Evaluating evaluation

Angela DOWNING
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Susan HUNSTON and Geoff THOMPSON: *Evaluation in Text. Authorial Stance
and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,
2000, (hbk). 2001 (pb). ISBN: 0-19-829986-9 (pbk), vii + 225 pp.

ABSTRACT

What the editors term 'evaluation' is an up-and-coming field of study in an area
in which semantics, pragmatics, grammar and discourse overlap. The present article
examines the nine contributions to the volume under review and finds a considerable
range of lexical, grammatical and textual approaches to the expression of opinion and
stance in English. These include corpus-based studies of lexical and grammatical items
carrying an evaluative load, evaluation in and of narrative, covert stance in persuasive
rhetoric, a systemic-functional modelling of Appraisal, and a layered discourse model
to persuasive texts.

Key words: Evaluation, affect, appraisal, stance, lexis, grammar, discourse,
system, rhetoric, narrative, disjunct, cohesion, status, value, averral, attribute.

RESUMEN

EVALUANDO LA EVALUACIÓN

La 'evaluación', término escogido por los editores de este volumen para englobar
los conceptos de opinión y actitud del hablante, es un campo de estudio actualmente
fructífero donde se solapan la semántica, la pragmática y el discurso. En este artículo-

reseña se analizan los nueve capítulos que comprende el volumen, descubriendo una variedad de enfoques, tanto léxicos y gramaticales como discursivos, que abordan la expresión en inglés de la opiníon y de la actitud del escritor o hablante. Se incluyen estudios basados en corpus de palabras y expresiones que encierran una carga evaluativa, la evaluación en la narrativa y de la narrativa, actitudes encubiertas en la retórica persuasiva, un modelo sistémco-funcional de la evaluación, y un modelo discursivo de varios niveles aplicado a los textos persuasivos.

Palabras clave: Evaluación, afecto, actitud, léxico, gramática, discurso, sistema, retórica, narrativa, adverbio, cohesión, estatus, valor, aseveración, atribución.

1.   INTRODUCTION

Interest in speakers' and writers' subjective attitude, stance or judgement towards what is expressed in their own or others' discourse has, according to the editors of this volume, made a somewhat belated appearance into the mainstream of linguistic description. Once on the scene, however, it appears to have increased rather than diminished in recent years. Evidence of this interest is reflected in such publications as the special issue on Affect in *Text*, 9, 3. (Ochs 1989), the special issue on the related field of evidentiality in the *Journal of Pragmatics*, number 33 (Dendale and Tasmowski 2001), certain of the volumes and chapters in the Pragmatics and Beyond new series, such as Andersen and Fretheim (2000) and Kenesei and Harnish (2001), together with articles in other journals (Page 2002). In the Preface, the editors state as their aim to collect together in one volume "a variety of approaches to the notion of evaluation (under its various names of *stance, affect*, *modality* and so on) which would make the case for the centrality of the notion and to serve as an introduction for students wishing to pursue research in this area". The wide range of approaches turns out to be not so much a range of widely differing theoretical approaches, as the reader might have expected, but instead, various aspects or treatments of the subject in relation to English: a particular language theory (systemic-functional linguistics), a particular discourse type (narrative) a particular methodology (corpus linguistics) and a particular view of the relation between language, knowledge and the world (language and ideology). Consequently, there is no reflection of the type of work currently being done within other models, for instance, within Relevance Theory on pragmatic markers of propositional attitude in several languages other than English (Anderson and Fretheim 2000). Comparisons are not established in detail, but mention is made of evidentiality as in Chafe (1986) and of Lakoff and Kövecses' (1987) study on emotion. The volume is strongly centred on the grammatical, lexical and textual tradition established at the University of

Birmingham by Eugene Gatt Winter, whose death in 1996 prevented him from finishing his own contribution to the volume.

2. THE TERMINOLOGY OF OPINION AND AFFECT

Nine chapters make up the volume, together with References, an Index, biographical notes on the contributors and a Preface. In the first chapter *Evaluation: An Introduction* Thompson and Hunston start with an over-view of the range of terms in use to describe language expressing opinion; these include *connotation, affect, attitude*, *affective meaning, appraisal*, *stance* and *point of view*. While connotative meaning "relates to the 'real-world' experience one associates with an expression" (3), the other terms relate to the language user. All the contributors to this volume share, within a broadly functional view, the language user perspective. But even so, there is sometimes overlap but little agreement on what each term covers. For Martin, *appraisal* comprises three sub-categories: *affect, judgement* and *appreciation*. Conrad and Biber use *stance* to cover *epistemic stance* (roughly probability) and *attitudinal stance* (roughly appraisal in Martin's terms). In choosing none of these, the editors have opted for *evaluation* as "the broad cover term for the speaker's or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about." (5)

They then proceed to explain why evaluation is important and the functions it fulfils: first, to express the speaker's or writer's opinion, and so reflecting the value system of that person and their community; second, to construct and maintain relations between writer and reader; and third, to organise the discourse. Each of these functions is accorded considerable discussion and excellent illustration. Under the heading 'How do we recognise evaluation?', the remainder of the Introduction deals with the signals in lexis, grammar and text that are picked up by an aware reader and then interpreted within the specific context. Contextualization is necessary, for specific items such as *deserted streets* which in isolation, or in other contexts, would probably suggest a negative attitude, can instead express positive opinion. This is the case in a travel leaflet promoting Paris and Barcelona for high season holidays. The lexical item, according to the authors, *only* (original emphasis) gives us an indication that some evaluation is going on; we must use interpretative procedures to establish what that evaluation is. A pragmatic approach is hinted at without using the term 'pragmatic'. With regard to the parameters of evaluation, the good-bad, or positive-negative parameter is taken as basic. The parameter of certainty-uncertainty is also examined, more briefly, in terms of writer's attitude to the information discussed. The chapter ends

with a brief overview of the book as a whole, and a key to each contributor's approach.

Each of the following eight chapters is preceded by an 'Editors' introduction' which further prepares the way for the contents of the chapter itself. Such a degree of signalling might be considered excessive, but in view of the targeted research student readership and the density of some of the chapters, this is hardly the case. Contributors have been allowed the "luxury" of comparatively long contributions which permit detailed discussion with copious textual illustration. The summaries and pointers to authors' goals are undoubtedly a benefit to the reader.

3. PERSUASIVE RHETORIC

Chapter 2, Michael Hoey's short and somewhat contentious article 'Persuasive rhetoric in linguistics: A stylistic study of some features of the language of Noam Chomsky' was first published in 1984, we see in an Acknowledgement, when it was perhaps even more controversial and impacting than it is today. Hoey's thesis, built on a previous work by Botha published a decade earlier and cited by Hoey, is that from 1964 onwards, though not earlier, Chomsky makes use of evaluative words and phrases which pre-empt criticism by anyone not sharing his ideas. Hoey's argument relies heavily on the concept of clause relations as described and taught by Winter (1982). Clause relations are what provide the logical connections between clauses, giving a text its coherence. The most fundamental relation in discourse connection, according to Hoey, is that of *Situation – Evaluation*, by which a known situation is described and then an evaluation is offered by the writer. Alternatively, the *Evaluation* or opinion can be offered first, followed by the rationale for such an opinion (*Evaluation – Basis*). A three-fold set of relations can be adopted: *Situation – Evaluation – Basis.* Such relations are easily perceived, enabling the reader to question the evaluation. Chomsky, Hoey claims, is a skilled rhetorician; yet in the Chomsky passages that Hoey selects for analysis he finds these patterns less clearly present. Instead, he claims, the evaluation and what is evaluated are interwoven in a complex way, which involves a good deal of embedding, as in the following sentence (2.3.) "For anyone concerned with intellectual processes, or any question that goes beyond *mere* data arranging (emphasis in Hoey's quotation), it is the question of competence that is fundamental". Hoey points out that the negative evaluation of data arranging as 'mere' is not the main point of the sentence. It is embedded at a depth which makes the evaluation very difficult for a reader to challenge, (one could say the triviality of data arranging is presupposed, not asserted) and also exempts Chomsky from providing a basis for his

opinion. More subtle still, the reader may feel, is the implication conveyed in the first part of the quotation of the worthlessness of any opponents' choice of alternatives. Hoey finds that in prefacing statements by phrases such as 'it is clear that' or 'such obvious comments', Chomsky is indulging in the Emperor's New Clothes gambit. Just as in the Hans Andersen tale a whole population is made to aver, under threat of looking foolish, that the Emperor, although naked, is indeed wearing clothes, the illustrious twentieth century linguist contrives to silence potential critics by inducing in them a fear of missing the obvious, of not being held to be serious linguists or of having trivial concerns such as engaging in corpus linguistics. Hoey goes so far as to conclude that the skilful but covert nature of Chomsky's controversial evaluations in his later writings greatly contributed to the acceptance of his ideas and also initiated an unfortunate trend for this type of debating style.

4.   EVALUATIVE LEXIS AND CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS

Chapter 3, Joanna Channell's 'Corpus-based analysis of evaluative lexis', takes certain individual lexical items such as *regime* or semi-fixed expressions such as *par for the course* and shows how a set of concordances from a large corpus allows a corpus-based analysis which goes beyond what intuitions can achieve. Through studying the typical contexts in which such items appear, we can use the collocational information we derive to pinpoint the evaluative meaning the word or expression carries. From there, it is a short step to identifying the writer's attitude or emotional reaction to the content of their text. Instead of 'connotation' for the associated meaning a word acquires from its frequent contextual use, Channell uses the term 'pragmatic meaning', on the grounds that this kind of meaning, as opposed to the literal meaning, is not accessible to introspection and is not visible from the study of single examples. It depends on implicature. For instance *par for the course,* derived from its use in golf to describe a score which is the expected one for that particular course, has undergone metaphorical extension to signal 'just what one would expect', when applied to behaviours or events which are reported as 'bad' and then claimed to be 'expected'. The term is in this way acquiring a usually negative slant. Interestingly, Channell suggests that new senses for existing words often start as implicatures which not all speakers are aware of. The verb *roam* as in *roam the world* is – or rather was- positive, conjuring up notions of aimless but harmless wandering, leisure, travel, beautiful countryside and so on. But alongside this established use, a recent collocation with *streets* (*roam the streets*) expresses negative evaluation, since activities undertaken while roaming the streets (*attacking people, stoning cars, randomly beating people, burning and looting, rioting*) are, unlike the previous

qualities associated with the verb, dangerous, threatening, disapproved of and purposeful. Channell's data show that the new, negative meaning is in the ascendancy, which allows her to predict that the positive meaning of *roam* will eventually disappear. Channell's discussion of these and other words and expressions shows how analysis of concordances of particular items can reveal tendencies in the development of meaning which are below the level of conscious awareness. She ends by wondering why there are more negative developments than positive ones and what there may be in common between linguistic items which display evaluative polarities not accessible to intuition.

5.   ADVERBS OF STANCE ACROSS REGISTERS

While Channell starts from the word or phrase and proceeds to reveal new and unexpected meanings through the analysis of concordances, Susan Conrad and Douglas Biber use a tagged corpus to produce an overall view of how stance adverbs are used across three registers. Chapter 4, 'Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing ' is in fact a sample of the wider treatment of the subject given in the *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (1999) of which Biber and Conrad are among the co-authors. The three registers covered in the *Grammar* are represented here: conversation, academic prose and news. As in the *Grammar*, the results are presented quantitatively, followed by discussion and illustrations. 'Stance' in this context is used as a cover term for the expression of personal feelings and judgements in three domains: epistemic stance, which (like evidentiality) indexes certainty, reliability and source of information; attitudinal stance, which comments on a speaker's attitudes and judgements, and style stance, which comments on the manner of speaking. Three major parameters are used in order to characterise adverbial stance markers: semantic class, grammatical realization and placement in the clause. The authors' own evaluation of their findings and methodology centres on the importance of aligning stance marking with register, a view with which most readers would probably agree. Differences between the adverbs are revealed in many respects: their typical meanings, positions in the clause, the predominance of certain types of grammatical realisations, and the most commonly used items. Generalisation across genres is therefore impossible. So for instance, stance adverbials are almost twice as common in conversation as in academic prose and news, the least frequent use being in news. This is explained by the fact that conversation is characterised by interpersonal involvement; speakers frame the content of their messages with their own judgements and attitudes. Writers of academic prose use twice as many stance adverbials as do newspaper writers, which Conrad and Biber find surprising. However, academic writing is concerned

with certainty and reliability, so it is not surprising after all that the most common adverbials of stance used in this genre are *perhaps* and *probably*. Epistemic stance markers are revealed to be much more common overall than attitude and style adverbials. In conversation by far the most common stance adverbial is *really*, followed by *actually*, *probably* and *sort of*, in that order, these adverbials together accounting for about 70% of all epistemic stance markers in conversation in the authors' data. One disadvantage of statistically-based analyses, we may feel, is that only the most frequently used items get mentioned, while less used, but highly charged adverbials, such as *surely* and *even*, whose attitudinal meaning is covert and has to be inferred (Downing 2001) are not listed or discussed. As regards position in the clause, initial or pre-verbal positions are favoured over final, again a consequence of the value of stance adverbials for framing propositions, which is no doubt their primary function. A secondary function is that of intensifying or condensing previous statements. Importantly, also, stance adverbials not only frame the clause but also mark its connection to the previous discourse. Thompson and Zhou present a similar finding in chapter 7 of the same volume. Conrad and Biber conclude by pointing to areas which require further attention; for instance, in noting how stance adverbials not only mark speakers' attitudes but also in some cases help to carry out a speech act function such as suggesting or disagreeing by softening the force of the act. The social role played by stance adverbials in conversation is a recommended choice for further investigation.

6.   A LOCAL GRAMMAR OF EVALUATION

In chapter 5 Susan Hunston and John Sinclair challenge the generally accepted view that evaluation is best analysed in terms of lexis rather than grammar by aiming to provide a 'A local grammar of evaluation'. That is, they refrain from forcing the evaluative patterns which cluster round evaluative adjectives and nouns into the traditional categories set up in large comprehensive grammars. Instead, they start from the semantic notion of 'expression of evaluation' and, working with the extensive Cobuild corpus, come up with highly untraditional but transparent categories such as "thing evaluated" and "evaluative category", together with a "hinge" which connects the two. These categories function within a wide number of patterns which cut right across traditional classifications. The justification for this methodology is that there are gaps in the coverage given to certain structures in large grammars which, in the name of comprehensiveness, squeeze out certain more local structures such as those the authors describe. The burning question is: can local grammars offer descriptive features that are superior to those of general grammars? Their answer is based on the concept of text and

applications in automatic parsing. Grammars should provide the categories and organisation necessary to describe in a satisfactory way any text composed in that language. Yet after the main body of the text has been parsed, corpus grammarians find that there is still a good deal left over.These 'left-overs' frequently belong to what are termed by the authors 'sublanguages' and for these an alternative description must be devised. Examples of sublanguages suggested are newspaper headlines and general dictionaries. For these authors the 'full-sentence' definitions of the Cobuild dictionary (of which John Sinclair was editor-in-chief), constitute another instance of a sublanguage. A parsed definition, adapted from Barnbruck's (1995) unpublished dissertation cited in the chapter would work out as in the authors' Table 5.2., reproduced here.

Table 5.2.
A PARSED DEFINITION
(Hunston and Sinclair in Hunston and Thompson, eds., 2001).
Adapted from Barnbruck (1995)

Hinge	Left-hand side		Right-hand side	
	Definiendum		*Definiens*	
When	**you run**		**you**	**move quickly, leaving the ground during each stride**

Citing recent work in corpus linguistics on patterns of grammar and lexis (Sinclair 1991, Francis 1993, Hunston and Francis 1998), the authors remind us of two important observations made: "first, that every sense of every word can be described in terms of patterns it commonly occurs in; and second, that words which share a particular pattern also share a meaning" (83). Of the thirty-three patterns described, I will illustrate just three:

Table 5.3.
PARSING FIRST PATTERN
(Hunston and Sinclair. In Hunston and Thompson, eds., 2001)

		Evaluative category	*Thing evaluated*
It	**link verb**	**adjective group**	**finite or non-finite clause**
It	was	certain	that he was much to blame
It	seemed	important	to trust her judgement
It	was	wonderful	talking to you the other day

Table 5.10.
PARSING FIFTH PATTERN (i)
(Hunston and Sinclair. In Hunston and Thompson, eds., 2001)

Hinge	Evaluating category	Evaluative context	Hinge	Thing evaluated
What + link verb	**adjective group**	**prepositional phrase**	**link verb**	**clause or noun group**
What's	very good	about this play	is	that it broadens people's view

Table 5.15.
PARSING WITH GRADED ADJECTIVES
(Hunston and Sinclair. In Hunston and Thompson, eds., 2001)

Thing evaluated	Hinge	Evaluative category	Restriction on evaluation
Noun group	**link verb**	**adjective group with 'too' or 'enough'**	**to-infinitive or prepositional phrase with 'for'**
He	looks	too young	to be a grandfather
Their relationship	was	strong enough	for anything

Even from this glimpse at a small part of Hunston and Sinclair's work we can see that various relationships of different kinds are involved in patterns which cut right across the traditional syntactic labels such as extraposition, *wh*-cleft and gradability of adjectives, respectively.

Each set of patterns is followed by analysis and comment in which distinctions are made between, for instance, patterns whose primary purpose is to evaluate (i.e. the speaker or writer evaluates) and patterns which attribute evaluation to another speaker. Both of these types will tend to select evaluative adjectives. Perhaps the most interesting comment, which appears in the Conclusions is that these patterns may be used as a 'diagnostic' for evaluative adjectives: that is, that the adjective may be evaluative in other patterns too. The authors point out that absolute certainty is not to be expected in this respect, however, for some adjectives have one or more evaluative sense(s), and one or more non-evaluative sense(s). Furthermore, when used creatively, a non-evaluative adjective may become evaluative. From the point of view of pedagogical applications the advantage of these patterns is that the participant roles such as 'evaluative category' and 'thing evaluated' are automatically identified and can easily be committed to memory. In a similar way, the preposition or clause type which follows in each pattern should prove to be

easily assimilated through being seen or heard in these patterns. All these factors should make a 'local grammar' of adjective and noun complementation a user-friendly tool for teachers and students.

7.   EVALUATION IN NARRATIVE

In Chapter 6, Evaluating evaluation in narrative, Martin Cortazzi and Lixian Jin examine three dimensions of evaluation as used in a specialised sense in connexion with narrative: evaluation *in* the text, evaluation *of* the text and evaluation *of* the teller. The first dimension, evaluation *in* the text, goes back to Labov's (1972) model of oral narrative, based on Black English vernacular in Harlem, in which Evaluation is an element of the narrative structure. The whole structure proposed by Labov as normal for narratives of personal experience is as follows (*op.cit*. 362):
Abstract ^ Orientation ^ Complicating action ^ Evaluation ^ Result or resolution ^ Coda. More recent proposals for narrative structures such as those of Martin and Plum (1997), restated in Eggins and Slade (1997), are not cited.

Within this generic structure evaluation is, according to Labov, the means used by the narrator to indicate the 'point' of the narrative... why it was told and what the narrator is getting at (1972:366). Also derived from Labov is the idea that evaluation is a key feature for distinguishing a narrative of personal experience from a report or summary of someone else's experience. In this classic view, according to Cortazzi and Jin, evaluation as 'point' indexes the teller's attitude, emotions or character or else makes some generalisation about the world. It does this by emphasising some of the narrative units in such a way that they are given prominence, an idea already present in Labov and Walesky's (1967) paper, as is the remark that unevaluated narratives lack structural definition (1967:39). Insofar as it neglects the relationship between teller and listener, however, Cortazzi and Jin consider the classic view insufficient They propose to broaden the perspective on evaluation by considering how evaluation is negotiated between speaker and listener by taking into account wider socio-cultural dimensions.

A further problem with evaluation in narrative is the identification of the evaluative elements. Evaluation can occur anywhere in the narrative and can be realised at any level of linguistic structure – lexical, phonological, syntactic, discoursal. At the discourse level, devices identified include the switch to historic present, reported thought and speech, flashbacks and meta-comment. To these can be added performance features related to the teller's communicative competence: *how* the teller tells the story.

In examining evaluation *of* narrative, that is, the way the text is received, shared cultural norms are important if the evaluation is to be understood by

the listeners. In the best outcomes, the evaluation is jointly constructed; in this area a good deal of research is reported by Cortazzi and Jin on interviews, doctor-patient consultations and conversation. Problems increase when speakers of widely different cultures are involved. This part of the chapter is explored in considerable detail, particularly with respect to Chinese-American and Chinese/British encounters, and include the telling by a Chinese research student of an incident which took place between himself and the Dean of the British Faculty where he enrolled. The interesting part, for the reader, is the different evaluation of the incident by Chinese students, including himself, who judged the incident to have negative consequences, and by their British fellow students, who saw it as neutral.

Within the context of Chinese culture, in the Chinese genre of *chengyu*, the narrative evaluation is a bridge between the known first line of the brief narrative and the equally well known terse ending. These set phrases are produced by different speakers, and the story does not actually need to be told. Such bridging depends for success on intimate cultural knowledge of the genre, which may not be accessible to members of Western communities. Cultural differences in narrative styles are a notorious hindrance to cross-cultural understanding, bearing out the notion that narrative both reflects and at the same time constitutes a culture.

The third dimension, evaluation *through* narrative, means that tellers are evaluated through the story-telling. For instance, children are often evaluated for their ability to tell a story. More recently, teachers too have been evaluated on their autobiographical stories. In therapeutic sessions and support groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous the telling of stories by counsellors, or the telling of one's own life stories by members of the group may lead to greater self-awareness.

Throughout this chapter the authors review a great amount of research on narrative carried out from different angles, sifting it into the three dimensions which make up their own classification of evaluation in narrative. Their own work on narrative in primary teaching is briefly referred to among others in their treatment of the third dimension, evaluation *through* narrative. However, unlike the majority of the other chapters in this volume, theirs does not report in detail any original research of their own. Nevertheless, the overview they present of perspectives on evaluation in narrative makes good reading as an essay, it has some revealing illustrations, and finally, it constitutes a useful introduction and classification, with an extensive set of references, to an area which many readers of the targeted readership will not have previously explored for themselves.

8.   EVALUATIVE DISJUNCTS AND TEXT STRUCTURING

Geoff Thompson and Jianglin Zhou in Chapter 7, 'Evaluation and organisation in text: The structuring role of evaluative disjuncts', argue for a different perspective on coherence and cohesion from the traditional view. According to the latter coherence derives largely from the logical connections readers make between the units of semantic content in the text, while cohesion, seen as the explicit textual signalling of coherence, is realised mainly by repetition, through grammar and lexis, and conjunction. Parallel to these, the authors suggest, there is sometimes 'evaluative coherence'. This is described as "the way in which, for example, writers work to convey a consistent personal evaluation of the topic they are dealing with" (123). One way of conveying personal attitude or evaluation is through disjuncts: evaluative adverbials such as *unfortunately* and *obviously* which are traditionally classed as 'comment' adverbials. It is this type of adverbial which Thompson and Zhou take up with the aim of exploring how such items not only comment on the propositional content of the clause in which they occur, but can also function to create a particular kind of cohesive link between clauses. One interesting result of this view is that the evidently interpersonal function of expressing speakers' and writers' attitude must be seen as inextricably combined with their textual function of cohesion-making. Such an analysis challenges Halliday's contention that the three metafunctions, the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual, must be kept separate: in other words, although every clause realises all three functions, each metafunction is represented by a separate structure. In Thompson and Zhou's analysis, however, it appears that conjuncts and disjuncts can play a role in two metafunctions at once, the interpersonal and the textual. Not only that, but even more notably, it is suggested that cohesion itself is an interpersonal as well as a textual phenomenon (Editors' introduction, 122).

Under the heading of 'Disjuncts as cohesive signals' the remainder of the chapter is devoted to an exploration of the features of disjuncts that enable them to function cohesively in text. Drawing extensively on the model of clause relations worked out by Winter and Hoey at the University of Birmingham, the authors devote a lengthy section to concession relations, with disjuncts such as *certainly*, *plainly*, *true* and *admittedly*. This is followed by shorter sections devoted to expectancy relations signalled by *surprisingly*, *predictably* and *sadly*, and hypothetical-real patterns containing *actually* and *ostensibly*, which signal speaker's reaction to the beliefs of others. Less clear-cut cases are presented under the heading 'Alternative relations' with *maybe* and *perhaps*, while a section labelled 'Other cases' deals with those disjuncts such as *broadly* and *generally* which seem to have a genuinely disjunctive, non-linking, function.

The length of the illustrations and the detailed analyses that follow them preclude an illustrative summary. The whole chapter is well worth careful reading. The analysis of concession relations reflects an independent standpoint, within the general systemic-functional framework, which would be worth comparing with other standpoints in the recent upsurge of interest in discourse models of concession (Azar, 1997; Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 2000).

9.   APPRAISAL SYSTEMS

Chapter 8, 'Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English' is perhaps the most recent account to date of J.R. Martin's work in this area. It is one of the two longest and most complex of the nine chapters contained in this volume, and in a short review it is impossible to do justice to the wealth of lexical detail displayed in the tables. The framework is that of systemic-functional linguistics, and Martin is one who takes the 'systemic' aspect seriously: his overall concept of 'Appraisal' as a meaning potential is seen as a system of choices available to language users which comprises the meanings that can be expressed and the linguistic realisations of those meanings. More concretely, Appraisal is used by Martin for "the semantic resources used to negotiate emotions, judgements, and valuations, alongside resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations" (145). Engagement for Martin means the speaker's degree of commitment to the appraisal expressed, and is expressed through modality and related systems (Editors' introduction, 142). Martin develops his Appraisal system as a means to exploring how language users become involved in appraisal in texts. His illustrations are taken, curiously enough, not from spontaneous spoken English but mainly from the play *Educating Rita* by Willy Russell, together with a lesser number of written texts.

Martin himself sees his Appraisal system as a necessary contribution to interpersonal grammar within the systemic-functional framework. Whereas previous work in interpersonal systems had been mostly devoted to the grammar of mood and modality, and to the development of discourse models such as exchange structure, a complementary perspective, "evaluative lexis", had been being developed during the 1990s by many people including Joan Rothery and Peter White at the University of Sydney.

Under the section heading 'Modelling Appraisal', Martin focuses on three systems - Affect, Judgement and Appreciation. Affect construes (i.e. expresses and simultaneously creates) emotional responses ('happiness, sadness, fear, loathing', etc.); Judgement is deployed for construing moral evaluations of behaviour ('ethical, deceptive, brave', etc.); and Appreciation construes the 'aesthetic' quality of semiotic text / processes and natural phenomena ('remarkable, desirable, harmonious, elegant, innovative', etc.) (146). In a

footnote on this page, Martin explains that in terms of the model of discourse semantic systems developed at Sydney, Appraisal resources are one of the three major systems, together with Negotiation and Involvement. Negotiation is concerned with speech function (the systemic-functional term for speech acts) and exchange structure (i.e. dialogue in everyday service encounters). Involvement deals with resources for including and excluding interlocutors, through specialised lexis, swearing, slang and naming. The three together are concerned with the ongoing re/construal of relations of power and solidarity among interlocutors. This section is illustrated by a number of excellent journalistic and classroom texts; see 8.7. for "the longest nominal groups I have ever analysed", which is at the same time a compendium of terms of negative Affect - in plain words, adjectives of insult.

The section under Affect comprises a detailed set of choices related to emotions, the first division being between *irrealis* Affect (fear and desire) and *realis* Affect, each of these construed as either Surge (of behaviour) vs. Disposition, in three degrees: low, median and high. *Realis* Affect comprises Un/happiness, In/security and Dis/satisfaction, each with one or more sub-types. So for instance, Unhappiness comprises misery and antipathy, as follows:

Table 8.2.
PART OF *REALIS* AFFECT: UNHAPPINESS
(Martin. In Hunston and Thompson, eds., 2001)

	Surge of behaviour	*Disposition*	
UNHAPPINESS			
misery (= mood 'in me')	whimper	down	(low)
	cry	sad	(median)
	wail	miserable	(high)
antipathy (directed	rubbish	dislike	(low)
feeling 'at you')	abuse	hate	(median)
	revile	abhor	(high)

In the discussion that accompanies the textual analyses within Affect, Martin acknowledges that in recent years a more principled basis for classifying emotions has not been developed, although variants have appeared in press. In fact the principles by which one variable is chosen rather than another, or why certain linguistic realisations are chosen and not others, is not entirely clear. For instance, there appears to be no place for such emotions as envy, jealousy, grief, delight, in the present version at least.

The two remaining variables within the typology, Judgement and Appreciation, are treated rather more briefly. For Martin, Judgement is the institutionalisation of feeling in the context of proposals (norms about how people should and shouldn't behave), while Appreciation institutionalises feelings as propositions (about things). In the terminology of Hallidayan grammar 'proposals' deal with offers and commands – the exchange of goods-and-services - as opposed to 'propositions', which grammaticalise statements and questions. Within Martin's 'evaluative lexis' Judgement is divided into two major groups, social esteem and social sanction. Each of these is realised by positive and negative items. Judgements of esteem have to do with normality (*normal, average, everyday* as positive; *odd, peculiar, eccentric* as negative.) Further sub-variables of Judgement are capacity (how capable a person is) and tenacity (how resolute s/he is). Social sanction is divided into veracity (to do with truth) and propriety (to do with ethics) each with positive realisations of praise (*truthful, honest, credible / good, moral, ethical*, respectively, vs. negative realisations of criticism or condemnation (*dishonest, deceitful / bad, immoral, evil* respectively.

The complexity of the systems is rendered more accessible by the clarity of the tables, and the two diagrams, Figures 8.1. and 8.2. which clarify the contents of the sections Modelling Appraisal and Negotiating solidarity, respectively. The analysis of the texts is revealing - that of the *Educating Rita* excerpts in terms of gender, class and social meaning is particularly lively, and the chapter ends with a nod to *Star Trek Next Generation*, a call to linguists to "explore strange new worlds, seeking out new life, where few linguists have gone before". (175)

10.   MULTI-LAYERED EVALUATION

The last chapter in the volume under review, 'Evaluation and the planes of discourse', by Susan Hunston, offers a view of evaluation that is more complex than those seen in earlier chapters. She starts from the statement that evaluation is often implicit and relies for its effect on intertextuality. Furthermore it is multi-layered. The reader can predict from this that for Hunston an understanding of evaluation is not restricted to the identification of individual lexical, grammatical or discourse items. Building on previous work of her own cited in the references, together with many refences to the work of John Sinclair, she explores what is evaluated and who does the evaluating in various layers in persuasive texts. She proceeds by applying Sinclair's (1986) distinction between attribution and averral. In Sinclair's words, a writer assumes responsibility for what is averred, but delegates responsibility for what is attributed to the attributee. Averral, that is, a

statement for which the writer assumes responsibility, may be modified by modals, vague language and hedges. Attribution, that is, what the writer attributes to someone else, may be modified more radically by the choice of lexical verb or other linguistic features. It is well known that by the use of *claim*, for instance, writers distance themselves from sharing any responsibility for the attributed statement. Hunston shows that by using the perfect, *has shown*, the writer indicates that the attribution is evaluated as true and therefore s/he (the writer) shares the responsibility with the attributee.

It would be interesting to compare Hunston's multilayered model with models of evidentiality. Attribution to sources of knowledge is often taken to be the core function of evidentiality. Both the distinction between attribution and averral, and between different sources of knowledge or 'modes of knowing' (Chafe 1986) can be used as guarantees of degrees of reliability and credibility, positioning the reader to accept more willingly what is attributed, or the contrary – leaving the reader the possibility of disagreeing. These distinctions are handled by Hunston, as by Sinclair, in terms of *status* and *value*. One of Chafe's modes of knowing is belief, for which evidence is not usually given, and this presumably would lie behind and support 'averral', treated later in the article under the heading 'Self as source: averral, emphasized and hidden', as opposed to 'Other as Source: responsibility delegated or reclaimed'. However, a more cognitive dimension such as Chafe's is not made explicit in Hunston's discussion. The emphasis is on subtle distinctions and textual realisations. The types of attribution that occur in authentic texts and the analysis of their functions are treated in great detail.

A further distinction that is introduced has to do with what is evaluated : either world entities or discourse entities. In her analysis of one textual excerpt about the increase of sects, groups of people, people's feeling about sects and anti-sect paranoia are classed as world entities, whereas the writer's assertion that paranoia is sweeping the world is a discourse entity. This distinction, Hunston claims, corresponds to Sinclair's distinction between interactive and autonomous planes of discourse, which may be thought of in terms of the roles of writer and reader. On the autonomous plane the writer informs and the reader is informed of the content of the text. On the interactive plane, the writer is the text-structurer and the reader is informed of the structure of the text. Both of these roles occur simultaneously. Attention may be drawn to evaluation on an interactive plane by the use of, for example *Certainly... but*, which signals that a concession will be followed by an assertion (Editors' introduction). Status and values are seen to operate on both planes in ways that are comparable but different (205). Hunston concludes by stressing how the role of evaluation is important in two ways: first, by constructing the ideological basis of a text, and thereby locating writer and reader in ideological space, and second in the organisation of the text itself.

10.   CONCLUSION

The volume starts on a deceptively simple and accessible level, and increases in density and complexity as it progresses. In the final chapter the level of abstraction and the interrelation of several binary distinctions set up as intruments of analysis make this more strenuous reading than any of those preceding it. But it shares with all the other contributions to this volume certain features that go to make the reading a rewarding experience: the careful structuring of the text and the impeccable layout, the excellent textual illustrations and the quality and sensitivity of the accompanying analyses, helped in many cases by tables of great transparency. In all the chapters clarity of exposition is high, which will be especially welcome to readers who may be unfamiliar with the concepts or terminology. Finally, the editors' introduction to each chapter proves to be an invaluable guide and prelude to each contribution to a volume that offers a perhaps unexpected variety of approaches to the subject of evaluation in text.

Departamento de Filología Inglesa I
Facultad de Filología - Edif. A
Ciudad Universitaria
28040 Madrid
email: adowning@filol.ucm.es

REFERENCES

Andersen, Gisle and Fretheim Thorstein (2000). *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Azar, Moshe (1997). Concession relations as argumentation. (*Text* 17 (3): 310-31.

Baker, Mona, Gill Francis, and Elena Tognini-Bonelli (1993). *Text and Technology. In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

Chafe, Wallace (1986). Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In Wallace Chafe and Joanna. Nichols (eds.) 1986: 261-272.

Chafe, Wallace and Joanna Nichols (eds.) (1986). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Volume XX in the series Advances in Discourse Processes. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Coulthard, Malcolm (ed.) (1986). *Talking about Text: Studies Presented to David Brazil on his Retirement.* Discourse Analysis Monographs No. 13. University of Birmingham: English Language Research.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Sandra A. Thompson (2000). Concessive patterns in conversation. In Couper-Kuhlen, E. and B. Kortmann (eds.).

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Bernd Kortmann (eds.) (2000). *Cause-Condition-Concession-Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives* (Topics in English Linguistics 33). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dendale, Patrick and Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). Special issue on 'Evidentiality'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33 (2001): 339-464.

Downing, Angela (2001) "Surely you knew!" *Surely* as a marker of evidentiality and stance. *Functions of Language* 8.2. (2001), 253-285.

Eggins, Suzanne and Diana Slade (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.

Francis, Gill (1993). A corpus-driven approach to grammar: principles, methods and examples. In Baker *et al* (1993): 137-156.

Hunston, Susan and Gill Francis (1998). Verbs observed: A corpus-driven pedagogic grammar of English. *Applied Linguistics*,19: 45-72.

Holland, Dorothy and Naomi Quinn (eds.) (1987). *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kenesei, István and Robert M. Harnish (eds.) (2001). *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics and Discourse. A Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Labov, William (1972). *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, William and Joshua Walesky (1967). Narrative analysis. In Helm, June, (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 12-44.

Lakoff, George and Zoltán Kövecses (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In D. Holland and N. Quinn (eds.): 195-221.

Martin, James. and G.A.Plum (1997). Construing experience: Some story genres. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7 (1-4): 299-308.

Ochs, Elinor (ed.) (1989). The Pragmatics of Affect. Special Issue of *Text,* 9, 3.

Page, Ruth E. (2002). Evaluation in childbirth narratives told by women and men. *Discourse Studies*, Volume 4, (1):99-116.

Sinclair, John (1986). Fictional worlds. In Coulthard, ed., 1986: 43-60.

Sinclair, John (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winter, Eugene G. (1982). *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English: The Clause and its Place in the Definition of Sentence*. London: Allen & Unwin.