Attitudinal and Epistemic Dimensions of Evaluation: Form, Meaning and Discursive Contexts
Attitudinal and Epistemic Dimensions of Evaluation: Form, Meaning and Discursive Contexts

ANNA RUSKAN
Approved for publication by the Board of the Faculty of Philology of Vilnius University on February 28, 2020 (Minutes No 18000-TP-3)

Reviewers:

Associate Professor Dr Birutė Ryvitytė, Vilnius University

Associate Professor Dr Marta Carretero, Complutense University of Madrid

The bibliographic information about the publication is available in the National Bibliographic Data Bank (NBDB) of the Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania


© Anna Ruskan, 2020
© Vilnius University, 2020
Contents

Acknowledgements 5
List of abbreviations 6
List of figures 6
List of tables 6
Preface 7

PART I: Attitudinal Dimension of Evaluation 9

Unit 1 Attitudinal stance (Biber et al. 1999) 12
1.1 Content and realisations of attitudes 13
1.2 Attitudinal stance markers in discourse 17
1.3 Tasks 18

Unit 2 Attitudes in the Appraisal Framework (Martin & White 2005) 22
2.1 Semantic distinctions of attitudes and their expression in discourse 22
2.1.1 Affect 26
2.1.2 Judgement 29
2.1.3 Appreciation 31
2.2 Ambiguity of attitudes, their co-occurrences and complexity 32
2.3 Grading of attitudes 35
2.4 Tasks 38

PART II: Epistemic Dimension of Evaluation 43

Unit 3 Epistemic modality 48
3.1 Definition of epistemic modality, degrees of commitment and realisations 48
3.1.1 Modal auxiliary verbs 48
3.1.2 Lexical verbs 51
3.1.3 Adverbials, adjectives and nouns 54
3.2 Epistemic modal expressions in discourse 57
3.3 Tasks 60

Unit 4 Evidentiality 65
4.1 Definition of evidentiality, evidential values and their realisations 65
4.2 Inferences and their expression 67
4.2.1 Verbs of perception 67
4.2.2 Verbs of seeming 71
4.2.3 Adverbials, adjectives and nouns 72
4.3 Reports and their expression 74
4.3.1 Verbs of speaking 75
4.3.2 Verbs of auditory perception and verbs of seeming 77
4.3.3 Adverbials 78
4.4 Evidential expressions in discourse 80
4.4 Tasks 82

Primary sources 89
Secondary sources 91
Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the two reviewers of the coursebook: Associate Professor Dr Marta Carretero and Associate Professor Dr Birutė Ryvitytė for their constructive comments and professional advice in improving the original manuscript of the coursebook. Their thorough reviews have contributed considerably to the revised version of the manuscript. I greatly appreciate Marta Carretero’s helpful suggestions concerning the categorisation of attitudinal and epistemic stance, interpretation of examples and a number of formal issues, the revision of which resulted in a more reader-friendly text. I am genuinely grateful to Birutė Ryvitytė for her valuable advice on the design of tasks and visualisation of categories as well as for her editorial comments.

I deeply appreciate the enthusiastic support of my colleagues and friends at the Department of English Philology of Vilnius University. My heartfelt thanks are due to Aurelija Usonienė, who has always been willing to share her expertise in modality and evidentiality. This coursebook would not have been possible without her encouragement to participate in research projects and conferences and her generous support throughout the years. Participation in the EVIDISPRAG Project (reference number FFI2015-65474-P MINECO/FEDER, UE), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and the European Regional Development Fund, has greatly facilitated the development of the materials for the coursebook. My warm thanks go to Audronė Šolienė and Jolanta Šinkūniienė for their helpful suggestions and friendly advice while designing the coursebook. I am also grateful to Rita Juknevičienė for her insightful remarks concerning the original manuscript and to my students for their eagerness and perseverance in tackling the topics of attitudes, modality and evidentiality.

Lastly, I give my thanks to my beloved family and friends, who have been my strong support and source of inspiration.
List of abbreviations

ADJ – adjective
AL – applied linguistics
BS – business
CTP – Complement-Taking-Predicate
FIC – fiction
MAG – magazine
MSC – miscellaneous
N – noun
NEWS – newspaper
SFL – Systemic Functional Linguistics
SPOK – spoken
V – verb

List of figures

Figure 1. Types of stance (Biber et al. 1999) 12
Figure 2. Expressions of stance (Biber et al. 1999; Biber & Zhang 2018) 12
Figure 3. Categories of the Appraisal framework (Martin & White 2005) 22
Figure 4. Frameworks for the epistemic dimension of evaluation 44
Figure 5. Notions of epistemic stance (Biber et al. 1999) 46
Figure 6. The category of epistemicity (Boye 2012) 46
Figure 7. Types of evidential values 65

List of tables

Table 1. Attitudinal markers 16
Table 2. Types of Attitude and its expression (Martin & White 2005; Bednarek 2010) 25
Table 3. Types of Affect (Bednarek 2008) 28
Table 4. Types of Attitude and its subcategories (Martin & White 2005) 34
Table 5. Subcategories of Graduation (Martin & White 2005: 154) 37
Table 6. Epistemic notions in Chafe’s framework (1986) 45
Table 7. Epistemic modal expressions 56
Table 8. Grammatical and lexical evidential devices 66
Table 9. Inferential verbs, adverbials, adjectives and nouns 74
Table 10. Reportive expressions 79
Preface

The aim of this coursebook is to acquaint senior undergraduate and postgraduate students of linguistics with the notion of evaluation and its different dimensions in discourse. The coursebook can be used for self-study and in courses guided by a lecturer, and it might also be addressed to students or scholars whose main interest is only the attitudinal or the epistemic dimensions of evaluation rather than both dimensions.

The coursebook focuses on two fundamental axes of evaluation by illustrating the wide scope of the category. The first axis concerns the evaluation of reality in terms of polarity, which involves the identification of positive and negative opinions and evaluations, and can be referred to as the attitudinal dimension of evaluation, whereas the second axis involves the assessment of the truth value of reality (true/false) and its evidentiary validity and can be defined as the epistemic dimension of evaluation. In this coursebook evaluation is viewed as a category encompassing a variety of the author's judgments, feelings and assessments, including epistemic and non-epistemic qualifications of reality and provides answers to questions “why, when, how, and what speakers and writers evaluate” (Hunston & Thompson 2000: 5-6).

The decision to incorporate two distinct dimensions of evaluation in a single coursebook can be motivated by the following reasons. First, students will gain awareness of the breadth and diversity of the notion of evaluation. Second, they will acquire the capacity to distinguish between evaluative meanings connected with modality and evidentiality and non-modal evaluation. Third, students will obtain knowledge about tools to investigate different dimensions of evaluation and plan their individual studies. Lastly, a study into different evaluative expressions will foster improvement of students’ production and comprehension of different discourse types and genres.

The coursebook comprises two parts, each consisting of two units. Part one introduces the attitudinal dimension of evaluation by drawing on the frameworks for attitudinal stance (Biber et al. 1999) and Appraisal (Martin & White 2005). Part two presents the epistemic dimension of evaluation by providing the realisations and illustration of the categories of epistemic modality and evidentiality within the category of epistemicity (Boye 2012). To facilitate students’ comprehension of the frameworks discussed and to prompt the design of their individual studies, much attention is paid to the illustration of the categories of attitude, epistemic modality and evidentiality, their formal realisations and discourse contexts. The data exemplifying various categorial distinctions have been drawn from corpora: The British National Corpus (BNC), Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), The TV Corpus (TV), The Movie Corpus (Movie), Corpus of American Soap Operas (SOAP), Corpus of Online Registers of English (CORE), Corpus of US Supreme Court Opinions (CUSSCO), from newspapers: The Guardian, The Telegraph and The New York Times as well
as from political speeches. Each unit of the coursebook is followed by a set of tasks designed to help students critically assess the approaches discussed and creatively apply them in different discourse and text types.

Hopefully, this coursebook will spark students’ interest in a linguistic inquiry, as evaluation permeates all spheres of life and is firmly entrenched in discourse, for “every word has its charge of evaluation: when we speak or write, even in those messages whose main role is to transmit information with a high degree of objectiveness, we design our utterances with the purpose of presenting a certain world view to the addressee” (Taboda & Carretero 2012: 277). Evaluations occur in spoken and written discourse, in different text types, and in the discourse of people representing different social and cultural backgrounds (Römer 2008: 115). Social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and other platforms) expand the broad field of evaluation by introducing “e-evaluation” (Thompson & Alba-Juez 2014: 13), which adds to the diversity and appeal of the study of evaluative language. Different dimensions of evaluation make it a complex and context-dependent category with many “faces”, where acts of evaluation “can be made manifest through the different subsystems of appraisal, by means of an ironic comment, some kind of judgement, the expression of one’s feelings, or a combination of all or some of these in a layered or overlapping fashion” (Thompson & Alba-Juez 2014: 6-7). Thus, the coursebook provides students with an opportunity to consider the complex nature of evaluation and to explore its realisations and role in a variety of genres in spoken and written discourse.
Evaluation is a broad area encompassing a variety of meanings and expressions. It may cover “the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about. That attitude may relate to certainty or obligation or desirability or any of a number of other sets of values” (Hunston & Thompson 2000: 5). Part one deals with the attitudinal dimension of evaluation concerned with a wide range of comments on reality (i.e. people, events, situations, processes, products, etc.) expressing various emotions and/or value judgements. For instance, works of art, politicians and implementation of their policies may be subject to evaluation. In (1), the mastery of Bruegel's paintings is appreciated; in (2) the British parliament’s rejection of the Brexit deal is criticised:

(1) Bruegel's drawings are exceptional for the time, a unique pictorial account of the city in which he was working, the activities of daily life he saw around him, and the clothing and behavior of its inhabitants. The prints remain a rich source of information about urban life in the Low Countries in the middle of the sixteenth century. (COCA, ACAD)

(2) The latest rejection of Theresa May's deal has created another element of uncertainty over Brexit, at a time when investors are desperately seeking clarity. (COCA, MAG)

Example (1) illustrates the author’s positive assessment of the entity, whereas example (2) provides a negative opinion of the MPs rejecting the Brexit deal, which has caused uncertainty and lack of clarity for investors in the UK. The attitudinal dimension of evaluation has been mainly covered within the frameworks for stance (Biber et al. 1999) and Appraisal (Martin & White 2005), widely applied in different types of discourse and genres (Hyland & Tse 2005; Biber 2006; Hyland 2008; Taboada & Carretero 2012; Taboada et al. 2014; Gray & Biber 2015). Conceptual categories of attitudes within both frameworks share a number of similarities (expression of feelings, personal assessments, value judgements), however, formal realisations of attitudinal assessments differ. Within the category of stance, grammatical expressions of attitudes (e.g. adverbials, complement clauses, modal verbs, etc.) are emphasised, whereas Appraisal advocates a lexical-semantic approach to attitudinal meanings or “a discourse semantic system” (Martin & White 2005: 45), which looks at how attitudes unfold at discourse level and what impact they create upon the audience. Unit 1 deals with the grammatical realisations of attitudes by drawing on “attitudinal stance” in Biber et al. (1999), whereas Unit 2 covers lexical and discourse expressions of attitudes by relying on the Appraisal framework in Martin and White (2005).
The point of departure for analysing different attitudes is identification of their target, i.e. what is assessed. Attitudinal markers may express evaluation of various entities (Hunston & Thompson 2000: 3-4), for example individuals, things, places, events, processes, states of affairs, propositions, etc. In the literature, the entities mentioned above are classified into first-order, second-order and third-order entities (Lyons 1977). Individuals and things are considered as first-order entities, which are located in space and time, may be referred to and “properties may be ascribed to them” (ibid. 442-443). For instance, in example (3) provided below, the author evaluates a French singer Camille by judging the singer’s vocal performance (howls like a wolf, sings audacious harmonies), her movements on the stage (dances like a galloping horse) and her overall unpopular artistic choices (maverick singer):

(3) A Camille concert is an extraordinary experience. Over two hours, the maverick singer writhes barefoot on the floor, dances like a galloping horse, howls like a wolf, sings audacious harmonies with a trio of backing vocalists and hits the kind of high notes that might only be audible to dogs. (Lewis, The Guardian)

Events, processes and states of affairs are second-order entities, “which are located in time and which, in English, are said to occur or take place, rather than to exist” (Lyons 1977: 443). In (4), Michelle Obama relates her anxiety during her first piano performance when she was a little girl, which illustrates the evaluation of an event (performing), i.e. a second-order entity:

(4) I was anxious about performing, even though back at home in Robbie’s apartment I’d practised my song practically to death. (Obama 2018: 15)

Third-order entities pertain to propositions, defined as abstract unobservable entities which lie outside space and time (Lyons 1977: 445) and present “a piece of information of the world that may be true or false” (Carretero 2016: 36), as shown in (5):

(5) Some German conservatives fear that proposals like de Maiziere’s may tear the party apart by moving it more to the left <…>. (COCA, NEWS)

What is evaluated is the proposition (the information that proposals like de Maiziere’s may tear the party apart by moving it more to the left). Third-order entities “can be asserted or denied, remembered or forgotten; they can be reasons, but not causes” and “may function as the objects of such so-called propositional attitudes as belief, expectation and judgement” (Lyons 1977: 445). Third-order entities (propositions), in contrast to second order entities (states-of-affairs), “can be said to have a truth value” (Boye 2012: 192).

Examples (3)-(5) above evoke the negative polarity of evaluation and illustrate a distinction between authorial (3)-(4) and non-authorial (5) evaluation. In (3)-(4), the evaluator is the author of the text, whereas in (5) the feelings of fear are attributed to German
conservatives. Non-authorial evaluation does not encode the author’s attitude, but it may imply some other evaluation. For instance, “the evaluative meaning of non-authorial affect can depend on the reader/hearer’s attitude towards the trigger or on social rules and expectations concerning emotional experience” (Bednarek 2008: 159). First-person and third-person accounts of emotional experience may vary in the degree of subjectivity and negativity/positivity parameter. First-person accounts tend to be more positive, whereas third-person reports may convey more negativity (Precht 2000 in Bednarek 2008: 159). In the following example from an editorial in The Telegraph, a negative third-person report serves to voice the positive authorial opinion:

(6) **Crispin Blunt MP described the Prime Minister’s statement on Brexit as “the most shameful surrender by a British leader since Singapore in 1942.”** That seems a bit unfair both to Theresa May and to Winston Churchill since there was no way to save Singapore once it had been occupied by the Japanese, while Mrs May denied it was she who was the obstacle to leaving the EU; it was Parliament. ([https://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/2019/03/26/faced-difficult-situation-mrs-may-offers-obfuscation/](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/2019/03/26/faced-difficult-situation-mrs-may-offers-obfuscation/))

The source of the third-person report, Crispin Blunt MP, expresses his annoyance with Theresa May, the Prime Minister, whereas the authors of the text (editors) defend her by stressing that she does not deserve the sharp criticism voiced by the MP. Thus, third-person reports may be deployed for the revelation of the authorial voice.
Unit 1 Attitudinal stance
(Biber et al. 1999)

As mentioned above, one of the ways to analyse various attitudes voiced by the author is the framework for stance (Biber et al. 1999), which includes not only the attitudinal dimension but also epistemic assessments as well as the category of style of speaking (Figure 1). This section of the coursebook considers only the attitudinal dimension, the core of which is the emotional element of the author’s judgement.

It is important to note that in the framework for stance developed by Biber et al. (1999), a clear distinction is drawn between lexical and grammatical or lexico-grammatical expressions of stance (Figure 2). The former include various “value-laden words” embedded in a proposition, as shown in (3) and (4) above, and the latter incorporate adverbials, complement clauses (example 5) and modal/semi-modal verbs.

It is argued that lexical marking of stance “differs from grammatical stance marking in that it involves only a single proposition, rather than a stance relative to some other proposition” (Biber et al. 1999: 968). This difference will be addressed in the following sections. Stance marked by lexical devices “is inferred from the use of an evaluative lexical item, usually an adjective, main verb, or noun” (Biber 2006: 89; Biber & Zhang 2018: 118). Lexical and grammatical/lexico-grammatical means of stance are “two complemen-

1 Biber and Zhang (2018) suggest the term of “evaluation” for attitudes and epistemic assessments expressed by lexical devices. “Stance” is used with reference to grammatical/lexico-grammatical coding of the speaker’s attitudes and epistemic judgement.
Attitudinal Dimension of Evaluation

1.1 Content and realisations of attitudes

In Biber et al.’s framework, the author’s attitudes are discussed within the semantic category of “attitudinal stance”, which subsumes the expression of attitudes or evaluations, personal feelings and emotions (Biber et al. 1999: 974). Markers of attitudinal stance include adverbials, complement clauses as well as modal and semi-modal verbs. Attitude adverbials (e.g. *sadly*, *hopefully*, *fortunately*) may convey “an evaluation, value judgment, or assessment of expectations” (Biber et al. 1999: 865):

(7) *I’m sorry I dragged you both into my fight, but, hopefully, this trip will end the Hand’s story in all of our lives.* (TV)

(8) *All right, uh, I hadn’t thought of that problem. Luckily, I have two more ideas.* (TV)

In (7), the proposition *this trip will end the Hand’s story in all of our lives* is modified by the attitude adverbial *hopefully*. Similarly, in (8) the adverbial *luckily* expresses the author’s emotions regarding the proposition *I have two more ideas*. The content of attitudes includes the notions of right and wrong (e.g. *correctly*, *incorrectly*, *rightly*, *wrongly*), wisdom (*cleverly*, *cunningly*, *sensibly*, *wisely*), satisfaction (e.g. *delightfully*, *pleasingly*) or dissatisfaction (e.g. *annoyingly*, *disappointingly*) (Quirk et al. 1985: 621-622), expectations² (e.g. *surprisingly*, *amazingly*, *astonishingly*), hopes and wishes (e.g. *hopefully*, *regrettably*) (Aijmer 2008: 15). Attitude adverbials are also referred to as “commentary markers” or “evaluative markers”, for they express the author’s evaluation of the proposition (Aijmer 2008: 14). It should be noted that attitude adverbials may be part of the propositional content expressed by the clause in which they are constituents, as illustrated in (9), or they may be outside the propositional scope, as shown in (10):

(9) *Miss Ellis writes cleverly and without wasting words.* (BNC, NEWS)

(10) *Cleverly, Ginn seems to have installed a genuinely nice guy.* (COCA, MAG)

² Evaluative markers expressing surprise may be related to the category of mirativity (Aijmer 2008: 33).
In (9), *cleverly* modifies the verb *writes* and functions as a manner adverb, whereas in (10) it modifies the proposition *Ginn seems to have installed a genuinely nice guy* and acts as a sentence adverb. In both examples the attitude adverbial *cleverly* expresses evaluation. Among lexico-grammatical patterns coding multiple attitudinal assessments are “attitude” verbs (e.g. *expect, fear, feel, forget, hope, mind, pretend, require, wish, worry*) controlling *that*-clauses or “desire/intention/decision” verbs (e.g. *hate, hesitate, hope, intend, like, love, mean, need, plan, prefer, prepare, refuse, want, wish*) controlling to-complement clauses (Biber 2006: 92), e.g.:

(11) *And despite the interpersonal tensions of the past year, I feel that* we have all grown stronger. My James is a shining example. (TV)

(12) *But your house is clearly failing, so I wish to* withdraw my investment. (TV)

Alongside verbs expressing various attitudes are also adjectives divided into affective/emotion adjectives (e.g. *amazed, aware, concerned, disappointed, encouraged, glad, happy, hopeful, pleased*) and adjectives expressing evaluation (e.g. *bad/worse, good/better/best, convenient, essential, important, interesting, necessary, nice, reasonable, silly, smart, stupid, surprising*), ability or willingness (e.g. *(un)able, anxious, careful, determined, eager, eligible, hesitant*) and ease or difficulty (e.g. *difficult, easier, easy, hard, (im)possible*) (Biber 2006: 93), e.g.:

(13) *That Matt kid sounds pretty tough. I’m amazed that* they got rid of him. (TV)

(14) *Sully was, let’s say, disappointed to hear you’ve been freelancing.* (TV)

(15) *It is amazing that you still have a job. I know, really.* (TV)

(16) *It’s really disappointing to see him walking out and being so ungrateful.* (TV)

In the examples above, the affective adjectives *amazed, disappointed, amazing and disappointing* provide a different perspective of the authorial stance regarding the information in the complement clauses. In (13)-(14) *amazed* and *disappointed* foreground the author’s stance, whereas in (15)-(16) *amazing* and *disappointing* background the author’s stance (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 672). The source of the attitude in (15)-(16) is hidden, which “increases the factivity of a statement and provides writers with a means of varying evaluation as an explicit and negotiable proposition” (Hyland & Tse 2005: 42) and “implicitly suggests that these are generally held evaluations, extending beyond the personal attitudes of the author” (Gray & Biber 2015: 229). Examples (15)-(16) are cases of extraposition and can be paraphrased by “That you still have a job is amazing” and “To see him walking out and being so ungrateful is really disappointing”. Biber (2006: 93) also mentions stance nouns followed by a *that* or to-clause (e.g. *hope, right, responsibility, threat, wish, willingness*):

(17) *I know you are sincere, Mr. Dove, sincere in your hope that the world will be righted and renewed.* (TV)
(18) *I felt it was my responsibility to deliver your orders personally.* (TV)

In the examples above, the content evaluated is explicit, as the complement clauses lie within the scope of the attitude nouns. The evaluated content can also be retrieved from the preceding or following discourse (Gray & Biber 2015: 242), as shown below:

(19) *[A system of levels with a clear description of the tasks encompassed in each provides a good guide to the general difficulty of a particular task.] This is useful both to the teacher planning a course of instruction and to the item writer when constructing assessments.* (Gray & Biber 2015: 238)

(20) *[The proliferation/differentiation balance of the steady state shifts towards stem cell renewal, resulting in increased stem cell number, genesis of new crypts, new cell lineages and mucosal replacement.] This phenomenon may be important in any application of enterocyte stem cell transplantation.* (Gray & Biber 2015: 239)

(21) *The important point is [that coronals tend to be the assimilated segments in both adjacent and nonadjacent assimilations].* (Gray & Biber 2015: 240)

In (19) and (20) the proposition evaluated by the adjectives *useful* and *important* occurs in the preceding discourse (in square brackets). Reference to the proposition is marked by the pronoun *this* (19) and the noun phrase *this phenomenon* (20). In (21), the attitude adjective *important* is used attributively and the phrase *important point* qualifies the proposition in the following discourse (in square brackets).

Attitudinal stance may also be expressed by modal and semi-modal verbs (grammatical devices), which in Marín-Arrese’s framework for stance (2011: 194-195), alongside other grammatical attitudinal markers (personal predicates, e.g. *we are required to*, *I want to*, impersonal predicates, e.g. *it is essential to*, *it is fair to*), are considered as instances of effective stance, defined as “the positioning of the speaker/writer with respect to the realization of events, to the ways in which the speaker/writer carries out a stance act aimed at determining or influencing the course of reality itself” (Marín-Arrese 2011: 195). Modal and semi-modal verbs function as attitudinal markers when they express the author’s requirements, intentionality, desirability, obligation imposed on the addressee and permission granted to the addressee. Intentionality and desirability are realised by the modal verbs *will*, *will not*, *would*, *would not*; obligation is coded by the modal verbs *must*, *should* and semi-modals *have to*, *ought to*, *need to*; and permission and capacity are expressed by the modal verbs *can*, *could*, *may* and *might*:

(22) *Er, yes I will invite Mr Perry to address the question of cost.* (BNC, SPOK)

(23) *She added: ‘We feel we have been duped. A stop must be put to it immediately.’* (BNC, NEWS)
Both parties need to do a better job of reaching out to those individuals, to those hardworking families, and providing job training, matching people and giving them new skills for new jobs. (COCA, SPOK)

In the literature the attitudinal meanings above coded by modal and semi-modal verbs have been considered within the categories of deontic, dynamic and boulomaic modalities (Carretero et al. 2007). Deontic modality includes the meanings of obligation (must, have to), recommendation (should, ought to), permission (can, may), negative recommendation (shouldn’t) and prohibition (mustn’t, can’t, may not) (ibid. 95). Dynamic modality comprises the meanings of tendency (will, would, won’t, wouldn’t) and capacity (can, could), whereas boulomaic modality refers to desirability and wishes (will, would, won’t, wouldn’t) (ibid. 96-98). The meanings of the modal and semi-modal verbs above are gradable. For instance, must and have to express a higher degree of obligation than should and ought to. Similarly, tendencies marked by will and would express a higher degree of predisposition than capacity marked by can and could (ibid. 97).

Thus, within the category of attitudinal stance developed by Biber et al. (1999) as well as within the category of effective stance (Marín-Arrese 2011) emphasis is laid on a variety of lexico-grammatical or grammatical devices expressing attitudes (affect, evaluation, ease/difficulty, ability/willingness, requirement, necessity, obligation, intentionality). A list of attitudinal stance markers is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Attitudinal markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKERS OF ATTITUINAL STANCE</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials</td>
<td>hopes and wishes, e.g. fortunately, hopefully, regrettably expectation, e.g. amazingly, astonishingly, surprisingly right and wrong, e.g. rightly, wrongly wisdom, e.g. cleverly, sensibly (dis)satisfaction, e.g. annoyingly, delightfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + that-clause</td>
<td>attitude, e.g. expect, fear, feel, forget, hope, mind, prefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + to-clause</td>
<td>desire/intention/decision, e.g. hate, hope, intend, like, love, want, wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective + that/to-clause</td>
<td>affect/intuition/emotion, e.g. amazed, concerned, glad, happy, pleased evaluation, e.g. important, good, necessary, silly ability/willingness, e.g. (un)able, determined, hesitant, willing ease/difficulty, e.g. difficult, easy, (im)possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + that/to-clause</td>
<td>attitude, e.g. hope, responsibility, right, willingness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal and semi-modal verbs</td>
<td>intentionality, desirability, e.g. will, will not, would, would not obligation, e.g. must, should, have to, ought to, need to capacity and permission, e.g can, could</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Attitudinal stance markers in discourse

Alongside expressions of epistemic stance, attitudinal stance markers (adverbials, complement clauses, modal and semi-modal verbs) have been extensively investigated in academic discourse (Hyland & Tse 2005; Biber 2006; Gray & Biber 2015). The study into verb, adjective and noun that-complement clauses in academic abstracts representing a variety of hard and soft science disciplines shows that attitudinal markers were less frequent than epistemic ones (Hyland & Tse 2005: 50). Attitudinal that-constructions were mainly found in business (25) and computer science and in applied linguistics (26):

(25) Our **hope** is [that similar approaches can be used to describe other aspects and types of emergent retail formats]. (BS) (Hyland & Tse 2005: 53)

(26) ... it is **hoped** [that the framework will be applied to other contexts and provide a basis for analysis of the situation of English in national contexts]. (AL) (Hyland & Tse 2005: 53)

In the examples above, the authors express favourable attitude towards “the direction or outcome of the research” and propose “a coherent research plan, positively evaluating both relevance and value” (Hyland & Tse 2005: 53). However, in academic abstracts, unlike in student writings, attitudes do not cover expressions of affect (like, dislike), expectation or obligation (ibid. 56).

Although in academic discourse expressions of attitudinal stance are not as frequent as realisations of epistemic stance, they are important in expressing an array of evaluative positions (Biber 2006: 114). Attitudinal stance adverbials play a key role in class management talk where they express the instructor’s personal attitudes (Biber 2006: 105), as shown in examples below:

(27) **There’s quite a bit to go into with that but that’s hopefully** given you some idea of how electricity works. (BNC, SPOK)

(28) **Unfortunately** this anaesthetist wasn’t very good and he didn’t give her enough. (BNC, SPOK)

Attitude verbs controlling that-clauses help to shape “directive discourse” and are most common in written course management (syllabi, etc.) as well as in institutional writing and spoken classroom management (Biber 2006: 108). Verbs of desire (e.g. want, like) controlling to-clauses are frequent in class management, office hours, and service encounters (spoken registers) and in institutional writing and course management (written registers) (Biber 2006: 109). Textbooks and course packs contain a number of attitudinal
adjectives controlling to-clauses (ibid. 113). The most common attitudinal adjectives in academic writing include the meanings of ease/difficulty and evaluation. They “typically assess propositions as important, interesting, desirable, necessary, reasonable/unreasonable, and useful” (Gray & Biber 2015: 232).
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1.3 Tasks

1. Identify expressions of attitudinal stance in the following contexts. Are they lexical or grammatical expressions of stance? Is it authorial or non-authorial stance?

a. I was four when I decided I wanted to learn piano. (Obama 2018: 8)
b. Despite my resistance to the hype that had preceded him, I found myself admiring Barack for both his self-assuredness and his earnest demeanor. He was refreshing, unconventional, and weirdly elegant. (Obama 2018: 98)
c. And finally, appalingly, at the end of lunch Barack lit a cigarette, which would have been enough to snuff any interest, if I’d had any to begin with. (Obama 2018: 98-99)
d. Barack was cerebral, probably too cerebral for most people to put up with. (This, in fact, would be my friend’s assessment of him when we next spoke.) (Obama 2018: 101)
e. He was modest and lived modestly, yet knew the richness of his own mind and the world of privilege that would open up to him as a result. <…> He could be light-hearted and jokey, but he never strayed far from a larger sense of obligation. (Obama 2018: 101)
f. My work was interesting and rewarding, but still I had to be careful not to let it consume me. I felt I owed that to my girls. (Obama 2018: 210)
g. I craved routine and order, and he did not. He could live in the ocean; I needed the boat. (Obama 2018: 211)
h. I didn’t want to be some sort of well-dressed ornament who showed up at parties and ribbon cuttings. I wanted to do things that were purposeful and lasting. My first real effort, I decided, would be the garden. (Obama 2018: 219)
i. But the drum was already beating. It was hard to make it stop. (Obama 2018: 220)
j. If people flipped through a magazine primarily to see the clothes I was wearing, I hoped they’d also see the military spouse standing next to me, or read what I had to say about children’s health. (Obama 2018: 332)
2. Identify expressions of grammatical stance and entities they evaluate (propositions or states of affairs). Specify the content of the attitudes expressed.

a. I mean, why would he lie? Why? Because Miranda had won. Because he hated to lose. Because he’s a vindictive, trouble-making bastard. (TV)
b. You know, it’s, um... it’s interesting that you’re the one that doesn’t trust me. (TV)
c. It is necessary that good men intervene to show these ladies the error of their ways. (TV)
d. Put it down! The chamber’s empty. Only he’s too stupid to count to six. (TV)
e. So you’re still determined to marry the Englishmen? I am determined to rule my country. (TV)
f. It’s stupid to let other people decide what is okay and what’s not. (TV)
g. It’s difficult to see who loses from this arrangement. (TV)
h. The glacier is right over there. And we are right over here. Annoyingly, again, they were right. Between the cheat and the ice field was a deep river and a lake full of icebergs. (TV)
i. Live from Batsfjord, Norway... where over 300,000 fans have travelled to the Arctic Circle... to see the legendary metal band, Dethklok, perform just one song. Surprisingly the song itself is a jingle. A coffee jingle. Never before have so many people travelled so far for such a short song. (TV)
j. Well, I was so anxious to help Mario get some customers. His food really is wonderful. (TV)

3. Identify attitude verbs and nouns controlling complement clauses in the following sentences.

a. “It is our hope that Congress will act in a bipartisan manner to ensure law enforcement personnel receive high quality, evidence-based training in non-lethal de-escalation tactics,” they wrote. (COCA, NEWS)
b. In all likelihood, European nations will band together to force a bad deal on Britain in order to protect European unity and defend their core principles. Perhaps May got the message: In recent days she has backed off her threat to leave the EU without a deal, after the government realized this would wreak economic havoc. (COCA, MAG)
c. It shows the entire scale of Clinton’s willingness to do anything and everything to gain power and wealth at all cost. (COCA, SPOK)
d. “I wish that an important aspect to this process had played out differently. It didn’t have to be this way,” McConnell said on Friday. (COCA, MAG)
e. This is fascinating, Don, and I expect to see more in the next month. (COCA, SPOK)
f. Fifty years into his career Dylan remains an intriguing figure in no small part because of the music, which has been uncompromising and varied and meaningful in different ways to different people over a long span of time. <...> And there’s his reluctance to over-share details of his life and art, which infuses the whole thing with a mystique that would be difficult to create and maintain in the digital age. (COCA, NEWS)
g. This decision creates an opportunity to review the history of municipal bankruptcy judicial selection. (COCA, ACAD)
h. Consequently, Congress’s failure to use express language to negate the reference canon is quite revealing. (COCA, ACAD)

i. Teachers often complain that they can not get their students to complete or attempt homework assignments. (COCA, ACAD)

4. In the contexts below, identify the attitudinal meanings of the modal and semi-modal verbs in bold.

a. I could smell the citronella that I put on my skin to ward off the mosquitoes and feel the breeze beginning to rise from the river. (BNC, FIC)

b. You cannot blame people for being defensive. (BNC, ACAD)

c. Can I count on the support of my friends and family? (BNC, NEWS)

d. A decision was made that the delivery should be by Caesarean section. (BNC, ACAD)

e. Will you have time to do that again and make more candy and cookies, too? (COCA, FIC)

f. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. (COCA, NEWS)

g. You want me to do you a favor, I certainly will. Just like I know you’d do a favor for me. (COCA, FIC)

h. They’ve got the wrong person. This person just would not do that. When he would get in an argument with another driver over some silly thing, and Chris would just walk away from it. He would not fight. (COCA, SPOK)

i. We must not turn our backs on each other. We must not be indifferent to each other. We must all stand together to reject violence and strengthen our communities. (COCA, NEWS)

j. Don’t forget you are grape growers and winemakers. There ought to be a harmony between the winemaker’s intent and the grapes themselves. (COCA, NEWS)

5. Compare the frequency of attitude adverbials per million words in different types of discourse in COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English). Are the adverbials more frequent in written or spoken registers? How can you account for these frequencies? Why is the frequency of hopefully considerably higher in spoken discourse than in the other types of discourse? Do positive or negative attitudes prevail?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA</th>
<th>SPOK</th>
<th>FIC</th>
<th>MAG</th>
<th>NEWS</th>
<th>ACAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happily</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadly</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortunately</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfortunately</td>
<td>59.31</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>49.72</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hopefully</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regrettable</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Compare the frequencies of attitudinal markers per 10,000 words in a travel blog, personal blog, news report/blog and sports report in the CORE (Corpus of Online Registers of English). Which registers favour attitude adverbials and why? Which adverbials are most frequent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Travel blog</th>
<th>Sports blog</th>
<th>Personal blog</th>
<th>News Report/Blog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>surprisingly</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>18.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astonishingly</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amazingly</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoyingly</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappointingly</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Compare the distribution of expressions of attitudinal stance in a research article from the humanities and medicine. What attitudes prevail in each discipline? What markers (modal verbs, complement clauses, adverbials or “value-laden words”) are most common?
Unit 2 Attitudes in the Appraisal Framework (Martin & White 2005)

An alternative framework for exploring the author’s attitudes was designed by Martin and White (2005). As mentioned in the previous subsection, Appraisal offers a lexical semantic approach to attitudinal meanings developed within the theoretical approach of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), regarded as “a multi-perspectival model, designed to provide analysts with complementary lenses for interpreting language in use” (Martin & White 2005: 7). SFL adheres to the view that language contains resources to express ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings/metafunctions that may be located at different levels of language (phonology and graphology, lexicogrammar and discourse semantics) (Halliday & Hasan 1989). Ideational metafunction of language is concerned with the coding of experience (processes/events happening in place and time). Interpersonal metafunction deals with the negotiation of social relations (speaker/hearer interaction/relationship). Textual metafunction pertains to the organisation of discourse, i.e. connection between parts of discourse concerned with ideational and interpersonal metafunctions (ibid.).

Appraisal is defined as “an interpersonal system at the level of discourse semantics” (Martin & White 2005: 33) that consists of “three interacting domains”, namely Attitude, Engagement and Graduation (ibid. 35), visualised in Figure 3.

The following subsections provide an overview of the semantic distinctions of the domain of Attitude, means of expression of various attitudinal assessments and ways of their intensification and mitigation (drawing on the domain of Graduation). The domain of Engagement is not considered in the following subsections, since it is closely connected with the epistemic dimension of evaluation, covered in Units 3 and 4.

2.1 Semantic distinctions of attitudes and their expression in discourse

The Appraisal framework (Martin & White 2005), adapted and extended in a number of studies dealing with evaluation in various genres and domains (wine reviews,
fiction, newspaper discourse, conversation, academic discourse) (cf. Bednarek 2008; Hommerberg & Don 2015; Su 2016), provides fine-grained semantic distinctions of attitudes, divided into Affect, Judgement and Appreciation (Martin & White 2005: 35-36). Affect pertains to the expression of emotions (1); Judgement refers to assessment of character and behaviour according to established social norms and ethical principles (2); and Appreciation shows evaluation of natural phenomena or aesthetic qualities of non-human entities (3) (ibid.):

(1) Oh no, I absolutely adore this area. (TV)

(2) But Lagerfeld was never a joke. He was the cleverest man in the fashion industry, with a deep love of culture and respect for learning. <...> A voracious reader in four languages, he would drop poetry into conversation – Emily Dickinson in English, Giacomo Leopardi in Italian, Rainer Maria Rilke in German and Catherine Pozzi in French. (Cartner-Morley, The Guardian)

(3) The hypermarché-sized Chanel store which he installed in the Grand Palais, with models walking between aisles filled with double-C branded household goods, was a mischievous commentary on the power of branding, and a brilliant piece of the fashion theatre at which Lagerfeld excelled. (Cartner-Morley, The Guardian)

The examples above illustrate the evaluation of first-order entities (Lyons 1977), namely individuals, places and things. The expression of Affect, Judgement and Appreciation can be realised by single lexical units (nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs) or phrases. For example, the verb adore (1) marks the author’s affectual assessment of the place; the noun a joke, the adjectives cleverest and voracious (2) as well as the verb excelled (3) exemplify judgemental lexis appraising the famous designer Karl Lagerfeld; and the attributive adjectives hypermarché-sized, double-C branded, mischievous and brilliant (3) express positive Appreciation of the fashion industry created by the designer. The phrases with a deep love of culture and respect for learning and drop poetry into conversation (2) illustrate the meaning of Judgement. Although most frequently Judgement concerns the evaluation of persons and ethics and Appreciation deals with the assessment of non-personal entities and aesthetics, there may be cases of aesthetic evaluations about humans and ethical evaluations about non-personal entities, as illustrated below:

(4) You’re a beautiful woman, Maude. You should never be left alone. (TV)

(5) My dad thought that Prohibition was an immoral law. (TV)

Thus, (4) is considered as an instance of positive Appreciation, whereas (5) is a case of negative Judgement. Although Appraisal provides a lexically based approach to meaning and is text oriented (Thompson 2008: 170), expressions of Affect, Judgement and
Appreciation can be identified through the “grammatical frames” they occur in (Martin & White 2005: 58). For example, instances of Affect occur in a frame containing “a relational attributive process with a conscious participant involving the verb feel” (e.g. *I feel disappointed today*). The frame of Judgement includes “a relational attributive process ascribing an attitude to some person’s behaviour” (ibid. 59) (e.g. *It was smart of him to continue his medical studies*). The frame of Appreciation involves “a mental process ascribing an attitude to a thing” (ibid. 59) (e.g. *I consider it interesting*). Despite the distinction of “grammatical frames” for each type of attitude, Affect, Judgement and Appreciation may co-occur in the same frame. For instance, in the examples “I felt disgusted with them for provoking him”, Affect and Judgement co-occur, whereas in the example “I felt disgusted with/by the smell” Affect and Appreciation are illustrated (Martin & White 2005: 61).

“Grammatical frames” or the wording of attitudes can resolve fuzzy boundaries between the subcategories of Appreciation and Judgement (Thompson 2008: 178). For instance, in the sentences “He was catching the ball brilliantly” and “His catches were brilliant” the distinction between Judgement and Appreciation is clear. In the first sentence the person’s ability to catch a ball is judged (action), whereas in the second sentence the result of the action is appreciated (ibid.). The sentence “His catching was brilliant” presents a question whether the appraised entity is action (Judgement) or the result (Appreciation). On the one hand, human behaviour is judged; on the other hand, the result of behaviour is appreciated. According to Thompson (2008), the type of the category of attitude should be determined by the wording of evaluation. The scholar maintains that “wherever possible, I would argue that the wording should be taken as the basis for the initial assignment of categories” (Thompson 2008: 180). Thus, in the sentence “His catching was brilliant”, the result is appreciated. Similarly, the descriptions of the entities like “a kind word” or “vicious rumor” appraise the results of behaviour rather than judge a person (Thompson 2008: 179).

Expressions of Affect have been considered as “emotion lexis” and expressions of Judgement and Appreciation as “opinion lexis” (Bednarek 2010). Types of attitude have been linked with complement patterns of evaluative adjectives (Su & Hunston 2019). Adjectives encode a variety of attitudes when followed by *that/wh/ing* and *to* clauses (6, 7), prepositional phrases (8), and occurring in extraposed (9), and *wh*-cleft constructions (10):

(6) Well I was **worried that** you would find this hard to deal with. (Movie)

(7) One of my best collections. I’m **pleased how** it turned out. (Movie)

(8) You know, sir, you’re really getting quite **good at** predicting these things. (Movie)

(9) But it is **exciting to** see you bring a whole new skill set to our little family business. (Movie)
Now, what is surprising is to hear a man be so honest and forthcoming about his flaws. (Movie)

Very few patterns correlate with only one attitudinal meaning, since most patterns are multifunctional (Su & Hunston 2019). As it is not always possible to find a meaning and form correlation between attitudinal meanings, a decisive criterion should be the target of evaluation (human target or thing target) and attitudinal lexis (emotion lexis, opinion lexis) (Martin & White 2005: 59; Su & Hunston 2019). Attitudes of Affect, Judgement and Appreciation should be considered within the context of an individual text because they are “meaning-based rather than form-based” (Su & Hunston 2019). The content of the category of attitude and its expression are provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>emotion lexis</td>
<td>words, phrases, stretches of discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>opinion lexis</td>
<td>“grammatical frames”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>opinion lexis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples above illustrate explicit realisations of attitudes, as they contain evaluative lexis. However, attitudinal meanings may also be implied (Martin & White 2005). Implicit attitudes are not coded by single lexical items or lexico-grammatical patterns but they arise from the content of the utterance or “ideational meanings which redound with affectual meanings <...>” (Martin 2000: 155), as illustrated below:

(11) Despite The Favourite entering the night with 10 nominations, it was the only award given to the film. (Bradshaw (b), The Guardian)

(12) This is work that is going undone, by a Tory administration that has been wholly consumed by Brexit for nearly three years and that now admits it cannot lead even on that. Forget Brexit in name only. Right now we are a country saddled with a government in name only. (Freedland, The Guardian)

In (11), a critical opinion of the film is implied by the fact that it was nominated for several categories but won an Oscar only for one category. In (12), the ruling Conservative party has been criticised for being inefficient in implementing various policies across the UK as well as for unsuccessful negotiations of the process of Brexit. The negative polarity of the evaluated entities above (the film, Brexit and Tory administration) is implied but not conveyed through explicit evaluative lexical items. With implied attitudes, the evaluative span may embrace a longer stretch of discourse. Lexically explicit attitudes, as shown in (1)-(10), are inscribed, whereas implicit attitudinal meanings, illustrated in (11)-(12), are
invoked (Martin & White 2005). In this coursebook, both explicit and implicit attitudinal meanings are considered.

The type of discourse or text determines the distribution of various attitudes (Martin 2000: 146). Affect is more likely to be found in fiction, personal comments, blogs; Judgement is common in opinion columns/editorials; and Appreciation permeates various types of reviews (film/theatre/book/car/food/hotel/restaurant/architecture, etc.).

2.1.1 Affect

Affect is mainly concerned with the revelation of the author’s or other people’s emotions, which “are an essential part of what makes us all human” (Bednarek 2008: 2). Affect can be described along the following parameters: positivity/negativity, manifestation of affect (signs of behaviour or internal experience or “ongoing mental state”), the trigger of emotions or its absence, the scale of the intensity of feelings, reality/unreality of stimulus and types of affect (Martin & White 2005: 46-49). Analysis of Affect in individual studies may be based on all parameters outlined in the framework or on selected features. Parameters deserving special interest and comments are triggers of Affect, types of Affect and reality/unreality status of the stimulus of affectual assessments.

Types of Affect outlined by Martin and White (2005: 49) include un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction, which may be triggered by a number of factors. The set of emotions making up un/happiness involves sadness, hate, happiness and love, which can manifest themselves as “the moods of feeling happy or sad, and the possibility of directing these feelings at a Trigger by liking or disliking it” (ibid. 49). These feelings express how well a person can relate to other people, to the environment he/she finds himself/herself in. For example, a person can feel affection towards someone by showing this through his/her behaviour (13) or by his/her “internal experience” (14):

(13)  She smiled too, **blushing** with relief, for finally she had a sign of warmth from him. (COCA, FIC)

(14)  You know, my dear, I’m **extremely fond of** your husband, but to tell you the truth I think you could have done... far, far better. (TV)

In/security pertains to the feelings of peace and anxiety which relate to the person’s well-being in society (ibid. 49), as illustrated in (15) below. Dis/satisfaction involves the feelings of “achievement and frustration in relation to the activities in which we are engaged, including our roles as both participants and spectators” (ibid. 50). The person may be interested in an activity, paying attention to the task (16), or may display his/her lack of interest (17):
(15) I worry about the cleanliness and safety of the beach for myself and my 2-year-old son. (COCA, NEWS)

(16) I’ve just been so engrossed in this project. And I’m really into it <...> (TV)

(17) I’ve been fed up with the way this has gone, and I’m tired. (TV)

In their description of types of Affect, Martin and White (2005: 48) draw a distinction between actual and potential feelings, with the latter representing “irrealis affect”. The set of “irrealis” emotions includes the feelings of fear and desire and is referred to as “dis/inclination” category (the latter is not presented as a separate type of Affect). The feelings of fear are shown to express negative emotions, whereas the feelings of desire are shown to be positive:

(18) Again, it is really fear of lawsuits that’s preventing this technology. (COCA, SPOK)

(19) I want to make a point about the liberal bias. (COCA, SPOK)

As illustrated above, all types of Affect are differentiated along the parameters of positivity and negativity (e.g. love-hate; anxious-calm; surprise-trust; interested-bored; fear-desire). However, it has been argued that not all emotions can be regarded as positive or negative, for they can be neutral or ambiguous, as evidenced by corpora examples illustrating the emotions of surprise, fear and desire (Bednarek 2008: 157). Martin and White’s illustration of surprise as a negative emotion within the category of in/security is not well-founded (Bednarek 2008: 161). Surprise should be distinguished as a separate type of Affect alongside un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction (ibid. 161). Similarly, the opposition drawn between fear (negative emotion) and desire (positive emotion) making up the category of dis/inclination in Martin and White’s (2005) categorisation should be reconsidered. Bednarek (2008: 165-166) proposes to draw an opposition between emotions expressing desire (volition) and non-desire (non-volition), claiming that dis/inclination is neither negative nor positive. The scholar (Bednarek 2008: 167) suggests five types of Affect: un/happiness, in/security, dis/satisfaction, surprise and dis/inclination. In her classification the emotion of fear is found within the category of in/security and dis/inclination includes emotions expressing desire (miss, long for, yearn for, want) and non-desire (refuse, reluctant, disinclined) (ibid. 165). Types of Affect outlined by Martin and White (2005) and Bednarek (2008) are presented in Table 3, adopted from Bednarek (2008: 169).
Table 3. Types of Affect (Bednarek 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>un/happines</td>
<td>un/happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhappiness</td>
<td>happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misery, antipathy</td>
<td>cheer, affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in/security</td>
<td>in/security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insecurity</td>
<td>security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disquiet, surprise</td>
<td>confidence, trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/satisfaction</td>
<td>dis/satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissatisfaction</td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ennui, displeasure</td>
<td>interest, pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/inclination</td>
<td>dis/inclination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disinclination</td>
<td>inclination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td>desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike Martin and White (2005: 51), Bednarek notices that emotions in all categories (un/happiness, in/security, dis/satisfaction, dis/inclination, surprise) can “relate to an irrealis trigger” (ibid. 166). For example, hypothetical feelings of surprise (20), desire (21), happiness (22), dissatisfaction (23) and insecurity (24) are illustrated in the following contexts:

(20) *I would be very surprised if they do reach those figures.* (BNC, SPOK)

(21) *Well if I married you I would want to have the name Signe Laine-Dempsey.* (BNC, FIC)

(22) *Many consumers might be happy to pay a small premium for the reassurance of sunny meadows.* (BNC, MAG)

(23) *He would be angry if she preferred her mother's help to his.* (BNC, FIC)

(24) *Other situations can be potentially fearful for a horse.* (BNC, MSC)

Expressions of Affect and their role in different types of discourse have been analysed in narratives, news reports and political discourse. Investigating patterns of evaluation in three different genres\(^3\) of journalistic discourse, namely in news reports, analyses and commentaries, Martin and White (2005: 174) found out that instances of Affect mostly occur in news reports. But it should be noted that Affect in news reports is attributed to

---

\(^3\) The authors use the term of “voice” of a news report, analysis and commentary.
the third party, i.e. an external source (25) or projected by the writer onto participants of the situation (26):

(25) ‘Clearly we are disappointed,’ said a spokesman, James Worsley. (BNC, NEWS)

(26) Angry crowds gathered outside a police station in Bootle on Merseyside last night. (BNC, NEWS)

The feeling of disappointment in (25) is attributed to a spokesman but not to the author/reporter of the text. Various affectual assessments are abundant in political discourse, for example in parliamentary debates, presidential debates and other genres of political discourse. As shown in a study into press releases of the Labour party and the populist UKIP party in the UK (Breeze 2019), emotive judgements and assessments constitute an important part of both parties’ discourse. Regarding the question of migration, the UKIP party resorts to the emotions of fear and anger, whereas the Labour party expresses concern.

2.1.2 Judgement

Alongside Affect, another type of attitude identified by Martin and White (2005) is Judgement, which conveys an assessment of a person’s character and behaviour. Attitudinal judgements are described by the parameters of “social esteem” and “social sanction” (Martin & White 2005: 52-53). “Social esteem” deals with the appraisal of a person’s special character features, abilities and competence as well as determination. The target of Judgement is often a famous person (e.g. a singer, an actor, a politician, a scientist, etc.), whose character, skills and willpower may be subject to social esteem. For example, Stephen Hawking’s personality and contribution to physics received wide media coverage after his death in 2018. On the one hand, the scientist was admired for his exceptional competence (27) and strong will and determination to overcome difficulties caused by his illness (28); on the other hand, he also received criticism, as he could not be equalled to Einstein (29):

(27) Hawking’s published work, disconnected from the legend of the man, reveals him to be a physicist of the highest calibre, who will be remembered in particular for some startlingly inventive and imaginative contributions to the field of general relativity. (Ball, The Guardian)

(28) Equally astonishing was the life that Hawking wrought from that excruciatingly difficult circumstance. (Ball, The Guardian)

(29) Hawking’s enthusiasm for a “theory of everything” highlights how he didn’t share Einstein’s breadth of vision in science, but focused almost exclusively on one subdiscipline of physics. (Ball, The Guardian)
In the original framework, the parameter of “social esteem” is described by such notions as “normality”, “capacity” and “tenacity”, which express positive and negative assessments (admiration, criticism) made by society when judging others (Martin & White 2005: 53). However, it should be noted that the boundaries between these notions may be blurred. The evaluation of a physicist of the highest caliber marks not only Stephen Hawking's high intellectual powers (“capacity”) but also emphasises his outstanding personality (“normality”). “Tenacity” is made explicit by referring to the astonishing life that the scientist managed to live despite the excruciatingly difficult circumstance (28), i.e. his illness. The parameter of “social sanction” involves judging a person’s behaviour according to some rules, laws and regulations established within a society and is described by the notions of “veracity”, i.e. truthfulness, honesty, and “propriety”, i.e. decency, righteousness (Martin & White 2005: 53):

(30) It’s no coincidence the kind of civil servant we need -- highly skilled, independent, tough, served under Democratic and Republican administrations -- was also fired by Trump after she refused to sign onto the president’s unconstitutional travel ban when she was acting attorney general. (COCA, NEWS)

(31) Seeking to raise doubts about Trump’s “temperament” to be commander-in-chief, Clinton mocked the mogul’s penchant for picking fights on social media. (COCA, NEWS)

A news extract in (30) portrays a civil servant as a woman of high integrity (the value of “veracity” is construed) because she did not agree to sign the president’s controversial travel ban, whereas in (31) Donald Trump is mocked by Hillary Clinton for his tendency to trigger quarrel and controversy on social media (the value of “propriety” is created). Judgements of character and behaviour are common in argumentative journalistic discourse, which contains reflection about politicians’ morality, actions, promises, etc. The topic of Brexit has received wide-ranging discussion and debate in the British press, resulting in conflicting opinions about the governing party and the Prime Minister Theresa May, who did not finalise the deal of exiting the EU:

(32) Mrs May’s inability to secure a majority for her withdrawal agreement suggests that her command over parliament is evaporating. There is virtually no chance that she can push through the agreement before Britain is due to leave the bloc on 29 March. (https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/mar/12/the-guardian-view-on-theresa-may-brexit-pause-it-and- rethink)

(33) So weakened is the prime minister that her authority does not even extend to the cabinet table, forcing her to give a free vote on whether or not to back a hard Brexit. (https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/mar/12/the-guardian-view-on-theresa-may-brexit-pause-it-and-rethink)

(34) <…> not only are the Conservatives ungovernable but, under the Tories, the country itself is ungoverned (Freedland, The Guardian)
The Prime Minister’s inability to finalise the Brexit deal with the British Parliament, her lack of authority as well as her weakened position (32)-(33) are criticised. The chaos within the Conservative party and their unruliness (34) drop a hint about the unreliability of the government and can be categorised as an instance of “veracity”. In argumentative journalistic discourse values of judgement (“social esteem” and “social sanction”) are frequently author-oriented, i.e. representing the author’s voice (Martin & White 2005: 170), whereas in news reports judgement is usually attributed to external sources. However, interestingly, the type of argumentative genre determines which values of judgement are author-oriented and which values are attributed. For example, in analytical articles (“analysis”), only “social esteem” dealing with the person’s competence and determination is author-oriented, whereas “social sanction” expressing evaluation of the person’s integrity is always attributed (Martin & White 2005: 170). Opinion columns and editorials, considered to be types of commentaries, contain author-oriented judgments of both “social esteem” and “social sanction”.

2.1.3 Appreciation

Alongside Affect and Judgement, the attitudinal dimension within the Appraisal framework covers the meanings of Appreciation (Martin & White 2005: 56). The targets of Appreciation comprise mostly non-human entities, such as films, books, performances, paintings, cars and other products created by people. For instance, by expressing his/her positive or negative Appreciation of a film, the author may communicate his/her reaction to the film (35), comment on its composition (36) and significance (37):

(35) Visually the film is stunning, a flawlessly executed journey through Van Gogh’s art. (Jones, Chicago Reader)

(36) The movie plays similar games throughout, invoking specific paintings through angles, subjects, lighting, and, above all, brush strokes. The handpainted images, glowing with the blues and yellows and ochres and vermilions of Van Gogh’s palette, are built up with thick impastos of pigment that seem to continuously evolve, as if the artworks themselves had come to life. (Burr, The Boston Globe)

(37) “Loving Vincent” is, indisputably, a technical achievement. (Merry, The Washington Post)

Examples (35)-(37) illustrate the reviewers’ positive Appreciation of the film Loving Vincent. In (35), the reviewer describes his general reaction to the film by appreciating its visual side. In (36), an extract reflects on the composition of the film, which entails comments on the images and colours of the production. In (37), the worth of the film is brought to the fore. The aspects of Appreciation illustrated above befall the subcategories of “reaction”, “composition” and “valuation” (Martin & White 2005: 56). Differences between
these meanings of Appreciation can be captured by their relation to mental processes. “Reaction” entails affect; “composition” is assessed on the grounds of perception; and “valuation” involves cognition (Martin & White 2005: 57). The notions of these subcategories can be more fine-grained, however, “the range of meanings listed is not exhaustive” (Martin & White 2005: 56). A number of studies following Martin and White’s (2005) framework have shown the adaptation of these appreciative meanings. For instance, in their study on wine reviews, Hommerberg and Don (2015) come up with new conceptual parameters of the meaning of “composition”. Alongside the parameters of “balance” and “complexity”, outlined in the original framework by Martin and White (2005), they suggest the parameters of “intensity” (38) and “persistence” (39), which appear significant in perceptual experiences of wine:

(38) Its inky/blue/purple hue is accompanied by scents of blueberries, white flowers, and black currents. (Hommerberg & Don 2015: 177)

(39) … a finish that lasts over 60 seconds (Hommerberg & Don 2015: 169)

The scholars also distinguish the meaning of “association” within the subcategory of “reaction”, defined as “the audience’s capacity to imagine the emotive response that the association conjures up” (Hommerberg & Don 2015: 168-169). In their study, the meaning of “valuation” has been enriched by the subcategories of “affordability”, “durability”, “uniqueness”, “typicality”, “naturalness” and “location”. As indicated by Martin and White (2005: 57), “valuation is especially sensitive to field since the value of things depends so much on our institutional focus”. For example in music, authenticity can be appreciated; in linguistics, innovation can be at stake (ibid. 57). The adaptation of the subcategories of Appreciation shows the flexibility of the Appraisal framework.

2.2 Ambiguity of attitudes, their co-occurrences and complexity

The complexity of attitudes and their analysis in discourse lies in blurry boundaries between different types of attitude. For instance, distinct subcategories of Appreciation (“reaction”, “composition”, “valuation”) may be blurred, as shown in the reviews of the film Loving Vincent (40) and (41) below:

(40) Loving Vincent is bold, particularly in the face of contemporary computer animation, which for all its technical gloss feels drained of artistry, to say nothing of aura. Instead of algorithms animating smirking donkeys or goofball jellybean-shaped Minions, real people are slaving over canvases to bring the world of an old master back to life. (Semley, The Globe and Mail) (composition + valuation)
By midpoint, though, the visuals have started to overwhelm a wandering screenplay and banal dialogue, and by the final scenes you may feel like you’re overdosing on a cake that’s all frosting. (Burr, The Boston Globe) (composition + reaction)

(40) exemplifies the ambiguity between the positive Appreciation of the composition of the film and its value within the cinematographic canon. On the one hand, the animation of the film combining painting and acting (“composition”) is appraised; on the other hand, the worth of the film (“valuation”) is appraised, for Loving Vincent is described as bold. In (41), the negative remarks about the composition of the film (visuals starting to overwhelm a wandering screenplay and banal dialogue) also display an affective response to the film (“reaction”), the meaning of which is strengthened by the reaction (feeling of the exaggerated effect of the film) expressed in the following discourse unit. As mentioned in 2.1, different attitudes may co-occur. For instance, Affect may combine with Judgement or with Appreciation. In one unit of discourse several targets of evaluation can be found (Su & Hunston 2019), as below:

(42) But it’s Singin’ in the Rain that we always return to: it bursts at every seam with light and colour and joy, and Donen and Kelly shape and guide its irresistible energy with inspired grace. (Bradshaw (a), The Guardian)

In (42), the musical Singing in the Rain is appreciated (its composition) and the directors of the musical are judged (their skills in directing the musical are praised). The focus on the target of evaluation helps to identify the attitude (Su & Hunston 2019). Moreover, “it is very common to find such cases, where one kind of appraisal is nested inside another kind for which it functions primarily in that context – or even typically in most contexts – as a token or basis” (Thompson 2008: 183), for example:

(43) In the end of course, it is the sheer gorgeousness of Singin’ in the Rain for which he will be most immediately remembered and treasured: certainly in my heart. It’s a film which distills happiness and hope. (Bradshaw (a), The Guardian)

(44) Ali’s performance is extremely elegant: he has the command and address of a classical actor in a classical role. (Bradshaw (b), The Guardian)

In (43), the appreciated beauty of the musical serves as a basis for appraising the director’s, Stanley Donen’s, achievements, and in (44) Ali’s performance is the basis for evaluating his skills. As illustrated by the examples above, attitudes may be multifunctional and diverse in their realisations. The underlying principle of identifying different types of attitudes is the establishment of targets of evaluation and consideration of the whole text, for attitudes are conveyed through lexis, grammar and discourse (Taboada et al. 2017: 60).
Ambiguities between attitudes and their subcategories may be explained by the fact that the underlying element of all of them is emotive. Although Bednarek (2008) as well as Su and Hunston (2019) draw an opposition between attitudes expressing emotions (Affect) and opinion (Judgement, Appreciation), a full opposition between them is not possible because they are interrelated, as explained by White (2011: 19):

_It must be stressed, however, that while the framework extends established notions of the ‘affec-tual’ in this way, it still sees the three categories as fundamentally interconnected in that they are all to do with the expression of ‘feelings’. It is just that the grounding of that feeling varies across the three modes. Under Affect, the action of emotion is directly indicated - feelings are presented as the contingent, personalized mental reactions of human subjects to some stimulus. But under both Judgement and Appreciation, these ‘feelings’ are institutionalized in some way and are recast as qualities which inhere in the evaluated phenomenon itself. Thus ‘I like that picture’ grounds the evaluation in the contingent, individual reactions of the speaker while ‘that is a beautiful picture’ grounds the evaluation in the ‘objective’ properties of the evaluated phenomenon itself. Under Judgement, feelings are reconstrued as proposals about correct behaviour - how we should or shouldn’t behave. Thus, in ‘He cruelly left the cat out in the rain’ the negative feeling towards the perpetrator of this act is here reworked as a proposal about what is right and wrong behaviour towards cats. Under Appreciation, feelings are reconstrued as propositions about the value of things. Thus in ‘That’s a beautiful picture: the positive feeling towards the picture is reworked as a proposal about the picture’s aesthetic worth._

It should be noted that Judgement and Appreciation may be the result of impersonalising Affect. For example, _I am disappointed by your behaviour_ expresses Affect, whereas _your behaviour is disappointing_ conveys Judgment. Similarly, _I am moved by the film_ reveals the author’s affectual assessment, whereas _the film is moving_ is a more impersonal expression of Appreciation. Although the boundaries between some attitudinal values may be blurry, the Appraisal framework may be adapted and adjusted to individual texts and types of discourse. A summary of the types and subcategories of attitudes is provided in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>un/happiness</td>
<td>social esteem:</td>
<td>reaction (e.g. brilliant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in/security</td>
<td>normality (e.g. extraordinary)</td>
<td>composition (e.g. harmonious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/satisfaction</td>
<td>capacity (e.g. able, capable)</td>
<td>valuation (e.g. important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/inclination</td>
<td>tenacity (e.g. determined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social sanction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propriety (e.g. decent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veracity (e.g. truthful)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Grading of attitudes

Analysis of attitudes also involves specifying the strength or degree of the author’s emotive commitment to value judgements and assessments made. In the Appraisal framework (Martin & White 2005: 137), expressions related to the strength of attitudes are considered within the subcategories of “force” and “focus” making up the category of Graduation. The “force” of attitudes can be expressed by means of intensification, most frequently by adverbs, as in the following examples:

(45) The ending is a bit of a letdown, but overall White Noise is a very interesting film that provides some good frights for a mainstream horror film. (CORE)

(46) The atmosphere is slightly odd, there are big windows and very high ceilings. (CORE)

The adverb very indicates the high degree of interest in the film (45) and functions as an “amplifier” of an attitude; and the adverb slightly (46) reduces the extent of being odd and is used as a “downtoner” of an attitude. Some amplifiers (so, very, more, too, good) indicate an endpoint on a scale and other amplifiers (e.g. totally, absolutely, quite in the sense of completely) mark degrees on a scale (Biber et al. 554-555). Downtoners “scale down the effect of the modified item” and may indicate that “the use of the modified item is not precisely accurate” (Biber et al. 1999: 555), e.g. almost, nearly, practically, kind of, sort of, quite, rather, partially, partly, slightly, somewhat, hardly, little, scarcely. An intensifying effect can be created by manner adverbs that modify adjectives (e.g. an easily debatable proposition, an openly hostile attack (Quirk et al. 1985: 448)). The “force” or strength of attitudinal assessments of various entities may also be created by means of quantification, i.e. indications of the amount/quantity, i.e. size, weight, number, extent of an evaluated entity (Martin & White 2005: 148), as shown below:

(47) That 1974 paper in Nature will be one of the most enduring, offering a memorable contribution to our understanding of black holes. (Ball, The Guardian)

(48) Most physicists now accept the idea of “Hawking radiation”, although it has yet to be observed. This work became a central pillar in research that has now linked several key, and hitherto disparate, areas of physical theory: general relativity, quantum mechanics, thermodynamics and information theory. (Ball, The Guardian)

In (47), the superlative one of the most enduring reinforces the positive Appreciation of S. Hawking’s paper and the quantifier several in (48) emphasises the importance of his contribution to physical theory. Expressions of Graduation are linked to particular attitudes expressed (Affect, Judgement, Appreciation). In (45)-(48), the expressions of Graduation (very, slightly, one of the most, several) modify the qualities of appreciated entities (interesting film, odd atmosphere, enduring paper, key areas of physical theory). The meaning
of an attitude may be upscaled not only by amplifiers and expressions showing quantification but also by inherently intense lexis (Martin & White 2005), for example:

(49) Neither, however, does the film come close to capturing the **glorious** and unlikely artifice of Queen itself, a band whose scrambling of sexual and musical codes remains a **remarkable** phenomenon in the history of popular culture. (Scott, The New York Times)

(50) The Turbine Hall at London’s Tate Modern is a **cavernous** maw that swallows and spits out all but the most confident artists. (https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/oct/04/the-guardian-view-on-tate-moderns-new-sculpture-a-gift-and-a-rebuke)

The lexical items **glorious**, **remarkable** and **cavernous** encode intense attitude and thus reinforce the positive prosody of the evaluated entities (**Queen**, **the Turbine Hall at London’s Tate Modern**). The adjectives **glorious** and **remarkable** attributed to **Queen** highlight the fame of the band that remains backgrounded in the film. The adjective **cavernous** (50) emphasises the magnitude of the hall at London’s Tate Modern which houses a grand sculpture **Fon Americanus**, made by the Afro-American artist Kara Walker. The magnitude of the hall as well as its personification (**swallows and spits out all but the most confident artists**) lay emphasis on the importance of the sculpture and its author. The intensity of attitudes can be indicated by presenting a sequence of elements or metaphors (Martin & White 2005: 144; 147-148):

(51) A baroque blend of **gibberish**, **mysticism** and **melodrama**, the film seems engineered to be as unmemorable as possible, with the exception of the prosthetic teeth worn by the lead actor, Rami Malek, who plays Freddie Mercury, Queen’s lead singer. (Scott, The New York Times)

(52) The reality was perhaps more interesting, and more nuanced, but in any case the overall narrative architecture of “Bohemian Rhapsody” is a **Lego palace of clichés**. (Scott, The New York Times)

The negative appreciation of the film (51) is intensified by describing the film as a **baroque blend of gibberish**, **mysticism** and **melodrama**. The metaphorical lexis in (52), namely the comparison of the narrative structure of the film **Bohemian Rhapsody** to a **Lego palace of clichés**, reinforces the negative appraisal of the film. In the Appraisal framework, Martin and White (2005: 152-153) emphasise that “upsampling of attitude frequently acts to construe the speaker/writer as maximally committed to the value position being advanced and hence as strongly aligning the reader into that value position”, whereas “downscaling frequently has the obverse effect of construing the speaker/writer as having only a partial or an attenuated affiliation with the value position being referenced.”
Attitudes can be graded not only in terms of intensity and amount, as shown above, but they can also be graded in terms of prototypicality. Grading of attitudes according to prototypicality brings to the fore the “focus” of attitudes. They can be “scaled by reference to the degree to which they match some supposed core or exemplary instance of a semantic category” (Martin & White 2005: 137). For instance, by saying *He is a true friend*, the prototype of a friend is invoked, whereas by saying *He is kind of friend*, assessment of a friend is “lying on the outer margins of the category” (ibid: 137). The attitudinal adjective *true* “sharpens” or emphasises the positive attitude towards a friend, whereas the hedge *kind of* softens a negative assessment of a friend (cf. Martin & White 2005: 139). An important observation should be made that attitudes assessed according to prototypicality pertain to non-gradable words (e.g. *friend*), whereas attitudes assessed according to intensity and amount relate to gradable words (e.g. *happy*). A summary of the subcategories of Graduation is provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Subcategories of Graduation (Martin & White 2005: 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATION</th>
<th>FORCE (grading according to intensity and amount)</th>
<th>FOCUS (grading according to prototypicality)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensification</td>
<td>Quantification</td>
<td>Sharpen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amplifiers, downtoners (e.g. <em>very happy</em>)</td>
<td>lexis indicating the amount/quantity of an evaluated entity, e.g. <em>true friend</em></td>
<td><em>kind of friend</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inherently intense lexis (e.g. <em>glorious victory</em>)</td>
<td><em>many worries</em></td>
<td><em>much trouble</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the Appraisal framework is one of the most widely applied models of evaluation across types of discourse and genres, which “combines an appealing simplicity with a potential for scales of delicacy in analysis” (Thompson 2008: 171). The adaptation of the framework in a number of studies proves its potential for being expanded and accommodated to the needs of an individual analysis. As Hommerberg and Don (2015: 162) claim, “the use of the Appraisal framework to describe the evaluation of targets, cannot be interpreted fully without reading evaluation in texts against its use in specialised fields of discourse” (ibid. 163).
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2.4 Tasks

1. Following Martin and White's (2005) Appraisal framework and Bednarek's (2008) classification of Affect, identify expressions of Affect in the following extracts. Consider the trigger, type and polarity of Affect. Is it authorial or non-authorial Affect?

   a. My father loved any excuse to drive. He was devoted to his car, a bronze-colored two-door Buick Electra ²²⁵. (Obama 2018: 13).
   b. I liked my job, and while it wasn’t perfect, I also liked my life. (Obama 2018: 223)
   c. Some of my peers felt their otherness more acutely than I did. (Obama 2018: 79)
   d. Barack was serious without being self-serious. He was breezy in his manner but powerful in his mind. It was a strange, stirring combination. Surprising to me, too, was how well he knew Chicago. (Obama 2018: 98)
   e. The truth was that Washington confused me, with its decorous traditions and sober self-regard, its whiteness and maleness, its ladies having lunch off to one side. At the heart of my confusion was a kind of fear, because as much as I hadn’t chosen to be involved, I was getting sucked in. (Obama 2018: 219)
   f. I negotiated the terms of our exit and a new relationship with our closest neighbours that protects jobs, our security and our Union. I have done everything I can to convince MPs to back that deal. Sadly, I have not been able to do so. I tried three times. I believe it was right to persevere, even when the odds against success seemed high. (https://brexitcentral.com/theresa-mays-resignation-speech-full-text/)
   g. It is, and will always remain, a matter of deep regret to me that I have not been able to deliver Brexit. It will be for my successor to seek a way forward that honours the result of the referendum. To succeed, he or she will have to find consensus in Parliament where I have not. Such a consensus can only be reached if those on all sides of the debate are willing to compromise. (https://brexitcentral.com/theresa-mays-resignation-speech-full-text/)

2. In the contexts below, identify expressions of Judgement and specify their content (social esteem: normality, capacity, tenacity; social sanction: propriety, veracity). Discuss the ambiguity of the attitudinal meanings. Comment on the expression of Judgement (word, phrase, segment of discourse) and its polarity (positive, negative). Identify instances of indirect Judgement. Are the judgements intensified or mitigated?

   a. It seems that many individuals choose activities conducive to original thinking, although only a handful of those individuals are considered to have creative genius, such as Hemingway, Einstein, and Monet. They were blessed with a personality style and abilities giving them persistence and productivity that led them to be revered as geniuses. (COCA, ACAD)
b. The notion of painting a single subject on a series of canvases over a period of time and during various conditions was perhaps the most influential aspect of late 19th-century French art. And no artist mined this innovation more than Monet. (COCA, NEWS)

c. As the singer for Queen, one of the most successful British bands of the '70s and '80s, Freddie Mercury was one of the most distinctive and instantly recognizable personalities rock has ever produced -- a flamboyant icon millions of fans around the world thought they knew, despite his many chameleon-like glam-rock guises. (COCA, NEWS)

d. Well, the Golden Globes are supposed to honor America's best performances in television and film ostensibly, but last night it turned into a politicized circus as you just saw. After receiving a lifetime achievement award, actress Meryl Streep ripped Donald Trump in a lengthy screed, just for some reason ridiculed the sport of football and Mixed Martial Arts. (COCA, SPOK)

e. And Frank Sinatra turns pop music into operatic arias or church music, and it's so sincere that it would overwhelm, I think, most dramatic scenes that it was juxtaposed with. With Dean, you get a nice sort of overcoat of '50s swinging love-struck hip, but you don't feel like you have to take the whole movie in that direction. (COCA, SPOK)

f. Boris Johnson sounds unlike any other contemporary politician. He is sharp, funny, joyful, lacerating and inclined to say what everyone knows but is too polite or cowed to say out loud. (COCA, NEWS)

g. Republicans have an agenda, Democrats don't have a clue. (COCA, NEWS)

h. The Obama administration has made liberal use of attacks from drone aircraft in the northern tribal areas of Pakistan. (COCA, NEWS)

i. In his excellent State of the Union speech, President Obama outlined more practical proposals for creating jobs than we've seen in many years. (COCA, NEWS)

j. Trump has also refused to release his tax returns, something all other presidential candidates in recent history have done. (COCA, NEWS)

3. In the contexts below, identify instances of Appreciation and their content (reaction, composition, valuation). Discuss the ambiguity of the attitudinal meanings. Comment on the expression of Appreciation (word, phrase, segment of discourse) and its polarity (positive, negative). Is Appreciation intensified or mitigated? What devices are used to intensify and mitigate Appreciation?

a. Yet Roma is a wonderful film, a thrilling journey into the past, all but defying gravity in its staggering set pieces and crowd-scene choreography with profoundly mysterious and moving moments. It is superbly acted, unbearably moving and visually electrifying. It is the evening's real winner. (Bradshaw (b), The Guardian)

b. Everyone loves Queen's Bohemian Rhapsody – with its staggering heft and operatic kitsch – as a go-to karaoke number <...> (Robey, The Telegraph)

c. Still, at its strongest, the film captivates; it grabs you by the heart and demands adoration. And in a film about Judy Garland, you would expect nothing less. (Ide, The Guardian)
d. Vincent van Gogh has always been one of my favorite visual artists. I'm drawn to his oil on canvas paintings. “The Starry Night” and “The Potato Eaters” are two of my favorites. # Neither of those pieces moves me quite like a disturbing self-portrait he created after he famously cut off his own ear. (COCA, NEWS)

e. This small, anomalous exhibition is a Van Gogh antiblockbuster with a seemingly counterintuitive theme, given the importance of the brilliant light of southern France to his art. It explores Van Gogh’s special relationship with darkness, where his interests in perception, color and symbolism fuse with unexpected intensity. And seeing a manageable number of Van Goghs -- including masterpieces like “The Potato Eaters,” “The Starry Night” and “Night Cafe” -- in intimate galleries is thrilling. (COCA, NEWS)

f. In Van Gogh’s painting, nature includes the heavens and infinity, that is, the possibility of a life beyond earthly death, perhaps in another dimension of the universe. # Van Gogh had long considered starry skies and the crescent moon to be natural evocations of life beyond death and of the eternal <…>. (COCA, ACAD)

g. Manet’s picnic inspired other important works. Among them was an enormous Monet woodland setting for a Dejeuner, one-third of which is now lost. The two remaining pieces are stunning: a gathering of fashionable men and women, all properly clothed, spreading their lunch on the grass, looking as if they have just been interrupted by the fellow with a palette and easel. Another reference to Manet, Cezanne’s startling Une moderne Olympia (A Modern Olympia), rendered in muddy colors, was made “modern” by its explicitness as well as its style. (COCA, MAG)

h. The Tommy Dorsey orchestra began to play and the unforgettable voice of the young Frank Sinatra filled the room. (COCA, SPOK)

i. The musical “La La Land” swept seven Golden Globe film awards. And the ceremony also touched off a war of words with president-elect Trump. It started with actress Meryl Streep and her speech accepting a lifetime achievement award. She deplored Mr. Trump’s imitating a disabled reporter during the primaries. (COCA, SPOK)

j. The Grammys stormed back this year: Lady Gaga arrived in an eggshell, sang an old Madonna song and left with three trophies; Mick Jagger revved up the crowd with a shockingly limber Solomon Burke tribute. (COCA, MAG)

4. Identify expressions of intensification and quantification in the extracts below and specify their role. What attitudes (Affect, Judgement, Appreciation) are they linked with?

a. It really warmed my heart to listen to President Obama’s State of the Union campaign speech. (COCA, NEWS)

b. CLINTON# Donald Trump’s ideas aren’t just different. They are dangerously incoherent. (COCA, SPOK)

c. Hawking’s recent efforts in this field have scarcely been decisive, but his colleagues were always eager to see what he had to say about it. (Ball, The Guardian)
d. Our menu (which I expect will have altered by the time you read this) featured a fabulous play on old-school Cumberland pie and peas – mutton with small, heavenly, bright green peas straight from the pod. (Dent, The Guardian)

e. Only at Wembley, as the band blows everyone away for Live Aid, do we feel the infectious blast of the real Queen sorcery. (Robey, The Telegraph)

f. The African American artist has built a 13-metre-tall fountain, a play on the Queen Victoria Memorial outside Buckingham Palace. It subverts the tropes of Britain’s pompous public monuments, and offers a mordant commentary on the nation’s enrichment through the transatlantic slave trade. (https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/oct/04/the-guardian-view-on-tate-moderns-new-sculpture-a-gift-and-a-rebuke)

g. Visually the film is stunning, a flawlessly executed journey through Van Gogh’s art. (Jones, The Chicago Reader)

h. Still, the form is very much the thing. And even when Loving Vincent sinks into long dialogues and black-and-white flashbacks, as Roulin attempts to disentangle the myth(s) of Vincent van Gogh, the animation itself entrances. (Semley, The Globe and Mail)

i. It all feels a bit procedural and chatty, the content bereft the inventiveness of the form. (Semley, The Globe and Mail)

j. <...> 125 artists diligently handpainted each frame based on film material created using a combination of live actors and digital animation. The results are visually dazzling. The movie as a whole is something less. (Burr, The Boston Globe)

5. Describe the attitudes co-occurring in the extracts below. Comment on the polarity and intensity of the attitudes.

a. Cooper is arguably prettier than Lady Gaga, but she is the one who commands your attention: that sharp, quizzical, leonine, mesmeric face – an uningratiating face, very different from the wide-eyed openness of Streisand or Garland. <...> Her songs are gorgeous and the ingenuous openness of her scenes with Jackson are wonderfully sympathetic. Meanwhile Cooper, whose screen persona can so often be bland and unchallenging, makes precisely this conservative tendency work for him in the role. He is so sad you want to hug him. Arguably, this film fudges some of Jackson’s dark side, by giving him partial deafness as well as alcoholism, but it is still a richly sympathetic spectacle. (Bradshaw (c), The Guardian)

b. Queen’s hits were always more about sound and sensation than sense, and Mercury’s lyrics were above all vehicles for his extraordinary voice. Sadly, absurdly, “Bohemian Rhapsody” is a plodding, literal-minded, conventional affair, in spite of Malek’s game attempt to mimic Mercury’s strutting theatricality onstage and his operatic moodiness in daily life. (Scott, The New York Times)

c. Renée Zellweger gives us a heartfelt, studied portrayal of Garland. Her performance and the film itself are forthright and un-camp, though careful to acknowledge the importance of Garland’s gay fanbase by adroitly creating two fictional gay superfans. (Ide, The Guardian)
6. Choose two editorials/opinion columns/features dealing with the same topic but representing a different political leaning (conservative vs liberal) and identify attitudes expressed in the two texts.

7. Choose two reviews of the same film/play/painting/concert/book and compare the expression and content of attitudes and targets of evaluation attested in the reviews. Consider the techniques of reinforcing or weakening the attitudes. Identify the ambiguity of attitudes, their co-occurrences as well as indirect realisations.

8. What similarities and differences do the frameworks for Stance (Biber et al. 1999) and Appraisal (Martin & White 2005) display? Why do some studies rely on the framework for Stance and other studies deploy the model of Appraisal? Which framework would you like to apply to your study? Discuss the content and devices for expressing attitudes in both frameworks.

d. *The film sugarcoats Garland's physical deterioration, her addictions, her wretchedness and her mortality. However, paradoxically, it's the most relaxed and personal performance we have seen from Zellweger in a while.* (Ide, *The Guardian*)
PART II: Epistemic Dimension of Evaluation

In contrast to the attitudinal dimension of evaluation covered in Units 1 and 2, the epistemic dimension deals with the assessment of the likelihood or factuality of communicated events and with the evaluation of evidence for the validity of these events (Marín-Arrrese 2009a, 2009b, 2015). The communicated events whose likelihood or evidentiary validity is considered by the author constitute a proposition (Boye 2010: 293), which may be true or false. Consider the following examples:

1. They live in a lovely place.
2. Definitely they live in a lovely place.
3. I think they live in a lovely place.

In (1), the adjective lovely refers to the quality of a place, which is a first-order entity found “in the world” (Boye 2010: 295). First-order entities, like second-order entities, do not have a truth value, i.e. they cannot be true or false. In (2) and (3), the markers definitely and I think express the author’s comments “about the world in the sense of having a truth value” (Boye 2010: 295). The information “they live in a lovely place” is subject to falsification or verification. We can say that in actual fact they do not live in a lovely place or they live in a lovely place. Thus, examples 2 and 3 illustrate the author’s epistemic evaluation of the world, which involves the evaluation of the proposition, i.e. a third-order entity. The core meanings of likelihood and evidence making up the epistemic dimension of evaluation have been considered in a number of frameworks, such as evidentiality (Chafe 1986), epistemic stance (Biber et al. 1999) and epistemicity (Boye 2012) (Figure 4). The scope and realisations of the epistemic dimension in different frameworks may vary, however, the key values of likelihood and evidence are found in almost all categorisations of epistemic meaning.

The broad notion of epistemic meaning or the epistemic dimension of evaluation is presented in the framework for “epistemological considerations” or “evidentiality” proposed by Chafe (1986). In Chafe’s framework, the central notion is knowledge, i.e. knowledge

---

4 “Since propositions, but not states of affairs, constitute information about the external world in the sense that they have a truth value or refer, only propositions can be evaluated epistemically” (Boye 2010: 293). The proposition is “understood either as a meaning unit with a truth value or as a conceptual representation construed as referring” (Boye 2010: 294).

5 In Chafe’s (1986) study this framework is called “evidentiality”. However, in this coursebook evidentiality will be defined following other conceptual frameworks and definitions.
about the world that can be qualified in a number of ways. Authors may express a variety of “attitudes towards knowledge”. It should be stressed that attitudes described by Chafe are distinct from those discussed in Units 1 and 2, as they are not emotion-based. The author may indicate the reliability of knowledge by specifying the degree of certainty of the proposition (4)-(5):

(4) **Perhaps** the most widely accepted justification for punishing criminal offenders is the deterrence of future crime. (COCA, ACAD)

(5) **As a result**, mixing recreational, residential, and agricultural land is **likely** to produce poor results. (COCA, ACAD)

The markers *perhaps* (4) and *likely* (5) express the author’s uncertainty regarding the propositional content. The author assumes that punishing offenders may deter future crime (4) and that mixing various types of land will probably bring negative results (5). Authors may indicate not only how reliable their knowledge about the world is but also how they obtained this knowledge:

(6) **I believe** we will see this type of service in place in the next 10 years. (COCA, NEWS)

(7) *Ma* was resting when I got back. *She must* have been painting all day. *She looked like all of her had been emptied out into a bucket.* (COCA, FIC)

(8) **And we are told** that there will be likely a vote on the CIA director designate Mike Pompeo on Monday. (COCA, SPOK)

(9) **According to the government scorekeeper, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, the Baucus bill would** cost $829 billion over 10 years, reduce the deficit over that time by $81 billion, and extend coverage to 29 million Americans who do not have health insurance. **That would leave 25 million people without coverage.** (COCA, SPOK)

Knowledge can be obtained through such modes of knowing as belief (6), inference (7), hearsay (8) and deduction (9) (Chafe 1986: 263). Belief (6) represents the author’s
subjective opinion not necessarily formed on the basis of evidence (Chafe 1986: 266). If the author acquires knowledge about the situation through an inference (7), he/she must have evidence leading to the opinion formed. In (7), the conclusion that the person most probably spent all day painting is drawn from the person’s look. In (8), the information about a vote comes from a verbal source, most probably written. In (9), the author makes a deduction about the budget of the state and health insurance programme. Authors may also indicate their knowledge of categories or prototypes by using hedges (10) or express expectations based on their knowledge of the world (11):

(10) *And they tend to be sort of farmer kinds of people.* (Chafe 1986: 270)

(11) *In fact, this whole week has been awful.* (Chafe 1986: 270)

In (10), the hedge *sort of* indicates how the author tries to match his knowledge of the prototype of “farmer people” to the situation at hand. In (11), *in fact* marks information contrary to the author’s expectations. As shown above, Chafe’s framework presents a wide range of markers related to knowledge. Although his categorisation of various epistemic markers has not been widely applied to practice, as it has been considered too broad, it undeniably sheds light on the vastness of epistemic notions and shows how these markers may be linked to knowledge in one or another way or how attitudes towards knowledge may be formed. A summary of Chafe’s framework is provided in Table 6.

Table 6. Epistemic notions in Chafe’s framework (1986)

| KNOWLEDGE |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Mode of knowing | Belief: *I think, I guess, I suppose, I believe* |
|                 | Induction: *must, obvious, seem, evidently* |
|                 | Hearsay: *people say, they say, I’ve been told, it seems, supposed to, apparently* |
|                 | Deduction: *should, presumably, can, could, would* |
| Source of knowledge | Evidence (induction) |
|                   | Language (hearsay) |
|                   | Hypothesis (deduction) |
| Degrees of reliability | *maybe, probably, perhaps, certainly, possibly, undoubtedly, surely, may, might;* |
|                      | †basically, by definition, essentially, exactly, generally, invariably, literally, normally, particularly, primarily, specifically, virtually* |

6 Chafe (1986: 265) draws a distinction between markers expressing “the probability that something is a fact or not a fact and a realization that something may turn out to be true most of the time, but not always”. In the Appraisal framework these adverbs function as devices for Graduation within the subcategory of Focus. They denote the degree to which the actual words used to express the proposition fit the situation described.
The notion of epistemic stance in Biber et al. (1999: 972) is also quite wide, for it comprises a variety of the author’s comments on the proposition, such as certainty and doubt, actuality, precision or limitation, source of knowledge and perspective. In a similar manner to attitudinal stance, epistemic stance can be expressed by adverbials (examples 4, 11), verb/adjective/noun complement clauses (example 5, 8) and modal verbs (examples 7, 9).

A more restrictive framework for expressions related to knowledge is the category of epistemicity encompassing the subcategories of epistemic modality and evidentiality (Boye 2012). Epistemicity pertains to the indication of the author’s reasons or grounds for evaluating the propositional content, i.e. “justificatory support for the proposition” (Boye 2012: 36). Although both epistemic modality and evidentiality are related to “justificatory support”, they are conceptually distinct categories. The former deals with the assessment of the factuality of the proposition and degrees of commitment, while the latter is concerned with how the author acquired knowledge for the proposition. The epistemicity framework is more restrictive, as it does not include such markers as of course, really, actually, considered as epistemic in other frameworks (cf. stance, Biber et al. 1999). The notions of epistemic stance (Biber et al. 1999) and epistemicity (Boye 2012) are summarised in Figures 5 and 6.
Like in the case of the attitudinal dimension of evaluation, it is important to distinguish between the author’s epistemic evaluation and an evaluation provided by some other persons than the author (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 173; Boye 2016: 120), e.g.:

(12)  *I think* he must have written it himself.

(13)  *He must have written it himself.* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 173)

(14)  *Kim thinks* he must have written it himself. (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 173)

The first-person subject in (12) makes the author’s perspective explicit, whereas in (13) the author’s perspective is implicit. In (14), the author reports the third person’s attitude. It is Kim who thinks that he must have written it himself. The following sections of the coursebook focus on the categories of epistemic modality and evidentiality representing the main epistemic qualifications. Unit 3 provides the definition of epistemic modality, types of epistemic modal expressions (modal verbs, lexical verbs, adjectives, nouns and adverbials) and their role in discourse. Unit 4 gives the definition of evidentiality, classification of evidential meanings, their realisations (verbs of perception, communication, adverbials, adjectives, nouns) and their functions in discourse.
Unit 3 Epistemic modality

3.1 Definition of epistemic modality, degrees of commitment and realisations

A number of definitions of epistemic modality show that its core meaning is the author’s assessment of the factuality of the proposition. According to Collins (2009: 21), “epistemic modality is prototypically concerned with the speaker’s attitude towards the factuality of the situation, the speaker’s judgement of the likelihood that the proposition on which the utterance is based is true”. A similar definition is found in Hoye (1997: 42), who maintains that “epistemic modality is concerned with matters of knowledge or belief on which basis speakers express their judgments about states of affairs, events or actions”. It should be stressed that “the speaker’s attitude towards the factuality of the situation” is different from the attitudes described in Units 1 and 2.

Epistemic modality is a gradable category, which indicates the author’s degrees of commitment to the proposition. The author may indicate that the information in the proposition is certain, probable or possible. On the scale of the author’s commitment, expressions of epistemic modality can be grouped into markers of high, median or low probability (Carretero et al. 2007: 94). More fine-grained distinctions of the author’s degrees of commitment are “knowledge, certainty, epistemic necessity, probability, likelihood, uncertainty, epistemic possibility, doubt, unlikelihood, epistemic impossibility” (Boye 2016: 117). In the present study the major distinctions are made between expressions of certainty, probability and possibility. Linguistic resources realising these values include modal auxiliary verbs, lexical verbs, adjectives, nouns and adverbials, presented in the following subsections.

3.1.1 Modal auxiliary verbs

The primary markers of epistemic modality in English are the modal auxiliaries must, will, would, should, may, might and could, the epistemic values of which have been considered in grammars (Quirk et al. 1985; Biber et al. 1999; Huddleston & Pullum 2002) as well as in a number of theoretical and empirical studies into modality (Carretero 2002; Carretero et al. 2007; Usonienė 2004, 2016; Collins 2009; Marín-Arrese 2009a, 2009b; Usonienė & Šolienė 2010; and others). On the scale of epistemic probability, the primary modal auxiliaries are divided into markers of high certainty (must, will, would), medium certainty or probability (should) and low certainty or possibility (may, might, could) (Carretero et al. 2007: 94):

(15) **It must be frustrating to arrive at a police station after a hectic drive, only to find that ‘the processes of investigation’ necessitated a quick confession from the client.** (BNC, ACAD)
When he sets a goal, he makes sure that everyone reaches it so I have no doubt that Horizon 2020 will be successful. (COCA, ACAD)

I think we have to have that debate, and it should be possible. As painful as that debate might be to some, it is essential. (COCA, SPOK)

This temperature may be too low for comfort in a regularly used living room, so try and find a cooler spot for a longer display. (BNC, ACAD)

He could be anywhere. (BNC, FIC)

When the modal auxiliaries above express the meanings of permission, obligation, requirement, desirability and volitionality (cf. deontic, dynamic and boulomaic modalities), mentioned in Unit 1, they are used in their non-epistemic sense, which means that they convey the author's attitudes towards the actualisation of an event (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 173). It should be noted that in British English, the modal verb can is not used epistemically in affirmative contexts. It denotes general truths (cf. “theoretical possibility” Leech 2004), permission, ability, suggestions, requests, i.e. modal meanings concerned with the attitudinal dimension of evaluation. In negative contexts, though, can may express a high degree of epistemic certainty:

It cannot have been easy living in the shadow of one of the world’s most famous women, the wife of President John F. Kennedy, and Mrs. Radziwill was hardly immune to competitive instincts. (COCA, MAG)

The lowest degree of probability or possibility is coded by the modal verbs may, might and could. Although all of them express the meaning of epistemic possibility and in a number of contexts may be interchangeable (Leech 2004: 76), they may differ in terms of the degree of the author's commitment. The modal verbs could and might may express a lower degree of probability than may (cf. Collins 2009: 111). A distinctive feature of may, might and could is their use in concessive contexts (Leech 2004: 76; Collins 2009: 93; 113), in which the author admits the veracity of the proposition despite some opposing views. In (21)-(23) below, the concessive contexts are signalled by however, nevertheless and although, which create the author's argumentation. The modal verbs may, might and could in the contexts illustrated add to the reinforcement of the truth of the proposition and highlight authorial stance:

Realistically yes, we are a small journal, and yes, we cannot compare our production with giants in medical publishing business. However, our constraints may turn out to be our strength. I believe that by a smart editorial policy we may attract original and well-written manuscripts within specific and recognizable research niches. (COCA, ACAD)
(22) *while religious organizations might* have charitable functions, they nevertheless differ from charitable organizations sufficiently in order to *justify their separate enumeration in the Tax Code.* (COCA, ACAD)

(23) *A cause could be* the greater use of vaccines today, although this relationship has *not been clarified so far.* (COCA, ACAD)

Although epistemic modal auxiliaries are traditionally considered as markers expressing the author’s degree of commitment, they may also indicate how the author obtained information for a claim. For instance, the modal auxiliary *must* expresses the high degree of the author’s certainty due to the evidence specified in the linguistic context:

(24) *I think he must be about eleven,* saying, *I’m concerned about safety crossing the road at Westgate, because cars and lorries go very fast along there.* (BNC, FIC)

(25) *This gate must have been a conspicuous structure,* since *its footings project some 8 metres from the eastern corner of the temple.* (BNC, ACAD)

In (24), the author expresses high certainty by saying that the boy is eleven years because he/she has evidence for this claim (the boy’s words). Similarly, in (25) the author’s certainty that the gate was a conspicuous structure stems from the evidence at hand (*its footings project some 8 metres from the eastern corner of the temple*). In the literature *must* has received a number of interpretations. Marín-Arrese (2015: 217) claims that the verb *must* should be categorised as an epistemic modal, though “with evidential nuances derived from its conclusional force”. However, some scholars (Mortelmans 2000; Fetzer 2014) show that either evidential or epistemic meaning component of *must* is foregrounded depending on the context and the marker reveals the epistemic-evidential overlap. Given a variety of the interpretations of the modal auxiliary *must*, it is not easy to decide upon its categorisation. Contextual analysis of the marker, though, may be a helpful clue.

Although both modal auxiliaries *must* and *will* are considered to express a high degree of the author’s commitment on the epistemic scale, they display some semantic and pragmatic differences and cannot be interchangeable in all contexts (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 189; Marín-Arrese 2009a: 242), as shown below:

(26) *To be so well preserved, the forest must have been completely buried by seafloor sediments,* say geologists. (COCA, NEWS)

(27) *Trump’s meetings with Chinese President Xi Jinping will be grander than their informal April talks at Trump’s Mar-a-Lago resort in Florida.* (COCA, NEWS)
Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 189) explain that “must conveys the idea of conclusion, and is often used in explanations <…> With central-epistemic will it is more a matter of assumption or expectation, very often with a suggestion of future confirmation”. Similarly, Marín (2006: 144) argues that “must suggests that there is only one possible conclusion drawn from the observable facts, whereas will seems to indicate a possible conclusion or a reasonable explanation drawn from previous knowledge”. In (26), the geological evidence that the forest is so well preserved leads to the conclusion that the forest was most probably buried by seafloor sediments, whereas in (27) Donald Trump’s meeting with the Chinese president is expected to be more official, as this time the presidents are not meeting in D. Trump’s resort in Florida. Thus, the conclusive force of must stems from observable facts, whereas will indicates a conclusion from general facts. It is also noteworthy that the strength of the modal auxiliaries may vary depending on the context (Carretero et al. 2007: 94), as illustrated below:

(28) The court will probably wish to terminate the defendant’s liability at a particular point. (BNC, ACAD)

(29) The flood banks will surely be rebuilt, hopefully made stronger by the use of wire mesh. (BNC, NEWS)

In (28), the co-occurrence of will with probably contributes to the lower authorial commitment in comparison to the co-occurrence of will with the adverb surely (29). While identifying the degrees of the author’s commitment, it is important to consider the whole context. The weaker degree of epistemic commitment is conveyed by the modal auxiliary should, which expresses “a tentative assumption, or assessment of the likelihood of the predication” (Collins 2009: 46). As claimed by Leech (2004: 101), “should weakens the force of must (= ‘logical necessity’) by indicating that the speaker has doubts about the soundness of his/her conclusion. An optimistic treasure-seeker would say, after working out the position by the aid of maps, This is where the treasure must be. A more cautious one would say This is where the treasure should be, so acknowledging that there could be something wrong with his/her assumptions or his/her calculations”. Should is more commonly used as a marker of deontic modality, found within the attitudinal dimension of evaluation (Collins 2009: 44).

3.1.2 Lexical verbs

Among expressions of epistemic modality are lexical verbs of knowledge (know, doubt) and belief (believe, think, suppose) (Boye 2016: 118), also referred to as cognitive verbs, illustrated below:

(30) I doubt that he would be the role model that all presidents are judged against. (COCA, SPOK)
(31) *Since you are a law professor, I know that you can handle specific questions.* (COCA, SPOK)

(32) *Longman’s are doing a study into the spoken language, and are looking for, I think, ninety million words that are in common usage.* (BNC, SPOK)

In (30)-(31), *doubt* and *know* function as Complement-Taking-Predicates (CTPs) controlling *that*-clauses (Boye 2012), whereas in (32) *think* occurs in a parenthetical clause *I think*, which is not integrated syntactically with the main clause and shows positional mobility. In the contexts above, the first-person cognitive verbs provide “subjectively qualified information” (Fetzer 2014: 72). When cognitive verbs function as lexical verbs, they do not display epistemic meanings, as exemplified below:

(33) *MR. WILLIAMS: I know who the lady is who came to the masquerade as a nun.* (BNC, FIC)

(34) *They might never have had a mentor who encouraged them to think ambitiously.* (COCA, ACAD)

In (33), *know* expresses the author’s knowledge, and in (34) *think* denotes a cognitive activity. As claimed by Capelli (2007: 194), “in the most “literal” case, *think* is construed as an action, the act of thinking, and, in the most “metaphoric” case, it is construed as the subjective result of the act of thinking, as an indicator of opinion”. In terms of the degrees of the author’s commitment, predicates of belief express “lack of total certainty” and qualify as markers of medium strength, whereas the verb *know* denotes “absolute certainty” (Carrtero et al. 2007: 94). In a similar vein to the verb *must*, predicates of belief may occur in contexts with explicit evidence and display the dimension of evidential meaning (Capelli 2007; Kӓrkӓinen 2007; Fetzer 2014), for example:

(35) *But as the threats we face evolve faster than ever, I believe it is vital that we work together to design new, dynamic arrangements that go beyond the existing arrangements that the EU has in this area – and draw on the legal models the EU has previously used to structure co-operation with external partners in other fields such as trade.* (https://ig.ft.com/theresa-may-florence-speech-annotated/)

(36) *And I think when you look at the letters that I get, a lot of people are worried that maybe they wouldn’t have a place in Donald Trump’s America.* (https://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/2016-presidential-debate-transcript-229519)

(37) *But because it was written by someone who is left-leaning, I guess we’re supposed to give it a pass.* (COCA, NEWS)
In (35), by using the subjective *I believe*, Theresa May does not only express a high degree of certainty but also refers to the evidence (threats, unstable global situation) leading to her belief that the EU and the UK should design new models of cooperation. In (36), in the 2016 presidential debates, Hillary Clinton voices a strong opinion that many Americans are worried if Donald Trump wins the elections. Her conclusion is based on the letters addressed to her. Similarly, in (37) *I guess* does not only express the author's reduced commitment but also an inference based on the information in the preceding discourse. Evidence is provided for the proposition in case the author's conversational contributions were “queried or challenged” (Fetzer 2014: 74).

Predicates of belief may refer to different types of evidence, which may affect the author's commitment. For instance, *believe* may pertain to “affective evidence”, i.e. the author's feelings, intuition, personal evaluation, impressions or “any type of evidence depending on the ego of the evaluator or for which the evaluator cannot provide a precise definition” (Capelli 2007: 132). When affective evidence “is brought to the foreground at the expense of the epistemic dimension, the verb is construed as lexicalizing a high degree of commitment on the part of the believer” (Capelli 2007: 170). Similarly, *I think* may express different degrees of probability depending on the plausibility of evidence (Capelli 2007: 194). However, in a number of cases *I think* does not draw on any evidence but expresses the author's subjective opinion (Capelli 2007: 183). *I guess* points to evidence in the prior discourse or “present in the actual physical or wider social environment where talk takes place” (Kärkäinen 2007: 190), expressing the author's reduced degree of certainty. Alongside *believe, think* and *guess*, other predicates of belief displaying the evidential dimension are *suppose, assume, presume, feel, sense, suspect*:

(38) *The aim of the euro is to further unite Europe. I suppose it will. Europe has for the past 55 years been united for the first time, due to the nuclear deterrent.* (COCA, NEWS)

(39) *He obviously had a long memory, and I assume it was only after he retired or died that my actions were forgiven <…>.* (COCA, NEWS)

(40) *Those specific pieces do not, I presume, evoke classical romance, unless perhaps you're going to use them as <…>* (COCA, NEWS)

*Suppose* denotes an inference (Capelli 2007: 224) and may convey different degrees of certainty depending on the context. In (38), *suppose* expresses a higher degree of certainty due to the author's knowledge about the situation in Europe specified in the following discourse (*Europe has for the past 55 years been united for the first time, due to the nuclear deterrent*). *Assume* encodes a higher degree of epistemic certainty than *suppose* and evaluates the propositional content on prior or encyclopedic knowledge (Capelli 2007: 252), as shown in (39). With *assume* the author does not require to verify the evidence
Presume (40) expresses quite a high likelihood of the proposition and “indicates that the evaluator, despite not having properly verified the validity of his/her premises, thinks that the evidence on which he/she bases his/her inferential process or the inferential work itself are reliable enough for him/her to accept those premises as valid for the argumentation” (Capelli 2007: 262). The verbs feel, sense and suspect refer to affective and vague evidence, as exemplified below:

(41) I feel very happy. I feel that this victory will continue to all Syria. (COCA, SPOK)

(42) But I just -- I sense that there's been a big change. (COCA, SPOK)

(43) Outlined against the window, he stretches. I suspect we are supposed to find him cat-like, but his movements are exaggerated. (COCA, FIC)

Feel and sense evoke “impressions”, whereas suspect pertains to “vague rational motivations” (Capelli 2007: 295). Thus, verbs of cognitive attitude emphasise not only the author’s belief in the validity of the proposition but may also qualify evidence underlying this belief. Depending on the context, these verbs “may upgrade or downgrade the degree of certainty expressed by the speaker” (Fetzer 2014: 72), since “epistemic evaluation changes according to the evaluation of evidence on which it is based” (Capelli 2007: 130). Predicates of belief and knowledge are very frequent in opinion columns, which “explicitly mark the presence of the speaker/conceptualizer in the discourse of opinion” (Marín-Arrese 2015: 223), and in political speeches (Fetzer 2014).

### 3.1.3 Adverbials, adjectives and nouns

Epistemic adverbials are classified into adverbials of probability (e.g. probably, likely, in all likelihood, in all probability, maybe and perhaps) and certainty (e.g. assuredly, certainly, doubtlessly, for sure, no doubt, surely, undeniably, undoubtedly and unquestionably) (Carretero & Zamorano-Mansilla 2013: 320). They can be expressed by single adverbs (44), prepositional phrases (45) or noun phrases (46):

(44) The clause, though having no legal validity, would very likely mislead the consumer as to his rights. (BNC, ACAD)

(45) In all probability not a single fox will live or die as a consequence of any vote we take this afternoon. (BNC, SPOK)

(46) No doubt he had already forgotten all about it. (BNC, FIC)

The scale of the author’s epistemic commitment includes adverbials expressing strong (e.g. assuredly, certainly, undeniably, definitely, surely, necessarily, truly, obviously, clearly),
quasi-strong (e.g. *doubtless, presumably, seemingly, apparently, evidently*), medium (e.g. *arguably, likely, probably*) and low (e.g. *conceivably, maybe, perhaps, possibly*) degrees of certainty (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 768). In reference grammars (Quirk et al. 1985: 620; Biber et al. 1999; Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 768), the list of epistemic adverbials also includes evidential adverbials such as *obviously, clearly, apparently, evidently* and *reportedly*. However, in more recent studies (Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007: 38; Carretero & Zamorano-Mansilla 2013: 320), evidential adverbials are treated separately from adverbials of epistemic modality, though it is admitted that they may display an epistemic meaning extension, which is their secondary meaning. Semantic-functional differences between epistemic and evidential adverbials and their different categorisation can be illustrated in the following examples of the adverbials conveying strong epistemic commitment:

(47) *Kim definitely chaired the meeting.* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 769)

(48) *Pat is obviously in love.* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 769)

*Definitely* (47) is used in response to the questioned proposition (*Kim chaired the meeting*), whereas *obviously* (48) indicates that the truth of the proposition (*Pat is in love*) is “easily perceived” (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 769). There is no reference to evidence that Kim chaired the meeting, whereas there is evidence that Pat is in love. For this reason, *definitely* and *obviously* should belong to different semantic-functional groups. Epistemic markers of “quasi-strong” commitment such as *apparently, seemingly* and *presumably* indicate that the proposition may be not true on the basis of appearances, which also presupposes their evidential meaning. However, these markers “do not so directly allow for the possibility that the proposition is false: they suggest a qualified acceptance of the proposition” (ibid. 769). The adverbials of low epistemic commitment (*maybe, perhaps, possibly*) “indicate that the proposition is not known to be false, with the chances of its being true falling in the range from slight to more or less fifty” (ibid. 769). Epistemic adverbials can also be used as response markers (49), boosters (50) or mitigators (51) of imperatives or requests (52):

(49) *Could I ask you why not? (SP:PS3YT) Certainly.* (BNC, SPOK)

(50) <...> *start looking at attainment target one and certainly fill in, you know* (SP:PS1LT) (BNC, SPOK)

(51) *Probably, probably leave it, leave that* (SP:KDoPSUNK) (BNC, SPOK)

(52) *Yes, could you, perhaps you could find out which school she’s at* (SP:DCHPSUNK) *Yes, okay.* (BNC, SPOK)
Examples (49)-(52) illustrate the pragmatization of epistemic modal adverbials. As shown above, in imperative sentences adverbials of certainty (certainly, definitely) strengthen the illocutionary force of a command (Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007: 99), whereas adverbials of probability (perhaps, possibly) mitigate the imperative force of a request (Hoye 1997: 196).

The author’s epistemic commitment can also be expressed by adjectives of certainty, probability and possibility controlling infinitive (53) or that-complement clauses (54)-(55):

(53) *His claims are certain to escalate into a big political scandal* <...>. (BNC, NEWS)

(54) *It is quite probable that* religious symbolism was once exclusive to each particular faith. (BNC, MSC)

(55) *For one thing, it is quite possible that* people may feel free and independent even when they are actually being manipulated. (BNC, ACAD)

Epistemic nouns (e.g. certainty, probability, likelihood, belief, possibility) are found in patterns with that- clauses (56)-(57) or of- phrases (58):

(56) *Tragically, it seems a deadly certainty that* the region will dissolve into war. (BNC, NEWS)

(57) *The only thing that makes it bearable is the irrational belief that* somebody interesting will come on in a minute... (BNC, FIC)

(58) *The likelihood of* a collision now is very tiny. (BNC, NEWS)

As shown above, epistemic modal expressions are realised by a variety of means that indicate the author’s evaluation of the factuality of the proposition. The versatile functional profile of epistemic modal expressions is reflected by their evidential meaning dimension and pragmatic functions, discussed in the following subsection. A list of the epistemic modal expressions is provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Epistemic modal expressions

| Modal verbs | must, could not, cannot, may, might, should, will, will not, would, would not |
| Lexical verbs | assume, believe, feel, guess, presume, sense, suppose, think |
| Adverbials | arguably, assuredly, certainly, conceivably, definitely, doubtless, likely, surely, maybe, perhaps, probably, possibly |
| Adjectives | certain, conceivable, definite, likely, sure, probable, possible |
| Nouns | certainty, likelihood, probability, possibility |
3.2 Epistemic modal expressions in discourse

Epistemic expressions play an important role in communication, as “without epistemic expressions, we would not be able to share communicatively our degree of confidence in propositions. We would not be able to distinguish between knowledge and belief, or between certain, uncertain, and possible facts. This would severely hamper our capability of adapting adequately to changes in the environment, and thus our chances of survival” (Boye 2016: 118). Given the communicative significance of epistemic modal expressions, they have been widely studied in different types of discourse, namely academic (Biber 2006; Gray & Biber 2015), journalistic (Marín 2006; Hidalgo 2006; Marín-Arrese 2015), political (Marín-Arrese 2009b; 2011), fiction (Usonienė & Šolienė 2010), and in different genres (Carretero 2002).

The role of epistemic expressions in different types of discourse has been disclosed in a number of studies into epistemic and effective stance. Epistemic stance refers “to the positioning of the speaker/writer with respect to knowledge concerning the realization of the event, to the ways in which the speaker/writer carries out a stance act aimed at estimating the likelihood of an event and/or judging the validity of a proposition designating the event” (Marín-Arrese 2011: 195). Effective stance, as mentioned in Unit 1, pertains to the author’s position regarding the actualisation of events and influence on “the course of reality itself” (Marín-Arrese 2011: 195). Resources of effective stance include predicates and modal verbs denoting obligation, requirements, desirability, and intentionality.

Expressions of epistemic and effective stance have turned out to be revealing in describing the styles of speaking of well-known politicians, who use stance resources for strategic purposes (Marín-Arrese 2009b, 2011). For instance, in their political speeches on education and parliamentary statements on the war in Iraq, G. Brown preferred markers of effective stance, whereas T. Blair used more epistemic stance, which “reflects a lesser degree of commitment to the truth of the communicated proposition” (Marín-Arrese 2009b: 38). Thus, G. Brown’s discourse was “oriented towards the realization of events”, whereas T. Blair’s discourse relied “more on assessments relating to the knowledge” (Marín-Arrese 2009b: 40). Stance expressions in political speeches may also vary across cultures. For example, George Bush and Tony Blair used more expressions of stance in their discourse than José María Aznar López, former President of Government of Spain, which suggests that “there is a tendency in Spanish to uphold truthfulness over politeness, which might have a reflection in the lower use of epistemic stance markers in discourse” (Marín-Arrese 2011: 211).

Epistemic modal expressions (modal auxiliary verbs, epistemic adjectives and adverbs, predicates of belief and knowledge) have been widely investigated in English and Spanish news reports and opinion columns in conservative and liberal newspapers (Hidalgo 2006;
Marín 2006; Marín-Arrese 2015). In English journalistic discourse epistemic modality is twice more frequent than in Spanish, which “reflects a more tentative style in argumentative discourse strategies in English, involving a lesser degree of commitment to their assertions” (Marín-Arrese 2015: 222). Dominant epistemic modal expressions indicate probability or uncertainty (possibility) (ibid.).

The use of epistemic modal devices across types of discourse and texts has uncovered the rhetorical effects of the markers and their interpersonal or intersubjective dimension. Using epistemic expressions, authors may not only express the assessment of the factuality of the proposition but also engage the addressee into a dialogue. Epistemic stance markers “reflect the speaker’s concern with the acceptance of the information as valid on the part of the hearer, and are an indication of the way in which they use legitimisation strategies in order to manage their interests” (Marín-Arrese 2011: 210). The rhetorical effects of markers of epistemic modality and their interpersonal dimension have been considered within the category of Engagement, a part of the Appraisal framework (Martin & White 2005), discussed in Unit 2. The category of Engagement draws on a dialogic and heteroglossic approach to language, originally proposed by Bakhtin/Voloshinov, who view all discourse as a response to what has been written or said before (Martin & White 2005: 92). Martin and White (2005: 93) argue that:

This dialogistic perspective leads us to attend to the nature of the relationship which the speaker/writer is presented as entering into with ‘prior utterances in the same sphere’ – with those other speakers who have previously taken a stand with respect to the issue under consideration, especially when, in so speaking, they have established some socially significant community of shared belief or value. Thus we are interested in the degree to which speakers/writers acknowledge these prior speakers and in the ways in which they engage with them. We are interested in whether they present themselves as standing with, as standing against, as undecided, or as neutral with respect to these other speakers and their value positions. At the same time, the dialogistic perspective leads us to attend to the anticipatory aspect of the text – to the signals speakers/writers provide as to how they expect those they address to respond to the current proposition and the value position it advances. Thus we are interested in whether the value position is presented as one which can be taken for granted for this particular audience, as one which is in some way novel, problematic or contentious, or as one which is likely to be questioned, resisted or rejected.

The category of Engagement deals with the positioning of an authorial voice with regard to other voices, suggesting or excluding alternative positions. Markers of epistemic modality that express less than full commitment to the proposition (modal verbs, adjectives, adverbs, predicates of belief, e.g. *may/will/must*; *it’s almost certain that* ..., *it’s possible, perhaps, probably, maybe, I suspect that, I believe that*) are considered to present the proposition as “one of a range of possible positions” and are defined as “dialogically expansive” resources (Martin & White 2005: 98), e.g.:
In (59), the author tentatively suggests that a New England township is the only literal political democracy in the world, and similarly (60) as well as (61) convey the author’s moderate opinion. Presenting the proposition as one of a range of possible interpretations, the author opens up a dialogue with the audience. The “dialogically expansive” use of I think is highlighted in contexts containing markers of epistemic possibility and probability, e.g. may, might, could, probably (Fetzer 2014: 90), as exemplified below:

(62) I think it’s probably effective in some situations. (COCA, ACAD)

Markers of epistemic certainty (e.g. naturally, of course, obviously, there can be no doubt that) present “the proposition as highly warrantable (compelling, valid, plausible, well-founded, generally agreed, reliable, etc.)” and are considered as “dialogically contractive” resources (Martin & White 2005: 98), e.g.:

(63) It is, of course, vital that any agreement reached – its specific terms and the principles on which it is based – are interpreted in the same way by the European Union and the United Kingdom and we want to discuss how we do that. (https://ig.ft.com/theresa-may-florence-speech-annotated/)

Presenting the proposition as the only possible interpretation, the author limits the possibilities of further discussing the issue. However, “dialogically expansive” and “dialogically contractive” markers should be viewed in context. For instance, I think may not only open up space for dialogue but also close it. In contexts containing expressions of necessity and prediction, e.g. must, should, will, certainly (Fetzer 2014: 89-90), I think acquires a boosting function, as illustrated below:

(64) However, I think those of us within the university need to work hard to maintain the set <…> (COCA, ACAD)

Similarly, the verb believe may not only convey a tentative conclusion, but also express the author’s high commitment bringing into the fore affective evidence (Capelli 2007:...
As illustrated by the use of epistemic modal expressions in journalistic and political discourse, for strategic purposes authors may boost or attenuate the force of epistemic modal markers (Fetzer 2014: 68).
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### 3.3 Tasks

1. **What is the difference between the attitudinal and epistemic dimensions of evaluation?** Identify the propositions modified by epistemic expressions.

   a. *Their statement is certain to cause another storm in Anglo-German relations.* (BNC, NEWS)
   b. *Parents who give in to a toddler’s temper will increase the likelihood of tantrums recurring and find themselves becoming more angry.* (BNC, ACAD)
   c. *People have probably known more about my politics than my music.* (BNC, NEWS)
   d. *Egypt’s ancient past is impressively recreated in the hotel’s interiors with its rooms adorned with original Egyptian paintings and ceramics, which will certainly give you a taste for the Egyptian Museum just across the road.* (BNC, MSC)
   e. *The probability of this happening is fifty percent.* (BNC, ACAD)
   f. *It must have been thunder. Like drums...* (By the end of the next speech, the band is faintly audible.) (BNC, FIC)
   g. *If Steve Wyatt was taken aback by the Duchess of York’s first phone call, he must have been even more surprised by her message.* (BNC, NEWS)
   h. *Corbett stared around. An unpretentious place: two rooms downstairs with possibly two small chambers above.* (BNC, FIC)
   i. *But Tracey is likely to miss three more games with a shoulder injury.* (BNC, NEWS)
   j. *Pirated computer games are the most likely source of spreading infections, according to one expert.* (BNC, NEWS)
2. Referring to Chafe’s framework (1986), identify expressions related to “attitudes towards knowledge” and comment on their role in the extracts below.

a. Elaine and Priscilla headed back to the kitchen to get more coffee for the guests. # “Everyone seems to be having a good time,” Priscilla commented. # “They’re in the Christmas spirit, and it gets me excited, too.” Elaine gave Priscilla’s shoulder a tender squeeze. (COCA, FIC)

b. John Scott Russell (1808-82), engineer and naval architect, was a graduate of Glasgow University and pursued a varied career as a designer of vessels (from canal barges to the Great Eastern); manager of Caird’s engine works in Greenock (1838); and Secretary of the Royal Society of Arts (1845) <…>. He is perhaps best remembered for his sustained investigations into what he called the “wave of translation” and also his shipbuilding work with Brunei in the 1850s. (COCA, ACAD)

c. I -- I think that the system is certainly under a tremendous amount of pressure and has been for a long time. (COCA, SPOK)

d. According to the logbook, the voyage began in Mobile on Thursday, December 13, 1945, and ended in New Orleans on Monday, March 18, 1946. (COCA, ACAD)

e. “Even though men are said to be physically stronger than women, there are cases where wives hurt or abuse their husbands in an extreme manner,” the 58-year-old politician said, the outlet reported. (COCA, NEWS)

f. This setup saves colleges money and, it is claimed, allows students to listen to the lectures at their convenience. (COCA, MAG)

g. Dundes added: “I realize that he must have been somewhat unhappy with the one review I have written of his Indian Folktale book.” (COCA, ACAD)

h. The discovery that biodiversity in urban areas is often high, and includes at least some endangered, rare, and native species, does not alleviate concern about further introductions of exotic species. Of course, exotic species have been major agents of disruption of ecosystem structure. (COCA, ACAD)

i. Europeans have proposed setting up a sort of trust fund, an alternative delivery mechanism, they say, to pay salaries. They’re hoping to avert a real humanitarian crisis in the territory. (COCA, SPOK)

j. The conditions could have proved daunting for an untrained pilot because in the dark above snow-covered, flat terrain, it would be difficult to distinguish between the ground and the horizon without relying on navigational instruments. (COCA, NEWS)

3. Do the epistemic markers in bold express authorial or non-authorial commitment?

a. They believe this action must be taken to prevent widespread destruction of wildlife habitats. (BNC, MSC)

b. I think we’re losing track (pause) of what this actually is Paul, there are, you’re trying to do two things at once what you’re trying to do, I think (pause) is use it as a learning process for children but (pause) this is an annual report for parents (pause) and I think that part of it a-- at least surely must be a report (pause) by the sa-- member of
staff, by the department on how the child has done, by the member staff. (BNC, SPOK)
c. It **might** not be complete but it’ll **certainly** give us some of them. (BNC, SPOK)
d. Mr Eunson said the company would **probably** appeal if the environment secretary ordered the undergrounding of cables. (BNC, NEWS)
e. They **think** they’re playing. You know they’re learning. Everyone’s happy! (BNC, MSC)
f. **Surely there must be** a job somewhere for someone with his ability. (BNC, NEWS)
g. But we haven’t actually had a set amou--, although they said that there **would be** money coming (SP:PS1j7) (BNC, SPOK)

4. **Identify epistemic modal markers in the sentences below. What degree of epistemic commitment do they express?**

a. Jones is likely to undergo surgery over the weekend or early next week. (BNC, NEWS)
b. She was 34 weeks pregnant and must have been anxious as to the health of her baby. (BNC, ACAD)
c. It is possible that some of a company’s shareholders will have interests, for example, as employees or customers, that are distinct from their investment interest in the business. Others, while having a relationship with the company only in the capacity of member, might prefer the directors to take account of such issues as the environmental or social consequences of the company’s activities, and where there is a conflict, to modify the profit instinct accordingly. (BNC, ACAD)
d. She may be the bird for which some wicked fowler will spread his snares. (BNC, FIC)
e. Undoubtedly, these schemes have allowed more teachers to be trained in a short period. (BNC, ACAD)
f. There is a strong probability that a financial loss will be blamed on the computer. (BNC, ACAD)
g. It can not be much fun to have a big crowd turn against you when you have come up with the top score of the day, inspired your team, and done your best to uphold the game’s standards of decency and chivalry. (BNC, NEWS)
h. They have this interest because such mating could affect the likelihood that an individual’s genetic constitution would be reproduced in an individual of a later generation. (BNC, ACAD)
i. Surely we shouldn’t allow that c-- to continue and surely that’s er that’s er can be made into quite a semi-formal type of that’s not on is it? (BNC, SPOK)
j. I believe that we must look very closely into the alternative meal. (BNC, SPOK)

5. **Are the modal auxiliary verbs in bold used in their epistemic or non-epistemic senses? Specify the modal meanings they express. Refer to attitudes expressed by modal verbs in Unit 1.**

a. The roads were full of refugees. You **could not** help them all. (BNC, NEWS)
b. Lisa Kennedy **cannot be** serious. How could any self-respecting, supposedly intelligent
film critic proclaim “The Wizard of Oz” as her all-time favorite movie without being held up to public disdain? (COCA, NEWS)
c. The main difficulty is that he could not have been in New York at that time and in Chicago scant hours later. (COCA, FIC)
d. If you do go outside, bring a blanket because the kids might get cold. (COCA, MAG)
e. May I ask you a naïve question, Mr. Falco? Exactly how does a press agent work? (COCA, SPOK)
f. This case file also is not on-line. Instead, a copy must be ordered from the Federal Records Center in Kansas City. (COCA, ACAD)
g. I know it must be hard for you, Patsy. You worked with Harry for so many years. (COCA, FIC)
h. Trump says that by the end of the election he will have spent more than $100 million of his own money on the campaign. (COCA, NEWS)
i. “I will tolerate no further absences from services,” she said. (COCA, FIC)
j. So if he drops out before Ohio, someone would get 66 delegates. (COCA, SPOK)

6. Are the predicates of knowledge and belief in bold used in their epistemic or non-epistemic senses?

a. Do you believe in the devil? (BNC, SPOK)
b. He smiled sarcastically. ‘Believe me, I’m all ears!’ (BNC, FIC)
c. I believe it is good for artists to teach students. (BNC, MAG)
d. I believe Dr Cox should have been given a long jail sentence. (BNC, NEWS)
e. This, I believe, does less than justice to their egalitarianism. (BNC, ACAD)
f. It’s a funny thing -- I cut my fingernails all the time, and every time I think to cut them, they need cutting. Now, for instance. (BNC, FIC)
g. Yes, one must think of the future. (BNC, FIC)
h. Think positively about what is right with your life every day. (BNC, MSC)
i. And I think, Mr. Williams, you of all men should not engage in this affair. (BNC, FIC)
j. He had, I think, been very much underrated. (BNC, MSC)

7. What degree of epistemic commitment do the cognitive verbs in bold express? Is their evidential dimension foregrounded in the contexts below?

a. Building a new Haiti with reasonable housing will take a decade or two, but I believe it will happen. If we are generous and wise with our aid money and hire Haitians to do the reconstruction for reasonable wages, then a more balanced economy and a real middle class could emerge, allowing democracy to flourish. (COCA, NEWS)
b. Now, this is an ideological illusion, I think, because there are more norms of life possible than this bourgeois class identified. (COCA, ACAD)
c. Oh, it’s just so beautifully written. It’s one of the greatest pieces of writing of our century, I think. It’s poetic, it’s hilarious, it’s surprising. It’s just genius. And it’s the kind of writing where you don’t want to ruin a syllable. (COCA, SPOK)
d. When I look at this team, I feel ... like we shouldn't ever lose. I don't see how we lose. But we do. (COCA, NEWS)

e. In view of the contents of these reports, I feel that the information in the reports backed up by signed statements taken by investigation is so bad that the council should immediately make available to the news media access to copies of all of these 27 voluminous investigative reports so the public can be told what has been going on in Independence. (CUSSCO)

f. (“My life was basically headed to either where--I guess where I ended up, in prison, or death. Now I have some optimism about my life, about what I can do with my life. I'm glad that I got this chance to try again I guess you could say at a decent life.... My life was going nowhere before, and I think it's going somewhere now”). (CUSSCO)

g. So Donald Trump’s campaign plan was by far the worse - if you’re judging just by number of people covered, it was a plan that basically repealed Obamacare and replaced it with very, very little - no tax credits, no reforms in the individual market, like most of these other Republican plans have. So, you know, I assume he's not planning to go forward with that plan. But, you know, we've seen him change his mind on the timeline a lot so far. We don't really know where he's at with the substance of health reform. (COCA, SPOK)

h. A lot of pundits around the nation are saying that I should just stand up and say this whole thing was a mistake, that it was just a bone-headed idea and I should just admit it, it was a mistake, and walk away from it. And I presume that a lot of folks would conclude that if I did that, that'd be good for me politically. But there's only one problem with that. It wouldn't be honest. (COCA, SPOK)

i. The metaphor of war has now been universally accepted and it was a centerpiece of President Bush’s speech and I suppose that's inevitable. But I think a somewhat more useful metaphor is the metaphor of crime. (COCA, SPOK)

j. He used to be such a satisfactory child, docile and obedient, but lately, I warn you, Agnes, I sense that there's something going on inside her that I worry about... some sort of rebellion under the surface, something I can't put my finger on. (COCA, FIC)

8. Compare the use of expressions of epistemic and effective stance in the speeches of a male and female politician. In your analysis, consider the markers employed (modal verbs, lexical verbs, adverbials, etc.) and their meanings. Which type of stance prevails in each politician’s speech? Why?

9. Consider the use of epistemic modal expressions in an editorial or an opinion column. What effect do they create? Are they “dialogically expansive” or “contractive”?

10. What is the scope of the epistemic dimension of evaluation in the frameworks presented by Chafe (1986), Biber et al. (1999) and Boye (2012)? Comment on the categories present in the frameworks and linguistic resources of epistemic meaning.
Unit 4 Evidentiality

4.1 Definition of evidentiality, evidential values and their realisations

As mentioned in Unit 3, the other essential component of the epistemic dimension is the category of evidentiality, which is concerned with specifying how the author obtained knowledge for the proposition (Aikhenvald 2004; Boye 2012). For instance, in (1) the author directly saw some people being dressed as chickens and rabbits. In (2), the evaluation that somebody was a heavy smoker was made on the basis of the visual clues available (the hands stained with nicotine). In (3), a claim that the Clintons experienced marital problems is based on external sources (heard or read information):

(1) From photographs I see that some were dressed as chickens, some as rabbits <...> (BNC, NEWS)
(2) She was evidently a heavy smoker for the first two fingers of her right hand were stained with nicotine. (BNC, FIC)
(3) The Clintons’ marital problems, they say, began then and lasted until a few years ago. (BNC, NEWS)

Evidential meanings illustrated above display the opposition between direct and indirect types of evidence (Willett 1988; Plungian 2001) or between first-hand and second-hand evidence (Aikhenvald 2004). Direct evidence signals that the author has direct perceptual (visual, auditory, tactile, olfactory or gustatory) access to the information or has participated in the events (1). Indirect evidence including an inference (2) and a verbal report (3) indicates that the author has not witnessed the event himself/herself. The evidential values are presented in Figure 7.
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**Figure 7. Types of evidential values**

Direct evidence and inferences are considered as a personal type of evidence, whereas reports are regarded as non-personal or mediated (Plungian 2001). It is important to note
that “it is always the speaker who possesses evidence for the described event. So, the information source cannot be separated with the speaker” (Diewald & Smirnova 2010: 56). Evidence that provides the cognitive and/or communicative basis for the author’s judgement could be compared to “a pair of glasses through which the primary event is perceived” (ibid. 53). As is the case with epistemic modal meanings, evidential meanings apply to propositions, which may be true or false (Boye 2012).

Evidential meanings can be realised by morphological (grammatical) and lexical means. In Amerindian and some Himalayan languages (Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2004), evidential values are coded by means of bound morphology (inflections, clitics, suffixes) and evidentiality is regarded as a grammatical category. In European languages, except for Georgian, Turkish and Estonian, there are no means of bound morphology that convey evidential meanings (Wiemer 2010: 67-68). In European languages, the verbal categories of TAM (Tense-Aspect-Modality) may serve as formal variants of evidential markers. For instance, in Romance and Germanic languages the conditional/subjunctive mood may acquire evidential extensions, whereas in Balkan (Bulgarian, Macedonian) languages, Baltic (Latvian, Lithuanian) languages and Estonian, evidential meanings are encoded by the forms of perfect tenses (Squartini 2008; Wiemer 2010).

In European languages, a common way of encoding evidential meanings are various lexical realisations (verbs, adjectives, sentence adverbs, particles). In English evidentiality is realised by perception and communication verbs (e.g. see, hear, seem, say, claim, etc.) (Chafe 1986; Usonienė 2000, 2002, 2003; Aijmer 2009; Whitt 2010), adjectives (e.g. evident, clear, obvious, apparent, etc.), adverbials (e.g. evidently, clearly, obviously, reportedly, supposedly, allegedly, according to) (Hoye 1997; Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007) and nouns (e.g. evidence, sign, proof) (Carretero 2016). Perception and communication are the crucial sources of evidential meaning, as they provide different types of evidence for evaluating the propositional content. However, it should be noted that other semantic domains may also be the source of evidential meanings, for instance the reportive particle podobno ‘reportedly’ in Polish or the quotative marker like in English derive from the domain of comparison. A summary of evidential devices is provided in Table 8.

Table 8. Grammatical and lexical evidential devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical devices</th>
<th>Lexical devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bound morphology</strong> (inflections, clitics, suffixes): Amerindian and some Himalayan languages</td>
<td>Perception and communication verbs (e.g. see, hear, seem, say, claim, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional/subjunctive mood</strong>: Romance and Germanic languages</td>
<td><strong>Adverbials</strong> (e.g. evidently, clearly, obviously, apparently, reportedly, supposedly, allegedly, according to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfect tenses</strong>: Balkan (Bulgarian, Macedonian) languages, Baltic (Latvian, Lithuanian) languages and Estonian</td>
<td><strong>Adjectives</strong> (e.g. evident, clear, obvious, apparent, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nouns</strong> (e.g. evidence, sign, proof)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following subsections present two main types of indirect evidence, namely inferences and reports, and their linguistic realisations.

### 4.2 Inferences and their expression

As mentioned in 4.1, inferences, alongside reports, express the author’s indirect evidence for the proposition. The taxonomies of evidential meanings distinguish “observation-motivated” and “reasoning-motivated” inferences (Willett 1988), exemplified below:

(4)  *Martine was obviously a frequent visitor and knew where everything was kept. She flung mats, knives, forks, spoons, salt and pepper containers onto the table.*  
     *(BNC, FIC)*

(5)  *Growth is obviously preferred by people in organizations because it reduces conflict to manageable proportions*  
     *(BNC, ACAD)*

In (4), the inference that Martine is a frequent visitor is drawn from the author’s observation of the woman’s behaviour (*she flung mats, knives, forks, spoons*, etc.), whereas in (5) the inference that growth is preferred by people in organizations stems from the author’s reasoning (because it reduces conflict to manageable proportions). “Observation-motivated” inferences derive from observable or other types of perceptual (auditory, olfactory, gustatory) data, whereas “reasoning-motivated” inferences are based on the author’s knowledge of the world, which can be marked explicitly in the previous or following discourse or remain implicit.

Inferential meanings are commonly expressed by verbs of visual perception (e.g. *see, look*), auditory perception (e.g. *sound*) and tactile perception (e.g. *feel*) as well as by perception-based adverbials (e.g. *evidently, obviously*), adjectives (e.g. *evident, obvious*) and nouns (e.g. *evidence, sign*). The following subsections discuss the syntactic patterns of evidential verbs and other expressions and their inferential meanings.

#### 4.2.1 Verbs of perception

Verbs of perception are used evidentially not in all contexts. For instance, in the examples below, only in (7) and (8) the verb *see* is used evidentially, whereas in (6) it does not denote evidence (Whitt 2010: 26):

(6)  *I see the house.* *(Whitt 2010: 26)*

(7)  *I see the house burning.* *(Whitt 2010: 26)*
(8)  I see that the house needs renovation.

In (6), the author indicates the act of perception, i.e. seeing the house. An act of perception itself is not considered as evidence. The evidential meaning arises when visual perception becomes evidence for an event (the house burning) or the proposition (the house needs renovation). In (7), there is direct visual evidence, while in (8) the author draws an inference that the house needs renovation from looking at the state of the house (cf. Usonienė 2003). It should be noted that in the literature there might be divergent views as to whether such cases as (7) could be regarded as evidential. Since (7) illustrates states of affairs (the house burning) but not the proposition (Boye 2010, 2012), the evidential meaning of see might be questioned. However, as shown by previous research (Usonienė 2003; Whitt 2010), perception verbs in different complementation patterns may display a variety of evidential values (direct evidence, indirect evidence).

Perception verbs are not used evidentially when they co-occur with modal verbs (except for the verb can) (Whitt 2010: 60-61), occur in conditional clauses (Whitt 2010: 77-78) or are negated (e.g. I did not see the house being robbed) (Whitt 2010: 79). The verbs look, listen, smell and taste functioning as agentive perception verbs are not used evidentially either (ibid. 145). As illustrated in a number of comprehensive studies (Usonienė 2002, 2003, 2016; Whitt 2010), verbs of perception denote direct visual evidence (9a), (10a), (11a), auditory evidence (9b), (10b), (11b) or tactile evidence (9c), (10c) for an event when they occur in non-finite complementation patterns:

(9)  a. He’s not here. Yeah. Yeah, I saw him leave. (TV)
     b. I happen to be passing by their bedroom door and I heard them say that you are gonna inherit the restaurant. (TV)
     c. I was... really nervous and I took his hand for reassurance, and I felt him squeeze it, but I thought he was just comforting me. (TV)

(10)  a. I saw them talking together at the club. The conversation got quite heated. (TV)
      b. I heard her arguing on the phone with him. Something about missing money. (TV)
      c. I’m afraid I feel that headache coming on. (TV)

(11)  a. A: Elston Carr has been shot?
      B: In the. I saw him sprawled on the floor. There’s somebody else in there with him. (TV)
      b. Who leaves their bike in the hallway? You know, if I knew how to ride one, I’d steal it. Ignore him, he’s just cranky because Bert from the geology lab won a big grant. Oh, I heard him interviewed on the radio! You know, when they told him he won, he didn’t believe it, but then he did believe it. It was so funny. (TV)
In (9), the verbs see, hear and feel are followed by the bare infinitive, which indicates the completion of the action. In (10), the present participle indicates the action in progress and in (11) the past participle shows a “resultant state” (11a) and a “passive event” (11b) (Whitt 2010: 73). In the examples above, the author himself/herself witnessed the events. The meaning of indirect evidence, namely inference, is expressed by verbs of visual perception (e.g. see, look), auditory perception (e.g. sound) and tactile perception (e.g. feel) in different complementation patterns. Verbs of visual and tactile perception denote inferences when they control that-complement clauses, as in the following examples:

(12) Now I see that she only wanted to have a little fun. Like all young people, Mr. Johnson. (TV)

(13) These are the sorts of remarks that are heard quite often, signalling the presence of a basic tension of teaching and learning. In what follows I have tried to be explicit and specific about experiences which are by their nature woolly and indeterminate, resisting expression. Looking back over them, I see that in many cases the same underlying tension is addressed in different ways. (BNC, ACAD)

(14) I feel that you are lying. I must concur. I do feel a strong connection to you. (TV)

An inference (12) that a girl wanted to have fun is drawn from an observation. An inference (13) may also be derived from the author’s reasoning, which serves as evidence for the proposition (Whitt 2010: 58). The verb feel (14) denotes the author’s emotions and intuition as a type of evidence that leads to a conclusion that the person is lying. The evidence denoted by the verb feel “is less global, and thus not as likely to express absolute certainty on the part of the speaker” (ibid. 189). The verbs see and feel can also encode inferences when they function parenthetically (15)-(16):

(15) You’ve traded four wheels for two, I see, Dr Enderbury. (TV)

(16) He was, I feel, very charismatic, people were, in a way, entranced by him. (TV)

The parenthetical see (15) marks an inference drawn from reasoning, and the parenthetical feel (16) stands for the author’s belief or intuition as evidence for an assertion. Parenthetically used see suggests that “there is a greater awareness of a larger community, and therefore an implicit acceptance of alternate possibilities of perception, evidence, and interpretations thereof” (Whitt 2010: 151), while “parenthetical feel does not function only to mark the perception of the perceiver because, after all, one’s personal feelings cannot be felt by anyone other than the self” (ibid. 200). Inferences can also be expressed by the perception verbs look and sound taking an adjectival complement (17), (18):

(17) I see you are, in a way, entranced. (TV)

(18) I feel the girl had a little fun. (TV)
In (17), the author infers that Park looked uncomfortable because he was rubbing his temples; in (18), Jennifer draws an inference from auditory perception. When “the speaker only makes a comment about some sort of physically tangible attribute of the perceived object but does not use perception as a basis for inference” (Whitt 2010: 119), as shown in (19), the perception verb expresses value judgement (Usonienė 2002; Whitt 2010), i.e. an attitude described in Units 1 and 2:

(17) Park looked uncomfortable, rubbing his temples. (COCA, FIC)

(18) “<...> If you want something strongly enough, and you are willing to do whatever it takes, and in this case you are willing to learn, then you will succeed,” Grama advised her. “That sounds reasonable to me,” Jennifer agreed. (COCA, FIC)

In a similar vein to look, the verbs sound, feel, smell and taste taking an adjectival complement often denote “a mere value judgement on the part of the speaker” (Whitt 2010: 214), as shown below:

(19) She comes out, she looks beautiful in her riding outfit, goes out for her ride, comes back, goes into the house, doesn’t say a word. (COCA, MAG)

(20) The coffee smells good. (COCA, FIC)

(21) And the wine still tasted fine! (COCA, NEWS)

In the examples above, there is no inference but mere appreciation of the smell of coffee and taste of wine. In patterns with adjectival complements verbs of perception may express “our impressions, which are evaluatively coloured and not necessarily true to facts” (Usonienė 2002: 144). Inferences drawn from visual clues can be made about one’s health, moods, behaviour, character traits (Whitt 2010: 117). When the verbs look, sound and feel are followed by a conjunction as if/as though, they imply tentative evidence (ibid. 115-122):

(22) She looks as if she is afraid to respond, but then she tilts her head as she considers my question. (COCA, FIC)

(23) Sometimes I felt as if my life was just a dream. (TV)

In (22), the visual evidence available is not sufficient, and there is no certainty that the woman was afraid to respond. In (23), intuition, i.e. a subjective type of evidence, serves as evidence for the assertion that the person’s life was just a dream.
4.2.2 Verbs of seeming

The verb *seem* is a phenomenon-based perception verb which indicates that “there is a phenomenon or stimulus (visual, aural, tactile) which gives rise to a reaction (e.g. a belief or opinion that something may be the case). *Seem* is related to other sense-impression or phenomenon-based verbs (*look, sound, feel*) but has a vaguer meaning and has developed additional uses where it is closer to evidential verbs such as *think* (Aijmer 2009: 72). The evidential meaning of the verb *seem* is also dependent on the type of complement patterns it is found in (Usonienė 2000, 2003; Aijmer 2009; Usonienė & Šinkūnienė 2013). The verb *seem* taking a *to*-complement clause (24) or occurring as a parenthetical (25) denotes an inference drawn from perception:

(24) Edmund: *Well, maybe that’s the babysitter. I -- I hired a new one. The kids *seem* to like her.*
Maria: Oh, really?
Edmund: Yeah. *She’s sweet and very responsible.* (SOAP)

(25) Bill: *I think my heart is... my heart, it seems, is working. Well, that’s good.* (SOAP)

As shown in (24), Edmund draws an inference that the children like the new babysitter from observing her behaviour with children; in (25), an inference is based on personal feelings. Evaluation of different types of sensory evidence may result in the author’s tentative conclusion (Usonienė & Šinkūnienė 2013: 296-297). In such contexts the verb *seem* may display the meaning of epistemic uncertainty, e.g.:

(26) *As fashion, gaming, pop music, social media and just about everything else have combined to shrink the world and bridge gaps of culture and taste, American movie audiences seem to cling to a cautious, isolationist approach to entertainment. # And the Oscars reinforce this, frequently ignoring accessible and entertaining movies from other countries and settling on a frequently random-seeming list of finalists.* (COCA, NEWS)

In (26), alongside its evidential meaning, *seem* reveals the author’s reduced epistemic commitment to the propositional content. When the verb *seem* takes an adjectival complement, as in (27), it also denotes an inference based on perception:

(27) Lizzie: *Mom’s coming here?*
Alan: *Yes. You seem surprised.* (SOAP)

This use of *seem* “can convey some modal qualification which can be derived from the perception meaning (inference on the basis of perceptual evidence)” (Aijmer 2009: 82). The multifunctional profile of *seem* has been illustrated by its multiple translation
correspondences in Germanic, Baltic, Slavic and Romance languages (Aijmer 2009; Usonienè & Šinkūnienè 2013), which prove the co-occurrence of evidential and epistemic meaning components of the marker.

4.2.3 Adverbials, adjectives and nouns

As mentioned in Unit 3, evidential adverbials, such as obviously, clearly, evidently, apparently, presumably, seemingly are placed alongside epistemic adverbials in reference grammars (Quirk et al. 1985; Huddleston & Pullum 2002). However, they are conceptually different from adverbials of epistemic modality. Evidential adverbials specify the source of information, while epistemic adverbials express the degree of the author’s epistemic commitment (Carretero & Zamorano-Mansilla 2013: 320). The group of inferential adverbials includes evidently, obviously, clearly, apparently, presumably and seemingly. The adverbials evidently, obviously and clearly display non-evidential use when they function as adverbials of manner, e.g.:

(28) It’s hard being an arts administrator, at least if you care as passionately about the arts as Mr. Lichtenstein so evidently does. (COCA, NEWS)

(29) I was just going to say obviously throughout this entire vetting process, the White House knew about that videotape, so... (COCA, SPOK)

(30) These pools of jurisdiction are even more clearly defined in the context of prescriptive jurisdiction, or the state’s power to regulate certain conduct or actors. (COCA, ACAD)

In the contexts above, the adverbials modify the action or quality but not a proposition and hence occur as adverbials of manner. Evidently, obviously and clearly display an evidential use when they express the author’s inference based on observation or other sensory data (31)-(32) or on the knowledge of the world (33)-(34), as exemplified below:

(31) He shuddered. Evidently his nerves were too weak this time. (COCA, FIC)

(32) He stared through her, haughty, cold, clearly unmoved by her apology. (COCA, FIC)

(33) I feel ambivalent about the need to choose, but evidently some philosophers do not. For example, take Joseph Raz, the Oxford professor <...> (COCA, ACAD)

(34) The study of interpersonal relationship skills is clearly important because deficits in this area may have lifelong correlates. (COCA, ACAD)
Whether the adverbials modify the proposition or an element within a clause can be checked by the predicative structure with the corresponding adjective, e.g. *it is evident/obvious/clear that*. For instance, (31) can be paraphrased by “it was evident that his nerves were too weak this time”. The adverbials *obviously, clearly* and *evidently* presuppose a high degree of the author’s commitment (Carretero & Zamorano-Mansilla 2013), whereas the adverbials *apparently, seemingly* and *presumably* imply the lower commitment, e.g.:

(35) *It was a rough video. She was apparently trying to break up a fight that her sister was in at school.* (COCA, SPOK)

(36) *Abundant, fulfilled, completely comfortable with her life, she picked up her pace, feeling somewhat foolish and silly for her thoughts. She laughed, the sound seemingly odd since she was walking alone, no one to hear her.* (COCA, FIC)

(37) *Defective genes are now presumably accumulating from generation to generation because natural pruning is no longer taking place.* (COCA, FIC)

The inferences marked by the adverbials above express tentativeness, and in a similar manner to the verb *seem* show the co-occurrence of the evidential and epistemic meaning components. Inferences can be expressed by related adjectives *evident, apparent, obvious* and *clear* or the nouns *evidence, sign, proof* (Carretero 2016):

(38) *It’s absolutely clear that we would be having adverse comments and criticism* <...> *(BNC, SPOK)*

(39) *There’s strong evidence that Cornwall fulfils the requirements of those special geographic considerations.* *(BNC, SPOK)*

As shown above, the evidential adjective *clear* and the noun *evidence* take a *that*-clause and qualify a proposition in terms of evidence. In both cases the evidence is strong, for *clear* co-occurs with the intensifier *absolutely* and *evidence* with the adjective *strong*. Evidential nouns “are used by the speaker/writer to qualify the truth of a proposition by characterizing and evaluating the evidence for or against this truth” (Carretero 2016: 55).

Summing up the realisations of inferences, it should be noted that “(...) inferentials arise from the need to assign causes to observed situations” (Willett 1988: 61) and “<...> inferential evidentials primarily denote the speaker’s reflection of some evidence, i. e. they indicate the relation between the described situation and some other situation, which is treated by the speaker as evidence for the former” (Diewald & Smirnova 2010: 63). A list of inferential verbs, adverbials, adjectives and nouns is provided in Table 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Inferential verbs, adverbials, adjectives and nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb of perception</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual: see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tactile: feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual: look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auditory: sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Verb of seeming</strong></th>
<th><strong>Structure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Indirect evidence (inference), illustration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>seem</td>
<td>V + that clause</td>
<td>• It seems that there's always something more important. (BNC, NEWS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V + to clause</td>
<td>• The laws of physics seem to be the same for particles and antiparticles. (BNC, ACAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenthetical</td>
<td>• Everybody, it seems, does some science. (BNC, NEWS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V + adjective</td>
<td>• The idea seems strange. (BNC, ACAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Adverbial</strong></th>
<th><strong>Structure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Indirect evidence (inference), illustration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>modify</td>
<td>• You're evidently a man who knows his way around. (BNC, FIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clearly</td>
<td>propositions</td>
<td>• Not very far from me another baby by, apparently full fed and contented. (BNC, FIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obviously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presumably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seemingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Adjective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Structure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Indirect evidence (inference), illustration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apparent</td>
<td>ADJ + that clause</td>
<td>• It is apparent that a step has been made in the right direction... (BNC, MSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is already evident that new roads only generate new traffic &lt;...&gt; (BNC, MSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obvious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Noun</strong></th>
<th><strong>Structure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Indirect evidence (inference), illustration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>N + that clause</td>
<td>• This is evidence that he does not posses any deep feelings at all for any of them. (BNC, MSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proof</td>
<td>N + of phrase</td>
<td>• The whole effect is evident proof of a fine tradition of Bohemian craftsmanship. (BNC, MSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Reports and their expression

Reports are expressed by verbs of speaking (e.g. say, tell, claim), verbs of auditory perception (e.g. hear), verbs of seeming (e.g. seem, appear) and by adverbials (e.g. reportedly, allegedly, supposedly). Reportive markers indicate that “the speaker has indirect access
based on someone else’s perceptual and cognitive capacities, i.e. what he has heard from someone else” (Diewald & Smirnova 2010: 64). The author does not show any personal commitment to the reported information. Reportives can be of two types: quotatives, which specify the exact source of the report, and hearsay, which does not reveal the source because it is unknown or unimportant (Aikhenvald 2004: 64), as shown below:

(40)  *Shirley and Christopher specialise in psychodynamics. This, they say, is healing the person from within and establishing how the past has affected* (BNC, NEWS)

(41)  *And, as they say in showbiz circles, a star is brawn.* (BNC, NEWS)

(42)  *An aide had apparently taken him aside and told him to do something fast about his image.* (BNC, NEWS)

(43)  *As they say, the show must go on.* (BNC, NEWS)

In (40), the source of the report are Shirley and Christopher mentioned in the preceding discourse. In (41), the source is more general, since it is attributed to people in show-business in general, and in (42) the source of the report is unknown. (43) exemplifies a report of common knowledge. The author may report not only what he/she heard from external sources (44) but also report other parties’ thoughts (45):

(44)  *Labour, they say, is likely to be distracted by deepening internal division over its constitutional plans <…>* (BNC, ACAD)

(45)  *They think they can produce a better result than the professionals and they are right.* (BNC, ACAD)

(44) emphasises the communicative aspect of “the acquisition of the information”, whereas (45) highlights the cognitive aspect (Marín-Arrese 2009a: 247). The following sub-sections deal with verbs of speaking (e.g. *say, tell, claim*), verbs of auditory perception (e.g. *hear*), verbs of seeming (e.g. *seem, appear*) and adverbials (e.g. *reportedly, allegedly, supposedly*) expressing reports.

4.3.1 Verbs of speaking

Alongside verbs of perception, verbs of speaking (*verba dicendi*), i.e. *say, tell, report, claim*, are another source of evidential meaning. In a similar manner to verbs of perception, they do not function as evidential markers in all contexts. When verbs of speaking occur in contexts of reported speech, they do not display an evidential use, as illustrated below:
Carolina Herrera, Tommy Hilfiger and Diane von Furstenberg have all said that any brand should be proud to dress the first lady of the United States. (COCA, NEWS)

Schatz said what surprised him most was the Bears inability to pick up blitzing defensive backs. (COCA, NEWS)

“The things I’m accused of are selfless acts,” he said. (COCA, NEWS)

Reported speech foregrounds the perspective of the original speaker, whereas reported evidentials communicate that information comes from external sources, without mentioning the original speaker (Chojnicka 2010). In (46)-(47), the verb said reports indirect speech, whereas in (48) it introduces direct speech. Reported speech contexts are characterised by “a specific human agent, as subject, or a missing subject that can be traced to a specific human agent” (Chojnicka 2016: 79). Verbs of speaking mark reportive evidentiality with collective subjects or “people in general” (49) or with subjects irretrievable from the context (50) (ibid.):

Authorities say that the parents of ride-hailing company Uber’s CEO were riding a boat on Pine Flat Lake when it hit a rock and sank. (COCA, NEWS)

New York, they say, is the great example of the Democratic Welfare State; (BNC, NEWS)

In (49), the source of the report is authorities, a collective subject, whereas in (50) the subject they in the parenthetical they say refers to “people in general”. Alongside the parenthetical they say, used as a marker of reportive indirect evidence (50), other evidential parentheticals including verbs of saying are I’m told, they tell me, they allege, it is said, it is reported, it is claimed, it is rumoured, it has been claimed, considered as “comment clauses” (Quirk et al. 1985: 1114). The primary function of these markers is to indicate that the author obtained information for the proposition from external sources, whereas the secondary function is to express “the speaker’s tentativeness over the truth value of the matrix clause” (Quirk et al. 1985: 1114), as exemplified below:

Journalism, it is said, is the first draft of history. (COCA, NEWS)

There will be a lot more such switches, I am told, if Republicans do well in the next few years. (COCA, MAG)

After Gray was hurt, they allege, the officer failed to get him prompt medical care <...>. (COCA, NEWS)

The neutral verbs say and tell (51)-(52) indicate that the reported information comes from external sources, whereas the verb allege (53) reinforces the tentativeness of the propositional content and the author’s disassociation from the reported information.
4.3.2 Verbs of auditory perception and verbs of seeming

The auditory perception verb *hear* and the verbs *seem* and *appear* may occur in different structural patterns when they denote reports. The verb *hear* indicates the author’s report when it controls a *that*-clause (54) or occurs parenthetically (55):

(54) Hollywood... Ooh, I would like to go to Hollywood. I *hear that* the climate is marvelous. Just great. Spend weekends in Palm Springs. (TV)

(55) But in these stories, *we hear*, there’s always... there’s always some justice in the end. (TV)

By using the verb *hear*, the author reports that he/she heard from external sources that the climate in Hollywood is marvelous (54) and that in these stories there is always some justice in the end (55). These examples illustrate second-hand reports, with the author not being present when the actual words were uttered. The second-hand source is frequently unspecified and “it is reported that the content of the proposition has been acquired via hearsay. That is the SP/W has heard someone else assert the content of the proposition, and this content is to be believed” (Whitt 2010: 137). In case of a first-hand report, the author is present at the moment when the actual words were uttered, as shown in example (56), which illustrates the non-evidential use of the verb *hear*:

(56) *I heard what* you said to Uncle Carl. You shouldn’t be listening to private conversations. And you shouldn’t have said what you did about Mommy! (TV)

Verbs of seeming express an external source of information when they control a *that*-clause or are used parenthetically, e.g.:

(57) Erica: *What about Pablo?*  
    Jack: Pablo? Yes, well, *it seems that* Pablo has dropped out of sight, as well. (SOAP)

(58) *Nixon, it appears, the governor of Missouri did not notify the White House.* (COCA, SPOK)

(59) *South Dakota, it seems, is every joker’s favorite state* <...> (COCA, NEWS)

In the examples above, the verbs denote a report shared with the addressee and thus display an intersubjective value (Cornillie 2010). It is argued that “the intersubjective aspect of *it seems that* is also underlined by the close similarity between this structure and *it is said that*. Because of the intersubjective meaning *it seems that* can be associated with a high degree of certainty or probability, i.e. the truth is further guaranteed by it
being shared” (Aijmer 2009: 78). Alongside parentheticals containing verbs of speaking, the parentheticals *it seems* and *it appears* are referred to as “comment clauses” in Quirk et al. (1985: 1114). It should be noted that verbs of seeming are multifunctional, since they may also display inferential functions, as shown in subsection 4.2.2.

### 4.3.3 Adverbials

The group of reportive adverbials includes *reportedly, apparently, allegedly* and *supposedly*. The most neutral is *reportedly* (60), which implies the official and professional nature of the original source (Wierzbicka 2006: 283-284):

(60)  *In a meeting with the Belgian prime minister on the same foreign trip, Trump reportedly offered an explanation. He holds negative views of Europe because it took so long to get his golf courses approved there.* (COCA, NEWS)

In (60), the author indicates detachment from the source (Celle 2009: 282), which is not identified. *Apparently* (61) does not attribute information to a professional source as *reportedly* (60) does (Wierzbicka 2006: 279):

(61)  *At the time Bannon was sharing the lease with Clohesy in Opechee, she was apparently involved with another man. Neighbors said they repeatedly saw a man they could not identify at the house.* (COCA, NEWS)

In (61), the information that a woman is involved with another man is based on information from neighbours (*neighbours said*). It is claimed that “the speaker is not casting doubt on the other person’s words but doesn’t accept responsibility for their validity either” (Wierzbicka 2006: 279). The adverbial *apparently* may also display an inferential function:

(62)  *Trump apparently cooled to the idea of moving the embassy following a meeting this month with King Abdullah II of Jordan, an ally in the U.S. fight against Islamic State extremists and other militants.* (COCA, NEWS)

In (62), *apparently* expresses an inference drawn from observation. *Allegedly* (63), unlike *apparently* and *reportedly*, denotes the author’s complete disassociation from the reported information (Wierzbicka 2006: 282):

(63)  *Brown is also accused of another shooting a few eeks earlier in the West Side Austin neighborhood, police said. # He allegedly confronted a 22-year-old man about 7:50 p.m. Oct. 19, 2016, in the 200 block of South Central Avenue and opened fire, striking the man in the leg.* (COCA, NEWS)
The author does not know whether the proposition is true or not. Interestingly, *allegedly* “does not necessarily imply an assertive source, hearsay serving as a fictitious pretext in a number of cases” (Celle 2009: 284). *Supposedly* (64), implying distance from the reported information, denotes the author’s scepticism of the report (Wierzbicka 2006: 281):

(64) *An inquiry into Fredericks’s conduct is continuing. The relay event the Brazilians were supposedly sponsoring never took place there.* (COCA, NEWS)

The reportive adverbials above are not interchangeable, as they imply different information about the original source and attitude towards the reported information (Wierzbicka 2006; Celle 2009). The primary function of reportive adverbials is to indicate external sources the proposition is based on. A list of reportive expressions is provided in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Reportive expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb of speaking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb of auditory perception</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb of seeming</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverbial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apparently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allegedly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reportive adverbial</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Indirect evidence (inference), illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>modify propositions</td>
<td><em>Alexander was, allegedly, infatuated with her but there was something wrong.</em> (BNC, FIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allegedly</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Apparently they’re causing quite te-- dreadful pollution.</em> (BNC, SPOK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reportedly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supposedly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reportive adverbials above are not interchangeable, as they imply different information about the original source and attitude towards the reported information (Wierzbicka 2006; Celle 2009). The primary function of reportive adverbials is to indicate external sources the proposition is based on. A list of reportive expressions is provided in Table 10.
4.4 Evidential expressions in discourse

A discourse-functional approach to evidentiality adopted in studies on evidential markers in European languages revealed that evidential expressions may acquire interactional and textual functions typical of pragmatic markers (Brinton 2008: 17-18). As a result of the process of pragmatisation, they cease to mark the author's epistemic justification and extend into discourse management devices. They establish a common ground with the addressee, emphasise the author's argumentation and link units of discourse (Brinton 2008). Much attention has been devoted to evidential adverbials displaying pragmatic functions. For instance, apart from its inferential function, obviously can denote common sense evidence (65), i.e. “as everyone should know”, or function as a solidarity marker (66):

(65) While I don’t know anything about President Obama’s transcripts, his grades were obviously high enough to get into Harvard Law School. (COCA, NEWS)

(66) Obviously, we could not ask our readers to vote for Mr. Clinton without addressing his most significant leadership problem. Many Americans do not trust him or believe him to be a person of character. (COCA, NEWS)

In a similar manner to epistemic markers mentioned in 3.2, evidential expressions may display “dialogically expansive” or “contractive” features in discourse, outlined within the category of Engagement in the Appraisal framework (Martin & White 2005). Obviously may imply the author’s agreement with the addressee with respect to the proposition and exclude contrary positions. Pertaining to “the shared value or belief as universally, or at least as very widely, held in the current communicative context” (Martin & White 2005: 124), obviously becomes “dialogically contractive”. Similarly, the adverb clearly makes the authorial voice persuasive and rejects opposing alternatives (Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007: 307), as illustrated below:

(67) Among this season’s presidential candidates, Barack Obama has clearly had the edge when it comes to that magical quality known as charisma. Pundits of every political stripe have commented on Senator Obama’s “rock-star quality.” After meeting him, even the most jaded political reporters have been known to report that he is something rare and special, the heir to such charismatic predecessors as John F. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy. (COCA, NEWS)

(68) Clearly, we must stop playing the blame game and find a solution to this largely man-made fire problem. There is considerable agreement that a good place to start reducing fire risk is on lands close to homes and communities. (COCA, NEWS)
In (67), clearly reinforces the author’s strong opinion that Barack Obama was a charismatic candidate for a president. In (68), the emphatic clearly expresses the author’s urgent appeal to combat the problem of fire. The emphatic use of clearly implies “the presence of some resistance, some contrary pressure of doubt or challenge against which the authorial voice asserts itself” (Martin & White 2005: 128). Evidential markers that evoke insufficient evidence, i.e. seem, apparently, seemingly present the author’s evaluation of a proposition as one of the possible interpretations, implying that there could be alternative views, and function as “dialogically expansive” markers (cf. Martin & White 2005: 109), e.g.:

(69) Football seemingly desires to avoid offending the sensibilities of the nation. (COCA, NEWS)

The “dialogically expansive” features also characterise reportive markers (Martin & White 2005: 111). For instance, reporting verbs say, report, believe, think, claim attributing information to external sources may show the author’s interaction with these sources:

(70) Technology, they say, will make future wars precise, rapid and decisive. (COCA, NEWS)

(71) Another was an Afghan youth from the town who claimed to be gathering brush. (COCA, NEWS)

Verbs such as say, report, believe express the author’s acknowledgement of other sources, whereas the verbs claim, rumour convey the author’s distance from the reported information. Through attributing information to sources, “the textual voice represents the proposition as but one of a range of possible positions” (Martin & White 2005: 98).

The rhetorical features of evidential markers make them significant linguistic resources in different types of discourse and genres. In spoken discourse, evidential expressions may acquire interactional and expressive functions (Cornillie 2010). In academic writing, they may reinforce the epistemic evaluation or mitigate it. In journalistic discourse, “they are used by journalists to give bases for subjective statements and to evaluate the reliability of different kinds of information” (Bednarek 2010: 31). Depending on the source of evidence (perceptual, cognitive, communicative) and mode of knowing (direct, indirect) accessible to the author, evidential markers may add to the credibility of reports and opinions found in news discourse. In a similar manner to epistemic modal expressions, evidential markers may realise the author’s strategic purposes in discourse.
Keywords:

Source of information: Observation-motivated inference
Direct evidence: Reasoning-motivated inference
Indirect evidence: Original source
Sensory/perceptual data: Distance from reported information
Inference: Verb of perception/speaking/seeming
Report: Common sense evidence
CTP: That-clause

4.5 Tasks

1. Which words in the extracts below express an evidential meaning? Identify the propositions they comment on.

a. *It was also evident that some of the interviewees were more relaxed during this session and more willing to develop their answers. The first sessions had obviously been a useful learning experience for all concerned. There was a more relaxed and unstilted feel to the interviews.* (BNC, ACAD)

b. *Figure 5.1 also shows John’s cube. John obviously had considerable spatial skills. Comments on his mathematical development from other teachers made no reference to this strength.* (BNC, ACAD)

c. *The levels of report in the Hughes and Cole study were all calculated per kilometre travelled. This was clearly necessary for their analysis since it allowed them to aggregate data over different drivers.* (BNC, ACAD)

d. *(...) the Oxford meeting which followed Cnut’s death decided that he should hold the country for himself and his brother, and that Emma was allowed to reside in Winchester with Harthacnut’s housecarls to keep Wessex for him. Harthacnut was thus evidently thought to have a claim (...).* (BNC, ACAD)

e. *Polls in 1963 confirmed that in American eyes Britain was still the most dependable ally, but Gallup in July also recorded that West Germany (58 per cent) was now only 5 per cent behind Britain. Overall British backing for the relationship was apparently marginally less in 1963 (67 per cent) than in 1952 <...>.* (BNC, ACAD)

f. *It’s a system which sets out to restore and maintain good health by inserting needles into specific points on the surface of your skin. The use of the needles is said to stimulate your body into rebalancing itself.* (BNC, MAG)

g. *I intended this to be a letter, but I see that it has turned into a political commentary.* (BNC, MSC)

h. *Two other state witnesses, Kenneth Kgase and Barend Mono, then said they were too frightened to give evidence. All three men had allegedly been abducted by Mrs Mandela’s bodyguards at the end of 1988.* (BNC, MAG)
2. Identify verbs of perception in the following extracts. What type of evidence (direct, indirect) do they express? In cases they denote indirect evidence (inference), specify the type of inference (observation-motivated, reasoning-motivated). Which examples illustrate non-evidential meaning (an act of perception, value judgement)?

a. She was crouching over some flower bed, I see her, always, extracting some weed or other. (BNC, FIC)  
b. There’s this person sitting on the pavement watching them. At first I think it’s an old man, but then I see it’s a lady. She’s all wrapped up warm with this big old coat on. (BNC, FIC)  
c. Then we saw the sky burst into red. (BNC, NEWS)  
d. The day was fine, and the grounds looked very pretty. (Whitt 2010: 119)  
e. PAMELA, in tears, rushes off and meets MRS. JERVIS. MRS. JERVIS: Come, I see you are troubled at something. Tell me what is the matter? (BNC, FIC)  
f. The refugees from the terror looked as though they had been tramping through the night. (Whitt 2010: 119)  
g. As I adjust, I see the most perfect garden, tended by invisible hands with exquisite taste and love. (BNC, MSC)  
h. The elderly are terrified to cross the road in what is the main shopping centre. An elderly lady, this weekend actually, it sounds funny but it’s rather serious what she said actually. (BNC, SPOK)  
i. Your face looks this instant pale as marble. (Whitt 2010: 119)  
j. She sounded very nervous. She said she was going away. (BNC, NEWS)  
k. Looking back, I feel that relationships between me and the team started to break down at the Hungarian Grand Prix. (BNC, NEWS)  
l. I felt my shoulders relax a little, thinking of the tranquil week ahead. (BNC, MSC)  

3. Do the adverbials in bold denote manner or evidence?

a. Tesco products are clearly labelled with the distinctive Tesco Cares “recyclable” logo. (BNC, MSC)  
b. In January she clearly needed another break and she was off skiing in Klosters. (BNC, NEWS)  
c. This may have been a just compromise, but it was clearly illogical. The normal rule in such circumstances is for the convictions to be set aside. (BNC, ACAD)  
d. Complete the form fully and clearly, attaching the documentation requested on the form. (BNC, MSC)  
e. But we couldn’t obviously see the plane. We could only see the flames and the smoke. (COCA, SPOK)  
f. Rane marched straight toward the front door of the shop. And she was obviously not in a good mood. (COCA, FIC)
g. A statue of him was **obviously** visible when one walked into any public school. (COCA, ACAD)

h. Media advocates **evidently** believe that such leaks ought to and will be protected by a shield law. (COCA, MAG)

i. **Evidently**, America found it fascinating. The interest surrounding the show, some silly show that at the time didn’t even have an air date, was overwhelming. (COCA, FIC)

j. And **evidently**, Nancy, you’re exactly right. The story is as disturbing as it is sad. (COCA, SPOK)

4. Identify the functions of the adverbials in bold in the following extracts. What rhetorical effects do the markers illustrate?

a. Bathsheba went back to the house, and returned a short while later in her new green riding dress. She and Boldwood were **obviously** going for a ride together. As Gabriel’s concentration was broken for a moment, his shears cut the sheep’s skin. (BNC, FIC)

b. They protested and you wanted rid of them so you decided to have their house set on fire. ‘One of the appalling things is the way you joined your co-accused in your wickedness. You **obviously** knew they were not the brightest of fellows.’ The judge ordered that Paul Spencer, 17, and Alwyn Stephenson, 16, both of Stockwell, be detained for 4 years. (BNC)

c. Now, I mean, **obviously**, the point is that he often tweets without things being verified and without all the full information. (COCA, SPOK)

d. Some Republican leaders in the Senate are saying they want to take a look at that. What is your view? SEN-JAMES-LANKFORD# Yes, we’re trying to look at the whole situation, **obviously**. It’s incredibly tragic. It’s what we always say in this situation. (COCA, SPOK)

e. Ben, **obviously**, this requires a world kind of working with us or at least rowing in the same direction. Will China? (COCA, SPOK)

f. I’m, I’m, I’m, I’m sorry, I’m sorry Councillor (-----), but you **obviously** haven’t been listening to debate this morning. the issue is about the settlement that we have received. It relates to lots of policy areas (SP:J3PPSUNK) (unclear) (SP:PS3MM) and the way in which the, the whole settlement is skewed against Shropshire, we hear it on every budget debate (SP:J3PPSUNK) (BNC, SPOK)

g. When you look at Meryl Streep and what she had to say the other night, there is **clearly** so much sort of fear mixed with anger on the part of certain elements of society. (COCA, SPOK)

h. They had not encountered any kind of combat. This time they did. Did the proper intelligence? Did they know what they were facing? **Clearly**, they did not, because they walked into an ISIS ambush. So that will be a key question (COCA, SPOK)

i. Nixon **clearly** had experience. He had been a congressman, he had been a senator, he had been vice president. (COCA, SPOK)

j. Where their house once stood, there is now a deep crater. **Evidently**, this was a precision strike. Israel says it has hit only terrorist targets. (COCA, SPOK)
5. Identify verbs of auditory perception in the following extracts and comment on the meanings they express.

a. I hear from Richie that you’ve agreed to go to Spain. (BNC, FIC)
b. I have not heard anyone propose a serious project for the restoration of full employment at the national level. (BNC, ACAD)
c. I hear you’re going on holiday with your mum and dad? (BNC, SPOK)
d. Then I slide off in the direction of New Cross Station. I hear them turn the engine on. Then they pass me. (BNC, FIC)
e. I think I hear the servants moving, sir. (BNC, FIC)
f. I hear pronounced heavy breathing behind me. A small boy catches up with me. (BNC, MSC)
g. You know, Judy, again and again, I heard from a group of 16 former employees in his companies that they felt guilty, that they felt a sense that they needed to speak out earlier and they had been too afraid for many years. (COCA, SPOK)
h. I heard from a friend that you’ve given up panning for the shiny stuff and are running a newspaper office instead. (COCA, FIC)
i. The United States is now, we hear, in a recession, and Japan is lower -- no growth. (COCA, SPOK)
j. “I heard what sounded like an explosion and raised voices outside Parliament, and so I rushed to the window,” HuffPost U.K. reporter Owen Bennett recounted. (COCA, FIC)

6. Identify markers of report in the following extracts from the spoken subcorpus of the BNC and indicate the sources of the report.

a. Now because of that, you can multiply by (unclear). Yeah, you can multiply (unclear) that’s fine (SP:PS2A7) (unclear) (SP:PS2A6) no problem there. It's only the division by zero (SP:PS2A7) Mm. (SP:PS2A6) erm because it doesn't follow all the rules, they say, well it’s not really a number. And it’s (unclear) you know, some say yes, some say no. I tend to think it isn’t. (BNC, SPOK)
b. I mean people are always going to want to want the convenience of er driving to a nearby established supermarket, but their profit margins will decline. (SP:PS5FE) But the big three supermarket chains deny their high court action is to kill off Costco. They say they simply want clubs to be subject to the same planning restrictions they face. (BNC, SPOK)
c. How do you fancy paying twenty pounds extra for the second set? Well I know you don’t fancy it, but do you think it’s fair? Well, this has been suggested by MPs on the Commons’ Heritage Committee, and this is part of their proposals to spread the burden of the B B C’s one point six billion pound costs. It would, they say, lessen the burden on hard-up viewers who can’t afford the eighty odd pounds, I think it’s eighty three pounds isn’t it for a television li-- a colour television licence now? (BNC, SPOK)
d. Certainly, I mean, something you should be aware of, however, if you’re using colour coding, if you’re using symbols and abbreviations, is the minute that you need a key
to understand your own abbreviations and your, or what the colours mean, you're wasting time. And these things have to be instantly recognisable. And again, I mean the training agency are, are sort of masters and mistresses they say, of this, because they, they had this stuff and then they actually you know, certain departments will have a pre-printed page with all the abbreviations that you should use. (BNC, SPOK)
e. The Chernobyl disaster sent radioactive fall-out across the northern hemisphere and scientists fear that the destruction of the rain forests have implications for the world's climate. Now Ecospan have produced a new book. Half the world is living in poverty, while the other half is over-consuming they say. Miles Lipvinoff from the Green Party has just published the earth scan handbook for people and the planet. (BNC, SPOK)
f. Now these are grown on my neighbours fence. I did ask. (SP:G3XPSUNK) (laugh) (SP:PS1VR) They're grown on my neighbours fence and it comes on to my path. And she doesn't like them. (unclear) for her to have them in the house. So I, ooh you know, could I have some? And I did have some of the (unclear) as well so. (laugh) I will be short of a little bit of blue so you have your (unclear) kaleidoscope. There. (pause) (unclear) blue. (crowd-noises) Well they say the more you pick them the more they come isn’t it? So let's hope they're right. (BNC, SPOK)

7. Comment on the meaning of the adverbials reportedly, apparently, allegedly and supposedly in the following extracts. How do the adverbials apparently and supposedly differ from reportedly and allegedly?

a. Lang visited Detroit on Thursday, according to a report from Jordan Schultz of the Huffington Post, apparently staying until at least Saturday. # He had been expected to then visit Denver, but that trip was canceled after the Broncos signed free-agent guard Ronald Leary. (COCA, NEWS)
b. However, both pilots knew that when they reached the coast of Europe, even if they were off course, they had enough fuel to reach Kaunas. Late on the evening of July 16th, after flying over northern Scotland, Darius wrote in his log that the Lituanica had run into the projected bad weather. This was his last entry. The pilots apparently attempted to fly around the storm. About 11pm that evening the plane was spotted over Stargard near Danzig, but flying north-east. (COCA, MAG)
c. That gives the people who got that money the same problem they had before: what to invest in, while never risking a loss? # Powerful investors have solved this problem by making up their own values. They can do this because they are often big governments, so nobody tells them not to. Uber, for example, is supposedly worth $68 billion, according to its early investors. But new investors don't want to pay that equivalent in stock price. (COCA, NEWS)
d. The latest Obama bungle was the resolution at the United Nations condemning Israel for existing. Supposedly, all the Obama regime did was abstain when the vote came up in the U.N. Security Council. The United States, as a permanent member of the Security Council, could have vetoed the resolution. (COCA, NEWS)
e. In a town south of me, a 17-year-old has been arrested for sending threatening texts purporting to be a clown. A 12-year-old boy *supposedly* made “a clown-related threat on social media to ‘shoot up’ an Ohio school.” (COCA, MAG)

f. A 41-year-old Vermont woman has been arrested in Whately for *allegedly* having 901 bags of suspected heroin in her pickup truck, according to State Police. (COCA, NEWS)

g. The suit also names Wells Fargo bank as a defendant for *allegedly* allowing Knapp to deposit hundreds of checks that weren’t made out to him. The auditors and the bank deny wrongdoing. (COCA, NEWS)

h. Roy, who had supervised the department’s investigation into McDonald’s shooting, drew withering criticism from Ferguson’s office. The inspector general placed blame for the detectives’ *allegedly* false narratives on Roy, but Roy told investigators that responsibility for the reports fell largely to his subordinates. (COCA, NEWS)

i. On April 15, Alebbini contacted the FBI to ask if he were able to travel overseas. The FBI *reportedly* told him that the Turkish embassy investigation didn’t bar him from traveling. # After discussing his desires, the source -- with FBI approval -- gave both Alebbini and his female partner $1,500 to purchase tickets from Cincinnati to Chicago then onto Turkey and Jordan, according to court documents. (COCA, NEWS)

j. Cruz-Rojas most recently lived in the Indian Trail area and previously in the 1500 block of Walkup Avenue in Monroe, according to the sheriff’s office. He *reportedly* left in a late ‘90s-early 2000s model Ford Explorer with an unknown tag number. (COCA, NEWS)

8. The expressions *it seems*, *seem* and *apparently* may denote both inference and report. What meaning do they express in the extracts below?

a. The other thing that’s been done, erm, and has been ongoing now for some months without too much success, but things *seem* to be moving a little bit, at least we’re told they are. (BNC, SPOK)

b. It’s a hundred and thirty years since the first of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland was created. The anniversary’s been marked with a Mad Hatter’s tea party, held in torrential rain. The British, *it seems*, aren’t easily put off when it comes to enjoying a picnic. (BNC, NEWS)

c. Teasdale Bros, *it seems*, were primarily agricultural engineers formed in 1835. An advert on the front page of the Darlington and Stockton Times in May 1885 boasts that the company worked out of the Bank Top Iron Works and was expert as ‘engineers, boiler smiths, iron and brass founders, iron merchants etc’. (BNC, NEWS)

d. The vast majority of Americans, *it seems*, are now behind Clinton. Even many voters who couldn’t bring themselves to endorse him last November are prepared to believe in what he calls the politics of hope. (BNC, NEWS)

e. One interesting thing about this fish is the temperature that it can *apparently* adapt to. (BNC, MAG)

f. I sat very still. He turned away, *apparently* satisfied, then pushed the glasses back into his pocket, flashed the torch briefly down at the rough stones of the pier, and went away with long strides in the direction of the house. (BNC, FIC)
g. *It's his leg -- the ankle. They thought it was broken, then they said it was just a bad sprain, but apparently they want to do another X-ray, so I simply don't know what's happening.* (BNC, FIC)

h. *We had a breakdown (unclear) yesterday it was an hour and a half. Apparently it was caused by dust getting in. Dust got into one of the circuit breakers on the machine and apparently shorted it out.* (BNC, SPOK)

i. *You're such an infrequent visitor. These days you *seem* to spend most of your time in the States.* (BNC, FIC)

j. *Not everything in it is stupid, but there's no point to the exhibition and there's certainly not a new spirit being displayed there. (SP:PS63G) They certainly *seem* to be unrelated, many of the artists and the canvases and the paintings shown.* (BNC, SPOK)

9. Compare the use of evidential expressions in two news reports targeted at a different audience. How does the target audience affect the distribution of evidential markers?

10. Compare the use of evidential expressions in two editorials. Do inferences or reports dominate? Are the expressions “dialogically expansive” or “contractive”? How does the target audience affect the distribution of evidential markers?
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