

**Juana I. Marín Arrese, ed. 2004: *Perspectives on Evidentiality and Modality*. Madrid: Editorial Complutense. 266 pp.**

María Jesús Pinar Sanz  
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha  
MariaJesus.Pinar@uclm.es

*Perspectives on Evidentiality and Modality*, a collective volume edited by Juana Marín Arrese, brings together, under different perspectives, the recent research by several scholars on evidentiality and modality. The book is structured in three clearly delimited parts following the editor's brief preface in which the reader is given an overview of the topics to be found in each. The first section deals with theoretical aspects on evidentiality and modality, in some cases from different language perspectives. The second part presents a diachronic perspective of evidentiality, and the third, the results of a research project concerning the expression of evidentiality and writer stance in newspaper discourse in English and Spanish, funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología. These three parts are bound logically and offer a deep insight into the state of the art in the field of evidentiality and modality.

The first section, "Theoretical Issues and Some Case Studies," opens with a paper by Per Aage Brandt, "Evidentiality and Enunciation: A Cognitive and Semiotic Approach." Brandt considers evidentiality to be an important aspect of enunciation (Dubois 2001; Greimas and Courtes 1986) that should be studied as grounded in it. Brandt's purpose is to develop certain models of the alleged organization of enunciation in order to specify its evidential aspect. After defining the term *space delegation*, he indicates the cognitive question that arises to be one aimed at clarifying what types of *space delegation* might actually be present. He proposes that the analysis of evidentiality may answer that question and, in order to do so, establishes several delegation types. Brandt shows the choices of the first generation of delegations along with those of a second generation of delegations and asks himself how many of these semiotic specifications, through generations of semantic delegations in discourse and discursive texts, the morphology of a language can reflect. Brandt also argues that his model may offer a new way of explaining fictivity. It can be concluded that Brandt presents evidentiality as a universal semantic dimension which regulates communication in general and the relationship established between the different participants in the communicative act.

Enrique Bernárdez's paper "Evidentiality and Beyond in Cha'palaachi" focuses on Cha'palaachi, a language spoken along the Capaya and Santiago rivers and several of their afluentes in northwestern Ecuador. Interestingly, this language features a distinction in the verbal system between a "first person" and a "non-first person" which is inverted in interrogatives under some special conditions. Bernárdez explains his reasons for not adopting the terms *mirativity* (DeLancey 1997) and *conjunct and disjunct* (Curnow 1997) and justifies his use of the term *evidentiality*: a distinction linguistically expressed in a systematic way, between what is or can be experienced or known in some culturally privileged way and what is not or cannot be experienced or known in the same way (14). The importance of culture is, therefore, significant and mediates between (external, "objective") reality and the individual, and therefore is part of that individual's cognitive and linguistic system (14). The analysis of vocalic alternations in Cha'palaachi and of the lack of distinction between movement and location is based on this distinction between

what is accessible to experience and knowledge and what is not, marking certain spaces or topographical dimensions as accessible and others as non-accessible. Therefore, the speaker/subject has complete accessibility, and the second and third person is the participant without such privileged access. If something is experienced by the subject/speaker, it has a high degree of evidentiality.

In “The Role of Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in Three English Spoken Texts from Legal Proceedings,” Marta Carretero argues that the choice of texts from legal proceedings is motivated by the crucial role of evidentiality and epistemic modality, as in all cases the speakers attempt to persuade the other parties (and the audience) that their view of the relevant facts is right. This aim, together with a stringent requirement for accuracy, motivate the high frequency with which speakers mention different sources and types of evidence, evaluate these sources, or qualify their statements with expressions of epistemic modality. Carretero disagrees with the notion that epistemic modality and evidentiality are two distinct conceptual categories (Aikhenvald 2003) and adopts the view that there is a continuum running from evidential to epistemic expressions. In the second part of her paper, Carretero describes and exemplifies the different types of expressions that may occur along the evidentiality-epistemic modality continuum, together with some specifications related to this continuum. The results show the importance of the epistemic expressions conveying personal commitment within the contributions of those speakers, such as judges, solicitors and defendants, whose role is to express their ideas firmly. These expressions are sometimes accompanied by evidentials in order to place emphasis on the first-hand evidence from which the personal epistemic judgements are taken. On the other hand, Carretero argues that such use of evidential and epistemic devices as persuasion strategies can not be found in the contributions of those participants whose role is to listen and observe, rather than to set forth their own views.

The final paper in the first section, “Speech Presentation and the Theory of Evidentiality: A Corpus Study of Greek Journalistic Discourse,” by Anna Darda-Jordanidou, begins by exploring the relationship between reported speech and source of information from the perspectives of evidentiality and reflexivity (Dendale and Tasmowski 2001; Plungian 2001). Darda-Jordanidou then describes the corpus and its annotation: eighty news stories from Greek newspapers reporting events of general political interest, and eight editorials. She later studies various categories of speech presentation in relation to source of information (narrator’s report of voice [NV], narrator’s representation of a speech act [NRSA], indirect speech [IS], free indirect speech [FIS], direct speech [DS], free direct speech [FDS], and narration of inferred internal states [NIi]). Two additional speech presentation categories were added: instances of narration reporting the absence of speech activity (NASA) and instances of narration which lie at the very boundary between presentation of other activity and speech activity (IRSA). Selection tendencies fall between speech presentation forms and specification of source of information. Their preferred combinations are chosen to endow the newspaper discourse with objectivity. As this study reveals, DS, FDS and FIS were not used in leaders and the choice of indefinite as well as non-personal SI-specification notably exceeds the definite variant. It seems that journalists who write leaders insist on facts rather than opinion and subjective judgement, as would have been the case if DS-forms associated with definite SI-specification had been used. This has important implications with regards to the “faithfulness to an original” related to DS forms (Short et al. 2002). Relating reported speech forms with source specification-variants

provides an empirical way to estimate objectivity as a quality depending on specific narrative choices. I agree with the author that further research over a variety of genres would be required, since the corpus is somehow limited in this respect.

The second section, *Diachronic Perspectives*, includes four papers which deal with evidentiality from a diachronic perspective. The first contribution in this part, "Evidence, Truth, and Power in the Speeches of the XVII Century in Britain," by Araceli Ballesteros, has three purposes. The primary aim is to analyse a number of the evidential expressions used by political and religious leaders in their speeches; its secondary aim is to then show how discourse producers are maintaining public face and legitimising political or religious positions with the use of evidential expressions, and finally to contribute to a better understanding of evidentiality in the English language. The first part of the paper deals with a theoretical review on evidentiality from four different perspectives: cross-linguistic, typological studies, the French tradition and studies on modality. Attention is also focused on evidentiality in English, evidentiality as a discourse strategy to manipulate and control the social relationships among the participants in the discourse process, and the concept of legitimacy in relation to evidentiality. The theoretical point of view is interesting because the analysis takes into account the semantic and morphosyntactic aspects of evidentiality, as well as the pragmatic and social meaning of evidential expressions. Ballesteros' conclusion is that the participants in her corpus use evidential expressions in order to downplay their positions in the view of their interlocutors, avoid personal responsibility towards the truth of the utterance, create a feeling of solidarity with the interlocutors, build up a negative representation of the enemy, and maintain their public image, authority and social status.

In "On the Use of Modal Auxiliaries Expressing Deonticity in Early English: A Comparison of two Corpora of Anglo-Saxon and Late Medieval English Wills," Gabriella Del Lungo Camiciotti and Javier E. Díaz Vera present an analysis of two corpora of medieval legal documents in order to explore how modality is expressed, paying special attention to volition. Their purpose is to determine precisely how Old English modal auxiliaries expressing such notions as volition, intention and possibility became carriers of deontic futurity and necessity in later English. Following Sweetser (1990), they state that these semantic changes are not random but follow certain well-defined paths of diachronic development. By analyzing two different sets of early English wills, they reconstruct the semantic evolution of English modals from root modality to deontic modality. They conclude that the notion of deontic futurity develops both from volition and obligation, whereas deontic necessity develops from deontic possibility. The examples chosen and the description of the processes involved are clear and contribute to a quick apprehension of the points made by these authors.

In the paper "Epistemic Strategies of Evidential Quotative Verbs," Ana Laura Rodríguez Redondo and Eugenio Contreras Domingo focus their attention on mediated discourse where the primary source of information is not specified, but where tokens that are used in the acquisition of information are based on language. They study various verbs from Old English, taken from a corpus of 800 contexts, whose primary meanings refer to the acquisition of oral information by means of hearing, asking or by means of having heard what is said. The aim is to establish the strategies used by actual speakers in the mediated communicative situation to code distance as well as to set the parameters with which the second mediator establishes that distance. They conclude that the choice of mediator is

related to the focus of the source of reliability, which the speaker presents to the audience. According to these authors, the following different situations may arise: (a) the source of reliability can be placed on the actual speaker, where the use of negative adverbials reinforces the speaker's role as source of reliability; (b) the first mediator may not be considered by the speaker as relevant for the assessment of reliability of the information by the audience; (c) the source of reliability may be placed on generic subjects outside the actual communicative situation; in that case, the present speaker defers the source of reliability beyond the actual communicative scene and its participants; (d) the source of reliability may be expanded if no explicit mediator exists to establish a greater distance between the actual speaker and the first mediators; (e) the source of reliability may be placed in the shared knowledge or tradition.

Paloma Tejada's paper "To Be About To: Approaching the Irrealis," is structured into four sections. The first one is a general framework of evidential and epistemic notions relevant to the study she carries out, followed by some reflection regarding diachronic modality. In part two, a core meaning of *about* is empirically suggested through a detailed, qualitative analysis of the selected corpus of examples compiled from the Oxford English Dictionary, Visser and the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts for the period 1350–1640. Section three offers a theoretical and cross-linguistic support for the grammaticalization process undergone by *about*. The study supports the hypothesis that *about* can be interpreted along evidential-like parameters. As Marín Arrese points out in her preface, Early Modern English *about* functions as a semi-grammatical hedging device, which is used to mitigate the expression of the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition, by placing assertions in a lower rank of the epistemic certainty scale.

The last section of the book, "Comparable Corpora Studies," includes a collection of papers which present results from the authors' research on the expression of writer stance in newspaper discourse in English and Spanish. Marín Arrese's paper, "Evidential and Epistemic Qualifications in the Discourse of Fact and Opinion: A Comparable Corpus Study," aims to explore similarities and differences in writers' expressed attitudes towards knowledge and expression of beliefs about a situation. The paper explores the expression of evidentiality and epistemic modality by means of verbal markers in two comparable corpora of press editorials and news reports taken from newspapers of both liberal and conservative orientations. Her hypothesis is that there will be a higher presence of epistemic modal qualifications in editorials and a greater presence of perceptual evidential qualification in news reports, a hypothesis which is unquestionably confirmed in the analysis of the corpus, even though a difference across languages does exist and appears to indicate that the Spanish cultural model favours the presentation of information in editorials using evidential qualifications. It is notable, however, that writers are shown to be more tentative in the presentation of news reports. In the English press, in contrast, more tentativeness is present in editorials, which may be a cultural reflection of politeness requirements associated with the expression of personal opinion. Section two provides a characterization of the domains of evidentiality and epistemic modality and of their connections and interactions. Section three includes a description of the dimensions identified with examples from both languages provided.

In the paper "Evidentiality and the Verbal Expression of Belief and Hearsay," Elena Martínez Caro investigates the expression of both personal and mediated evidentiality, focusing on the use of verbs denoting mental cognitive and verbal processes as evidential markers. The corpus comprises press editorials and news reports from English and Spanish

sources. Her conclusions accord with Willet's hypothesis (1988:86), which describes the relationship between the source of information used in an assertion and the strength with which it is asserted. Thus, an assertion based on sensory evidence will be presented as "certain, or perhaps emphasized by the use of the appropriate language-specific devices"; if it is based on hearsay evidence, the assertion will be expressed as being less certain; further, if it is based on inference, "the assertion will likely reflect even less certainty and more probability" (Willet 1988: 87–88). The study investigates the correlation between evidentiality and the use of verbs denoting knowledge stemming from belief or opinion and knowledge having been acquired through language.

In "Non-Verbal Markers of Modality and Evidentiality and the Expression of Writer Stance in a Comparable Corpus of English and Spanish Editorials and News Articles," Laura Hidalgo Downing explores similarities and differences in the expression of writer stance by means of the use of non-verbal markers. The author first reviews the concept of stance (Biber and Finnegan 1989) and its relation to the expression of modal and evidential meanings (Chafe 1986; Willet 1988; Palmer 1990; Givón 1993; Werth 1999). She also explores similarities and differences between the notions of modality and evidentiality, and takes the position that evidential and modal meanings are considered to form part of a more general function of language: the modal function or interpersonal function according to Halliday (1994: XIII). A classification of non-verbal markers of writer stance is proposed on the basis of the distinction between markers of deontic modality, epistemic modality and evidentiality. A study of the frequency of the different types of markers appearing in press articles from four different newspapers, in English and Spanish (*The Guardian*, *The Times*, *El País*, *ABC*), is then carried out. Hidalgo's first hypothesis is confirmed, that there would be different preferences in each language in the coding and the frequency of use of the non-verbal categories of deontic modality, epistemic modality and evidentiality in expressing different writer stance styles. The second and third hypotheses are confirmed only partially, as (a) there were no significant differences with regard to markers of evidentiality but there were differences with regards to epistemic and deontic markers and (b) only *ABC* has a higher percentage of deontic markers.

In "The Expression of Deonticity in English and Spanish Factual and Argumentative Texts," Silvia Molina explores in depth the notion of deontic modality as opposed to epistemic modality. Her aim is to explore the differences and similarities in deonticity in editorials and news texts in English and Spanish. The results show that deontic modals in the corpora are instances of reflexive judgement on personal, social and natural being-in-the-world. According to Molina, these deontic modals register a perceived gap between what the writer intuitively feels necessary in his/her world and what happens in fact, especially in editorials. No important differences are demonstrated regarding the two languages and the two genres analysed—editorials and news.

The last paper "Encoding Writer's Attitudinal Stance," by María Luisa Blanco Gómez, explores the degree to which newspaper writers express their attitude and feelings toward the piece of news they are dealing with. She focuses on grammatical, as opposed to paralinguistic, devices used to express stance meanings (Biber et al. 1999: 966). She also shows the differences between news and editorials in two English newspapers, *The Times* and *The Guardian*.

This is a highly commendable book both for advanced students and scholars and may serve as an excellent guide to what is currently under investigation regarding evidentiality

and epistemic and deontic modality from various reference points: theoretical issues, diachronic perspectives and comparable corpora studies. The relationship established in this book between evidentiality and modality has been intensely studied and can be summarized in four different groups: (a) the view that epistemic modal meaning and evidential meaning are entirely separate types of meaning (Aikhenvald 2003); (b) the view that epistemic modal meaning and evidential meaning are separate, but overlapping types of meaning (van der Auwera and Plungian 1998); (c) the view that epistemic modal meaning encompasses evidential meaning (Givón 1982; Palmer 1986; Willet 1988); and (d) the view that evidential meaning encompasses epistemic modal meaning (Chafe 1986). Evidentiality is defined as a universal semantic dimension of validity (Brandt); as a culturally mediated distinction between “what is—or can be—experienced or known in some culturally privileged way and what is not or cannot be experienced or known in the same way” (Bernárdez 14), as the expression of the source and/or kind of evidence which the addresser has at his/her disposal as regards the truth of an utterance (Carretero); as a discourse strategy to manipulate and control the social relationships among the participants in the discourse process or as the different linguistic resources used by speakers to establish the nature of the information conveyed in their propositions, among others.

This book attempts to analyse the cognitive functions of modals and their relationships to other cognitive functions. In this sense, it would be interesting to study in more detail whether the relevant cognitive functions determining modal expressions are related to interpersonal power relations and to the expectations of the agents involved in the speech situation (Talmy 1988: 79). Sweetser’s (1990) and Talmy’s (1988) views of the epistemic use of modals as a metaphorical extension of the deontic use should be studied in relation to some of the case studies presented in this book. According to Sweetser (1990: 50), root modal meanings are extended to the epistemic domain precisely because we generally use the language of the external world to apply to the internal mental world, which is metaphorically structured as parallel to that external world.

In my opinion, this book opens new paths for investigation, both in diachronic and corpus linguistics; some of the points made could be studied in application to different genres or in taking into account different variables within the genres studied. Forensic linguistics could amply benefit from this study: the objectivity of the remarks made by the different participants in a specific communicative act can be assessed, and the way in which evidentiality manipulates and controls social relationships among the participants can be unveiled. The field of political discourse is another area of interest as politicians frequently use evidential expressions to avoid personal responsibility for the truth of an utterance, to create a feeling of solidarity with the interlocutors or to maintain their public image, authority and social status. A detailed analysis of election manifestos or speeches could yield interesting results.

#### Works Cited

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2003: “Evidentiality in Typological Perspective.” *Studies in Evidentiality*. Ed. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Robert Malcolm W. Nixon. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Biber, Douglas, and Edward Finnegan 1989: “Styles of Stance in English: Lexical and Grammatical Marketing of Evidentiality and Affect.” *Text* 9: 93–124.

- Biber, Douglas, et al. 1999: *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1986: "Evidentiality in English Conversation and Academic Writing." *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Ed. Wallace L. Chafe and Johanna Nichols. Norwood: Ablex.
- Curnow, Timothy J. 1997: *A Grammar of Awa Pit (Cuaiquer)*. PhD Thesis, Australian National University.
- DeLancey, Scott 1997: "Mirativity: The Grammatical Marking of Unexpected Information." *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33–52.
- Dendale, Patrick, and Liliane Tasmowski 2001: "Introduction: Evidentiality and Related Notions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 339–48.
- Dubois, Jean 2001 (1994): *Dictionnaire de linguistique*. Paris: Larousse.
- Givón, Talmy 1993: *English Grammar: A Function-Based Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Greimas, Algirdas J., and Joseph Courtés 1986: *Sémiotique: dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*. 2 vols. Paris: Hachette.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1994: *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold
- Palmer, Frank 1986: *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- 1990: *Modality and the English Modals*. 2nd ed. London: Longman.
- Plungian, Vladimir A. 2001: "The Place of Evidentiality within the Universal Grammatical Space." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 349–57.
- Short, Mike, et al. 2002: "Revisiting the Notion of Faithfulness in Discourse Presentation Theory." *Language and Literature* 11.4.
- Sweetser, Eve 1990: *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Talmy, Leonard 1988: "Force Dynamics in Language and Cognition." *Cognitive Science* 2: 49–100.
- Van der Auwera, Johan, and Vladimir Plungian 1998: "Modality's Semantic Map." *Linguistic Typology* 2.1: 79–124.
- Werth, Paul 1999: *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Willet, Thomas 1988: "A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticization of Evidentiality." *Studies in Language* 12.1: 51–97.