DE GRUYTER OPEN

The functions of external voices in hard news Appraisal: A dialogic perspective

Zuzana Nádraská
University of Pardubice, Czech Republic

Abstract

This paper discusses the interaction between voices in the so-called Appraisal satellite, a section in the generic structure of hard news concerned with evaluation (White, 1998). The discussion focuses primarily on the interplay between external voices brought into the discourse by various forms of presentation, i.e. forms of reporting the language of others (Semino and Short, 2004); in addition, the paper touches upon the interplay between external voices and the internal authorial voice of the journalist. External voices are considered in terms of the function they fulfil in hard news Appraisal. Prototypically, external voices serve as the main source of evaluation but also fulfil various subsidiary roles; for instance, voices serve as the target of evaluation, express attitude, and provide a summary, background information and justification. Correspondences are found between voice functions and forms of presentation. Voice functions are interpreted from a dialogic perspective, more specifically in terms of their potential to expand and contract the established dialogic space (Martin and White, 2005).

Key words

Introduction

In this paper I examine the occurrence of external voices evoked by forms of presentation (i.e. forms of reporting the language of others, reported language) in the genre of hard news. The issues of voice and reported language have attracted considerable attention in many studies which examine them both generally and in specific genres, including media genres, and which address them from a number of perspectives. Considering current research, an ideological perspective on the presence of external voices and reported language is adopted by Calsamiglia and Lopéz Ferrero (2003), Garretson and Ädel (2008) and Piazza (2009), who examine various aspects of reporting practices in different genres. An evaluative-evidential perspective is found in Hunston (1999), Bergler (1992; 2006) and Bednarek (2006a). An argumentative (rhetorical) angle is adopted by Smirnova (2009) or García Riaza (2012, pp. 250-270).

This paper synthesises the dialogic and generic perspectives. As regards the generic perspective, i.e. the roles voices play in the generic structure of hard news, I draw on White (1997; 1998; 2000; 2012) and Urbanová (2013). White (1997; 1998; 2000) pays attention to two key features of hard news, namely the typical generic structure referred to as the orbital structure and the so-called reporter voice, i.e. a kind of authorial voice devoid of internal evaluation. Following White (1998), in Urbanová (2013) I show that compared to other parts of the generic structure, the Appraisal satellite (i.e. a section in the generic structure whose aim is to appraise) is notable for the occurrence of voices realized by direct reported language, and only a small number of Appraisal satellites do not rely on any direct forms and are built solely upon non-direct forms and narrative authorial discourse. The overwhelming presence of external voices in the Appraisal satellite and the fact that their words are reported predominantly in a fully direct form point to the effort to background the journalistic voice and foreground the external voice to the maximum possible extent. Reported language is thus a major source of voice and dialogue in hard news Appraisal.

As regards the dialogic perspective on voices and forms of presentation, this paper draws on Bakhtin (1981), Semino and Short (2004), and Martin and White (2005). Martin and White (2005) describe a system of engagement, i.e. language means which enable the author to accept or reject different dialogic alternatives and thus further affect the established dialogic space. The dialogic dimension is also an important aspect of White's (1997; 1998; 2000) concept of authorial voice and the concept of hard news as a social process; however, White does not examine in more detail the (rhetorical/generic) roles voices perform in Appraisal (or hard news in general), their mutual relations and the effect voices with particular functions have on the established dialogic space. My contribution to the discussion presented in White (1998; 2012) and Urbanová (2013) is a synthesis of generic and dialogic perspectives: I examine voices in terms of voice function, i.e. the way they contribute to the realization of Appraisal, and the potential of voices performing different functions to maintain/open or diminish a heteroglossic context. In addition, I try to identify the relations between voice functions and forms of presentation.

1. Theoretical background
1.1. Hard news – function and generic structure

The aim of hard news is to identify an event of extra-linguistic reality which potentially or actually destabilizes or threatens the established status quo and accepted social norms; it often reports on events that cause harm and damage, change power relations or deviate from established morality (White, 1997). Compared to other stories, the hard news story purportedly fulfils its goal in a manner that is objective and impersonal (White, 1998; 2000; Feez, Iedema and White, 2008).

Hard news is characterized by two features which are instrumental in fulfilling its communicative aim, namely reporter voice and the orbital generic structure. Reporter voice is a kind of authorial voice, "constructed as impersonal, as anonymous or even absent, as the voice of the institution of journalism rather than of a human individual" (Feez, Iedema and White, 2008, p. 201). It is a "strategic impersonalization by which the journalist's evaluative role is backgrounded and that of the quoted source foregrounded" (White, 2012, p. 58). Reporter voice shuns certain kinds of authorial evaluation, especially those evaluating human behaviour (judgment) and things (appreciation), and is largely limited to expressing non-authorial affect (White, 1998, pp. 145-154, 169-245; Martin and White, 2005, pp. 42-91, 161-209; Feez, Iedema and White, 2008, pp. 200-248). Authorial evaluation is implicit, overt and inferred on the part of the reader; explicit evaluation is confined to quoted sources allowing the hard news text to advance particular attitudinal positions (White, 2012, pp. 58-59).

The orbital generic structure consists of the nucleus, namely the Headline(s) and Lead, and a number of specifying satellites. The nucleus identifies a socially, politically or economically disrupting event, establishes the angle from which news is presented and underscores certain aspects of an event as important, noteworthy and newsworthy. A satellite is a section of a news story which fulfils a particular function and is characterized by strong functional and formal affinity with the nucleus. Satellites specify the nucleus in various ways while inter-satellite links tend to be scarce (White, 1997; 1998, pp. 246-375; 2000; Feez, Iedema and White, 2008, pp. 100-115). The taxonomy of nucleus-satellite relations includes Elaboration, Contextualization, Cause-Effect relations and Appraisal. [1] Even though focus is placed on voices in the Appraisal satellite, the other satellite types and their functions will be described since the present study has found that some of the subsidiary roles voices play in Appraisal are semantically or pragmatically comparable to the kind of specifications other satellites provide to the nucleus. Only the relations which are relevant to the description of the functions voices play in the Appraisal satellite will be commented upon.

Let us start with the Appraisal satellite. Appraisal evaluates the nucleus in affective, aesthetic or moral terms, commenting on its emotional impact or referring to some set of value judgments (White, 1997; 1998, pp. 278, 339-340; 2000, p. 384). Another nucleus-satellite relation that is relevant to voice functions is that of Justification, one of the textual Cause-and-Effect relations; a satellite with the Justification function provides evidence or reasoning for the proposition or proposal in the nucleus (White, 1998, p. 340). Another similarity between voice and satellite functions is in the Contextualization satellite, whose role is to provide spatial-temporal and social context, specify events which precede, follow or take place simultaneously with the event in the nucleus or are presented for comparison (White, 1997; 1998, pp. 278, 339-340; 2000, p. 384).

1.2 Voice – dialogue and forms of presentation

Let us now move on to the issues of voice, dialogue and monologue, and forms of presentation (FoP).

The concept of voice is inextricably connected with the issue of monologue and dialogue, or monoglossia and heteroglossia – the notions which form the framework for interpretation in the present paper. Bakhtin (1981, p. 281) understands dialogue as "the background

---

[1] In the present paper the generic use of the term Appraisal referring to the Appraisal satellite (capitalized) is to be distinguished from its non-generic use applied to the system of evaluation in Appraisal theory outlined in e.g. Martin (1997), White (1998) and Martin and White (2005).

of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions, points of view and value judgements [...] in the consciousness of the listener, [...] pregnant with responses and objections". One type of dialogic discourse, the so-called hidden dialogue, is described as a conversation with an "invisible speaker", whose imaginary, unspoken words, however, have a direct bearing on the utterance of a present, visible speaker (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 197). On the other hand, monologic discourse (bare propositions) refuses to recognize another consciousness, suppresses heteroglossic divergence, does not expect the other's response and presents information as if it were without potential opposition (Bakhtin, 1984, pp. 292-293; White, 1998, p. 382). Discourse which engages with dialogic alternatives is grounded either in the subjectivity of the internal voice of the author or the subjectivity of an external voice; the former case is referred to as intra-vocalization and can be achieved e.g. by means of epistemic modal expressions, while the latter is referred to as extra-vocalization and is typically achieved by means of attribution/FoP (White, 1998, p. 390; 2012, p. 61). In accordance with reporter voice, in hard news the authorial journalistic voice is to a considerable extent subdued, while external voices are foregrounded. FoP in hard news make (some of) the invisible external voices visible and explicit; the materialized voices may lead a dialogue with those remaining in the background, including the audience and possible other (adversarial or concurring) voices.

Applying Bakhtin's (1981; 1984) notion of dialogue, White (1998, pp. 115-144) and Martin and White (2005, pp. 92-135) describe the system of engagement, a component of their appraisal system providing resources that enable authors to take a stance towards the values existing inside and outside the text. The individual engagement categories differ in terms of the author's overt alignment with the evoked voice and thus in the potential to maintain or weaken the heteroglossic backdrop. The aspect of authorial dialogic positioning, or to what extent the established dialogic space is maintained or narrowed, is captured in the concepts of dialogic expansion and contraction: dialogic expansion engages with dialogic alternatives by accepting and inviting alternative positions and thus opens the dialogic space, while dialogic contraction engages with dialogic alternatives by challenging and dismissing them and thus closes the dialogic space (Martin and White, 2005, pp. 102-104).

Dialogic expansion and contraction are divided into a number of sub-categories, not all of which are relevant to the present paper. Since this study focuses on voices evoked by FoP, of importance is especially attribution, a sub-category of dialogic expansion. The expansive category of attribution "dissociates the text's internal authorial voice by attributing ... [the proposition] to some external source", typically by means of reporting verbs of saying and thinking, nominalizations of these verbs and reporting adjuncts (Martin and White, 2005, p. 111). An attributed proposition is represented "as grounded in the subjectivity of an external voice", which attenuates the factual status of the content that is presented since an attributed proposition is represented "as but one of a range of possible positions" (Martin and White, 2005, p. 98). FoP may also correspond to other engagement categories, such as entertain (dialogic expansion) and the categories of proclaim (dialogic contraction), namely pronounce and endorse (Martin and White, 2005, pp. 104-117, 126-129). In most cases, the discussion in the present paper is confined to the distinction between dialogic contraction and expansion; only when convenient, references to the corresponding sub-categories are made at relevant points in the text. For a more detailed review of the individual categories see Martin and White (2005, pp. 92-135).

The dialogic role of external voices is highlighted as indispensable for the functionality of hard news, especially with respect to the heteroglossic diversity in which hard news operates (White, 1998). Given that hard news aims to identify events which challenge the established social order and at the same time tries to reach a wide audience which is necessarily ideologically diverse, the presentation and interpretation of the reported event is likely to cause disagreement and resistance and, as a result, reduce the text's acceptability (White, 1998, p. 379). While monoglossic discourse is dialogically uncontested, heteroglossia (especially dialogic expansion) embraces and accepts

opposition, leaves room for solidarity with and negotiation between different social positions, ultimately reduces possible rejection and increases the chance of the text's acceptance by readers with different heteroglossic background (White, 1998, pp. 381-385). External voices present propositions as personal opinions grounded in the isolated subjectivity of an individual, as one of many potential dialogic alternatives (White, 2012, p. 61). Thus external voices are not only crucial to the strategy of impersonalization and effacing of the authorial voice but they are also employed in response to ideological diversity. However, see White (2012) and Martin and White (2005, pp. 114-117) on the means of authorial alignment and its effect on the opening and closing of the dialogic space produced by the choice of the reporting frame, especially the reporting verb.

The classification of FoP applied in this paper is described in Semino, Short and Culpeper (1997), Semino and Short (2004) and Leech and Short (2007), who distinguish fully direct FoP (direct FoP and free direct FoP without the reporting clause, such as *The PM said: "I'm deeply worried about the consequences of this controversial meeting."*; *"I'm deeply worried about the consequences of this meeting."*), various non-direct forms (*The PM said he was worried about the consequences of the meeting; The PM criticised/disapproved of the meeting; The PM was worried about the consequences of the meeting*.) ² and non-direct forms appearing in combination with a partial direct quote inserted into the reported section (*The PM said he was worried about the "controversial" meeting*.). FoP are characterized by faithfulness claims with regard to form, content and speech act value, and a number of deictic and grammatical properties (e.g. the presence or absence of a separate reporting clause, the syntactic relation between the reported and reporting clause, the form and deictic orientation of the reported element). A detailed description of the individual forms is not necessary for the aim of the paper but, when relevant to the discussion, FoP occurring in the

---

² Non-direct FoP include all forms with the exception of (free) direct forms; it is an umbrella term that is both more general than indirect reported discourse and inclusive of it.

illustrating examples will be described more fully. However, the aspects that require a more detailed description are the notions of control and perspective, and the concept of embedding.

According to Leech and Short (2007, p. 260), reported language is a scalar phenomenon and individual FoP create a continuum of directness and control by the reporting speaker (RingSp) and the reported speaker (RedSp). At one end of the scale lie the most direct forms, those with supposedly maximum control by the RedSp; at the opposite pole verging on unattributed monologic narration lie minimal forms, i.e. forms with a minimal degree of directness and a maximum degree of non-directness, as well as the RingSp's intervention. In between are situated various non-direct forms with different degrees of directness and reporting/reported speaker's control. In hard news, the RedSp coincides with an external voice while the RingSp typically (but not necessarily) coincides with the internal voice.

Directness and control are closely related to perspective. Perspective, referred to by different terms by different authors, is understood as a selective presentation of information restricted to a participant's subjective understanding of the world and their thoughts, emotions or experience; perspective confines the validity of the information that is presented to a particular person in discourse (e.g. Sanders and Redeker, 1993; Leech and Short, 2007, pp. 218-221, 273-274). It will be suggested that some voice functions are associated primarily with FoP expressing purely the perspective of an external voice/RedSp (direct FoP), whereas others are fulfilled by FoP which are a mixture of the internal voice's/RingSp's and external voice's/RedSp's perspective (non-direct and partially quoted FoP). In addition, the extent to which a FoP has the potential to reveal the perspective of an external voice can affect the extent to which dialogic space can be opened.³

---

³ The terms perspective and voice have a different theoretical grounding, with a clear difference in focus. Voice is applied in contexts focusing on monologicity/dialogicity and engagement with diverse ideological positioning; perspective is associated primarily with the spatial-temporal, cognitive and emotional orientation of the text.

Komentář [A1]: check

Another aspect that is of relevance to the discussion of voice functions is so-called embedding. According to Semino and Short (2004, pp. 33-35), embedding refers to a recursive occurrence of FoP, more specifically to a situation in which one FoP appears embedded, i.e. contained within, another FoP (e.g. *He said that she said that they said...*). Since in the present study the occurrence of an external voice is bound to an occurrence of a FoP, external voices also appear embedded within one another. In such cases a host non-embedded external voice (*He* in the above example) calls upon (embeds) another external voice (*she* and *they* in the above example). The first reason for the distinction of embedding is that it simply describes formal properties of attributing structures and it is often impossible to provide a comprehensive description without the reference to it. Secondly and more importantly, some voice functions are confined to the context of embedding and their nature clearly derives from them being embedded in another voice; on the other hand, other voice functions appear only in the absence of embedding.

2. The objectives of the paper

In the present paper I aim to contribute to the discussion presented in White (1998; 2012) and Urbanová (2013). The research questions I pose concern the generic and dialogic roles of voices in hard news Appraisal and the relation between voice functions and FoP.

From the generic perspective the questions are as follows: *What rhetorical roles do external voices perform in the Appraisal satellite and how do they contribute to the evaluative role of Appraisal?*

The dialogic focus of the present study is based on the assumption that even though external voices establish a heteroglossic context, their presence does not automatically guarantee that dialogic alternatives are recognized and accepted (Martin and White, 2005). From the dialogic point of view, the research questions are the following: *How is the established dialogic space affected, i.e. maintained or further opened on the one hand, or contracted on the other, as a result of voice interaction? How do voices fulfilling different functions contribute to dialogic contraction and expansion?*

The final questions concern the relation between voice functions and forms of presentation: *Are there any tendencies as regards voice functions and their realization by pure external (direct) voice on the one hand and a mixture of external and internal (non-direct) voice on the other? How is dialogicity affected by potential correlations between voice function and the degree of directness in different FoP?*

3. Data and methodology
3.1 Data description

The Appraisal satellites were extracted from a corpus of 175 hard news reports (79,945 words) excerpted from the news sections of British broadsheet newspapers (*The Times*, *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Guardian* and *The Independent*) published in 2010 and 2011. The individual newspaper reports were chosen according to selection criteria mentioned in Bell (1991, pp. 22-23). As regards text selection, the criteria were the key features instrumental in realizing the rhetorical potential of hard news, namely the nucleus-satellite generic structure and reporter voice. The Appraisal sub-corpus that was examined contains 87 hard news reports and 146 satellites counting 7,800 words.

3.2 The generic perspective and voice functions

The Appraisal satellites were established on functional grounds, i.e. on the basis of their relation to the nucleus. Some of the formal signals of Appraisal function may include, for instance, the presence of (inherently) evaluative items, external voices and the reference to the nucleus (working as the target of evaluation). Since satellites are functionally distinct and self-contained units, inter-satellite boundary was often signalled at the ideational, interpersonal and textual level (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004; Feez, Iedema and White, 2008, pp. 100-115).

Voices were considered from the point of view of their function in the Appraisal satellite. In the beginning my approach to voice functions was largely text-driven and did not assume any prior classification (e.g. Bednarek, 2006a). However, the functions I identified were in certain aspects comparable to those performed by the basic elements of the orbital structure (White, 1997; 1998; 2000) and the

taxonomy of relations introduced in Rhetorical Structure Theory (Mann and Thompson, 1988). Consequently, I used the concepts from these two frameworks to describe the functions voices are assumed to play in Appraisal.

The basic distinction was made between voices which directly contribute to the underlying evaluative role of Appraisal and those which do not evaluate but serve functions subsidiary to the main nuclear evaluation. The former group includes voices which work as the source and target of evaluation. The latter group includes voices which work to express an attitude towards the evaluation that is provided by the source external voice; voices which provide summary of, justification for and background to the evaluation, frame the evaluation as an opinion and fulfil other miscellaneous functions. It is especially voices with the secondary functions that were assessed in terms of the effect they may produce on the presented evaluation and on the established dialogic space.

The voice which works as the source of evaluation embodies the main voice of Appraisal and its role thus coincides with the role of the Appraisal, which is to evaluate the nucleus in affective, aesthetic or moral terms, comment on its emotional impact or refer to some set of value judgments (White, 1997; 1998, pp. 278, 339-340; 2000, p. 384). Voices which function as the target of evaluation represent the object of evaluation (i.e. what is evaluated) and can be seen as a condensed counterpart of the nucleus; the nucleus serves to identify an event that is perceived to be morally, culturally, politically, economically and otherwise disrupting and threatening (White, 1998, pp. 267-277, 332-338; 2000; Feez, Iedema and White, 2008, pp. 81-82, 91-98) and voices with the target function are condensed statements, claims or accusations which are identical to the verbal events representing the source of disruption in the nucleus.

Now let us proceed with voices with functions which are not directly involved in evaluation. Voices in Appraisal may provide justification and background information. Voices which provide justification show a close rhetorical relation to the source of evaluation; they provide arguments, justification, explanation or reasons for why the evaluation was made and why it should be accepted as correct and credible. The voice function of justification closely resembles the analogous nucleus-satellite relation recognized in the orbital structure (White, 1998), so the label was retained. As will be shown, the rhetorical support voices in Appraisal give to the source of evaluation may be rather implicit and tentative. Voices with the Background function report on verbal events which may relate to various aspects of the evaluating event itself or which provide more distant background to the main evaluating event. Background corresponds to the Contextualization satellite in the orbital structure of hard news (White, 1997; 1998); the main difference between Background in the present paper and the Contextualization satellite is that the former is necessarily of a verbal nature while the latter may describe verbal or material events (processes), states of being etc. (e.g. Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004).

In some cases no analogue was found between a voice function and a satellite function recognized in White (1997; 1998; 2000). This concerns voice functions referred to as the attitude-and/or summary-signalling function and the opinion-signalling function. These relations display a certain affinity with the relations identified in the Rhetorical Structure Theory (Mann and Thompson, 1988; Carlson and Marcu, 2001), which aims to identify the hierarchical structure between portions of text and specifies the relations between them. Voices which summarize precede the main source of evaluation and offer a paraphrase or a condensed summary of the content presented by the source of evaluation. The summary function in the present paper largely overlaps with the RST relations termed as summary (a shorter restatement of a different portion of text) and possibly restatement (a statement that is comparable in length and content to a different portion of text) (Mann and Thompson, 1988, p. 277). The attitude-signalling voices also precede the voice with the evaluative function but do not summarize or paraphrase the content of the evaluation; rather they specify the attitude (e.g. Martin and White, 2005) with which the evaluation was made. Often, the boundary between the attitude- and summary-signalling functions is fluid

and/or the functions co-occur, i.e. both the summary and attitude are provided. On account of the functional overlap and low frequency, the attitude- and summary-signalling roles were conflated into a single category (Table 1).

The opinion-signalling function is one of the least frequent functions voices in Appraisal were found to carry out; in RST it coincides with the attribution function which corresponds to direct and indirect FoP and includes verbal and cognitive predicates (Carlson and Marcu, 2001). Voices with an opinion-signalling role hedge the presented content, make it more tentative and/or present it as a personal opinion. In many cases this role involves self-reference in indirect thought (*I think, I believe*). Moreover, there was also a group of miscellaneous voice functions with low frequency of occurrence.

As explained above, the function of source of evaluation was determined with respect to the nucleus and derives from the underlying evaluative role of the Appraisal satellite, while the non-evaluating ancillary roles (background, justification, summary etc.) were identified with respect to other EVs (especially the source of evaluation) confined to the satellite boundary of the same Appraisal. As the function of and interplay between voices in Appraisal is the main concern of this paper, intra-satellite interpretation of voice interaction involving voices which serve ancillary roles was given preference to possible nucleus-satellite interpretation of voice interaction (such as the nuclear voice vs. voices providing justification, background, summary etc.). On the dispreferred nucleus-satellite interpretation the relations are more indirect and tentative, and were not reflected in the analysis and in the quantification of voice functions.

Finally, it needs to be stressed that although the nucleus-satellite relations recognized in the orbital structure and, when needed, selected relations in the RST provided the basis for the analysis of voice functions, the primary framework and ultimate angle for the interpretation of voice functions were dialogic and drew on Martin and White's (2005) concepts of dialogic expansion and contraction. Consequently, voices/functions were assessed with respect to their effect (expanding or contracting) on the

established dialogic space. In addition, the primary evaluating and ancillary non-evaluating roles were correlated with the FoP employed to bring external voices serving these functions into the text.

3.3 The dialogic perspective and FoP
The basic criterion for voice distinction was between the internal, authorial voice of the report and external voices brought into the discourse by means of FoP. Attention was paid to external voices evoked in (free) direct forms where they appear uncontaminated by the internal voice and in partially quoted and non-direct FoP where the external voice blurs with the internal voice (Semino and Short, 2004). In a purely averred/narrated context the role of the internal voice was not considered. As explained in section 1.2, FoP (and the functions of external voices) were also assessed with respect to the level of embedding (Semino and Short, 2004).

All the satellites in the Appraisal sub-corpus feature multiple voices, a condition arising from the presence of the internal and external voice(s) mixed in non-direct and partially quoted FoP; moreover, these often appear in the company of pure external voices evoked by (free) direct FoP. Satellites were also considered multi-voiced if they contained a reference to self; although in such cases there is in fact one voice involved; the "referring" voice and the voice "referred to" fulfil different functions and have a direct bearing on the degree of heteroglossia.

As the internal authorial voice was not paid attention to unless it appeared in non-direct FoP, compared to Martin and White (2005) and White (2012) I did not take into consideration the different kinds of authorial (and reader) engagement (alignment, disalignment or neutral stance) with the available dialogic alternatives. Rather, I focused on discourse originating with an external source and regarded dialogic expansion and contraction as resulting from the interplay between the functions external voices fulfil in the Appraisal satellite.

4. Voice functions
This section aims to describe external voices in terms of function, the contribution to heteroglossia and the principal tendencies of voice realization by means of FoP. The functions relate to the

evaluative role of Appraisal, i.e. the satellite's generic relation to the nucleus, and the roles voices assume with respect to each other within Appraisal.

Since the function of the Appraisal satellite can be described only in connection with the nucleus, the latter will be partially reproduced (either Headline or Lead). The occurrence of voice is signalled by abbreviations inserted in angle brackets and placed in front of the relevant section: the abbreviation EV refers to an external voice, while IV stands for the internal voice; numbers accompanying the abbreviations serve to distinguish different EVs (EV1, EV2) whereas letters signal that different FoP evoke an identical voice (EV1a, EV1b). A distinction is also made between non-embedded and embedded voices: embedded FoP/voices are marked with the abbreviation *e* and their scope is indicated by italics; the absence of embedding receives no special marking. For economy's sake, only the parts of Appraisal which illustrate the issue that is being discussed will be brought to attention and described; the forms under discussion are marked in bold.

The voices, their functions and the presence/absence of embedding are shown in Table 1 and Table 2. In total, there are 556 EVs, 312 non-embedded and 244 embedded. Table 1 specifies the number of voices that are directly involved in evaluation and work as the main source of evaluation (334) or the target (37) of evaluation; in addition, it shows voices whose role in evaluation is more ancillary and which frame evaluation as an opinion (17) and express attitude and/or summarize (29). Table 2 lists voices which serve further subsidiary roles, more specifically those that provide additional background information (67) and justification (31) for evaluation. The miscellaneous category covers various roles of low frequency (41).

Function	Source	Target	Opin.	Att./ Sum.
Non-embedded	200	0	0	29
Embedded	134	37	17	0
Total	334	37	17	29

Table 1: External voice functions I.

Function	Back.	Just.	Misc.
Non-embedded	50	18	15

Embedded	17	13	26
Total	67	31	41

Table 2: External voice functions II.

EVs working as the source of evaluation (334) are directly associated with the function of Appraisal and serve to appraise the nucleus. The high frequency can be explained by the underlining evaluative role of Appraisal and testifies to the prevailing functional homogeneity of the examined satellites. The non-embedded (200) voices fulfil this function more frequently than the embedded (134) ones and differ in directness and the speech/writing vs. thought distinction. At the non-embedded level there is a strong association between the source function and unambiguous (free) direct discourse (61.5%) rather than non-direct (23.5%) and partially quoted (14.5%) voices, and between the source of evaluation and speech/writing (94.5%) rather than thought (5.0%). Conversely, at the embedded level the principal tendencies are the opposite: unambiguous non-direct voices (84.3%) prevail over (free) direct discourse (3.7%) and partially quoted (0.7%) forms, and thought (68.7%) outnumbers speech/writing (20.1%). In other words, the evaluating host voice tends to be presented in its full subjectivity and their evaluation originates as a verbal event; on the other hand, if the host voice calls upon the voices of others or self to evaluate, the latter are likely to be presented non-directly and the evaluation takes the form of a thought event.

The tendency for the source of evaluation to be expressed by direct (non-embedded) voices can be explained as follows. Although all FoP acknowledge the existence of diverse opinions and open up space for solidarity and dialogic negotiation, direct discourse has the potential to retain a maximum degree of directness and lay bare the perspective of the EV to the maximum possible extent, relatively intact and unblemished by the perspective of the reporting/internal voice. Direct discourse individualizes and subjectifies evaluation and thus accepts, accentuates and particularizes diversity of points of view. This leads to the potential of direct FoP to recognize alternative positions and open the dialogic space. On the other hand, non-direct (and partially quoted) forms are associated with the

function of interpretation, summary and paraphrasing, characterized by a lower degree of detachment and a higher degree of interference and control by the internal/RingSp's voice (e.g. Waugh, 1995; Smirnova, 2009). Even though non-direct forms also establish a heteroglossic context, the EV is overlaid by the IV and becomes blurred together with it.

Example 1 is a typical example illustrating the function of source of evaluation. The evaluating voices are evoked by a non-embedded direct speech (*she said*) and embedded non-direct forms on the thought scale (*me*). The Appraisal evaluates an attack in which rocks were thrown from a bridge onto the cars driving below.

(1) a. **Nucleus**
A ... windscreen was smashed when a rock the size of a football was dropped from a bridge...
b. **Appraisal**
<EV1a>"*<eEV1b>It scared me a lot made and <eEV1c>me realise how precious life is,*" she said...
(Daily Telegraph reporter, 2011)

The evaluating voice of the victim is specified in the direct discourse (EV1a) and simultaneously refers to the self in the embedded indirect thought (eEV1c) and the so-called internal narration (eEV1b). The internal narration, a minimal form on the thought scale, conveys the meaning of affect, specifically insecurity (*scared*) (Semino and Short, 2004, pp. 45-47; Martin and White, 2005, pp. 45-52); the evaluation in the indirect thought (*life is precious*) is presented as a result of a mental process (*realize*). Since the evaluation is reported in (free) direct FoP and its validity is confined to the EV of the RedSp, it is non-factual and recognizes the existence of alternative positions. The presence of the embedded self (identical to the host EV), together with the mental states and processes which are particular to the embedded voice, intensifies the EV's subjectivity and reinforces or even opens further the dialogic space.

The function of the target of evaluation (37) is limited to the embedded level. As objects of evaluation, voices with this function are often identical to those representing the source of disruption in the nucleus. Most naturally, the target is expressed by non-direct FoP (86.5%),

especially those which summarize the reported content in phrasal form or do not report content at all (Semino, Short and Culpeper, 1997; Semino and Short, 2004, pp. 52-53). Prototypical voices working as the target of evaluation are referred to by means of economical expressions (e.g. a possessive determiner or proper noun in 2b and 2c) or are inferable from the preceding context.

Besides the source of evaluation function, examples 2a-2c illustrate the role of the target of evaluation. The nucleus reports the claim that public officials are kept in their jobs despite not being fully occupied.

(2) a. **Nucleus**
<EV1a>'Thousands of civil servants have nothing to do – but it's too expensive to fire them'
b. **Appraisal 1**
<IV>But<EV2a>civil service unions described *<eEV1b>his claims* as nonsense <IV>and <EV2b>accused him of trying to "manipulate public opinion" in favour of his plans to slash compensation terms for 500,000 civil servants....
c. **Appraisal 2**
...<EV3a>"This is nonsense and is simply not a situation in the Civil Service that *<eEV2c>we would recognise.*" <EV3b>He [Jonathan Baume, FDA's general secretary] added: "*<eEV2d>We would like to see the evidence* to justify *<eEV1c>Mr Maude's comments*. It looks like he is just trying to manipulate public opinion about redundancy arrangements."
(Sherman, 2010)

Let us discuss the source of evaluation first. In Appraisal 1 the source of evaluation is the non-embedded EV, more specifically the official voice of the civil service unions (EV2a, b). It is brought into the discourse by means of a non-direct (EV2a) and partially quoted (EV2b) FoP. Both EV2a and EV2b evaluate the nuclear voice (Mr Maude) negatively (*nonsense* in EV2a and *trying to "manipulate public opinion"...* in EV2b). Appraisal 2 features a substantial overlap in content and form (*nonsense* in EV3a, *trying to manipulate public opinion* in EV3b). However, the non-embedded source of evaluation is

Komentář [A2]: unclear

particularized and individualized and appears as EV3a and EV3b (*he* referring to *Jonathan Baume, FDA's general secretary*). Apart from the change to a more individualized source, there is also a shift in directness regarding the FoP that are employed – free direct discourse (no reporting clause, EV3a) and direct discourse (EV3b). Although the host voice of EV3 is given space in (free) direct discourse, unlike the source of evaluation in example 1 (EV1a) EV3 does not take up this opportunity to express their own individual point of view but calls on the support of the more official voice of the civil service unions (*we*, eEV2b, c), which thus serves as another source of evaluation in Appraisal 2 and which also appears as the main non-embedded source of evaluation in Appraisal 1 (EV2a, b). The official voice of an organization lends more authority, prestige and legitimacy to the evaluation than the voice of an individual, albeit a member of that organization. Despite the non-factual status of the evaluation, the embedded voice of institution may partly overshadow the subjectivity of the host individual; the reader who may be more inclined to accept the evaluation owing to the aura of authority and credence of the embedded EV may refuse alternatives and thus, in fact, contribute themselves to dialogic contraction.

Let us proceed with the target of evaluation (eEV1b *his claims*, eEV1c *Mr Maude's remarks*, underlined). In example 2a, the voice in the Headline (EV1a) introduces the main point of contention and is thus given space in a non-embedded free direct discourse, a form which represents the nuclear voice and its subjectivity in full without the influence of the reporting IV. In the Appraisals, the nuclear voice (eEV1b in Appraisal 1 and eEV1c in Appraisal 2) becomes the target of evaluation and hence embedded; as the evaluated voice has already been given space in the nucleus and the satellites preceding the Appraisal, the evaluated reported content becomes context-dependent and in the Appraisal the voice is encapsulated in more condensed forms that only specify the speech act value without mentioning the reported content. The nominalized forms present the speech events as static discourse entities, facts or final results (Francis, 1994; White, 1998, pp. 153-154; Downing, 2000; cf.

Martin and White, 2005, pp. 52-61; Bednarek, 2007, pp. 117-118). Voices which serve as targets of evaluation do not seem to affect dialogic space to any considerable extent since they have been already established in the discourse and their status of a dialogic alternative may not be at risk.

Voices with the attitude- and summary-signalling function (29) precede voices/FoP working as the source of evaluation, enter into a thematic/rhetorical relation with them and differ from them in terms of directness and perspective. Voices with the summarizing function paraphrase the following direct or partially quoted source of evaluation. Summarizing voices tend to be evoked by indirect FoP (40%, example 3b below) and less frequently by partially quoted FoP (25%) and more condensed FoP reporting content in phrasal form (25%). The Appraisal in example 3b is a more fully reproduced Appraisal 2 in example 2c providing not only the source of evaluation proper (EV3) but also the EVs with the summary function (in bold, EV2); EV1 appears in the nucleus (EV1a) and in the Appraisal works as the target of evaluation (underlined, eEV1b, c).

(3) a. **Nucleus**
       \<EV1a\>'Thousands of civil servants have nothing to do – but it's too expensive to fire them'
   b. **Appraisal**
       \<EV2\>**The FDA union ... said** <u>*\<eEV1b\>Mr Maude's remarks*</u> **were totally unjustifiable**. ...\<EV3\>He [Jonathan Baume, FDA's general secretary] added: "We would like to see the evidence to justify <u>*\<eEV1c\>Mr Maude's comments*</u>. It looks like he is just trying to manipulate public opinion about redundancy arrangements." (Sherman, 2010)

In example 3b, the voice with the role of summary (EV2, *The FDA union ... said Mr Maude's remarks were totally unjustifiable*) is evoked by indirect discourse, i.e. a mixture of the IV and EV which interprets and condenses the original speech event. Conversely, the source of evaluation proper (EV3, "*We would like to see the evidence to justify Mr Maude's comments...*") takes the form of direct discourse and thus predominantly

reveals the EV and "illustrates" the speech event by providing "a glimpse of *how* the speaker argued" (Gruber, 1993, p. 482). The direct discourse repeats the event using (allegedly) the EV's own words and thus corroborates the correctness of the summary given in the preceding indirect discourse. The rhetorical interwovenness between the non-direct and direct forms also manifests itself formally in the reiteration of reporting structures and key words (*Mr Maude's remarks, Mr Maude's comments, totally unjustifiable, the evidence to justify*). The interplay between a general voice (such as *FDA union, We would like to...*) and an individualized source (such as *Jonathan Baume*) was discussed in example 2c above.

The attitude-signalling function is similar to the summary-providing function in that it interacts with the source of evaluation proper, however, in contrast to summary it does not paraphrase content but specifies only the stance adopted in the act of evaluation. The attitude-signalling function is performed by non-direct FoP, especially those with a greater summarizing potential (100%) than indirect FoP; typically, attitude is expressed by speech act verbs in condensed FoP without a separate reported/reporting clause (e.g. Mr Cameron *welcomed* the ruling...) or internal narrations (example 4, *much of Gaza city appeared indifferent to the rally*). The expression of attitude tends to be coupled with general voices (e.g. *Gaza City*) rather than specific individuals (e.g. *Mr Cameron*). The Appraisal in example 4 evaluates a pro-Hamas mass rally held in the centre of Gaza City.

(4) a. **Nucleus**
Hamas ... mounted a show of strength with tens of thousands attending a lavishly staged rally in the centre of Gaza City.
b. **Appraisal**
<IV>As life went on as normal elsewhere, **<EV1>much of Gaza City appeared indifferent to the rally,** <IV>including in cafes where it was being shown live on TV. <EV2a>Physiotherapist Sameh Aloul, 30, said *<eEV2b>he doubted that either Hamas or Fatah were capable of winning an election* and <EV2c> added: "In my opinion it is

a waste of money to have this luxury festival." (MacIntyre, 2011)

In example 4, the voice whose function is to signal attitude is the non-embedded general and metonymically implied voice of EV1 expressing affect in the form of internal narration (*much of Gaza City appeared indifferent to the rally*). The source of evaluation proper is the non-embedded specific and already individualized voice in the form of direct discourse (EV2c, *Physiotherapist Sameh Aloul, 30 ... added: "In my opinion it is a waste of money to have this luxury festival."*). The adverbial (*In my opinion*) further underscores the perspective of the individual EV2. EV1 and EV2 are closely interwoven: EV1 specifies the angle in the light of which EV2c is understood, and EV2c provides more details and exemplifies EV1. The IV can assert itself more fully in the internal narration than in the direct discourse, which is also manifested in the semantic and grammatical links between the internal narration and the preceding and following authorial discourse (IV), which is also, untypically, evaluative (*life went on as normal*). EV2a fulfils the justification function and will be commented upon below.

In examples 3 and 4 the non-direct forms, which are more RingSp oriented and in which the IV and EV cannot be clearly separated, anticipate the direct FoP. The direct FoP provide more detail and since they are without the layer of the RingSp's assessment, they simultaneously act to retrospectively support and justify the (internal) voice in the non-direct forms. Such sequences create close-knit functional units whose rhetorical strength lies in the mutual reinforcement of the individual forms and voices. Consequently, the interaction seems bidirectional rather than mono-directional and operates at the semantic (summary/paraphrase) as well as the rhetorical (rhetorical support) level (cf. Hunston, 1999; Bednarek, 2006a). The dialogic space established by direct forms may be constrained by the presence of non-direct forms as it only opens within the confines and direction set by the IV enforcing a particular point of view. Examples 3 and 4 also show that the textual dialogic space may not be homogenous. The voices/FoP are ordered in such a way that the sequence displays a

gradual increase in the perspective and subjectivity of the RedSp/EV and the gradual shift in perspective is accompanied by a step-by-step introduction and specification of the EV: in example 4 the voice (EV1) in the internal narration is referred to as *much of Gaza City*, whereas the ellipted voice (EV2c) in the direct discourse is already individualized in the preceding EV2a as *Physiotherapist Sameh Aloul, 30*; in example 3 the reference to *the FDA union* (EV2) in the first indirect discourse changes in the following direct discourse (EV3) to a more particularized reference to one of its members, *Jonathan Baume, its general secretary*. The IV weakens and is backgrounded, while the EV strengthens and is foregrounded. In other words, the dialogic space may tend to open gradually too, albeit within the confines set by the IV (or other EVs).

Voices/FoP with the justification function (31) have no direct role in evaluation (as target or source) but provide rhetorical support for the source of evaluation. The low frequency goes hand in hand with the reporting rather than argumentative role of hard news and makes it impossible to draw any generalizing conclusions. But a slight prevalence of non-embedded FoP (18) over embedded forms (13) and a prevalence of unambiguous non-direct FoP (57.8%, mostly indirect discourse) over (free) direct FoP (29.0%) and partially quoted forms (6.5%) accentuate the role of the IV in the juxtaposition of voices and orchestration of the rhetorical interaction.

Let us now return to example 4 discussed above. In example 4 the voice which works as the source of evaluation (EV2c) also provides justification (EV2a) and belongs to a single specific individual and a member of the general public: the reported content in EV2a/eEV2b provides the reason or explanation for why the evaluation in EV2c is valid (*it is a waste of money to have this luxury festival* [because] *[n]either Hamas or Fatah were capable of winning an election*). Moreover, the justification is attributed to self (eEV2b, *he*) and the indirect thought structure (*he doubted...*) frames it as an opinion, a voice function which will be discussed below. The reference to self in the form of indirect thought and the adverbial (*In my opinion*) mitigate the justification/evaluation and underscore

the non-factuality of the whole construction.

Example 5 also illustrates the justification function but is different from example 4 in that more voices come into play. The Appraisal evaluates the news that a Britton (Abdul Jabbar) suspected of terrorism was killed in Pakistan by a US drone.

(5) a. **Nucleus**
Briton killed in a US drone attack in Pakistan last month was targeted after he was overheard boasting about wanting to attack the UK, senior counter-terrorism officials said yesterday.
b. **Appraisal**
<IV>Despite their apparent collaboration in the case of Jabbar, <EV1a> he [a Pakistani official] said: "*<eEV1b>I don't think <eEV2a>the British support these drone attacks.*"**<EV2b>British officials have made clear that any attack being planned by Jabbar was not imminent when he was killed.** (Norton-Taylor, 2010b)

The Appraisal is realized by a mixture of three voices – the IV of the journalist, the voice of a Pakistani official and the voice of British security and intelligence. The EV of the Pakistani official (EV1) does not evaluate the nucleus by himself but relies on another source of evaluation, namely the specified voice of British intelligence (eEV2a). On the one hand, the correctness of the Pakistani official's opinion regarding the British view of drone attacks seems undermined by the IV in the initial concessive comment (*despite their apparent collaboration in the case of Jabbar*), which counters EV1 and whose inclusion may be in anticipation of disagreement with the presented evaluation, possibly on the part of (some of the) readers. On the other hand, the re-evoked non-embedded voice of British officials (EV2b, indirect discourse) which performs the justification function highlights the absence of any immediate threat from Jabbar, a statement which could be interpreted as casting doubt on the legitimacy of Jabbar's killing and thus supporting EV1 and the interpretation regarding EV2's negative attitude to drone attacks (source of

evaluation). Consequently, in comparison with example 4, this satellite does not seem to be entirely homogenous regarding the stance adopted by the evoked voices, especially the IV and EVs. The view provided by EV1 is open to alternative opinions by being grounded in the subjectivity of a single individual and framed as an opinion (*I don't think* in eEV1b); the introductory concessive context (IV) favours indirectly these alternatives and to some extent pushes EV1 from the dialogic space; simultaneously, EV2b may work to support EV1 and thus constrain the dialogic space in the opposite direction.

In general, the presence of rhetorical support strengthens evaluation and may lead to the effacing of other alternatives in the dialogic space, especially if the justification (and evaluation) is not ascribed to a member of the general public (example 4) but to a voice of authority (example 5) (cf. Hunston, 1999; Bednarek, 2006a). Voices in Appraisal may also clash, as in example 5, illustrating a push and pull between voices. The examples also show that the rhetorical interplay between voices (and the IV's role in the orchestration of the interplay) can be very subtle and may rest only on the juxtaposition of voices; often the rhetorical interplay between voices is implicit and it is up to the reader to construct the possible rhetorical links between voices.

Voices providing background information (67) tend to be evoked by non-direct FoP (80.6%), especially the forms without a separate reported/reporting clause; partially quoted (1.5%) and (free) direct discourse (9.0%) occur much less frequently. Background information may relate to the evaluating event itself, e.g. by representing the accompanying circumstances (example 6) and characterizing the evaluating RedSp, or by giving more general background (example 7).

The Appraisal in example 6 evaluates Wikileak's effort to mitigate harmful effects of a document leak.

(6) a. **Nucleus**
... He [William Assange] claimed that WikiLeaks had implemented a "harm-minimisation policy" to

weed out documents that could endanger the lives of Afghans.
b. **Appraisal**
<EV1>**When pressed by a lawyer in the audience on whether WikiLeaks had the expertise to apply such a policy**, <EV2>Mr Assange said: "… If someone can apply this policy surely we can do it." (Coghlan and Whittel, 2010)

In example 6, the background information (EV1, indirect discourse, in bold) relates to the evaluating event (EV2) and specifies the verbal conditions under which the evaluation originated; EV1 suggests that the evaluation was given under pressure and probably unwillingly, which may cast a negative light on the evaluating RedSp and the evaluation.

The Appraisal in example 7 is a more fully reproduced satellite identical to Appraisal 1 in example 2b evaluating the inactivity of public officials. The voice of EV2 (in bold) does not take part in the evaluation (EV1a, b) but provides more distant background to the main evaluating event and facilitates its proper understanding.

(7) a. **Nucleus**
'Thousands of civil servants have nothing to do – but it's too expensive to fire them'
b. **Appraisal**
<IV>But<EV1a>civil service unions described his claims as nonsense <IV>and <EV1b>accused him of trying to "manipulate public opinion" in favour of his plans to slash compensation terms for 500,000 civil servants. <IV>Mr Maude introduced **<EV2>a Bill last week cutting redundancy payments from an average of three years' to one year's salary for compulsory severance, and 15 months' salary for voluntary payouts…** (Sherman, 2010)

The source of evaluation is provided by EV1 in a non-direct (EV1a) and partially quoted form (EV1b). EV2, an indirect writing, together with the preceding IV, does not serve to appraise the nucleus but expounds on the information presented in the non-direct section of the partial quote (*his plans to slash compensation terms*)

and aids the reader in understanding the evaluation. The change in voice corresponds to the change in function: the shift from the main evaluative role to the rhetorically dependent (explanatory) function corresponds to the shift from the mixture of the IV and EV1 in the non-direct/partially quoted FoP to the mixture of the IV and the inanimate EV2 of the written document in the indirect writing.

Similarly to the rhetorical support given by voices with the justification function, background information can affect heteroglossia. Putting various aspects of the evaluating event (e.g. verbal events characterizing the RedSp or the circumstances of the evaluation, verbal events preceding the evaluation) into a positive or negative light increases the likelihood of readers' acceptance or refusal of the evaluation; both positive and negative portrayals seem to close the dialogic space as they promote what has been positively evaluated against alternatives in the former case, and the alternatives against what has been negatively evaluated in the latter case. The information which increases readers' understanding of the evaluating event may also be conducive to their accepting the evaluation more readily and, consequently, lead to the contracting of the dialogic space (cf. Gruber, 1993; Hunston, 1995; 1999; Lemke, 1998; Floyd, 2000; Martin and White, 2005, pp. 114-117; Bednarek, 2006b, pp. 209-211).

Voices may also function to frame the reported content (e.g. evaluation, justification, background information, etc.) as the RedSp's opinion (17). Voices with this function are confined to the embedded level and are evoked by non-direct forms on the thought scale (100 %), especially indirect thought (e.g. *I think* in example 8b below, see also example 4b *he doubted* and example 5b *I don't think*). Most often non-direct thought involves reference to self; in fewer cases the host voice relies on other voices, especially the voice of the authority or institution they are affiliated with (e.g. *We think*, *We believe*).

The Appraisal in example 8b evaluates positively the attempt of an exiled sheikh to take control of RAK, one of the United Arab Emirates.

(8) a. **Nucleus**

Israel is aiding an exiled Arab sheikh who is vying to seize control of a strategically important Gulf emirate only 40 miles from Iran...

b. **Appraisal**

...<EV1a>"This is a new kind of coup...It is the first of its kind and *<eEV1b>I am betting on it being successful. <eEV1c>I think by the end of the summer we will have a verdict*." (Booth and Fergusson, 2010)

The source of evaluation is the non-embedded voice (EV1a) in the form of free direct discourse. EV1a embeds instances of reference to self (eEV1b, c) which together with the thought act verbs (*I am betting, I think*) frame the evaluative statements as non-factual opinions. In eEV1c the presence of self together with the verb (*think*) mitigates the force of the evaluation, reinforces subjectivity and further opens the dialogic space established by the host evaluating voice. Conversely, although eEV1b also serves to underline the subjective and non-factual nature of the evaluation, the self is coupled with the verb (*bet*) which strengthens the evaluation and presents it as less open to alternatives. In the system of engagement, reporting verbs (or nouns) such as *think* or *believe* pertain to the category referred to as "entertain" and are likely to be dialogically expansive, whereas verbs such as *know, agree* or *bet* pertain to the category referred to as "pronounce" (*I know, agree, bet*) and are likely to be dialogically contractive (Martin and White, 2005, pp. 104-111, 127-133). In addition, voices referring to authorities or institutions may not, due to potential greater authority and credence, open dialogic space to the same extent as an individual voice referring to self does. Generally, however, in the examined corpus of Appraisal satellites voices with the opinion function tend to open the dialogic space, as the majority of cases involve reference to self in the first person singular (10 out of 17) and verbs which tend to recognize alternatives and open the dialogic space (13 out of 17).

The miscellaneous category (41) contains voices which either fulfil numerous low-frequency functions or, quite frequently, voices whose role is peculiar to the particular satellite and does not recur elsewhere, a situation which makes the functional specification

less certain owing to the absence of comparable examples. In one of the functions, referred to as textual, voices serve to prepare the ground for the ensuing evaluation. The textual function is illustrated in example 9 (EV1a); the Appraisal evaluates Tony Blair's decision to involve British troops in Afghanistan.

(9) a. **Nucleus**
Tony Blair bounced military commanders into deploying large numbers of British troops to Afghanistan while they were facing a growing insurgency in Iraq..., the Chilcot inquiry was told yesterday.
 b. **Appraisal**
<EV1a>He [Dannatt] described how he heard of *<eEV2>Blair's announcement at a Nato summit in June 2004 that he had committed British troops to taking the lead in Nato-led operations in Helmand province, southern Afghanistan, from 2006.* <EV1b>Dannatt, commanding Nato troops in Germany at the time, told the Chilcot inquiry: "*<eEV1c>I was totally unaware. <eEV1d>'Where did it come from?' was my feeling at the time*." (Norton-Taylor, 2010a)

The source of evaluation is the voice of General Dannatt in EV1b and the two embedded forms (eEV1c and eEV1d) expressing the feelings of surprise and disbelief (*I was totally unaware, "Where did it come from?"*) experienced by EV1 on learning about the decision. Besides the pronominal reference (*it*), the evaluative structure makes no explicit mention of the target of evaluation (the decision), which coincides with the nucleus. The nuclear theme and the object of evaluation is, in fact, brought into the discourse in the first part of the satellite as eEV2 (*Blair's announcement at a Nato summit...*) embedded in the host EV1a. EV1a does not evaluate the nucleus as the source of evaluation proper does, and neither does it provide paraphrase and/or stance as voices with the summary- and attitude-providing function do. EV1a works as a prospective device which signals the upcoming occurrence of the evaluation proper (*He described how he heard...*) and prepares the ground for it by mentioning

the source and mainly the object of evaluation. The voice embedded in EV1a, i.e. eEV2, was not categorized as the target of evaluation since it does not appear in a structure which primarily serves to evaluate and was also put into the miscellaneous category. The embedded eEV2 reintroduces the nuclear theme into the discourse after the preceding satellite dealt with a different topic; thus its role is also primarily textual. Regarding heteroglossia, as voices with the textual function serve mainly to introduce and anticipate evaluation but do not provide evaluation themselves, they do not seem to produce a marked effect on dialogic space. In example 9 the negligible effect on the dialogic space is co-produced by the reporting frame of EV1 which contains a stance- and dialogue-neutral speech verb (*describe*) that in the system of engagement pertains to the attribution category (Martin and White, 2005, pp. 111-117).

Conclusion
This paper aimed to contribute to the discussion of the functions fulfilled by EVs/FoP in the genre of hard news. Synthesizing the generic and dialogic perspectives, the paper has shown that the rhetorical roles performed by EVs/FoP in the evaluative sections of the hard news generic structure have a direct bearing on dialogic expansion and contraction. In the Appraisal satellite EVs are prototypically engaged in the evaluation of the nucleus but may enter into relations with other EVs (and the IV) within the satellite. Voices work as the target of evaluation, express attitude and/or give a summary of the evaluation, frame the reported content as opinion, and provide background information and justification. These roles, together with the degree of directness and the salience of an EV or the IV, affect the established dialogic space.

Voices working as the source of evaluation, i.e. a function characterized by the need to recognize alternatives, show a strong tendency to be expressed by direct FoP, forms which are characterized by the salience of an EV and a great potential to open dialogic space. Justifications, which have a relatively close-knit relation to the source of evaluation and contract the dialogic space of the claims they defend, are provided by voices which tend to be evoked by indirect and (free, partially

quoted) direct discourse and thus are simultaneously likely to exist as mere alternatives themselves. In the case of voices which provide summary, i.e. a function characterized by an overlap in form/content with the source of evaluation, indirect (and partially quoted) FoP predominate over minimal and phrasal forms – FoP in which the IV can assert itself relatively freely. Background information and the expression of attitude, i.e. functions with a relatively loose and tentative relation to the source of evaluation, are characterized by the prevalence of phrasal and minimal FoP which are near-factual and their dialogic space is likely to be narrower.

A possible line of research that would be complementary to the issues addressed in this paper might concern rhetorical roles of the pure internal voice, its interaction with EVs and the resulting effect on dialogic expansion and contraction, especially outside reporting frames – a topic that has received little attention here. For instance, in examples 2 and 7 the IV has a conjunctive function (*and*, *but*); in example 4 it provides additional circumstantial (and also evaluative) information (*As life went on as normal elsewhere … including in cafes where it was being shown live on TV*); and in example 5 (*Despite their apparent collaboration in the case of Jabbar*) the IV provides additional concessive context to the ensuing text.

The present research could also be extended to include other sections in the body of hard news, i.e. satellites with other than an evaluating relation to the nucleus. For instance, it could be examined whether EVs (and possibly the IV) in the satellites which elaborate on, provide background information to, and justify or contradict the nucleus serve the functions which primarily contribute to the satellites' generic roles (i.e. elaboration, background, justification, concession) or whether EVs in these satellites perform some ancillary roles similarly to the secondary non-evaluating voices in Appraisal. Examination could proceed along similar lines and reveal the rhetorical roles voices perform, their mutual interaction, the effect on text dialogicity and possible correlations with FoP.

Further research could also address the issue of voice from the point of view of, for instance, the rhetorical, thematic and voice heterogeneity of a satellite and, ultimately, satellite prototypicality. For example, Appraisals which contain extensive portions of text that evoke voices which relate more readily to other EVs within the satellite than to the distant nuclear voice and perform other than the evaluating function (e.g. background in example 7) feature increased rhetorical complexity and thematic heterogeneity. In addition, a change in function may correspond to a change in the voice/FoP (*a Bill*, EV2 in example 7). As units with a single underlying function, such satellites are still functionally dependent on the nucleus; yet, as discourse develops within the satellite, i.e. away from the nucleus, these satellites show strengthened intra-satellite relations at the expense of the nucleus-satellite relation. This could render such satellites less typical.

Primary data
BOOTH, R. and FERGUSSON, I., 29 July 2010. Israel linked to exiled sheikh's bid for 'coup' in Gulf emirate. *The Guardian*, p. 17.
COGHLAN, T. and WHITTELL, G., 28 July 2010. Afghan leaks expose the identities of informants. *The Times*, pp. 1, 8.
DAILY TELEGRAPH REPORTER. 6 December 2011. I'm lucky to be alive, says driver in rock attack. *The Daily Telegraph*, p.13.
MACINTYRE, D., 15 December 2011. Emboldened Hamas renews calls for the end of Israel. *The Independent*, p. 34.
NORTON-TAYLOR, R., 29 July 2010a. Blair brought military close to seizing up, says ex-army chief. *The Guardian*, p. 14.
NORTON-TAYLOR, R., 7 October 2010b. Briton killed by US drone 'had wanted to attack UK'. *The Guardian*, p. 5.
SHERMAN, J., 28 July 2010. 'Thousands of civil servants have nothing to do – but it's too expensive to fire them'. *The Times*, p. 5.

References
BAKHTIN, M. M., 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
BAKHTIN, M. M., 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Translated by C. Emerson. London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
BEDNAREK, M., 2006a. Epistemological positioning and evidentiality in English news discourse: A text-driven approach. *Text and Talk*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 635-660.
BEDNAREK, M., 2006b. *Evaluation in media discourse*: *Analysis of a newspaper corpus*. London and New York: Continuum.
BEDNAREK, M., 2007. Polyphony in appraisal: Typological and topological perspectives. *Linguistics and Human Cognition*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 107-136.
BELL, A., 1991. *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
BERGLER, S., 1992. *Evidential analysis of reported speech*. Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University.
BERGLER, S., 2006. Conveying attitude with reported speech. In J. G. Shanahan, Y. Qu and J. Wiebe, eds. *Computing attitude and affect in text: Theory and applications*. Dordrecht: Springer Verlag, pp. 11-22.
CALSAMIGLIA H. and LOPÉZ FERRERO C., 2005. Role and position in scientific voices: Reported speech in the media. *Discourse Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 147-173.
CARLSON, L. and MARCU, D., 2001. Discourse tagging reference manual. ISI technical report. ISI-TR-545. [Accessed 11 September 2001] Available at: https://www.isi.edu/~marcu/discourse/tagging-ref-manual.pdf
DOWNING, A., 2000. Nominalisation and topic management in leads and headlines. In E. Ventola, ed. *Discourse and community: Doing functional linguistics*. Tübingen: Verlag, pp. 355-378.
FEEZ, S., IEDEMA, R. and WHITE, P., 2008 *Media literacy*. Surry Hills: Adult Migration Education Service.
FLOYD, A., 2000. The reporting verbs and bias in the press. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, vol. 13, pp. 43-52.
FRANCIS, G., 1994. Labelling discourse: An aspect of nominal-group lexical cohesion. In M. Coulthard, ed. *Advances in written text analysis*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 83-101.
GARCÍA RIAZA, B., 2012. Attribution and thematization patterns in science popularization articles of the Guardian newspaper. PhD dissertation, Universidad de Salamanca.
GARRETSON, G. and ÄDEL, A., 2008. Who is speaking? Evidentiality in US newspapers during the 2004 presidential campaign. In A. Ädel and R. Reppen, eds. C*orpora and discourse: The challenges of different settings*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 157-187.
GRUBER, H., 1993. Evaluation devices in newspaper reports. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 19, pp. 469-486.
HALLIDAY, M.A.K. and MATTHIESSEN, C.M.I.M., 2004. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.
HUNSTON, S., 1995. A corpus study of some English verbs of attribution. *Functions of Language*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 133-158.

HUNSTON, S., 1999. Evaluation and the planes of discourse: Status and value in persuasive texts. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson, eds. *Evaluation in context: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 176-207.

LEECH, G. and SHORT, M., 2007. *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

LEMKE, J., 1998. Resources for attitudinal meaning: Evaluative orientations in text semantics. *Functions of Language*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 33-56.

MANN, W. C. and THOMPSON, S. A., 1988. Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 243-281.

MARTIN, J. R., 1997. Analysing genre: Functional parameters. In F. Christie and J. R. Martin, eds. *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school*. London and New York: Cassell, pp. 3-39.

MARTIN, J. R. and WHITE, P. R. R., 2005. *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London and New York: Palgrave.

PIAZZA, R., 2009. News is reporting what was said: Techniques and patterns of attribution. In L. Haarman and L. Lombardo, eds. *Evaluation and stance in war news: A linguistic analysis of American, British and Italian television news reporting of the 2003 Iraqi war*. London and New York: Continuum, pp. 170-194.

SANDERS, J. and REDEKER, G., 1993. Linguistic perspective in short news stories. *Poetics*, vol. 22, pp. 69-87.

SEMINO, E., SHORT, M. and CULPEPER, J., 1997. Using a corpus to test a model of speech and thought presentation. *Poetics*, vol. 25, pp. 17-43.

SEMINO, E. and SHORT, M., 2004. *Corpus stylistics: Speech, writing and thought presentation in a corpus of English writing*. London and New York: Routledge.

SMIRNOVA, A. V., 2009. Reported speech as an element of argumentative newspaper discourse. *Discourse and Communication*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 79-103.

URBANOVÁ, Z., 2013. *The function of direct forms of presentation in the generic structure of newspaper reports*. PhD dissertation, Charles University.

WAUGH, L. R., 1995. Reported speech in journalistic discourse: The relation of function and text. *Text*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 129-173.

WHITE, P. R. R., 1997. Death, disruption and the moral order: The narrative impulse in mass-media 'hard news' reporting. In F. Christie and J. R. Martin, eds. *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school*. London and New York: Cassell, pp.101-133.

WHITE, P. R. R., 1998. *Telling media tales: The news story as rhetoric*. PhD dissertation, University of Sydney.

WHITE, P. R. R., 2000. Media objectivity and the rhetoric of news story structure. In E. Ventola, ed. *Discourse and community: Doing functional linguistics*. Tübingen: Verlag, pp. 379-397.

WHITE, P. R. R., 2012. Exploring the axiological workings of 'reporter voice' news stories: Attribution and attitudinal positioning. *Discourse, Context and Media*, vol. 1, pp. 57-67.

Author's address and contact details
PhDr. Zuzana Nádraská, Ph.D.
University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy
Department of English and American Studies
Studentská 84
Pardubice
532 10
Czech Republic
Email: zuzana.nadraska@upce.cz