

EVIDENTIALITY IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN QUALITY DAILY PRESS

UDC 811.111:811.112.2]42:070

Predrag Niketić

Faculty of Occupational Safety, University of Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *This paper focuses on the linguistic concept of evidentiality, which is yet to be uniformly defined by linguists, its relationship to epistemic modality, and its linguistic realization in English and Serbian, specifically in selected corpora from daily quality newspapers in English and Serbian. The aim of the paper is to establish relevant cross-linguistic similarities and/or differences between English and Serbian expressions of evidentiality as manifested in English and Serbian quality press journalistic discourse by applying contrastive analysis to the various markers of evidentiality used in the selected journalistic corpora of both languages. Methodologically, evidentiality is treated as both a grammatical and a functional category. The corpus is limited to the topic of world news articles, as more uniform examples provide for a more objective contrastive analysis. The analysis of the examples reveals a significant overlap between the syntactic structures and semantic properties of reported evidentiality markers in English and Serbian journalistic discourse.*

Key words: *modality, evidentiality, quality press, journalistic discourse*

1. EVIDENTIALITY – THEORETICAL ISSUES

If we accept the definition that evidentiality is the linguistic coding of the source of information for a proposition, i.e. “an indication as to how the evidence was obtained” for a given proposition (Gurajek, 2010: 13), then we can trace the notion of evidentiality as far back as Franz Boas, who stated that, “while for us definiteness, number, and time are obligatory aspects, we find in another language location near the speaker or somewhere else, [and] source of information—whether seen, heard, or inferred—as obligatory aspects” (Boas, 1938; as cited in Aikhenvald, 2004: 1). Traditionally, evidentiality was divided into direct and indirect, depending on whether the speaker of a proposition obtained the evidence by directly witnessing it, deducing it, or learning about it from another source (Cornillie, 2009: 45), but this classification has meanwhile undergone certain changes. To a large extent, the typological discrepancies among various definitions of evidentiality are

Submitted February 5th 2016, accepted for publication March 14th, 2016

Corresponding author: Predrag Niketić

Faculty of Occupational Safety, University of Niš, Čarnojevića 10a, Serbia

E-mail: predragniketic@hotmail.com

due to different linguistic corpora on which they are based; for instance, Aikhenvald (2004) investigated native South and North American languages, as well as some Eurasian languages, whereas Rooryck (2001a; 2001b), Nuyts (2001a; 2001b), and de Haan (2005) also include Dutch and German. The extensive research of evidentiality made it abundantly clear that there were substantial differences in the linguistic realization of evidentiality among many non-European languages on one hand, and among most European language families on the other hand. Namely, specific non-European languages possess the strictly grammatical category of evidentiality, which is realized morphologically, usually via inflections, whereas most European languages possess no strict grammatical category; instead, evidentiality is expressed lexically, as is the case with English and Serbian, where evidentiality can be expressed, among other things, with modal verbs or adverbs. This raised the issue of whether or not evidentiality could be considered a category separate from, or connected with, modality, which will be discussed below.

The modern cross-linguistic study of evidentiality is widely considered to have begun with the publishing of *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, a collection of papers edited by Wallace L. Chafe and Johanna Nichols in 1986. The collection presented individual studies of evidentiality across numerous languages, both individually and cross-linguistically. The influence of the publication lies in its representation of evidentiality as encoding not only the source of information, i.e. evidence, but also the speaker's qualification of the evidence. This involvement of qualification puts epistemic modality into the picture because epistemic modality refers to "a speaker's evaluation of the likelihood of a state of affairs, as expressed in language" (e.g. *John is probably home / Jovan je verovatno kod kuće*¹) (Nuyts, 2001a: xv). This raises the second issue – how evidentiality is connected to epistemic modality.

To simplify the matter, I will try to summarize the two issues as follows: Is evidentiality a category completely separated from epistemic modality and if it is not, what is the nature of the relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality?

The answers to these questions vary with the researcher. The following section presents the dominant views of evidentiality by some of the most influential researchers of the topic.

2. EVIDENTIALITY – THEORETICAL INTERPRETATIONS

As regards the above questions, we can distinguish between the 'narrow' and 'broad' interpretations of modality, the former being the grammatical interpretation, whereby evidentiality is a strictly grammatical system unrelated to epistemic modality (although it can be complemented by it) that only marks the source of evidence, and the latter being the semantic interpretation, which takes into account all possible realizations of evidentiality, be they grammatical or lexical, and thus also marks the speaker's qualification of the evidence, relating it to epistemic modality.

Another distinction pertaining to the theoretical relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality is offered by Dendale and Tasmowski (2001: 341-2, italics in the original; as cited in Gurajek, 2010: 127), who distinguish between three types of the relationship: "*disjunction* (where they are conceptually distinguished from each other), *inclusion* (where one is regarded as falling within the semantic scope of the other), and *overlap* (where they partly intersect)".

¹ Hereinafter all writing in Serbian will be by the author unless otherwise specified.

The two classifications can be applied to the theories of some of the most prominent researchers on the topic.

The renowned Russian linguistic typologist Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (2004: 7) interprets evidentiality in the narrow sense and in terms of disjunction:

Evidentiality is a category in its own right, and not a subcategory of any modality [...] or of tense-aspect. Scholars tend to assume that evidentials are modals largely because of their absence in most major European languages, thus trying to explain an unusual category in terms of some other, more conventional, notion. There is simply no other place in a Standard Average European grammar where they could be assigned. For want of a better option, evidentials are then translated into European languages with epistemic markers.

Nevertheless, she allows for the possibility “[t]hat evidentials may have semantic extensions related to probability and speaker’s evaluation of the trustworthiness of information” but that does not necessarily mean that evidentiality is a part of modality (ibid. 7-8). Therefore, even though she acknowledges semantic, or epistemic (ibid. 6), extensions, she limits the scope of evidentials to grammatical markers, which have “to have ‘source of information’ as [their] core meaning; that is, the unmarked, or default interpretation” (ibid. 3), whereas she considers lexical markers optional and outside of the scope of evidentiality as a grammatical category. Other grammatical categories, such as mood, modality, tense, voice, or person can also be extended to express evidentiality as their secondary meaning, and Aikhenvald calls the evidential extensions of these categories ‘evidential strategies’ (ibid. 20).

She also classifies studied languages according to the number of evidentials in their evidentiality systems, and specifies systems with two, three, four, and up to five and six choices of evidentials (see ibid. Chapter 2). Regardless of the number of choices, Aikhenvald bases all of them on the following six semantic parameters for the source of evidence: visual (seeing), non-visual sensory (all the other senses), inference (based on readily available evidence), assumption (based on reasoning or general knowledge), hearsay (reported information without the original source), and quotative (reported information with an explicitly stated original source) (ibid. 63-64).

Insofar as he opts for a narrow and disjunctive interpretation of evidentiality, Ferdinand de Haan (2005) may be said to share Aikhenvald’s view. According to him, “there is no good reason to consider evidentiality a part of epistemic modality or even to consider them to be interchangeable terms. Evidentiality *asserts* the evidence, while epistemic modality *evaluates* the evidence” (de Haan, 2005: 3; italics in the original). Similarly to Aikhenvald, he does not deny that evidentiality and epistemic modality are connected, “but such a relation is secondary at best. It should not be thought that epistemic modality is part of the basic meaning of evidentiality but it can be added as a pragmatic feature” (ibid. 29). He bases his claims on evidence from Dutch, as well as native North and South American languages. However, de Haan diverges from Aikhenvald when he interprets evidentiality as a deictic category. He quotes Anderson and Keenan’s definition of deictics as “those linguistic elements whose interpretation in simple sentences makes essential reference to properties of the extralinguistic context of the utterance in which they occur” (1985; as cited in de Haan, 2005: 6), and applies their definition to evidentiality, comparing evidentials to demonstratives, as they both share the speaker of the utterance as the deictic centre (ibid.).

He further proposes that evidentiality should be included within the category of deixis as an instance of what he calls *propositional deixis* (ibid. 29).

Regarding the source of information, de Haan accepts the traditional classification into direct and indirect evidentiality, with their respective visual and auditory, and inferential and quotative subcategories (which require no additional explanation, as they overlap with some of Aikhenvald's types, see above), and posits that speakers choose whether to use direct or indirect evidentials depending on whether the propositional content in question belongs within or outside of their deictic sphere (ibid. 1-2, 20). A deictic interpretation of evidentiality can also be found in Mushin (2000).

Jan Nuyts (2001a: 27) also draws a clear line between evidentiality and epistemic modality:

Yet the notion of evidentiality can be defined such that it is clearly distinct from the category of epistemic modality. Evidentiality concerns the speaker's indication of the nature (the type and quality) of the evidence invoked for (assuming the existence of) the state of affairs expressed in the utterance. This does not involve any explicit evaluation in terms of the state of affairs being true or not.

Furthermore, he separates epistemic modality from deontic and dynamic modalities and proposes that evidentiality be added to these as a fourth, separate, category (ibid. 27, 174). Accordingly, his stance can also be considered as narrow and disjunctive, although he, too, cannot neglect that "evidential categories often suggest or imply a certain degree of probability of the state of affairs", when comparing the lower reliability of hearsay evidence with direct visual perception (ibid. 27). He also draws upon Givón's (1982; as cited in Nuyts, 2001a: 27) scale of epistemic certainty, high, medium, and low, observing that evidentiality occurs in domains of medium epistemic certainty. Nuyts remains within his narrow stance while acknowledging that a clear line might, after all, be hard to draw (ibid. 28).

This is evident when he re-examines the notion of subjectivity/objectivity in epistemic modality (Nuyts, 2001a: 33-36; Nuyts, 2001b) and concludes that subjectivity should be considered not in terms of the quality of evidence but in terms of the availability of evidence – subjectivity refers to the speaker being the only one privy to the evidence, but in case the evidence is also shared by the hearer (or even more people), the evidence is no longer objective but intersubjective. This dichotomy can be linguistically realized by means of expressions such as *in my opinion, if you ask me* as opposed to *it is well known, we all know* (in Serbian *po mom mišljenju, ako mene pitaš / dobro je poznato, svi znamo*).

Intersubjectivity is, in fact, a relevant concept for journalistic discourse as it can make a journalist's job that much easier if they know that their readers will share a certain amount of general knowledge with them. I will return to this issue in the example analysis section.

Johan Rooryck (2001a; 2001b) offers a broad and inclusive interpretation of evidentiality and emphasises the importance of both the source and the reliability of information. He believes that "[evidentials] put in perspective or evaluate the truth value of a sentence both with respect to the source of the information contained in the sentence, and with respect to the degree to which this truth can be verified or justified" (Rooryck, 2001a: 125). Accordingly, he treats evidentials, epistemic modals, and evaluative markers (a modal category characteristic of some languages, which includes miratives² and (dis)approval

² According to DeLancey, "mirativity refers to the marking of a proposition as representing information which is new to the speaker" (DeLancey, 2001: 369). He argues that mirativity is a distinct grammatical category separated from evidentiality (ibid.).

expressions) on equal terms since they all measure the information status of a proposition (ibid.). The term ‘information status’, which Rooryck introduces, comprises “both the truth value of a sentence and the relative importance accorded to it”, i.e. the three categories share the ‘source of information’ (which stands for the information status) and ‘evidence type’ (measuring the sentence in terms of reliability, probability, expectation, or desirability) (ibid.). He also notices that the source of information and evidence type interact in a limited number of combinations; for instance, “if the ‘source of information’ is 1st person, the ‘evidence type’ can be visual, intuitional, or inferential but not, for example, hearsay or quotative, whose source is inherently 3rd person” (ibid. 126). Naturally, the issue of reliability is also significant for news reporting.

In the theoretical work of Frank Palmer (2001), evidentiality could be said to be interpreted less narrowly than by Aikhenvald or De Haan but more narrowly than by Rooryck. Chronologically, in his first edition of *Mood and Modality* from 1986, Palmer interpreted evidentiality as a subcategory of epistemic modality (Palmer, 1986: 51), which constitutes an inclusive relationship. However, in the 2001 edition he revised his stance and offered a new typological classification of modality by suggesting two main categories – event modality and propositional modality, whereby the former comprises deontic and dynamic modality and the latter epistemic modality and evidentiality, or evidential modality (Palmer, 2001: 8-10; cf. Nuyts, 2001a). Regarding the relationship between the latter two categories, Palmer claims that “the essential difference [...] is [...] that with epistemic modality speakers express their judgements about the factual status of the proposition, whereas with evidential modality they indicate the evidence they have for its factual status” (ibid. 8). Furthermore, based on the types of epistemic judgement, Palmer introduces three epistemic subcategories – Speculative, Deductive, and Assumptive (ibid. original capitalisation), two of which, deductive and assumptive are based on evidence obtained either visually/sensory (deduction) or in terms of previous knowledge or experience (assumption) (ibid. 29). For the deductive category, Palmer provides the example of the epistemic *must* in the English language, whose use implies a judgement based on evidence (ibid. 8). Consequently, this represents an overlapping relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality, as deductive and assumptive categories clearly apply to evidentiality, as well. A second significant postulation by Palmer is his subcategorisation of evidentiality into “purely evidential categories” (ibid. 35), namely sensory and reported evidentiality, the latter including hearsay, quotative, and deductive evidentials (cf. Aikhenvald above). In this paper, I will adhere to Palmer’s categorization of types of evidentiality as modified by Gurajek (2010).

Johan van der Auwera and Vladimir Plungian (1998: 86) offer a broader and overlapping interpretation of evidentiality by using ‘semantic maps’, i.e. geometric representations of meanings and their interrelations. Their typology of modality is restrictive and based only on possibility and necessity, but includes a distinct type of epistemic necessity, which expresses probability, as opposed to deontic necessity, which expresses obligation. Both types of necessity are exemplified in English by a dedicated use of the modal *must* (cf. Palmer above): *He must be sleeping / You must finish your paper by this weekend*, respectively. Yet, however restrictive, van der Auwera and Plungian’s typology includes an overlap of epistemic necessity and inferential evidentiality (based on the theories reviewed so far, it is fairly obvious that inferential evidentiality refers to assumptions and deductions, to use Palmer’s distinction) (ibid.).

Bert Cornillie (2009: 45) defines evidentiality “as the functional category that refers to the perceptual and/or epistemological basis for making a speech act”. His narrow approach is evident in his distinction of evidentiality and epistemic modality, whereby “[e]videntiality refers to the reasoning processes that lead to a proposition and epistemic modality evaluates the likelihood that this proposition is true” (ibid. 46-47). Yet, his functional definition of evidentiality separates him from Aikhenvald, for example, because “the functional domain of evidentiality is present in most languages, and hence may be considered a language universal” (ibid. 45). Cornillie might be said to attempt to reconcile the large number of different theoretical approaches because he believes that the confusion regarding the evidentiality / epistemic modality relationship lies in the equation of how the reliability of the evidence is evaluated and how epistemic likelihood is graded (strong/weak epistemic modality or epistemic necessity/possibility, see van der Auwera and Plungian above). For instance, the motivation to include *must* in epistemic necessity is its higher reliability in relation to *may* (ibid. 58). Cornillie stresses the importance of reliability (cf. Rooryck above): “a reliable evidential statement is understood as a statement that is generally (repeatedly) considered as trustworthy” (ibid.), which implies that reliability is not necessarily dependent on how the information is obtained. Instead, reliability depends on the shared or non-shared status of the evidence, i.e. whether the source of evidence is 1) only the speaker, 2) the speaker and other entities, or 3) only the other entities; according to Cornillie, the information is most reliable in the second case (cf. intersubjectivity in Nuyts, 2001), which again bears relevance to the investigation of daily news. Cornillie then makes a distinction between evidentiality and epistemic modality in terms of evidence status: “if the evidence for the qualification can be shifted from the speaker to another source and vice versa, an expression is evidential” (Cornillie, 2009: 58).

In this theoretical ‘salad bowl’, it is perhaps worth mentioning the works of McCready (2010) and Plungian (2001), who try to analyse evidentiality in terms of its universality, as well as the work by Ozturk and Papafragou (2008), who investigate the acquisition of evidentiality by children, which, if sufficiently expanded, could have relevant implications for the universality of evidentiality.

3. TYPES OF EVIDENTIALITY

I will adopt the classifications of evidential types according to Gurajek (2010), which is a modification of Palmer’s (2001) classification and according to Popović (2010), which, for the purpose of this paper, is essentially the same as Gurajek’s. There are also obvious similarities to Aikhenvald’s categorization (see above, 2-3). The classifications are summarized in tables 1 and 2 with some of their linguistic realizations in both languages.

Although the data are arranged differently and some categories are labelled differently, closer inspection of the data will reveal that the two systems essentially, i.e. semantically, cover the same types of evidentiality. For example, direct or sensory evidentiality in the English table is labelled zero evidentiality in the Serbian table. The Serbian categories *self-quotation*, *specified source of information*, and *epistemic amplifier w/specified source of information* correspond to the English quotative category, whereas the Serbian categories *unspecified source of information* and *general source of information* correspond to the English hearsay category.

Table 1 Types of evidentiality and their lexical realizations in English (Gurajek, 2010: 72)

Evidentiality Type		Representations in English
Direct	Visual Auditory Tactile Olfactory Gustatory	1. subject-perceiver verbs: <i>see, hear, feel, taste, smell</i> (first person subject; noun phrase complementation; gerund participle complementation; bare infinitive complementation; with <i>can</i> ; progressive aspect)
	Inferred	<p>Deductive</p> 1. subject-perceiver verbs: <i>see, hear, feel, taste, smell</i> (followed by a <i>that</i> -clause) 2. subject-percept verbs: <i>look, sound, feel, smell, taste</i> (followed by <i>and</i> an adjective; plus <i>like</i> and a noun phrase or finite clause) 3. verbs <i>seem</i> and <i>appear</i> 4. modal verb <i>must</i> 5. modal adverbs: <i>perhaps, probably, certainly</i>
Indirect	Assumptive	1. verbs <i>seem</i> and <i>appear</i> 2. modal verb <i>will</i>
	Reported	<p>Quotative</p> 1. subject-perceiver verbs: <i>see, hear, feel, taste, smell</i> (third person subject) 2. subject-percept verbs: <i>look, sound, feel, smell, taste</i> (in the past tense) 3. verbs <i>seem</i> and <i>appear</i> 4. reported speech (reference to concrete source of evidence)
	Hearsay	1. verbs <i>seem</i> and <i>appear</i> 2. reported speech (no reference to concrete source of evidence) 3. expressions: <i>I've heard, I've been told, He/She is said to be</i> etc. 4. adverbs: <i>apparently, reportedly, supposedly, allegedly</i>

Table 2 Types of evidentiality and their lexical realizations in Serbian (Popović, 2010: 45; translation of Popović's terms into English by the author)

Raportivna evidencijalnost / <i>Reported evidentiality</i>	uopšteni izvor informacije / <u>general source of information</u>	<i>verba dicendi</i> + dopuna sa predlogom (<u>preposition</u>) <i>u</i>
	neodređeni izvor informacije / <u>unspecified source of information</u>	a) <i>priča se, kažu, govore, vele, izgleda, ako verovati pričama, kolaju priče;</i> b) <i>navodno, čini se, izgleda, tobož(e), bajagi, kao bez navedenog izvora informacije</i>
	epistemički amplifikator uz konkretni izvor informacije / <u>epistemic amplifier w/specified source of information</u>	<i>kako tvrditi; negirati; navodno; kao; bajagi; tobož(e); kao bajagi (kobajagi)...</i>
	konkretni izvor informacije / <u>specified source of information</u>	<i>kako + kazati/reći, javljati/javiti, saopštavati/saopštiti, prenositi/preneti... + Nom; prema rečima, prema mišljenju + Gen; saglasno + Dat; u skladu sa + Instr; prema, po + Loc...</i>
	autocitiranje / <u>self-quotation</u>	<i>kao što sam + reći, istaći, naglasiti...sećate se (u knj. delu sa naracijom u 1. l. / literary w/1st person narration)</i>
Inferencijalna evidencijalnost / <i>Inferred evidentiality</i>	glagoli percepcije u indikativu uz veznik (<u>indicative perception verbs w/conjunction</u>) <i>da: vidim, osećam da...</i>	<i>smatram; po meni; po mom mišljenju; čini mi se; izgleda mi; (sasvim) sigurno; mora da; vidi se; očigledno; ipak; verovali ili ne; još; već; kao što je poznato...</i>
Nulta evidencijalnost / <i>Zero evidentiality</i>	glagoli percepcije u indikativu i imperativu uz veznik (<u>indicative and imperative perception verbs w/conjunction</u>) <i>kako: gledati, videti kako/gde, slušati, čuti, osećati...</i>	

4. ANALYSIS OF EXAMPLES FROM DAILY WORLD NEWS IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN

Before the actual analysis of the news examples, the selection and some terminology should be clarified. To use the term from the theoretical portion of the paper, this paper incorporates a ‘narrow’ view of journalism, which incorporates quality, or ‘serious’ journalism. Quality press is the term that refers to British newspapers with national circulation that are characterised by their seriousness and objectivity and whose coverage primarily focuses on political, economic, cultural, and sports news. This type of journalism does not include tabloid journalism, which has been disregarded for the purpose of this paper. Quality press in Britain is also referred to as ‘broadsheets’ reflecting their large format, but this label is slowly becoming obsolete as many quality newspapers have adopted smaller (‘tabloid’) formats. In Serbia, the line between serious newspapers and tabloids is often not clearly drawn because many newspapers calling themselves serious devote some space to tabloid stories. Nevertheless, based on the amount of space allocated for tabloid-like stories, serious newspapers can still be distinguished from tabloids.

Another reason for excluding tabloid newspapers is the choice of topic – world news, since tabloids typically cover stories about various celebrities and the entertainment industry and seldom give attention to world events unless they are potentially sensationalist, which would cater to their readers. World news has been chosen as the domain of examples, as this topic can be considered as the least subject to political, national, or other bias, and it is representative of the category of ‘hard news’. Consequently, editorials have also been excluded.

The examples are extracted from the following daily newspapers: *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Guardian*, and *The Independent* (UK); *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* (USA); and *Politika*, *Danas*, *Večernje novosti*, and *Blic* (Serbia). The online editions of the UK and USA newspapers were used due to the unavailability of print editions. All examples are from late September 2014. The evidential markers are marked in bold, whereas the source of information, if stated, is underlined.

According to the Society of Professional Journalists’ Code of Ethics (2014), the first out of four fundamental principles of ethical journalism is to “seek truth and report it”. The other three are “minimize harm”, “act independently”, and “be accountable and transparent”. Embedded in the first principle is the rule that “[t]he public is entitled to as much information as possible to judge the reliability and motivations of sources” (ibid.). The key notion here is reliability. When the first principle is placed within the context of evidentiality types, reported evidentiality is the first that comes to mind, in particular quotative/specified source of information. The analysed news examples revealed that this is indeed the case in English and Serbian journalistic discourses, as will presently be shown. There were no cases of deductive/assumptive inferential and direct evidentiality, which was expected, as that would be in keeping with the principle of journalistic objectivity. Assumptive inferential evidentiality implies subjectivity in utilising previous knowledge or experience. Deductive inferential evidentiality is based on immediate visual/sensory evidence, which is not how journalists collect their information. Similarly, direct/sensory/zero evidentiality is not related to written hard news reports, since it involves the first person subject and offers no intersubjectivity, which is the cornerstone of reliability of information (see Nuyts; Cornillie above). Such evidentiality would be more likely to occur in the context of television, for instance when a television news reporter is reporting live from another location (e.g. *I hear gunshots not far from where I’m standing* [direct] / *The rebels must be getting closer* [deductive] / *It appears the rebels have violated the ceasefire* [assumptive]). Tabloid

journalists often use reported evidentiality mechanisms, including the infamous ‘anonymous source’³ to manipulate their readers into believing the information is reliable (see also Popović, 2010: 24, ex. (16)).

The following sections present the examples classified into the categories of quotative reported evidentiality (where the source of information is specified), hearsay reported evidentiality (where the source of information is unspecified), and ‘subordinated’ evidentiality (multiple evidentiality markers within a sentence).

4.1. Quotative reported evidentiality – specified source of information

Both the English and Serbian news examples include cases of quotative reported evidentiality. Linguistically, both languages employ either quoted direct speech or reported speech. The default way of doing this is to use verbs of speaking (*Lat.* *verba dicendi*), such as *say*, *tell* or Serbian *reći*, *kazati*, *pričati*. Examples like the following abound in both languages:

- (1) Defence Secretary Michael Fallon **said**: “I can confirm that the RAF were in action today in support of the Iraqi government in north west Iraq”. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]
- (2) “When we do release our weapons we have to be absolutely sure that they are against Isil (IS) targets, that they are not going to kill innocent Sunni Muslim civilians in areas that are occupied by Isil”, he **told** the BBC’s Daily Politics. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]
- (3) The Tornado jets destroyed a heavy weapons post and vehicle with a mounted machine gun in support of Kurdish troops, the Ministry of Defence **said**. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]
- (4) Daniel Shepherd, the firm’s British head of Asia derivatives, **told** *Bloomberg* they wanted to help the protesters eat properly as they continued demanding free elections. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]
- (5) The impact, experts **say**, goes beyond ridding Iraqi cities of their cultural diversity. [Washington Post, 30 Sep 2014]
- (6) „Hongkong je kineski Hongkong“, **rekla je ministarka spoljnih poslova Hua Čunjing** na konferenciji za novinare u Pekingu. [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]
- (7) U obraćanju preko katalonske televizije Artur Mas **je rekao** da je reč o istorijskoj odluci i istorijskom danu za Kataloniju. [Blic, 28 Sep 2014]
- (8) Fejzić **kaže** da Kujević nije razrešen ni zato što je, pored matične kuće, službovao i u Islamskoj zajednici u Srbiji (IZS), niti što je na poslednjim lokalnim izborima politički podržao BDZ. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (9) Obama **je kazao** da je njegova vlada precenila iračku vojsku koju su Amerikanci godinama obučavali, a koja se ovog leta nemoćno povukla pred naletom Idila. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (10) Nisam čuo, ali su mi džematlije (vernici) preneli da su me nazivali popom i Amfilohijem”, **ispričao je glavni imam rožajske džamije Redžep Murić**. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

³ The Society of Professional Journalists’ Code of Ethics (2014) clearly states under what circumstances anonymity may be granted to a source.

The verbs in almost all of these examples are in the past tense, which is to be expected as news stories refer to past events. However, the present tense is used in (5) and (8), the purpose of which is to enhance the narrative structure of the article (cf. Mushin, 2000). Examples in English like the ones above are by far the dominant mechanisms of expressing quotative evidentiality, with the verbs *say* and *tell* being the most frequent, based on the limited number of examples selected for this paper⁴. The situation is similar for Serbian, except that the neutral verbs of speaking and ‘non-neutral’ verbs (this term will be discussed below) of speaking are more equally distributed. The reason for this is that there are several more verbs in Serbian that could be included in the neutral group of speaking verbs, more importantly, that are heavily used in journalistic discourse. These are *javiti* (inform), *preneti* (convey), *navesti* (quote, cite), *saopštiti* (communicate, announce), *izjaviti* (declare, say), *izvestiti* (report), and *poručiti* (tell, lit. send a verbal message). The first three are frequently used when quoting another news agency or newspaper, which is particularly evident in the world news sections as Serbian newspapers have a limited number of foreign correspondents at their disposal. Thus, in Serbian newspapers examples such as the following also abound:

(11) Tajni agent na čelu jedinice koju je Mosad poslao da osveti otmicu i ubistvo izraelskih olimpijaca u Minhenu 1972. Majkl Harari preminuo je u Tel Avivu u 87. godini, **javio je AP**. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(12) Od kada je skandal procurio u javnost obezbeđenje u ovom utočištu je zamenjeno, **javlja Rojters**. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(13) Situacija u gradu je veoma napeta, a tokom noći između nedelje i ponedeljka se mogla čuti artiljerijska vatra, navedeno je u saopštenju gradske skupštine, **preneo je AFP**. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(14) Najmanje četiri osobe su poginule, a dve su povređene u samoubilačkom napadu koji su juče izveli talibani nedaleko od aerodroma u Kabulu, neposredno pre nego što je novi predsednik Ašraf Gani (65) položio zakletvu i zamenio na mestu šefa države Hamida Karzajaja, **prenosi Tanjug**. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(15) To je najveći broj žrtava na ukrajinskoj starni od stupanja na snagu dogovora o prekidu vatre, 5. septembra, **naveo je Rojters**. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(16) Ako Ustavni sud oceni da je održavanje referenduma neustavno, šef vlade Katalonije Artur Mas može da zatraži raspisivanje vanrednih izbora, **navodi agencija Frans pres**. [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]

Again, journalists can opt to use either the past tense ((11), (13), and (15)), or the present tense ((12), (14), and (16)). The common English equivalents of these Serbian evidentials are the phrase *according to [agency] reports/sources*, a dependent clause, e.g. *as [agency] said*, or a main clause, e.g. *the [agency] reported*. For example,

(17) **German media reported** that the victim was from Leeds but police did not give any further details. [Independent, 29 Sep 2014]

(18) The bodies were being examined at an elementary school in the nearby town of Kiso, while the families of the missing waited at a nearby municipal hall, **the Associated Press reported**. [Washington Post, 29 Sep 2014]

⁴ See Clark (2010) for a more comprehensive and statistically-oriented study of a corpus exclusively in English.

The same English equivalents apply for the verbs *saopštiti* and *izvestiti* in examples such as

(19) Skoro 600 američkih vojnika, u pratnji tenkova, stići će za vikend u Poljsku i baltičke zemlje radi učešća u vojnim vežbama, **saopštilo je poljsko Ministarstvo odbrane**. [Blic, 28 Sep 2014]

(20) Lokalni list „Saut Čajna morning post“ **izvestio je** da su se štrajku priključile i osnovne i srednje škole, da je obustavljeno oko 200 linija javnog prevoza i da je veći deo banaka zatvorio svoje ekspoziture. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

The verbs *izjaviti* and *poručiti*, as in

(21) Bivši šef nemačkog Generalštaba Harald Kujat **izjavio je** juče da niz nedavnih neprijatnih skandala s vojnom opremom pokazuje da Nemačka treba da izdvađa više za odbranu. [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]

(22) Marijano Raho, premijer Španije, **poručio je** iz Pekinga, gde se nalazi u zvaničnoj poseti Kini, da se „Mas sam uvalio u probleme“ [Blic, 28 Sep 2014],

are expressed by equivalent English verbs *say* or *tell*.

In the previous section, the term ‘*non-neutral verbs of speaking*’ was used to refer to the verbs that are ‘epistemically amplified’ (Popović, 2010) but that essentially convey the information that something was said, only more semantically marked, as shown in the following examples (in the Serbian examples (36)-(47) the lexical verb evidential markers are translated into English):

(23) RAF fighter jets have carried out their first air strike against Isis in Iraq, **the Government has confirmed**. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]

(24) “Otherwise we are having the opposite of the effect we are intending to have”, **he warned**. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]

(25) It comes just days after **the German defence minister, Ursula von der Leyen, admitted** the country’s military is facing equipment shortages so severe it cannot meet its NATO commitments. [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(26) **An armed forces report** submitted to the defence committee of the Bundestag **revealed** that only 42 of Germany’s 109 Eurofighters are available for immediate use, alongside 38 of its 89 Tornado aircraft. [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(27) **Ms von der Leyen** insisted Germany can fulfil its role in ongoing NATO operations, but **she conceded** at the weekend that it cannot meet all its commitments to the alliance. [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(28) **Beijing-leaning media have** also accused the CIA of infiltrating schools in Hong Kong and **claimed** Britain has planted intelligence agents in the city’s government, judiciary, and chambers of commerce. [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(29) **A spokesman denied** on Monday that Mr. Obama was blaming intelligence agencies in his interview on “60 Minutes” on CBS News. [NY Times, 29 Sep 2014]

- (30) About 350 French citizens are currently on the ground there, he estimated, including 60 women. [NY Times, 29 Sep 2014]
- (31) In remarks at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York on Monday, Modi asserted that India, the world's second-most-populous country, will challenge China for primacy this century. [Washington Post, 29 Sep 2014]
- (32) Human rights advocates fear that a discussion of ongoing religious persecution in India will get short shrift during Modi's visit as the two sides spend most of their time on economic and security interests. [Washington Post, 29 Sep 2014]
- (33) Outside commentators have guessed that Kim has gout, which runs in the family, or has been drinking and eating too much. [Washington Post, 29 Sep 2014]
- (34) Russia may remove itself from the global Internet to protect itself against perceived threats from the West, a Kremlin spokesman suggested on Friday. [Independent, 19 Sep 2014]
- (35) ... the Rossiya 24 channel regurgitated Chinese reports suggesting that leaders of the Occupy Central movement "underwent special training with the American secret services". [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2104]
- (36) Prva dva „ruska reaktora“ u JAR počće sa radom 2023. godine, objavili su (notified) ruska nuklearna agencija „Rosatom“ i južnoafrička ministarka za energiju Tina Jemat-Peterson... [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (37) Policija je juče potvrdila (confirmed) da su članovi privatne agencije za obezbeđenje zlostavljali azilante, o čemu su lokalni mediji ranije izvestili. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (38) Obama i dalje tvrdi (claims) da neće vratiti vojsku u Irak (iako je tamo već poslao oko 1.600 vojnika) i da neće biti kopnene intervencije u Siriji. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (39) Poglavar Islamske zajednice Crne Gore Rifat Fejzić najavio je (announced) da će pozvati državu da tu versku zajednicu zaštiti od muftije Muamera Zukorlića... [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (40) ... Fejzić konstatuje (asserts) da je Zukorlić svoj naum pokušao da ostvari preko svog „pomoćnika za južni Sandžak“ Hafiza Kujevića... [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (41) „Obuka će se sprovoditi prema američkim metodima“, objasnio je (explained) Semčenko. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (42) „Svi problemi moraju da budu rešavani u krugu petorke koja raspolaže suverenim pravima kada je u pitanju odnos prema moru i njegovim resursima“, naglasio je (stressed, emphasised) ruski predsednik Vladimir Putin. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]
- (43) On ističe (stresses, highlights) da ga ne brinu izjave ukrajinskih političara jer će ranije ili kasnije Luganska oblast postati – deo Rusije. [Večernje novosti, 27 Sep 2014]
- (44) Rojters je ocenio (estimated) da najnoviji događaji predstavljaju „najveći izazov Pekingu od gušenja demonstracija na Trgu Tjenanmen pre 25 godina“... [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(45) Međutim, mnogi konzervativci i jastrebovi smatraju (*think, believe*) da jedino američka vojska može da uništi Idil i da je zato kopnena intervencija nužna. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(46) Takođe, [Kina] **strahuje** (*fears*) da će se protesti proširiti na druge delove Kine. [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]

(47) Talibani su na svom nalogu na „Tviteru“ **precizirali** (*specified*) da su meta napada bili strani i avganistanski vojnici. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

The majority of the verbs used as evidential markers in the above examples are in fact speech act verbs, many of them assertives, and although only five pairs share evidential markers, (23)-(37), (28)-(38), (30)-(44), (31)-(40), and (32)-(46), it is perfectly acceptable to use the unpaired markers in both languages. They all clearly indicate the proposition has been stated but, unlike *say* and other neutral verbs of speaking, they are semantically marked, e.g. *claim*=say something without evidential support, or *warn*=say that something is potentially problematic or dangerous. The verbs *guess/nagađati*, *pretpostavljati*; *fear/strahovati*; and *think/smatrati* are mental verbs, which inherently carry inferential meaning, but these too can be considered as marking reported evidentiality because their role is descriptive as it only serves to report on someone else's attitude (Nuyts, 2001a: 111-112; Section 3.2), naturally, with the assumed lower “degree of strength of the epistemic judgment” (ibid. 111). There are, of course, many other verbs that could be used as evidential markers but that were not present in the selected examples, such as *recognize/prepoznati* or *agree/složiti se*.

In view of (47), this seems like a proper time to mention the effect of online social networks as regards evidentiality marking. Of the two most popular social networks, namely Facebook and Twitter (not necessarily in that order), the latter spawned a new English verb *tweet* (also a noun), which has not been introduced into standard Serbian. Accordingly, (47) could be translated as [*The Taliban*] *tweeted that...* instead of the literal [*The Taliban*] *specified on their Twitter account that...* Facebook has yet to produce an officially accepted similar verb; instead, verbs such as *post*, *write*, or *say* are commonly used for citing Facebook (or other social networks, blogs, etc.) as the source. There are two such instances among our examples.

(48) Regarding the meeting, Nossik wrote on his Facebook page: “there comes a moment to discuss the complete unplugging of Russia from the global Internet, so that no bytes would come here from abroad”. [Independent, 19 Sep 2014]

(49) Occupy Central, the other grouping key to the protests, **said** in a tweet that it would announce new civil disobedience plans on Wednesday... [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

So far, the discussion has only included verbs as lexical realizations of evidentiality. Nevertheless, quotative evidentiality in English and Serbian can also be realized with adverbial phrases and dependent clauses. In the English examples, the only prepositional phrase realization of quotative evidentiality was the phrase *according to [the source]*, followed with a single instance of a quotative clause.

(50) **According to Russian agencies**, the visit is the first by a North Korean minister since Kim Jong-un assumed power in Pyongyang more than two years ago. [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

(51) More people have died in 2014 attempting to sail across the Mediterranean to Europe than ever before, **according to new research from Amnesty International**. [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(52) The White House resisted being seen by Sunnis as “Maliki’s air force”, **as a number of officials put it**. [NY Times, 29 Sep 2014]

There was also an interesting example that might seem problematic and that will be subsequently discussed.

(53) “I am currently handcuffed and there is a car waiting outside to take me for the execution”, **Ms Jabbari was quoted as saying**. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]

This marker might initially be confusing as to whether it should be regarded as quotative or hearsay owing to the absence of the source of Ms Jabbari’s quotation and owing to the fact that the passive voice is frequently used to express hearsay evidentiality (see section 4.2. below). However, since this is a direct speech quotation, and since Ms Jabbari, as the primary source, takes precedence over the unspecified source in the predicate, this is a clear instance of quotative evidentiality.

In Serbian, as in English, the prepositions *prema* and *po* (according to) are commonly used, followed by the NP denoting the information source.

(54) **Prema saznanjima ovog lista**, za katalonske specijalce kupljene su moderne automatske puške proizvedene u Češkoj, korišćene u ratovima u Avganistanu, Libiji i Kipru. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(55) ... oštro kritikujući nameru Katalonije da održi, **po njegovim rečima** neustavan referendum o nezavisnosti... [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]

(56) **Prema prvim informacijama**, gori nekoliko miliona litara nafte i goriva, a požaru je prethodila snažna eksplozija. [Blic, 28 Sep 2014]

Serbian journalistic language also employs the dependent clause seen in (52) according to the formula *as* + S + V, or *kako* + V + S / (S) + V in Serbian, the only difference being that the marker is used considerably more in Serbian than in English examples in this ‘micro’-corpus.

(57) Harari je osamdesetih napustio Mosad i, **kako podseća „Njujork tajms“**, postao savetnik panamskog lidera Manuela Norijege. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(58) **Kako javljaju svetske agencije**, iz vazduha su napadane vojne baze, napuštene škole u kojima su islamisti imali sedišta, silosi za skladištenje žitarica, kontrolni punkt i najveća sirijska plinara Konoko. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(59) ... zbog čega je on, **kako je rekao**, prošle sedmice na vanrednoj sednici rožajskog Odbora izopšten iz IZCG. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

To conclude the section on quotative evidentiality, two more verbs will be listed, which, in addition to serving as evidential markers, also serve to enhance the narrative structure of a

newspaper article. This makes their use optional. The ones identified in the examples are *add* and *continue* for English and *dodati* (add) for Serbian. It should be noted that these markers require a preceding sentence that also contains an evidential marker.

(60) “We don’t have enough episodes of Generations, so we will only go until today,” SABC spokesman Kaizer Kganyago told AFP. “We are hoping that Generations will have episodes ready for the first week of December,” he added. [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

(61) “What’s more,” Rossiya 24 continued in a broadcast shown on Tuesday and published online, “experts believe that Great Britain stands behind the protests in Hong Kong...” [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(62) „Mi ovde imamo problem sa jednom ideologijom, pokušajem novopazarizacije (sandžakizacije) Rožaja“, rekao je Fejzić i dodao da Zukorlić želi da za sebe prigrabi veliki deo IZ u Crnoj Gori. On je, dodao je, šokiran izlivom fašizma i mržnje ideološke oligarhije iz Novog Pazara... [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

4.2. Hearsay reported evidentiality – unspecified source of information

It will be assumed that there are three reasons why journalists omit to explicitly specify the source of information. First, the source is unknown, second, the source is irrelevant, and third, the source can be inferred from the context. The English hearsay evidential markers in the first set of examples include reported speech without referencing the source of evidence, for which impersonal expletive-*it* and passive constructions are commonly employed, or the adverbs *allegedly*, *apparently*, and *reportedly*.

(63) No suspects have yet been arrested for killing Hannah Witheridge, 23, and 24-year-old David Miller but three people **are believed** to be involved. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]

(64) Either way, Mr Sarkozy has been forced to declare his hand early and to take an enormous risk (against, **it is reported**, the wishes of his wife, Carla Bruni-Sarkozy). [Independent, 19 Sep 2014]

(65) **It has been estimated** that between 1998 and 2013, 623,118 refugees and migrants reached the shores of the EU irregularly – an average of almost 40,000 people a year. [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(66) Twelve people **have so far been confirmed** dead in one of the most lethal volcanic eruptions in Japan in living memory... [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

(67) The man, who took a commercial flight from Liberia, **is said** to be the first traveler to have brought the virus to the United States. [NY Times, 30 Sep 2014]

(68) About 2.5 million people – coincidentally the same number of people who live in Pyongyang, home of the most loyal political class – **are thought** to subscribe to the service. [Washington Post, 29 Sep 2014]

(69) In her post, translated by *Fox News*, Ms Paravan **apparently** recounted an emotional farewell from her daughter. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]

(70) He had **reportedly** woken up drunk while being treated for a head wound and refused demands to put down the weapon. [Independent, 29 Sep 2014]

(71) On an earlier trip, in 2002, he travelled all the way to Moscow on his special train, **allegedly** having live lobsters helicoptered in en route. [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

(72) Secret Service agents twice interviewed and released a disturbed veteran in the weeks before he scaled the White House fence and burst into the President's home with a knife, **it emerged** on Tuesday. [Daily Telegraph, 30 Sep 2014]

In examples (63-68), evidentiality is marked with passive constructions, either with a passive subject or with an expletive *it*. In the former case, the *that*-clause of an active sentence is converted into a non-finite clause followed by the *to*-infinitive (e.g. *They believe (that) three people are involved* → *Three people are believed to be involved*), whereby the subject of the subordinate clause becomes the grammatical subject of the main clause, while in the latter case, the *that*-clause of an active sentence becomes the passive subject, but the grammatical position is occupied by the expletive *it* (e.g. *They report that three people are involved* → *That three people are involved is reported* → *It is reported that three people are involved*). It should be noted again that the mental verbs, although inferential in relation to the proposition, are considered reportative in the context of journalistic reporting. In examples (69-71) evidentiality is marked with epistemic adverbs. Interestingly, all three can be translated into Serbian with the adverb *navodno*, but only *apparently* has a core meaning (seemingly, evidently, *Serb.* *naizgled, očito*), which, in most other contexts, would fall under the inferential category. The final example, (72), is a variant of the first pattern because it contains the expletive *it*, but with the active voice since the verb *emerge* is intransitive.

The following examples are also included:

(73) However, he also **appeared** to suggest that the position may have altered since then – saying merely that it “was the truth” at the time. [Independent, 30 Sep 2014]

(74) “It is common knowledge who the main administrator of the global Internet is”, the Kremlin’s spokesman Dmitry Peskov was quoted as saying by *Interfax* news agency on Friday, in what **seemed** to be a comment directed at the West. [Independent, 19 Sep 2014]

(75) Pyongyang **appears** to be engaging in something of a diplomatic offensive. Since his appointment this year, Ri has made a number of foreign trips, including to Iran. Last week he became the first top North Korean diplomat for more than a decade to attend the UN general assembly in New York. [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

(76) But **it is doubtful** that that is a viable option in Hong Kong. [. . .] Such bloodshed would greatly damage the party’s legitimacy and jeopardize the city’s standing as a global financial center. [NY Times, 29 Sep 2014]

In all of them, there is also no specified source of information (except in (73) but only as an embedded direct speech quotation). Yet, this does not imply that the quality of evidence provided here is poor, because reliability does not always depend on the source (see Cornillie, 2009 above). The wider context for these examples has been included deliberately, as it adds to the reliability of the propositions modified by evidential markers, regardless of the absence of the source. The evidential markers include the verbs *seem* and *appear* (73-75) and the expletive *it* + adjective (76). The verbs *seem* and *appear*

tend to cause confusion due to their ambiguities and usage as both reported and inferential markers. The case here does not seem to produce any ambiguity because the verbs are used in the third person and involve no subjectivity due to their context, i.e. they are used by writers who report on events using the data they receive. The issue might become clearer if we consider their Serbian translation in the above examples: *čini se / izgleda da...* (*it seems / it appears that...*, without the subject) as opposed to their ‘subjective’ variations *čini mi se / izgleda mi da...* (*it seems / it appears to me that...*), which would imply inferential evidentiality and epistemic overlap (see Trbojević Milošević, 2004: 168; Popović, 2010: Sections 2.1, 3.3). Example (76) could be incorporated into the formula of the other three examples through simple paraphrase: *But it appears that that is not a viable option...* Hence, it would not be wrong to assume that the newspaper reader would take (or has taken) the propositions listed above as having a high degree of reliability, i.e. they would be inclined to accept the propositions as accurate, given their context.

Serbian hearsay evidentiality markers are also coded with mechanisms for expressing impersonality. These include passive voice without the explicit subject (which is obligatory in English) (77-79), reflexive verbs, again without the explicit subject (80-82), and the clause with the verb *imati/lit. have*, with its existential meaning, translated as *there is/are* (83).

(77) Više puta u protekloj godini „Političari“ **je potvrđeno** iz Ministarstva spoljnih poslova u Madridu da Španija, bez obzira na pritiske, nema nameru da prizna nezavisnost Kosova. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(78) „Takođe se protivimo pružanju podrške ilegalnim pokretima kakav je „Okupirajmo centar“, **saopšteno je** iz kineskog ministarstva spoljnih poslova. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(79) Kako **je saopšteno** u Beču, austrijski kancelar Verner Fajman sutra će otputovati u Kijev, gde će razgovarati sa predsednikom Ukrajine Petrom Porošenkom. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(80) **Veruje se** da je Harari ipak sustigao „svog čoveka“ u Bejrutu 1979. ubivši ga bombom na daljinsko upravljanje. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

(81) **Precizira se** da je reč o najvećem napadu u poslednjih nedelju dana i da je više zgrada u severnom delu grada oštećeno u bombardovanju. [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]

(82) Svima onima za koje se oceni da su „podržavali rusku agresiju, terorizam i okupaciju dela Ukrajine, biće zabranjen ulaz u zemlju“, **kaže se** u saopštenju. [Večernje novosti, 27 Sep 2014]

(83) **Ima naznaka** (*there are indications*) da se u Barseloni nagomilava oružje. [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

Due to a limited number of examples, no Serbian examples with the epistemic adverb *navodno* were found, or with the verbs *činiti se / izgledati* (seem/appear), although they are generally very common. The predicates marking evidentiality in these examples are all in the present tense, whether passive or active, but this does not exclude past tense usage (although (77) includes the temporal adverbial *u protekloj godini / in the past year*). However, all examples except (80) implicitly refer to the past because the phrase *veruje se / it is believed* in (80) indicates that the proposition that Harari assassinated his target remains unverified up to the present day. The impersonal passive voice in the present tense is

commonly used in Serbian to denote a past action and it is just as commonly translated with English past tense. Regarding (83), a synonymous clause with a loan word is also widely used in Serbian – *postoje indikacije* (same translation as above). Another important observation pertains to the first three examples and the fact that they all refer to a larger entity to which the true source of information belongs or in which it is located, but the true source remains unspecified. The true source is presumed to be an unknown official working for the corresponding government entity. This is indicated by the prepositions *iz/from* and *u/in*: (77) *It was confirmed from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, (78) *It was communicated from the Chinese Ministry*, and (79) *As it was communicated in Vienna*. Note that (79) includes the adverb *kako/as*, which, as we have seen, can also be used to modify verbs indicating hearsay evidentiality (see p. 15 above). Example (82) is a similar case and is formally categorized as hearsay, but it could be interpreted as quotative because it can be paraphrased to be explicitly quotative: lit. *it is said in the statement* vs. paraphrase *the statement says/said*. The same can be claimed for the following example:

(84) Prostor Kaspijskog mora mora da bude pretvoren u „zonu mira, dobrosusedstva, saradnje i druželjubivosti“, **stoji** u dokumentu (*it says [lit. stands] in the document*). [Politika, 30 Sep 2014]

The final two examples in this section deserve to be juxtaposed due to their striking similarity.

(85) During a three-hour grilling by MEPs in Brussels, Oettinger said it would not be his job to protect stars “stupid enough to take a nude photo of themselves and put it online” – **seemingly** unaware that the recent leak of celebrities’ nude photographs had come about as a result of a targeted hacking attack. [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

(86) Gradonačelnik Kijeva, bivši svetski prvak u profesionalnom boksu, Vitalij Kličko, pozvao je nemačku vladu da im prenesu iskustvo građenja Berlinskog zida. Kličko **očigledno** ne zna da je vlada Istočne Nemačke sredinom juna 1961. donela odluku da izgradi zid kako bi zaustavila veliki odlazak svojih građana na Zapad. [Večernje novosti, 27 Sep 2014]

(86) translated: The Mayor of Kiev and former boxing world champion, Vitali Klitschko, appealed to the German Government to share their experience with building the Berlin Wall. Klitschko **apparently** does not know that in mid-June 1961 the Government of East Germany decided to build the Wall in order to prevent the large outflow of their citizens to the West.

In both examples, the subject performs an action which is then commented on with the use of an epistemic adverb. As to the reliability of information in both examples, it must be noted that the Serbian adverb *očigledno* can also be translated with *obviously* or *evidently*, which would indicate a higher degree of the writer’s certainty regarding its truthfulness. However, this does not disturb the logical-semantic connection between the two propositions. In fact, it is perfectly acceptable to translate (86) with *Klitschko is apparently unaware that...*, as it is acceptable to translate (85) with *očigledno ne znajući*.

4.3. “Subordination” of evidentiality

This section is dedicated to several interesting examples of multiple markers of evidentiality within a single sentence.

(87) “Iran should also be given the chance to show it can be part of the solution, not part of the problem”, **Cameron said** during his speech, **according to a transcript published on the government’s website**. [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

(88) “He made comments later at his [UN] speech which were wrong and unacceptable”, **Rouhani told** Iranian reporters, **according to Iran’s state television**. [Guardian, 30 Sep 2014]

(89) And in Shanghai, Shen Yanqiu, another dissident, was **reportedly** taken away by police officers after sending photos of her newly shaved pate, **according to the rights defense website** weiquanwang.net. [NY Times, 30 Sep 2014]

(90) At Monday’s meeting, Putin **is expected** to discuss a contingency plans to disconnect Russian citizens from the web in the event of “an emergency” **Vedomosti reported**, **according to the Guardian**. [Independent, 19 Sep 2014]

(91) Vrednost akcija na berzi Hongkonga juče je opala za 1,18 odsto, a saobraćaj i privredne aktivnosti su ozbiljno poremećene, **saopštile su gradske vlasti**, **prenela je Beta**. [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]

(92) Televizijski prenos haosa izazvao je reakcije van Hongkonga, naročito na Tajvanu, **izveštavaju dopisnici**, **prenele su agencije**, u kojem je uspostavljena potpuna demokratija... [Danas, 30 Sep 2014]

In each of these cases, there are at least two instances of evidentiality. All evidential markers are marked in bold, the secondary source is underlined, and the primary source of information is double-underlined. The classification into the primary and secondary source is only provisional, of course, as is the term subordination of evidentiality. In case two specified sources are reported for a proposition, the source from which the propositional information directly originated is the secondary source and it becomes a part of the new proposition modified by the primary source. Perhaps this is best clarified on the example of (87): Cameron is specified as the one who uttered the quoted direct speech, i.e. the original proposition. Cameron is the secondary source of information. The fact that Cameron said the quoted words is the new proposition, the source of which is a transcript published on the government’s website, which is now the primary source of information. Cameron is thus subordinate to the transcript as the source of information. The primary source is also the closest to the recipient of the information, viz. the readers of news. Example (89) has an unspecified (hearsay) secondary source of information and a specified primary source. However, (90) seems to be the most interesting example because it includes three evidential markers, which requires the introduction of a ‘tertiary’ source. In this case, the tertiary source is unspecified, the secondary source is the Russian newspaper, and the primary source is the Guardian.

It would be interesting to see examples with four and more lexical evidential markers. Theoretically, in view of the possibility of embedding dependent clauses *ad infinitum* while still producing grammatical sentences, it could also be possible to include a reference to the source of information in each clause. However, this should be left for future consideration.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper attempted to provide a summary of theoretical research of evidentiality, its treatment in linguistics, its typology, and its relation to epistemic modality through a review of some of the most influential theoretical considerations of evidentiality, followed by an analysis of daily newspaper examples from quality British and American newspapers and from Serbian newspapers that belong in the quality press category.

The review of the theoretical approaches revealed that there is still no consensus among linguists whether evidentiality should be considered a strictly grammatical or both a grammatical and functional category, as well as whether it should be studied as completely distinct from, overlapping with, or a part of epistemic modality. The irreconcilable nature of the various theories makes it difficult for any researcher of the topic to decide on a methodology. The research dedicated to establishing the universality of evidentiality as both a grammatical and a functional category seems like a good starting point.

The examples used in this paper were topic-specific focusing exclusively on world news articles in the nine selected newspapers in order to preserve the uniformity of the examples for a more objective contrastive analysis. As expected, the corpus contained only examples of reported evidentiality, classified into quotative, where the source of information is specified, and hearsay evidentiality, where the source of information is unspecified. Cases of direct and inferential evidentiality would not be in keeping with the journalistic ethical code and objectivity, as they are characterised by subjectivity in providing and qualifying information.

The analysis of the examples indicated that there is significant overlapping between the parts of speech and syntactic structures used as reported evidentiality markers in English and Serbian journalistic discourse, as well as between their semantic properties, which was shown through their translation equivalents. The differences were evident on the lexical level. The final section of the paper was dedicated to the phenomenon of two or more evidential markers within a single sentence and a provisional terminology was proposed to describe the phenomenon. More comprehensive results would require a study of a considerably wider scope and a firmer theoretical grounding.

CORPUS

1. *The Independent*, (19, 29, 30 September 2014), <http://www.independent.co.uk/>
2. *The Guardian*, (30 September 2014), <http://www.theguardian.com/>
3. *The Daily Telegraph*, (30 September 2014), <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/>
4. *The New York Times*, (29, 30 September 2014), <http://www.nytimes.com/>
5. *The Washington Post*, (29, 30 September 2014), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/>
6. *Politika*, (30 September 2014), print edition
7. *Danas*, (30 September 2014), print edition
8. *Večernje novosti*, (27 September 2014), print edition
9. *Blic*, (28 September 2014), print edition

REFERENCES

1. Aikhenvald, A.Y., (2004), *Evidentiality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
2. Chafe W. L. and J. Nichols (eds.) (1986), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, Ablex Pub. Corp, Norwood, NJ.
3. Clark, C., (2010), Evidence of evidentiality in the quality press 1993 and 2005, *Corpora*, Volume 5, pp. 139-160.

4. Code of Ethics, (2014), Society of Professional Journalists, <http://www.spj.org/pdf/spj-code-of-ethics-poster.pdf>
5. Cornillie, B., (2009), Evidentiality and epistemic modality, On the close relationship between two different categories, *Functions of Language* 16(1): pp. 44-62.
6. de Haan, F., (2005), Typological Approaches to Modality, In: Frawley, W. (ed.) *Modality*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin. pp. 27-70.
7. DeLancey, S., (2001), The mirative and evidentiality, *Journal of pragmatics* 33 (3), pp. 369-382.
8. Dendale P. and L. Tasmowski, (2001), Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: pp. 339-48.
9. Givón, T., (1982), Evidentiality and epistemic space, *Studies in Language* 6, pp. 23-49.
10. Gurajek, B., (2010), *Evidentiality in English and Polish* (Master's thesis), University of Edinburgh, http://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/1842/5313/1/Beata%20Gurajek%20thesis_full.pdf
11. McCready, E., (2010), Evidential Universals, In: Peterson T. and U. Sauerland (eds.), *University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics: Evidence from Evidentials*, pp. 105-127, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
12. Mushin, I., (2000), Evidentiality and deixis in narrative retelling, *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: pp. 927-957.
13. Nuyts, J., (2001a), *Epistemic Modality, Language, and Conceptualization: A Cognitive-pragmatic Perspective*, Benjamins, Amsterdam.
14. Nuyts, J., (2001b), Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions, *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: pp. 384-400.
15. Ozturk, O. and Papafragou, A., (2008), The acquisition of evidentiality in Turkish, *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics: Vol. 14(1), Article 23*, Available at: <http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol14/iss1/23>
16. Palmer, F.R., (1986), *Mood and modality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
17. Palmer, F.R., (2001), *Mood and modality*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
18. Plungian, V., (2001), The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space, *Journal of pragmatics* 33: pp. 349-357.
19. Popović, Lj., (2010), Kategorija evidencijalnosti u srpskom i ukrajinskom jeziku [Evidentiality in Serbian and Ukrainian], *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* (77), pp. 17-47.
20. Rooryck, J., (2001a), State of the article: Evidentiality, Part I, *Glott International* 5(4), pp. 125-133. <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/14555/Rooryck%20%20State%20of%20the%20article%20Evidentiality%20Part%20I.pdf?sequence=2>
21. Rooryck, J., (2001b), State of the article: Evidentiality, Part II, *Glott International* 5(5), pp. 161-168.
22. <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/14586/Rooryck+-+State+of+the+article+Evidentiality+Part+II.pdf?sequence=2>
23. Trbojević Milošević, I., (2004), *Modalnost. Sud. Iskaz. Epistemička modalnost u engleskom i srpskom jeziku [Modality. Judgement. Proposition. Epistemic Modality in English and Serbian]*, Filološki fakultet, Beograd.
24. van der Auwera, J. and V. A. Plungian., (1998), On modality's semantic map, *Linguistic Typology* 2: pp. 79-124.

EVIDENCIJALNOST U OZBILJNOJ DNEVNOJ ŠTAMPI NA ENGLESKOM I SRPSKOM JEZIKU

U radu je prikazan lingvistički koncept evidencijalnosti, koji još uvek nema standardnu definiciju u lingvistici, kao i njegov odnos s epistemičkom modalnošću i jezičku realizaciju u engleskom i srpskom jeziku, u konkretnom korpusu preuzetom iz ozbiljne dnevne štampe na dvama jezicima. Cilj rada je određivanje relevantnih međujezičkih sličnosti i/ili razlika između engleskih i srpskih izraza evidencijalnosti upotrebljenih u „ozbiljnom“ novinarskom diskursu putem kontrastivne analize različitih markera evidencijalnosti iz odabranog korpusa. Metodološki, evidencijalnost se tretira i kao gramatička i kao funkcionalna kategorija. Korpus je tematski ograničen na članke posvećene vestima iz sveta jer veća jednoobraznost primera obezbeđuje objektivniju kontrastivnu analizu. Analiza pokazuje značajno preklapanje sitaksičkih struktura i semantičkih svojstava među markerima raportivne evidencijalnosti u engleskom i srpskom novinarskom diskursu.

Ključne reči: modalnost, evidencijalnost, ozbiljne novine, novinarski diskurs