

## Multivoicing via Parentheses and Scare Quotes in *Bon Appétit*<sup>1</sup>

Gwynne Mapes  
Georgetown University

### 1 Introduction

This paper focuses on how intertextuality, the idea that discourses across various contexts are connected, manifests itself in the food/lifestyle magazine *Bon Appétit*. By exploring the ways in which the editor (Adam Rapoport) of this foodie publication uses parentheses and scare quotes to multivoice his text, I not only illuminate a multilayered definition of intertextuality at work in this context, but also comment on how these punctuation marks allow Rapoport to engage with his foodie audience in a way that transcends social and class boundaries. The original usage of the term ‘foodie’ is generally attributed to *The Official Foodie Handbook (Be Modern – Worship Food)* [1984] by Paul Levy and Ann Bar (Johnston and Baumann, 2010:53). Johnston and Baumann note that foodies approach eating “as a subject for study, aesthetic appreciation and knowledge acquisition” (57); because of this emphasis on food knowledge, foodies possess specific cultural capital (in addition to economic capital, in many cases). Despite these elements of distinction, Johnston and Baumann also note that ‘foodie’ as a term has been re-claimed in recent history to define those who are anti-snobbery, or against the elite gourmets of 1950’s-era French cuisine. For my purposes, I consider foodies to be those whose eating practices are especially important as personal expressions of identity, particularly as they occur within foodie groups or discourses.

This brings me to my particular focus: in the proceeding discussion I address the discourse of a monthly column in *Bon Appétit* (hereafter *BA*), the “Editor’s Letter” by Adam Rapoport. Arguing for a multifaceted definition of intertextuality (which I address and explain in the following section), I establish how the editor not only tailors his writing to reflect a ‘middle-class elite’ social status, but also, in his use of parenthetical asides and scare quotes, ensures his discourse is multivoiced. By using parentheses to mark everyday/ordinary experiences and colloquial language constructions, instances of specific detail, instructional asides, and elitist opinions, Rapoport intertextually repeats and voices

---

<sup>1</sup> Many thanks to Heidi E. Hamilton and Anastasia Nylund for insightful comments on earlier versions of this paper, which has been adapted from my MA thesis “The Construction of an Elite Middle-Class: Foodie Discourse in *Bon Appétit* Magazine”.

the observed ideals of the foodie community. Likewise, by using scare quotes to either diminish his own privileged status (via humor) or convey distance from non-foodies (or non-foodie terms), the editor reinforces the distinctions between foodies and ‘others’ while simultaneously grouping himself with his readers.

## 2 Multilayered Intertextuality

The focus of this paper stems from a specific understanding of intertextuality. My definition of the term is three-fold: first, in line with Fairclough (1992) and a Critical Discourse Analysis approach (Wodak and Meyer, 2009), I assert that language use connects with, and in some cases constitutes, social and cultural processes. In this sense, texts repeat forms of social practice, and vice versa. Second, these same socially-situated texts can be considered dialogic (Bakhtin, 1984) in the sense that no utterance represents a single speaker, but rather encapsulates the utterances of others before it. Parentheses are one rhetorical mechanism by which these voicing patterns are clearest: literary theorists posit that parentheses allow writers to carry on two conversations at once (Buchholz, 1979:1); highlight and voice parody (Hanoosh, 1989); and link ideas between sentences or to other texts and worlds (Suleiman, 1977). In this way, it seems that multivoicing is a quality almost inherent to one’s use of parenthetical asides in writing.

Third, the text is also multivoiced in that it anticipates its audience. It is designed with respect to the potential words of the listener/reader, whether or not s/he is able to respond (see Bakhtin, 1984). This third element of intertextuality lends itself especially to texts that are monologic: despite the readers’ literal absence from “Editor’s Letter,” they can be seen as “invisible speaker[s]” (197) guiding the path of the writer’s discourse. This idea is reiterated in Talbot (1995): the author discusses how magazine writers attempt to establish friendship between themselves and their readers by communicating “‘I know what you’re like, and I’m like that too.’” (154). Use of scare quotes is a tactic via which *BA* writers seem able to accomplish this: Scollon, Tsang, Li, Yung, and Jones (1998) note that scare quotes make texts “polyvocal” (236) while also adding emphasis or focus to particular words. Predelli (2003) confirms this idea, adding that the quotes themselves imbue the enclosed terms with contextual information from which the readers interpret additional meaning(s)—in this sense, scare quotes mark certain words as possessing particular semantic values, which the writer assumes his anticipated audience will understand.

## 3 Food, Language and Society

Before explaining the significance of intertextuality in *BA*’s “Editors Letter,” I will briefly discuss work in food studies research, which overwhelmingly highlights the importance of food and food discourse to social life (Julier, 2013; Guthman, 2013; Elliott, 2008; LeBesco and Naccarato, 2008). Bourdieu (1984) argues that food is a marker of class and gender, and that its ability to serve as a symbol of ‘distinction’ and ‘good taste’ is a testament to its social power. Mintz and Du Bois (2002) repeat these ideas, noting that the discourse surrounding a cuisine can essentially define the cuisine itself; in this sense, it can be seen to legitimate the food practices of certain communities (Van Leeuwen, 2007). Linguists have reiterated these findings; while Jurafsky (2014) discusses the “language of food” as it relates to one’s (embedded) cultural preferences, Lakoff (2006) contributes more specifically to the discussion of food, identity, and discourse using qualitative discourse analysis. Her comparison of three recipes from three cookbooks reflects “very different kinds of communication, based in turn on different assumptions

made by each author (or set of authors) about who the reader is..." (164). Though Lakoff does not address foodie journalism specifically, her idea that discourse concerning food is tailored to a specific readership is explicitly relevant to my research interests.

Regarding the foodie community in particular, few scholars (Hanke, 1989; Johnson and Bauman, 2009, 2010; Mapes, 2015) have considered discourse in magazines and other periodicals, and how these texts apply to foodie culture. Johnston and Baumann focus on texts produced by gourmet food writers and on interviews (conducted in 2008) with foodies themselves, demonstrating how foodie journalism and discourse help contribute to food's serving as a source of status and distinction in society—despite the fact that issues of class are virtually absent from the discourse, or are referenced off-hand and normalized (189). Thus, it is clear that food, and talk about food, have been tied to social practice and class distinction. In my own work (Mapes, 2015), I have also sought to exemplify this relationship, arguing that Rapoport navigates social class boundaries via the juxtaposition of ordinary and extraordinary life experiences in his columns. Aside from my research, however, there has been little sociolinguistic analysis of foodie journalism, and foodie discourse in general. The following paper expands on previous studies by commenting on intertextuality as a resource for Adam Rapoport to navigate social class boundaries in his "Editor's Letter."

#### 4 Background, Data, and Methodology

*BA* is published by the mass media company Condé Nast, which lists the circulation demographics of the magazine on their website, noting that 73% of the 6.5 million readers are female. The median household income is \$91,879, 50% have graduated college, and 62% are married. There is very little data available beyond these statistics, but it does offer insight into the life of *BA*'s average reader—one can conclude that *BA* is meant to identify mostly with a female, middle-class audience, half of which has graduated from college.<sup>2</sup> Notably, Rapoport's household income is most likely considerably larger than the median of the magazine's readership; an article in *New York Magazine* (from 2000)<sup>3</sup> claims that the editor-in-chief of an NYC-based periodical like *BA* makes anywhere from \$500,000 to \$1.5 million annually.<sup>4</sup> Rapoport also actively maintains his presence in the New York social scene: he and his wife have been photographed on numerous occasions with notable socialites, celebrities, and at red carpet events. The aforementioned is relevant simply in that it conveys a discrepancy between the editor's life and the probable lives of his readers: though his discourse appears to be mostly designed for a middle-class audience, Rapoport himself is distinctly upper-class both in lifestyle and economic standing.

My dataset includes all *BA* issues during a 44-month timeframe: May 2011 through December 2014 (a total of 44 articles). I analyze the "Editor's Letter" articles in the dataset, all of which are written by Rapoport, who became editor-in-chief of the magazine in May 2011. This particular column a worthy site for analysis first because of Rapoport's role as the editor of the magazine, which puts him in control over its full content and vision. "Second, "Editor's Letter" is one of the few articles that appear in every issue, in a

<sup>2</sup> I should note that this percentage (50%) is markedly higher than the national average (30%). See 2012 US census statistics: <[www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov)>.

<sup>3</sup> "Salaries in the City." *New York Magazine*, November 20, 2000.

<sup>4</sup> I suspect this range has increased considerably in the last decade. For example, Anna Wintour, editor-in-chief of *Vogue* magazine (a CN publication) reportedly made \$2 million annually in 2005 ("Who Makes How Much?" *New York Magazine*, September 26, 2005. Edited by Kate Pickert.)

relatively predictable format. This sort of consistency allows for the least amount of variability in the data, strengthening my analysis and conclusions. To analyze the data I use a combined quantitative and qualitative approach. First, I counted the occurrences of parenthetical asides and scare quotes in the dataset and categorized them based on their perceived purpose in the column—for instance, whether they seemed to mark instruction for the readers, or some sort of colloquial expression, or out-group status (among several other categories, outlined earlier). In what follows I first address parenthetical asides, and second, scare quotes. Ultimately I comment on how these punctuation features contribute to multivoicing and intertextuality in Rapoport’s “Editor’s Letter” columns.

## 5 Parenthetical Asides

I organized the data by putting each occurrence of parentheses in one of four categories. At times I noticed potential overlap across two or more of these, but this was

Table 1 Parenthetical aside usage in *BA*

<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of occurrences</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Example</i>
<b>1. Standard, middle-class experience/conversational language</b>	38	44%	“(I think it was a metal mixing bowl)”
<b>2. Instructional</b>	15	17%	“(Beer first, then ice)”
<b>3. Extra detail/specificity</b>	30	34%	“(shrimp cocktail with a side caddy of oyster crackers...)”
<b>4. Upper-class</b>	4	5%	“(unless I’m in Paris)”
<b>Total:</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>100%</b>	

relatively rare. The final tally is depicted in Table 1. It illustrates that while many uses of parentheses point to elaboration on the editor’s part (Category 3: e.g. telling the reader what he ate at the restaurant he’s discussing), over 40% of parenthetical asides seem to index a middle-class membership of sorts, or friendly rapport with the reader. Additionally there are 15 occurrences of purely instructional content—in these instances, Rapoport seems to lay claim to his expert status in the foodie community. The smallest category is number 4; instances in which Rapoport makes explicit references to an upper-class lifestyle or elitist ideology via parentheses were rare.

The aforementioned categories lead me to my qualitative analysis. In what follows I consider specific uses of parenthetical asides from each category, beginning in order with Category 1, and concluding with Category 4. First, I show how Rapoport uses parentheses as a means of voicing and appealing to his readers as members of the same community via reference to ‘everyday’ experiences. I then proceed to illustrate how Rapoport’s instructional asides mark his unique position and expert voice, contrasting the solidarity expressed in his other parenthetical asides; next, I demonstrate how specific uses of detail and elaboration serve as a strategy through which to legitimate the editor’s foodie status and experiences. Finally, I examine an occurrence of the explicit indexing of elitist ideology. Throughout this analysis, I suggest that the editor’s writing is reminiscent of a

larger social practice—the tendency to index classlessness in foodie discourse, while simultaneously appealing to a classed audience.

*Category 1 – Ordinary Experiences/Language (38 occurrences)*

As I mentioned earlier, most parenthetical asides were classified as instances of indexing ordinariness via middle-class, normal experiences, and colloquial or conversational language. The following example, from Aug. 2013, describes an instance of the former: while on vacation with his family in a rented beach house in Montauk, Rapoport prepares lunch for friends who stop by unexpectedly. Forced to make-do without a full kitchen, the editor describes his process. Consider how the use of parentheses allows him to take on different voices in the column:

- (1) 1 On went the pasta water, and into a makeshift ice bucket (I think it was a
- 2 metal mixing bowl) went a couple bottles of rosé.
- 3 Then, I sliced up some Sun Gold cherry tomatoes from a nearby farmstand.

First, note that for a casual lunch with friends, Rapoport insists on chilling his wine in “a makeshift ice bucket” (line 1) instead of keeping the bottles cold in the fridge. This description explicitly demonstrates Rapoport’s upper-class voice—by referencing a formal treatment of wine in a situation that is deemed low-key, he indexes the life experiences of the wealthy elite. However, the editor uses a parenthetical aside to voice a more ordinary sentiment: he says the ice bucket was “a metal mixing bowl” (lines 1-2), seemingly seeking to establish an unexceptional quality to the lunch. Additionally, the use of a common kitchen tool conveys his similarity to other foodies; even the construction of the detail itself reflects this sort of ordinariness: using “I think” (line 1) implies that the ice bucket was so unremarkable that Rapoport barely remembers what he used. In this way, Rapoport appears to mitigate his upper-class voice with a parenthetical reference to normalcy. This tactic allows him to navigate the social class differences between himself and his readers, and to reflect the foodie ideal of anti-snobbery.

*Category 2 – Instructional Asides (15 occurrences)*

Van Leeuwen (2007) posits that authority “is vested in a person because of their status or role in a particular institution...” (94); as the editor of *BA*, Rapoport has an established identity as a foodie with expert knowledge and status. In support of this role, Rapoport routinely references specialty ingredients and specific instructions—in the example below, from Jun. 2014, Rapoport discusses backyard barbeques, including how he and his colleagues prep a beer-cooler. In the excerpt below, he uses parentheses to mark specific instructions:

- (3) 1 Yes, we work plenty hard, but if there’s a going-away party or a birthday,
- 2 we’ll absolutely pull out the Coleman cooler.
- 3 And there will be a discussion about how to properly stock it
- 4 (beer first, then ice) and whether or not to add water
- 5 (definitely—it helps loosen things up, making for easy bottle withdrawal).

Notice how Rapoport gives a direct instruction in line 4: “(beer first, then ice).” This command stands out as it directly contrasts the collaborative sense depicted in line 3: “And there will be a discussion about how to properly stock it”, implying that there is a difference of opinion between the group of colleagues. In voicing his own opinion,

however, Rapoport channels his expert status, instructing readers to stock the cooler accordingly. Line 5 is another example of this usage; on the topic of whether one should add water to the cooler Rapoport insists: “(definitely—it helps loosen things up, making for easy bottle withdrawal)”, implying, again, that there is no debate concerning this issue. By voicing himself as expert, however, Rapoport also appears to reinforce his ordinariness. The detail of a “Coleman cooler” (line 2) stocked with beer immediately evokes rural America, and casual socializing. This use of instructional voicing to relay information pertaining to ordinary, middle-class experiences is a prime example of Rapoport’s reaching out to the reader: not only is he anticipating their acceptance of him as expert, but he is also tailoring his talk to relate to their presumed social status.

### *Category 3 – Detail and Elaboration (30 occurrences)*

The importance of detail in conversation has long been established by Tannen (2007 [1989]); van Dijk (2012) reiterates many of her ideas, saying that use of detail conveys credibility, and is consequently an effective means of persuasion (600). In using parentheses to include extra detail about a particular topic, Rapoport not only lends truth to his experiences, but also allows his readers to participate more fully in his narratives. Thus, consider the following excerpt from Sep. 2012, during which the editor writes about one of his favorite restaurants in New York, an unknown, family-owned Italian place serving traditional food. Note how Rapoport laces his description with detailed asides to the reader:

- (4) 1 The food is kind of Italian (veal Marsala, chicken *francese*),
- 2 kind of old-school Continental (shrimp cocktail with a side caddy of oyster
- 3 crackers; broiled lamb chops with emerald-green mint jelly).

Throughout the column, Rapoport appears to be painting a picture of the restaurant—this excerpt is no exception. By including details about the Italian dishes “(veal Marsala, chicken *francese*)” (line 2) he conveys the authenticity of the establishment. Similarly, describing “old-school” (line 2) dishes like “(shrimp cocktail with a side caddy of oyster crackers)” and “(broiled lamb chops with emerald-green mint jelly)” (lines 2-3) vividly depicts traditional restaurant-fare of earlier decades; readers seem invited to recall these sorts of restaurants, and to relate the editor’s narrative to their own experiences with the dishes he names. It is important to also note that Rapoport’s discussion of this anonymous restaurant, one that is not trendy or expensive is a clear example of the foodie preference for omnivorousness: the editor appears to be pursuing “the populist ethic of equivalence among cultural preferences while still laying claim to cultural refinement and superiority by implicitly marking some genres as exceptionally worthy” (Warde, Martens, and Olsen, 1999:123). Thus, as depicted in earlier examples, Rapoport makes use of parentheses as a means of marking text designed for the readers specifically, while also accentuating his foodie status and ideals.

### *Category 4 – Upper-class Practices/Elitist Ideologies (4 occurrences)*

Occasionally, Rapoport appears to take on a voice that expresses a sense of distinction and value representative of the Upper class. The utterances in this category could have been placed in Category 3 (they are all clearly details designed to elaborate on the topics of the columns). However, they each seemed to serve an additional function; to communicate Rapoport’s conception of worthy foods, and to convey his privileged lifestyle. Bourdieu (1984) discusses how the application of aesthetic concerns to mundane,

everyday practices is one of the most telling identifiers of the upper-class—this idea seems to apply directly to the example below, taken from the Mar. 2012 issue. The experience described in the column is a casual “Pizza Nite” at the editor’s home. In what follows, note especially his evaluation of pizza sauce:

- (5) 1 In terms of toppings, we always break out some fresh mozzarella, good olive  
 2 oil, and cans of San Marzano tomatoes  
 3 (jarred “pizza sauce” is banned from the pantry).

In describing the ingredients the family uses, Rapoport writes: “(jarred “pizza sauce” is banned from the pantry)” (line 3). First, “pizza sauce” is in quotations, implying that it is so unworthy of the Rapoport family’s consumption it should not even be called pizza sauce. Furthermore, it is officially “banned” from their household, clearly indicating its unacceptability as an ingredient. Rapoport intensifies this description by specifying a particular type of tomatoes as a replacement, drawing a symbolic boundary between worthy and unworthy food (Johnston and Baumann, 2010). It is this distinction between good and bad food that conveys an elitist ideology, and that is telling of Rapoport’s privileged status. In marking his voice emphatically with parentheses, he draws attention to the importance of deeming certain foods acceptable and others not; furthermore, his expert foodie position allows him to offer this idea to his readers as a standard by which they should also live.

Thus, in this instance and in the other examples, Rapoport appears to use parenthetical asides as a means of characterizing particular voices in the text. In so doing he is able to navigate class boundaries and appeal to ordinary, middle-class readers while also representing elite foodie ideals; the result is a depiction of the two social statuses as being equivalently desirable and important.

## 6 Scare Quotes

Scare quotes in the text function differently than parenthetical asides in that they literally indicate words spoken by others, or by the author himself, at some point in time. They mostly appear to convey some sort of distance from the terms they mark, whether this means a temporal separation or an ideological one; this can function as a means of indicating out-group or in-group status. Thus, I arranged the data by dividing the 21 occurrences according to the various ‘quoted’ parties to which each instance can be attributed, implicitly or explicitly. In the first group, I placed tokens that were said by the editor’s friends, family, and coworkers – an auxiliary in-group, so to speak (e.g. “my dad let it be known that I’d have to go out and find a ‘real’ job” – Sep. 2014). Group 2 contains the uses that seem to reference a former period of Rapoport’s life during which, by his own admission, he was immature or unstylish; these occurrences convey a humorous or mocking tone (e.g. “The red ‘accent’ wall I thought was so daring became chocolate brown” – Jun. 2013). The uses in Group 3 convey things said by non-foodies, or ‘others’. They seem to illustrate a marked distance from (and even disdain for) these speakers (e.g. “In an era when powders, foams, and ‘tweezer food’ dominate the culinary world’s headlines, Brock wants to take us back home.” – Sep. 2011). Lastly, Group 4 contains words attributed to Rapoport’s current self—in most cases these appear to index normalcy and relatability, or an ordinary class-membership (e.g. “I wouldn’t call it ‘cooking’ per se” – Aug. 2013).

The aforementioned categories serve to depict how scare quotes in *BA* ensure its multivoiced quality, according to which particular voices are portrayed at a given time. In the subsequent qualitative section I focus on examples from Groups 3 and 4 (words attributed to non-foodies and words attribute to Rapoport's current, foodie self, respectively). I have selected these two categories for analysis because they seem to best represent issues of class boundaries in the editor's discourse; while examples from the other groups certainly contribute to the classless quality of the writing, they are less straightforward in terms of attributable function. With this in mind, I first examine examples of scare quotes occurring as references to the words of 'others', demonstrating what values are attached to non-foodie membership, and how these uses allow Rapoport to distance himself from the associated group. Second, I consider scare quotes occurrences from Group 4, illustrating ways these marked terms seem to convey normalcy and foodie in-group status. Ultimately this analysis reveals how the words of foodies and non-foodies are marked in order to create solidarity with readers and other presumed foodies.

### *Group 3 – Voicing Non-foodies*

In his discussion of the semantic role of scare quotes, Predelli (2003) remarks that they can often evoke sarcasm, and are used “with the intent of mocking someone's inappropriate use of [a word]” (14). By marking the item with quotes, the editor suggests that ‘tweezer food’ is actually not food at all, and those who consume it are (perhaps) snobbish *gourmands*, or are simply not privy to his (and other foodies') superior knowledge. Another column also exhibits this sort of voicing: the Apr. 2014 article discusses a friend of the editor (Meeghan Truelove) and her devotion to cooking elaborate, impressive dishes. In the column Rapoport describes the complicated recipes, culminating in a challenge to his readers to tackle similarly difficult projects. In the excerpt below, notice how the editor employs scare quotes as a means of voicing those who do not advocate this sort of cooking (e.g. cooking shows such as “30-Minute Meals with Rachael Ray”):

- (6) 1 It's this sort of spirit—ambitious, energetic, fearless—that fuels our
- 2 section The Project.
- 3 In it, we offer up the kinds of dishes that explicitly aren't “quick” or
- 4 “simple” or that have “five ingredients or less.”
- 5 These are involved dishes that, when pulled off, are absolute showstoppers.

Firstly, the editor immediately references the “spirit” (line 1) of his foodie-friend Meeghan Truelove: by indirectly proclaiming her “ambitious, energetic, fearless” (line 1), and equating these qualities with *BA* staff (in the “our” of “It's this sort of spirit...that fuels our section The Project” – lines 1-2), Rapoport creates a particular identity for foodies. They should be ambitious in the kitchen, and cook things that are challenging “showstoppers” (line 6). Consider how these qualities are juxtaposed with those proclaimed by non-foodies: “we offer up the kinds of dishes that explicitly aren't ‘quick’ or ‘simple’ or that have ‘five ingredients or less’” (lines 3-4). This sort of characterization appears to reference magazines (or other types of food media) that cater to a different kind of home cook – one who is concerned only with saving time, and not with the craft of preparing food. By voicing these ‘others’ with scare quotes Rapoport seems to mock their non-foodie values, while also elevating his own, and those of other foodies.

### *Group 4 – Voicing Self and Other Foodies*



As I demonstrate in earlier sections, though he continually indexes his own privilege, Rapoport seems to also downplay his foodie prestige as a way of relating to, or voicing his readers. As a presumed expert in his field, and for the economic and social class differences noted previously, Rapoport appears to mitigate his high status via his use of scare quotes, particularly as they pertain to his ability to prepare food. The following example is from the Feb. 2014 issue: the title of the column is “It’s Okay to Cheat,” and it documents Rapoport’s use of frozen puff pastry and rotisserie chicken to construct a chicken pot pie for his wife’s birthday dinner. In particular, note how the editor uses scare quotes as a means of minimizing his own skill:

- (7) 1 After work, I grabbed a rotisserie chicken from the market across from our  
 2 apartment, along with a bag of frozen peas and pearl onions, a bundle of  
 3 carrots, and a package of Dufour frozen puff pastry.  
 4 I snipped some thyme and flat-leaf parsley from our garden and got to work.  
 5 So no, it wasn’t exactly “from scratch.”  
 6 But just like we do in the magazine every month, I focused on flavor and  
 7 technique. I made a silky béchamel that I enriched with chicken stock I had  
 8 in the freezer.

First, consider how Rapoport’s preparation for the meal is framed as casual: he “grabbed a rotisserie chicken from the market across from our apartment,” bought frozen vegetables and a non-descript “bundle of carrots” (lines 1-2). This sort of language indicates a certain lack of effort; the ingredients were purchased on his way home and were predominantly pre-made. Even the “bundle of carrots” suggests a lack of planning or precision—the meal appears to be thrown together casually. This sort of nonchalance is also indexed in line 5: Rapoport’s use of scare quotes to highlight his decision to not cook the meal ““from scratch”” seems to convey his acknowledgement that this behavior is contrary to readers’ expectations. The editor is a presumed food expert, and the skill required to cook a meal from start to finish is one commonly associated with foodies. In fact, as noted above, the magazine itself is devoted to this value: its main purpose is to teach readers how to make trending dishes for their daily meals and parties. In this sense, the cooking experience Rapoport describes is marked, normalizing his status as a skilled cook and foodie.

In downplaying his foodie prestige, the editor appears to group himself with his ‘ordinary’ readers; however, as the column continues he explains how he maintains foodie values despite using short cuts in his cooking practices. Rapoport writes: “just like we do in the magazine every month, I focused on flavor and technique. I made a silky béchamel that I enriched with chicken stock I had in the freezer” (lines 6-8). Thus, though the meal is not prepared ““from scratch”” it still has homemade components. Furthermore the “technique” and “flavor” Rapoport mentions are associated with the magazine has a whole: pointedly including his cooking practices with those of other foodie writers implies the in-group status he attributes to himself and his readers. While this example ultimately serves to demonstrate how scare quotes can be used to voice the ordinariness of foodies, it also points to how Rapoport allows himself (and others) to “cheat” without compromising the distinction and value they place on certain ingredients and experiences.

## 7 Conclusion

Talbot (1995) claims that although readers are in control of the discourse they ingest, “The sense of autonomy that we experience as readers is an illusion...Readers are drawn into a kind of complicity with the texts they read. When meanings are obvious, that

complicity and subjection are complete” (146). This idea, that texts are created with the intention of appearing natural and normal to an audience, is precisely the phenomenon I have sought to illustrate in the preceding analysis. By revealing how intertextuality is not only present in the repetition of foodie ideals in *BA* discourse, but visible also in the editor’s multivoicing tactics, I have demonstrated the true effect of Bakhtin’s notion of ‘the invisible speaker’. In representing himself and other foodies as classless, or ‘middle-class elites’, Rapoport participates in the observable trend in foodie discourse to deny the relationship between food and social distinction (consciously or unconsciously). As Johnston and Baumann (2009) write: “It is this discrepancy between a framing of food as classless and the actual class linkages with food that cause us to identify foodie discourse as involved in class politics” (25). Indeed, Rapoport’s writing for *BA* could be interpreted as perpetuating these conditions as they exist in the U.S.

Although the reach of my conclusions may be limited in scope, they bring to light two main issues of import. First, the perception of classlessness in foodie discourse seems to be an accurate one, and is partly enacted via usage of parentheses and scare quotes in Rapoport’s “Editor’s Letter” columns. Second, though readers of magazine texts are not responsive in a typical understanding of the term, *BA* discourse is tailored toward their eventual responses in other contexts, whatever they may be. In sum, this study demonstrates how intertextuality is at work in a foodie publication, as well as how issues of class and distinction are prevalent in the discourse of its editor.

### References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics*. Translated and edited by Caryl Emerson, introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buchholz, William J. 1979. Punctuation: The dynamics of obscure marks. *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 1979, 226-7.
- Elliott, Charlene. 2008. Consuming the Other: Packaged representations of foreignness in President’s Choice. In *Edible ideologies: Representing food and meaning*, ed. by Kathleen LeBesco and Peter Naccarato, 184-204. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics and Education* 4: 269-293.
- Guthman, Julie. 2013[2003]. Fast food/organic food: Reflexive tastes and the making of “Yuppie Chow.” In *Food and culture, Third edition*, ed. by Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik, 23-30. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Hanke, Robert. 1989. Mass media and lifestyle differentiation: An analysis of the public discourse about food. *Communication* 10.221-239.
- Hanoosh, Michele. 1989. The reflexive function of parody. *Comparative Literature* (41)2: 113-127.
- Johnston, Josée, and Shyon Baumann. 2009. Tension in the kitchen: Explicit and implicit politics in the gourmet foodscape. Online: *Sociologica* 1/2009. DOI: 10.2383/29565.
- Johnston, Josée, and Shyon Baumann. 2010. *Foodies: Democracy and distinction in the gourmet foodscape*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Julier, Alice P. 2013. *Eating together: Food, friendship, and inequality*. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Chicago Press.

- Jurafsky, Dan. 2014. *The language of food: A linguist reads the menu*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Lakoff, Robin. 2006. Identity a la carte: You are what you eat. In *Discourse and identity*, ed. by Anna de Fina, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg, 142-65. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- LeBesco, Kathleen and Peter Naccarato. 2008. Julia Child, Martha Stewart, and the rise of culinary capital. In *Edible ideologies: Representing food and meaning*, ed. by Kathleen LeBesco and Peter Naccarato, 225-42. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mapes, Gwynne. 2015. The construction of an elite middle-class: Foodie discourse in *Bon Appétit* Magazine.
- Mintz, Sidney W. and Christine M. Du Bois. 2002. The anthropology of food and eating. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 99-119.
- Predelli, Stefano. 2003. Scare quotes and their relation to other semantic issues. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26: 1-28.
- Scollon, Ron, Wai King Tsang, David Li, Vicki Yung, and Rodney Jones. 1998. Voice, appropriation and discourse representation in a student writing task. *Linguistics and Education* 9(3): 227-250.
- Suleiman, Susan. 1977. The parenthetical function in *A la recherche du temps perdu*. *PMLA* 92(3): 458-470.
- Talbot, Mary. 1995. A synthetic sisterhood: False friends in a teenage magazine. In *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, ed. by Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz, 144-165. London: Routledge.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2007[1989]. Imagining worlds: Imagery and detail in conversation and other genres. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*, 133-160. New York: Cambridge.
- van Dijk, Teun. 2012. Discourse and knowledge. In *Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. by James Paul Gee and Michael Handford, 587-603. London: Routledge.
- van Leeuwen, Theo. 2007. Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse and Communication* 1(1): 91-112.
- Warde, Alan, Lydia Martens and Wendy Olsen. 1999. Consumption and the problem of variety: Cultural omnivorousness, social distinction and dining out. *Sociology* 33(1): 105-127.
- Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. 2009. Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In *Methods of critical discourse analysis, Second edition*, ed. by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 1-33. London: Sage.

Gwynne Mapes  
 Department of Linguistics  
 Georgetown University  
 Poulton Hall 240  
 Washington, DC 20057  
 gem48@georgetown.edu