

Reveal of Author's Intention through Evidentials

Grichin S.V.

Department of Foreign Languages of the Faculty of Humanities
Novosibirsk State Technical University
Novosibirsk, Russia
grichinsergei@mail.ru

Abstract—The article describes an attempt to develop a method to reveal the author's intention in a scientific text based on evidential markers. The method proposed in the article is based on the analysis of the proportion of explicit and implicit evidential markers, correlation of evidential strategy markers with axiological operators and some other data expressed in a scientific text. The described method transforms the evidential markers into a tool to reveal the authors intention and thus adds to reader's understanding of the ways an author creates scientific texts and discourse.

Keywords—*evidentials, evidential markers, author's intention, scientific text, scientific discourse, research article*

I. INTRODUCTION

The present paper addresses the study of discourse-pragmatic functions of evidential markers in scientific discourse, and attempts to create a method of revealing the author's intentions through evidential strategy in academic articles published in Russian. The author's intention in scientific discourse is regarded in this article as an explicitly expressed problem, the aim of writing an academic paper. It is also assumed that evidential markers are means of implementing the author's intention in an academic text.

The approaches to the understanding of the author's intention differ depending on discourse. It is obvious that the author's intention in academic texts is expressed explicitly. It can even be inferred from the compositional parts of the text such as title, purposes, etc., though other types of discourses may manifest different forms of communication between the author and the reader as shown in [1].

The idea of evidential strategy comes from the concept of evidentiality, which has been looked at from different perspectives. The first perspective considers evidentiality in its narrow sense, as a grammatical phenomenon [2, 3]. Palmer [4], Chafe [5] and Crystal, D. [6] are the representatives of a semantic view on evidentiality and consider evidential constructions as part of epistemic modality. The third view [7] on evidentiality is pragmatic; it claims that evidential constructions have additional pragmatic values.

Aikhenvald in her work [8] states that words and constructions the meaning of which is associated with information source (verbs, adverbs, adjectives, parentheticals, modal verbs, particles and speech report constructions) should be "considered apart from closed evidential systems" [8]. She also states that "the term 'evidential' is best used for closed

grammatical systems, and the term 'information source' for the vast body of other ways of referring to knowing things" [8]. Lampert and Lampert [9], on the contrary, argue, "the category of evidentiality is of use only, we conjecture, if a radical conceptual stance is taken in order to not miss capturing alternative linguistic strategies of expressing this notion. Hence, we strongly endorse the primacy of functional criteria and suggest including all linguistic representations that serve as cues for evidentiality in context".

Many linguists consider evidentiality to be associated with the concepts of epistemic modality and stance and describe evidential constructions as epistemic expressions. This view was put forward in Babel [10] and brought about opposing views.

In the Russian linguistic literature, the problem of evidential meanings and devices was first discussed by G. A. Zolotova in her "Essay on the functional syntax of the Russian language" in 1973. She noticed that sentences conveying the information about objective reality may include "another structural-semantic area" which is related to the subject of perception, ascertaining and evaluating of the phenomena of reality and, in some cases, relating to the nature of perception" [11]. She called this phenomenon "authorization", stressing that the meanings it conveys relate to the subject (that is, an author). Following this view, evidential markers are considered in this article as a semantic class particularizing the source of information.

First presented as a notion of functional and semantic syntax, "authorization" attracted attention of a great number of Russian researchers. They came to realize that this complex notion revealed itself in different levels of language system and thus could be viewed and described from different aspects, including sentence, text, style, and discourse.

In this article the differences in the status of evidentiality are ignored because evidential devices (in Russian "authorization constructions") are considered as devices referring to the source of information, and the focus is made on the structures with assessment meaning that accompany them in the academic texts. Evidentiality in this way can be "defined as the functional category that refers to the perceptual and / or epistemological basis for marking a speech act" [12]. Moreover, the overt coding of evidentiality in both Russian and English is optional, which means there is no closed set of morpho-syntactical markers, so quite a wide range of linguistic devices can code evidentiality.

Taking into consideration the title of this paper, it can be said that evidentiality in this work is analysed from a wide view [13], which means that the speaker's assessment, the field of epistemicity and pragmatic analysis of evidentiality are taken into account.

As for the author's intention, it is assumed to a certain extent that it is subject to interpretation even in scientific discourse, where it should be expressed clearly and explicitly. The author agrees with Invin saying that "interpretation can legitimately aim at a variety of direction targets, which might include the meaning intended by the author, the meaning(s) careful and well-informed audiences attribute to the work, or the meanings projected onto the work by audiences engaged in virtually unconstrained interpretative play" [14]. So in this paper it is suggested that the combination of evidentials with positive or negative attributes as author's positive or negative attitude to the subject matter, is part of author's intention expressed (encoded) in a research article. It should be mentioned, that it is not the meaning of words that is subject to interpretation in this work. Interpretation here is not concerned with the linguistic meaning of words and should be considered in a broader sense, as part of speech-acts.

Moreover, the central idea of this paper is that the combination of evidentials (or simply markers of information source) with positive or negative attributes can be a means of discourse organization and, consequently, influence the transmission of scientific knowledge.

Thus, this work develops the idea of cognitive-discursive analysis of evidentiality first introduced in [15]. In accordance with this approach, evidentiality is presented as a means of speech, which marks the author's cognitive-discursive activity in a text. This activity consists in embodying the emerging knowledge structured in accordance with the author's concept, his/her world outlook and based on the epistemic conditions embedded in a text.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The method of the author's intention analysis in relation to evidentiality in a scientific text presented in this paper is based on the way a reader perceives the topic (the idea) of the text. There are two factors that are taken into consideration: 1) the ratio of subjectivized / objectified forms of evidentiality / evidentiality to the subject matter in a sentence within a selected micro theme, and 2) the connection of evidential devices with positive / negative estimation of a micro theme. By subjectivised forms of evidentiality the author means evidential devices that introduce the speaker's source of information (*I think, to my mind, as I said*, etc.). Objectified forms introduce somebody else's opinion, thoughts, ideas (*he states, they wrote, the paper deals with*, etc.). Any operators denoting assessment (highly informative, very useful, worth mentioning, of low value, etc) may be negative or positive. It is assumed here, that both logical and compositional structure of a scientific text is characterized by the combination of evidential devices accompanied by estimation operators. Thus, the following combinations (called models) can be distinguished: 1) explicit evidential devices with positive (a), "neutral" (b), negative (c) assessment, and 2) implicit evidential devices with positive (a),

"neutral" (b), negative (c) assessment. Conventionally these modes are denoted here as 1A, 1B, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2B.

Analysing how these models occur in a scientific text can contribute to the possibilities of characterizing such texts from the point of view of the author's manner of writing, of revealing the author's strategies of text building, and much more. Revealing the author's intention and text strategies based on finding the suggested models places this attempt to an array of both cognitive-oriented studies (because, in the end, it aims at analysing the mental processes underlying knowledge representation) and pragmatic ones (due to its focus on authorial intentions).

Considering the importance of the category of assessment in the present study, it is necessary to describe how the author regards it. Following a number of researchers, assessment is considered as a verbalized (reflected and registered in a speech act) result of the qualifying activity of consciousness. It can also be the activity of the sensory (sensual, emotive) sphere of the human psyche, as well as the psychological process in which value is "grasped" by consciousness.

The fact that research articles, fixing the cognitive process and its result, are permeated with assessment, it was described in detail in the works of [16] and [17].

The key features of assessment in research articles is the predominance of the rational type of assessment (97.3%) over the emotional type (2.7%), and the fact that positive assessment operators prevail in such texts [18]. The means of assessment include numerous units of different levels of language: lexical (nouns, adjectives, adverbs, phraseological combinations), syntactic operators (cliché phrases, negative adversative constructions, interrogative and exclamatory sentences), "predicates of opinion" [19], as well as context. According to Bazhenova and Kondakov, "it is important that estimation is the basis of conceptual knowledge that is formed and developed in the text. Explicitly or implicitly expressed estimation is always connected with the author's choice of concept, idea or just judgment, opinion, belief, statement, fact as certain (positive or negative) scientific value [20].

III. RESULTS

Turning to the text analysis, the approach to the selection of texts will be described. Firstly, the focus of our attention is on the texts with the explicitly expressed purpose of research, which is an indispensable attribute of a research article and a manifestation of the author's intention. Secondly, such a text should introduce a certain problem (theme) that is developed in the article; it should contain some new knowledge about the subject under review. It is common practice to describe the purpose of the article in the title and the introductory part. In the first text under review, the article by Bychkova [21], the goal is expressed by means of metatext: "We will analyse rhinology in this way, which will help to identify the image of the nose as a particularly significant part of the body in Gogol's works".

The goal formulated in this way signifies about the author's intention to refer to a number of information sources (Gogol's works), and to give a positive assessment of the selected object (the significance of the nose compared with other organs of

human perception). Thus, the *nose* is the central problem (theme) of the article under review.

Next, all the sentences containing this lexeme are selected and distributed according to the following parameters: implicit / explicit forms of evidential devices and the presence of assessment operators. Interpretation is sometimes required to judge if the assessment is positive or negative.

In the text under review, these sentences are arranged as follows. Nineteen sentences contain the implicit forms of evidentiality and neutral evaluation of the *nose* lexeme, that is 2B model. Another six sentences with implicit form of evidentiality contain a positive evaluation of the lexeme (2A model).

Thus, 24 sentences include implicit forms of evidentiality. Among the sentences with explicit forms of evidentiality six demonstrate neutral assessment, eight sentences are marked with positive assessment, and no sentences with negative assessment were revealed. The absence of sentences with evidential devices accompanied by negative assessment of the main lexeme can obviously be explained as the general predominance of axiological operators with positive assessment in research articles mentioned above [18]. The pragmatic set of this combination is to show the image of the *nose* as a particularly significant part of the body both in Gogol's work and in the research article.

Among the sentences with implicit evidential devices, which are described here as containing a neutral evaluation, several sentences contain at the same time a positive assessment of other objects directly related to the main lexeme. One example could be the image of the nose: *Предметность носа подчеркивается и фразой «носовые ноздри», создающей выразительный пластический образ* [21] - *The objectivity of the nose is emphasized by the phrase "nasal nostrils", which creates an expressive plastic image.* Also assessed in this way are the functions of the nose which are not inherent to it: *Активность носов в поэме проявляется, в том числе, в их фантастической подвижности. При этом акцент на способности носа совершать самостоятельные движения может быть поставлен и методом от противного* [21] - *The activity of noses in the novel is manifested, among other things, in their fantastic mobility. At the same time, the emphasis on the ability of the nose to make moves independently can also be made by a contrario reasoning; Как и лимбический отдел, связанный с функционированием подсознания, литературные носы обладают самостоятельностью в поведении* [21] - *Like the limbic brains, which are connected with the functioning of the subconscious, literary noses are independent in their behavior; Анна Андреевна предпочитает отказаться от своих глаз и пользоваться одним носом* [21] - *Anna Andreevna prefers to refuse from her eyes and use only her nose; Чтобы разглядеть что-либо глазами, персонажам произведения необходимо высунуть нос ...*[21] - *In order to see something with their eyes, the characters of the novel need to stick their nose out.*

A remarkable feature of sentences with implicit evidentiality accompanied by positive evaluation is that all of them (in the article in question 100%) describe the properties and functions of the main lexeme (concept) in a positive way.

Способность быть чутким, осторожным также связана с чувствительностью носа [21] - *The ability to be responsive and careful is also associated with the sensitivity of the nose; В мире гоголевских произведений главную роль в коммуникации человека с миром исполняет нос* [21] - *In the world of Gogol's works, the main role in a man's communication with the world is played by the nose; Таким образом, ссылаясь на Шекспира, Гофман не только помещает сюжет рассказа в ринологический контекст концепта сна, но и обыгрывает архетипическую связь носа и мотива познания ...* [21] - *Thus, referring to Shakespeare, Hoffmann not only puts the plot of the story in the rhinological context of sleep, but also plays with the archetypal connection of the nose and the cognitive process ...; Таким образом, нос, обладая способностями всех пяти чувств, а порой и замещающий собой остальные части тела, оказывается способным воспринимать информацию в любом виде* [21] - *Thus, the nose with its abilities of all the five senses, sometimes takes the place of the other parts of the body, and is able to perceive information in any form; В рассмотренных случаях нос выступает в качестве главного средства общения с окружающим миром, что соотносится также с представлениями первобытных людей о запахах, которые использовали благоговения и сожженные жертвы для того, чтобы общаться с богами* [21] - *In the cases considered, the nose acts as the main means of communication with the world, which also corresponds to primitive people's ideas about smells, who used incense and burned sacrifices to communicate with the gods; Нос оказывается продолжением мозга...* [21] - *The nose turns out to be an extension of the brain...*

The analysis of sentences with explicit forms of evidentiality and positive evaluation of the main topic shows some pragmatic and meaningful differences. An essential feature of such sentences is that in terms of content they describe the characteristics of the main concept in a narrower aspect, reflecting the transition from the general to the particular, from the plural to the individual. The subject of perception, qualification, and the source of information tend to "uniqueness". *Носы у Гоголя отвечают не только за обоняние, но и оказываются необходимыми для функционирования всех остальных чувств* [21] - *Gogol's noses are responsible not only for the sense of smell, but also prove necessary for the functioning of all the other senses; Полную замену зрения обонянием представляет себе как совершенную идиллию Анна Андреевна...* [21] - *Anna Andreevna thinks that replacing vision with a sense of smell could be a perfect idea; И, наконец, самостоятельность образа носа Гоголь подчеркивает, уравнивая его с человеческим сознанием* [21] - *And finally, Gogol emphasizes the independence of the image of the nose, equalizing it with the human consciousness; С этим соотносится факт физиологии о том, что в головном мозге обонянию уделен целый отдел, и, исходя из такой логики, получается, что большие размеры носа коррелируют с высоким уровнем интеллекта* [21] - *The physiology fact that the whole brain region is responsible for to the sense of smell in the brain is related to this, and, based on this logic, it turns out that a big nose signifies a high level of intelligence; Из данного примера видно, что нос представляется одушевленным с помощью не только семантических, но и грамматических средств*

[21] - From this example, it can be seen that the nose is animated using not only semantic, but also grammatical means.

The following example from the text demonstrates the transition from several sources of information to just to one. *Принимая во внимание рассмотренные выше примеры из нескольких произведений, свидетельствующие о всеобъемлющей способности носа к получению любых форм информации, можно прийти к заключению, что в мире художественной литературы нос представляет собой самостоятельно функционирующее одушевленное существо [21] - Taking into account the above examples of several works, which testify to the comprehensive ability of the nose to receive any form of information, one can come to a conclusion that in the world of fiction, the nose is an independently functioning animate object; There are only two examples of a "multiple" source of information in the analysed text: 1) Так, в «Мертвых душах» можно встретить множество случаев, где носу уделяется главное внимание при характеристике героев [21, p. 16]; В глазах персонажей поэмы «Мертвые души» нос является определяющей чертой человека. Оценивая личность, люди смотрят исключительно на нос [21] - So, in "Dead Souls" you can find many cases when characters are described by their nose; 2) В глазах персонажей поэмы «Мертвые души» нос является определяющей чертой человека. Оценивая личность, люди смотрят исключительно на нос [21] - In the eyes of the characters in the Dead Souls novel, the nose is a defining feature of a man. When evaluating a person, people look solely at their nose.*

The focus on single and individual characteristics of an object is also intrinsic to the sentences with explicit form of evidentiality and neutral assessment of the main concept of the novel (type 1B). *Таким образом, в плане «биологического» воплощения нос функционирует у Гоголя в виде отдельно существующей части тела, т.е. как самостоятельный персонаж [21] - Thus, being "biologically" impersonated, the nose in Gogol's work functions as a separate part of the body, i.e. as an independent character; Нос сопоставляется с категорией знания и у Э.Т.А. Гофмана, произведения которого могут считаться одним из ринологических источников произведений Гоголя [21] - The nose is also referred to the category of knowledge by E.T.A. Hoffmann, whose works can be considered a rhinological source of Gogol's works; Данный тезис соотносится с замечанием С.Г. Бочарова о том, что отделившийся нос в повести утрачивает свойства «живой человеческой плоти» [21] - This thesis is consistent with S.G. Bocharov's comment that the separated nose in the story loses the properties of "living human flesh".*

However, the number of described objects in the dictum part of the sentences with explicit forms of evidentiality may be more than one. *О том, что лакей Петрушка имеет крупный нос и губы, Гоголь с настойчивостью сообщает на протяжении текста поэмы [21] - Gogol emphasizes in many places of the text that the footman Petrushka has big a nose and big lips.*

The number of "detection subjects" can also be higher: *Мотив приравнивания носа и связанного с ним чувства*

обоняния к сознанию и интеллекту встречается также у Бержерака, Лудовико Ариосто, Эдмона Ростана [21] - The motive of equating the nose and the sense of smell to consciousness and intellect is also found in the works by Bergerac, Ludovico Ariosto, Edmond Rostand.

To demonstrate the differences in the author's evidential strategies aimed at expressing the authorial intention one more text was analysed, [22]. The purpose of this article is expressed explicitly as follows: "It is necessary to frame the scope of linguistic problems in this area of interdisciplinary research, and find its own "legitimate" and independent place in it. First, it is necessary to formulate the most generalized definition of self-identification as a verbal action, which could correspond to the focus of different linguistic schools and orientations" [22]. Such a formulation of the article's goal allows predicting the need to refer to the scope of sources available to the author, which should contain the definition of self-identification and to select the one that best suits the research tasks. Thus, the central lexeme (the main concept) of this article is *self-identification*.

A comparative analysis of the use of assessment operators accompanying the evidential devices shows some quantitative difference.

TABLE I. COMPARING THE RESULTS OF THE EVIDENTIAL MODELS IN TWO TEXTS

Text	Evidential Models					
	1 A	1 Б	1B	2 A	2 Б	2 B
1	8 (20.5%)	6 (15.3%)	0	6 (15.3%)	19 (48.7%)	0
2	0	11 (45.8%)	0	0	13 (54.1%)	0

The first text demonstrates a higher number of assessment operators with a positive meaning in the sentences with both implicit and explicit forms of evidentiality. A somewhat different authorial intention in the second article (finding a definition to self-identification) makes qualification meaning more important and assessment meanings less represented.

IV. DISCUSSION

Thus, the verbalized author's intention in the research articles determines the appropriate selection of language means of its expression in the aspect of evidentiality. So, the intent to describe the main lexeme (the main concept of the text) as positive (which is significant in the article under review) is reflected in the prevalence of axiological indicators with a positive assessment in both sentences with implicit and explicit forms of evidentiality.

Evidential devices introducing the source of information lead to the inclusion of additional meanings the common feature of which is a strong focus on a separate, individual and outstanding characteristic of the object. This feature is emphasized and contrasted with the other features. The positive assessment of the main concept makes these meaning even more emphasized, while neutral assessment makes them less underlined.

It seems that the described property of evidentiality has a cognitive basis and its origin is in the intent to streamline knowledge when fixing it in the text. It means that each idea worth attention has its own author, and only the defining outstanding characteristics of the object are worth consideration.

The compliance of the selected evidential devices to the goals and objectives of the author forms the text-building function of evidentiality. Moreover, the selection and use of evidential constructions may not only reflect the author's strategies throughout a text, but also, given a sufficient amount of analysis, may characterize the style of a researcher as well.

V. CONCLUSION

Thus, analyzing the proportion of explicit and implicit evidential markers in a sentence and matching them with axiological operators and some other data expressed in a scientific text allows revealing the author's intention through evidentiality. This makes evidential markers a tool to explore the author's intention. Apart from analyzing the author's intention, the presented method is helpful in describing ways of scientific texts and discourse creation.

References

- [1] P. Dixon and M. Bertolussi, "Text Is Not Communication: A Challenge to a Common Assumption," *Discourse Processes*, vol. 31(1), pp. 1-25, January 2001.
- [2] A.Y. Aikhenvald, "Evidentiality," Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [3] LI. B. Andersen, "Evidentials, paths of change and mental maps: typologically regular asymmetries," 1986.
- [4] F. Palmer, "Mood and modality," Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986.
- [5] W. Chafe, "Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing," in W. Chafe and J. Nichols, Eds. "Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology," Norwood: Ablex, 1986, pp. 261-72.
- [6] D. Crystal, "A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics," 6th ed., Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.
- [7] E. Ifantidou, "Evidentials and relevance," Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- [8] A. Aikhenvald, "Information source and evidentiality: what can we conclude?" *Rivista di Linguistica*, vol. 12 (1), pp. 209-227, 2007.
- [9] G. Lampert and M. Lampert, "Where does evidentiality reside? Notes on (alleged) limiting cases: seem and be like," *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*, vol. 63, No. 4, pp. 308-321, 2010.
- [10] A.M. Babel, "Dizque, evidentiality, and stance in Valley Spanish," *Language in society*, vol. 38(4), pp. 487-511, 2009.
- [11] G.A. Zolotova, "Essay on the functional syntax of the Russian language," Moscow: Science, 1973.
- [12] B. Cornillie, "Evidentiality and epistemic modality: On the close relationship between two different categories," *Functions of Language*, vol. 16 (1), pp. 44-62, 2009.
- [13] I. Mushin, "Evidentiality and epistemological stance: Narrative Retelling," Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- [14] S. Irvin, "Authors, Intentions and Literary Meaning," *Philosophy Compass*, vol. 1(2), pp. 114-128, 2006.
- [15] S.V. Grichin and T.A. Demeshkina, "Evidentiality in the text of a research work: a cognitive-discursive aspect," *Tomsk State University Bulletin. Philology*, vol. 44, Iss. 6, pp. 5-19, 2016.
- [16] S. Hunston, "Evaluation in experimental research articles," PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham, 1989.
- [17] Xiaoyu Xu and Hilary Nes, "An analysis of the evaluation contexts in academic discourse," *Functional Linguistics*, vol. 4(2), pp. 1-17, 2017.
- [18] E.A. Bazhenova, "Academic text in the polytextuality aspect," Perm: Perm State University, 2001.
- [19] E.M. Volf, "Functional semantics of evaluation," Moscow: Nauka, 1985.
- [20] E.A. Bazhenova and B.V. Kondakov, "Text-forming through the sense dynamic aspect," *Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 5 (2), pp. 125-130, 2014.
- [21] A.T. Bychkova, "The image of the nose as a body part in works by N.V. Gogol and in Western European literature," *Tomsk State University Bulletin*, vol. 372, pp. 13-18, 2013.
- [22] M.A. Lappo, "Self-identification: direct, indirect explicit and indirect implicit description of the identity of the speaker," *Tomsk State University Bulletin*, vol. 372, pp. 28-32, 2013.