

# ***Linguistic and Extralinguistic Study of Evidentiality In English***

## **With Reference to Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby**

SAWSAN KAREEM

### **Abstract**

Evidentiality is a system within a language which tells the hearer how the speaker came about the knowledge that s/he is trying to communicate. Evidentiality can be defined as the linguistic expression of a speaker's source of information. In English, a speaker making a factual statement uses some means of expressing the source of evidence on which a proposition is based. This paper deals with evidentiality, the coding of the source of information and the commitment on the part of the speaker to his/her statement. Moreover the use of evidentiality has a pragmatic implication. Crosslinguistically, the essential distinction expressed is between direct (i.e. perceptual) and indirect evidence (inference, reports). English expresses evidential distinctions by various linguistic and extralinguistic markers; by means of modal auxiliaries, evidentials adverbials, miscellaneous phrases and etc.

### **1-Introduction**

In linguistics, the term 'evidentiality' has been recognized since Boas (1938), but only recently it has come to the attention of a larger number of linguists. This can be attributed mostly to the collected volumes on the topic by Chafe and Nichols (1986). A more recent typological comparison is Aikhenvald (2003) (Narrog, 2005:379).

As Franz Boas put it, languages differ not in what one can say but in what kind of information must be stated: "grammar [...] determines those aspects of each experience that must be expressed" (Boas, 1938:132) [as cited in Aikhenvald, 2004:2]. In any language including English, every statement must specify the type of source on which it is based. For example, whether the speaker saw it, or heard it, or inferred it from indirect evidence, or learnt it from someone else. This grammatical category whose primary meaning is information source is called "evidentiality".

In Boas's words (1938:133)

while for us definiteness, number, and time are obligatory aspects, we find in another language location near the speaker or somewhere else, [and] source of information whether seen, heard, or inferred—as obligatory aspects.

An early work on evidentiality is Chafe and Nichols (1986: vii). They state that there are some things "people are sure of, either because they have reliable evidence for them... Other languages express these and other attitudes toward knowledge in sometimes similar, sometimes quite different ways". Moreover, they add "the ways in which ordinary people... naturally regard the source and reliability of their knowledge... The term evidentiality has come to be used for such a device".

Evidentials, then, serve to indicate where a given piece of knowledge came from, and the degree of reliability the speaker assigns to it. (ibid).

Another recent typological work of importance is Aikhenvald and Dixon (2003). They say that "evidentiality is understood as stating that there is some evidence for some information this includes stating that there is some evidence, and also specifying what type of evidence there is"

### 1.1 Evidentiality in Linguistics

In linguistics, evidentiality is, broadly, the indication of the nature of evidence for a given statement, that is, whether evidence exists for the statement and / or what kind of evidence exists. Anderson (1986:274).

'Evidential' and 'evidence' as a linguistic category differs from evidence in common parlance. According to the definition in the Oxford English Dictionary (1999:260), "evidence' covers' the available facts, circumstances, etc. Supporting or otherwise a belief, proposition etc. or indicating whether or not a thing is true or valid".

While all the linguists agree that evidentials have something to do with the source of the information that is the basis for the assertion, there are different understandings for their semantic aspects. This results in different approaches to evidentials as a modal category.

Within one tradition, evidentiality is defined as a part of epistemic modality. Epistemic modality is in its turn understood as the semantic domain expressing the speaker's attitude toward the truth of the proposition. Evidentials express this by indicating the source of his information.

According to Lyons (1977:793), the epistemic modality is "concerned with the nature and source of knowing" and qualifies the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition. Lyons sees it as primarily evidential in nature. A similar understanding can be found in Chafe (1986). Chafe (1986: 271) defines evidentiality as "

any linguistic expression of attitudes toward knowledge", i. e. assessment of its reliability. Knowledge, according to him, has various modes: belief, hearsay, induction, expectation and deduction, each of which is based on a different source.

In Chafe's terminology, evidentiality in a narrow sense refers to making the source of knowledge. Evidentiality in a broad sense is making the speaker's attitude toward his /her knowledge or reality. Such view of evidentiality subsumes specification of probability, degree of precision or truth, and various extensions typically expressed with modalities.

In his book "mood and modality", Palmer (1986:51) claims that evidentiality is part of the epistemic modal system. According to him, both deal with the degree of commitment on the part of the speaker to the speech utterance. This means that Palmer considers evidentiality to be irrealis category.

There are at least four ways in which a speaker may indicate that he is not presenting what he is saying as a fact, but rather:

- (i) that he is speculating about it.
- (ii) that he is presenting it as a deduction.
- (iii) that he has been told about it.
- (iv) that it is a matter only of appearance, based on the evidence of (possibly fallible) senses.

... All four types are concerned with the indication by the speaker of his (lack of) commitment to the truth of the propositions being expressed.

Based on Palmer's own definitions, type (i) deals with pure epistemic modality, while (ii)-(iv) deal with evidentiality, namely inference, hearsay, and sensory evidence. Palmer makes this claim even more explicit: 'it would be a futile exercise to try to decide

whether a particular system is evidential rather than a judgment '.

On the same token, Gronemeyer (1997 :49 ) states that evidentiality is a part of epistemic modality as a category expressing the speaker's judgment of the degree of assertability of the truth of a proposition relative to the speaker's state of knowledge.

Another tradition places the evidentiality outside epistemic modality, strictly speaking. It emphasizes that evidentials indicate the source of the speaker's information, and need not necessarily be related to the extent of the speaker's belief in the truth of the proposition.

Chafe and Nichols (1986) argue that the epistemic moods code the relative truth of an assertion in general, while evidentials mark the reliability of the evidence on which they are based, that is ,the source of the knowledge. Moreover, Chung and Timberlake (1986) make a clear distinction between evidential and epistemic meanings. Epistemics characterize the situation with respect both to the actual world and other possible worlds , as evaluated by the speaker. On the other hand , evidentials evaluate the situation of the actual world with respect to the speaker's source of information (Oswalt ,1986:43).

All evidentiality does is supply the information source. The ways in which information is acquired –by seeing, hearing, or in any other way- is its core meaning. In Hardman' words (1986:121) ,marking data source and concomitant categories is ' not a function of truth or falsity'. The truth value of an utterance is not affected by an evidential. Moreover, in fact, an evidential can have a truth value of its own. It can be negated and questioned, without negating or questioning the predicate itself. Unlike most other grammatical categories, information source can be marked more than once in a

clause, reflecting the same observer, or different observers, perceiving the information through different compatible avenues.

Infantidous(2001:2) defines evidentiality broadly. She includes the term both the marking of the source of knowledge as in:

(1) I see him coming.

and the speaker's commitment to the truth of what is being said by using declarative sentences like:

(2) I guess he is coming.

Thus, evidentiality is a semantic category which may be realized grammatically, lexically or paraphrastically. Further, evidential categories involve both source of information and speaker commitment in their semantics.

## 1.2 The Pragmatics of Evidentiality

Much, if not most, of language use is about talking about things one knows about, regardless of how that knowledge may have been acquired and how speakers might assess the quality of that knowledge. Evidential forms are the linguistic forms par excellence with capture the expression of a speaker's relationship to their knowledge.(Mushin ,2001:52)

The use of evidentiality has pragmatic implication. For example , a person who makes a false statement qualified as a belief may be considered mistaken ; a person who makes a false statement qualified as personally observed fact will probably be considered to have lied. (Faust ,1973: 369 )

Evidential sentences have multifaceted meaning – in – context , and this makes them of vital interest to be studied exploring all kinds of multidimensionality , including those that drive from presupposition accommodation , conversational implicature , and illocutionary force. In this paper the

researcher does not stand on the nature of these meanings. Rather, the meaning component that seems to drive most directly from presence of the evidential morpheme: a speaker's commitment to the existence of a situation of a certain type is highlighted in this paper. (Speas, 2000:3)

Consider the following English sentences:

- (3) a. He got burned ( I have direct evidence , i. g., I saw it happen )  
 b. I burned my hand( I feel the sensation of burning in my hand )  
 c. They must have gotten burned ( I see circumstantial evidence signs of fire, bandages, burn cream).  
 d. They got burned, they say, ( I am reporting what I was told )

In (3 a), the speaker commits himself/herself to having direct evidence of the propositional content. In (3 b) and (3 c), the speaker commits himself/herself to have direct evidence expressed by sensory evidence with its non visual type and to have an inferential depending on direct evidence of the propositional content respectively. Further, in (3 d), the speaker commits himself/herself to have heard a report of the propositional content.

There is a persistent intuition that these morphemes form a hierarchy based on an abstract notion of strength that related intimately to evidence types.

Cross-linguistically, evidential constructions fall into one of just a handful of categories:

- (1) Personal experience >> direct evidence >> indirect evidence >> hearsay. (Willett, 1988 :57)

Willett treats the categories in (1) as pragmatic categories, and posits that they are arranged in a pragmatic hierarchy. This hierarchy corresponds to how reliable the speaker feels the evidence to be. In other words, the categories of evidentiality lie in a hierarchy, corresponding to the degree to which the evidence directly involves the speaker's own experience.

According to Speas (2000:2), evidentials are perceived to be stronger than others, and that this can, in turn, impact perceptions about the speaker's commitment to the main clause content.

Comments on this pragmatic hierarchy saying that at the top of the hierarchy is personal experience of the situation; next is inference from sensory evidence, which involves the speaker's own experience making the inference and also of perceiving the situation, but not direct experience of the situation itself. Inference from indirect evidence is next, as it involves the speaker's experience of making the inference, but no other experience. With hearsay, the speaker has no experience at all with the reported situation, and so this category is at the bottom. (ibid.)

The pragmatic account of this hierarchy does not predict that the restriction to only four categories. Rather, this restriction is given the range of ways that notions about knowledge sources and reliability can be expressed when adverbs, modals auxiliaries or propositional attitudes predicates are used to express them (Speas, 2001 :3). For examples,

- (4) It must be bad weather  
 (5) I deduce that it is bad weather  
 (6) My mother tells me it is bad weather  
 (7) I guess it is bad weather  
 (8) Apparently it is bad weather  
 (9) It seems to be bad weather

It is generally assumed that the features expressed by such markers of evidentiality are pragmatic in nature: they reflect an evaluation of the source of evidence, which is made by the speaker of a given discourse.

### 1-3 The classification of evidential categories:

Evidentiality is traditionally divided into two main categories: direct evidentiality, which shows that the speaker has directly the action, and indirect evidentiality, which shows that the speaker has no direct

evidence for his /her statement , but has other sources for making the statement. Typical direct evidential categories are visual and auditory evidence, stating that the speaker has respectively seen and heard the action. Indirect evidentials can be inferentials , which mean that the speaker has inferred the action from available evidence, and quotatives, which states the speaker knows about the event from being told by another person( Dehaan , 2005 :1-2).

The reasoning for treating evidentiality as a modal category is the belief that one is inherently less certain about actions one was not witnessed than about those one has witnessed. This belief is anchored in the fact that when one sees something with one's own eyes ,one tends to accept that sight as a true representation of the world while a second hand report is viewed with more suspicion. Hence , indirect evidentiality presents the action as less certain than does direct evidentiality ( Dehaan, 2004: 49 )

### 1.3.1 Direct Evidentiality

#### 1.3.1.1 Sensory Evidentiality

Palmer (1986 : 74-5 ) states that sensory evidentiality is an evidential signaling that the speaker evidence for the truth of his or her statement is derived from the speaker's own sensory experience. Sensory evidentiality can often divided into different types. Some languages mark visual evidence differently from nonvisual evidence that is heard, smelled or felt.

#### 1.3.1.1 Visual Evidentiality

Visual evidentials are defined as those morphemes that show that the information contained in the speaker's utterance has been witnessed personally by the speaker ; the speaker has seen the action described in the sentence (Dehaan ,1998 : 2).

The visual evidentiality usually covers information acquired through seeing, and also generally known and observable facts It

may be extended to indicate certainty.(Aikhenvald, 2006:324)

(10) I see him coming.

(11)He is gone to work. (I saw him go)

The category of visual evidentiality refers to the deictic situation in which the speaker is in visual distance of the action described.

#### 1.3.1.2 Nonvisual Evidentiality

On the other hand, auditory evidentiality is nonvisual evidential that signals that the speaker's evidence for the truth of his statement is based on what he has heard (Oswalt , 1986 : 37).

Other direct evidentials include auditory evidentials which denote that the information was perceived by hearing the action involved, and nonvisual sensory evidence which denotes that the action was perceived by any of the senses except sight. Also, languages can not make a distinction at all and have sensory evidential to denote all types of direct evidence. (De haan ,1998 : 3 ).

The using of auditory evidentiality markers has a crucial reference to the extralinguistic context. For instance, an auditory can only be used in certain situation in which the speaker has heard the action or event he |she is describing. This also implies that action or event is capable of making sounds. (Anderson and Keenar , 1985:259)

Auditory evidentials appear to be routinely from the verb " hear "

(11) I heard sally singing.

(Dehaan, 2005:2)

Non visual sensory evidentiality refers to information acquired by smell, touch, or feeling and has no epistemic extension.

### 1.3.2 Indirect Evidentiality

#### 1.3.2.1 Reportative Evidentiality

The reported evidential is systematically uniform in systems of all types. Its core meaning is to mark that information comes from

someone else's report. A reported evidential can be used as a quotative, to indicate the exact authorship of the information, or to indicate a direct quote. It can be a second hand or third hand report. A report evidential may develop an epistemic extension of unreliable information. (Aikhenval, 2006:324)

Faust (1973:69) defines quotative evidential as "an evidential that signals that some else is the source of statement made". For example,

(12) Reportedly, while he was going (in the boat), he turned over.

Similarly, Oswald (1986: 37) says that quotative evidentiality states that the speaker knows about the event from being told by another person. Reportative evidentials indicate that the information was reported to the speaker by another person. Reportative includes both hearsay evidentials and quotative evidentials. While hearsay evidentials indicate reported information that may or may not be accurate, quotative evidentials indicate the information is accurate and not open to interpretation (i.e. is like a direct quotation).

(13) It is said that she will do it.

(14) She says that she will do it.

(Faust, 1973: 273)

Although quotative and auditory evidential categories are usually not thought of as having much in common, they do have in common the fact that the speaker receives auditory input in both cases. In the case of the quotative the input is verb, namely a description of an event received by a third person. In the case of auditory evidentiality the input

consists of event itself. The distinction between them is marked in the complement clauses of verbs like "to hear", as in (15) and (16) below. The differences between the (a) and the (b) sentences is that the (a)

sentences show the hearing of the singing, while the (b) sentences mark the hearing of the report of the singing. (De haan, 2005 : 21).

(15) a. I heard Sally sing.

b. I heard that Sally had sung.

(16) a. I heard Sally's singing.

b. I heard of Sally's singing

There are then differences and similarities between the role of the speaker in both cases and this can be reflected in the coding of the evidential. In the case of the (a) sentences the speaker serves as the experiential center of the act of hearing, but in the (b) sentences he is the recipient of the act of somebody else's report. In other words, the deictic relation between the speaker and the action is closer in the (a) sentences than in the (b) sentences.

### 1.3.2.2 Inferentiality

The evidence category of inference is used in which the speaker has witnessed the action personally, but has witnessed evidential traces of that action. An example is shown in (4) in which the action, the rotting of the plant, was not, but rather deduced from the end result.

(17) It rotted (said of a plant after pulling it up to examine it).

(De haan, 2005:16)

A witness evidential indicates that the information source was direct observation by the speaker. Usually this is from visual observation (eye witness), but some languages also mark information directly heard with an indirectly seen. A witness evidential is usually contrasted with a non witness evidential which indicates that the information was not witnessed personally but was obtained through a secondhand source or was inferred by the speaker. A second hand evidential is used to mark any information that was not personally observed or experienced by the speaker.

De haan ( 2005:6) points out that inferentiality is in fact a hybrid direct / indirect evidential category , because the speaker is aware of the evidence for the action. Thus, in example (17) above inferential can be used because the speaker has personally witnessed the evidence. If s/he had not, then the inferential would not have been used.

For this reason, a distinction between witnessing an event and witnessing the result of an event in their choice of complement clauses is made. A common example in (18) from English:

(18) a. John saw Mary cross (ing) the road.

b. John saw that Mary had crossed the road.

Sentences (5a), with its infinite embedded clause, is used to denote witnessing of an event, while (18b) , with a finite embedded clause , is

used when the result of an action is witnessed , but not the action itself.

Hence, (18a) denote simultaneity of perception and action, while (18b) denotes that perception is subsequent to the action (as also evidenced by the choice of verb tense in the embedded clauses). (ibid:16-17)

The inferred evidential typically covers inference based on visual evidence, or non visual sensory evidence, on reasoning or on assumption.

It is also used to refer to someone else's ' internal states ' –feelings, knowledge ,and the like. It may acquire an epistemic extension of uncertainty. (Aikhevnald,2006:324)

#### 1.4 Markers of Evidentiality

Evidentiality is expressed by various grammatical, lexical, discursal and pragmatic markers. This section is a survey of the devices in which evidentiality is formally expressed in English. These

devices are used to convey various attitudes towards knowledge.

##### 1.4.1 Grammatical markers

English modal "must " is considered to have evidential readings as a possible interpretation. This is true, but the presence of evidential interpretation does not make it a fully grammaticalized evidential. (Dehaan , 1999 :90 )

Interestingly, Sweetser (1999: 61) paraphrases sentence (19a) with (19b) in which a high degree of emphasis is placed on the probability based on evidence.

(19) a. You must have been home last night.

b. the available (direct ) evidence compels to the conclusion that you were home last night.

Thus ,a sentence such as (20 a) would be described as (partly) evidential due to the fact that epistemic necessity is based on some kind of evidence the speaker has for the statement. This evidence can be expressed overtly, as in (20b).

(20) a. John must be at home.

b. The light is on.

On this interpretation of "must " the speaker bases his or her statement on evidence and in this sense, "must " can be said to have evidential

nuances. However, more importantly, the speaker also introduces a degree of doubt into the statement. In other words, "must" in these cases is an epistemic modal, and not an evidential. As can be seen from (20c )and (20d ) below , the same evidence that is used to assert (20 a ) , namely (20 b )" the light is on " , can also be used to assert (20 c ) , a simply declarative sentence. It can even be used to assert (20d ) a sentence using the modal verb "may ", which is modal with a weaker force than "must". (De haan , 1999:91)

(20) c. John is at home , because the light is on.

d. John may be at home , because the light is on.

Epistemic modals "may "and " might " can be used on the basis of available evidence; in fact, they ordinary are, for it would be peculiar for a speaker to assert the possibility or likelihood of something based on no evidence. But they differ in not expressing their sources explicitly; someone processing an utterance with a true modal has no way to determine how the speaker arrived at her conclusion. Evidential modals express their sources explicitly. ((McCready & Ogata, 2006: 6)

(21) I'm hearing a sound from the garden.

There may be a cat (there).

#### 1.4.2 Lexical Markers

Every language has some way of referring to the source of information, but not every language has grammatical evidentiality. Having lexical means for optional specification of the source of knowledge is probably universal.

##### 1.4.2.1 Lexical adverbs and adjectives

Mushin (2001:56) asserts that English lacks clear grammatical markers of evidentiality. However, she comes to say that English compensates for such lack of reportive means by other identifiable means by which speakers express, for instance, that the story they are

telling was the product of someone else's. In particular, she notes

that English does have a rich inventory of adverbials of " propositional attitudes" such as (certainly, probably, obviously possibly, undoubtedly, etc.)

In English, evidentiality can be illustrated by evidential adverbs as in:

(22) Apparently it rained last night.

This example indicates that the speaker not witnessed the raining event, but rather draws an inference on the basis of observation result as large puddles of water

on the ground. The expression of evidentiality in English is lexical.

Furthermore, English language has means of specify the source of information. There are lexical words (adverbials) like " reportedly" and "allegedly".

(23) Reportedly, while he was going (in his boat he turned over )

(24) Allegedly there were, it is said large forests here language . (Chung & Timberlake , 1985: 245)

On the other hand, adjectives can be used to express an inference such as:

(25) It is obvious \ evident \apparent that it is raining.

(Chafe , 1986 : 266 )

##### 1.4.2.2 Lexical verbs and Miscellaneous phrases

On the other hand, evidentiality may not be considered as a grammatical category in English because it is expressed in diverse way and is always optional. In addition , the speaker is required to mark the main verb or the sentences as a whole for evidentiality , or offer an optional set of affix for indirect evidentiality , with direct experience being the default assumed mode of evidentiality.(Faust ,1973 : 5 )

Consider these English sentences:

(26) I am hungry.

(27) Bob is hungry.

It is unlikely to say the second unless someone (perhaps, Bob himself) has told that Bob is hungry. (it might still say for someone incapable of speaking for himself , such as a baby or a pet ) .

If it is simply assumed that Bob is hungry based on the way he looks or acts , and it is more likely to say some like :

(28) Bob looks hungry.

(29) Bob seems hungry

Here the fact it is relying on the sensory evidence rather than on direct experience, is



conveyed by the using of the verbs " look "or " seem".

While some verbs express sensory evidentiality like (feel, smell), indirect evidentiality also can be expressed through indirect perception verbs (weak assertions) as in:

(30) It feels \ looks \ smells\ sounds like it is raining. (Chafe, 1986: 266)

Furthermore, there are other lexical means to express evidentiality in English like " They say, I hear that, I see that , I think that , as I hear , as I can see , as far as , I understand , it is said , it seems ,it seems to me that , it looks like , it appears that , it turns out the, etc.)

To express a hearsay evidence, one can use direct (31) and indirect speech(32)and (33) as in:

(31) Joe said ,' it is raining'.

(32) Joe says it is raining.

(33) They say it is raining.

The speaker gives Joe responsibility for the truth of the statement, without repeating his words. (Chafe ,1986 : 268 )

On the other hand, in using the verbs of reporting " hear , reported "

The speaker ascribes responsibility to unnamed sources.

(34) I hear it is raining.

(35) It is reported to be raining. (ibid)

#### 1.4.2.3 Parenthetical Markers

A valuable discussion of 'parenthetic' expressions in English, which are widely used to optionally indicate the source of information. These lexical means can be of different statuses. They may include " I guess, I think , I supposed".(Gronemeyer, 1997 :95)

(36) I think\ guess \ suppose it is raining(or it is raining , I think \guess\ suppose.)

(37) The ball, I think , is over the line.

Pragmatic inference plays a major role in their interpretation (e.g., the strength of an

assertion with the parenthetical "I think" depends on who the speaker is.)(Infantidou, 2001:2)

#### 1.4.3 Extalinguistic Markers

Evidentiality is expressed by the term " hedge ". Hedge was introduced by Lackoff (1972) and has generally been defined as " words whose job is to make more or less fuzzy "

Hedges are expressions which mark a proposition as "only approximately true "

(38) It is sort of a book ( it is not a typical book )

(39) It is sort of \ kind of raining ( it is not ' really ' raining)

Or they express a proposition as approximation like the following example,

(40) It rained about \ approximately three inches.

According to Chafe (1986:269) the above examples express a degree of reliability.

#### 1.4.4 Discoursal Markers

The following markers suggest that the proposition is either in line with or opposed to what the speaker thinks the hearer expects to be the case.

(29) Of course / in fact / actually / oddly enough, it's raining.

#### 1. 5 The analysis of Evidentiality

In this section , texts are chosen from THE GREAT GATSBY to be analyzed. The choose of this novel of the nineteenth century reflects clearly the use of evidentiality since it reflects the American dream that man wants to achieve. These chosen texts will be analyzed in relation to semantic and pragmatic aspects of evidentiality.

Text (1)

'Wait!' commanded Daisy as I started my motor. 'I forget to ask you something, and it's important. We heard you're engaged to a girl out West. '

'That's right, ' agreed Tom. 'We heard that you're going to marry.' (p.9)

The opening of the conversation contains an important indicator of propositional attitude on the part of the speaker who is " Daisy ".She ascribes evidentiality by using a verb of report ' heard '.In this context, Daisy is not committed to the truth of proposition i.e. her speech does not entail that she believes the proposition.The same reportative event is repeated by Tom saying " we heard that...." asking his friend Nick about his engagement. Moreover, the role of the speakers can be reflected in the coding of evidential. In both sentences, Daisy and Tom are the recipients of the act of somebody else's report. In this text, the source of information represents reportative evidential. In both cases, Daisy and Tom ascribe responsibility to unnamed sources. Thus, according to Chafe (1986), these two sentences express the attitude of hearsay evidence expressing by indirect evidence. On the other hand, the verb " heard " can be used as direct evidential as in the following text.

I couldn't sleep all night. Towards dawn, I heard a taxi go up Gatsby's drive immediately I jumped out of bed. I felt that I had something to tell him and to warn him about. (P.80)

This context shows the hearing of a taxi: it's Gatsby returning to his house which represents auditory evidence which is direct evidence. As the speaker " Nick " is closer to the event, he serves the experiential center of the act of hearing. The sentence here which expressing evidentiality under normal circumstances entails that the speaker has a justified belief in proposition, i.e. knows proposition, or more accurately, has come to know the proposition.The speaker asserts the truth commitment to the event being described.

Text ( 2 )

One afternoon late in October, I saw Tom Bunchanan walking restlessly ahead of me along Fifth Avenue. I began to walk more slowly to avoid him, but he stopped to look into the window of a jewellery store and saw me. He came back, holding out his hand. (p.98)

The speaker" Nick" here uses the marker of evidentiality " I saw" which expresses a sense of perceptual knowledge of evidence on the part of him. This marker, in Chafe's (1986) account, implies degree of reliability. In this context, Nick sees the referent in front of him and his heightened the sense of reliability arises from the certainty of seeing Tom walking restlessly..Thus the verb "saw" in the text expresses direct source of information which is sensory evidentiality in its visual type.

Text (3)

'Aunt Jordan's got a white dress, too, ' said the child.

'Do you like your mother's friends?' Daisy turned her to face Gatsby. 'Do you think they're pretty?'

'Where's Daddy?'

'She doesn't look like her father,' explained Daisy. 'She looks like me.' (p.60)

In this text, Daisy expresses a weak assertion by using indirect perception verb " look like ". This verb declines the inference from the direct witness of the event itself.Daisy uses some evidence at hand (the similarity between them in certain aspects and behaviors) as the basis for her claim. In his inference, she comes to believe the proposition, but on the basis of evidence insufficient to justify knowledge.

Text (4)

Mr Sloane lay back in his chair and said nothing. The woman said nothing either until she had had two drinks.

'Well all come to your next party, Mr Gatsby,' she then suggested. 'Certainly, I'd be delighted.'

'Very nice,' said Mr Sloane without meaning it. 'But now we ought to go.' (p. 53)

The situation here reflects a suggestion by Mr. Sloane to attend the party which Mr. Gatsby will make it. Mr Gatsby's answer to him using the evidential marker 'Certainly' signals a message which specifies his strength of commitment towards the force of the basic message. This is consistent with fact that this marker comments on the strength of the belief and this is expressed only in declaratives.

Text (5)

She was very nervous when we left New York, and she thought driving would help. But then this woman rushed out at us. It seemed to me that she wanted to speak to us, that she thought she knew us. But we were just passing a car coming the other way, and first Daisy turned away from the woman towards the other car and then she turned back. (p. 78)

In this context, inference is conveyed by the evidential marker "it seemed to me". Here the knowledge based on inference from direct evidence and this is an induction. Moreover, the sense of inference that arises is an implicature stemming from the kind of evidence needed for use of this evidential. In this context, the marker of evidentiality "it seemed to me" is classified as "hedge" and has been seen as indicating that the speaker is uncertain that the woman in the car comes to talk to them. The speaker uses this marker in his utterance to reveal some aspect of his current state of mind, some condition of the knowledge or beliefs he is seeking to communicate.

Text (6)

Gatsby moved us both forwards to a table. "This is a nice restaurant here" said Mr Wolfsheim. 'But I like the one across the street better! It's hot and small, but full of memories.' (p. 35)

The speaker "Mr. Wolfsheim" is making an assertion and indicating that there is some evidential basis for this claim. The specific source of the evidence is direct. This so-called quotative evidentiality which refers to an internal source of evidence. Quotative evidentiality here indicates that the information is accurate. The reason for such speech to be considered as quotative is that it involves inserting a communicative verb to indicate that the source of the information been transmitted is hearsay. So the speaker here is committed to the proposition of his statement.

Text (7)

It was on this night that he told me the strange story of his time with Dan Cody – told me because Tom had destroyed 'Jay Gatsby'. He would have told me anything now, I think, but he wanted to talk about Daisy. (p. 80)

The speaker "Nick" here uses a reportative evidence by using the verb 'told' which tends to convey a hearsay evidence. Here Nick tells us that this is the time when he learned of Gatsby's early days with Dan Cody. Gatsby also tells Nick how he first met Daisy. Within the same context there is another marker of evidentiality that is "I think". This text contains an important propositional attitude on the part of the speaker. The speaker (Nick) uses the belief expression "I think" in his utterance. He, thereby, explicitly qualify his commitment to the truth of his respective proposition. This expression "I think" expresses the deductive mode of reasoning by using "

would ". Such deductive reasoning involves 'intuitive ' leaps to hypotheses on the part of the interlocutor, from which conclusion is deduced. Speaker's 'would' indicates some degree of reliability in the speaker's mind, evidently due to deductive reasoning, indicating certainty of knowledge. Nevertheless, it is what may be called, "soften" certainty. In this respect, the use of 'would ' has the effect of qualifying the proposition content. It expresses the speaker's propositional attitude.

### Conclusion:

The term " evidentiality " literally evokes the notion of evidence: the source from which a speaker comes to know something that he \she wants to express in language. Besides, evidentiality broadly involves the speaker's assessment of the propositional content of the utterance in terms of its informational source and \ or the degree of speaker's attitude towards knowledge. Direct evidentials are used when the speaker has some sort of sensory evidence for the action or event he / she describing. Normally, a direct evidential denotes visual and auditory evidence. Indirect evidentials are used when the speaker was not a witness to the event but when he/ she learned of it after the fact. There are two broad subcategories, inference and quotative. Pragmatically, these evidential categories have been classified into four: personal experience – direct – indirect –and finally hearsay. These categories depend on the degree of reliability to which the evidence involves the speaker's own experience.

Source distinctions are encoding in English through a variety of evidential markers with the attitudes of knowledge they tend to express. These markers have been divided into, grammatical, lexical, discursal and pragmatism. Thus, in English, evidentiality is neither grammatical nor lexical but it is a

mixture of linguistic and extralinguistic markers.

Moreover, the analysis of certain texts from THE GREAT GATSBY reveals that evidentiality involves both the source of information and speakers commitment in their semantics. In addition, the analysis reflects the pragmatic feature of evidentiality in certain context in which it is used.

### Bibliography:

- Aikhenvald , Alexandra. 2004. Evidentiality.Oxford University Press.
- -----, 2003. "Evidentiality in typological perspective ". In Aikhenvald & Dixon Studies in Evidentiality pp.1-31. John Benjamins.
- Aikhenvald, A. & R.W.Dixon.2003. Studies in Evidentiality. Amestrdam:John Benjamins Publishing Company .
- Anderson ,L.B.1986 " Evidential paths of change , and mental maps: typologically regular a symmetries". In Wallace Chafe and Nichols (eds.) Evidentiality :The linguistic coding of epistemology.273- 312.Norwood ,new jersey :Ablex publishing Corporation.
- Chafe,Wallace & Johanna Nickols 1986.Evidentiality : The linguistic coding of Epistemology.Norwood. Nj :Albex.
- Chafe, Wallace 1986."Evidentiality in English Conversation and academic writing " In Wallace Café & Nickols (eds.) Evidentiality :The linguistic coding of epistemology. 261-272 Norwood, Newjersey :Albex Publishing Corporation.
- Chung, Sandra, and Alan Timberlake. 1985."Tense, aspect, and mood". In Shopen 1985d 202–258. 9683101704.

- De haan ,F. 1998."Visual evidentiality and its origins".Ms. University of Arizona.
- ----- 1999."Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality : Setting Boundries ".Southwest Journal of Linguistics 18 , 83-101.
- -----2005. "Encoding Speaker Perspective : Evidentials". In Frajzyngier and Rood(eds) Linguistic diversity and theories. Amsterdam: Benjamins. .
- Faust, Norma. 1973.Lecciones para el aprendizaje del idioma Shipibo-Conibo. Lima, Peru: Summer Institute of Linguistics
- Gonomyer, Claire.1997. " Evidentiality in Lithuanian ". Working Paper. Lund University. 46, 93 -112.
- Ifanitidou ,Elly (2001) Evidentials and Relevance. Review by Stanka A. Fitneva. John Benjamins
- Lyons,John.1977. Semantics.Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- McCready, Eric & Norry Ogata.2006. "Evidentiality , Modality and probability".Klumer. Academic Publishing Netherland.
- Mushin ,I.2001.Evidentiality and Epestimology stance :Narrative Retelling. Amesterdam , John Benjumins PublishingCo.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2005 "Review of Aikhenvald ,( 2004) Evidentiality". Sky Journal of Linguistics 18 379-388.
- Oswalt,R. L.1986."The Evidential System of Kashaya". In Chafe and Nichols, 29-45.
- Oxford English Dictionary.1999.pnblishing in Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, Frank R.1986. Mood and Modality. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Speas,Margaret. (2000)" The Pragmatic Value of evidentiality". Ithaca,NY:CLC Publication.
- Willett, Thomas L.1988."A cross-linguistic Survey of the Grammaticalization of Evidentiality". Studies in language 12 51 -97.
- Wikipedia , the free encyclopedia (2006) Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a U.S. registered 501(c)(3) tax-deductible nonprofit charity.

#### الخلاصة:

دراسة لغوية للدلائلية في اللغة الانكليزية  
 الدلائلية هي نظام في اللغة والتي فيها يخبر المستمع كيف أن المتكلم يأتي بالمعرفة التي يحاول أن يتصل بواسطتها مع الآخرين. تُعرف الدلائلية بأنها تعبير لغوي للمتكلم عن مصدر المعلومات. في اي لغة من ضمنها اللغة الانكليزية يجعل المتكلم جملة الحقيقة باستخدام بعض الوسائل المعبرة عن مصدر البرهان والتي تعتمد عليها الفكرة. يُعنى هذا البحث بالدلائلية كونها تستقصي مصدر المعلومات ودرجة التزام المتحدث بجمليته. واستخدام الدلائلية يعبر عن وجود التداولية ضمن سياق كلام المتحدث. لغويا، هنالك تمييز جوهري بين الدليل المباشر (المُدرك أو المُلحظ) والدليل الغير المباشر (الاستدلال و المنقول). تُعبر اللغة الانكليزية عن التمييزات الدلائلية باستخدام وسائل لغوية وما فوق اللغة منها الأفعال المساعدة والظروف الدلائلية والتراكيب والعبارات.