
2. How are these types of intertextuality attributed to sources?

3. For what purpose is the intertextual element is used?
4. How are these elements endorsed?

6. Data Collection

A careful data collection method has been set in this study to ensure a sound corpus and obtain sufficient and representative sample to investigate the target phenomenon. First, in order to avoid any diachronic overlap in the sample, a time span for the included articles was decided: only articles published during February, March, and April, 2025 were included. Second, the selected opinion articles covered the news of the US president Donald Trump tariff policies. Third, the opinion articles were downloaded from two political, daily, free access British newspapers, namely *The Telegraph* and *The Sun*. A total of 20 articles (10 from each newspaper), comprising a word count of 19,658, were included in the study corpus.

The decision to analyze opinion articles among other media genres to explore intertextuality is motivated from several perspectives. First, opinion articles are usually written by professional writers who articulate their expert views and comments on contemporary events on local and global levels (Biber, 1988; Maynard, 1996). Second, because of their persuasive nature and their evaluative and engaging style, they can be considered ideal target for linguistic analysis (Van Dijk, 1998). Likewise, these articles utilize linguistic resources that echo their writers' attitudes and ideologies, and seek to create interactional relationships with their target audiences (Connor, 1996; Khalil, 2000). Third, although this genre covers different social, economic and political topics, it is still under-researched compared to their journalistic genres (Van Dijk, 2004). With all these features, opinion articles can provide important and suitable data for the investigation of intertextuality and its functions.

٧. Data Analysis

An eclectic model based on Bazerman's (2004) framework on intertextuality and White's (2002) framework of attribution is designed for the sake of data analysis. In his framework, Bazerman distinguishes different levels at which a text links to another text. In White's (2002) framework, attribution refers to the source of attitude and acknowledgement of alternative voices within the texts (Martin, 2002). As can be seen in the Figure 1, intertextual representation can take four forms: direct quotation, indirect quotation, paraphrasing, and description. Sources encompass two types: attributed and unattributed, each one subsumed multiple categories. Four main functions are listed in this model:

background information, evidence, beliefs or ideas, and others. Finally, three types of endorsement are identifies: non-endorsement, endorsement, and dis-endorsement. These categories are displayed in the figure below.

Figure (1): Model of adapted from White (2002) and Bazerman (2004)

1. Intertextual representation (How writers include outside sources in a text)

- Direct quotation
- Indirect quotation
- Paraphrasing
- Description

2. Source type (What types of sources writers use)

- Attributed
 - Personal or impersonal
 - Identified or unidentified
 - Specific or generic
 - Singular or plural
 - Status neutral or high/ low status
- Unattributed
 - Mentioning of a person, document, or statements
 - Comment or evaluation on a statement, text, or otherwise invoked voice
 - Implicitly recognizable language and forms

3. Source function (What writers use outside sources for)

- Background information
- Evidence
- Beliefs, ideas, issue circulated
- Others

4. Endorsement (How the writers position themselves as writers in relation to outside sources)

- Non-endorsement (neutral) (responsibility delegated)
- Endorsement (positive) (responsibility reclaimed/shared)
- Dis-endorsement (negative) (responsibility delegated)

٨. Results

The selected opinion articles display a rich and deliberate use of intertextuality, serving both epistemic and rhetorical functions. Through a complex interplay of quoted, reported, and summarized voices, the writers construct an authoritative narrative that is simultaneously dialogic and

ideologically charged. The analysis of each category is presented below with excerpts, frequency and commentary.

٨.1. Intertextual Representation

In the current data, the utilization of intertextual representation is strategically varied, reflecting a deliberate balance between evaluative positioning and informational density. Examples and frequency of each type of intertextual representations are provided in Table 1 below.

Table (1): Intertextual representation

Type of Representation	Examples	Frequency
Direct Quotation	“It’s time for all these low-value businesses that sell to Walmart to close,” said Andy Xie. / “CUT INTEREST RATES, JEROME...”	Present in 8% of intertextual instances. Used for emphasis and dramatic effect, especially with Trump’s own words.
Indirect Quotation	“Trump persists in telling the world...” / “He proposed dropping 30 to 50 cobalt H-bombs...”	Frequent (25%). Used to maintain narrative flow while bringing in external ideas.
Paraphrasing	“Exports to the US have fallen...” / “Bessent says China is playing with a pair of twos...”	Common (30%). Helps maintain authorial control while summarizing external perspectives.
Descriptive Reference	“Uncle Ming’s Remarks, a hugely popular WeChat blog...” / “Battle of Triangle Hill – Shangganling – a 1950s film...”	Most frequent (37%). Used to frame historical, cultural, and economic references contextually.

The most prominent modes of intertextual inclusion are description and paraphrasing, which together account for the majority of source integration. This prevalence suggests that the writers prioritize interpretive framing over verbatim citation, allowing him to maintain a consistent evaluative stance while mediating the perspectives of others. Descriptive references are frequently employed to contextualize historical, economic, or political developments, such as the Korean War, rare earth mineral exports, or the role of the Federal Reserve. These descriptions often function as background scaffolding, situating the reader within a narrative that implicitly supports the columnist’s critique of Trump-era economic nationalism. Paraphrasing serves a similar function but with greater emphasis on the circulation of ideas, particularly those attributed to political figures, economists, or anonymous collective actors (e.g., “Trumpian fellow travellers” or “a whole school of economists in China”).

This approach allows the writers to subtly infuse their own interpretive lens while still foregrounding external voices.

While direct quotations are used more sparingly, they are highly strategic. They tend to appear at moments of rhetorical emphasis or irony—for instance, quoting Trump's tweet to underscore impulsiveness, or invoking the pseudonymous "Uncle Ming" to exemplify nationalist sentiment in China. These direct quotations act as rhetorical pivots, inviting the reader to assess the credibility or absurdity of the source in contrast to the authorial voice. These quotations further supplement the representation of external sources, often used to report statements by identifiable figures (e.g., Powell or MacArthur) without invoking the authoritative force of direct citation. This allows the columnist to incorporate a wider range of voices without disrupting the coherence of his own commentary.

The writers' utilization of intertextuality in the current data favors flexible incorporation of external discourse—leveraging descriptive and paraphrased representations to exert evaluative control, while reserving quotation for points of emphasis or critique. This aligns with White's (2002) model of heteroglossic interaction, where the author positions himself dialogically in relation to other voices to construct a persuasive and ideologically marked narrative.

٨.2. Source Type

The examined opinion articles deploy a broad array of source types, combining both attributed and unattributed voices to construct a layered and persuasive argument. This blend enables him to shift between authoritative appeal, evaluative judgment, and ideological critique, while also maintaining journalistic fluency and editorial control. Table 2 displays examples and frequency of the source types found in the data.

Table (2): Source types of intertextuality

Source Type	Examples	Frequency
Attributed (Identified, Specific, High Status)	Andy Xie (former Morgan Stanley banker), General MacArthur, Powell, Milley, Uncle Ming	Most (65%) sources are explicitly named and considered high status, enhancing credibility.
Attributed (Unidentified/Generic)	"Economists in China argue..." / "There is a whole school of economists..."	Moderate use (15%). Adds weight to argument without overcommitting to one authority.
Unattributed (Implicit References, Recognizable Forms)	References to "Korean War", "patriotic education", or terms like "Trumponomics", "Maga revolution"	Frequent (20%). Reflects cultural or ideological knowledge assumed to be shared with the reader.

First, a significant proportion of the sources are attributed, many of which are identified, personal, and high-status, lending credibility and weight to the columnist's claims. For example, figures such as General Douglas MacArthur, Jerome Powell, General Mark Milley, and Andy Xie are cited by name, with their professional or historical authority foregrounded. These sources are typically used to buttress arguments or provide insight into elite decision-making, aligning with Bazerman's (2004) notion of source use as a means of "constructing social facts."

There is also use of impersonal and institutional attributed sources, such as the US Treasury, Federal Reserve, or Capital Economics. These lend epistemic authority through their perceived objectivity or analytical capacity, even when the commentary around them is evaluative or critical. The articles occasionally invoke plural and collective sources—for example, "a whole school of economists in China"—which serves to invoke a broader ideological consensus without the specificity of individual voices. Interestingly, generic attribution is also present, such as when the author refers to "Trumpian fellow travellers" or "Republican deficit hawks." These unspecified groupings are ideologically marked and function to construct social actors as part of a broader evaluative framework, often in a negative light.

Second, unattributed sources appear frequently in the form of implicit commentary, backgrounded evaluations, or invoked social voices. For instance, expressions such as "it is easy to see how China could create panic" or "markets are heavily discounting everything he now says" are not explicitly sourced, yet evoke a shared understanding or conventional wisdom, a phenomenon White (2002) terms "invoked voices." These unattributed assertions often carry ideological weight, reflecting the columnist's stance while appearing objective or widely accepted. There are also referential mentions of documents, institutions, or public discourse—e.g., films like *Shangganling*, platforms like WeChat, and blogs such as Uncle Ming's Remarks—that function more as cultural or discursive markers than as evidentiary sources. These references are often status-neutral or low-status but strategically used to signal public mood, state propaganda, or ideological framing in China. By combining high-status, identifiable attributed sources with evaluative and ideologically resonant unattributed voices, these writers construct a multi-layered intertextual field. This not only increases the persuasive depth of his argument but also enables flexible authorial positioning—alternating between alignment, distancing, and implicit judgment.

٨.3. Source Function

Sources are strategically deployed to serve a variety of rhetorical and discursive functions in these opinion articles, ranging from bolstering claims and foregrounding expert authority to expressing ideological alignment or distancing. These functions are listed in Table 3 below with examples and frequency.

Table (3): Source functions

Function	Examples	Frequency
Background Information	Historical references to the Korean War, atomic planning in 1951, and the role of rare earths	35% – Provides context and builds parallels between past and present.
Evidence	Trade figures (exports dropped from 6.7% to 2.7% GDP), debt-to-GDP ratios, Fed statements	40% – Used to support the argument that US policy under Trump is unsustainable.
Beliefs/Ideas Circulated	“Maga revolution”, “Anti-American War”, “middle income trap”	20% – These circulated ideas lend ideological or emotional weight to the narrative.
Other (Rhetoric, Irony)	Use of “TV reality show”, “order a captive Fed”	5% – Injects irony and satire to delegitimize Trump's strategy.

These functions align with Bazerman's (2004) classification of how sources construct knowledge and White's (2002) appraisal-based perspective on intersubjective positioning. A large proportion of attributed sources serve a supportive or evidential function, particularly when the author seeks to substantiate economic, military, or geopolitical claims. For example, statements from high-profile individuals like Jerome Powell or Andy Xie are used to validate macroeconomic interpretations or forecasts. Similarly, institutional sources such as the US Treasury or Federal Reserve are invoked as epistemic anchors that ground the article's more speculative or evaluative commentary. This aligns with Bazerman's (2004) view of citation as a way of building “social facts” through appeals to expert consensus or institutional authority.

Several sources are used to illustrate or contextualize the broader argument, often through examples drawn from military history, contemporary Chinese society, or financial markets. For instance, references to General Douglas MacArthur or the Shangganling war film are not cited for empirical authority but rather to frame the narrative or evoke ideological connotations. These instances reflect White's (2002) concept of invoked voices, where the intertextual reference functions less as an argument and more as a cultural or ideological touchstone. The

writers also employed sources for evaluative and ideological purposes, especially when attributing statements to politically or ideologically charged groups. Terms like “Trumpian fellow travellers” or “Republican deficit hawks” are used not only to represent a viewpoint but also to evaluate and often undermine it through implicit or explicit criticism. Even when specific individuals are quoted, such as Trump or his advisors, the context and framing often position them in opposition to the columnist's stance, thereby allowing for distancing or disalignment. This use reflects White's notion of heteroglossia, where voices are brought into the text not simply for information but as part of a dialogic contest of viewpoints.

Another distinct function is the use of sources to project future developments—a rhetorical move that enhances the columnist's authority as a forecaster. For example, economic analysts and strategists like those from Capital Economics or Bridgewater are cited not only for what *is* happening, but to give weight to predictions about what *might* happen. This forward-looking use of sources blurs the line between expert commentary and strategic forecasting, allowing Evans-Pritchard to frame speculative claims with the veneer of expert consensus.

٨.4. Endorsement

The examined data demonstrate a nuanced range of endorsement strategies, revealing how the writers position themselves in relation to the voices and perspectives they integrate into their articles. Examples of these endorsement types alongside with their frequency are provided in table 4 below.

Table (4): Endorsement types

Type	Examples	Approx. Distribution
Endorsement	Citing Powell's cautious Fed policy with approval / “Biden strove to bring America back...”	30% – Positive framing of non-Trump actors to reinforce contrast.
Non-Endorsement (Neutral)	Reporting of historical events / MacArthur's H-bomb proposal	45% – Neutral stance, used to inform rather than persuade.
Dis-Endorsement	“Trump has punched allies in the face”, “mad antics”, “illiterate policies”, “Trumponomics as a recipe for stagflation”	25% – Strong negative evaluation of Trump's actions, both rhetorically and explicitly.

In line with White's (2002) appraisal theory—particularly the concept of engagement—the writer negotiates heteroglossia by endorsing, disclaiming, or entertaining source viewpoints depending on their alignment with his argument, ideological stance, and rhetorical objectives. For example, the columnist Evans-Pritchard frequently endorses expert or

institutional sources with high epistemic status. Statements from central banks, renowned economists, or respected institutions such as the Federal Reserve, Capital Economics, or Bridgewater are reported without hedging or distancing. These endorsements are often framed with confident declarative statements (e.g., “The Fed will not flinch”) or with intensifying lexis that foregrounds certainty. In Bazerman’s (2004) terms, such moves contribute to the construction of social facts—knowledge claims that are presented as stable and collectively accepted.

The writers also selectively use attribution to distance themselves from voices they seek to critique or satirize. This is particularly evident when referencing Trump, his administration, or allied ideological groups. For example, when citing “Trumpian fellow travellers” or Republican deficit hawks, the use of pejorative or ironic framing signals disalignment, even when direct quotation is employed. White (2002) categorizes such moves as disclaiming or countering, where the inclusion of a source simultaneously invites and resists its authority.

In cases where the writer references adversarial voices—such as Chinese media, military threats, or diplomatic communiqués—the tone is often neutral or observational, allowing readers to infer ideological difference without overt editorializing. This is a subtle rhetorical tactic: the author entertains the voice while refraining from overt endorsement or rejection. Such balance helps maintain journalistic ethos while signaling a critical stance through context rather than explicit evaluation.

Where sources reflect or reinforce the columnist’s worldview, particularly with respect to free markets, Western institutions, or fiscal realism, the writers often amplify their authority through repetition, lexical intensification, or cumulative citation. For instance, repeated references to fiscal unsustainability are bolstered through the layering of expert opinions, creating a polyphonic chorus that supports the author’s critique of Trump’s economic policy.

٩. Discussion

The results of the analysis of the selected opinion articles confirm and extend the conceptualizations of intertextuality presented in the literature review. The findings align with key theoretical positions concerning the dialogic, multimodal, and functional aspects of intertextuality, especially as applied to media discourse. This discussion will contextualize the empirical findings within the broader theoretical framework, focusing on the nature, functions, and implications of intertextuality as observed in the selected texts.

Kristeva's (1986, 37) foundational proposition that "any text is a mosaic of quotations" is amply demonstrated in the examined articles. These articles are marked by a pronounced *polyphonic quality* (Bakhtin), wherein multiple "voices" — such as central bankers, economists, institutional reports, political figures, and media outlets — are drawn into the textual fabric. These voices often present contrasting viewpoints, thereby embodying the "plurality of independent and unmerged consciousnesses" Bakhtin emphasized. For example, quotations from IMF reports or the Bank of England are juxtaposed with Trump administration statements, creating dialogic tension that shapes the reader's understanding of economic developments. This dynamic illustrates Bakhtin's conception of dialogism not merely as linguistic interaction but as a social interaction of ideologies, perspectives, and histories embedded within language. It also reflects Meinhof and Smith's (2000) suggestion that intertextuality should be understood as a condition of production and interpretation, not just a textual trait.

Echoing Eco's (2006) distinction between the semantic and semiotic reader, the examined intertextual strategies appear to engage both types of readership. For the semantic reader, references to recent market data, bond yields, or inflation forecasts provide clear narrative consequences. For the semiotic reader, the framing of these references—how the journalist positions certain voices over others—invites critical attention to how meaning is constructed through textual layering and evaluative stance. This interpretive engagement assumes a reader who possesses some level of economic literacy, supporting Kress's (2000) claim that the comprehension of intertextuality depends on the reader's social context and background knowledge. Readers are not passive recipients but co-constructors of meaning, required to infer evaluative positions through a dense network of allusions and citations.

Fitzsimmons' (2013) categories of obligatory, optional, and accidental intertextuality offer a useful lens through which to analyze the cited material. Obligatory intertextuality is evident in the journalist's frequent incorporation of institutional reports, economic indicators, and political statements that are essential for understanding the article's arguments. For instance, without understanding Federal Reserve policy or China's trade balance, readers would miss critical implications of the journalist's evaluative claims. Optional intertextuality is observed in historical comparisons or rhetorical invocations of past economic crises, which enrich the narrative but are not strictly necessary for comprehension. These

references deepen meaning and invite alignment with prior experiences or shared cultural memories.

The results also support Fiske's (1988) distinction between primary, secondary, and tertiary texts. These opinion articles function as primary texts that draw on secondary texts to support their arguments. These secondary texts not only reinforce the authority of the primary text but also position it within a broader intertextual media landscape. Meanwhile, tertiary texts, although not directly observable in the articles themselves, are implicated through expected reader responses—such as financial decision-making or political positioning—thus echoing Fiske's point that intertextuality extends into interpretation and practice.

Consistent with Meinhof and Smith's (2000) and Petersen's (2005) arguments, the data exemplify intertextuality as not merely a textual feature but a social condition. The articles are embedded in, and contribute to, an intertextual media environment where snippets of discourse circulate between institutions, media outlets, and public discourse. This is particularly salient in economic journalism, where interpretations of global events are constructed intertextually across time and media forms. The notion of the intertextual commodity (Marshall, 2002) is also pertinent. These articles function not only as journalism but as part of a broader economic discourse that shapes market perceptions and public policy debates. The branded voice of the columnist thus becomes an intertextual node within a larger media economy, influencing how economic information is received, repackaged, and disseminated.

Finally, in line with Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), the articles demonstrate how intertextuality serves as a methodological entry point into the power dynamics of media discourse. Through strategic selection and framing of sources, the writers align themselves with particular ideological positions, legitimize certain viewpoints, and delegitimize others. For instance, critical representation of political actors (e.g., Donald Trump) versus deferential citation of central banks exemplifies how intertextuality enables the journalist to encode evaluative and ideological stances subtly but persuasively.

10. Conclusion

This study has explored the role of intertextuality in a select of opinion articles through a framework informed by White's (2002) appraisal theory and Bazerman's (2004) typology, supported by broader theoretical conceptions of intertextuality articulated by Bakhtin, Kristeva, Eco, Fiske, and others. Drawing from a combination of linguistic, discursive, and

media studies perspectives, the analysis has shed light on the complex and strategic deployment of intertextual elements in journalistic opinion discourse.

The analysis revealed a wide range of intertextual types, including explicit attribution, implicit intertextuality, and assimilated voices. These instances align with obligatory and optional intertextuality as defined by Fitzsimmons (2013), and include primary and secondary intertextual references in Fiske's (1988) terms. Primary intertextuality occurred through direct quotation or paraphrasing of financial experts, government officials, or institutional reports. Secondary intertextuality was seen in references to media coverage, financial journalism, and broader economic discourse. Moreover, the articles exhibited horizontal intertextuality when referring to other journalistic voices and commentary, and vertical intertextuality when connecting institutional reports to journalistic interpretations and then to audience-level meanings.

Attribution was primarily explicit and strategic, often naming expert economists, institutional bodies, or publications. This practice reflects Bazerman's (2004) notion of intertextuality as citation and genre inclusion, used to embed credibility into journalistic discourse. However, some attributions were implicit, invoking widely circulated economic narratives without citing their source, thereby enacting a form of assimilated intertextuality that blends other voices into the authorial perspective. For the types of function intertextuality served in the current data, it is found that it served multiple, overlapping functions. Firstly, it was used to construct authority and legitimacy, drawing on expert voices and institutional data to substantiate evaluative claims. Secondly, it functioned persuasively, as a rhetorical strategy to frame economic events, justify predictions, and lend weight to criticism of U.S. policy under Trump. Thirdly, it facilitated ideological positioning, helping the writer align with or distance from certain viewpoints, often framing Trump's economic policies as reckless or self-defeating.

The endorsement of intertextual elements was varied and rhetorically significant. Sources were often aligned or disaligned with the author's evaluative stance. Positive alignment was marked by strategic choices in lexical framing, contextual placement, and authorial commentary that reinforced the credibility and desirability of the cited viewpoint. Disalignment occurred through ironic distancing, contrastive markers, or recontextualization that undermined the cited source. The writer frequently

endorsed voices that critiqued Trump's policies, while neutralizing or backgrounding voices that may appear to support them.

This study demonstrates that intertextuality in opinion journalism is a multifunctional discursive strategy that goes beyond mere citation or reference. It is tightly interwoven with stance, ideology, and the communicative goals of persuasion and evaluation. In the current data, intertextuality becomes a means of shaping economic reality for readers through dialogic interaction with other texts, voices, and discourses.

References

- Allen, G. (2011). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 83-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Bell, W. (2000). *Against intertextuality*. *Philosophy and Literature*, 28(2), 227-242.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across Speech and Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blinova, O. A. (2019). Intertextuality as a genre-defining feature of English-language political media discourse. *Conference Proceedings of the 6th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts SGEM*, 6(2), pp. 195-200.
- Child, P., & Flower, R. (2006). *The Routledge dictionary of literary terms*. London: Routledge.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Droga, L., & Humphrey, S. (2002). *Getting started with functional grammar*. Sydney: Target Texts.
- Druick, Z. (2009). Dialogic Absurdity TV News Parody as a Critique of Genre. *Television & New Media*, 10(3), 294-308.

- Eco, U. (1993). *Lector in fabula. La cooperación interpretativa en el texto narrativo*, trans. Ricardo Pochtar. Barcelona: Lumen.
- Eco, U. (2006). Intertextual irony and levels of reading. *On Literature*. London: Vintage Books.
- Iqani, M. (2009). Megatextuality: Re-enunciating media intertextuality in the age of global media discourse. *LSE*, 14(1), 1-26.
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/media@lse/mediaWorkingPapers/>
- Khalil, Esam N. 2000. *Grounding in English and Arabic news discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kress, G. (2000) "Text as the punctuation of semiosis: pulling at some of the threads" in U. H. Meinhof and J. Smith (eds.) *Intertextuality and the media: From genre to everyday life*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 132-54.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue and the novel. In *The Kristeva reader*. In T.Moi (ed). *The Kristeva reader* (pp. 35-61.) New York: Columbia University Press.
- Marshall, P.D. (2002) "The New Intertextual Commodity" in D. Harries (Ed.) *The New Media Book* (pp. 69-81). London: BFI Publishing.
- Martin, J. R. (2002). Meaning beyond the clause: SFL perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 52-74.
- Maynard, S. K. (1996). Persuasion of one's view in Japanese newspaper columns: Commentary strategies and sequencing. *Text* 16 (2): 391-421.
- Meinhof, U. H. & Smith. J. (2000). *Intertextuality and the media : from genre to everyday life*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Peterson, M. A. (2005) "Performing media: Towards an ethnography of intertextuality" in E. Rothenbuler and M. Coman (Eds.) *Media Anthropology* (pp. 129-38). London: Sage.
- Porter, J. E. (1986). Intertextuality and the Discourse Community. *Rhetoric Review*, 5(1), pp. 34-47.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2004) 'Text and Context of Parliamentary Debates', in P. Bayley (ed.) *Crosscultural Perspective on Parliamentary Discourse*, (pp. 339-72). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (eds.) *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Authorial voice and intertextual reference: an analysis of
intertextuality in selected British opinion articles on Trump's
tariffs policies

مجلد كلية التربية الأساسية للعلوم التربوية والإنسانية
مجلة علمية محكمة تصدر عن كلية التربية الأساسية – جامعة بابل

- Van Zoonen, L. (2017). Intertextuality. In Rössler, P., Hoffner, C. and L. van Zoonen.(eds). *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects*. Wiley-Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781118783764
- Velykoroda, Y., & Moroz, O. (2021). Intertextuality in media discourse: A readers' perspective. *Explorations in English Language and Linguistics*, 9(1), 56-70. DOI: 10.2478/exell-2022-0003
- White, P. (2002). *Appraisal and journalistic discourse*. Retrieved 9/04/2025, from www.grammatics.com/Appraisal/.