Nádraská, Zuzana

Inexplicit reported speakers in hard news : text, discourse and genre perspective

Inexplicit Reported Speakers in Hard News: Text, Discourse and Genre Perspective

Zuzana Nádraská

Abstract

This paper investigates forms of presentation with inexplicit, i.e. covert or formally unexpressed, reported speakers in hard news discourse in British broadsheets. The research develops the discussion presented, for instance, in Ljung (1998), Marín-Arrese (2002a), Semino and Short (2004), Martínez-Caro (2006) and Stenvall (2008a, 2014) in three perspectives. The textual perspective concerns (potential) co-reference between an inexplicit reported speaker and external voices present explicitly in the text. The discourse perspective compares agent obfuscation in two different contexts – the context of epistemic assessment and the context of negative evaluation (Bednarek 2006a; Bednarek and Caple 2012). The research shows that the functional distinction between epistemic and negative evaluation manifests itself in the differences in lexico-grammatical choices, the type of forms of presentation, the linguistic cues that signal the presence of voice and the potentiality of blending of the internal and external voice. The genre perspective discusses the influence of generic conventions on the distribution of inexplicit voices across the generic structure of hard news (van Dijk 1988; Feez et al. 2008; Urbanová 2013a).

Key words
Hard news; forms of presentation; inexplicit reported speaker; epistemic and negative evaluation; generic structure

1. Introduction

In this paper I aim to contribute to the discussion of reported language in hard news discourse. Previous research has amply highlighted the importance of talk and reported speech in news reporting (Zelizer 1989; Bell 1991; Waugh 1995; White 1997; Floyd 2000; Bednarek 2006a, b; Richardson 2007; Berkowitz 2009; Piazza 2009; Cotter 2010; Bednarek and Caple 2012; Harry 2014; Landert 2014). The significance of reported language does not derive only from the reported content and form but also from the external voice of the reported speaker. The importance of attribution and source identification is recognised by Zelizer (1989: 371), who says that quotes "herald back to people who make them", and by Boeyink (1990: 233, 235), who points out that sourcing explains the significance and meaning of the reported message, enables the verification of accuracy and

is closely related to the values of ethics, accountability and fairness. According to Van Dijk (1988: 86), external voices and their reports offer the reader "the illusion of truth"; Berkowitz (2009: 109) ventures to say that statements by high status credible sources can be taken at face value without verifying their factual status. The importance of external voices in news texts is also recognised in news values, especially factuality, prominence, power and eliteness on the one hand, and personalisation on the other (Cotter 2010; Bednarek and Caple 2012; Elorza 2014; Bednarek 2015; Bednarek and Caple 2017).

Bednarek and Caple (2012: 91) mention different strategies regarding the attribution of reported content: information can be attributed to a specific source referred to by a proper name, an anonymous source (*police, sources, officials, scientists, reports*), an unidentified source, or it can remain unattributed. The constructions with an unidentified source such as *She is believed to..., It has been described as..., The idea that...* or *The accusation of ...* are clear instances of attribution which contain a reporting noun or verb denoting a speech or thought act but which simultaneously lack overt reference to the reported speaker. Boeyink (1990: 234) is critical of reliance on unnamed anonymous sources and ascribes it to "flagrant disregard for attribution". Thompson (1996: 509) adopts a more neutral stance and notes that even though context can normally disambiguate voice identity, it is "useful to explore the reasons why a non-specifying structure has been used". It is the aim of the present paper to investigate some of the motivations underlying the use of forms of presentation (attribution/reporting) with unidentified/inexplicit reported speakers.

2. Inexplicit voices

The present paper is concerned with forms of presentation (FoP) evoking reported speakers whose presence is not coded in language; formally absent reported speakers are referred to as inexplicit or covert, and the labels are used synonymously and interchangeably, as are the terms reported speaker (RedSp) and external voice (EV). There are two types of FoP under examination: FoP which include a reporting signal (especially a reporting noun or verb) but lack overt reference to the RedSp (e.g. indirect speech, *Mr Wan's wife is said to have emigrated to Britain already.*); and FoP which lack a reporting frame altogether and attribution to an EV is indicated only by quotation marks and/or the reported content and form (e.g. authorial discourse combined with a partial direct quote, *Millions of Britons face a "hell of a shock" when they reach retirement because of their failure to save.*).[1]

The studies on inexplicit voices in newspaper discourse or in general adopt the following, sometimes intersecting, perspectives: the expression of ideology and bias (Fairclough 1988; Garretson and Ädel 2008; Sclafani 2008); a purely linguistic and descriptive approach (Thompson 1994, 1996; Waugh 1995; van Leuween 1996; Ljung 1998; Marín-Arrese 2002a; Ikeo 2007; Głaz and Trofymzuk 2020); a corpus approach (Ljung 1998; Biber et al. 1999; Stenvall 2003; Semino and Short 2004); the expression of evaluation and evidentiality (Bednarek 2006a,

b; Martínez-Caro 2006; Stenvall 2008a, 2014; Bednarek and Caple 2012); common journalistic practice and its objectives (Stenvall 2003, 2008b, 2014); and, finally, a dialogic perspective (Dahl and Fløttum 2014). Most relevant findings will be presented in greater detail in section 2.1, dealing with the motivations for agent omission, and section 2.2, dealing with ambiguity and the degree of inexplicitness and recoverability, and will be compared to the results of the present research discussed in section 5.

2.1 Motivations for agent omission

This section aims to summarize possible motivations for the occurrence of FoP with inexplicit EVs. The reasons for agent omission include textual retrievability and shared extratextual knowledge, the need for economy and avoidance of repetition (e.g. Thompson 1994: 156, 161; van Leuween 1996: 38–42; Blanco-Gómez 2002: 18–21; Pérez de Ayala 2002: 63–67; Semino and Short 2004: 107–108). Other not unrelated reasons include processes connected to the textual organisation and flow of discourse such as topicalization, summary, advance labelling and end-focus (Thompson 1994: 162; Blanco-Gómez 2002: 18–21; Pérez de Ayala 2002: 68).

Moreover, the equirements of the generic structure can also be decisive. For instance, unframed (free) direct speech can be used as a convenient space-saving strategy in headlines (Thompson 1994: 156; Waugh 1995: 144). The type of agent can play a role too: agents that are judged to be unknown, indeterminate, irrelevant, unimportant or self-evident and whose identification is impossible or unnecessary are excluded. In addition, general collective speakers presenting common or traditional knowledge also tend to be unspecified (Thompson 1994: 62–64, 133–134; Blanco-Gómez 2002: 18–21; Martínez-Caro 2006).

Attributive structures with inexplicit agents are exploited as a strategic rhetorical device. One of the functions that is traditionally associated with evidentiality and reported language is that of hedging and mitigation. Ljung (1998: 114–115, 120–121) regards impersonal passives as evasive devices which make statements more tentative and which enable journalists to distance themselves from the reported claims. Similarly, Thompson (1994: 135) states that authors use impersonal structures in contexts of uncertainty about the correctness of the reported opinion or belief; Martínez-Caro (2006) ascribes the use of hearsay and belief evidentiality with inexplicit agents to the purpose of avoiding responsibility for the reported content and stance, and to the purpose of presenting common or tradition-based knowledge.

There are studies which explore in different depth omissions which can be ideologically motivated and may involve purposeful blocking of knowledge (van Leuween 1996: 38–42). Thompson (1994: 156–157) notes the convention of "off the record" comments made by elite persons. Marín-Arrese (2002a), a collection of studies examining impersonalising strategies in newspaper discourse, and Stenvall (2003, 2008a, 2014), who examines the discourse produced by news agencies, find that vague and impersonalising structures serve to intentionally conceal identity and reduce responsibility of an institution or an elite group.

2.2 Ambiguity and the scale of inexplicitness and recoverability

Many studies dealing with discourse produced by EVs are concerned with ambiguity. Discussions of ambiguity related to unattributed discourse, i.e. discourse that originates with an external voice but is presented without an explicit reporting signal as internal, authorial discourse, concern the blurring of boundaries between voices and the coalescence of an EV and the internal voice (IV) due to the dissemination of the linguistic mark-up and style of one mode into the other (Bell 1991; Bednarek and Caple 2012: 91; Fairclough 1988: 126–130; Waugh 1995: 144–145; Ikeo 2007; Sanders 2010; Głaz and Trofymzuk 2020). Ambiguity of voice in attributed discourse with an inexplicit RedSp is examined in Biber et al. (1999) and Martínez-Caro (2006). Discussing different attribution devices marking stance (e.g. passive, adverbial -ed clauses, nouns and nominalisations), Biber et al. (1999: 976–978) refer to attribution which is ambiguous between attribution to the speaker/writer and a third party. Martínez-Caro (2006) sees Biber et al.'s (1999) ambiguous attribution as having impersonal generic reference potentially embracing the whole mankind. The potential for ambiguity between an EV and the IV is exploited by journalists for strategic purposes such as avoidance of direct responsibility (Biber et al. 1999: 977) or, as noted by Ikeo (2007: 377) in the case of free indirect discourse, insertion of their own evaluations, explanations and predictions.

The studies in Marín-Arrese (2002a) posit different linguistic strategies on a scale of agent implicitness and contextual recoverability: at the one pole an agent's identity is recoverable from the preceding or following textual context while at the other pole there are no traces of an agent's identity; the space in the middle is occupied by cases where identity is inferred on the basis of shared extratextual knowledge (e.g. world-knowledge, the event reported on, conventional situations) (Marín-Arrese 2002b: 3). Pérez de Ayala (2002) offers a finer distinction regarding different degrees of textual recoverability, differentiating between the presence of an agent in the most immediate context with a minimum degree of mystification (e.g. within a sentence boundary) and in a wider context with a greater degree of mystification (e.g. a paragraph boundary) (cf. van Leuween's 1996 notions of suppression and backgrounding).

3. Research aims

This paper is intended as a contribution to the research outlined in section 2. It aims to contribute to the study of FoP in newspaper discourse and their role in increasing implicitness and covering agency and responsibility (Zelizer 1989; Blakenburg 1992; Marín-Arrese 2002a; Calsamiglia and Ferrero 2003; Murphy 2004; Martínez-Caro 2006; Garretson and Ädel 2008; Stenvall 2008a; Piazza 2009; Duffy 2010; Johansen 2011; Pjesivac and Rui 2014). In addition, it continues the discussion of voice mixing and blending and the gradient between structures giving voice to the author of the text and to speakers which are external to it (Fairclough 1988; Biber et al. 1999: 976–8; Hunston 2000; Bednarek 2006b; Ikeo 2007; Sanders 2010; Głaz and Trofymzuk 2020).

There has been considerable research on the occurrence of inexplicit voices in news discourse. However, the studies do not address (all) the phenomena I examine (Fairclough 1988; Ljung 1998; Ikeo 2007; Landert 2014); overlap in focus but adopt a different perspective (Bednarek 2006a; Bednarek and Caple 2012); or provide a quantitative rather than qualitative focus (Biber et al. 1999; Semino and Short 2004). Even though Marín-Arrese (2002a) include reported discourse in their study of impersonalisation strategies in Spanish and English newspaper reports, their explanations relate to grammatical form and do not take into account the specifics and peculiarities of FoP.

The present study corroborates the findings of the research mentioned above. At the same time, it hopes to expand the relevant body of research. It is narrower in focus, concentrates on inexplicit EVs in FoP and takes into account their formal and functional properties. It takes notice of the linguistic cues that are indicative of a particular function of agent obfuscation. It combines the perspective of genre, especially the perspective of the generic structure, with a textual and discourse functional point of view. The paper poses the following research questions:

1. What FoP are typically used with inexplicit RedSps and in what discourse contexts/functions?

2. What is the textual/referential status of inexplicit RedSps?

3. How do the aim of hard news, peculiarities of the generic structure and the role of the internal journalistic voice influence the occurrence of inexplicit RedSps?

4. Data and methodology

The data for the analysis were collected from 175 hard news reports (79,945 words) excerpted from UK quality newspapers (*The Times, The Daily Telegraph, The Guardian* and *The Independent*). The criteria for the selection of a particular copy of a newspaper follow Bell (1991: 22–23). The key criteria for text selection were the generic structure and reporter voice, i.e. aspects which are related to the functionality of hard news and which are instrumental in contributing to (the impression of) an objective and impersonal style of reporting (e.g. White 1997, 1998, 2000, 2006, 2012; Feez et al. 2008). Even though the internal style guides of the respective media outlets or the individual journalists' writing styles may have had an impact on the language used in the reporting of events, neither was taken into account during the text selection process or the subsequent interpretation of the data.

The classification of FoP follows Semino and Short (2004); on further information regarding the data see Urbanová (2013a). The condition for the inclusion of a text in the analysis was the absence of an explicit RedSp in the reporting frame or a complete absence of the frame. FoP referring to inexplicit RedSps whose identity was, however, revealed within a sentence boundary were excluded

from the analysis (cf. Pérez de Ayala 2002). Consequently, only inexplicit RedSps whose occurrence could be explained by reference to links that span across a sentence boundary or reach outside the text and which relate to textual, discourse or generic reasons were subjected to analysis. In addition, instances with a metonymically expressed RedSp (*The report/document suggests …*) were also excluded.

Inexplicit EVs were assessed in terms of a potential presence of a co-referential overtly expressed EV located across a sentence boundary. On the basis of retrievability (context dependency), three types of inexplicit RedSps were distinguished: unspecified, retrievable and ambiguous. An unspecified EV refers to an inexplicit RedSp whose identity has not been overtly specified at the point of occurrence in discourse; this category also includes cases where a RedSp's identity can be deduced extratextually or where a source is specified at later stages in the text development (e.g. an unspecified RedSp in the headline or lead becomes specified in the body of the text); on a different approach see Landert (2014: 188). A retrievable RedSp refers to an inexplicit EV whose identity has been specified in the preceding context across a sentence boundary. The category of ambiguous RedSps is rather heterogenous and encompasses the following cases: potential yet uncertain co-referentiality with at least one explicit EV; an ideological rather than a textual scope of reference; and ambiguity with the IV of the journalist.

Finally, the presence of inexplicit EVs was assessed in terms of three possible motivations: firstly, the function of a FoP as a mitigation device in the context of epistemic evaluation; secondly, the function of a FoP as a conveyor of negative evaluation; thirdly, the position of a FoP in the generic structure and the operation of principles governing the presentation of information (van Dijk 1988; Feez et al. 2008; White 1998, 2000; White and Thompson 2008). While in some cases the textual, discoursal and generic motivations clash and one seems to override the other, in others they are in agreement and produce identical results. In the latter case, I accepted simultaneous operation of more different factors (cf. Landert 2015: 35–36; Dontcheva-Navratilova 2016: 60).

5. Results of the analysis

This section aims to examine inexplicit EVs from the point of view of FoP (5.1), reference (5.2) and function (5.3).

5.1 Forms of presentation

The analysis of FoP draws on Semino and Short (2004) and Leech and Short (2007). They view reported language as a continuum with individual FoP located on the scale between narrative/authorial discourse of the IV and a fully direct reported discourse of an EV. FoP report speech, writing and thought and are distinguished according to the following criteria: punctuation (quotation marks), deictic aspects reflecting either the reporting or the reported situation, a separate reporting clause (presence/absence, parataxis/hypotaxis) and reported content (presence/absence, phrasal/clausal form). Moreover, non-direct FoP and

narrative discourse can combine with a partial direct quote (Semino et al. 1997; Semino and Short 2004).

Different combinations of the above criteria give the following FoP. Direct discourse is characterised by the presence of quotation marks, deictic independence of the reported element and a paratactic reporting clause (DD, She said: *"The road is dangerous."*); free direct discourse differs from DD in that it lacks quotation marks, the reporting clause or both (FDD, *The road is dangerous.*) (Leech and Short 2007: 258; cf. Short 2007). Free indirect discourse is a deictic blend with or without a paratactic reporting clause (FID, *The road was dangerous, she said.*). Indirect discourse is characterised by a separate reporting clause, a subordinate reported clause and the deictic orientation reflecting the reporting situation (ID, *She warned us that the road was dangerous.*). Narrator's representation of a discourse act has no separate reporting clause and specifies only the illocutionary force (NRDA, *She gave us a warning.*); a variant of NRDA can represent content but only in a phrasal form (*She warned us of the dangerous road.*). Finally, minimal FoP merely note that a speech, writing or thought event has occurred or indicate attitudes, mental states and emotions (MIN, *She was worried about the dangerous road.*). As mentioned, non-direct FoP that can report content (FID, ID, NRDA) and the internal narrative voice of the journalist (N) can be interspersed with a partial direct quote (-q) (ID-q, *She warned us that the road was "dangerous".*; N-q, *The road was "dangerous".*).

Table 1 summarizes the frequency of occurrence of the individual reporting forms; the division reflects the presence or absence of a reporting frame. The reporting structures with an absent or parenthetical reporting frame include narration with a partial direct quote (N-q), free direct discourse (FDD), free indirect discourse (FID) and its partially quoted variant (FID-q). The FoP with a present (non-parenthetical) reporting frame but an inexplicit RedSp include indirect discourse (ID) and narrator's report of a discourse act (NRDA) together with their partially quoted variants (ID-q, NRDA-q), and minimal forms (MIN). In addition, there are ambiguous forms (A). Out of the total of 930 FoP, 206 instances are thought reports.

Table 1. Forms of presentation

REPORTING FRAME								
absent		absent or parenthetical	present					
N-q	FDD	FID(-q)	ID(-q)	NRDA(-q)	MIN	A	total
30	154	8	201	401	103	33	930
	0	0	100	50	55	1	206
	THOUGHT							

The functions of FoP and the form-function correlations in connection to the absence of an explicit RedSp will be discussed in section 5.3.

5.2 Inexplicit reported speakers: retrievable, unspecified and ambiguous

This section discusses the co-referential relations between inexplicit RedSps and explicit external sources. Its purpose is to provide a quantitative overview while the motivations and explanations are given in section 5.3. Table 2 shows the frequency of RedSps which are retrievable from the preceding text across a sentence boundary (484), unspecified at the point of occurrence (274) and ambiguous, i.e. having more potential referents (172).

Table 2. Inexplicit reported speakers

INEXPLICIT REPORTED SPEAKER			
retrievable	unspecified	ambiguous	total
484 (149 FDD)	274	172	930

Let us briefly comment on the most frequent category, i.e. inexplicit RedSps which are context dependent and retrievable. Out of the total of 484 instances, there are 149 cases of FDD employed in the body of the text immediately preceding or following DD; as the RedSp is identified across a sentence boundary, FDD was included in the analysis. Such occurrences of FDD are a matter of stylistic convention and result from the chunking of extended stretches of DD into a series of individually separated DD and FDD, especially for the purpose of readability (Semino and Short 2004: 94–95). Inexplicit RedSps in FDD are not of interest to this paper and will not be considered here, with the exception of a free-standing FDD found in headlines (regarding a different approach to the quantification of FDD see Landert 2014: 180–182). When irrelevant FDD is excluded, there are 335 inexplicit RedSps retrievable from the preceding context. Frequency-wise, unspecified RedSps (274) follow second and inexplicit RedSps with an ambiguous reference represent the least numerous category (172). All three types of inexplicit RedSps will be discussed in section 5.3.

5.3 Motivations for the omission of the reported speaker

This section aims to discuss the motivations for the omission of the RedSp. As noted in section 4, the reasons may be concomitant and their operation not mutually exclusive. Given the number of the relevant retrievable RedSps (335), context-dependency seems to be the most obvious reason for EV omission. Even though retrievable RedSps are the most frequent, the occurrence of unspecified (274) and ambiguous (172) RedSps is far from negligible, which suggests that other reasons than context dependency must be at play.

A possible motivation for the occurrence of unspecified RedSps (274) is their identification on the basis of extratextual knowledge. This concerns especially institutionalised and professional settings where participants are officially appointed, have the authority to fulfil roles specific to their position or possess specific knowledge. Declaratives (*adjourn, rule, convict, charge, find guilty, sentence,*

diagnose) are felicitous only under specific circumstances in a given cultural-institutional setting (Bednarek 2006a: 57–58) and the assumption of the reader's knowledge of these constraints, including the potential RedSp, is one of the reasons explaining unspecified reference.

Even though textual dependency and extratextual knowledge can be assumed to be significant contributory factors, the discussion of inexplicit RedSps will focus on other aspects – the need for hedging and mitigation in the context of epistemic evaluation, agent mystification in the presence of negative evaluation and generic conventions.

Presentation of epistemic evaluation

FoP with an inexplicit RedSp may fulfil the role of hedges by means of epistemic modification of the reported content and by avoiding attribution to a specified source (*It is expected to...; It is believed/understood (that)...; Mr X is thought to ...*). When the information or the source is uncertain, unreliable or incomplete, hedging FoP protect the IV or the EV by leaving the relation between the reported content and the RedSp inexplicit. The present paper approaches hedging FoP from a qualitative perspective, characterises them in terms of lexico-grammatical preferences and specifies some contextual linguistic cues serving as voice indicators.

In total 79 FoP with an inexplicit RedSp were identified to serve as hedges. Even though grammatical form is not of primary focus, it may be interesting to note that there were 68 short passives and only 8 nominalisations, a ratio strikingly different from the FoP used in the context of negative evaluation; there were also 3 instances falling into other structural categories. Agentless passive can thus be presumed a typical realisation form of the FoP with the hedging function. Regarding the FoP, they display the following characteristics: there is a rather limited repertoire of FoP (1 FID, 68 ID, 7 NRDA, 1 minimal and 2 ambiguous forms); the subjectivity and deictic features of the FoP tend to accommodate the IV rather than an EV; none of the non-direct FoP contains a partial direct quote; finally, there are 59 thought reports and only 20 speech reports. Consequently, the data seem to suggest a relatively strong association between the hedging function, an inexplicit RedSp and passive indirect thought.

Generally, ID allows to focus on content and disregard form and, despite the potential to summarize, the reported content is still felt to be relevant and significant (Semino and Short 2004: 78–79, 106). Non-direct FoP reporting thought may represent inferred cognitive processes, general moods, opinions and general knowledge of the world; as thought cannot be directly accessed, ID is the norm for its presentation. References to thought acts are often based on observable behaviour and may, in fact, be used to represent an original speech act (Thompson 1994: 120, 124; Semino and Short 2004: 78–79, 106, 136, 138–139, 143–145; Leech and Short 2007: 276). Consequently, Landert (2014: 172–173) prefers to regard impersonal indirect thought expressing a prevalent opinion (*It was thought that...*) as speech or writing. Martínez-Caro (2006) concludes that impersonal structures such as *It is said that* and *It is (generally) believed that* are similar in function as long as they convey common knowledge. However, generally FoP reporting thought allow for less exposure of both the author and the EV than FoP

reporting speech irrespective of the in/explicitness of the EV (Semino and Short 2004: 140). The high frequency of thought reports attested in the corpus and the examples below will hopefully show that the choice of thought rather than speech or writing is functionally motivated.

According to Bednarek (2006a: 164), propositions, especially those combining the parameters of mindsay and expectation or belief, which are attributed to unknown sensors, e.g. by means of passivisation or nominalisation, have low reliability. Bagnall (1993: 22, cited in Bednarek 2006a: 165) points out that *It is believed that* can be paraphrased as *"I can't say who by, but probably true"* and the expression *It is understood that* is a firmer version of the former. In addition, such combinations allow writers to summarize and interpret information while avoiding responsibility for it. Whether mindsay or hearsay (*X is said to ...*), the content is mitigated, presented as more tentative and less assertive, allowing the writer to mention information whose veracity and reliability may be difficult to assess and challenge, and for which there may not be enough evidence (Semino and Short 2004: 141; Bednarek 2006a: 165–167).

Table 3 below shows the frequency of occurrence of the reporting verbs and nouns with the hedging function which have occurred at least three times in the corpus. In addition, there were a few expressions serving the same function which appeared only once or twice in the corpus (e.g. passives such as *be hoped* and *be estimated,* and nouns and nominalisations such as *the word is, rumour, claims, estimates, allegations*). The identified reporting expressions have an epistemic meaning and evaluate the speech act and the reported content mainly in terms of reliability.[2]

Table 3. Epistemic evaluation: lexico-grammatical choices

GRAMMAR AND LEXIS	23	13	11	7	4	3
passive	expect	believe	understand	think, say	(not) know	allege
nominalisation						speculation

Out of the total of 79 instances, there were 11 retrievable, 10 unspecified and 58 ambiguous RedSps. Let us begin with the retrievable and unspecified RedSps. For the description of illustrating examples the following conventions are used: reporting frames containing the discussed inexplicit RedSps are marked in bold; overt RedSps (potentially) co-referential with inexplicit RedSps are underlined; other relevant items are italicised; brackets enclose the information regarding the placement in the generic structure (headline, lead, the body of the text); even though the examples are only partial excerpts, the original order of presentation has been preserved.

Example 1 illustrates an inexplicit RedSp retrievable from the preceding context.

(1) <u>Belgian police earlier announced</u> that they had found the body of *a woman in her forties* in a garage next to the home of *Nordine Amrani*. **It is believed** that *Amrani* shot *her* just before he left for his attack in Liège city centre on

> Tuesday, which resulted in the killing of two teenage boys … (body of the text) (Lichfield and Mock 2011)

In example 1 the FoP with an inexplicit retrievable RedSp is indirect thought (*It is believed*); the RedSp is specified in a FoP in the preceding context (*Belgian police earlier announced*) linked to the ensuing indirect thought by a common theme (the discovery of the woman's body and the circumstances of her death) and formally by cohesion (*a woman in her forties – her, Nordine Amrani – Amrani*). The co-reference between the explicit and inexplicit RedSp is also suggested by the fact that the knowledge of the reported content in both FoP is bound to a specialised field of work. The epistemic status of the presented information corresponds with the employed FoP: the undisputed event (*they had found the body …*) is reported as speech with an explicit RedSp while the uncertainty of the reported content (*Amrani shot her just before he left …*) calls for indirect thought with an inexplicit RedSp.

Example 2 illustrates indirect thought with an unspecified RedSp. The identity of the EV can be deduced on the basis of extratextual knowledge (scientists).

(2) Graphene is the world's thinnest and strongest nano-material and conducts electricity and heat. **It is thought** to be the best material to replace silicon semiconductors. (body of the text) (Alleyne 2010)

Naturally, textual and extratextual retrievability in examples 1 and 2 respectively can be considered the reason for the omission of the RedSps. However, the examples display identical formal features that recur in the majority of the FoP interpreted as hedges (agentless passive, thought reports, epistemic meaning). This seems to suggest that there may be another reason at stake, namely the increase in tentativeness. As in example 1, the voice in example 2 is involved in a specialised field of work. Engagement in a specialised activity, possession of specific knowledge and the cohesive links between the FoP with explicit and inexplicit RedSps indicate that in examples 1 and 2 the IV is excluded as a potential source of the information. The significance of cues indicative of voice will have become obvious during the discussion of ambiguous RedSps.

The category of RedSps with an ambiguous reference (58) is not homogeneous; the ambiguity resides in the potential co-referentiality of an inexplicit RedSp and more EVs (35); in other cases the ambivalence seems to lie between an EV and the IV interpretation (23). FoP with an ambiguous RedSp often provide additional background information and the digression from the main topic may weaken the strength of the referential link between an explicit and inexplicit RedSp. In general, the conspicuous high frequency of ambiguous RedSps seems to go hand in hand with the meaning of epistemic uncertainty.

Let us start with ambiguity between an inexplicit RedSp and more explicit EVs, illustrated by example 3.

(3a) Millions of people will be cared for by remote control in their own homes, with medical equipment that can monitor their health and transmit the results to doctors, <u>David Cameron has announced</u>. (lead)

(3b) **It is hoped** that the <u>NHS</u> will save *£1.2 billion a year* by caring for the long-term sick in their own homes rather than in hospitals. Medical equipment worth *£750 million* will be supplied by private companies as use of remote health care **is expected** to expand *in the next 10 to 15 years*. (body of the text) (Smith 2011)

In example 3, there are two EVs (*David Cameron, the NHS*) that are potentially co-referential with the inexplicit RedSps (*it is hoped, use of remote health care is expected;* indirect thought) and are the source of ambiguity. The ambiguity may also be partly caused by the shift in the aim, i.e. from the introduction of the topic in the lead to the discussion of financial issues in the body of the text. Simultaneously, there are features that exclude the IV as the source such as the thought verb expressing a positive evaluation of future happenings (*hope*) and the presence of factual information (*£1.2 billion, £750 million, the next 10 to 15 years*). Other features that are not compatible with the IV and that have been attested in the corpus are, for instance, a past time location of a speech or thought event (*Ms Holgate was said to have been ill ..., They were expected to take part in ...*) or embedding of an impersonal structure in direct speech.

Let us now proceed with ambiguous reference featuring a potential presence of the internal, journalistic voice (23). In these cases it is not clear to what extent the hedge protects the IV or the EV and/or to what extent these two merge. These hedges are characterised by a hundred per cent preference for the thought scale. In addition, the range of thought verbs is very limited, including mostly *understand* (example 4) and *think* (example 5). The FoP in bold in examples 4 and 5 are indirect thought reports; the EVs which are potentially coreferential with the inexplicit RedSps are underlined (*Gloria de Piero, Ministry of Defence* in example 4; *One senior lawyer, News International* in example 5).

(4a) The taxpayer is spending more than £15m a year to send the children of British diplomats and military officers to private schools such as Fettes, Winchester, Roedean and Marlborough. (lead)
The extraordinary hidden privilege <u>has been unearthed by Gloria de Piero, a new Labour MP</u>, in written questions ... (body of the text)
(4b) **It is understood** the same privilege is provided to senior members of the military, but <u>no figures have been divulged by the Ministry of Defence</u>. (body of the text) (Wintour 2010)

(5a) <u>One senior lawyer told</u> The Independent the inflation in NI's [News International] settlement fund "indicates they are serious to avoid further damage in court". (body of the text)
(5b) <u>News International</u> *appears to be keen* to settle as many cases as possible before mid-February when Mr Justice Vos begins to hear a group of test cases ... (body of the text)
(5c) Several of those lead cases **are** among those **thought** *likely* to be settled out of court *in coming weeks*. Other claimants *could* be brought in to serve as new test cases, but that is *likely* to result in a delay which *would* allow Wapping more time ... (body of the text) (Hickman and Cusick 2011)

Examples 4 and 5 illustrate some of the contextual cues which give rise to the impression that the indirect thoughts are the IV's subjective interpretation or a merger of the IV's and the EV's assumptions. For instance, the context may describe some kind of observable behaviour substantiating the authorial line of reasoning (underlined ID-q in example 5a). In some cases, the context evokes EVs that could remove doubt and uncertainty but that expressly decline to provide the information (*no figures have been divulged by the Ministry of Defence* in example 4b). The blatant disconnection between the EV and the hedged content supports the impression that the information provided is partly the IV's assumption. Moreover, as shown in examples 5b and 5c, hedging FoP may cluster with clear signals of the IV's subjectivity such as expressions of epistemic modality and/or futurity (*appears* in 5b*, likely, could, would, in coming weeks* in 5c). Finally, in contrast to hedges involving ambiguity solely between EVs (example 3b), the statements or predictions of future happenings which are associable with the IV tend to be of general nature and do not contain any hard facts. The interpretative nature of hedges may be underscored by the co-occurrence with other structures that involve inference on the part of the IV, such as reference to an EV's attitudes or emotions (*appears to be keen* in 5b, *It is understood he liked the concept ...* attested in the corpus).[3]

In examples 1–3 there seem to be no linguistic cues indicating the IV as the source of the information and in examples 4–5 the IV seems to be present to different degrees; in example 6, however, the IV seems to prevail.

(6a) The Pope was at the centre of a new controversy last night after campaigners in the Church accused him of demeaning the role of women in Christ's life in a children's book, The Friends of Jesus. (lead)

(6b) The book, **thought** to be the first written for children by a pope, came under attack because no mention was made of Mary Magdalene or any other female friends of Jesus. (body of the text) (Gledhill 2010)

The FoP (indirect thought) in example 6b was assessed as attributable primarily to the IV. This ID seems to be a step further from the FoP in examples 4 and 5, moving towards the internal end point on the scale between external and internal sourcing. In example 6, the indicators of the IV are the thought act verb, the parenthetical nature of the passive supplying additional background information and the absence of a suitable explicit EV. The ID can be interpreted as an assumption on the part of the IV, whose agency is, however, obscured in order to mitigate the low reliability of the information.

Many studies that examine structures similar to examples 1–6 from the perspective of responsibility, objectivity, (inter-)subjectivity and evidentiality do so in relation to their clinal nature. Discussing different attribution devices marking stance, Biber et al. (1999: 976–978) mention attribution which is ambivalent between the speaker/writer and a third party and serves to "avoid direct responsibility". As mentioned above, the distinction between hearsay/speech (*It is said*) and mindsay/thought (*It is believed*) can make a difference in terms of the potential implication of the writer/journalist. Whereas speech cannot be attrib-

uted to the author/reporting speaker, if a belief or expectation is attributed to an unknown agent, the reporting speaker cannot be excluded as a source (hence *I/We believe*) (Bednarek 2006a: 161). Bednarek and Caple (2012: 151) suggest that the presentation of information as "communal epistemic background" and "commonly known fact" allows the writer to hide their subjectivity, agency and responsibility. The idea of sharing attitude and responsibility is captured in the notion of intersubjectivity (Marín-Arrese 2013: 428; Nuyts 2015: 107) and the so-called "opaque responsibility", i.e. responsibility which is shared and "diffused" (Marín-Arrese 2013: 431, 436). Similarly, White (2006: 64–65) considers epistemic passives with inexplicit agents a type of "evidential standing", a means of authorial alignment in which the reported content is presented as warrantable on account of being widely accepted by diverse sources. Commenting on passives with an inexplicit RedSp occurring in the vicinity of a plausible source, Ljung (1998: 119) believes that "it is a grey area where different readers will sometimes have different views" regarding sourcing.

Drawing on Sinclair (1988) and Hunston (2000), Bednarek (2006b) shows that the degree of subjectivity is marked by the combination of sourcing (I/self or other) and basis (evidence construed as perception, proof, general knowledge, something obvious, unspecified, hearsay or mindsay). Considering examples 1–6, they are all formally classified as identical FoP (indirect thought/mindsay) but due to inexplicitness the distinction between *I believe* and *others believe* becomes blurred. Moreover, even though the voice of the IV is expected to be subdued in hard news discourse, examples 1–6 seem to form a continuum differing in the extent to which the IV becomes salient. Although the differences may be subtle and the distinction not very sharp on account of context sensitivity and the scalar nature of FoP, it seems that on the continuum between the IV and an EV examples 1–3 are posited close to the EV, example 6 towards the IV and examples 4–5 seem to be located in between. Forms which are close to the IV end of the scale (such as example 6) seem to be falling out from the realm of "objective" evidentiality of hearsay/mindsay (Hunston 2000; Bednarek 2006b) and move towards the realm of subjective and attenuated "entertaining" of ideas (Martin and White 2005: 104–111). Even though examples 1–6 are all indirect thoughts, the interplay between attribution-related aspects (reporting expression, indirectness, reported content) and contextual cues points to a construal that is primarily indicative of the IV, EV or both. Explicit structures such as *The Guardian understands that* ... identify the IV as source unequivocally and are posited at the very end of the EV-IV cline.

Marín-Arrese (2013: 430, 436) draws on Langacker's (2000: 350, 2009: 286) notions of a "virtual" and "generalised conceptualiser" and, taking the subjectivity of the IV as the starting point, considers passives and nominalisations invoking a de-individualised, backgrounded and indeterminate assessor as expressing a lesser degree of subjectivity than, for instance, modal verbs (see example 5). Mañoso-Pacheco and Juárez-Escribano (2019) compare reported discourse to reportive evidentiality, understood as rumours, claims or evidence that are not verified and are to be approached with reservation. In agreement with Chojnicka (2012), they believe that there is a functional overlap between reportive eviden-

tials and reported discourse. By their criteria (2019: 198–202), reportive evidentiality is characterised by unclear or absent sourcing and structurally by the location of both the reporting and reported elements within a single proposition; on the other hand, reported discourse is characterised by specific/explicit attribution and by the location of the reporting and reported events into two separate propositions. Even though examples 1–6 may not be prototypical illustrations of either of the two phenomena as defined above, example 1 could be placed closer to reported discourse, example 6 closer to reportive evidentiality and examples 2–5 in between. In other words, not all instances of indirect thought featuring an inexplicit RedSp are functionally alike; among other contextual cues, the presence of a relevant EV in the near context seems to be an important criterion. All in all, the high number of RedSps with an ambiguous reference seems to correspond to the indeterminacy of the passive indirect thought.

Presentation of negative evaluation

This section examines FoP with an inexplicit RedSp that evaluate along the good versus bad dimension (Martin and White 2005; Bednarek 2006a, b). For instance, FoP portray the reported event as a negative emotion (*The figures have increased concerns over the use of interception powers.*) or subject someone or something to criticism (*The move was criticised for being particularly unfair on mothers who stay at home to care for their children.*).

In total there were 232 inexplicit RedSps found in this type of evaluative context. While a large proportion of FoP present negative evaluation (202), only 30 inexplicit RedSps are found in positively evaluating contexts. Let us focus on the structures in the context of negative evaluation. The expressions of hearsay and mindsay, especially those of mental states and emotions (*fear, accuse, idea, concern, criticise, question* etc.), combine with the parameter of negative emotivity, which is connected to the news value of negativity (Bednarek 2006a: 179). Negative evaluation is present either as inscribed or invoked attitude and covers a range of evaluating dimensions including affect, appreciation and judgement, not discriminated systematically for the purpose of this paper (Martin and White 2005: 42–68). The strategic omission of the RedSp enables the IV to disassociate the source or target from the negative assessment. The ratio of the three types of EVs (202 in total) is relatively balanced: there are 73 ambiguous, 78 unspecified and 51 retrievable RedSps.

Let us now compare inexplicit RedSps occurring in the context of negative evaluation with those expressing epistemic stance. FoP used as epistemic hedges are less frequent (79) than those presenting negative evaluation (202). The proportion of ambiguous RedSps is much more conspicuous in epistemic contexts (58 out of 79) than in the context of negative evaluation (73 out of 202). The functional distinction also finds reflection in different lexico-grammatical characteristics. While the reporting signals in hedging FoP tend to be realised by agentless passives (68 out of 79), in negatively evaluating contexts the frames tend to be realised by nominalisations (107 out of 202), which prevail over agentless passives (67), non-finite forms (12) and FoP without a reporting signal (16), mostly narrative discourse interspersed with a partial direct quote (N-q). As shown in

Table 4, the repertoire of the reporting expressions in negative contexts is more heterogenous compared to a rather limited inventory of the reporting signals functioning as hedges (Table 3).

Table 4. Negative evaluation: lexical choices

LEXICAL CHOICES			
freq.		**freq.**	
12	fear(s)	6	question
9	accuse/accusation	5	claim
8	idea, concern(s)	4	decision, blame, proposal, expect, tell, describe, doubt, alleged/allegations, suggest
7	criticise/criticism	3	say, see, mention

Moreover, a number of reporting verbs/nouns appear only once or twice in the corpus (e.g. *demonise*, *furore*, *report*, *urge*, *warn*, *consider/consideration*, *hate*, *argument*, *disregard*, *condemn*, *regard*, *overinterpret*, *judge*, *brand*, *attack*, *complaint*, *admission*, *term* etc.). See Hunston (2004) on the description of how writers exploit different grammatical constructions and meanings to express conflict and consensus to the extent that these can be diagnostic of the writer's stance.

Other differences relate to the type of FoP. While epistemic evaluation is typically expressed by indirect thought, FoP in negatively evaluating contexts vary: 1FDD, 61 ID(-q), 97 NRDA(-q), 26 minimal forms, 14 N-q and 3 ambiguities; the variation in FoP makes it harder to establish a straightforward link between negative evaluation and a particular FoP as it has crystallised between epistemic evaluation and indirect thought. Moreover, ID, the most frequent FoP in epistemic evaluation, is in a epistemic evaluation, is in negatively evaluating contexts outnumbered by NRDA. In addition, while in epistemic hedges inexplicit RedSps are largely evoked by the IV, in negative contexts inexplicit voices are also embedded in direct reported discourse (70 out of 202) and are thus evoked by an EV (example 7 below); embedding in non-direct reported discourse (36 out of 202) is less frequent and the blending of voices precludes unambiguous assignment of responsibility either to the IV or an EV. Moreover, the presence of partial direct quotes (altogether 24 including N-q) also brings an EV into the foreground. Although the number of thought reports is relatively high (71 out of 202), the proportion is much lower than in epistemic evaluation (59 out of 79). All in all, the presence of speech and direct and partially quoted FoP highlights an EV at the expense of the IV and makes the former more salient than it is in epistemic contexts.

The greater salience of an EV is in line with the so-called "reporter voice", a type of journalistic voice applied in hard news characterised by almost no or limited occurrence of unattributed/authorial inscribed attitude (White 1998, 2006, 2012; Martin and White 2005: 178; Feez et al. 2008). However, the EVs in the examined examples become, despite their importance, omitted and backgrounded and the responsibility for the evaluation unexpressed. A possible rea-

son may be that despite attribution the IV remains responsible for the choice of the FoP, the reporting frame and in the case of non-embedded non-direct forms also for the wording and interpretation of the reported content. By means of these choices the IV expresses alignment or disalignment with the RedSp or content and by the omission of the RedSp at least some aspect of the evaluation is left implicit.

Let us start with RedSps with an ambiguous reference (73), which involves ambiguity between EVs (49) and ambiguity (or vagueness) arising from an unclearly delimited scope of reference (24). The former and more frequent type of ambiguity does not, in principle, differ from the referential indeterminacy shown in example 3 above, i.e. ambiguity which involves solely EVs and excludes the IV; consequently, it will not be illustrated here. As in the context of epistemic assessment, referential ambiguity in the context of negative evaluation precludes unequivocal identification of the source and serves to protect the IV and/or the EV. However, in neither context can ambiguity between EVs be seen in isolation from the conventions of the generic structure; consequently, the issue will be raised again in the discussion section below.

Example 7 illustrates ambiguity resulting from an unclear referential scope; this type of ambiguity has to do with an inclusion or exclusion of a voice in the community holding the presented point of view, with groups being formed on an ideological rather than a purely referential basis (see e.g. Pavlidou 2014). The ambiguous RedSp in example 7 appears in two instances of narrator' representation of a discourse act (*can only be termed, to describe it*; NRDA), which are embedded in DD and are thus employed strategically by the explicit EV (*he/the Turkish PM*), not the IV. Due to a formal dissociation (passive, infinitive) of the RedSp from the presented point of view, the explicit EV is allowed to express an opinion without implicating themselves or a third party in the evaluation.

(7) "*What we saw happen* was taking place in international waters and *this attack* in international waters as such **can only be termed as *piracy*** - there is no other way **to describe it**," he [the Turkish PM] said. (body of the text) (Prince 2010)

The FoP in example 7 express negative evaluation of the described situation (*this attack, piracy*) corresponding to negative judgement in Martin and White (2005: 52–56) and negative emotivity in Bednarek (2006a: 42, 45–48); the reporting verbs evaluate along the dimension of evidentiality and style (Bednarek 2006a: 42, 56–58). The opinion of the explicit EV is phrased as an impersonalised collective point of view formally attributed to an inexplicit voice but ideologically attributable to the EV and possibly others that share the proposed evaluation and belong to the same ideological community (hence the unclear referential scope). The reference to shared visual experience (*what we saw …*) supports the collective ideological interpretation of the inexplicit EV in the embedded FoP and underlines the "we" versus "them" dichotomy (cf. Nádraská 2020 on the use of collective "we" in hard news discourse). The structures in example 7 correspond to Hunston's (2000) "hidden averral" (or simply averral in Hunston 2004) and

to Halliday and Matthiessen's (2004: 613–617, 624–635) interpersonal metaphor. They serve to objectify and disguise one's opinion as that of others, construct consensus and in-group feelings and invite others, including the reader, to share the proposed point of view (Hunston 2000: 190–191; Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 616–617, 624–625). The situation of a speaker using a structure normally associated with attribution for the purpose of averral (Sinclair 1988) or at least for the purpose of wedging their own point of view into the assessment is also found in example 6 and perhaps to a certain extent in examples 4 and 5, only with the difference that in these cases it is the IV, not an EV, that sneaks in.

Examples 8–10 illustrate unspecified RedSps (78). Examples 8a-8c show unspecified RedSps which re-cur across the text in different parts of the generic structure: *criticism* and *decision* in the lead (8a), and *was criticised* (8b) and *complaints* (8c) in the body of the text. With the exception of the inexplicit RedSp in the nominalised indirect thought (*decision*), which is specified in 8c (*the Government*), the RedSps never become explicit at any point in the text; consequently, the intentional mystification of agency for the purpose of dissociating the RedSp from the presented criticism offers itself as a very plausible explanation. The knowledge of the socio-political situation can help readers identify the source of the criticism.

(8a) ... as he [Cameron] attempted to fend off **criticism** of **the decision** to deny child benefit to higher-rate taxpayers. (lead)

(8b) *The move* **was criticised** for being particularly unfair on mothers who stay at home to care for their children. (body of the text)

(8c) He said that <u>the Government</u> would "obviously" listen to **complaints** that it should look at families' total income, rather than simply remove child benefit from households with a single higher-rate taxpayer. (body of the text) (Winnett and Porter 2010)

The nominalised thought act (*the decision* in 8a) functions as the target of the evaluation, the other forms (*criticism, was criticised, complaints*) function as the source of the evaluation. Even though the negative evaluation in 8a can metonymically extend from the thought act to the inexplicit RedSp (cf. Gruber 1993; Bednarek 2009), blatant criticism of the latter is avoided and direct evaluation is limited only to the thought act itself. Note also that the target of evaluation in 8b is realised by another nominalisation (*move*). Thus, the section is rife with inexplicit agents/RedSps enabling the IV to provide the evaluation without referring overtly to the target (8a–b) or source (8a–c). Regarding the employed FoP, there are two instances of ID (*complaints that it..., the decision to deny...*) and two instances of NRDA (*the move was criticised, criticism of ...*); it is especially NRDA that enables the IV to condense and summarize the reported context.

As mentioned, nominalisations are the most frequent realisation forms of the FoP in the context of negative evaluation (see also example 9 below). Nominalisations are grammatical metaphors in which the configuration of transitivity changes; as the agent is not encoded, the degree of transitivity is reduced (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 637, 656–658; Perez de Ayala 2002: 56). Nominal-

isations construe actions as non-causal abstract settings (Langacker 1991) and transform "processes and activities into states and objects, and concretes into abstracts" (Fairclough 1992:182). Processes are backgrounded and their effects are foregrounded, making the attribution of causality and responsibility foggy and murky (Fairclough 1989: 124, 2000: 26). As a result, nominalisations distance the participants from the original process, obscure the actional component and allow the mystification of agents (Langacker 1991; Pérez de Ayala 2002: 57; Stenvall 2008b: 1575). As shown in examples 7 and 8b, a similar effect of "possible ideologically motivated obfuscation of agency, causality and responsibility" is achieved by passives (Fairclough 1989:124).

In example 9a below there are two unspecified RedSps (*Al-Qaida was blamed*, *reinforcing concerns*). The FoP in bold evaluates by means of observed affect (*concerns*), a type of attitude that is compatible with reporter voice (Martin and White 2005: 178). As in example 8a (*decision*), the RedSps become specified later in the body of the text (*Intelligence agencies* in 9b); this issue will be raised again in the discusion section dealing with the aspects of the generic structure.

(9a) *Al-Qaida was blamed* for an attack on British diplomats in Yemeni capital Sana'a yesterday, reinforcing **concerns** about jihadi terrorism in the impoverished Arabian peninsula country. (lead)
(9b) <u>Intelligence agencies</u> point to resilience in Yemen of al-Quaida in the Arabian Peninsula (Aqap), one of the most active branches of Osama bin Laden's organisation outside its hard core in Afghanistan and Pakistan. (body of the text) (Black 2010)

As shown in Table 4 above, expressions denoting emotions (*fears, concerns*) are among the most frequent reporting nouns. Being non-factual and evaluative, emotions have the power to bring a subjective element into the discourse, imbue the text with colour and human interest, and potentially trigger emotional reaction in the reader; negative emotions are linked with the news values of negativity and personalisation (Ungerer 1997; Lombardo 2004: 233, cited in Bednarek and Caple 2012: 150–154; Montgomery 2007: 168). Reports of thoughts and emotions (parameters of mindsay and mental state/emotion) are assessed to be of high reliability as they presuppose the truth of the attributed proposition (Bednarek 2006a: 162, 168).

The observed affect in example 9a is expressed by internal narration (*concerns about jihadi terrorism ...*, NI), a narrator-dominated FoP reproducing stance, mental states and emotions (Semino and Short 2004: 45–47). The idea of "observed" affect corresponds to the concept of "inferred" thought in Semino and Short (2004: 55–56). Although observed affect/ inferred thought is generally construed on the basis of the IV's interpretation or deduction irrespective of the type of non-direct FoP, it is especially NI that is close to the authorial voice, thus functioning as a clever rhetorical device enabling the IV to attribute and simultaneously share the expressed evaluation (Bednarek 2006a: 162). Indeed, Short (2007: 233–236) suggests a re-classification of NI as authorial narration already falling off the reporting scale. See Landert (2014: 177–178) on the personalizing effect of emotions expressed by direct speech.

Formally, the NI in example 9a is a nominalisation. Nominalised emotions have the same effect as nominalisations in general. They are presented as "things" or "free-floating entit[ies]" and, as both the emoter and the trigger of the emotion may remain hidden, they are fuzzy and difficult to verify, creating an aura of obscurity and mystification around themselves (Fowler 1991: 82; Stenvall 2008b: 1577–1578, 2014: 474–478). The distance between the emotion and the cause also stems from the fact that in news texts nominalised emotions often appear as circumstances of material processes (Stenvall 2008b: 1577–1578). For instance, the noun in example 9 occurs in a participial supplementive clause which, due to its formal inexplicitness, expresses only a general accompanying circumstance of the situation – the trigger of the emotion – described in the matrix clause (*Al-Qaida was blamed for an attack on British diplomats ...*) (Quirk et al. 1985: 1124–1127).

Let us now proceed to the discussion of retrievable RedSps (51). Retrievable RedSps functioning as the source and target of evaluation are shown in example 6 above where the explicit RedSps in 6a (*campaigners in the Church accused him [the Pope] of demeaning the role women...*) reappear as inexplicit retrievable RedSps in 6b (*The book... came under attack because no mention was made of Mary Magdalene...*). Example 10, discussing a dramatised documentary about the hypothetical kidnapping of Prince Harry broadcast by Channel 4, shows an interaction between a retrievable and unspecified RedSp and points to a backgrounded yet significant role of the IV in the orchestration of the evaluative context.

(10a) <u>Channel 4's</u> approach *is likely* **to raise questions**. <u>The programme's</u> focus on Prince Harry *will* prompt **accusations** of sensationalism. (body of the text)

(10b) **There *will likely* be questions**, however, about why **it was felt** necessary to make the programme as a dramatised documentary ... rather than a more traditional documentary. (body of the text) (Frost 2010)

Example 10 illustrates an inexplicit RedSp retrievable from the preceding context (*it was felt necessary* in 10b retrievable from 10a – *Channel 4/the programme*) and two unspecified RedSps (*questions, accusations* in 10a and 10b). The unspecified RedSps function as the source of the evaluation while the underlined explicit EVs and the inexplicit retrievable RedSp function as the target of evaluation; although the evaluation in 10b is directed at the reported attitude (*it was felt necessary*), it can metonymically extend to the retrievable RedSp.

Apart from the inexplicitness of the source and the target, there are other strategies which contribute to the implicitness of the evaluation and which make the relation between the source and the target less direct and more tenuous. For instance, although the target of the evaluation is overtly marked in 10a, it appears only at the sub-clausal level as a possessive determiner (*Channel 4's, the programme's*). In addition, rather than expressing attitude in the form of *X is evaluated (by Z)* (*Channel 4's approach will be questioned/Channel 4 will be accused*), the passage is reminiscent of a series of causes, consequences and reasons (*Channel 4's approach is likely to raise questions, The programme's focus will prompt accusations, questions about why it was felt necessary*). Even though context-dependency cannot

be ruled out as a potential factor behind the omission of the retrievable target, inexplicitness is in line with the other agency suppressing strategies employed in this passage; moreover, it fits the general pattern of agent obfuscation attested in other examples featuring negative evaluation.

Despite the presence of FoP, there are a number of cues indicative of the IV: the epistemic assessment (*will, likely*) predicting the occurrence of the evaluative speech acts; the choice of condensing and summarizing FoP (NRDA – *questions, accusations*); and finally, the absence of any explicit external source of the evaluation. These linguistic choices enable the IV to (potentially) wedge in their own assessment in the guise of that of an unspecified EV.

Discussion: Epistemic and negative evaluation in against the background of generic conventions

The variation in the choice of referring expressions in dependence on their position in the generic structure of a news article has been noted, for instance, in Jucker (1996), Landert (2014), drawing on Chovanec (2000), and Nádraská (2017). This section aims to explain how generic conventions affect the employment of inexplicit RedSps. As mentioned in section 4, the potential impact of style guides on the language used was disregarded. In order to show that the occurrence of inexplicit RedSps can be ascribed to more aspects simultaneously, I will discuss the examples used to illustrate epistemic and negative evaluation.

According to White (1998, 2000), Feez et al. (2008) and White and Thompson (2008), the rhetorical functionality of a typical hard news story is based on the relation between the nucleus (headline(s) and lead) and satellites, i.e. functional generic units in the body of the text. The nucleus highlights the news event and provides a kind of lens thorough which the event is approached; satellites relate to the nucleus and specify it in a number of ways (repeat, provide more detail, contextualize, evaluate etc.). The repetitious nucleus-satellite relation places the nucleus in the foreground and increases its salience. Other aspects that interact with the nucleus-satellite structure are the principles that govern the presentation of information in hard news, particularly the principles of relevance and gradual elaboration of information. According to these principles, temporal sequence is dismantled and information is delivered cyclically with frequent interruptions and resumptions; on each mention there is an increase in detail and decrease in importance, relevance and newsworthiness (e.g. van Dijk 1988; Bell 1991; Ungerer 2000; Bednarek and Caple 2012: 98; cf. Chovanec 2014: 205–268).

Before we have a look at concrete examples, let us briefly discuss the distribution of unspecified, ambiguous and retrievable RedSps across the generic structure. The nuclei contain 99 unspecified RedSps (i.e. 36.1% out of the total of 274 unspecified RedSps), 37 ambiguous RedSps (i.e. 21.5% out of the total of 172 ambiguous RedSps) and only 22 retrievable RedSps (i.e. 6.6% out of the total of 335 retrievable RedSps). The data suggest that more than one third of unspecified RedSps and about one fifth of ambiguous RedSps appear in the nucleus, which is not insignificant given the length of the nucleus in comparison to the body of the text. Nuclear unspecified and ambiguous RedSps are explainable,

for instance, by the introductory and focusing role of the headline/lead and the gradual accumulation of detail.

Moreover, referential ambiguity in the nucleus may stem from the absence of contextual cues which would be sufficient for a successful referent identification. Gradual elaboration of detail can also explain the prevalent occurrence of retrievable RedSps in the body of the text. However, it must be borne in mind that other aspects may come into play and either override the mentioned generic factors or work in tandem with them, including context dependency, extratextual knowledge as well as epistemic and negative evaluation.

The pattern of attribution to inexplicit RedSps located in the nucleus and their subsequent more detailed specification in the body of the text emerges in examples 8 and 9, where the employment of the unspecified RedSps was also explained by agent obfuscation in the context of negative evaluation (*the decision – the Government; Al-Qaida was blamed/reinforcing concerns – Intelligence agencies point to resilience*). Not unrelated to the focusing and introductory role of the nucleus mentioned above is another generic factor that could be seen as contributing to agent obfuscation in evaluative nuclear sections, namely the negativity associated with hard news. The aim of hard news is to report on primarily negative events (accidents, criminal acts, natural disasters, war, problems in the sphere of politics, economy etc.) and present them as disruptions of and threats to the established social and moral order (White 1997, 1998). Thus the occurrence of inexplicit (especially unspecified) RedSps in the headline/lead results from a simultaneous operation of generic and discoursal factors.[4] However, since some inexplicit sources/targets of negative evaluation never become specified and/or appear in negatively evaluating contexts also outside the nuclear section (*criticism, the move was criticised, complaints* in example 8, *to raise questions, will prompt accusations, there will likely be questions* in example 10), the expression of negative evaluation offers itself as a legitimate factor motivating agent omission.

The predisposition of the headline/lead towards attracting negative evaluation and inexplicit RedSps is supported by the fact that out of 202 inexplicit RedSps in the context of negative evaluation, 62 appear in the nucleus. In contrast, inexplicit RedSps in epistemic evaluation occur largely in the body of the text (71 out of 79; examples 1–6). Thus the distribution across the generic structure is another aspect differentiating between inexplicit RedSps in epistemic and negative evaluation.

Referential indeterminacy of ambiguous RedSps was said to protect the IV and/or the EV in the context of epistemic and negative evaluation. From the generic point of view, ambiguous RedSps occurring in the body of the hard news text may be accounted for by a formal and functional discontinuity between satellites and frequent shifts in topics and participants. Satellites relate back to the nucleus rather than contract relations within the body of the text, demonstrating disregard for the informational and thematic organization of the preceding text (White 1998: 252–263, 284–294; Feez et al. 2008: 98–115). Ambiguity between inexplicit RedSps in the body of the text has been shown in example 3 (*David Cameron, the NHS*) and 4 (*Gloria de Piero, Ministry of Defence*); example 3 also shows a shift in topic, which weakens potential co-referentiality between the explicit and inexplicit EV.

The lack of linearity within the body of the text together with the cyclical, instalment-like presentation of topics may result in the avoidance of retrievable RedSps and preference for FoP with explicit RedSps (cf. Šaldová 2002; Zhan 2012). However, as mentioned above, retrievable RedSps are the most common inexplicit RedSps (335) and 93.4% of them are employed in the body of the text. Retrievable RedSps often occur in the close vicinity of a co-referential explicit RedSp, especially within a paragraph boundary (*Belgian police – It is believed* in example 1). However, the occurrence of retrievable RedSps can presumably be attributed to the operation of the same principles due to which they may be avoided; once nuclear participants become explicit, owing to the continual repetition of and gradual elaboration on the nuclear topic they remain activated and available for reference. This is shown in example 6: the EVs identified in the nucleus (6a) via explicit referring expressions (*campaigners in the Church accused him [the Pope] of demeaning the role women...*) reappear in the satellite (6b) as inexplicit retrievable RedSps (*The book... came under attack because no mention was made of Mary Magdalene...*). In such contexts generic conventions and contextual recoverability go hand in hand.[5]

6. Conclusion and summary

The paper aimed to contribute to the discussion of FoP and inexplicit RedSps occurring in hard news reports; it has attempted to show that the omission of the RedSp results from a combination of factors – textual, discoursal and generic.

Textually, the analysis has distinguished three possibilities regarding potential co-referential relations involving an inexplicit RedSp: textually retrievable, textually irretrievable and hence unspecified, and ambiguous RedSps. These have been interpreted in connection to the discoursal functions of agent omission and aspects of the generic structure.

The occurrence of inexplicit RedSps has been examined in two contexts featuring agent obfuscation, namely the contexts of epistemic and negative assessment. In both cases, inexplicitness, especially in the case of unspecified and ambiguous RedSps, protects not only the EV but also the internal authorial voice. However, the FoP and linguistic characteristics of the two contexts differ. The epistemic context is almost exclusively characterised by passive indirect thought (*it is believed*) and the examples attested in the corpus display different degrees of authorial subjectivity and blending of the IV and EV; the IV seems to be present in FoP which provide general assumptions and interpretations, sometimes on the basis of observable behaviour. On the other hand, the context of negative evaluation is characterised by a preference for nominalised speech reports, a variety of non-direct FoP, and despite the general preponderance of non-direct reports, direct and partially quoted FoP appear as well with the effect of highlighting the EV. Even though the IV can find ways to signal their attitude (e.g. through the choice of reporting expressions and particular FoP), the EV and IV seem to be better separated.

Further, it has been shown that the discoursal functions of agent mystification cannot be seen in isolation from the omnipresent aspects of the generic structure

since these factors may be at play simultaneously. Unspecified and ambiguous RedSps appearing in the nucleus may reflect its initial position and the pattern of gradual elaboration of information. In addition, given the focusing role of the nucleus and its orientation to socially and otherwise disrupting events, the nucleus attracts FoP with inexplicit RedSp presenting negative evaluation. Regarding the body of the text, frequent shifts in topic and underdeveloped inter-satellite relations may explain ambiguous RedSps, while the repetitive nature of elaboration together with the salience of the nuclear event may account for the occurrence of retrievable EVs. The body of the text is also the preferable place of occurrence of inexplicit RedSps in the context of epistemic evaluation.

The present research has implications for the interpretation of responsibility and agency associated with FoP employed in hard news discourse, especially in connection to ideology and voice blending. It has shown that agency and responsibility are highly context-sensitive and characterised by gradience and indeterminacy. Simultaneously, though, the interpretation of agency and responsibility bound to FoP with inexplicit RedSp can be guided by the lexico-grammatical features of these forms. Further research could compare the occurrence of inexplicit voices in printed hard news with the situation in online news reports or other news genres characterised by a different configuration of the key generic variables (e.g. soft news, features, editorials, commentaries or specialised news such as popular science news).

Notes

[1]   Authors discussing inexplicit voices apply a number of different overlapping terms: unattributed discourse (Bell 1991; Bednarek and Caple 2012: 91); unsignalled discourse (Fairclough 1988); inexplicit, covert or hidden voices (Bednarek and Caple 2012: 91); unspecified others (Thompson 1996: 508–509); unspecified basis (Bednarek 2006a, b); impersonal, anonymous and unnamed sources (Garretson and Ädel 2008: 166; cf. Landert 2014: 188–189).

[2]   See Ljung (1998), Semino and Short (2004), Bednarek (2006a) and Martínez-Caro (2006) on larger statistics regarding the co-occurrence of covert agents and various lexico-grammatical options, including FoP.

[3]   It will be noticed that all the reporting forms discussed in examples 1–5 are in the present tense. The state present suggests the general validity, factuality and permanency of the presented thought acts (Quirk et al. 1985: 179; cf. Chovanec 2014: 123–144) and, together with the inexplicit RedSp, contributes to the impersonality of the constructions.

[4]   Moreover, the disrupting impact of the nuclear event may be intensified by presenting it as something experienced collectively by groups rather than individuals, as shown in example 9a featuring an unspecified collective emoter and the nominalisation in the plural form (*concerns*) (cf. Stenvall 2008b: 1572–1573).

[5]   See Urbanová (2012, 2013a, b) and Nádraská (2017) on the distribution of FoP across the generic structure of hard news.

References

Bagnall, Nicholas (1993) *Newspaper Language*. Oxford: Focal Press.

Bednarek, Monika (2006a) *Evaluation in Media Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Bednarek, Monika (2006b) Epistemological positioning and evidentiality in English news discourse: A text-driven approach. *Text and Talk* 26 (6), 635–660. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.027

Bednarek, Monika (2009) Polyphony in appraisal: Typological and topological perspectives. *Linguistics and Human Cognition* 3 (2), 107–136. https://doi.org/10.1558/lhs.v3i2.107

Bednarek, Monika (2015) Voices and values in the news: News media talk, news values and attribution. *Discourse, Context and Media* 11, 27–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2015.11.004

Bednarek, Monika and Helen Caple (2012) *News Discourse*. London/New York: Continuum.

Bednarek, Monika and Helen Caple (2017) *The Discourse of News Values: How News Organizations Create Newsworthiness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, Allan (1991) *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Berkowitz, Dan (2009) Reporters and their sources. In: Wahl-Jorgensen, Karin and Thomas Hanzitsch (eds.) *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. New York: Routledge, 102–115.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Person Education Ltd.

Blakenburg, William B. (1992) The utility of anonymous attribution. *Newspaper Research Journal* 13 (1/2), 10–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/073953299201300103

Blanco-Gómez, María L. (2002) Hiding the agent in English and Spanish newspaper articles: the periphrastic passive. In: Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (ed.) *Conceptualisation of Events in Newspaper Discourse: Mystification of Agency and Degree of Implication in News Reports*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 9–30.

Boeyink, David E. (1990) Anonymous sources in news stories: Justifying exceptions and limiting abuses. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics: Exploring Questions of Media Morality* 5 (4), 233–246. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327728jmme0504_2

Calsamiglia, Helena and Carmen L. Ferrero (2003) Role and position of scientific voices: Reported speech in the media. *Discourse Studies* 5 (2), 147–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445603005002008

Chojnicka, Joanna (2012) Reportive evidentiality and reported speech: is there a boundary? Evidence of the Latvian oblique. In: Usonienė, Aurelija, Nicole Nau and Ineta Dabašinskienė (eds.) *Multiple Perspectives in Linguistic Research on Baltic Languages*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 170–192.

Chovanec, Jan (2000) *Interpersonal Aspects of Printed News Discourse*. Doctoral dissertation. Brno: Masaryk University.

Chovanec, Jan (2014) *Pragmatics of Tense and Time in News: From Canonical Headlines to Online News Text*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cotter, Colleen (2010) *News Talk: Investigating the Language of Journalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Trine and Kjersti Fløttum (2014) A linguistic framework for studying voices and positions in the climate debate. *Text and Talk* 34 (4), 401–420. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2014-0009

Dontcheva-Navratilova, Olga (2016) Rhetorical functions of citations in linguistics research articles: A contrastive (English-Czech) study. *Discourse and Interaction* 9 (2), 51–74. https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2016-2-51

Duffy, Matt J. (2010) *Unnamed Sources: A Longitudinal Review of the Practice and its Merits.* Doctoral dissertation. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

Elorza, Izaskun (2014) Newsworthiness, attribution and lexicogrammatical strategies in two types of news articles in English and Spanish. *Topics in Linguistics* 14 (1), 16–33. https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2014-0009

Fairclough, Norman (1988) Discourse representation in media discourse. *Sociolinguistics* 17, 125–139.

Fairclough, Norman (1989) *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman (2000) *New Labour, New Language?* London/New York: Routledge.

Feez, Susan, Rick Iedema and Peter White (2008) *Media Literacy.* Surry Hills: NSW Adult Migrant Education Service.

Floyd, Alan (2000) The reporting verbs and bias in the press. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 13, 43–52. http://dx.doi.org/10.14198/raei.2000.13.04

Fowler, Roger (1991) *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press.* London/New York: Routledge.

Garretson, Gregory and Annelie Ädel (2008) Who's speaking?: evidentiality in US newspapers during the 2004 presidential campaign. In: Ädel, Annelie and Randi Reppen (eds.) *Corpora and Discourse: The Challenges of Different Settings.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 157–187.

Głaz, Adam and Anastazja Trofymczuk (2020) Voice and viewpoint in journalistic narratives. *Language Sciences* 80, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2020.101274

Gruber, Helmut (1993) Evaluation devices in newspaper reports. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19, 469–486.

Halliday, Michael A. K. and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen (2004) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Hodder Arnold.

Harry, Joseph C. (2014) Journalistic quotation: Reported speech in newspapers from a semiotic-linguistic perspective. *Journalism* 15 (8), 1041–1058. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884913504258

Hunston, Susan (2000) Evaluation and the planes of discourse: status and value in persuasive texts. In: Hunston, Susan and Geoff Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in Context: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 176–207.

Hunston, Susan (2004) It has rightly been pointed out ...: attribution, consensus and conflict in academic discourse. In: Bondi, Marina, Laura Gavioli and Marc Silver (eds.) *Academic Discourse, Genre and Small Corpora.* Rome: Officina Edicioni, 15–33.

Ikeo, Reiko (2007) Unambiguous free indirect discourse? A comparison between 'straightforward' free indirect speech and thought presentation and cases ambiguous with narration. *Language and Literature* 16 (4), 367–387.

Johansen, Marianne (2011) Agency and responsibility in reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 2845–2860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.001

Jucker, Andreas H. (1996) News actor labelling in British newspapers. *Text* 16 (3), 373–390. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1996.16.3.373

Landert, Daniela (2014) *Personalisation in Mass Media Communication: British Online News between Public and Private.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Landert, Daniela (2015) Reportable facts and a personal touch: the functions of direct quotes in online news. In: Arendholz, Jenny, Wolfram Bublitz and Monika Kirner-Ludwig (eds.) *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then.* Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 29–52.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar.* Vol. II. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (2000) *Grammar and Conceptualization.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Langacker, Ronald W. (2009) *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Leech, Geoffrey and Mick Short (2007) *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Ljung, Magnus (1998) 'It is believed that he is dead': unspecified source attribution in news texts. In: Renouf, Antoinette (ed.) *Explorations in Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 113–122.

Lombardo, Linda (2004) That-clauses and reporting verbs as evaluation in TV news. In: Partington, Alan, John Morley and Louann Haarman (eds.) *Corpora and Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang, 221–238.

Mañoso-Pacheco, Lidia and Beatriz Juárez-Escribano (2019) Reportive evidentiality: A theoretical revision. *Revista Inclusiones* 6 (4), 189–206.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (ed.) (2002a) *Conceptualisation of Events in Newspaper Discourse: Mystification of Agency and Degree of Implication in News Reports*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (2002b) Mystification of agency in passive, impersonal and spontaneous situation types. In: Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (ed.) *Conceptualisation of Events in Newspaper Discourse: Mystification of Agency and Degree of Implication in News Reports*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 31–54.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (2013) Stancetaking and inter/subjectivity in the Iraq inquiry: Blair vs. Brown. In: Marín-Arrese, Juana I., Marta Carretero, Jorge A. Hita and Johan van der Auwera (eds.) *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 411–445.

Martin, James R. and Peter R. R. White (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martínez-Caro, Elena (2006) The verbal expression of belief and hearsay in English and Spanish: evidence from newspaper discourse. In: Hornero, Ana M., María J. Luzón and Sylvia Murillo (eds.) *Corpus Linguistics: Applications for the Study of English*. Bern: Peter Lang, 159–175.

Montgomery, Martin (2007) *The Discourse of Broadcast News: A Linguistic Approach*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

Murphy, Amanda C. (2004) A hidden or unobserved presence? Impersonal evaluative structures in English and Italian and their wake. In: Partington, Alan, John Morley and Louann Haarman (eds.) *Corpora and Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang, 205–220.

Nádraská, Zuzana (2017) Orbitality, periodicity and prosody in the generic structure of hard news'. In: Hůlková, Irena and Renata Jančaříková (eds.) *English Discourse Studies in the Times of Change*. Conference Proceedings. Seventh Brno Conference on Linguistics Studies in English, 12th–13th September 2016. Brno: Masaryk University, 99–122.

Nádraská, Zuzana (2020) When "We believe that …": The role of collective "we" in the dialogic negotiation in hard news discourse. *Prague Journal of English Studies* 9 (1), 157–196. https://doi.org/10.2478/pjes-2020-0008

Nuyts, Jan (2015) Subjectivity: Between discourse and conceptualization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 86, 106–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.015

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula (ed.) (2014) *Constructing Collectivity: 'We' Across Languages and Contexts*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pérez de Ayala Becerril, Soledad (2002) Nominalization as impersonalization strategy: some corpus notes for the study of agency mystification. In: Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (ed.) *Conceptualisation of Events in Newspaper Discourse: Mystification of Agency and Degree of Implication in News Reports*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 55–70.

Piazza, Roberta (2009) News is reporting what was said: techniques and patterns of attribution. In: Haarman, Louann and Linda Lombardo (eds.) *Evaluation and Stance in War News: A Linguistic Analysis of American, British and Italian Television News Reporting of the 2003 Iraqi War*. London/New York: Continuum, 170–194.

Pjesivac, Ivanka and Rachel Rui (2014) Anonymous sources hurt credibility of news stories across cultures: A comparative experiment in America and China. *International Communication Gazette* 76 (8), 641–660. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048514548534

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Richardson, John E. (2007) *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sanders, José (2010) Intertwined voices: Journalists' modes of representing source information in journalistic subgenres. *English Text Construction* 3 (2), 226–249. https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.3.2.06san

Sclafani, Jennifer (2008) The intertextual origins of public opinion: Constructing Ebonics in The New York Times. *Discourse and Society* 19 (4), 507–527. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508089941

Semino, Elena, Mick Short and Jonathan Culpeper (1997) Using a corpus to test a model of speech and thought presentation. *Poetics* 25 (1), 17–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(97)00007-7

Semino, Elena and Mick Short (2004) *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.

Short, Mick (2007) Thought presentation twenty-five years on. *Style* 41 (2), 225–241.

Sinclair, John (1988) Mirror for the text. *Journal of English and Foreign Languages* 1, 15–44.

Stenvall, Maija (2003) An actor or an undefined threat? The role of "terrorist" in the discourse of international news agencies. *Journal of Language and Politics* 2 (2), 361–404. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.2.2.10ste

Stenvall, Maija (2008a) Unnamed sources as rhetorical constructions in news agency reports. *Journalism Studies* 9 (2), 229–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700701848279

Stenvall, Maija (2008b) On emotions and the journalistic ideals of factuality and objectivity – Tools for analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40, 1569–1586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.04.017

Stenvall, Maija (2014) Presenting and representing emotions in news agency reports. *Critical Discourse Studies* 11 (4), 461–481. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2013.866588

Šaldová, Pavlína (2002) Cohesive devices in newswriting. *Prague Studies in English* 23, 187–200.

Thompson, Geoff (1994) *Reporting: Collins Cobuild English Guides 5*. London: Harper Collins.

Thompson, Geoff (1996) Voices in the text: Discourse perspectives on language reports. *Applied Linguistics* 17 (4), 501–530. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.4.501

Ungerer, Fridrich (1997) Emotions and emotional language in English and German news stories. In: Niemeier, Susanne and René Dirven (eds.) *The Language of Emotions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 307–328.

Ungerer, Friedrich (2000) News stories and news events – a changing relationship. In: Ungerer, Friedrich (ed.) *English Media Texts Past and Present*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 177–195.

Urbanová, Zuzana (2012) Forms of presentation and narration in the lead of hard news. In: Hopkinson, Christopher, Renáta Tomášková and Gabriela Zapletalová (eds.) *The Interpersonal Language Function Across Genres and Discourse Domains*. Ostrava: University of Ostrava, 203–223.

Urbanová, Zuzana (2013a) *The Function of Direct Forms of Presentation in the Generic Structure of Newspaper Reports*. Doctoral dissertation. Prague: Charles University.

Urbanová, Zuzana (2013b) The function of reported language and narration in the headlines of hard news. In: Bell, Gregory J., Katarína Nemčoková and Bartosz Wójcik (eds.) *From Theory to Practice 2012: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Anglophone Studies,* Vol. 4. Fourth International Conference on Anglophone Studies, Zlín, 13th–14th September 2012. Zlín: Tomas Bata University in Zlín, 113–124.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1988) *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Van Leeuwen, Theo (1996) The representation of social actors. In: Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen R. and Malcolm Coulthard (eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 32–70.

Waugh, Linda R. (1995) Reported speech in journalistic discourse: The relation of function and text. *Text* 15 (1), 129–173. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1995.15.1.129

White, Peter R. R. (1997) Death, disruption and the moral order: the narrative impulse in mass-media 'hard news' reporting." In: Christie, Frances and James R. Martin (eds.) *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Continuum, 101–133.

White, Peter R. R. (1998) *Telling Media Tales: The News Story as Rhetoric*. Doctoral dissertation. Sydney: University of Sydney.

White, Peter R. R. (2000) Media objectivity and the rhetoric of news story structure. In: Ventola, Eija (ed.) *Discourse and Community: Doing Functional Linguistics*. Tűbingen: Gunter Nar Verlag, 379–397.

White, Peter R. R. (2006) Evaluative semantics and ideological positioning in journalistic discourse: a new framework for analysis. In: Lassen, Inger, Jeanne Strunck and Torben Vestergaard (eds.) *Mediating Ideology in Text and Image*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 37–67.

White, Peter R. R. (2012) Exploring the axiological workings of 'reporter voice' news stories – Attribution and attitudinal positioning. *Discourse, Context and Media* 1 (2–3), 57–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2012.10.004

White, Peter R. R. and Elizabeth A. Thompson (2008) The news story as rhetoric: linguistic approaches to the analysis of journalistic discourse. In: Thompson, Elizabeth A. and Peter R. R. White (eds.) *Communicating Conflict: Multilingual Case Studies of the News Media*. London: Continuum, 1–23.

Zelizer, Barbie (1989) 'Saying' as a collective practice: Quoting and differential address in the news. *Text* 9 (4), 369–388. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1989.9.4.369

Zhan, Lili (2012) Analysis of lexical repetition – Taking a news discourse as an example. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2 (10), 2160–2167. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.10.2160-2167

Sources

Alleyne, Richard (2010) How pencil lead and sticky tape led to Nobel Prize. *The Daily Telegraph*, October 6, p. 12.

Black, Ian (2010) UK diplomats survive Yemen rocket attack. *The Guardian*, October 7, p. 8.

Frost, Vicky (2010) Channel 4 defends its kidnap drama fiction about Prince Harry. *The Guardian*, October 7, p. 16.

Gledhill, Ruth (2010) Pope forgets Jesus's female friends. *The Times*, July 28, p. 28.

Hickman, Martin and James Cusick (2011) Murdoch's £100m plan to settle hacking cases before they get to court. *The Independent*, December 29, p. 10.

Lichfield, John and Vanessa Mock (2011) Liège gunman 'feared going back to prison'. *The Independent*, December 15, p. 31.

Prince, Rosa (2010) Gaza is like a prison camp, says PM. *The Daily Telegraph*, July 28, p.10.

Smith, Rebecca (2010) Health care at home by 'remote control'. *The Daily Telegraph*, December 6, p.1.

Winnett, Robert and Andrew Porter (2010) Tax-break olive branch in child benefit row. *The Daily Telegraph*, October 6, p. 6.

Wintour, Patrick (2010) Taxpayers £15m bill for diplomats' private school fees. *The Guardian*, July 29, p. 1, 2.

ZUZANA NÁDRASKÁ obtained her doctoral degree in English linguistics from the Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, and her dissertation focused on the role of direct forms of presentation in the generic structure of hard news reports. Her current research interests include the discourse of newspaper reports, forms and functions of reported language, the use of scare quotes and the issues of dialogue and polyphony in general.

Address: PhDr. Zuzana Nádraská, Ph.D., Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Charles University, Celetná 13, 116 39, Praha 1, Czech Republic. [email: zuzananadraska@gmail.com]