

PREFACIO

JUANA I. MARÍN ARRESE

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Este volumen recoge una serie de capítulos que ilustran los objetivos de investigación y trabajos del grupo ‘Discurso y Comunicación en Lengua Inglesa: Estudios de Lingüística Cognitiva y Funcional’ (DISCOM-COGFUNC) (Ref. 930160), <<https://www.ucm.es/discom-cogfunc/>>. El grupo fue creado y validado positivamente en 2004, convocatoria GR201/04. Desde 2005 ha venido recibiendo subvenciones en las diversas convocatorias del Programa de Creación y Consolidación de Grupos de Investigación UCM-CAM. Agradecemos la ayuda para este volumen del Vicerrectorado de Política Científica, Investigación y Doctorado, UCM. En la actualidad es un grupo de investigación consolidado UCM, y recientemente ha recibido la evaluación de Excelente por la Agencia Estatal de Investigación (AEI). Desde los inicios del *Campus de Excelencia Internacional-Moncloa*, el grupo está integrado como miembro del Clúster de Patrimonio Cultural.

La finalidad del grupo DISCOM-COGFUNC (930160) es la descripción, el análisis y la interpretación, y a la postre la explicación de diversos fenómenos del discurso desde distintas perspectivas teóricas (Lingüística Cognitiva, Lingüística Funcional, Estudios Críticos del Discurso, Análisis del Discurso Multimodal) y metodológicas (Lingüística de Corpus, Lingüística Contrastiva), y atendiendo a una variedad de aspectos socioculturales (Interculturalidad, Género, y otros). Se trata de estudiar los diversos modos, recursos y estrategias de comunicación y de representación mediante los cuales creamos significados y los transmitimos, a menudo de forma indirecta, o mediante formas o expresiones que pueden resultar ambiguas u opacas, y, precisamente por ello, pueden constituir una forma efectiva de producir o reproducir determinadas ideologías, y de realizar diversos tipos de estrategias de (des)legitimación en dominios discursivos

y géneros tan variados como el discurso publicitario, el discurso político y de los medios de comunicación, el discurso narrativo, o el de los medios sociales.

El objetivo de este volumen es la transferencia del conocimiento y la difusión de la investigación de los componentes del grupo sobre la relación entre lenguaje, discurso y sociedad. El volumen contiene nueve capítulos, en los que cada autor/a presenta los resultados de su investigación, para audiencias especializadas y no especializadas. Esperamos que el lector tome conciencia de los mecanismos y estrategias de construcción del significado, de la representación de actores sociales y eventos, de persuasión y manipulación, y de construcción de identidades, presentes en las formas de discurso a través de las que interactuamos en nuestra vida diaria. Querría expresar mi gratitud a las co-editores/as y autores/as, que han contribuido a hacer posible este volumen.

STANCE AND SUBJECTIVITY IN DISCOURSE

JUANA I. MARÍN ARRESE

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a tradition in discourse studies, as Martin & White (2005: 92) note, in which «all utterances are seen as in some way stanced or attitudinal». The multifaceted nature of stance, the expression of beliefs, evaluations or value judgements, attitudes or emotions, or the way we align or disalign with particular positions or information advanced by others in social interaction, has been addressed from diverse and often overlapping perspectives and frameworks, such as the work on *stance* (Biber & Finegan, 1989), *affect* (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989), *assessments* (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992), *evaluation* (Thompson & Hunston, 2000), *hedging* (Hyland, 1998), *attitude* and *engagement* (Martin & White, 2005), and *stancetaking* (Englebretson, 2007).

Stancetaking strategies by speakers and writers involve the use of a variety of lexico-grammatical elements which «overtly express an evaluative frame for some other proposition» (Biber et al., 1999: 967). These expressions of dialogical positioning may involve the striving for control of conceptions of reality and providing justificatory support for a proposition (epistemic stance), the striving for control of relations at the level of reality (effective stance), or they may express their evaluative positioning (evaluative stance) with respect to the representation of events and social actors (van Dijk, 1998; Englebretson, 2007; DuBois, 2007; van Leeuwen, 2008; Jaffe, 2009; Marín-Arrese, 2009, 2011a, 2015; Boye, 2012; Langacker, 2013; Thompson & Alba-Juez, 2014; Wodak & Meyer, 2015).

The expression of stance and dialogical positioning relates to issues of inter/subjectivity, to the ways and the extent to which speakers/writers are explicitly or implicitly present in the discourse and text, and take overt or covert responsibility for their communicated propositions (Langacker, 1991, 2007, 2009, 2013; Nuyts, 2001, 2012).

A related concern is the ways in which stance resources are used as strategies of persuasion, and serve the strategic functions of legitimisation and coercion in discourse (Chilton & Schäffner 1997; Marín-Arrese, 2011b). Chilton (2004: 117) observes that one basic type of legitimising strategy is essentially epistemic in that it has to do «with the speaker's claim to have better knowledge, recognition of the 'real' facts». A second type of legitimisation strategy is deontic, where «the speaker claims, explicitly or implicitly, to be not only 'right' in a cognitive sense, but 'right' in a moral sense».

This chapter aims to explore the potential applications of this framework for the critical analysis of stance and subjectivity in discourse, and to reveal the various epistemic and effective strategies of legitimisation of knowledge and actions.

2. EPISTEMIC VS. EFFECTIVE STANCE

In characterising the domain of stance, two macro categories of stance are posited: the epistemic and the effective (Marín-Arrese, 2009, 2011a). These draw on Langacker's (2007) distinction between the epistemic and the effective level in the grammar. As Langacker (2009: 291) notes, «Epistemic relations are those which hold at the level of **knowledge**, and thus involve **conceptions** of reality. By contrast, **effective** relations hold at the level of reality per se». In terms of the discourse these categories reflect the systematic opposition between striving for control of conceptions of reality and striving for control of relations at the level of reality (Langacker, 2013).

Epistemic stance pertains to speaker/writer's striving for control of conceptions of reality, which involves their estimation of the veracity of the event designated and the likelihood of its realization, and/or their specification of the sources whereby they feel entitled to make an assertion (Marín-Arrese, 2009, 2011a). The conceptual domain of epistemicity or «justificatory support», as Boye (2012: 2-3) consistently argues, comprises the «subcategories evidentiality and epistemic modality». Epistemic modality has been defined in the literature in terms of speaker's degree of certainty or degree of commitment concerning the proposition, or as Boye (2012: 21) argues, the degree of «epistemic support» for a proposition. Evidentials have been characterized as primarily indicating the source of information (Aikhenvald, 2004), and the evidence on the basis of which the speaker feels entitled to make a claim (Anderson, 1986), or as «epistemic justification» for the proposition (Boye, 2012: 2-3). Within

epistemic stance resources we also include verbs of mental state or cognitive attitude, which indicate speakers/writers' reflective attitudes or beliefs regarding the described event (Capelli, 2007), and personal and impersonal cognitive factive predicates, which are generally defined as presupposing the truth of the proposition designated by their complement clause (Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970) (cf. Marín-Arrese, 2009, 2011a).

- (1) *Epistemic modality*: The reason for the indifference **may** <EM, SI> lie in the nature of the celebration, which is to mark the Queen's Golden Jubilee (CESJD¹-ELG²).
- (2) *Inferential Evidentiality*: Chained to each other and restrained by leg irons and handcuffs, the prisoners look like helpless victims. The photographer **appears** <IE, IO> to have caught their captors in the course of a gross violation of human rights (CESJD-ELT).
- (3) *Cognitive attitude*: Standing shoulder-to-shoulder with a triumphant, reinvigorated and providence-driven Bush will, **I think** <CGA, SE>, simply infuriate the Labour workers, MPs and many ministers on whom he depends for further successful years in office (CESJD-EOG).
- (4) *Cognitive factives*: Thanks to Lord Butler, we have seen the original intelligence, and **we know** <FTV, IE> that the dossier was not a fair representation of it - it was sexed up (CESJD-EOG).

Effective stance pertains to the positioning of the speaker/writer with respect to the realization of events, to the ways in which the speaker/writer carries out a stance act aimed at determining or influencing the course of reality itself. Effective stance strategies exert a direct persuasive function on hearers/readers' acceptance of action plans and events, by expressing the directive force to carry out an act, or by claiming the social desirability,

¹ Comparable Corpus of English and Spanish Journalistic Discourse (CESJD), 1999-2012, compiled and annotated by Juana I. Marín Arrese (JMA): opinion columns, leading articles, and news-reports from The Guardian & The Times (426,574 words)

² The annotation system for the texts of the CESJD-JMA corpus is the following: ELG: English-Leading article-The Guardian; ELT: English-Leading article-The Times

EOG: English-Opinion column-The Guardian; EOT: English-Opinion column-The Times

ENG: English-News reports-The Guardian; ENT: English-News reports-The Times

advisability or requirement of a particular act or event, by expressing intention or determination to carry out those action plans, or more indirectly by indicating their feasibility or enabling circumstances (Marín-Arrese 2009, 2011a). Effective stance resources include a variety of lexico-grammatical elements: expressions of directivity, such as deontic modals, imperatives and hortatives and various forms of directive speech acts; personal and impersonal predicates expressing normativity or intentionality, as well as modals of volition; and modals of possibility expressing potentiality (Marín-Arrese, 2009, 2011a).

- (5) *Directivity*: This leads to a deeper issue that Mr Blair **must** <DIR, SI> ponder as he contemplates the slump in his popularity and plans his re-election campaign. This can be put as a simple question: Does Mr Blair want to go down in history as a cautious, competent consolidator or as the leader of a hyperactive Government of radical reform? (CESJD-EOT).
- (6) *Normativity*: We are left with the English language, and since that is all we are left with, **it is essential** <NRM, IO> that immigrants with no English or poor English be taught the language. For, unless they speak English, it is hard to see how they can become British; and if they don't become British, they will remain unassimilated foreigners (CESJD-EOT).
- (7) *Intentionality*: Along with millions in this country who care about poverty overseas, Oxfam welcomed the Blair commitment to put Britain at the forefront of the fight against poverty in Africa. Now **we want** <INT, IE> to see policies that match the rhetoric (CESJD-EOG).
- (8) *Potentiality*: The policy is also a recognition of a shift in world economic power, headlined by the emergence of China, India and others as nations shaping the future, while the importance of the US and Europe declines. It implies an appreciation that the UK economy needs to be rebalanced in favour of the production of things **we can** <POT, SE> sell abroad — easy to say, harder to do (CESJD-ELG).

In addition to their contentful meaning, epistemic and effective stance expressions are also indexical of the speaker/writer's subjective and intersubjective construal (Langacker 1991b, 2002), and relate to the notion of speaker/writer commitment to and/or responsibility for the communicated proposition (Nuyts 2001, 2012).

3. INTER/SUBJECTIVITY

The formulation of subjectivity as the capacity of the speaking self to view him/herself as subject of enunciation (*sujet d'énonciation*) is found in the seminal work by Benveniste (1966 [1958]). He drew attention to the fact that the relationship of 'intersubjectivity' between the speaker/writer and hearer/reader is a basic condition for linguistic communication. As Finegan (1995:1-2) defines the notion, subjectivity «concerns expression of self and the representation of a speaker's (or, more generally, a locutionary agent's) perspective or point of view in discourse» («a speaker's imprint»). The subjectivity of discourse is a crucial factor or facet of language, since it concerns «language as an expression –an incarnation, even– of perceiving, feeling, *speaking subjects*». Lyons (1977, 1995) and Traugott (1995) are concerned with the expression of self, with how the semantics of an expression relates to the speaker (subjectivity) or whether it is non-speaker-related (objectivity). An 'objective' use of language has been typically associated with linguistic expressions where the speaker/writer's viewpoint is not explicitly invoked (i.e., nominalization, passive construction, etc.). The use of more 'subjective' language is associated with various ways in which the speaker/writer is present in the discourse, either through indexing the current speaker's perspective and his/her sources information (evidentiality), through the expression of his/her epistemological stance (epistemic modals, cognitive predicates, etc.), or through the expression of his/her effective stance.

Subjectivity in terms of speaker-relatedness (subjectivity) vs. non-speaker-relatedness (objectivity) should be distinguished from Langacker's (1991a, 1997, 2000) notion of subjectivity, which always involves a connection to the speaker/writer. Langacker's (1991a: 316-317) conception of subjectivity is explained drawing on perceptual notions. In any viewing arrangement, there are two basic components: the viewer (**V**) or 'subject of perception', and what is perceived or the 'object of perception' (**P**). In a situation of *optimal viewing arrangement* there is maximal asymmetry between the viewer or *subject* of perception and the scene viewed or *object* of perception: the *subject* of perception remains 'offstage', implicit and non-salient, whereas the *object* of perception is 'onstage', salient and constitutes «the explicit focus of attention».