



INTERTEXTUAL AND POLYPHONIC RELATIONS IN THE *WIKIPEDIA* ARTICLE “EUROPEAN UNION REACTIONS TO THE GAZA WAR” FOR HUMANITARIAN KNOWLEDGE BUILDING

DÉSIRÉE RUSSO

Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro

d.russo31@phd.uniba.it

Abstract

(EN) Drawing on the concepts of “polyphony” (Bakhtin 1981) and “intertextuality” (Kristeva 1986), this paper proposes to analyse, through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis, the presence of multiple, often contradictory, voices that coexist within Wikipedia discourse. Notably, the “ideological struggle” emerges both through the use of different voices, which re-contextualise the speech from its original co-text and context, and the presence of «a permutation of texts, intertextuality in the space of a given text» (Kristeva 1986: 36). The extracted passages illustrate different perspectives (e.g., direct EU statements, individual Member States’ reported positions, criticisms, and editorial notes) while contributing to humanitarian knowledge co-building, presumably under the Wikipedia principle of the “neutral point of view”. In this context, the study aims to explore how Wikipedia discourse re-enacts ideological tensions and power dynamics between *voices* by examining such passages. The results demonstrate that knowledge is continuously produced and renegotiated in a polyphonic and intertextual, digital space.

KEYWORDS: Intertextuality; Polyphony; Critical Discourse Analysis; Knowledge building; Wikipedia.

(ITA) Attingendo ai concetti di “polifonia” (Bakhtin 1981) e “intertestualità” (Kristeva 1986), il presente contributo si propone di analizzare, attraverso l’Analisi critica del discorso, la presenza di molteplici voci, spesso contraddittorie, che coesistono all’interno del discorso Wikipediano. Nello specifico, la “battaglia ideologica” emerge sia attraverso l’uso di diverse voci, le quali ricontestualizzano il discorso rispetto ai suoi co-testo e contesto originali, sia attraverso la presenza di una «riscrittura di altri testi preesistenti, l’intertestualità all’interno di un testo» (Kristeva 1986: 36 – traduzione mia). I passaggi estratti mostrano diverse prospettive (ad es. le dichiarazioni dirette dell’UE, le posizioni riportate dei singoli Stati membri, le critiche e le note redazionali) e, al contempo, contribuiscono alla co-costruzione del sapere umanitario, verosimilmente in linea con il principio Wikipediano del “punto di vista neutrale”. In tale contesto, il contributo è volto a esplorare le modalità con cui il discorso Wikipediano ricrea le tensioni ideologiche e le dinamiche di potere tra le *voci* attraverso l’analisi di tali passaggi. I risultati dimostrano che il sapere è continuamente prodotto e rinegoziato in uno spazio digitale polifonico e intertestuale.

PAROLE CHIAVE: Intertestualità; Polifonia; Analisi critica del discorso; *Knowledge building*; Wikipedia.



1. Introduction

As a free, open, collaborative, multilingual encyclopaedia online, Wikipedia embodies a unique convergence of knowledge building and volunteer-driven writing and translation, helpful in disseminating vital information on humanitarian concerns such as health emergencies, global (social, economic, political, etc.) crises, and armed conflicts, amongst others. Its open-source model with a decentralised, editing structure enables it to serve as a tool for promoting equity, transparency, and inclusion in the digital knowledge ecosystem under the claimed policy of “neutral point of view” (*NPOV*: [Wikipedia: Five pillars - Wikipedia](#)), which proves to be a “language point of view” (*LPOV*). Indeed, as noted by Johnson, Kaffee, and Redi (2024), Wikipedia represents the largest encyclopaedia ever created and one of the most widely used information resources on the internet, mainly due to its accessibility and broad availability of content in several languages. Thus, it is a sort of “collective memory negotiation” (Kanhabua, Nguyen, and Niederee 2014), which preserves memories of past events while counteracting the broader tendency towards “fast forgetting” (*ibid.*). This model of knowledge production and transmission is, in fact, of utmost importance in a political context, for example, for humanitarian knowledge co-building.

In line with the scope of *Cross-Media Languages. Applied Research, Digital Tools and Methodologies* Journal, this study endeavours to provide insights into the semiotic-linguistic aspects of Wikipedia by observing, while attempting to answer such research questions, the role of polyphony and intertextuality in the knowledge process, production, and dissemination, as well as the social purpose it serves in representing diverse perspectives and projecting them in reality. Notably, it aims to build a bridge between Semiotics, Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA), and Wikipedia research. Indeed, the author makes this contribution to enlightening the relevance of Wikipedia through the lens of CDA’s approach to polyphonic and intertextual analysis (Bloor and Bloor 2013; Fairclough 2003, 2010) to investigate the presence of multiple, conflicting voices within its discourse, which showcases a division in ideologies – since «for Halliday, language is always agentive in the construction of reality, and by extension, is always ideological» (Lukin 2017: 3). The ultimate goal is to demonstrate how power relations are reflected in Wikipedia discourse, intended both as a non-finite, lexicographic product and «never finished» process (Shirky 2008: 119), whose linguistic-semiotic features of references, allusions, and reported utterances are constantly negotiated.

Knowledge, intertextuality, and polyphony are interconnected in Bakhtin’s (1981) “philosophy” of dialogism, which presents knowledge as grounded in language use and the self as fundamentally relational. In this sense, dialogism emphasises multiplicity rather than dualism since the “self” arises in dialogue with others, that is, oneself and the natural, social, and cultural world. In Wikipedia, knowledge and meaning are inherently relational due to the interactive dialogues between editors, texts, contexts, and the digital environment. Knowledge, then, does not constitute fixed truths within individuals but a multi-voiced space (polyphony) where meanings are constantly negotiated with other texts (intertextuality). Thus, any text, in a dynamic sense, refers to “all other texts” (Kristeva 1986) due to «*l'impossibilité de vivre hors du texte infini*» (Barthes 1973: 59). In such a context, this study would position dialogism not only as a key, contemporary epistemology concentrating on communicative action (i.e., discourse) rather than language systems, but also as a valid, theoretical framework for the polyphonic and intertextual analysis of Wikipedia discourse.

This contribution is organised as follows: *Section 2* illustrates the background of Wikipedia; *Section 3* outlines the proposed methodology; *Section 4* includes the case study and findings; *Section 5* covers the concluding remarks.

2. Background: Wikipedia as a dialogic genre, participatory platform, and collaborative practice

As an unconventional, encyclopaedic genre, Wikipedia represents a «radically new form of encyclopedia writing» (Benkler 2006: 70), attempting to balance between «attention to [encyclopaedic] genre and openness to potential innovation results in a community that is aligned both by its genre tradition and by the public, communal processes of modifying that tradition» (Kill 2012: 397). It may not be «“the” information resource» (Knight and Pryke 2012: 1), however, it constitutes «a fluid multiple perspective dialogic object» (Gatto 2016: 180). Its genre fluidity may be considered «“dynamic constructs” (Bhatia 1997: 360), characterized by the constant interplay between the contradictory, albeit complementary, aspects of integrity and innovation» (Gatto 2024: 89). As Gatto (2012) has noted, Bakhtinian centripetal (i.e., policies for genre and style) and centrifugal (i.e., user-driven content) forces of discourse characterise the efforts to both standardise and vary the genre of Wikipedia with patterns of both negotiation and, sometimes, struggle. Notably, the pattern of struggle is assumed to dialogically construct all meanings (Alfaro 1996), knowledge itself is debatable on Wikipedia. Indeed, a “struggle” of perspectives and ideologies permeates the textuality of Wikipedia, especially in political articles on conflicts, such as the case study shown in *Section 4*. Due to these dialectic tensions, Wikipedia exceeds the boundaries of the traditional, encyclopaedic genre while providing a great variety of information.

As expected, Wikipedia is first and foremost a participatory, multilingual media platform «built by volunteers and backed by a non-profit [i.e., Wikimedia Foundation]» (Kill 2012: 390), who constitute its community, together with the “consumers” or readers and “prosumers” (Toffler 1980). Both readers and prosumers access and participate in co-building knowledge. Indeed, Wikipedia users play an active role not only in the production but also in the circulation of content, unlike readers of traditional encyclopaedias. Such a shift from consumers to “prosumers”, i.e., both producers and consumers, is due to forms of participation that devolve power to Wikipedia communities in the creation, negotiation, and either inter- or intra-linguistic translation of content. As Zwischenberger (2022) stated, such a phenomenon denotes a «liberating, empowering and democratising process» (2022: 8) within online, collaborative practices. It foregrounds a «shift from synchronous, industrial text production to asynchronous text production in which the editing and revising runs parallel to text production» (ibid.). In most cases, the author noted that prosumers participate for their own needs (ibid.). On the other hand, Goldenberg and Reed (2008) pointed out that such an “active” participation in content production might be as problematic as “passive” consumption in political, ethical, and creative terms. For example, as Benkler (2006) argued, “commons-based peer production” operates outside the market, casting doubt on the “integrity of the self/user” (Goldberg 2010).

Furthermore, scholars have questioned the encyclopaedic authoritativeness that is arguably still missing in Wikipedia. This thorny issue concerns the lack of many features listed below: A scientific committee (editorial teams, HR, etc.); submission procedures (offering instead a “vandal fighter bot”, developed by Tawker in 2006, to both identify and reject acts of vandalism); copyright agreements (replaced by Creative Commons Attribution or Share-Alike License (CC BY-SA) «with the copyright being retained by the original author» (*Wikipedia:Multi-licensing*)); lexicographic and dictionaristic criteria (it provides general *pillars* for writing); and an established, genre structure (substituted by a hybrid one). Despite this, Eco (2009) has devoted a newspaper article to the continuous tension between the reliability and openness of Wikipedia, which materialises his model of “open work” (Eco 1962) in which the “unlimited semiosis” (1979) occurs, thereby shifting the role of users from “passive” consumers to active interpreters of texts. Thus, Wikipedia is not only an information archive, but also a semiotic product, in which knowledge appears both as dynamic translation and co-building of meaning within its digital “semiosphere” (Lotman 2005).

As an «online collaborative encyclopaedia» (Eom and Shepelyansky 2013: 2), Wikipedia, thus, constitutes a work of human collaboration for the co-construction of knowledge. Indeed, it seeks to collect «the whole human knowledge» in several language editions, which characterise its remarkable feature of «cross-cultural difference» (ibid.). Within Translation Studies (TS), Wikipedia represents an ideal breeding ground for the study of collaborative practices. In particular, in Jiménez-Crespo's (2017) distinction, Wikipedia appears as an instance of «online collaborative translation» (2017: 18), i.e., an “unsolicited” (Jiménez-Crespo 2015) initiative of a self-organised community of either amateur or professional volunteers. Notwithstanding, recent courses involving Italian universities in conjunction with Wikimedia Italia such as *Translatathon@UniBa* (Gatto 2020) for translation tasks, may be categorised as «translation crowdsourcing» (Jiménez-Crespo 2017: 18). Such practices combine “solicited, top-down” and “unsolicited, self-managed” models (Zwischenberger 2022) through a call from the participating university.

As collaborative and participatory practice, Wikipedia relies on miscellaneous processes of original composition, translation, collation, commentary, adaptation, summarisation, paraphrase, and synthesis (Jones 2018). Wikipedia knowledge production, in a broad sense of “translation”, is a “form of (re)narration” (Baker 2014) that, following Bakhtin's principle of “relationality”, is far from impartial in the associations it constructs. Indeed, “socio-narratives” are rarely articulated in full within a single text; rather, as Baker (2006) noted, they underpin an array of texts and discourses. Facts, sources, texts, and events are constantly re-translated, thereby composing the polyphonic and intertextual structure of Wikipedia articles. However, its open-source model, where anyone can freely edit – either anonymously or not –, raises many issues, including the possibility to consider Wikipedia articles as the translation of one another, and the reliability of the edits – due to a lack of control of discourses and sources, though “Wikimedians” affirm they can keep track of such edits and remove content.

2.1 “Knowledge building” and Wikipedia-mediated voices

The concept of “knowledge building”, which originates in Education research as «the production and continual improvement of ideas of value to a community» (Scardamalia and Bereiter 2003: 1371) involving participation in a public, digital environment, has been applied in Wikipedia research. Scholars have focused on “collaborative knowledge building” related to the technological and cognitive aspects of Wikipedia activities (Moskaliuk, Kimmerle, and Cress 2012). Notably, they have stressed the cognitive motive behind participation, including “cognitive conflicts” that arise from irritation (Cress and Kimmerle 2008). From a linguistic-semiotic perspective, it can be argued that knowledge benefits from such conflicts, which oppose monologic knowledge (Bakhtin 1981) and disseminate as many perspectives as possible. Indeed, Wikipedia articles are constantly negotiated, translated, renovated, and arguably improved by means of “edit wars”, community discussion (“talk page(s)”), peer review, and consensus-driven updates. This dynamic process of multi-voiced knowledge building reflects the “constructive process” of the “knowledge building” paradigm, according to which knowledge is incessantly refined through shared inquiry.

Since “conceptual artifacts” (Scardamalia and Bereiter 2003) of participants are publicly debated, Wikipedia *lives* in the real world, beyond individual cognition. At the core of Wikipedia knowledge building are co-authoring *voices*. Wikipedia functions as a “polyphonic arena” – translating Bakhtin's notion of “struggle” between multiple voices – by reuniting heterogeneous participants whose contributions interweave to form a shared «international repository of knowledge» (Shuttleworth 2018: 248). As «independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses» (Bakhtin 1999: 6) that are «fully valid» (ibid.), contributors from varied social, cultural, ideological,

professional, and linguistic backgrounds engage in dialogic encounters, thereby producing a tapestry of voices rather than a monologic, single-authored narrative.

Nevertheless, *voices* are delegated to – and mediated through – Wikipedia editorial policies, such as *NPOV* and *Verifiability* as well as social norms (e.g., community-driven “consensus”), that shape how individual perspectives are integrated. Wikipedia bridges disparate perspectives through conflict between *voices* to meet the expectations of the global audience while offering extensive knowledge. In political and humanitarian contexts, such as Wikipedia articles on armed conflicts, multiple perspectives are vital. Here the motivation might be, for example, to help make informed decisions.

2.2 LPOV and “ideological struggle”

Wikipedia is not a monolith: It currently contains three-hundred-fifty-eight language editions ([List of Wikipedias - Wikipedia](#)), each with its own community. Although they all share key principles, their rules and practical application of *NPOV* may differ depending on the language edition.

Wikipedia’s *NPOV* policy is a core content policy, alongside *Verifiability* and *No Original Research*, that requires articles to represent all significant viewpoints fairly, proportionately, and without bias ([Wikipedia: Neutral point of view - Wikipedia](#)). Indeed, *Due weight* stands for impartial summaries of viewpoints, not neutrality: Prominence should reflect its prevalence in reliable sources, not popularity among editors or the public (*ibid.*). However, research shows that measuring neutrality or bias (e.g., in edits) is challenging as *NPOV* is foundational but also difficult to implement uniformly (Ashkinaze *et al.* 2024; Redi *et al.* 2021). Although Wikipedia maintains a *NPOV* policy, some degree of cultural bias and cultural diversity is unavoidable, since knowledge and knowledge description are shaped by culture, like other forms of human behaviour.

In *Manypedia: Comparing language points of view of Wikipedia communities* (2013: Unpaginated), Massa and Scrinzi argued that failure to adhere to *NPOV* policy can be traced in «divergent representations for the same topic» by each existing language edition. Their tool, i.e., *Manypedia*, enables to cross-compare such representations. For example, it has shown that the Wikipedia article *Palestinian territories* is culturally and ideologically framed differently by the English and Arabic language community editions. In so doing, it proves that the co-presence of conflictual *voices* within Wikipedia can exist intertextually in the sense elucidated in the present study: A “struggle” of discourses, ideological positioning, and frames. This evokes the Soviet conceptualisation of “ideological struggle” (Pork 1989), in which divergent *voices* fight against centripetal forces.

The ideological struggle occurs in the example provided by Massa and Scrinzi throughout and *outside* the *same* topicalised text. As a «class struggle that takes place in the intellectual sphere of the life of the society» (Pork 1989: 284), the ideological struggle reflects practical and organisational needs of society, which frames them according to its shared experiences. In Wikipedia, each language edition creates, either simultaneously or diachronically, interferences that form the struggle of *voices*, shared experiences, and perspectives. Such a struggle embraces change, improvement, and even the risk of undermining information integrity, textual cohesion, and discursive coherence. Centrifugal voices (i.e., contributors) struggle against centripetal forces (editorial requirements). As Bakhtin (1999: 232) stated: «the destruction of one's own image in another's eyes, the sullyng of that image in another's eyes as an ultimate desperate effort to free oneself from the power of the other's consciousness and to break through to one's self for the self alone».

3. Methodology: Polyphony and Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis

This study has adopted a CDA framework based on Bakhtin's (1981) concept of "polyphony" and Kristeva's (1986) concept of "intertextuality" to examine how knowledge is produced and negotiated in Wikipedia's digital, collaborative environment, – which represents a non-institutional, political discourse –, and then, how Wikipedia knowledge reflects ideological positionings that emerge from power and social relations.

Polyphony, intertextuality, and knowledge are intrinsically intertwined by the presence of relational, pluri-vocal "chains" of texts that constitute a dialogical and ideologically saturated discourse (Fairclough 2003), counteracting a monologic and neutral representation of it (Bakhtin 1981). Following Bakhtin's concept of "dialogic language", Fairclough (2003) has argued that «intertextuality opens up difference» (2003: 41) and such an «orientation to difference brings into focus degrees and forms of dialogicality in texts» (2003: 42). Difference entails an existing "range of voices" within any text, alluding to the idea that any text and discourse can be simultaneously dialogical, polyphonic, and intertextual. In this sense, Fairclough defines intertextuality as «a set of other texts and a set of voices which are potentially relevant, and potentially incorporated into the text [...] rather extensive and complex» (2003: 47). Fairclough insists on the idea that «the difference between voices reported in a text may include the fact that that different voices draw upon different discourses» (2003: 54) – i.e., interdiscursivity. Wikipedia highlights the "dialogicality" of a text, i.e., a dialogue between *voices* that establishes the co-presence of *voices* in texts. Thus, Wikipedia discourse is, following Fairclough's CDA framework, inherently relational and polyphonic. On another layer of analysis, intertextual analysis can trace how Wikipedia contributors draw upon, incorporate, recontextualise, or suppress other texts and discourses, thereby revealing the underlying meaningful parts of such texts (Fairclough 2003, 2010).

To reveal such meaningful cruxes – e.g., exclusion (this issue echoes Fairclough's (2003: 47) "initial" research question) – in Wikipedia discourse of EU reactions to the Gaza war, this study has intersected Noy's (2022) CDA approach of conflictual voices, the so-called "polemic polyphony", and Fairclough's (1992a) CDA approach to intertextual relations to examine "meaningful" content through text(s). According to Fairclough (2010) CDA is, indeed, a "theory of language" and its scope is wider than that of discourse analysis, since it aims to find what is both on the *surface* of and *behind* any discourse, i.e., power relations, ideology, and social inequalities whose constructive effects are manifest in social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief (Fairclough 1992b). Ultimately, CDA can effectively analyse how diverse voices come into play to construct social realities. It also extends Bakhtin's and Kristeva's ideas on digital spaces, emphasising how multiple perspectives, languages, and ideologies are interrelated in "shared" texts.

3.1 Polyphony

The notion of "polyphony" has provided a useful lens for analysing how Wikipedia structures *voices* and discourse. Texts or utterances may maintain cooperative or conflictual relations, that is, agreeing with other texts or "polemicising" them (Bakhtin cited in Fairclough 2003). As "public sphere", Wikipedia operates within Habermas's (cited in Fairclough 2003: 44) idea of a «zone of connection between social systems and the "lifeworld"», in which both elements of polemic and agreement, in the form of either direct or indirect, reported utterances, result in the infinite potentiality of textual relations (*ibid.*). Indeed, the present case study has shown that Wikipedia contributors play an active role by polemicising on, for example, political concerns while either legitimising or delegitimising

events, behaviours of political actors, and so forth. The multifaceted panorama of information offered by Wikipedia contributors benefits from the struggle of *voices*. Although Wikipedia's open model entails many "controversies" ([List of Wikipedia controversies - Wikipedia](#)), this study aims to shed light on the "polemic polyphony" that characterises the Wikipedia article. This is not to say that problems of reliability, authoritativeness, or validity do not exist, quite the contrary, Wikipedia articles somehow reflect the contrasting, ideologised narratives coexisting in the *outside*.

Drawing on Noy's (2022) "polemic polyphony" paradigm, this study has observed this "ensemble" of discourses that conflictual *voices* establish and make recognisable as political in Wikipedia. As suggested by Noy, they can narrate events and take a stance by using "reported speech" through direct quotations and "represented speech" through indirect reporting (*ibid.*). Wikipedia contributors recount the EU and international reactions to the war in Gaza by quoting the parties involved, such as EU leaders. Such a concatenation of directly or indirectly reported speeches are also used as argumentation and persuasion, as usual in political discourse (*ibid.*). The extracted passages in the case study reveal the co-occurrence of *voices* that either align with the political actor's perspective or deflect the original intention, thereby producing layered polemic polyphony. Such uses of reported utterances as argumentation not only multiply perspectives but also function rhetorically to involve audiences in public affairs by offering evaluations and assessments. In some of the examples studied, Wikipedia contributors framed the political reality of the war and organised it into morally polarised narratives, recounting the words of those in power but not of the victims. Such dichotomous narratives, described as "defiant discourse" or "speaking truth to power" in non-institutional environments (*ibid.*), are unequivocally marked in this context, where ethno-nationalist and populist tendencies exclude other *voices*. In fact, CDA scholars (Fairclough 2003; Noy 2022; Savski 2020) argue that both the presence and absence of voices constitute a key concern as both can reveal and structure power relations and ideological dynamics.

3.2 Intertextuality

Kristeva's *Word, Dialogue and Novel* (1966, 1986) and *The Bounded Text* (1980) introduced the concept of "intertextuality" that was further developed and applied in a wide range of theories, disciplines, and analytical frameworks, including Literary studies, Semiotics, Historicist Criticism, and CDA. Centred around the idea that no text is a container of the whole meaning or knowledge, but only a trace of otherness, for Kristeva (1980), the text is "bounded" operatively, but unlimited within a broader process, namely textuality, in which other texts dialogue with one another. Notably, intertextual analysis is adopted in CDA to observe the "external relations" that encompass the "(inter)dependence" of texts in the form of genre and style (Fairclough 1992b), constituting text "chains" (Fairclough 2003), and the reflection of social events, social practices, and social structures (*ibid.*) since texts are historically embedded. In this sense, this study attempts to underline how the *outside* is brought into Wikipedia articles, e.g., how official sources are incorporated, fact-checking journalism is drawn upon, and public speeches are used to depict the event. As an interpretive activity, intertextual analysis is highly dependent on the researcher's own experience and assessment (*ibid.*), indeed, the study also has research limitations, including the fact that it does not observe other language editions or previous and following edits of the English-language edition.

The intertextual nature of Wikipedia should be intended both as the incorporation (Fairclough 2003; Kristeva 1986) or hybridisation of texts (Fairclough and Fairclough 2016) by combining genres, discourses, styles, and practices, as well as the transformation of texts in a "new" (con)text (Bloor and Bloor 2013) by "re-contextualising" texts, events, and discourses in other texts (Fairclough 2003) through a "mosaic of quotations" (Kristeva 1986), attributions, and references. The former refers to elements of anticipation or response that combine two or more genres in one "main" genre,

such as Fairclough's (2003) example of television chat that blends the genres of conversation, interview, and entertainment. As discourses, genres may be "disembedded" from a given context and "flow" into others (*ibid.*). For instance, the case study shows that Wikipedia blends a nonconventional, encyclopaedic genre *per se* (identified as the "main") and other genres as further explained in *Section 4*. As for the latter sense, Bazerman (2004: 88) has identified six techniques of intertextual relations, viz., direct and indirect quotation (the former is marked by typographic setting, whereas the latter by a form of re-narration), mentions, comment or evaluation, phrases or terminology associated with another discourse, and texts echoing certain types of communication, discussion, and documents. Fairclough (2003) has also found that intertextuality involves assumptions, i.e., "implicit meanings of texts" that refer to the background of what is unsaid, that is, left implicit. However, intertextuality broadly focuses on both what is included and what is excluded from the events and texts represented by bringing other voices into a text.

In the present analysis, Wikipedia contributors proved to explicitly attribute representations to sources, i.e., *voices*, against the complicated background of the war while excluding other *voices*. In so doing, all the above identified techniques were employed. Thus, the analysis included not only the represented *voices*, but also the *voices* of those who represent such *voices*, – arguably all the existing *voices* (*ibid.*). The re-contextualisation of multiple voices has become problematic as the incorporation of another's discourse involved framing choices related to "authorial account" and reporting speeches (*ibid.*). One issue in reporting concerns the faithfulness to what is reported (through quotations, etc.), which should correspond to what was actually uttered. This is linked to the difference between "direct" – i.e., the exact words – and "indirect" – i.e., a representation of them. The Wikipedia article includes both forms plus free, indirect speech, representing a "mixed" speech form (Maier 2015) that constitutes a form of narration sentence (Schlenker 2004; Eckardt 2015). As a narrative strategy – it is worth noting that indirect report is also known as «Narrative Report of Speech Acts» (Leech and Short 2007: 260) –, free, indirect reporting expresses one's own perspective and ideological stance (Caldas-Coulthard 2008; Espunya 2024; Obiedat 2006) not in neutral terms. Based on previous studies, the author identified the patterns of representation and narration in both direct and indirect speech, including clauses of «projection» (Halliday cited in Caldas-Coulthard 2008: 73), both "projecting" and "projected" clauses (Obiedat 2006). Projection clauses are particularly relevant to the aim of this study since they constitute grammatical realisations of social meaning (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014), constructing how to position *voices* (e.g., attributing ideas shifts agency and responsibility from the contributor to a given actor) and whether they align with, distance themselves from, or contest represented *voices*. In this Wikipedia article, projection is constructed through hypotaxis, transitivity processes of both verbal and mental types, focus on propositional content, mood choices, and shifts in tense (e.g., present or future tenses may become conditional tense) (Obiedat 2006).

4. Case study: *European Union reactions to the Gaza war*

The author has analysed the Wikipedia article *European Union reactions to the Gaza war* ([European Union reactions to the Gaza war - Wikipedia](#)), accessed after the last edit by *Thepharoah17* at 01:18 on 30 December 2025. It was selected since it reveals a "mosaic" of *voices* – translating Kristeva's (1986) idea of reporting as the direct manifestation of individual thought – emerging from numerous, disparate, yet interrelated texts that form intertextuality. Through both direct and indirect speech related to EU statements and press releases, UN statements, NGO criticism, protests, and media reports, this Wikipedia article exhibits layered institutional, humanitarian, journalistic, and contributors' discourses. In so doing, it creates a polyphonic structure, where multiple, conflictual

voices both coexist and contradict one another, thereby resulting in conflicts of perspectives, ideologies, and narratives of events that reflect power relations *outside* Wikipedia. The *voices* of Wikipedia contributors include official EU, dissenting member states, civil protesters, militants, media, and contributors. They prove to intensify the layered, polemic polyphony in a complex network of intertextual relations between this particular article and the texts reported, as further explained in Sections 4.1 and 4.2. Notably, the Wikipedia article operates as a tool for disseminating real-world issues of humanitarian concern and, as such, constitutes an emblematic instance of humanitarian knowledge co-building benefitting from polyphonic and intertextual relations.

4.1 Polyphonic aspects

4.1.1 Dichotomous polemic: Official, diplomatic unity v. individual, moral outrage

The article embeds multiple voices; however, the dominant ones are institutional and state actors – EU bodies and individual member-state leaders. Notably, it portrays intra-EU polemic polyphony, showing internal contradictions. The polyphonic opposition is structured around two incompatible, binomial, evaluative frames, i.e., «self-defence v. terrorism» and «moral/humanitarian v. legal». The former frame involves concerns of security through contrasting lexical choices as follows: “*right to defend itself*” and “*right to self-defence*” against “*terrorist*”, “*heinous*”, and “*barbaric*” attacks. The “general” attitude (early phase) is attributed to the “official” *voice* and leading figure of the EU, i.e., President of EU Commission Ursula von der Leyen, thereby constructing the artificial EU unity and unanimous condemnation of Hamas’s attack on 7 October.

-  European Union: President of the European Commission Ursula von der Leyen said she "unequivocally" condemned "the attack carried out by Hamas terrorists against Israel", calling it "terrorism in its most despicable form" and saying "Israel has the right to defend itself against such heinous attacks".^[33]^[34] EU ambassador to Israel Dimitar Tzantchev condemned the attack.^[35] Israeli flags were raised outside the headquarters of the European Commission and the European Parliament in Brussels, while the latter's president Roberta Metsola led a vigil in the chamber on 11 October to commemorate the Israeli victims of the attack which also featured a minute's silence and a rendition of the Israeli national anthem. The European Council issued a joint statement of 15 October, condemning "in the strongest possible terms" Hamas and its brutal and indiscriminate terrorist attacks.^[36]

Figure 1.

European Union’s “voice” (*Timeline* section, *Initial reactions from member States* subsection)

The choice of free, indirect reporting produces a rhetorical effect: Encyclopaedic neutrality is intertwined with a clear, ideological stance. This is projected through the personal pronoun “*she*”, which derives from the first-person singular used in her post via X ([Ursula von der Leyen su X: “I unequivocally condemn the attack carried out by Hamas terrorists against Israel. It is terrorism in its most despicable form. Israel has the right to defend itself against such heinous attacks.”](#) / X – citation no. 33) that represents the personal positioning rather than the institutional *voice* of the EU. In addition, adjectives such as “*terrorist attacks*” express a strong moral judgment, which is not neutral but laden with evaluative force. Such an adjective signals normative stances embedded in political discourse. Likewise, the use of deontic modality such as in «*Israel has the right to defend itself*» situates moral and legal legitimacy in terms of “entitlement” rather than fact portrayal. The contributors’ selection of official statements and announcements, thus, embraces emerging and silencing ideologies reflecting a security-oriented frame: Hamas is delegitimised as terrorists and a normative lens of International Law is implied by references to “*right to defend itself*”, justifying one party’s actions while condemning others. Despite the *dominant voice* of the EU passing through official documents, such as the *European Council statement*, dissent emerges from individual leaders’ voices. Such a dialogic tension reflects broader, geopolitical and ethical debates.

-  Spain: Prime Minister [Pedro Sánchez](#) strongly condemned what he called terrorism and demanded the immediate cessation of indiscriminate violence against the civilian population, likewise affirming Spain's standing commitment to regional stability.^{[75][76]} Deputy prime minister [Yolanda Díaz](#) called on the international community to put pressure on Israel to stop what she called a massacre in Gaza,^[77] while Minister of Social Rights [Ione Belarra](#) accused the EU and the US of "being complicit in Israel's war crimes" and called for Israel to be denounced before the [International Criminal Court](#) because of what she identified as ongoing "planned genocide" in the Gaza Strip against the Palestinian peoples.^[78] In November 2023, Sánchez criticized Israel's bombardment of the Gaza Strip and called for an "immediate ceasefire". He promised to "work in Europe and in Spain to recognise the Palestinian state".^[79]

Figure 2.

The voices of Spain (*Timeline* section, *Initial reactions from member States* subsection)

The individual *voice* of Spanish Prime Minister Sánchez exemplifies the internal, contrasting perspectives on the war, structuring antagonism that mirrors ideological tensions and power dynamics within EU politics. Indeed, Wikipedia's policies do not resolve this opposition; quite the contrary, they maintain Noy's (2022) "polemic polyphony". *Voices* are not neutralised but reported in a presumably neutral tone. The *voice* of Spain, expressed through first-person plural *we* in his post via X ([Pedro Sánchez su X: "Seguimos con consternación el ataque terrorista contra Israel y nos solidarizamos con las víctimas y sus familiares. Condenamos rotundamente el terrorismo y exigimos el cese inmediato de la violencia indiscriminada contra la población civil. España mantiene su compromiso con la" / X – citation no. 75](#)), is translated into "*he*", as if to distance the two perspectives. Moreover, Spain's Social Rights Minister Belarra's freely reported speech identifies Israel's actions as "*planned genocide*", introducing another internal counter-discourse: An institutional *voice* of a member state defines Israel's actions as "genocide". Polyphony emerges from the conflict between the presumably unified message of the EU and the dissenting positions by single, political actors. The implicit reference to humanitarian debates on the concept of "genocide" contrasts the normative implications, exceeding the Wikipedia article itself.

The latter frame is, indeed, characterised by lexical choices such as "*collective punishment*", "*illegal blockade*", "*international humanitarian law*", "*ceasefire*", and "*genocide*". The normative frame clashes with the humanitarian frame, i.e., the Israeli illegal actions provoked the humanitarian crises. For example, these contrasting *voices* coexist in the same section, viz., *Position in international bodies*.

On 27 October, the United Nations General Assembly [held a vote](#) that saw 120 countries pass a resolution calling for a humanitarian ceasefire and demanding aid be allowed into Gaza. Eight EU countries — Belgium,

Figure 3.

UN "voice" (*Position in international bodies* section)

were working on making their governments support the suit.^[278] On the other side, Austria, Czechia, France, Germany, Hungary and Italy stated their opposition to this case,^{[279][280]} with the Hungarian Foreign Minister condemning the "legal attack launched against Israel" and German Foreign Minister [Annalena Baerbock](#) stating that "Israel's self-defence" against Hamas cannot be considered genocide".^[281] On 26 January 2024,

Figure 4.

Individual member states' "voices" (*Position in international bodies* section)

On 18 January 2024, the European Parliament passed a resolution calling for a permanent ceasefire, although conditional on Hamas releasing the hostages they made on 7 October attacks, as included by the

Figure 5.

EU Parliament "voice" (*Position in international bodies* section)

By rhetorically juxtaposing «*Israel's right to self-defense*» with «*the United Nations General Assembly [...] resolution calling for a humanitarian ceasefire*» and «*the European Parliament passed a resolution calling for a permanent ceasefire*», Wikipedia contributors have emphasised sovereignty, security, and defence, on the one hand, and evoked humanitarian ethics, on the other. They have created a polemic contrast not through explicit disagreement, but syntactically relational

tension between narratives of attacks and defence. This contrast exemplifies two broader attitudes: The geopolitical endorsement of Israel’s military actions and the humanitarian call for a ceasefire.

European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen was criticised for supporting Israel and not calling for a ceasefire while EU's foreign ministers condemned the attack by Hamas but also "called for the protection of civilians and restraint, the release of hostages, for allowing access to food, water and medicines to Gaza in line with international humanitarian law."^[108] Some EU member states — Ireland, Spain, Belgium, Luxembourg, Slovenia, and

Figure 6.

The “voices” of EU Commission President and EU’s foreign ministers (*Development* section)

Here polyphony manifests itself in the coexistence of two utterances in tension: The reiterated support to Israel and condemnation of Hamas’ attack, on the one hand, and the call for protection of Palestinian civilians, on the other. In so doing, the reported utterance attempts to balance military legitimacy and humanitarian principles through the reference to International Humanitarian Law regulations. Intertextuality appears in the text by linking the represented *voice* of Ursula von der Leyen to the citation no. 108, in which the direct quote of Iratxe García’s statement to POLITICO reports «However, as chief representatives of the EU and its institutions, they had the duty to represent the position of the Union as a whole including its Member States» ([Von der Leyen accused of ‘unacceptable bias’ toward Israel – POLITICO](#)).

While the Wikipedia article tends to foreground official statements by leaders and institutional spokespeople, broader *voices* and contested narratives, which the article may not fully integrate, emerge in both citation choices and structure, including the use of “*condemned*” and “*criticized*”. “*Condemning*” carries moral, ethical, and legal disapproval – the verb often recurs in official documents such as EU resolutions –, while “*criticising*” highlights evaluative judgement. In other terms, the former signals unquestionable outrage, whereas the latter may involve further debates. For example, the involvement of the EU as complicit in humanitarian harm is criticised rather than condemned.

4.1.2 Temporary polemic polyphony: Shifts in evaluations

The author explored how polyphony might also be diachronic. The initial and later phases of the war reconstruction, in which the *voices* mentioned shift positions, exemplify Fairclough’s (2003) idea of “re-contextualisation” of events: The same conflict is discursively re-constructed through different orders of discourse over time. The unusual feature concerns the fact that re-contextualisation occurs in the same text, as it doubles: The self (an earlier version of the facts) and the other (later versions) coexist in a single text, composing a multifaceted mosaic.

The initial phase is characterised by a near-unison response to the chain of events during the war in the *Initial reactions* subsection of the *Timeline* section that exhibits low intensity of polemic polyphony. These voices (Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, etc.) repeatedly *condemn* Hamas’s actions and articulate positions expressing solidarity with Israel and support for the Israelis’ right to defend themselves. Throughout the *Timeline* section, contributors frame Hamas’s attack as *terrorism* and emphasise *solidarity* with Israel by reporting official statements from heads of government and foreign ministers. On the other hand, individual member states and political actors (Spain) represent dissonant voices, as aforementioned.

In contrast, later phases in the *Development* section include “*critical*” assessments of both Israeli occupation of and massacre in Gaza and EU early responses to the war by evoking the actual, humanitarian conditions and international legal obligations, further supported in sections such as *EU sanctions against Israel* and *Public opinion*. Such shifts acknowledge that some member states have

become critical of Israel's conduct, while others have maintained neutral or supportive stances toward Israeli security policies. The later phase is, in fact, marked by fragmentation and layered, ideological divergence also due to some member states accusing the EU of double standards. As civilian casualties and humanitarian consequences are foregrounded, the discourse becomes overtly polemic, thereby creating narratives of escalation. Whereas initial statements frame the conflict as a “*terrorist attack*” needing condemnation, later sections illustrate conditionality and accountability. Such a temporal shift underlines how the polemic, narrative orientation evolves from initial solidarity with Israel to increasing emphasis on humanitarian principles and potential policy consequences.

4.1.3 Included and excluded voices

The article structure positions overtly normative, institutional evaluations (official condemnations) expressing the *voices* of the EU and single, political actors, alongside more descriptive, public opinion and protest *voices*. This creates a sort of heteroglossia where multiple voices with distinct authority and purpose appear. Although debates around civil letters and criticism of EU inaction exist *outside* Wikipedia, the article foregrounds unified positions rather than disagreements. It does not systematically present counter-discourses (e.g., protests and critical academic interpretations) alongside official statements, thus obscuring competing frameworks for interpreting and reconstructing the war-event. This structural choice marginalises the presence of several, dissenting voices. Notably, absent and under-represented *voices* include explicit narratives from Palestinian voices within the EU context, Israel's official push-back against EU criticisms, and non-EU, global perspectives that would complicate EU legitimacy claims. These absences themselves are part of the polyphonic texture: The lack of certain voices shapes narrative perception, thereby creating narrative gaps, and may privilege official EU and member state perspectives over others. For example, humanitarian critiques of Israel's military conduct represent some marginalised ideologies, while the attribution of structural causes to the conflict (e.g., occupation and blockade) is largely absent from the institutional reactions and only exists in public protests. The article does not include direct statements from either Palestinian civilians, residents of Gaza, militants, or humanitarian actors whose perspectives may contest dominant, political narratives. Quite the contrary, their experiences are presented via reported statistics, e.g., polls and death tolls, respectively in *Public opinion* and *Background / References* sections. Also, Palestinian civilians are evoked through mass protests and public opinion solidarity.

Since the start of the Israeli operation, more than 33,000 Palestinians in Gaza have been killed,^[13] including over 14,000 children and 9,000 women.^{[14][15]} Several thousand more are missing and presumed trapped under rubble.^{[16][17]} Nearly all of the strip's 2.3 million population has been internally displaced.^[18] Israel's tightened blockade with cut off food, clean water, medicine, and attacks on infrastructure have led to a humanitarian crisis in the Gaza Strip, including a collapse of the healthcare system and an ongoing famine, leading to accusations that Israel is using starvation as a weapon of war.^{[19][20][21]} By early 2024, Israeli forces had destroyed more than half of Gaza's houses,^[22] hundreds of cultural landmarks,^[23] 38-48% of tree cover and farmland^{[24][25]} and dozens of cemeteries.^[26] Israel's ground invasion started on 27 October, focusing initially on northern Gaza, including Gaza City. After the expiration of a seven-day truce which involved the release of dozens of Israeli hostages for Palestinian prisoners, Israel moved south to attack Khan Yunis on 3 December. By January 2024, Israel reoccupied most of northern Gaza.^{[27][28][29]} Israel's next stated objective is a major offensive in Rafah, despite objections from the international community. Israeli forces claim to have killed an estimated 9,000 Palestinian militants during the conflict^[30] while the latter killed over 250 Israeli soldiers.^[31]

Figure 7.
Humanitarian crisis in Gaza (*Background* section)

The juxtaposition between the “*Israeli operation*” and the several causes of civilian suffering in Gaza (in the last subparagraph of the *Background* section) creates an implicit tension between security narratives and actual, humanitarian concerns. The use of the passive voice in «*Palestinians in Gaza have been killed*», in which the agent is omitted, shifts the attention from accountability and agency to abstract, human suffering. The agency only appears in material clauses such as «*Israeli forces had destroyed more than half of Gaza’s houses*», undermining the value of the human right to live.

4.2 Intertextual aspects

4.2.1 Genre and style

Wikipedia stands as a nonconventional, encyclopaedic genre *per se* (identified as the “main”) by hybridising several lexicographic genres, such as «general and specialized encyclopedias, almanacs, and gazetteers» in the English-language edition ([Wikipedia:Five pillars - Wikipedia](#)). These incorporated “subgenres” constitute the textual “chains” (Fairclough 2003) of Wikipedia while representing its “known” features that characterise its relative stability as a “speech genre” (Bakhtin 1986). Nevertheless, according to the present, intertextual analysis, participatory writing through the wiki tool involves the incorporation of other genres depending on two factors, i.e., the style adopted by the individual contributor and the subject area of Wikipedia article. As a matter of fact, intertextuality can be traced in the Wikipedia article under analysis through the reformulation of rhetorical discourses typical of and relevant to political discourse.

The presence of institutional actions, positions, and public debates conveying an orchestra of voices, displays its remarkable feature as a polyphonic genre, representing Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of “heteroglossia”. Multiple, conflictual, both internal and external *voices*, discourses, linguistic registers, styles of reporting, and ideological perspectives emerge. In fact, neutrality is not achieved by silencing *voices*, but by structuring them in a layered polyphony. From the polemic polyphony perspective (Noy 2022), the text does not merely juxtapose voices; it organises them along latent, conflictual axes, allowing ideological struggle to unfold implicitly. Indeed, the article provides a detailed description of the actions and reactions taken by the EU and international leaders. Polyphonic and intertextual elements together reveal a discursive field marked by contestation, divergence, and de/legitimacy, which are far from *NPOV* despite the encyclopaedic purpose.

Notwithstanding, this article overlaps historical and political elements, though remaining primarily an encyclopaedic – thus referential – genre in purpose and overall structure. Indeed, newsworthy events are written in a typical, encyclopaedic style rather than purely historical. Timelines are used as in conventional encyclopaedias to briefly inform on the context. By contrast, one distinguishable feature of political genres – such as directives, regulations, and resolutions – may be the use of formal, diplomatic language, e.g., “strongly condemned”, to convey authority and political legitimacy. Most importantly, this Wikipedia article includes reported speeches introducing intertextuality that functions as embedded, political discourse within the encyclopaedic genre. It strives for balanced reporting, as usual in Wikipedia. Yet the selection of quotes and events – e.g., the repeated condemnations of Hamas, the repeated affirmation of Israel’s right to defend itself, and the absence of direct Palestinian *voices* – creates narrative tensions that may shape the reader’s comprehension by privileging certain rhetorical frames. This produces a meta-discursive effect building political evaluations into the supposedly neutral, encyclopaedic frame.

4.2.2 *Direct, indirect, and free, indirect reporting: Uses and strategies*

The Wikipedia contributors employ reporting forms that characterise the generic structure of the article. The prevalence of indirect reporting and free, indirect reporting is demonstrated by the total number of their uses, i.e., 125 times. Out of these, 41 introduce the term *condemned* throughout the article. While *told*, *suggested*, *stated*, *said*, *alleging* constitute verbal process, *condemned* may be intended as both a verbal process uttering a judgement (“*condemned the attack*”) and a mental process as internally judging or disapproving. Such reported speeches are attributed to specific *voices* of EU and international leaders or are cited as sources, e.g., official documents and newspaper articles (e.g., *Politico* and *Al-Jazeera*).

The intertextual analysis has also shown that the various forms of reporting create a complicated network of evaluations, assessments, and events that constitute a form of narration. Notably, as intertextual features, reporting speeches are marked by projection clauses elements, including the verbal process. For example, «*President of the European Commission Ursula von der Leyen said she “unequivocally” condemned “the attack carried out by Hamas terrorists against Israel*» and «*Sanchez criticized Israel's bombardment of the Gaza Strip and called for an “immediate ceasefire*» show the contrast between what are generally perceived as, respectively, “ethical” and “judgemental”. Such evaluations function as legitimation or delegitimation, thus shaping moral and political interpretations of the conflict; projecting a moral alignment with not all the victims around the world.

On the interpersonal level of tenor (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014), the modal verb “should” projects different moods of EU reactions to the Gaza war, appearing in declarative statements, often recommendations, by both EU leaders and institutions to express what is assumed to be “right” or desirable in those situations, rather than mandatory. For example, “should” is used in this sense in the indirect report as follows: «*On 10 April 2024, the UN's special rapporteur on Palestine Francesca Albanese said that the EU should suspend ties with Israel to prevent crimes of genocide in Gaza*» (*Development* section).

Direct reporting is used, for example, in «*The Ministry of Foreign Affairs made a statement on X, said that “Denmark shares the concern of EU and others regarding a potential Israeli military offensive in Rafah where more than half of Gaza's population is seeking refuge.”*» in the subsection *Rafah military operation*. It introduces a vague polyphony by mentioning the “European Union” as a coherent unity, but the absence of individual voices of the EU confers a form of neutral authority to the utterance, hiding actual divergences between the single EU member states.

On the other hand, indirect reporting such as «*Iran's attacks have drawn criticism from the United Nations, several world leaders, and political analysts, who warned that they risk escalating into a full-blown regional war.*», in the subsection *April 2024 Iranian strikes in Israel*, exhibits a contradiction: “Criticism” breaks the seeming *NPOV* and opens to a polemic dimension, introducing a third party's POV, thereby creating a counter-discourse. Also, it shifts the focus from the Israeli invasion and genocide in Gaza to Iran's effort to destabilise Israel – which further layers the discourse involving other discourses such as Iran's financial aid to Hamas for arguably Islamic expansion (see Fatima, Azam, and Naz 2025).

Lastly, the *References* section provides instances of free, indirect reporting in which Trump's reported discourse is framed as authoritative and monologic.

199. ^ “Trump says US will take over Gaza and all Palestinians should relocate”[†]. *Sky News*. Retrieved 7 February 2025.

200. ^ “Spain says Palestinians must stay in Gaza, rejecting Trump's proposal to resettle them”[†]. *Reuters*. 5 February 2025.

Figure 8.

Trump's reported voice (*References* section)

This reporting depicts those in power as anti-dialogical or “monologue”, in Bakhtin’s (1981) terms. This exhibits his attitude as *deaf* to other perspectives and portrays as having the last word, characterising the authoritative and monologic qualities of his discourse. “Trump says” is a projecting clause that realises the verbal process, while the two projected clauses realise the material process. The verbal clause is used to construct the future experience projected in the two material clauses, which are marked respectively by the median modality of probability (will) and of obligation (should). “Will” expresses either prediction or volition, whereas “should” recommendation. In both cases, no other perspectives are considered, e.g., if Palestinians agree.

5. Conclusion

From a CDA perspective, drawing on Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of “polyphony” and Kristeva’s (1986) concept of “intertextuality” that were further developed by Noy (2022) and Fairclough (1992a, 1992b, 2003, 2010), the Wikipedia article emerges not as a unified or neutral account of the EU’s reaction to the Gaza war but as a polyphonic space where knowledge is co-built through the convergence of heterogeneous and conflictual voices and intertextual relations between them. Notably, references and reported speeches – e.g., official statements, press releases, and institutional actors – arguably foreground a dominant, official *voice* – i.e., that of the EU – that mirrors diplomatic discourse, while single EU member states and political actors alongside external voices contradict such an official narrative. In this sense, Wikipedia functions as a crossroads of dialogic, varied, authoritative *voices*: A hybrid genre shaped by dense, intertextual relations (as product) and by a polemically structured multiplicity of conflictual voices (as process).

Furthermore, the selection of reporting and of *voices* is ideologically consequential. By privileging formal condemnations and institutional evaluations and by marginalising perspectives critical of EU responses and not centred on civilians’ experiences, the article orients readers toward sovereignty and security-based frames over humanitarian and legal-oriented ones. Reported speeches mainly operate as representative speech acts by means of free, indirect dialogues, in which “voices” are treated as forms of action rather than mere opinion, thereby narrativising political events and attributing evaluative force to them.

In conclusion, the tensions emerging from divergent, member-state positions, institutional standards, and evolving, geopolitical actions generate a layered and contradictory polyphony, while omissions create equally meaningful silences. In this context, knowledge is produced through the reconciliation of conflicting multiplicity within a single entry, which however extends by means of intertextuality *beyond* the web page to the wider cultural and historical systems in which it circulates. Further research may include the analysis of metaphors to integrate other insights into the intertextual structure that characterises this article.

References

- Alfaro M. J. M., 1996, “Intertextuality origins and development of the concept”, *Localización: Atlantis: Revista de la Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos*, 18 (1-2): 268-285.
- Ashkinaze J., Guan R., Kurek L., Adar E., Budak C., Gilbert E., 2024, “Seeing Like an AI: How LLMs Apply (and Misapply) Wikipedia Neutrality Norms.”, *ArXiv abs/2407.04183*.

- Baker M., 2006, "Translation and Activism: Emerging patterns of narrative community", *The Massachusetts Review*, 47 (3): 462-484.
- Baker M., 2014, *Translation as Re-narration* in J. House (ed.) *Translation: A multi-disciplinary approach.*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke: 158-177.
- Bakhtin M., 1981, *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*, M. Holquist, C. Emerson (transl./eds.), University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Bakhtin M., 1986, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, C. Emerson, M. Holquist (eds.), University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Bakhtin M., 1999 (1963), *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo*, C. Emerson (transl./ed.), *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 8th ed., 8, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis - London.
- Barthes R., 1973, *Le plaisir du texte*, Seuil, Paris.
- Bazerman C., 2004, *Intertextuality: How Texts Rely on Other Texts* in C. Bazerman, P. A. Prior (eds.), *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Mahwah, NJ: 83-96.
- Benkler Y., 2006, *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Bloor M., Bloor T., 2013, *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*, Routledge, London.
- Caldas-Coulthard C. R., 2008, "Reporting speech in narrative discourse: stylistic and ideological implications Reporting speech in narrative discourse: stylistic and ideological implications", *Ilha do Desterro*, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis: 67-82.
- Cress U., Kimmerle J., 2008, "A systemic and cognitive view on collaborative knowledge building with wikis.", *Computer Supported Learning*, 3: 105-122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-007-9035-z>
- Eckardt R., 2015, *The Semantics of Free Indirect Discourse: How Texts Allow Us to Mind-Read and Eavesdrop*, Brill, Leiden, Neth.
- Eco U., 1962, *Opera aperta. Forma e indeterminazione nelle poetiche contemporanee*, Bompiani (La Tipografica Varese), Milano.
- Eco U., 1979, *Lector in fabula. La cooperazione interpretativa nei testi narrativi*, Bompiani, Milano.
- Eco U., 2009, *Ho sposato Wikipedia?*, Espresso.it.
- Eom Y.-H., Shepelyansky D. L., 2013, "Highlighting entanglement of cultures via ranking of multilingual Wikipedia articles", *PLoS One*, 8 (10): 1-21.
- Espunya A., 2024, "Narrative Report of Speech Acts as characterization resource in Mansfield Park and its Spanish and German translations", *Language and Literature*, 33 (1): 25-43.
- Fairclough N., 1992a, *Discourse and social change*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Fairclough N., 1992b, "Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis", *Discourse and Society*, 3: 193-217.
- Fairclough N., 2003, *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*, Routledge, London.
- Fairclough N., 2010, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, 2nd ed., Routledge, London.
- Fairclough N., Fairclough I., 2016, *Textual Analysis* in M. Bevir, R. A. W. Rhodes (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science*, Routledge, London and New York: 186-198.
- Fatima M., Azam S., Naz A., 2025, "The Role of Iran in Israel-Palestine Conflict.", *Insights: Journal of Humanities and Media Studies Review*, 2 (1).
- Gatto M., 2012, *Centrifugal and centripetal forces in web 2.0 genres: The case of Wikipedia* in S. Campagna, G. Garzone (eds.) *Evolving genres in web-mediated communication*, Peter Lang Linguistic Insights 140, Bern: 151-174.

- Gatto M., 2016, “MAKING HISTORY. Representing “Bloody Sunday” in Wikipedia.”, *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 19: 179-196.
- Gatto M., 2020, *Wikipedia nella didattica della traduzione. Il caso di Translatathon@Uniba*. in C. Petrucco, V. Gallo (eds.), *Wikipedia in Academia*, Padova University Press, Padova: 143-154.
- Gatto M., 2024, “The Power and Politics of Online Collaborative Genres during the Covid-19 Information/Health Crisis”, *Iperstoria*, 23: 85-105.
- Goldberg G., 2010, “Rethinking the public/virtual sphere: The problem with participation”, *New media & Society*, 13 (5): 739-754.
- Goldenberg D., Reed P., Fall 2008, “What is Participatory Practice?”, *Fillip*, 8. Accessed on 17/06/2026 <https://fillip.ca/content/what-is-a-participatory-practice>
- Halliday M. A. K., Matthiessen C. M. I. M., 2014, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.*, 3rd ed., Routledge, London.
- Jiménez-Crespo M. A., 2015, “Collaborative and volunteer translation and interpreting”, *Researching translation and interpreting*, Routledge, London: 58-70.
- Jiménez-Crespo M. A., 2017, *Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Johnson I., Kaffee L.-A., Redi M., 2024, *Wikimedia data for ai: a review of wikimedia datasets for nlp tasks and ai-assisted editing.*, *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Advancing Natural Language Processing for Wikipedia*, 91-101.
- Jones H., 2018, “Wikipedia, Translation, and the Collaborative Production of Spatial Knowledge.”, *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, 38: 264-297.
- Kanhubua N., Nguyen T. N., Nieder.ée C, 2014, *What triggers human remembering of events? A large-scale analysis of catalysts for collective memory in Wikipedia*, *IEEE/ACM Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, London: 341-350.
- Kill M., 2012, *Teaching Digital Rhetoric: Wikipedia, Collaboration, and the Politics of Free Knowledge* in B. D. Hirsch (ed.), *Digital Humanities Pedagogy*, Open Book Publishers.
- Knight C., Pryke S., 2012, “Wikipedia and the University, a case study.”, *Teaching In Higher Education*, 17 (6): 649-659.
- Kristeva J., 1980, *The Bounded Text* in T. Gora, A. Jardine, L. S. Roudiez (transl.), L. S. Roudiez (ed.), *Desire in Language: a semiotic approach to literature and art by Julia Kristeva*, Columbia University Press, New York: 36-63.
- Kristeva J., 1986 (1966), *Word, Dialogue and Novel* in T. Moi (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader.*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Leech G., Short M. H., 2007, *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, Longman, London - New York.
- Lotman J., 2005, “On the semiosphere”, W. Clark (transl.), *Sign Systems Studies*, 33 (1): 205-229.
- Lukin A., 2017, “Ideology and the text-in-context relation.”, *Functional Linguist*, 4 (16): 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-017-0050-8>
- Maier E., 2015, “Quotation and unquotation in Free Indirect Discourse”, *Mind Lang*, 31: 345-73.
- Massa P., Scrinzi F., 2013, “Manypedia: Comparing language points of view of Wikipedia communities”, *First Monday*, 18 (1). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v18i1.3939>
- Moskaliuk J., Kimmerle J., Cress U., 2012, “Collaborative knowledge building with wikis: The impact of redundancy and polarity.”, *Computers and Education*, 58 (4): 1049-1057.
- Noy C., 2022, “Polemic polyphony Voices of the fools and the righteous in Sheikh Jarrah, East Jerusalem”, *Pragmatics and Society*, 13 (5), John Benjamins Company, London: 815-836.
- Obiedat N., 2006, “The pragma-ideological implications of using reported speech. The case of reporting on the Al-Aqsa intifada”, *Pragmatics*, 16 (2/3): 275-304.

- Pork A., 1989, "The Concept of 'Ideological Struggle': Some Soviet Interpretations", *Government and Opposition*, 24 (3), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 283-293.
- Redi M., Gerlach M., Johnson I., Morgan J., Zia L., 2021, "A Taxonomy of Knowledge Gaps for Wikimedia Projects (Second Draft)", *arXiv:2008.12314v2*.
- Savski K., 2020, "Polyphony and polarization in public discourses: hegemony and dissent in a Slovene policy debate.", *Critical Discourse Studies*, 17 (4): 377-393.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2019.1609537>
- Scardamalia M., Bereiter C., 2003, *Knowledge Building*, *Encyclopedia of Education*, 2nd ed., Macmillan Reference, New York: 1370-1373.
- Schlenker P., 2004, "Context of thought and context of utterance: a note on free indirect discourse and the historical present", *Mind Lang*, 19: 279-304.
- Shirky C., 2008, *Here comes everybody: The power of organizing without organizations*, Penguin Press, New York.
- Shuttleworth M., 2018, "Translation and the Production of Knowledge in Wikipedia: Chronicling the Assassination of Boris Nemtsov.", *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, 38: 231-263.
- Toffler A., 1980, *The Third Wave*, William Morrow and Company, New York.
- Zwischenberger C., 2022, "Online collaborative translation: its ethical, social, and conceptual conditions and consequences.", *Perspectives*, 30 (1): 1-18.

Websites

[Wikipedia:Five pillars - Wikipedia](#)

[List of Wikipedias - Wikipedia](#)

[Wikipedia:Neutral point of view - Wikipedia](#)

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multi-licensing>

[List of Wikipedia controversies - Wikipedia](#)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union_reactions_to_the_Gaza_war

[Ursula von der Leyen su X: "I unequivocally condemn the attack carried out by Hamas terrorists against Israel. It is terrorism in its most despicable form. Israel has the right to defend itself against such heinous attacks." / X](#)

[Pedro Sánchez su X: "Seguimos con consternación el ataque terrorista contra Israel y nos solidarizamos con las víctimas y sus familiares. Condenamos rotundamente el terrorismo y exigimos el cese inmediato de la violencia indiscriminada contra la población civil. España mantiene su compromiso con la" / X](#)

[Von der Leyen accused of 'unacceptable bias' toward Israel – POLITICO](#)