Chapter 1
Introduction. Intertextuality, dialogism, and memory: The fabric of linguistic creativity

Nullum est iam dictum, quod non sit dictum prius.
Terence, *Eunuch*

1.1. The usage-oriented model from an intertextual perspective

The goal of this book is twofold. On the one hand, it explores the general strategy of approaching speakers' linguistic competence in a way that highlights its heterogeneous and volatile nature – the result of its inextricable linkage to manifold contexts and communicative goals within which speakers develop their language skills, and for the sake of which they practice them. On the other hand, it is an attempt to work out a coherent conceptual apparatus, grounded in linguistic form, that could describe, or at least outline, the way speakers handle their ever-changing, creatively challenging communicative tasks by the established means of language.

Critique of the rationalist model of language as a hermetic system of algorithmic combinatorial rules, presumably underlying all the versatility of overt linguistic behavior, has a long and rich history. As far as the general philosophical argument goes, the alternative "dynamic" vision of language as an open-ended creative process was offered, with remarkable intellectual force, by such philosophers, semioticians, and literary theorists of the past century as Ludwig Wittgenstein, Walter Benjamin, Mikhail Bakhtin, and Jacques Derrida.[1] Their work in turn emerged from a deep historical background; it was grounded, first and foremost, in the Romantic and neo-Romantic critique of Cartesian and – in a more complicated way – Kantian rationalism,[2] most notably by Johann Gottfried Herder, Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis), Friedrich Schlegel,[3] Wilhelm von Humboldt, and Karl Vossler.[4]

Until recently, however, this philosophical vision of language had little impact on linguistics proper. Without the painstaking construction, component by component and layer by layer, of an alternative conceptual edifice that could accommodate speakers' dynamic experience of language, any

critique of the rigid artificiality of abstract patterns and algorithmic rules leaves them essentially intact. For all its limitations, the treatment of language as a system of immanent rules – from Quintillian's Latin grammar and the all grammar surveys and textbooks that stemmed from it (Love 1995: 383-384), to various theoretical models, notably Jakobson's structural universalism and generative grammar – resulted in a fully developed apparatus for describing speakers' linguistic competence, no matter how remote from actual speakers' practice. Critics of this approach, on the other hand, rarely ventured onto the descriptive terrain beyond isolated examples, however brilliantly analyzed.

The situation changed in the last two decades of the twentieth century. It was a time marked by concentrated efforts to build conceptual categories and descriptive techniques that would be as manifest and systematic as, yet fundamentally different from, those offered by formal linguistic models. I mean, of course, a constellation of loosely related ideas identified by the umbrella name of "cognitive linguistics": the usage-oriented model of language (Langacker 1987); frame semantics (Fillmore 1982a; 1997a) and construction grammar (Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor 1988; Kay 1997b); the theory of conceptual metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980); the idea of mental spaces (Fauconnier [1985] 1994); and finally, studies of various aspects of language in the light of the prototype theory (Berlin and Kay [1969] 1999; Taylor 1989; Taylor 2002). One should also acknowledge the important contribution of studies of oral speech (Halliday [1978] 1994; Chafe 1994) to the emerging new understanding of language.[5]

The approach taken in this book has many points of intersection with diverse facets of this novel trend. It is, first of all, usage-oriented; I cannot agree more with the thesis, expressed with particular force by Langacker, that the command of a language involves a massive knowledge of linguistic conventions, "regardless of whether these conventions can be subsumed under more general statements" (Langacker 1987: 494) – knowledge that from a rationalist point of view looks "massively redundant" (Langacker 1999: 91). Reliance on the enormous amount of conventionalized expressions erodes the boundary between the lexicon and grammar (Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor 1988; Langacker 2002: 1). Since each such expression bears an imprint of tangible situations in which it is typically used, the "encyclopedic" knowledge of a broad situational background becomes an integral part of its meaning, making all but redundant the distinction between "competence" and "performance" (Fillmore 1979: 89), or between "syntax," "semantics," and "pragmatics" (Fillmore 1996: 57; Schegloff, Ochs

and Thompson 1996; Kay 1997a: 52; Langacker 2002: 16). The general strategy of describing language that stemmed from this approach can be characterized, in Langacker's aphoristic formulation, as "non-reductive, maximalist, bottom-up," in contradistinction to the "reductive, minimalist, top-down" strategy of generative grammar (Langacker 1999: 90).[6]

I believe that this book occupies a distinctive place within this general intellectual domain due to its particularly strong allegiance to the facts of speech, in all the richness of the texture which they possess as tangible artifacts emerging from speakers' efforts to express themselves and to communicate. According to Gibbs (2006: 11), "linguistic structures are related to and motivated by human conceptual knowledge, bodily experience, and the communicative functions of discourse"; one can accept this thesis, yet the question remains: what is the place of *speech itself* in this scheme of things?

I consider speakers' ability to use language to be anchored, first and foremost, in their raw, unprocessed memories of fragments of their past speech experience, remembered as concrete pieces of language matter, with their meaning pinned to concrete communicative situations. The prevalent mode of speakers' linguistic activity can be called "intertextual," in the sense that speakers always build something new by infusing it with their recollection of textual fragments drawn from previous instances of speech. The mental work involved in this process – shifting frames, blending conceptual domains, making analogical extensions – is not purely conceptual: it is grounded in and intermingled with tangible pieces of textual matter that are in speakers' possession.

"Language" (i.e., conventional forms of expression) does not determine "thought," in a Whorfian sense; but it is more than just a "prompt" for thought (Fauconnier and Turner 2002: Ch. 17). It offers firm ground from which volatile cognitive endeavors can be launched, and on which they eventually land as products of speech. Creating and interpreting meanings is not a purely mental issue; it always bears the imprint of the language matter used in the process. The speaker's creative will makes these pieces of language matter pliant; it alters, mixes, and reinterprets them, accommodating them to the speaker's intention. But that intention itself becomes pliant in the process, accommodating itself to the material that has served for its realization. However transformed by the speaker's current mindset, this material never completely loses its intertextual appeal, i.e., its allusional connections to previous instances of its usage, which never coincide completely with the speaker's needs and intentions of the moment. What-

ever one chooses to make out of a quantum of language matter, one cannot abstract it from its original association with a certain experiential landscape out of which it has been drawn by memory.

All cognitive operations with language are intertextual in their nature. The Kantian "genius" of speakers – their unlimited and unconstrained faculty of schematization, creative imagination, and analogical thinking – does not emerge unmediated from the spiritual depths of an individual's mind. It becomes a fact of expression only when mediated by specific speech items made available by interpersonal linguistic experience. To paraphrase Novalis's famous dictum, whenever a speaker strives to reach the *Unbedingte* (unconditional, absolute) of his inner intention, he ends up with *Dinge* (things, objects) of remembered speech fragments.[7]

A conventional unit of language is a "thing" first and foremost – a tangible piece of experience kept by memory. It can be schematized, blended with other pieces, analogically stretched, reframed; yet in all these cognitive operations it preserves what is an inalienable feature of any tangible object – its *texture*.[8] The intertextual model of language usage can be understood as a part of the usage-oriented approach that highlights the impact of unique textures of remembered fragments of speech on cognitive operations with language.

1.2. The notion of texture

It is characteristic of works in theoretical linguistics that some particularly striking examples have been used repeatedly, by different authors and for different purposes; this habit in itself can serve as a vivid illustration of the intertextual nature of language usage. Let me follow this tradition by revisiting the famous example from (Faucomnier [1985] 1994) for the purpose of showing the role of the texture of speech fragments in cognitive operations with language:

(1.1) The mushroom omelet left without paying.

It is hard to find a more vivid illustration of speakers' creativity in dealing with language. Mapping one "mental space" (that of the mushroom omelet) onto another (that of the client who ordered it) involves an effort of imagination that could be neither prescribed nor predicted by any set system of rules. It is the cognitive "genius" of the speaker and the addressee

that enables them to create and comprehend such an improvised conceptual blending.

What remains to be explored after this product of creative blending has emerged as a fact of speech is: where does its discourse (as suggested by its texture) belong, i.e., who might say this, to whom, under what circumstances, and for what purposes. Of course, the fact that the imagined scene takes place in some kind of a restaurant is suggested by its subject matter itself; yet some details need further exploration. Let us suppose that there are customers sitting at the next table in that restaurant who witnessed this scene; would they use those words to convey their observations to each other, or to the waiter? The probability of this is rather low, unless the customers in question include admirers of Fauconnier's book who make the scene a live incarnation of his thesis by citing his example. Typically, we expect this remark to be made by one waiter or waitress to another. Why should this be so obvious? Because identifying people with the food they eat – ostensibly for the sake of brevity, but in fact adding a slight touch of mockery into the bargain – is a perceivable feature of "waiters' discourse." It is perceivable as such because each of us has experienced bits and pieces of that discourse, together with the psychological and social overtones involved in it, in real life and / or in fictional narratives. Furthermore, one senses behind the brusque rhythm of this remark the rushed atmosphere of a simple eatery; somehow, a phrase like *The terrine de canard left without paying* does not seem as perfectly natural as the one involving the mushroom omelet – unless, again, it is uttered by a Fauconnier reader as a sarcastic intertextual transplantation of the commonplace scene (made vivid by the original phrase) into the pretentious atmosphere of an American-French restaurant. One can also surmise that the hypothetical waiter / waitress uttering the phrase about the mushroom omelet was in fact more contemptuous than upset. A waiter really hurt by the loss of a mushroom omelet would probably have said something more sharply targeted at the delinquent client's personality. As the sentence goes, the imagined speaker, amidst the rush and clatter of an imagined American eatery, seems to be satisfied with a momentary outburst whose implied contemptuous mockery toward one of "them" – those ever-hungry, demanding, unscrupulous species, the clients – reasserts solidarity among his / her comrades-in-arms.

What hovers over all these psychological, social, and stylistic overtones of the sentence is a comic image of a mushroom omelet getting up from the table and surreptitiously slipping away. A literal incarnation of the expression is not completely obliterated by awareness of the conceptual blending

done to it.[9] *The mushroom omelet* remains 'the mushroom omelet,' whatever one chooses to make out of it. It stays in the sentence's background, ready to be explored in further cognitive ventures – for instance, making an observation about the particular softness of the mushroom omelet's tread that might contribute to its successful escape. An actual case of such secondary literalization of a metonymy can be found in one of Chekhov's humorous pieces. It poses as a mock bookseller's advertisement, in which the names of various books and magazines and the advertisement's comments about them clash to create comic *double entendres*:

(1.2) **The *Russian Thought* is available in hard cover only.**

The expression *Russian thought* has its own allusional aura that evokes – particularly in combination with *hard cover* – certain mental landscapes, no matter how thoroughly we understand its actual usage as the title of a journal.

Full understanding of a fact of speech involves, alongside the cognitive abilities needed for its interpretation, recollections of certain situations and, most crucially, of shreds of their linguistic attire which have been retained by memory. The sentence (1.1) appears to us as a fragment taken from a comprehensive discourse. Our memories, which allow us to recreate this discourse in our mind, include previously overheard bits and pieces of waiters' talk when they speak to each other, the atmosphere of a certain type of eating establishment, stereotypical roles and situations, and what was actually said, or could be said, by their various protagonists. Our capacity for manipulating mental spaces may well be inborn as an integral part of Kantian "judgment" (*Urteilskraft*). But what is needed, above and beyond general mental abilities, for a sentence like (1.1) to emerge, is allusional baggage drawn from particular facets of previous experience whose fragments have been retained by memory. The sentence's fabric contains innumerable threads that connect it to the discourse from which it stems, and which it evokes. We take note of its brusquely concise syntax, of a certain way of labeling people – by the number of the table, by the food they ordered – with its business-like, but also slightly disdainful connotation; we perceive, if only as a hint, the intonation with which the sentence could be uttered, the tempo of speech and the emotional timbre of the speaker's voice; one can almost hear the clatter of plates shoved into the dishwasher and the murmur of voices in the background.

This is what happens every time one person creates and another comprehends a fact of speech. It can never be a pure cognitive construct, fresh

from the speaker's mind; it always belongs to a certain domain of experience that exists outside the speaker's self, and largely out of his control. We cannot cast off the discourse from which the given object of speech has emerged and to which its texture alludes. Our creative imagination can put any fragment of language material to a variety of usages, transplant it to different mental landscapes, alter its shape; but it cannot shut off the instant, unmediated impression with which we react to this fragment as an existing fact of speech.

The notion of texture is related to but not identical with that of the semantic frame; it is more broad in scope than the latter. In a similar way to the frame, the texture discloses the meaning of a given expression as a "comprehensive scenario" (Fillmore 1976) whose meaning is always richer in detail than that of the sum total of its constitutive parts. But the texture of an utterance also includes, together with the scenario of the situation itself, a comprehensive scenario of its "speech situation," i.e., its speech genre, the profiles of the speaker and the implied addressee, and a peculiar social and psychological atmosphere that gave rise to this particular utterance.

Kay (1997e) illustrates the comprehensive character of meaning by analyzing a simple story about a chef who one day went to Fisherman's Wharf and bought some fish from a fisherman. Kay's "ideal reader" is able to comprehend the story because his knowledge of the linguistic structures involved in its expressions is inseparable from all kinds of information about chefs, fishes bought for a restaurant, Fisherman's Wharf, etc. What is absent from Kay's analysis is the genre of the story: a fairy-tale transplanted into a setting whose remoteness from the "chronotope" (Bakhtin [1975] 1981a) of a conventional fairy-tale creates a humorous effect, something that is fully understood by a reader well-versed in the "fairy-tale" wonders of Bay Area hedonistic culture. The implications of the genre are not without consequences for the subject matter of the story: the reader who recognizes the fairy-tale pattern attunes his expectation to await something extraordinary that has to happen with the chef, the fisherman, or the fish. (Was that particular fish bought on that particular morning extraordinary in some way?) If nothing happens, the ensuing effect of a thwarted expectation would contribute to the story's subversive / humorous modality.

The principal claim laid out by the notion of texture is that there is no such thing as the comprehensive meaning of a situation as such; the way the meaning is presented is always predicated on a particular facet of discourse to which the manner of presentation (i.e., its texture) alludes.[10] Whatever is conveyed in speech is always imbued with and modified by an

implicit understanding of who has conveyed it, for whom, in what mode, and under what life circumstances.

Wittgenstein and Bakhtin should be credited for emphasizing the heterogeneity and multifaceted nature of language experience.[11] To summarize their principal thesis, there is no such thing as "language" in general; rather, there is an enormous variety of specific "language games" (Wittgenstein)[12] or "speech genres" (Bakhtin [1975] 86).[13]

What I call the texture of a fragment of language material is its inherent intertextual potential. The texture of an utterance as a whole is built out of fragments – however modified – of remembered speech material that stand as tokens of a certain discourse or discourses. It impregnates the meaning of an utterance with particular experiential circumstances, from social parameters and the physical ambiance of the situation to psychological nuances concerning its participants.

A specific texture built in every fact of linguistic expression affects the cognitive operations to which it can be subjected. A similar operation of conceptual blending may yield thoroughly different effects due to the difference in the texture of the language material involved. In *David Copperfield*, Dickens describes the classroom at Mr. Creakle's school by saying that if it had not had a roof over it, and if it had been pouring day and night ink instead of water from the sky, it could not have been more ink-stained than it actually was. The device used in this description – the imagined transplantation of a scene into a manifestly impossible situation – is identical with that shown in one of Fauconnier's examples: that if Nixon were President in France, Watergate would not have hurt him. The conceptual similarity of the two sentences only highlights the striking difference of "speech scenarios" built into their discourses: one distinctively literary (i.e., belonging to a literary narrative more than to a conversation) and slightly old-fashioned (one could hardly expect it to emerge in a narrative by a modern author); the other distinctly modern, stemming from an intellectual conversation between a cosmopolitan-minded group of interlocutors of a certain educational level, social position, and political persuasion; one's irony bitingly reticent, the other's eagerly sarcastic.

The process of prototypical recognition is also affected by the diversity of textures. The chair in *The room had only one chair* is quite different from that in *I cannot remember anybody ever sitting in that chair*, or in *We need more chairs here*. A chair can never be simply (prototypically) 'a chair,' as far as it has been spoken about; whenever it surfaces in speech, it does so within a certain expression alluding to a particular discourse, which

bestows on it particular attributes and places it in a particular ambiance. Even the most elementary, seemingly absolutely neutral *This is a chair* is by no means devoid of a discourse-specific aura: its exuberantly demonstrative tone, together with the total redundancy of the meaning (it is hard to find anyone in need of such an explanation, except a very small child – to whom it would most likely be presented in a different way),[14] focuses our perception on the "language game" of elementary language teaching and learning, recalling examples from a first-year language textbook (or its parodies).

Finally, the factor of intertextuality interferes with the way speakers operate with conceptual metaphors. It has become common knowledge (after Lakoff and Johnson 1980) that metaphoric expressions do not stand as individual phenomena: they are derived from a more abstract schema under which one conceptual domain is mapped onto another. Thus, the conceptual metaphor (i.e., the metaphorical schema) AN ARGUMENT IS WAR gives rise to an open number of concrete metaphorical expressions, in which various aspects of 'war' are mapped onto various aspects of 'an argument.' The far-reaching quality of this insight is indisputable. However, while following the process by which concrete metaphorical expressions emerge from a conceptual metaphor, one should not lose sight of their disparate discourse allegiances. *He demolished my argument* evokes the mode of an informal yet intellectually dense conversation – most probably, between colleagues or in an intellectual company, in an environment that is relaxed but appropriate for a high-brow exchange. *It was a critical bombshell* is reminiscent of an ornate but formulaic discourse on the "culture page" in a newspaper or magazine; one could hardly offer this to a company of one's intellectual friends otherwise than as parody. *The journals geared up for a trench war* conveys the speaker's posture of sarcastic alienation, which he presumes to be shared by the implied addressee; it distinctly belongs to a written narrative – probably, a description of the mores of literary / journalist circles à la Balzac. *Upon examination, no weapons of mass destruction could be detected behind the critic's belligerent posture* – this realization of the conceptual metaphor bears an unmistakable imprint of Anglo-American political realities and political discourses of today, leaving no doubt about the speaker's, and his addressee's, position concerning these matters.[15]

Contrary to the claim that the metaphor "resides in thought, not just in words" (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 2), or that it is "conceptual, not linguistic, in nature" (Kövecses 2002: 201), the disparities between discourses of different expressions stemming from the same conceptual metaphor indicate

that their creation is not an internal conceptual matter. They appear at the intersection of cognitive operations with language, on the one hand, and tangible textures of speech material, on the other, as a compromise between cognitive patterns of creativity and the compulsory textures of remembered fragments of speech.

1.3. Dialogism

The usage-oriented model pays allegiance to the "experiential" approach to cognition; it sets itself against an abstract formal approach that strives to separate formal knowledge from concrete experience.[16] The opposition to "abstract rationalism" has been presented in particularly strong terms by Lakoff, Johnson, and Turner (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Lakoff and Johnson 1999; for the psycholinguistic perspective, see Gibbs 2006). The philosophical aspect of their argument is somewhat undermined by the authors' tendency to present their critique of what they call "Western thought" in sweeping terms, without historical specification.[17] Nevertheless, the recognition of speakers' experience in general, and of their experience of using language in particular, as the core issue of linguistic theory is refreshing, even striking, given how this experience has been contemptuously swept aside for decades as something *menschliches, allzu menschliches* and therefore not worthy to be an object of theoretical investigation. Another aspect of the "anti-Cartesian" critique consists in emphasizing speakers' creativity as essential for dealing with language, in contradistinction to treating it at best as an ornament over "core" operational rules. The resulting portrait of speakers' competence as flexible and adaptive, unconstrained by preset limitations, and always ready for bold leaps of imagination, is a vast improvement over the drab picture of the speaker as an assembly-line laborer, busy with "encoding" and "decoding" elements[18] of the given lexicon according to the given rules, somehow (don't ask how) preprogrammed in his genes by "millions of years of evolution" (Chomsky 1964: 59; cf. also Chomsky 1993; Pinker 1994).

For all the richness of its critique of the rationalist approach, the new trend shares one important feature with its much-repudiated opponent. The speaking subject of cognitive linguistics remains *lonely* in all the endeavors of his creativity and imagination – as lonely as the speaking subject of structural linguistics and generative grammar were in their application of preprogrammed rules.[19] A speaker, as envisioned by cognitive psychology

and linguistics, does not need other speakers to be able to operate with language the way he operates. Once he has mastered a conceptual metaphor, such as AN ARGUMENT IS WAR, he can proceed in building an open multitude of derivative metaphorical expressions at his own discretion. Likewise, he does not seem to need anything but his own imagination and worldly experience for performing a metonymical blending (that of the mushroom omelet and the client who ordered it), or for mapping one situation onto another ('if Nixon were President of France'). To be sure, the products of cognitive operations must be comprehensible to other speakers. But each of those receiving and comprehending "others" is also acting on his own, performing similar operations in his mind; "sharing of experience" between different individuals becomes a matter of "simulation" (Gibbs 2006: 35). When Fauconnier and Turner (2002) speak of "the way we think," they do it in terms that make 'we' seem uniform, a simple multiplication of an 'I.'

Paradoxically, it is the emphasis cognitive models place on the creative subjectivity of speakers that often leads to universalist claims, much akin to the universalism of their antipodes, the formal models of language. Indeed, if the subject of a cognitive model operates with language on his own, the emphasis on the universality of his cognitive processes becomes the only way to explain how he is able to communicate with other subjects as lonely as himself. For instance, the theory of conceptual metaphor poses strong claims of universality, despite the recognition of some marginal differences between diverse cultures (see a rather cautious expression of the latter point in Kövecses 2002: 177). As far as one language and culture is concerned, an individual speaker is supposed to be in unconditional possession of the given repertory of conceptual metaphors. The universalist trend has been particularly strong in some works on prototypes.[20]

A peculiar combination of individualism and universality can be seen in the theory of "image schemes" (Lakoff 1987). Its principal claim is that abstract concepts are ultimately derived, via conceptual metaphors, from sensual bodily experiences (Johnson 2005: 22; see further discussion in Gibbs 2006). One can sense almost a messianic fervor in the repudiation of "disembodied symbol-manipulation" (Lakoff 1987: 8), that attribute of what is often summarily referred to as the "classical theory" or even "Western thought."[21] Presenting an abstract concept via a metaphorical embodiment is indeed a widespread phenomenon that can be observed in various languages and cultures. However, the claim of absolute universality for this cognitive pattern seems as much an exaggeration as any universalist

claim about language. Certainly, one can present one abstract conceptual domain through another ('mathematics is music,' or 'music is mathematics'), or a corporeal phenomenon through a non-sensual projection – as, for instance, in George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*, where the solemnly unhurried gait of a rector's horse is described as "ecclesiastical." I cannot help sensing, in attempts to reduce the whole conceptual world to bodily experience, a whiff of narcissistic individualism. In its absolute concentration on the (corporeal) 'I,'[22] radical sensualism meets the radical idealism of Fichte.

In seems fair to say that the linguistic critique of "Western rationalism" has so far largely neglected an important point – one that, on the contrary, occupied the central position in a similar critique that emerged, approximately at the same time, from the fields of literary theory and cultural studies. I mean an array of ideas concerning the interpersonal aspect of expressing one's thought, an idea most often labeled as the principle of "dialogism."[23]

Cooperation between individual speakers in a dialogue has drawn considerable attention from linguists and psychologists in the last twenty years, especially among those who put an emphasis on the study of oral communication (Tannen 1988; Tannen 1993; Givón 1989; Givón 1995; Sanford & Moxey 1995; Chafe 1994; Schegloff, Ochs & Thompson 1996; Clark 1996). However, the notion of dialogism has a much broader scope than that of actual dialogue. It goes beyond the direct cooperation between interlocutors in a given speech situation. What dialogism means is that every act of speech, of any genre and mode, bears an imprint of the "other" – whether the "other" is directly present or implied, known to the speaker directly or construed.

Recognition among today's linguists of the importance of dialogical interaction led to the foregrounding of informal oral speech as the primary, most "natural" mode of using language (see in particular Halliday [1978] 1994; Chafe 1994; Clark 1996).[24] Dismissing written discourse, or at least pushing it to the background,[25] in fact mirrors the dismissal of oral discourse by proponents of formal models, who never took the trouble to notice how remote their constructs were, in particular, from the practices of oral communication. Both attitudes neglect the enormous variety of "language games" in which speakers are involved – oral and written, directly interactive or targeted at a hypothetical audience – which, I am convinced, constitutes the very essence of language. The notion of dialogism makes intersubjectivity as manifestly present in written texts as in an informal conversation. A written text, even of the most formal and abstract charac-

ter, always cooperates with its implied reader[26] whose shadowy presence determines the tacit understanding of what needs to be stated, refuted, explicated, argued for or against, with all the ensuing consequences for the choice of concrete means of expression.

The most far-reaching implication of the principle of dialogism lies in its contention that any expression ever used by a speaker, in whatever mode and for whatever purpose, is not entirely his own. However modified, an expression always bears traces of its previous usages. A speaker never has full control over the material he uses in speech.[27] Whatever his individual intention, he has to incorporate it in the material already used by other speakers on other occasions; his own "voice" comes through only when it is mixed with the voices of others. The result is what Bakhtin ([1975] 1981b) calls "heteroglossia" – the heterogeneous fabric of speech, never completely controlled by the unique "here and now" of the speaker's present state of mind.[28]

In order to become fully effective, the cognitivist critique of linguistic rationalism has to abandon its summary attitude toward the "Western" history of ideas. A particularly important antecedent of the cognitivist approach comes from the linguistic thought of the early Romantics, especially Friedrich Schlegel and Novalis. In his *Fichte-Studien*, Novalis offered a profound critique of individualism, particularly of Fichte's concept of the self. According to Novalis, the subject becomes aware of his own self only by assuming an outward observation point from which he can contemplate and recognize himself: "For the I to be able to establish itself, there must be a non-I."[29] Novalis countered Fichte's famous assertion of the absoluteness of the self, *Ich bin Ich*, with what can be taken as an aphoristic formulation of the principle of dialogism: *Ich bin nicht-Ich*.[30] Both Novalis and Schlegel strongly argued against any "system" – a phenomenon possible only under the condition of the hermetic isolation of the subject. Their vision of mind and language was that of a multitude of fragments involved in never-ceasing commotion.[31] Schlegel's and Novalis' thought has been echoed in modern times by such theoreticians of discourse as Mikhail Bakhtin, Roland Barthes, and Julia Kristeva. Their idea of dialogism opened the way to describing language as a *fragmented unity* that exists not otherwise than in a plurality of diverse facets and under diverse perspectives.

1.4. Memory and intertextuality

A crucial feature of the usage-oriented model is its strong emphasis on the necessity for a speaker to learn a "massively redundant" (Langacker) amount of primary language material in order to be able to speak the language adequately. One can appreciate the intellectual courage behind this thesis in that it was expressed, particularly by Langacker and Fillmore, at a time when academic conventions uniformly promoted the "economy," "elegance," and "coherence" of the scholarly description, regardless of the price at which these admirable qualities were to be achieved.[32] Still, even today this thesis looks striking: that one has to learn hundreds or even thousands of single representations of a pattern, when they could all be produced instead by a rule (however complicated), may seem an awfully inefficient way to proceed; it goes against the grain of our intellectual instincts which always strive for generalizations and shortcuts. For a person aware of his ability to discern patterns even among the most diverse data (and one can hardly become a linguist without possessing this ability to a high degree), it is hard to concede that whatever his intellectual efforts and achievements in this direction, he has, in order to become a fluent speaker, to absorb "a prodigious amount of actual learning" (Langacker 1999: 90), i.e., of the unstructured, almost random memorization of a vast quantity of primary speech data, to a degree that makes the implementation of patterns almost redundant.

The concept of language memory highlights an aspect in the usage of language that makes the requirement of the "massive redundancy" of speakers' knowledge not so wasteful as it may overtly look. It adds to our perception of language a factor that is crucial in any actual usage of language yet is rarely, if ever, acknowledged by linguistic models – namely, the factor of the continuing nature of speech experience.

A linguistic description typically approaches language as if it were a one-time event – as if speakers had to prove their command of word forms and word combinations just once, in the way of a proficiency test. Such an approach does not address the qualitative difference between the knowledge that is necessary and sufficient for a successful one-time operation, and the competence suitable for repeated usage over a long stretch of time – in the case of language, over the speaker's entire lifetime.

The usage-oriented approach to language is an approach that is *memory-oriented* and *time-oriented*. Our language is not a phenomenon to be grasped once and forever; it is a continuous life-long occupation. For recur-

rent usage, the accumulation of a massive unstructured body of knowledge is indeed the most efficient and "economic," in fact the only feasible strategy.[33] If we had needed certain word forms or word combinations only once, it would have been strange to memorize all of them separately, instead of generating them by a uniform rule. But under the conditions of needing them on an uncountable number of occasions over many years of language usage, their direct retrieval from memory becomes more efficient than the repeated implementation of a generative rule, however striking in its explanatory power.

The mode of operation predicated on memory applies to much of our language competence. The question is – how much? It is obvious that most of the sentences that speakers produce rarely repeat themselves in their entirety (although the extent of their "novelty" is often exaggerated).[34] The emergence in speech of a non-formulaic sentence or sequence of sentences is in most cases indeed a one-time event, even though their components might be used repeatedly. The problem of fundamental importance is that of the relation between the routine and the new, between memorization and construction. How much memorization is employed in the creation (and respectively, comprehension) of a new product of speech as a whole? In other words, how do speakers manage, starting from what they actually remember, to create new constellations of language matter that never figured exactly in that way in their previous language experience?

The fact that linguistic expressions carry in their fabric recollections of and allusions to other texts has been initially explored in regard to literary texts only. Since the 1970s, this phenomenon has become epicentral in literary and semiotic studies. Within those disciplines, it is known as *intertextuality*.[35] While the intertextual nature of literary texts has become an axiom for literary and cultural studies, little has been done so far in exploring the role intertextuality plays in everyday communication.[36] Studies of intertextuality often limit their approach to literary texts while relegating everyday language to the conceptual confines of a system of objectively set signs. To this effect, (Barthes 1966: 54) speaks of the distinction between "linguistics" and "semiotics," an opposition that proclaims openness and pluralism to be exclusive attributes of literary and cultural studies, while confining studies of language to a formal approach; cf. also (Kristeva [1974] 1984; Grivel 1974). (Kristeva [1977] 1980) reinforces this opposition when she speaks of linguists as "men" still persisting in "basking in the glory of the seventeenth century" – a statement clearly showing that to her, linguistics still remains exclusively the Chomskean "Cartesian linguistics."

I believe that intertextuality is as pervasive, and as crucial, in everyday language as in literary discourses. The elucidation of the foundational role of this phenomenon in speaking is one of the primary goals of this study. It seeks to explore how every new artifact of speech emerges out of the material provided by previous speech experience.

The underlying premise for this exploration can be preliminarily formulated as follows: all new facts of language usage are always grounded in and related to speakers' memory of previous experiences in using language. In other words, speech is primarily the product of speech. Language memory provides the crucial link between the cognitive intention of a speaker and the material facts of speech – their texture – in which this intention is incarnated.[37] Any new communicative task, without exception, mobilizes in the speaker's mind some remembered fragments of speech that can be used, one way or another, in response to the present challenge. Such recollections, diverse, fragmentary, even not fully distinct as they are, constitute an implicit yet indispensable background of every act of speaking or receiving speech. It is the speaker's ability to draw from and allude to this background that gives his communicative effort a chance to succeed. This ability constitutes the essential part of the speaker's language skills – of what can, in fact, be described as his linguistic competence.